



SCOTTISH

**CHILDREN'S REPORTER**

ADMINISTRATION

## Scottish Children's Reporter Administration Minute of Information Governance Leads held on Tuesday 23 August 2022 via Microsoft Teams

**Present:**

Alistair Hogg (chair), Angela Mitchell, Hannah McCulloch, Paul Mulvanny, Janet Robertson, Jacqueline Johnston, Bruce Knight, Gill Short, Stephen Eodanable, Nicola Baird, Donald Lamb, Craig Brown (stepping in for Jaqueline), Gwen McNiven, Victoria Ritchie and Kerry-Ann Kean

		<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Apologies</b> Jacqui Stephen, Sheena Banks, Ed Morrison, Maryanne McIntyre, Jo Donald, Pamela Armstrong, Kelly Campbell, Helen Etchells and Isobel Irvine</p>		
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Any other Business</b> One item added:</p> <p><b>i) Stephen Eodanable – CSAS Warning Box</b></p> <p>Following on from the ND audit report findings. One interpretation of the SOM is that only Rule 16 and PI sibling should be contained in the CSAS warning box. Wanted to establish if there is merit in other urgent information being included. IG team have suggested additional wording for SOM as to what can and cannot be saved in the box. Suggested adding dates to notes being added into warning box. Also considering putting communication on Connect. Asked if this was an issue across the board. There seemed to be different levels of reliance and use of the warning box across localities with recognition that it can get messy. DL concerned that dates would not necessarily be completely recorded, causing potential confusion. Consensus was that a consistent approach needs to be agreed across the organisation, based on feedback.</p>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Minutes of last Meeting (24 May 2022)</b> Gill Short - minutes could be clearer. Specifically X and Y case and wording of item 2. GS will speak with SE to revise wording. Will wait until it arises on this agenda to discuss further.</p> <p>JR – it was Christina and Michelle Hamilton that had spoken to other LRM's on enveloping. Minutes to be amended.</p> <p><b>Matters arising</b></p> <p>Restrictiveness of CSAS - this is going to be picked up within the Data Quality group looking specifically at duplicate records. Group has decided to put together a questionnaire to staff who have created duplicate records to try and separate facts from opinions. Try to understand if people knew they were creating a duplicate or if it were due to system issues, like being unable to search for existing record.</p> <p><b>Updates on actions from previous minutes</b></p> <p>Alistair welcomed Jacqueline Johnston who has taken over from Jim McClafferty.</p> <p>Item 7 - BK requested a copy of the ND audit.</p>	<p><b>ASAP</b></p> <p><b>ASAP</b></p> <p><b>ASAP</b></p>	<p><b>GS/SE/ JD</b></p> <p><b>JD</b></p> <p><b>HM</b></p>

		Timescale	Action
	<p>Envelope Provision – PM - ongoing communications with Royal Mail on this. Barcode issues with black envelopes. Aspiring to get consistent approach where we all use same envelope that do not cause data protection risks.</p> <p>Restricted folders for managers – SE - communication went out on Connect last month. No timescale but will be advised when these are all completed. Uniquely for storage of performance management records to be retained for 4 years. They will be clearly named and it will be obvious what should be stored within them.</p> <p>Storage of court-related documents – SE - initial discussions at last meeting were that after appeal period expired there could be a housekeeping exercise where records could be deleted. JM flagged risk with this as even after appeal they could be required. Practice checked back and there have only been five s110 applications in last 10 years and only one passed the test and was passed to stage 2. Initially did not feel it was proportionate to retain records for one, but decision made that retention was probably necessary. GS noted that it is not just 110 applications that can be necessary to revisit in subsequent years, but other evidence too. Storage capacity was discussed, especially with refurbishments ongoing within localities. Also time limits for storage and the possibility of a central location with proper indexing. SE to discuss further with GS.</p>	<p><b>Before next meeting</b></p>	<p><b>SE/GS</b></p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Retention of records update</b></p> <p>Close to final draft which is in line with what has been approved by EMT. Feedback requested from all. Obvious concern was what IG would need from LRM's in regards to retaining cases. Examples could be added to the retention policy to assist future requestors. Plan is that IG will have function to activate the retention, telling the system not to delete it and give ample time for localities to get in touch. Localities will be notified on 172 cases where retention flag had already been ticked which will take approx. one month. Automated retention goes live in November so the 172 cases would need to be looked at prior to that. The majority apply to children under 16 so SE unsure why retention ticked. Two options – send round a list, or remove against all and everyone will have opportunity to make a request. SE can circulate 16 years and above to reduce need for reviews. DL clarified that the data will be anonymised in the data warehouse following 18<sup>th</sup> birthday. <u>Data warehouse is purely reflection of CSAS so once information has gone from CSAS there is no holding period and the personal information will be completely removed with no opportunity for retrieval.</u> BK addressed the issue of things not covered by the policy such as paper files and info held in G:Drives. These should not be held either but the focus is on CSAS at this stage, and these areas will be addressed in time. PM noted that with office refurbishments ongoing, paper files are being cleared out which is reassuring. Donna may have the G:Drive issue in hand but BK confirmed the recent focus has been on H:Drives. DL sought clarification on how far the policy goes. Does it include records not attached to children e.g. joint reports and associates? Standard Prosecution Report 2 may have multiple children on one document with one reaching 18 but including a younger sibling. SE happy to take these queries to Douglas Cameron. However, everyone has agreed to the basic principle of it and the automation feature should go live in November. There would be an annual review 20 days before the child's birthday and IG will contact relevant LRM. GS referenced the Practice team retaining information from appeals to the High Court. This is mostly anonymised and retention shouldn't apply to anonymised information. GS believed that the final paragraph re stats and research exception is</p>		

		<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Action</b>
	superfluous as this isn't case identifiable information. GS asked if a review period should be included and also noted G:Drive issue.		
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>ND Group workstreams</b></p> <p>AH – Really good meeting last week. Potential solution to the recording of decisions and statutory documents where we would like these to be c/o Principal Reporter. The IT team introducing this but it appears to be possible that a Reporter can continue to record the decision as they do now, but the system will generate the documents with crucial information replaced with a form of wording that is still to be agreed. If that all becomes possible we need to consider if this should apply to all cases or only ND cases. Everything will be legally and properly recorded but when the documents are generated they will automatically be redacted and contain the amended information e.g. child is to reside in care of Principal Reporter. This will require a request process, so people can access the full non-redacted version and a process where we can produce that. The Group hope to finalise it for their next meeting in September and then will agree a timescale for implementation. There are many cases where this would have prevented a breach.</p> <p>Discussions took place regarding possibility of amending Rule 16 to include <i>prospective</i> whereabouts of child. Would cut down the risk of breaches.</p> <p>Discussed envelope checks and need to give this further thought and how it relates with two redaction checks required in CSAS, also, what is expected at stage of putting documents into envelopes.</p>		
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Training update</b></p> <p>SE - on behalf of JD - training got off to a great start some sessions included over 40 participants. 418 staff have received training, 24 on long term leave or secondment. 55 number still to sign up. This is of concern if breach occurs and ask that remaining 55 be encouraged to book on. Sessions now booked through iTrent. Asked those who attended to complete a survey. We will look at this and report any useful feedback to help formulate future training. AH asked for distribution lists to be kept up to date which sparked further discussion between GS and BK. Distribution lists are generated through staff directory or manually done by IT team or managers themselves. You can see if there is an owner when you go to the directory (search for dist. list&gt;right click&gt;properties).</p>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Dist. list owners</b>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>IG Leads Development day</b></p> <p>AH – requested suggestions and ideas for what was to be included in the day. This is not a requirement but came out of different groups and forums. A Development day would be an opportunity to take time out of meeting with a usual agenda and see how IG Leads operates as a group. Is what we do now helpful, do we have the right representation etc. Explore the idea of an external speaker from an organisation that experiences similar issues to SCRA. SE had received some ideas. Not been developed and still open to what would be most beneficial. Get in touch if any more ideas. Discuss at next meeting.</p>	<b>Before or by next meeting</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>6 Monthly Report summary</b></p> <p>AH &amp; SE - report goes to A&amp;R committee. Overall data breaches trend is in the right direction. Going down but not steeply down. In relation to data</p>		

		<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Action</b>
	breaches and ND breaches there is stability. Appears to be a lot more under control although they are still occurring and cause anxiety and stress for staff as well as children and families. Focus on them should continue. Developments in relation to ND may help this again. Committee all recognised a trend in the right direction. AH thanked everyone for their efforts in minimising breaches.		
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Notifying an affected party of a data breach</b></p> <p>SE – This matter has arisen a few times recently. Different approaches to this. We are only obliged to notify an affected party if we assess the risk is high. Some localities feel it is a courtesy and others feel opposite. Where there is nothing affected parties can do they will be often be annoyed and this may invite a complaint. Stephen happy to get involved in conversation when locality is making the decision as to whether to notify a family. Need to notify someone if there is an option where they can take action. Stephen suggests if low risk no merit in advising families as causes additional stress.</p>		
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Breach form on Connect (details being saved)</b></p> <p>SE – reminded everyone the breach notification form has warning in text that it must be saved then edited and not saved when on Connect. It has happened a few times recently. Polite reminder can it be passed on to everyone.</p>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Redacting previous ND addresses from RoPs</b></p> <p>JJ – this is something discussed within their locality. They are now back to standard papers where they include all RoPs. Redaction should apply if ND historical but CMS information didn't come through as redacted in the migration. Wanted to discuss what is the higher risk – missing something or putting everything in, as it is not always easy going through old cases notes? AH responded that a lot of work is currently being done on this by Alison in Practice. Quite complex with a need to categorise things to simplify, whilst maintaining adherence to statutory duties. Different scenarios depend how far back or forward we go. PD changed in 2017 with names of carers no longer recorded on RoPs, so if it's migrated from CMS it will come over unredacted. Scenario where a former ND case which is no longer ND would mean releasing information that was previously ND. This raises IG questions. Legal obligation to provide all previous decisions and reasons and CHS were insistent we returned to that. There has been a lot to consider and it is on the radar. In the meantime continue redacting if the case is ND but if it is no longer ND then different consideration should be given as there is no legal requirement to do so, but some Reporters may feel uncomfortable sending out information that was previous withheld. DL has been able to pull lists and assess what category they fall into. If the concern is about disclosing previous placement at point of arranging a Hearing then a conversation with SW could take place. Discussion then took place in the group and the consensus was that Reporters felt more comfortable erring on the side of caution, despite the additional time it might take to redact information. Sometimes Social Workers don't know the history so it is better to not share the information. There is a risk of applying ND to those who don't require it but that is a lower risk than not applying redaction to those that may cause an issue. GS confirmed that the duty is to withhold the address as that's what the measure is, so no need to be concerned with schools information. AH commented that the discussion had been helpful and he would liaise with Alison.</p>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>AH</b>

		<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Examples of good locality practise or issues arising</b></p> <p>VR – avoided 2 near misses by checking page numbers against number of pages in HIP at envelope stage on ND cases.</p> <p>JJ – support team phone SW department when doing notifications to check address, so if something is posted and it's incorrect we know we have received it straight from SW. Easier for them as it is a smaller community, but it works really well. Sometimes the address is still not an up-to-date one. The parent calls and says they informed SW that they had moved a few weeks ago, but we have acted on what SW advised as they are in closer contact with family. Or, report comes in with different address and SW haven't updated their system.</p>		
<b>13.</b>	<p><b>New risks</b></p> <p>DL – Unusual event occurred recently. ND lists are sent out fortnightly to SW and Health Board. Child resides in Renfrewshire and that is their Local Authority, but HB Ayrshire &amp; Arran got in touch. AH advised that implementation authority should be notified of this, as it is their responsibility.</p> <p>BK – phishing scams require monthly update. Suggested a monthly report for Connect as risks are enormous.</p>		
<b>14.</b>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b>  <b>Tuesday 22nd November 2022 – via Teams @ 13:30</b>  AH thanked everyone for attending the meeting.</p>		