

## **SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES FROM RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON SBNI**

1. The definition of safeguarding was commented on by many respondents. Most felt that it was too wide and that including the accidental injury of a child, would take the SBNI focus away from significant harm of children. The comment was also made that the membership reflected a focus on the non-accidental rather than the accidental harm of children.
2. A number of respondents raised the issue of a lack of connection between the SBNI and the children's Services Planning process. They felt that it was vital that the planning process should be firmly embedded in the operation of the SBNI but they were not sure how this was planned.
3. NICCY made the point that the Chair should not be involved in the management of the SBNI but should follow the approach taken within their organisation and have an operations officer, sitting below the chair, to run the business. A number of responses argued for a full time appointment rather than a three day a week role.
4. The representation of key interests was frequently commented on, some noting the tension between full representation and creating an unworkable body which would be too large to manage. Key points were made regarding having designated officers to support the SBNI with particular areas of expertise. Examples being a paediatrician, designated teacher, and nurse, and so on.
5. Doubt was raised as to whether children and young people had been involved in the preparation of the proposal and the extent of the consultation that was undertaken with young people prior to bringing forward our proposals.

6. The needs of particular groups of children, in particular children with a disability or children from ethnic minority groups require specific consideration in the structure. This absence was noted and caused concern in some respondents that their needs may not be adequately represented.