



SCOTTISH

**CHILDREN'S REPORTER**

ADMINISTRATION

## Scottish Children's Reporter Administration Minute of Information Governance Leads held on Tuesday 21st May 2024 via Microsoft Teams

**Present:**

Stephen Eodanable (chair), Jo Donald, Jackie Johnston, Donald Lamb, Hannah McCulloch, Gwen McNiven, Janet Robertson, Kelly Scarlett, Jennifer McIlree, Kerry-Ann Kean, Angela Mitchell, Jacqui Stephen, Julie Duncan, Caroline McCall, Victoria Thorpe, Ross Montieth, Claire Veitch, Jay Knezovic

		<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies</b> Alistair Hogg, Bruce Knight, Neill Mitchell, Sheena Banks		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Any other Business</b> None		
<b>3.</b>	<p>Minutes of last Meeting (21<sup>st</sup> February 2024) Accepted as correct.</p> <p>Matters arising Updates on actions from previous minutes</p> <p>(i) <b>Objective Connect Test of Change – update SE</b> – After reiterating the background to this item, SE explained that Douglas Cameron had previously highlighted that given the sizes of HIPs, these would be too large to send via Outlook. He offered to update CSAS to allow the sending of direct emails from CSAS in a PDF format. This fed into workstreams and should have taken around 3 months to complete without significant costs. Coinciding with this was the NS project which was trying to identify long-term solutions and look at uptake. This has slowed down the progression on to CSAS but hopefully the project will lead to a solution. It was agreed to take this off the IG Leads agenda for the time being.</p> <p>(ii) <b>Quality of breach reports and accountability of managers – SE</b> – This concerns the updating of the breach reporting form. The form is clearer now and the comments on the changes proposed were all positive. There are ongoing HR and Unison discussions regarding identifying the person responsible for the breach, but reassurances have been offered. JD is awaiting the outcome because she will be using the new form in her breach prevention training video.</p> <p>(iii) <b>Uploading of documents on CSAS with a view to future SARs – HM</b> – OD were able to change RoPs to save a PDF version. They auto-generate as PDFs and upload into Sharepoint. There is an option to make changes in Word e.g. Change of Panel Member and then convert into PDF to re-upload.</p> <p>(iv) <b>Royal Mail delivery of Court documents – SE</b> – This concerned whether we should consider introducing a freepost service to have mail returned if it is unmarked SCRA. It was decided that there was no real benefit for freepost when we receive very few complaints about 'signed for' mail being mis-posted with 'SCRA addressee only' marked on the envelope with return details.</p> <p>(v) <b>CSAS dropdowns – SB</b> – Moved to next meeting as Sheena unable to attend.</p> <p>(vi) <b>Integrity of recorded RoPs – DL</b> – The only solution for it is to have Panel Members electronically signing the papers themselves in the Hearing but this is highly technical, and we are far from that capability at present. This</p>	<p><b>Update next meeting</b></p> <p><b>Next meeting</b></p>	<p><b>SE</b></p> <p><b>SB</b></p>

		Timescale	Action
	<p>work is currently in a backlog. VT commented that there are lots of RoPs with an incorrect Chair named on them and a correction would be useful. This item can be reintroduced to the agenda if there is an update.</p> <p>(vii) <b>Outlook Retention (prev item 6) – SE /CM –</b> There was an error made at the last meeting in that it wasn't made clear that the retention discussed applies to Locality Mailboxes only. SE has now clarified. There is usually a 3-month retention period, but this hasn't been applied by SCOTS as yet. There was discussion in the group as to how much this would affect current working practices e.g. if a Locality was asked for a Social Work report that came in more than 3 months previously. JJ commented that she thought it was already an applied 3-month retention as she has to go in and weed out the mailbox. They are not auto deleted but she thought they would rarely need anything longer than 3 months. JK – She does this manually as well and wouldn't want it longer than 3 months. JS advised that they only keep things up to 3 months and deal with this manually. CM wanted to ensure there would be no adverse effects if the 3-month retention was applied as if auto-deletion was applied, items will be gone forever. VT could only think of two occasions where over 3 months would be useful, and she usually does a 3-month deletion. She approved. JR noted that there have been occasions where it has been good to check back but if it's a 3-month rule then she is also happy it goes. CM then discussed the Court Copies mailbox. Donna is looking at options open to us using the latest tech. The timing of 3 month auto-delete is now accepted for Locality mailboxes.</p> <p>(viii) <b>Restricted cases on CSAS — SE –</b> There are currently 75 cases with restricted access. This will be reviewed annually and over time restrictions will be removed. If the restriction is still required, the new form will need to be completed. CSAS Helpdesk will action this. There are some requests that are more questionable than others. Requests will come to IG initially. JS commented that LRMs had asked why they aren't making the decision instead of the IG Team? SE responded that it is Alistair who will make the final decision. IG will approve the request if it is not contentious. If a full justification is not identified, then Alistair will make the final decision. LRMs are unlikely to want to make unjustified requests. The LRM will then receive an annual update. JR noted that her LRMs had no comments to make on the form, but she raised the potential issue of Vicarious Trauma Support. Could this be flagged on the form? SE agreed that this could be added in. SE confirmed that the CSAS team have been sent the form to check if it contains everything they would require. CSAS Helpdesk will bounce back requests without forms.</p> <p>(ix) <b>Email banners – proposed project for external email alerts – RM –</b> The banner project was temporarily paused. A different Microsoft link was used as an alternative. SCOTS devices aren't licensed. The Digital Team has not been able to update Ross in time for this meeting. There has been feedback regarding seeing the banner too often when dealing with public mailboxes causing it to be less beneficial. Where attacks appear to come from inside the organisation, if it appears with a banner, we will know it is from an external source.</p>	<p>Next meeting</p>	<p>RM</p>

		Timescale	Action
4.	<p><b>Removal of personal belongings from Hearing Rooms to allow privacy – SE</b></p> <p>This matter is being raised after a father left his jacket in a Hearing room and left his phone in the pocket, recording the conversation between his child and the Panel Chair. SE wants to know if it is a proportionate response to this incident for us to take some further action. Should we ask people to leave with their belongings? VT knew of a case where the father inappropriately videoed a Hearing. The mother went into a linked Hearing room and was left with lots of high-tech devices. VT asked if they could take this matter to their respective team meetings? Some parents can disrupt Hearings and decision making becomes more challenging. JR will raise in Ayrshire. CM was happy this had been raised and didn't expect it would cause an issue to ask people to take their belongings. JulieD commented that a father filmed her on reception one day and she felt uncomfortable. She is not comfortable with mobile phones in Hearings at all as you don't know how or where recorded information will be shared. SE noted that personal belongings are safer with the person. Agreed to bring this back to the next meeting after discussions with respective teams. If we decide to go ahead with such a request, where should the reminder live e.g.SOM? What do people think?</p>	Next Meeting	All
5.	<p><b>Obligation to inform SCRA of address change – methods of reminding – SE</b></p> <p>Onus on others to update information. SE was keen to know e.g mother has new address, how would that be taken? How do we verify? JK stated that it would be useful to note the child's dob and previous address, which they don't at present. VT stated that they used to have a housekeeping protocol where they would routinely ask 'are you still at this address?' at any encounter with the RP. It is good to capture this. Families are often reluctant to advise the SW team. If they are phoning in, we have to get it in writing too. To be sure we are speaking to the right person, we ask questions such as 'when was the last hearing?' VT will reintroduce the protocol locally. SE would like to introduce a banner at the foot of every letter we send out concerning Hearings asking the reader to update their address with us. This would also have a benefit of mitigating complaints and any claims. JJ has posters up in the building reminding people to update their details. SE believes that people need to be constantly reminded of their responsibility to let us have current details. JK noted that if someone has come to a Hearing, we would assume they received an invite at their current address that we have on record. We need to verify this and ask at reception to let us know if they are moving. The Hearing Reporter might check but it can be difficult during the Hearing and the RP might leave before the end of a Hearing. CM noted that the Reporter is expected to check addresses at the Hearing. SE suggested a scenario where a Hearing is attended, and three months later there is another referral. SCRA writes out and they are no longer at that address. If there is a banner on every letter, we can evidence that we did request an update that would have prevented a breach. There can be no excuses, 'I thought Social Work would let you know' etc. It is about apportioning responsibility. This may feed into a current project. CM asked if we have linked in to the current 'Letters' project? SE responded that we might be too late, but hopefully not. JR stated that anything that would help with addresses would be welcomed. There is a pilot at Ayrshire, Glasgow and Lanarkshire where Support Assistants are contacting families prior to Hearings, with part of that being about checking addresses. Each family will have a named person within a Locality. This kicks off next week to assist prevention of breaches. VT would be keen on an audit trail. They have done something similar in the past and it was effective. JulieD asked at what point were families being contacted? JR explained that this was through a Keeping the Promise offshoot – child-friendly scheduling. 12 weeks before the review flags up and 6 weeks before with Assistant Support. There is a QR code that links to the actual Hearing centre and transport options. We are hoping they get more from it by having personal input. Two-three SA's are interested and involved. JR and JJ will update at next meeting and an agenda item will be created. JM commented that it should help to prevent</p>		New item

		<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Action</b>
	deferred hearings. One thing they are looking at is expenses paid prior to travel which is not what Glasgow usually do.	<b>Next meeting</b>	<b>for JR&amp;JJ</b>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>GDPR Training Update &amp; Cyber Security training (induction and refresher) JoD &amp; RM</b></p> <p>JoD - confirmed that the training for this year will focus on breach prevention rather than GDPR itself. It will comprise 4 parts available online to be completed at the staff member's own pace. Jo is getting to grips with the new tech to help the training delivery and is awaiting sign-off on the new breach form. Training will be available before the next IG Leads meeting in August, so a further update then.</p> <p>RM – There are new forms coming in for Access to CSAS Induction course. Phishing campaigns are being run on a quarterly basis. SCRA staff are generally good at reporting real or test phishing attempts. The advice is still to delete and get rid off such emails or report as follows: Staff are to report suspicious or phishing emails to the Cyber Security and Defence Mailbox and cc the SCRA Security Mailbox including the suspect email as an attachment.</p>		
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Examples of good Locality practice or issues arising</b></p> <p>Some discussed today.</p>		
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>New risks</b></p> <p>No new risks noted.</p>		
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting - Tuesday 20th August 2024 via Teams @ 13:30</b></p> <p>Stephen thanked everyone for attending the meeting.</p>		