

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 16th April, 2014

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 49 - 61)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 19 - 26)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 44 - 56)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 51 - 65)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 28 - 38)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 62 - 74)
7. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 7 - 9)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
13th March, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Doyle, Barron, Dalton, Havenhand, Kaye and Wootton, Vicky Farnsworth (SpeakUp), Robert Parkin (SpeakUp) and Peter Scholey.

Councillor Doyle was also in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beaumont, Goulty, Hoddinott, Middleton, Sims, Watson and Wyatt.

69. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

70. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The Chairman reported receipt of a written question from the Youth Cabinet as follows:-

“Many young people do not know who their School Nurse is, the full range of help and support they provide or how to contact them. We have found that increasingly young people are experiencing mental health issues which may result in self-harm or other related health issues and do not know where to go to for help and support.

Can School Nurses have more of a presence in schools and be accessible to all young people with clear information publicised about the services they provide?”

The Chairman requested that he be supplied with the answer in writing which he would forward to the Youth Cabinet.

71. COMMUNICATIONS**(1) Childhood Obesity Cabinet Response**

The Cabinet's response had been submitted to the Overview and Management Board in January, 2014. Of the 12 recommendations, 10 had been accepted and 2 deferred (revising the report template to show consideration of health implications and promotion of the Rothercard). A monitoring report was due to be submitted to the Commission in July but, as work was currently taking place on the pre-tender questionnaire and current providers continuing until October, it may be more appropriate to delay until a more appropriate time.

(2) Work Programme

The Mental Health Review was to roll over into 2014/15 as the Carers Review and Childhood Obesity mini-Review had been carried out which had not formed part of the original Programme. Mental Health Services was potentially a very large Review so there needed to be a clear focus as to what it should centre upon.

The 2014/15 Work Programme would need to be agreed by June so any suggestions would be welcomed by the end of April.

(3) Public Health Conference

The Chairman reported that he had recently attended the above conference. A written report would be submitted in due course.

(4) "Working Together for a Healthier Rotherham"

The Chairman reported that a conference, entitled as above, was to be held in Rotherham on 16th July, 2014, at the New York Stadium.

(5) Rotherham Heart Town

The initiative had done very well to be short listed for a national award.

72. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 9th and 23rd January, 2014.

Arising from Minute No. 61 (CAMHS), Janet Spurling, Policy Officer, reported that the formal target was approximately 18 weeks. With regard to statistics for the incomplete pathway within 8 weeks i.e. patient waiting, December had stood at 63% and January 66%. In terms of the completed pathway within 8 weeks, i.e. starting treatment (currently defined as the second appointment), it was 79% for December and 71% for January. The CCG was working closely with CAMHS with regard to data quality and revisiting the definitions.

Resolved:- That, with the addition of co-optee members Vicky Farnsworth, Robert Parkin and Peter Scholey being added to the attendance of the 23rd January minutes, the minutes of the meetings held on 9th and 23rd January, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

73. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on (i) 22nd January and (ii) 11th February, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meetings be received and the contents noted.

74. PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICINES WASTE

Stuart Lakin, Head of Medicines Management, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group, presented a report on the work taking place in Rotherham to reduce pharmaceutical and medical waste as identified in the Select Commission's 2013-14 work programme.

The report highlighted that in Rotherham:-

Summary of Savings

- Nationally 10.7% (£831,292,864.99 per annum) of prescribing expenditure was on appliances (continence/stoma), nutritional supplements and wound care products – Rotherham had managed to significantly decrease the cost whilst improving the patient experience
- Estimating that if Rotherham's nutritional expenditure had increased in line with national cost growth trends since the service redesign – then spending would have been 89% higher, a potential saving of £468,125 per annum
- Continence prescribing costs had decreased in Rotherham by -8.99%
- Management of gluten free products through prescribing by the dietician had resulted in a -19.61% decrease
- Stoma prescribing costs had decreased from £964,687 in 2011/12 to £748,159 in 2012/13 (-22.45%)
- The above savings had been achieved by the improved management of prescriptions and regaining prescribing of appliances from the Direct Appliance Contractors – estimated savings of £1,094,753 against Rotherham's 2012/13 prescribing costs

Reducing Waste

- Patients understood that excess medicines was a waste of NHS resources
- Approximately 300 patient questionnaire had been sent directly to patients in 2012 but had not revealed waste as an extensive problem nor identify any causes of waste
- Continence and stoma patients reported receipt of unrequired products or surplus quantities – requests to practices to change the prescription/appliance companies went unheeded. Similar issues with medication from pharmacists
- Patients were genuinely resistant to tell their doctor that they were not taking a particular medication

- Only intervention demonstrated to reduce medicine waste was the adoption of a 28 day prescription policy – 34 of Rotherham's 36 GP practices had this in place
- Pharmacies were paid for everything they dispensed under the current contract

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Care homes tended to throw medication away at the end of the month unnecessarily and order new – no specific figures for care homes but overall waste is estimated at £1.5m in Rotherham
- A pharmacy technician was to be seconded to work with the CCG for a year to look at the pathways of the hospital and wastage
- Consideration was being given to having a pharmacy technician work with care homes. If that resulted in a reduction of waste and saved more than it cost, it may be rolled out across Rotherham
- Need to ensure that patients had a variety of ways to order their prescriptions e.g. out of hours, on line
- Branded versus generic medication
- Consideration given to certain drugs for certain conditions – quality criteria monitoring
- Data was collected by searching the 2 IT systems
- Due to European Legislation, medicines could not be re-issued once they had left the control supply chain even if they had not been opened
- There were very few independent pharmacies in Rotherham – pharmacies were used to competing against each other
- Sheffield – incentivised non-dispense scheme
- The Department of Health had no desire to look at the pharmacy contract in England at present
- Previously if a pharmacy agreed to provide 100 hours a week they would be awarded a pharmacy contract, but now have to prove a need for a pharmacy in a new area

Resolved:- (1) That the progress made in Rotherham in reducing costs with regard to pharmaceutical and medical waste be noted.

(2) That the proposed actions to work towards further reductions in waste be noted.

(3) That a further update be submitted on the progress of the actions outlined in Appendix 1 of the report submitted.

(4) That the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care be requested to ascertain the practice for pharmaceutical and medicines waste in the Local Authority-owned care homes and to consider taking part in a pilot project.

75. SCHOOL NURSING SERVICE

Anna Clack, Public Health, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Healthy Child Programme 5-19

Core ambition to have children and young people who were happier, healthier and ready to take advantage of positive opportunities and reach their full potential

- Framework for universal and progressive services for prevention and early intervention
- Key role was to identify children with high risk and low protective factors
- Partnership working to develop high quality services
- Effective use of resources informed by a local needs assessment
- Delivered to local population regardless of school status – Academies, educated at home
- Evidence based programmes

National Guidance

- Working Together to Safeguard Children
- National Child Measurement Programme 2012/13
- You're Welcome
- Healthy Child Programme

Getting it right for Children and Families – an opportunity to

- Revitalise the profession
- Review and revise local services
- Reaffirm School Nurses as leaders and key deliverers on Public Health
- Develop a framework for local service delivery
- Involve children and young people in Service development
- Provide a Service that is 'in synch with the way young people live their lives'
- Four levels of activity/intervention with safeguarding running through all

Outcome Measures for Children, Young people and Families

- Improved emotional wellbeing of looked after children
- Reduced school absences
- Reduced excess weight
- Reduced under 18 conceptions
- Reduced chlamydia prevalence in 15-24 year olds
- Reduced smoking prevalence
- Reduced alcohol and drug misuse
- Reduced tooth decay in 5 year olds
- Population vaccine cover

Where we are now

- Delivering elements of Healthy Child Programme
- Key professionals in safeguarding children and young people
- NCMP – offering targeted advice and support
- Integrated HV and SN Team to support seamless transition
- Delivery of efficient and effective vaccination programmes
- Use of system one to evidence outcomes
- Working in partnership on Early Help Strategies
- Offering and co-ordinating targeted support for children and families – CAF's
- Use of the 4 level Service model to categorise need in caseloads on SystemOne e.g. Universal Plus
- Working with agencies to promote emotional health at tier 1
- Offering signposting and support on sexual health
- 'brief interventions' to promote healthy lifestyles

What does a good Service look like?

- A high quality evidence based service
- An appropriately skilled School Health Team
- Efficient delivery of our local Service model
- Involvement of children, young people and families and stakeholders in development, review and evaluation
- All children and young people from school entry age have access to a skilled Public Health Nursing Service
- Working in partnership to get best outcomes
- School Nursing recognised as a career opportunity

The updated Rotherham Service Specification

- Focuses on quality health improvement (outcome measures)
- Is detailed and more prescriptive than the previous specifications
- Has to acknowledge the intense work of the vaccination programme and National Child Measuring programme
- Recognises the separate commissioning of the vaccination programme (NHS England responsibility)
- Ensures children and young people from school entry age have access to a skilled Public Health Nursing Service

- Will deliver the specification (still subject to contract negotiations) with a 10% reduction in the Service contract budget

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- School Nursing for Special Schools was commissioned separately by the CCG
- The Service consisted of 15.5 full-time equivalent School Nurses, 2 full-time equivalent Staff Nurses and 3 support staff who carried out the Child Measuring Programme and support
- Usually 1 Team would cover a School Learning Community consisting of 1 secondary school and the cluster primary schools. Some did have 2 secondary schools – it was based on numbers. Academies were involved
- The Service was generally based on need and deprivation scoring, however, some had significantly higher numbers of deprivation
- The caseload was between 3,500-4,000 children per Team
- Public Health commissioned the Service from Rotherham Foundation Trust. It would transfer to the Council hopefully next financial year
- The contract would be performance managed by Public Health
- A large part of the Service/time was spent on the National Child Measuring Programme and School Vaccination and Immunisation Programme which was not a Local Authority responsibility. However, there were issues with regard to the funding of the Programme so it had been agreed that in Rotherham it would be a transition year and the contract for School Nursing and the School Immunisation and Vaccination Service would be separated and contracted separately next year. This was a national problem and had been raised with the Local Government Association
- Some schools did not want to have a School Nurse on site which was an issue for the children not knowing how to access the Service. If the school still wanted a vaccination programme but not necessarily a presence on site, a compromise would be reached. Within the specification this issue had been addressed by the use of social media to promote the Service
- Outcome measures for child protection were statutory and were very clear, stipulated in the Safeguarding priorities

- Concern that the standard of school nursing in Special Schools had deteriorated

Anna was thanked for her presentation.

Resolved:- (1) That the presentation be noted and a future update be provided in due course.

(2) That a report on School Nursing in Special Schools be submitted to a future meeting.

(3) That the Strategic Director, Children's and Young Peoples Services, be contacted to ascertain the position with regard to those schools not participating in the School Nursing Service.

76. BETTER CARE FUND

Kate Green, Policy Officer, and Tom Cray, Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Adult Services, presented a report on the Better Care Fund and how Rotherham had developed a local plan to meet its requirements.

The Fund was announced by the Government in June, 2013, the spending round providing a catalyst for local authorities and Clinical Commissioning Groups to transform and integrate health and social care. It did not offer any new money but provided a single pooled budget made up of money already in the system to support health and social care services to work more closely together in local areas.

The local plan had been developed by a small multi-agency task group of the Health and Wellbeing Board supported by an officer group and contributed to achieving the overarching vision of the Health and Wellbeing Board i.e. "to improve health and reduce health inequalities across the whole of Rotherham".

The action plan (Appendix 2) demonstrated the specific actions that would be delivered locally as part of the Better Care Fund. The actions were aligned to the 4 strategic outcomes of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy as well as demonstrating how locally they contributed to the 6 national conditions.

Locally plans had to deliver against 5 nationally determined measures:-

- Admissions into residential care
- Effectiveness of reablement
- Delayed transfers of care
- Avoidable emergency admissions
- Patient and Service user experience

plus 1 locally agreed measure which Rotherham had chosen as 'emergency readmissions'.

The first draft of the plan had been submitted to NHS England on 14th February, 2014. It was reviewed by NHS England and also by a local authority peer review. Initial feedback was:-

- NHS England suggested that all the information was contained within the plan but needed much more detail before the 4th April submission. Based on what they had seen, it was likely to score "green"
- The Peer Review stated that the plan showed really good evidence and agreed that it was a workable plan. It also referred to engagement with the public and providers, impact on providers, development of actions, degree of transformational change, alignment with Health and Wellbeing Strategy, scoping of projects, finances and transfer of funds from Hospital/Acute Services to Community, Prevention and Early Intervention, performance targets and workforce requirements

Discussion ensued on the report and feedback with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Intention of the Fund to transfer money from Acute to Early Intervention and Prevention but was not new money. However, this was complicated due to the two Government Departments (Health and Communities and Local Government) having differing opinions with regard to the Guidance, with the DoH view being recommissioning of NHS services and the CLG referring to whole system transformation.
- Initial submissions had been assessed against criteria that had not been published at the time they had been submitted
- The Officer and Task Groups were meeting on a regular basis where difficult negotiations were taking place which were not helped by the conflicting Government Guidance
- Performance measures still had to be resolved with the Council's representatives striving to ensure they met the 3 aims i.e. drive change, satisfy NHS England and be stretching but achievable. Clarity was also required with regard to some of the re-commissioned projects as to the potential consequences for the Local Authority relating to funding
- The funding would be paid in 2 or 3 tranches; the first 50% being drawn in April, 2014 and then evidence of performance and transformational change to enable drawing down of the remaining 50%. If not, potentially the money could be withheld by NHS England and a damaged reputation

- There had to be a whole system transformation so the plan needed more emphasis on early intervention and prevention
- The important role of unpaid carers in providing support and contributing towards prevention and early intervention as noted in the recent scrutiny review

Resolved:- (1) That the work undertaken to develop a local Better Care Fund plan be noted.

(2) The Health Select Commission notes with concern the issues regarding the outstanding matters relating to the Better Care Fund submission.

(3) The Health Select Commission wants to be satisfied that the projects submitted have taken account of the effects on the whole system, so that citizen experience was improved end to end.

(4) The Health Select Commission would also like assurance that all aspects of the plan were deliverable and that there were no unfunded consequences for the Local Authority.

(5) That the final Better Care Fund be submitted to this Commission in due course.

77. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF CONTINUING HEALTHCARE

The Director of Health and Wellbeing reported on the progress made on the recommendations from the joint Health and Improving Lives Select Commissions' review into Continuing Health Care (CHC).

A senior management group consisting of both RMBC and NHSR staff had agreed a set of actions to ensure effective multi-disciplinary working and delivery of better outcomes for customers:-

- CHC and Social Care Assessments - An improved working relationship now existed and an understanding of each professional's role in participating in a multi-disciplinary assessment and completing the Decision Support Tool. However, it had yet to be seen whether this would impact upon the financial position as positively as was required.
- Assessment, Decision Making and Access to CHC for Children with Complex Needs - For children and young people with significant needs, there were 2 main areas which needed to be improved. Firstly, reviews of current cases and consideration of a number of new cases which had yet to be assessed and considered by the Panel and secondly, an improved system of decision making through a revised

Continuing Care Panel which complied with national guidance on Children's Continuing Healthcare and 'Who Pays'. There had been a commitment to address the backlog by the end of March, 2014, however, it had since become apparent that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Commissioning Support Unit (CSU) were unable to meet the deadline and it is now likely to be June. It had since been agreed that the CCG would backdate their financial commitment for cases in 2013/14 to the date from which the package of care started for children and young people agreed as eligible for CHC funding and they were seeking clinical assessment support to carry out the work. CCG and Council staff were meeting fortnightly to progress the agreed programme of work.

- Joint Protocol – Had been drafted and work had commenced with Continuing Health Care manager/staff and RMBC CHC Champions – CHC Lead now in post. Specific training for those working in Children's Services would be based upon regional advice following the National Guidance on CHC and take account of the new Panel arrangements. The Protocol would include how to resolve disputes and written guidance for staff produced to ensure consistency and compliance once issued.
- Training – To be delivered jointly by CHC/RMBC leads and rolled out across hospital, Community Health and Social Care Teams. Progress on delivery had been delayed as CCG required to provide information regarding the start date.

It was noted, that since the report had been produced, the training had been stopped and that the CSU had taken the decision to provide training on a regional basis. This was disappointing given the agreement made and also raised concerns about consistency if people were no longer training with their local colleagues.

The RMBC/CHC Senior Management Group, Personalisation Stream, would continue to meet and consider budget issues/develop cost effective delivery of personal health budgets by 1st April, 2014, based on a pilot project implemented from 1st April, 2013.

The latest Yorkshire and Humberside CHC benchmarking information for the final quarter ending 31st March, 2013, revealed that Rotherham was marked 7 out of 15 in terms of the number of people receiving CHC funding. In terms of actual expenditure Rotherham was ranked 10th and, therefore, still below the average spend per person within the region.

It was noted that Healthwatch Rotherham had approached the CCG and CSU regarding concerns expressed by members of the public regarding the lack of information available and the commissioning of reviews. This was echoed across the region.

The CCG held the CHC budget and had commissioned the CSU to carry out assessments and manage the budget, but the performance management arrangements and outcome measures were unclear.

Resolved:- (1) That the update on progress and issues arising from the Scrutiny Review of Continuing Healthcare be noted.

(2) That due to the concerns expressed, the Clinical Commissioning group be requested to attend a future meeting.

78. JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, submitted a report on the new review of Congenital Heart Disease Services and the proposal for the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) (Yorkshire and the Humber) in relation to the review.

The previous work of the JHOSC with regard to the Safe and Sustainable Review of Children's Congenital Cardiac Services in England (SSR) was well known and recorded. There was clear support from the constituent authorities for the work of the JHOSC to continue and for the new review of Congenital Heart Disease Services to benefit from similar robust scrutiny arrangements.

Following the decision to halt the SSR, the JHOSC had continued to meet. It had been made aware of NHS England's intentions for the new review to consider the whole lifetime pathway of care for people with Congenital Heart Disease covering services to both children and adults. The existing terms of reference had been revised to reflect the changed approach and scope of the new review.

Leeds City Council was the administering authority and their Scrutiny Support Unit would continue to provide day-to-day support for the work of the JHOSC. However, in recognition of the level of support already provided and the view from JHOSC members that the new review would benefit from similar robust scrutiny arrangements to those that were in place for the SSR, all constituent authorities had been requested to make a financial contribution of £1,000 per authority for the 2014/15 financial year. A budget for this would need to be identified.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That Councillor Steele, Chairman of the Health Select Commission, be confirmed as its nominee to sit on the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber) in relation to the new review of Congenital Heart Disease Services, in line with the terms of reference submitted.

(3) That a report be submitted to Cabinet recommending to Council:-

(a) the support for the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber) in relation to the new review of Congenital Heart Disease Services, as set out in the terms of reference submitted, be reaffirmed;

(b) that the relevant functions (in relation to the Council) set out in the terms of reference for the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber) be exercisable by that Committee subject to the terms and conditions;

(c) that the Chairman of the Health Select Commission be appointed as the Council's representative to the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber);

(d) that any necessary amendments be made to the Council Constitution.

79. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 13th March, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
20th February, 2014

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Atkin, Beck, Ellis, Godfrey, J. Hamilton, Vines and Watson.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Beaumont and Tweed.

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

54. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

55. COMMUNICATIONS

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser, Scrutiny and Member Development, provided an update following the recent sub-group, chaired by Councillor Atkin, looking at the Corporate Plan outcomes and the way that performance was reported. Two sessions had taken place with staff from the Performance and Quality Team. The first performance report using the format would be submitted in September, 2014. This would also be included in the Self Regulation Select Commission's Work Programme going forward.

56. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9TH JANUARY, 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 9th January, 2014 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

57. BUDGET 2014/15

Further to Minute No. 49 of the meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 9th January, 2014, Stuart Booth, Director of Financial Services, gave a presentation on the financial challenge facing the Council in setting its 2014/15 budget.

The presentation provided information on:-

- The financial challenge update on the 2014/15 budget position.
- Budget summary position 2014/15.
- Additional proposals supported by Cabinet to close the funding gap.
- Increasing Council Tax – impact.
- Impact on households with a Council Tax increase.

- A summary of the key area of savings.
- Next steps.

Discussion ensued on the Council Tax figures and if precepts had already been accounted for which had been included in the Council spend, the verification and robustness of risks and assurances that equality impact assessments had been undertaken for the delivery of services going forward, maximisation of income, impact of the budget savings and the delivery of savings in collaboration of key partners and the continuation of safeguarding children and the most vulnerable.

Resolved:- (1) That Stuart Booth, Director of Financial Services, be thanked for his informative presentation.

(2) That the presentation be received and the contents noted.

58. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST DECEMBER 2013

Further to Minute No. 175 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th February, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by Stuart Booth, Director of Financial Services, which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2013/14 based on performance for the first nine months of the financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would overspend against its Budget by £2.217M (+1.0%). This represented an improvement in the forecast outturn of -£0.882M since the November monitoring report. The main reasons for the forecast overspend continued to be:-

- The continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough.
- Income pressures within Environment and Development and ICT Services.
- Continuing Health Care income pressures within Adult and Children's Services, with concern that this pressure was increasing further.
- Additional, one-off property costs relating to the continued rationalisation of the Council's asset portfolio as part of the efficiency drive to reduce operational costs.
- Some savings targets were currently pending delivery in full in 2013/14.

The moratorium on all except 'essential' spend had been in place since 16th October, 2013 and was contributing to the reduced forecast overspend. Services were continuing to explore opportunities to maximise the flexible use of grant funding, whilst ensuring grant conditions were complied with. Further, the recent opening of the offer for staff to apply for Voluntary Early Retirement/Voluntary Severance (VER/VS) was also generating savings which would contribute to both reducing the in-year pressure and potentially contribute to closing the 2014/15 Budget Gap.

These savings would become more evident in the next monitoring reports as applications were approved and reflected in the revised forecast outturn.

Meetings were taking place with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) about concerns over access to, and timely payment of, Continuing Health Care income for clients with Continuing Health Care needs. An Action Plan was being developed and updates presented to a series of future meetings between early December and the end of the financial year. As the financial impact of these meetings became clearer, this would be reported through to Cabinet.

The Select Commission considered each of the key areas of forecasted spend, whether this was an over or an underspend, in turn and asked a number of questions.

Children and Young People's Services:-

- Current numbers of looked after children and whether an increase would skew the budget causing an in-year pressure.
- Vulnerability of young people with mental health issues and their inclusion on adult wards.
- Complexity of the higher care needs of some children and the impact of this on the budget.
- Recruitment of foster carers and if they had relevant experience/specialism to work with children with more complex care needs;
- Raising of specific questions about looked after children at the meeting of the improving Lives Select Commission on 12th March, 2014 which was being convened to look at this issues and to which an invitation would be extended to all Scrutiny Members of the Council.

Environment and Development Services:-

- Underspend in Streetpride Services and whether this could be used to mitigate some of the risk with grounds maintenance.
- Shortfall in income recovery where income targets were inflated for Parking Services.

Neighbourhoods and Adult Services:-

- Overspend in Adult Services of over £1 million and the plans to resolve this.

Resources:-

- Under recovery of income for ICT Services and the reduced spend on I.T.

Central Services:-

- Forecasted reduction in the transfer of reserves for the HRA statutory ring fenced account.
- Comparisons of agency and consultancy spend across the Directorates and the attempts being made to reduce this expenditure.
- The budget and the scrutiny of this process.

The Select Commission welcomed the questions raised, but suggested that for the latter matters of discussion that consideration be given to revisiting the recommendations of the two Scrutiny Reviews that were undertaken into consultancy and agency spend and the budget process. It was noted that a review into the matters for agency and consultancy spend was currently taking place and it may be timely for this to be included as an agenda item for the next meeting.

The Select Commission requested that for all future budget monitoring reports submitted consideration be given to specific questions requiring Cabinet Member/Strategic Director attendance and for this to be identified in advance of the meeting.

Resolved:- (1) That the current forecast outturn and significant financial challenge presented for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2013/14 and the actions implemented to address the forecast overspend be noted.

(2) That the Director of Human Resources and relevant officers be invited to attend the next meeting to outline in detail the actions taken to reduce agency spend.

(3) That consideration be given to revisiting the recommendations of the two Scrutiny Reviews that were undertaken into consultancy and agency spend and the budget process.

(4) That for all future budget monitoring reports submitted consideration be given to specific questions requiring Cabinet Member/Strategic Director attendance and for this to be identified in advance of the meeting.

59. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 27th March, 2014 at 3.30 p.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
27th March, 2014

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Ellis, Godfrey, Sharman and Watson.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors J. Hamilton, Tweed and Vines.

60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

61. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

62. COMMUNICATIONS

No items of communication had been received, but the Senior Adviser (Member Development and Scrutiny) advised the Select Commission that a member development session on Chairing Skills was taking place on Friday, 28th March, 2014 and some places were still available.

63. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 20th February, 2013 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Reference was made to Minute No. 58 (Revenue Budget Monitoring) and the questions about Looked After Children which were raised at the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission and which the Chairperson felt were adequately covered.

64. AGENCY WORKER USAGE

Consideration was given to a report presented by Phil Howe, Director of Human Resources, accompanied by Warren Carratt and Mori McDermott from Children and Young People's Services and Adrian Gabriel from Environment and Development Services, which provided an overview of agency worker activity across the Council including rationale for use.

It was noted that the Council had a master vendor contract for the supply of temporary agency workers in place since 2007 and it was important that usage of such workers should be managed in a cost effective and business efficient way. In order to ensure this happens an overarching policy document, plus a range of guidance documents were in place to inform managers of the processes and procedures which should be followed to achieve this efficiency.

If used correctly the additional costs for agency workers in higher hourly rates and agency commission could largely be offset by not incurring other 'On-costs' associated with National Insurance and Pension contributions or costs nor eventual redundancy payments or employment litigation costs associated with employment being brought to an end.

Senior management in each Directorate were supplied, on a monthly basis, with a range of data regarding their agency usage. Detailed workforce data was also supplied on an annual basis to assist with workforce planning.

Over the last three year period the overall spend on agency workers had dropped significantly although there was a slight upward trend showing in this current year (2013/14).

A short summary of Directorate activity was provided and reference made to the information contained within the appendices, which were included with the report as submitted.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Current spend in Children and Young People's Services to cover vacant posts, sickness/absence and maternity leave and whether this was not in accordance with the current policy.
- Detailed update of agency worker usage in Directorates was received and the accumulation of continuous service was questioned on specific examples, e.g. the Admin. Assistant in Environment and Development Services and whether this was more widespread elsewhere when Agency workers may be retained beyond the 12 weeks outlined in the policy.
- Allocation of appropriate resources and the risks to the Council should it not be able to cover vital posts through agency cover.
- Loss of key staff through voluntary severance/redundancy and the role of the manager in minimising the reliance on agency staff.
- The control and safeguards in place to minimise the risk to vulnerable people.
- Agency cover for key social work staff and the aspirations for long term solutions in Children and Young People's Services.
- Duration of assignments for agency cover, the maximum extensions and the long term aim.
- Flexible working arrangements, opportunities and options for staff.
- Reliance on agency cover for sickness absence and the areas most at risk.
- Managerial responsibility to manage flexible working given that the vast majority of requests come from women.
- Implementation of the Temporary Agency Workers Policy, its performance management and an appreciation of the hard work undertaken by staff.

- Noting the Temporary Agency Workers Policy was subject to review by the end of 2014.
- Appropriate co-ordination and redeployment of staff and the confidence of managers to implement.

The Select Commission were informed of plans to review the Temporary Agency Workers Policy by the end of 2014 and it was suggested that this be included as part of the work programme going forward.

Resolved:- (1) That the continued use of agency workers, if managed in accordance with the Temporary Agency Workers policy and supporting guidance, be supported.

(2) That the review of the Temporary Agency Workers Policy be included as part of the work programme going forward.

65. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST JANUARY 2014

Further to Minute No. 207 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19th March, 2014, consideration as given to a report presented by Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2013/14 based on performance for the first ten months of the financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would overspend against its Budget by £1.183m (+0.5%). This represented an improvement in the forecast outturn of -£934k since the December monitoring report. The main reasons for the forecast overspend continued to be:-

- The continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough.
- Income pressures within Environment and Development and ICT Services.
- Continuing Health Care income pressures within Adult and Children's Services.
- Additional, one-off property costs relating to the continued rationalisation of the Council's asset portfolio as part of the efficiency drive to reduce operational costs.
- Some savings targets were currently pending delivery in full in 2013/14.

The moratorium on all except 'essential' spend had been in place since 16th October, 2013. The impact of this and the approval of 102 applications for Voluntary Early Retirement/Voluntary Severance (VER/VS) were now reflected in this monitoring report. 45 applications were also currently under consideration.

Reference was made to the reasons for the projected pressure from winter maintenance given that the winter had been relatively mild and an explanation was provided on budget and salt usage.

Resolved:- That the current forecast outturn and significant financial challenge presented for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2013/14 and the actions implemented to address the forecast overspend be noted and welcomed.

66. CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2013/14 AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET 2014/15 TO 2016/17

Further to Minute No. 208 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19th March, 2014, consideration as given to a report presented by Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, which provided details of the current forecast outturn for the 2013/14 programme and enabled the Council to review the capital programme for the financial years 2014/15 to 2016/17.

The budget process that led to the original Capital Programme for 2013/14 to 2016/17 ensured that the Council's capital investment plans were aligned with its strategic priorities and vision for Rotherham.

In order to maintain that strategic link and make best use of the capital resources available to the Council, it was important that the programme was kept under regular review and where necessary revisions were made. This programme was initially reviewed in July, 2013, following the finalisation of the 2012/13 outturn capital expenditure and financing and had now been the subject of further reviews, the result of which was reflected in the Directorate summary table as set out in the report along with the detailed analysis of the programme for each Directorate.

Clarification was sought on the A57 Improvement Scheme, which was nearing completion, and whether the schedule of works completion date had slipped any.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and the contents noted.

(2) That the recommendation to approve the updated 2013/14 to 2016/17 Capital Programme be noted.

67. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 24th April, 2014 at 3.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
12th March, 2014**

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Burton, Clark, J. Hamilton, Kaye, Lelliott, License, Pitchley, Read and Sharman.

Other Select Commission members in attendance: - Councillors Dalton, Sims, Whelbourn and Vines.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Astbury, Buckley and Dodson

50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

51. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS.

There were no members of the public or the press in attendance.

52. COMMUNICATIONS.

On behalf of Councillor Clark, the Senior Scrutiny Adviser and Member Development (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Chief Executive's Office) reported that the District Commander of South Yorkshire Police had issued a commendation for the work of Council Officers and Partners in the delivery of a proactive approach to managing Domestic Abuse Services. The Improving Lives Select Commission's Scrutiny Review into Domestic Abuse Services had reported on 21st February, 2014, the progress against the recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Minute No. 102 refers).

The Improving Lives Select Commission wished to record their congratulations to the Domestic Abuse Team and Partners for the work.

53. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 22ND JANUARY, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 22nd January, 2014, were considered.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

54. SCRUTINY OF OUTCOMES FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN.

Councillor G. A. Russell introduced Officers who had come to present information on the outcomes for Looked After Children.

In attendance were: -

Joyce Thacker	Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services Directorate;
Paul Dempsey	Service Manager for Family Placements and Residential Services, Safeguarding Children and Families, Children and Young People's Services Directorate;
Martin Smith	Manager of the Get Real Team, School Effectiveness Service, Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services Directorate;
Sue Wilson	Performance and Quality Manager, Performance and Quality, Neighbourhood and Adults Services Directorate.

Background papers had been distributed in addition to Rotherham's draft Looked After Children Strategy and draft Sufficiency Strategy for Looked After Children, along with recent performance information. Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission were also referred to the 'Ten questions to ask yourself if you're scrutinising services for Looked After Children' published by the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

The Service Manager for Family Placements and Residential Services introduced himself and outlined his role and how he was working with a range of professionals across all sectors to produce an 'agreed vision' for all Looked After Children in Rotherham. The agreed vision included: -

- Services had high aspirations for Looked After Children and young people;
- Meet the requirements of the new Ofsted inspection framework;
- Ensure cost efficient services that achieved the most with limited resources;
- Promote strong and inspiring leaders so that the professional workforce had high aspirations;
- Confirm a clear and consistent focus on education;
- The Strategy would ensure that looked after children enjoyed stable, safe and permanent relationships;
- The voice of Looked After Children would inform the content;
- Learning would be evidenced from the best local authorities, along with research findings and learning from new things;
- Contribute to the provision of care and support for Looked After Children that was good enough for our own children.

The Service Manager for Family Placements and Residential Services was asked to outline each Priority objective and members of the Improving Lives Select Commission asked questions about each one.

- **Priority Objective One - To ensure the degree and timeliness of placement stability and permanence and ensure children are able to enjoy continuity of relationships: -**

The Service Manager described actions that were taking place in the Authority to ensure that this Priority could be achieved. These included ensuring that there were sufficient local care placements, working with the Voluntary Sector, service changes to ensure that young people did not have to change their social worker at key points in their lives, changes to ensure that the Local Authority was less dependent on the independent sector, development of in-house fostering placements and the Fostering Plus initiative. During 2012/2013, 25% of Rotherham's looked after children left care to be adopted. The national average was at 14%. Extra resources and therapeutic in-pat had been secured to reduce placement breakdown following adoption.

Rotherham expected performance on long-term placement stability against the relevant National Performance Indicator to be at least in line with the national average; it was currently around 1% above the national average for all Rotherham's Looked After Children and even higher for children in in-house fostering placements.

The development of a Sufficiency Strategy showed how Rotherham aimed to get more care placements, including placements for groups where difficulties in getting a sufficient range existed. These included developing additional carer placements for teenagers; Fostering to Adoption where children and young people were placed with carers who were acting as foster carers who later adopted the child/ren, resulting in less moves and more stability earlier in their care journey; and increasing the number of local independent care providers to avoid long journeys for young people to and from placements.

The Chairperson welcomed the new model for young people up to age of 18 and the ability for young people to retain the same personal adviser between the ages of 16 – 25. This was a vulnerable time when continuity was crucial and disruptive changes were not always in the best interests of young people.

How achievable was it that placements would be brought back to the Local Authority area? – This would not be achieved for 100% of placements as it was in some placement's interests to be out of the area. Excluding those placements that needed to be out of the area, it was possible that 10% of existing out-of-authority placements would be based back in the Local Authority, over the next year. This had been built into the budget profile and would result in cost efficiencies.

What were the measurable goals that were related to the draft Strategies and had the overall context of public spending reductions been taken account of? Did we have an evidence base to measure the Strategies against, as many of the aspirations of the new

Strategies – around having high aspirations for looked after children – had always been held by the Local Authority? – The budget had been agreed to support the development of the Strategies. A number of the workstreams had started towards the end of 2013, including the Fostering Plus initiative and a competitive package for fosters carers of teenagers. This package matched independent agencies, including therapeutic support and supervision, access to the Get Real Team, the Virtual Head Teacher and Health Services.

What feedback was being received from Foster Carers? – General feedback considered the Local Authority to be offering a good service, and this was backed-up by the findings of an inspection. Carers appreciated the therapeutic support of the Looked After and Adopted Children's (LAAC) Therapeutic Support Team and the Adoption Team. Areas for development included better support for working with challenging young people and young people reported wanting to see more of their Social Worker.

Was the Local Authority on par with the Independent Sector? – The Service Manager believed that Fostering Plus was better than many of the independent provisions/offers available.

Is there an action plan to support the Strategy? – The Strategies had been presented to the Corporate Parenting Panel. The five Priority Objectives informed the teams within the Service and formed part of their measurable Service Plans.

Had young people been consulted and given feedback on the content? – Not yet. They had been consulted via the LAC Council. The LAC Voice and Influence Officer was part of the Strategic Group that was developing the Strategies. However, it was felt that the Strategic Group was too adult focussed and work was taking place to see how young people could attend the meetings, including holding them in the evenings.

Had the use of a Mystery Shopper been explored? – Similar methods of finding out service users' experiences were being used. These included the 'Tell Us Your Views' survey, where children and young people were asked to complete a questionnaire at a specific point in their journey. The Performance and Quality Team analysed the responses and reported on the responses each month to Children and Young People's Service's Directors. In addition there was the role of the Independent Reviewing Officer role who had responsibility to record children and young person's wishes and feelings at regular points in their care journey. There was also a Complaints procedure available for all people with concerns. All of these methods were independent from the Safeguarding Children and Families' Service.

Looking to speed up the adoption process could be a risky thing in terms of placement breakdown and so on. Had strategies worked well here? – It was a Central Government expectation that the adoption process was made quicker. Work had been undertaken to see whether this was over-ambitious and prioritised speed over good practice and the wellbeing of children. There had been no evidence in Rotherham that speeding the process up had increased placement breakdown. Rotherham had continued to place children for adoption wherever it was appropriate, however, if it was to reach the Central Government target, it would need to increase the speed of adoptions.

What resources existed for adopted children to understand their journey and was work taking place – either locally or nationally – to provide role models for adopted children and young people? – Resources did exist for under and over 5s. Adoption Workers would talk to the potential adopters about ‘dual-connectedness’ and how the child/young person was connected to two families. Lifestory work was also undertaken to produce a book or series of materials about the child or young person’s life. Adult Service’s provided counselling support and support for tracing birth parents/family members with a voluntary organisation in Yorkshire.

- **Priority Objective Two - To improve the emotional wellbeing and physical health of looked after children: -**

Strengths and difficulties questionnaires were being undertaken to measure the Services’ progress every six-months. This created a picture of need that was used to commission relevant therapeutic services for looked after children and young people. In addition all professional workers were required to have a good working knowledge of trauma, attachment and other relevant theories. The Local Authority was acting as a partner to the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group on their therapeutic strategy and the commissioning and remit of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service.

Were Looked After Children and young people able to access sports and other activity clubs in the same way that their non-looked after peers were? Anecdotal evidence/experience suggested that Looked After Children were not accessing clubs and activities as frequently. Was there a strategy to support looked after children and young people’s access to sport? – The Officers in attendance did have knowledge that Looked After Children and young people were accessing activities outside of school to pursue their interests. The Get Real Team Manager outlined the range of activities that were on the Personal Education Plans of Looked After Children and young people which they had indicated an interest in and were taking part in.

Was there an obligation on Foster carers to take children to activities? – Yes, any reports of children being prevented from pursuing their interests and activities would be followed-up by the Safeguarding Children and Families' Service.

Where children were going missing it suggested that their needs were not being met. What procedures existed to ensure that their needs would be met following them running away? – The Local Authority was working in partnership with the Police on the definition of missing – there was a difference between young people going missing and young people being absconded or late. When they returned, young people were interviewed and a strategy meeting was called. Partners were included in the meeting as required by the circumstances of the case. A key worker was identified who would build-up a relationship with the individual young person to address their needs.

- **Priority Objective Three - To improve educational progress and attainment and narrow the gap between attainment of looked-after children and their non-looked after peers: -**

Nationally at least two levels of progress were expected between each Key Stage. To reduce the gap between non-looked after children and their looked-after peers, the Local Authority worked with designated teachers in each school. The Virtual School existed for all Looked After Children and young people aged between 0 – 25 and was overseen by a full-time Virtual Head Teacher. The Personal Education Plan template had been revised to capture more information and provide a measurable plan. A monthly Education and Social Care Panel was being set-up and chaired by the Virtual Head Teacher to address admissions and exclusions. Councillor G. A. Russell was the Virtual School's Governor.

The Virtual School consisted of a roll for all Looked After Children to be monitored and supported as a group, in addition to the children attending their own schools. The Virtual Head Teacher was an experienced Head Teacher who was looking at the education of every Looked After Child and the strategies in place to promote their attainment. They worked closely with the Get Real Team and other agencies, including Designated Teachers, to update Personal Education Plans for all looked after children.

Overall attainment was on an upward trajectory – where were looked-after young people in this performance? – In summer 2013 GCSE performance was good. 24% of the cohort achieved 5 A-Cs including English and Maths. The national average was 15.5%.

Each cohort was different and it was impossible to show yearly patterns as each cohort's needs varied. The 2014 cohort had a high percentage of children with Statements of Special Educational Needs, and attainment was likely to decrease on the previous year. However, consideration was given to each child being able to achieve their own true potential and

having the opportunities to develop their own skills and interests. The recent Post-16 Awards Ceremony showcased the whole range of outcomes and destinations of Rotherham's Looked After young people.

- **Priority Objective Four - To improve support for and opportunities open to care leavers sufficiently to increase the number and proportion of them who are in employment, education or training (EET): -**

A Central Government target was for all Care Leavers to live in suitable accommodation. 96.4% of Rotherham's Care Leavers in 2012-2013 were classed as living in suitable accommodation. The national average was 88%.

Rotherham's Care Leavers who were in employment, education or training was at 54%, which was slightly below national average.

The Local Authority was developing the ability of young people to stay in their foster care arrangements after they had turned 18, including transferring their placement into a 'Supported Lodging Placement'. This aimed to give Looked After young people the same continuity, stability and permanency as their non-looked after peers. Work was also continuing to increase the breadth of work experience opportunities available to Looked After young people. Rotherham had two semi-independent homes staffed by the Leaving Care Service.

- **Priority Objective Five - To listen to children and young people so as to ensure that their views influence their own plans, as well as wider service delivery and development:**

This included meetings of the Looked After Children Council, which was continuing to involve young people in recruitments, strategy and as a sounding board. The 'Entitlements Inquiry', a consultation exercise undertaken by the All Party Parliamentary Group for Looked After Children, found that many Looked After Children and care leavers did not know what services and support they were entitled to. Work was ongoing in Rotherham to discover if Looked After Children and care leavers were similarly unaware of their entitlements. Future reports would be presented to the Corporate Parenting Panel as a strategy was devised to ensure that looked-after children and care leavers knew what they are entitled to and how to get it.

What would be the Member involvement in these Strategies? – Reports would be presented to the Corporate Parenting Panel and the Improving Lives Select Commission on a yearly basis that provided benchmarking information and performance outcomes.

Statistics presented needed to show how the Looked After Children population compared to their non-looked after peers to give balance and proportion to the conversations – The performance monitoring report that had been submitted was referred to; statistics were given per 10,000 of the population. There were 70 Looked After Children in Rotherham per 10,000. The national average was 60 per 10,000, statistical neighbours were 81 per 10,000 and the Yorkshire and Humber figure was 66 per 10,000.

How were Looked After Children who were parents supported to enter employment, education and training? – This was a balancing act between their education and parental responsibilities. The Get Real Team and the Rowan Centre carefully supported these young people. Case studies were available to evidence this support.

All Services were coping with diminishing resources and expectations rightly remained high for all Looked After Children. Given the available resources, how could the Council be supportive?
- Officers believed that the Council did demonstrate its commitment to prioritise the needs of Children and Young People through invest to save initiatives. There was capacity to increase and improve the Service. Members had an important role in holding Services to account at a time when placement costs had been driven down and quality had increased. Sometimes it was necessary to increase spending on cases to procure more costly placements when it was necessary for children and young people's improved outcomes. The Looked After Children Budget had been set at 320 children and had never been increased when the number of Looked After Children had significantly increased.

Elected Members had been supporting events for the recruitment of foster carers and this had increased morale and given a higher profile to the recruitment activity. Furthermore, the attendance of Elected Members at celebration events like the Post-16 Awards had increased the sense of corporate family and helped to celebrate achievements and offer positive role models for looked after children.

Councillor Russell thanked the Officers for attending the meeting and for their contributions. Corporate Parenting remained everyone's responsibility and it was right that the Improving Lives Select Commission continued to hold Services to account on the outcomes and experiences of looked-after children.

Resolved: - (1) That the submitted report be noted.

(2) That Rotherham's draft Looked After Children Strategy and draft Sufficiency Strategy for Looked After Children be endorsed.

(3) That a further update on the impact of the developing Strategies be reported to the Improving Lives Select Commission in twelve months' time.

55. LIFESTYLE SURVEY, 2013.

Councillor G. A. Russell introduced Bev Pepperdine, Service Improvement Officer (Performance and Quality, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate). Bev had submitted a report on the Lifestyle Survey, 2013, that outlined the findings and also updated on the actions taken as a result of the 2012 Lifestyle Survey.

Minute No. C159 (Lifestyle Survey 2013) of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th January, 2014, noted when the outcomes of the 2013 Survey were accepted by the Cabinet.

The Service Improvement Officer reported on the results of the 2013 Lifestyle Survey.

- **Background and history: -**
 - Surveys had been taking place since 2006;
 - Pupils took part in Years 7 and 10;
 - Participation was not mandatory;
 - All findings were shared with stakeholders;
 - Actions and activities were devised by stakeholders to address the outcomes of the survey.

- **Increased participation in 2013: -**
 - All 16 of Rotherham's secondary schools had taken part in 2013 (in 2012 8 secondary schools had participated);
 - In 2013, 3,474 young people had responded;
 - The Local Authority provided regular updates to schools following the survey concluding;
 - The window for completion had been extended to 7 weeks to aid participation rates.

- **Positive improvements since 2012: -**
 - More young people felt that they were a healthy weight;
 - More young people reported taking regular exercise;
 - More young people were aspiring to attend university;
 - Reports of community cohesion had improved;
 - Teenage pregnancy was at its lowest ever recorded rate in the area.

- **Improvement actions since 2012: -**
 - Obesity Steering Group – had, in the past 4 years, supported 1,721 children to access weight management services;
 - Joint working between DC Leisure and the Rotherham Institute for Obesity;
 - The More4Life programme took place at the Rotherham Leisure Complex, Maltby Leisure Centre and the Aston-cum-Aughton Leisure Centre;

- The Healthy Schools Programme was working with 98% of schools;
- Smoking remained a priority measure in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

- **Areas for attention: -**
 - More young carers were identified;
 - Safety issues reported with regards to the Town Centre and public transport. Similar reports to those in 2012, young people did not feel safe;
 - Bullying rates remained similar to 2012, but less pupils were reporting when they had been bullied;
 - Local shops were identified as one of the places where young people were buying cigarettes and alcohol, and parents supplying their children with cigarettes and alcohol was also reported;
 - Pupils feeling good about themselves had reduced;
 - Other stakeholders may highlight different areas for attention.

- **Actions: -**
 - Personal safety – 12% reported feeling safe in the town centre and 18% reported feeling safe using public transport (compared to 14% and 17% respectively in 2012);
 - However, the young people who regularly used the Town Centre did report feeling safe;
 - Bullying – 38% of young people reported that they had been bullied, the same as 2012;
 - Smoking, drinking and drugs – family was the highest response to where young people got alcohol from;
 - Local shops were reported as the most common place where young people were buying cigarettes. Work was taking place by Partners to promote the health risks of giving cigarettes and alcohol to any under-aged person and Trading Standards were implementing the 'Responsible Retailer' logo;
 - Supermarkets had recorded a very low rate of supplying cigarettes and alcohol to young people;
 - Feelings – pupils reporting that they were feeling good had decreased. A self-harm pathway had been created for frontline workers who had contact with those aged between 9-25;
 - A Bereavement pathway was available;
 - A letter to parents and carers had been sent out via schools in June 2013 to highlight the available support for young people who may be experiencing emotional distress;
 - Adverts for the available support placed on the Public Health Channel in the summer and autumn months, 2013;
 - The Youth Cabinet was considering this issue and the Children's Commissioner Day to be held on 27th February,

2014, would consider activities around preventing self-harm and supporting those experiencing it.

- **Areas where young people were supported: -**
 - Youth Cabinet and Scrutiny work on Safety and Self-harm. Partners who had attended the Children's Commissioner Day had taken away the actions to address the issues raised;
 - Youth Cabinet were also addressing the questions in the survey;
 - The Police were working closely with the Youth Cabinet to address the issues raised about safety in the Town Centre and on public transport in greater detail;
 - Elected Members had supported young peoples' projects and made contributions via their Community Leadership Funds;
 - Health had received the information and had shared it with their Strategy Groups.

- **Next steps: -**
 - All 16 secondary schools had signed-up to participate in the 2014 survey and Service Improvement were consulting with schools on the future questions to be asked;
 - Consultation was continuing with partners on reviewing the content of the questions asked;
 - Youth Cabinet would review the 2014 questions and plans were in place for them to be more involved in the findings of the 2014 review and consulted on making improvements for the 2015 survey;
 - The positive outcomes from the 2013 survey would be shared via a communications and media plan;
 - A plan was in place to monitor the activities to support young people and address the issues identified in the 2013 survey.

The Service Improvement Officer outlined how she was collating the outcomes of the survey and would rely on the partner agencies to feed back to her the progress of their activities to address the issues raised. The Service Improvement Officer was also working with the Independent Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board to monitor actions on a quarterly basis, and request updates from the multi-agency partners represented on the Board. The Service Improvement Officer was also working with Sheffield City Council to compare questionnaires as there was a difference between the length of each authority's document.

Discussion ensued and the following questions were raised: -

- **Teenage pregnancies had reduced, what actions had caused the reduction? –** The rate was now 30.3 conceptions per 10,000 of the under-18 population. The aspirations of the ten year Strategy had been met. The reduction had been achieved through

work to promote opportunities, the Raising Participation age, the availability of Long Acting Reversible Contraception (LARC) and improving exam results.

- **The results for feeling safe in the Town Centre were still very low, which was surprising and worrying, given the work that had taken place since the 2012 survey** – The Youth Cabinet was acting as a sounding board about the work that was taking place, and they had confirmed their assurance that issues were progressing. Further work was needed to determine whether those reporting issues with the Town Centre regularly used it, to see whether there were differences between perception and reality in order that this might be addressed. Other measures including mystery shopping and reporting to the Transport Liaison Group were also taking place. Consideration was also being given to the things that prompted young people to come into the Town Centre and use its facilities.
- **How were messages passed on that things were changing because of the Lifestyle Survey?** – A key issue newsletter was distributed to all participating schools to cascade to all pupils.
- **The responses on bullying had an ‘Other’ category, was this cyber bullying? Cyber bullying was a significant issue for the people who were affected by it. It was also only seen by the ‘victim’ and could really reduce their quality of life and self-esteem** – Work was continuing to ensure that Rotherham’s survey appropriately covered issues relating to internet safety and e.safety. Pathways were available to support young people experiencing bullying.
- **The positive contribution of the Lifestyle Survey should be celebrated. The successes and actions that had been garnered from the Survey should be held up to young people as examples that democracy and their voices counted and that they could make a difference. The Survey was empowering and resources should be secured for future development of the Survey and the resulting actions.**
- **It was concerning that young people were reporting feeling less good about themselves. Why was this the case?** - This was unfortunate and did match national trends. It was likely that the increase was due to the current economic climate. Services needed to embrace the technology that young people used. Apps and other internet-based technology were being explored to allow young people to share their feelings in a safe way and access support.
- **What work was taking place to advertise the dangers relating to solvent use and restricting their access?** – Further information would be sought for the Improving Lives Select Commission. Solvents had been placed behind some shop counters to restrict access/control purchase.

The Chairperson thanked the Service Improvement Officer for her presentation and responses to the questions raised. The outcomes of the Lifestyle Survey were important to all stakeholders and Elected Members as corporate parents. The Improving Lives Select Commission would retain their interest in the outcomes and actions taken to ensure that the Survey remained a living and breathing exercise. A member of the Select Commission also asked for updates on the work of the Youth Cabinet in support of the Lifestyle Survey to be shared at the same time.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That the outcomes of the Lifestyle Survey, 2013, be noted.

(3) That a further report be presented to the Improving Lives Select Commission on the outcomes of the 2014 Lifestyle Survey and providing an update on the actions from the 2013 Survey.

56. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 30th April, 2014, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
21st February, 2014

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Currie, Dalton, Gilding, Read, G. A. Russell, Sims and Steele.

99. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

100. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

101. CORPORATE PLAN UPDATE.

Councillor G. Whelbourn, Chairperson of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, welcomed the Policy and Research Officer (Planning and Regeneration, Environment and Development Services Directorate) to the meeting. The Policy and Research Officer had prepared a presentation in relation to the continuing work around the Council's Corporate Plan.

Minute No. 41 (Corporate Priorities) of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 26th July, 2013, refers.

The proposed updated Corporate Plan Priorities had been subject to public consultation as part of the wider consultation that the Local Authority had undertaken on budget setting.

The presentation included: -

• **Context: - role of the Local Authority: -**

The proposed new Corporate Plan Priorities had been set in response to the Local Authority's current context: -

- Funding;
- Demographics;
- Welfare Reform;
- Devolution and service transformation;
- Public consultation.

The proposed new Corporate Plan Priorities were: -

- Priority One: Stimulating the local authority and helping local people into work;
- Priority Two: Protecting our most vulnerable people and families, enabling them to maximise their independence;
- Priority Three: Ensuring all areas of Rotherham are safe, clean and well-maintained;
- Priority Four: Helping people to improve their health and wellbeing and reducing inequalities within the Borough.

Each priority had a number of specific commitments underneath it and there were ten statements that outlined what success would look like if each of the Priorities were met.

Discussion ensued on the Priorities, commitments and defined success criteria. The following questions and comments were made: -

- In the current climate of reducing resources, the priorities should be realistic;
- The community underpinned all of the values and it was important to build community resilience: -
 - The new Priorities recognised the structural changes brought about by the provisions of the Localism Act and how integrated service provision with partners and service users was taking place, including the Better Care Fund and Troubled Families initiative;
- Continuing Scrutiny Reviews were looking at ways in which the Local Authority could support local businesses across the Sheffield City Region area. Other Local Authorities used their own municipal boundaries as their definition of 'local';
- Frontline staff were continuing to make significant contributions to the Borough. Consideration needed to be given to supporting and protecting the back office functions that supported the frontline workers;
- The inclusion of Rotherham's roads and footpaths being at least as good as the national average – did Rotherham realistically have resources to make this the case, and what was the national average?;
- Were partners included in the Priorities and commitments? – Yes, they were included in the 'business principles' section;
- Would the Council self-assess performance on the success criteria on an ongoing basis? –
 - The Self-Regulation Select Commission was looking at performance measurement and establishing baselines. Directorate monitoring would be ongoing and Cabinet would take an overview. Where it was necessary, interventions and performance clinics would be used.
- Would the Council consider that national averages were based on many factors, including that some authorities had more money than others. For the members of the public, benchmarks meant very

little, and they relied on what they could see and experience in terms of road condition and litter;

- The expectation of personal responsibility was paramount when it came to litter;
- Arrangements in another Local Authority that were employing Officers to enforce issues – did this work?;
- What did success look like?;
- Using the same language as the public when discussing the priorities – for example, PROs and pavements;
- Consultation had focussed on the Budget and very few responses were received relating to the Corporate Plan update;
- Were the Corporate Plan Priorities deliverable?;
- The role of the Council in tackling inequalities and creating happier fairer communities;
- The loss of ‘no community left behind’ – this should be included at Priority 4;
- Some areas did not feature on the Deprived Neighbourhood’s programme but did have pockets of deprivation. Ensuring that these communities did not lose out;
- Linking to other initiatives, including the Think Family programme;
- The language should reflect the resources available, so ‘we will’ should be changed to ‘we will seek to achieve’.

In summary, the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to the proposed Corporate Plan update covered: -

- Ensuring that Rotherham priorities were not submerged in favour of City Region priorities;
- The Corporate Plan update contained overall priorities and not wider performance management measures;
- The ten outcomes should reflect the Local Authority’s aspirations. The removal of ‘no community left behind’ was felt to be a loss to the Plan;
- The importance of reflecting the policy framework.

Resolved: - (1) That the report and presentation be received and its content noted.

(2) That the views now expressed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be forwarded to the Cabinet, to assist the further development and discussion about the corporate priorities.

102. CABINET RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE.

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Strategic Director, Children and Young People’s Services, that provided an update on the recommendations of the Improving Lives Select Commission Scrutiny Review of Domestic Abuse, presented to Cabinet on 6th November, 2013 (Minute No. C111 refers). The recommendations focussed on the

improvement of service provision to victims of Domestic Abuse in Rotherham.

Joyce Thacker was the Chair of the Domestic Abuse Priority Group in Rotherham. The Domestic Abuse Priority Group was part of the Safer Rotherham Partnership structures. The issue of Domestic Abuse affected thousands of lives across the Borough.

The Review made 20 recommendations. Only one recommendation was deferred (recommendation 1), and one was agreed subject to available funding being identified (recommendation 18). Funding for the Team had been secured on a temporary basis meaning that the Team had time to plan to long-term when funding was agreed on a yearly basis. A permanent source of funding was being pursued. Throughout the Scrutiny Review, a number of best practice ideas were identified and incorporated into the Service.

Councillor G. A. Russell, Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission spoke in support of the Domestic Abuse Service. It remained an important and high-profile priority and something that should have multi-agency buy-in. The role and successes of the Service should be publicised more.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised: -

- Examples of successful work with school children undertaken by a local sports team in Bradford had given a really positive prevention message. There was a role for Elected Members as community leaders to give out prevention messages;
- Sports strips had been used to display prevention messages and reach a targeted audience;
- A question was asked relating to 'safe houses' in the Borough, did they still exist? - The Strategic Director confirmed that safe houses did exist, some located out of the Authority for the safety of those who needed them. In addition, work referred to as 'target hardening' was also continuing, where security devices were added to homes where necessary to protect those living there;
- The importance of a one-stop-shop or single point of contact to avoid individuals being passed between different agencies, to make reporting a better experience and to help them to feel safe when they reported domestic abuse;
- The future establishment of the Multi-Agency Support Hub in Riverside House was looked forward to by all partners as it would mean that all Child Protection functions would be together in one place, and next door to the Domestic Abuse Hub to enable closer working and information sharing;
 - Methods of making information easier to access, including technology apps and a texting service were suggested;
 - Funding was also provided by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

Resolved: - (1) That the Cabinet response to the Scrutiny Review be noted.

(2) That it be noted that the Cabinet have agreed any further Cabinet response to the report is fed back to the Safer Rotherham Partnership in February, 2014.

(3) That a monitoring report be provided to the Improving Lives Select Commission in six-months' time.

103. UPDATE REPORT ON SCRUTINY REVIEW OF FUEL POVERTY.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Public Health Specialist that provided a six-month update to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on the Fuel Poverty Scrutiny Review (Minute No. 32 of 12th July, 2013, meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board refers).

The report provided an update on the progress of the 11 recommendations of the Scrutiny Review.

Highlighted actions included: -

- The procurement of three Green Deal Provider Partners who would target the most vulnerable in Rotherham;
- A £1.3M funding application had been submitted to the Department of Energy and Climate Change Green Deal Communities Fund;
- The Warmer Homes Strategy Group was co-ordinating Warm Homes Healthy People funded activity;
- Fuel poverty training and workshops had taken place and had been funded by the Department of Energy and Climate Change and delivered by the National Energy Action;
- RMBC Contracting Partners, Wilmott Dixon and Mears had established a 'Making Every Contact Count' campaign to support clients living in or at risk of fuel poverty;
- Department of Energy and Climate Change funding from the Local Authority Competition 2013-2014 worth £400,000 was successfully received to provide loft and cavity wall insulation;
- £2.6M of capital investment had been made during the year to improve the Council's housing stock.

Clarification was sought on the Green Deal Provider Partners and whether the inaugural partner meeting would report to a member of the Cabinet.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised: -

- How did the Local Authority identify and raise awareness? – By working with Age UK, the deployment of a Voluntary Action Rotherham Pilot and awareness training for front-line officers;
- Examples were shared where agencies had not worked together and an older person had many visits to fix their radiators when it had been an issue of fuel poverty;
- Youth Cabinet had highlighted fuel poverty as one of their key issues – a project led by Sheffield Hallam University – Warm Well Families – had been run in Rotherham alongside GROW and CYPs;
- Tasabee work that had taken place had worked with vulnerable members of the community to educate people on how to improve their fuel efficiency;
- The report offered good news on how funding was being secured and was meeting a real need;
 - Keeping Ward Members informed about the work that was taking place in their areas – This is a good idea. A Communications Plan was being brought together; however, due to the complex nature of the available funding, communications needed to be targeted on a household level to ensure accuracy.

All in attendance commended the level of work that had taken place and how it had benefitted the residents of Rotherham.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That a follow-up report be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in September, 2014, or sooner if performance started to decrease.

104. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

It was reported that the Children's Commissioner Take Over Day would take place on Thursday 27th February, 2014. All members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board were asked to attend the joint meeting that would take place with the Youth Cabinet.

105. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 24TH JANUARY, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 24th January, 2014, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

106. WORK IN PROGRESS (CHAIRS OF SELECT COMMISSIONS TO REPORT)

Self-Regulation Select Commission: -

Councillor S. Currie, Chairperson of the Self-Regulation Select Commission, reported that the final meeting relating to the budget setting

process had taken place. The meeting had reflected on the process, what had worked well and what questions were useful to scrutinise the budget setting process on behalf of the electorate.

The Members' Training Session on chairing skills had been well received.

The Scrutiny Review of Procurement was continuing positively. Officers were really engaged and providing information.

The Performance Management Sub-Committee was convened and Councillor Atkin was chairing the meeting.

Improving Places Select Commission: -

Councillor K. Sims, Vice-Chairperson of the Improving Places Select Commission, reported on the inspection of the Local Plan and the Inspector's report.

The Select Commission had considered the consultation in relation to the 60 miles per hour speed-limit on the M1, which was also relating to the proposed four-lane carriageway and local air quality.

The Scrutiny Review into Homelessness was continuing, evidence had been taken and a progress report on housing repairs and voids was also ongoing. The Select Commission aimed to present a draft at the next meeting in March.

The Local Economy Scrutiny Review was also ongoing and two sessions were planned for evidence gathering. A draft report would be submitted to a future meeting.

Improving Lives Select Commission: -

Councillor G. A. Russell, Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission, reported on the single item agenda of the previous meeting of the Commission. This had focussed on Rotherham's efforts to counter Child Sexual Exploitation. The meeting had been well attended by Scrutiny Members and representatives of agencies involved in this work. The next meeting would focus on outcomes for Looked-After Children and Corporate Parenting. This meeting would be open to all Scrutiny Members. Training for all Members on their role as a Corporate Parent was being provided.

Health Select Commission: -

Councillor B. Steele, Chairperson of the Health Select Commission, outlined two Scrutiny Reviews that were ongoing. One related to GP's practices and one to Continence. The Select Commission intended to meet with the Chair and Chief Executive of Rotherham Hospital around their Forward Plan.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board: -

The Scrutiny Manager reported that the Department for Work and Pensions' sanctions review had completed hearing evidence. This issue had also been considered by the national Select Committee. The review would be making a number of key recommendations predominantly around the development of local protocols. These would be shared with the Welfare Steering Group to be held in March. Two Scrutiny Reviews were planned to start, one relating to Member Structures and one on Deprived Communities.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

107. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
21st March, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Gilding, G. A. Russell, Sims and Steele.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck and Read.

112. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

113. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

114. ROTHERHAM VULNERABLE PERSONS UNIT

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board received a presentation from Carol Adamson (RMBC Community Engagement Team) and Detective Sergeant Nigel Taaffe (South Yorkshire Police) concerning the Rotherham Vulnerable Persons' Unit.

The presentation included the following salient issues:-

: the role of the Vulnerable Persons Unit, which is now based in the Council's Riverside House office building (including community tensions monitoring; hate crime; support for vulnerable people; anti-social behaviour);

: the staff establishment of the Unit, the majority of whom are Police Officers;

: the work of the Unit is reported to the Safer Rotherham Partnership Joint Action Group;

: planning support for vulnerable adults who fall below safeguarding thresholds; effective information sharing to prevent silo working; monitoring and reducing risk; reducing demand on partner agency resources (including health care services);

: examples of the co-ordination of multi-agency Vulnerable Adult Risk Management (VARM) meetings, with regard to specific cases being dealt with by the Vulnerable Persons Unit;

: co-operative working with the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit;

: community tension assessments;

: efforts to reduce hate crime (eg: harassment involving race, religion, disability, gender identity and sexuality); research project by students of Sheffield Hallam University on disability and related harassment; encouraging the early reporting of incidents; the role of the South Yorkshire Police Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel (which includes community members);

: statistics of hate crime incident reporting (in the past, there has been under-reporting of such incidents);

: the organisation 'Tell MAMA' – a national service for the reporting of any form of anti-Muslim abuse;

: community engagement and the role of the 'Silver Prevent Group' – engagement after major incidents and reassurance to vulnerable groups;

: Together for Wellbeing project – emotional and practical support for young people (aged 18-24 years) at risk of offending and experiencing mental distress or mental ill health; funding from the Barrow Cadbury Trust (Transition to Adulthood programme), the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and from the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group;

: proposed introduction of the Vulnerable Adults Panel – to be chaired by this Council's Adult Safeguarding Manager; responding to new legislation relating to anti-social behaviour; the process and framework for the Vulnerable Adults Panel is currently being developed.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

: within the Council, the Vulnerable Persons Unit reports regularly to the Cabinet Member for Communities and Cohesion;

: a further report, specifically about mental health services, is shortly to be submitted to this Council's Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care;

: the Unit works closely with the Council's Adult Social Care services;

: awareness raising of the Unit's work, with Area Assemblies and with Parish Councils;

: the overall capacity of the Vulnerable Persons Unit (initial calls/reports are usually made to the Police; some cases are referrals from the statutory agencies);

: community engagement and the role of the Independent Advisory Group – whether there is a role for Elected Members;

: issues concerning domestic violence (dealt with by specialist officers within the Council and by the South Yorkshire Police Public Protection

Unit);

: Elected Members asked for contact details, to enable them to refer issues to the Vulnerable Persons Unit; use should also be made of the South Yorkshire Police '101' telephone number, as well as making referrals to the Safeguarding Unit;

: care of young adults in care homes and at homes such as Rush House;

: details of the part-time and full-time Police roles;

: the Unit is currently monitoring 21 cases (including full VARM assessments); numbers are expected to increase as more referrals are received; the case work is undertaken by the relevant professionals (eg: social workers and mental health workers);

: the assessment of an individual's 'vulnerability' by the appropriate agencies.

Mrs. Adamson and DS Taaffe were thanked for their informative presentation.

Resolved:- (1) That the role and work of the Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit be noted.

(2) That progress reports about the Vulnerable Persons Unit be submitted to meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at intervals of six months.

115. AREA ASSEMBLY AND AREA ASSEMBLY CO-ORDINATING GROUP MEETINGS

Further to Minute No. 26 of the meeting of the Area Assembly Chairs held on 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Housing and Communities Manager, concerning the review of the Area Assembly and Area Assembly Coordinating Groups' Terms of Reference and Article 12 of the Council's Constitution. The proposed changes, included in the submitted report, reflected the feedback from the Area Coordinating Groups and the Area Chairs meetings held in September and November 2013 and at the meeting held on 20th January 2014.

Specific reference was made to:-

: role of the Area Assemblies;

: frequency of meetings;

: membership of Area Assembly Co-ordinating Groups (including co-opted members, based on the local issues under consideration);

: devolved budget procedure;

: voting rights at co-ordinating group meetings.

Discussion took place on the establishment of strong links between the scrutiny process and the Area Assemblies.

It was noted that the proposals will be considered by the Cabinet, prior submission for approval by full Council on 6th June, 2014.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the role of the Area Assemblies shall be the subject of continuing review.

116. HOSPITAL DISCHARGES - CABINET RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 190 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 26th February, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Director of Health and Wellbeing, concerning the spotlight scrutiny review of hospital discharges in Rotherham, which had been undertaken during the Summer, 2013. Included with the report were the recommendations of the scrutiny review, the action plan and the response of the Cabinet to each of the eight recommendations.

The report stated that the scrutiny review had been undertaken because:-

a) patients are admitted into acute hospital beds who do not necessarily require that acute level of care;

b) the number of emergency admissions continues to rise year on year, and this year there is to date a 7.6% increase in emergency admissions compared to last year; there is also a significant increase in the number of frail elderly people being admitted to hospital; and

c) of concerns based on anecdotal evidence, that there was a problem with out-of-hours discharges (late at night, or weekend) and patients being discharged without adequate support arrangements in place.

It was noted that the progress of the action plan is to be monitored by the Council's Health Select Commission, including receipt of reports from hospital staff.

Reference was made to (i) the Rotherham hospital's 'perfect week' consultation process about patient care, currently taking place; and (ii) the introduction of the Better Care Fund.

Members discussed the journey taken by patients, from hospital treatment to the care received after discharge from hospital.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the leaflet which is to be published by the Rotherham Foundation

Trust, providing information about the hospital discharge process, shall be provided for Elected Members.

(3) That the appropriate officers ensure that discussions take place with the Council's partner agencies to facilitate implementation of the revised hospital discharge arrangements arising from the scrutiny review.

117. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Discussion took place on the successful meeting about the Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day, held on 27th February 2014, reviewing the subject of young people and self-harming. The meeting had included Cabinet Members, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Rotherham's Youth Cabinet. It was agreed that the scrutiny review report on this issue be submitted to the Council's Cabinet as soon as possible and that the Chair of the Youth Cabinet be invited to attend that meeting and present the report.

118. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 21ST FEBRUARY, 2014 AND ON 27TH FEBRUARY, 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on (i) 21st February, 2014 (with the inclusion of Councillor Falvey's apologies for absence) and (ii) 27th February, 2014 (the Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day), be approved as correct records for signature by the Chairman.

119. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Health Select Commission:-

: monitoring the progress of the action plan resulting from the scrutiny review of hospital discharges;

: study of the work to reduce pharmaceutical and medical waste;

: review of the school nursing service, including the service provided for special schools;

: consideration of the introduction of the Better Care Fund;

: discussions with representatives of Healthwatch Rotherham and of the Health and Wellbeing Board, concerning the scrutiny of health services;

: consideration of the public expenditure reductions affecting the Rotherham Foundation Trust and hospital;

: consideration of the priorities of NHS England.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Places Select Commission:-

: review of the scrutiny work programme;

: review of progress of scrutiny reviews concerning (i) homelessness; and (ii) improving the local economy.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Lives Select Commission:-

: scrutiny of outcomes for Looked After Children, including an assessment of the role of Children and Young People's Services;

: study of the results of the 2013 Lifestyle Survey of Rotherham school pupils.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

The Chair and the Scrutiny Manager reported on the recent activities of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

: scoping the terms of reference, both by Members and by the Chief Executive, for the forthcoming scrutiny review of Elected Member structures within the Council;

: Centre for Public Scrutiny – annual meeting to be held during June 2014; possible attendance by an Elected Member;

: Centre for Public Scrutiny – annual questionnaire; Members were invited to assist in completing this questionnaire;

: Regional Joint Health and Overview Committee – scrutiny review of the national consultation about the review of hospital cardiac services (for both adults and children); it was noted that this matter is being considered by the Health Select Commission and by the Cabinet;

: a meeting of Parliament's cross-party Public Administration Select Committee, held at the University of Sheffield in February, 2014 – a number of learning points, about the scrutiny process, had been gained from attendance at this meeting, which will be considered further as part of the Elected Members' training and development process; it was agreed that arrangements be made for attendance at future meetings of the Parliamentary Select Committees;

: Children's Commissioner Takeover Day meeting with the Youth Cabinet, which had taken place on 27th February, 2014.

120. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
19th February, 2014

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Dodson, Ellis, Gilding, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Pickering, Read, Roche, P. A. Russell, Sims, Swift, Vines and Whysall; together with co-opted members Miss P. Copnell and Mr. B. Walker.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jepson, Johnston and Wallis.

43. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

44. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) Further to Minute No. 183 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th February 2014, reference was made to this Council's response to the coalition Government's consultation on the proposed High Speed Two (HS2) railway. Members noted that this Council's response to the consultation had been submitted on 16th January, 2014, in accordance with the timetable. The response will be distributed to all Members of the Improving Places Select Commission.

(2) The future work programme of the Improving Places Select Commission will be considered at the next meeting, to be held on Wednesday, 26th March 2014.

45. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15TH JANUARY, 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 15th January, 2014, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

46. LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION ON MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE CORE STRATEGY

Further to Minute No. 182 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th February, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Planning Policy Manager, outlining the modifications to the Local Plan Core Strategy to accommodate the changes required by the Planning Inspector. The report stated that these modifications are necessary to make the document sound and enable the Council to adopt the document, by following due process.

Details of the Inspector's initial conclusions and the key recommended changes to the Core Strategy were included in the submitted report. Consultation on the Inspector's main modifications to the Core Strategy

will take place during March and April 2014.

It was noted that the eventual adoption of the Core Strategy remains a decision to be taken by Elected Members (via Cabinet and full Council meetings), after receipt of the Inspector's final report.

During discussion, the Select Commission raised the following salient issues:-

: the view of the Inspector on the target of the number of new houses to be built in the Rotherham Borough area (including the shortfall from previous years); national planning policy on the use of brownfield and greenfield sites for development; regional targets for new housing and co-operation with neighbouring local authorities;

: the proposed Bassingthorpe Farm development (which may ultimately be allocated as a principal settlement in the Local Plan Core Strategy, rather than as a 'broad location for growth');

: the new development at Waverley and the provision of school places;

: implications for the Local Plan Sites and Policies document (upon which, there will be public consultation during the Summer 2014);

: the usefulness of the public consultation process; Members noted the role of the Government-appointed Planning Inspector in considering the representations received during the public consultation;

: the impact of the housing market assessments, affecting both the Rotherham and Sheffield local authority areas;

: the overall target, for the Rotherham Borough area, of 25% of new housing being affordable housing;

: Rotherham's "town centre first" policy – Members suggested that this policy ought to be reviewed;

: sites which are suitable for commuters, often located near to motorway junctions;

: reference to specific areas and sites within the Rotherham Borough area (eg: Wath-Manvers; Bramley-Wickersley; Eastwood trading estate);

: the 'phasing' of new development during the life of the Local Plan.

The Select Commission noted that there will be a further Examination in Public of the Local Plan Core Strategy, during the Summer 2014, after the public consultation has concluded.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the review group examining the support for Rotherham's local economy be asked to consider the need for a review of the "town centre first" policy.

47. PROPOSED RESPONSE TO THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY CONSULTATION ON MAXIMUM MANDATORY SPEED LIMIT - M1 JUNCTIONS 28 TO 35A

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Transportation and Traffic Manager, containing this Council's proposed response to the Highways Agency's consultation on a maximum mandatory speed limit for the M1 motorway between junction 28 (Mansfield) junction 35a (Chapelton).

The report stated that the Highways Agency, on behalf of the Department for Transport, is currently progressing proposals for the implementation of the Smart Motorways Project (previously known as the Managed Motorways Project), which if implemented, will see the hard shoulder of the M1 Motorway between Junctions 28 and 31, and Junctions 32 and 35a converted to a live running lane for all traffic.

An environmental assessment has been carried out which indicates that the scheme, which has all-lane running at all times could have a significant adverse effect on local air quality at sensitive receptors and at Air Quality Management Areas, particularly in the Sheffield and Rotherham areas, when operating at the national speed limit and the predicted levels of traffic growth.

In order to mitigate the adverse impacts on air quality which arise from operation at the national speed limit, the Highways Agency is proposing to implement a maximum mandatory 60mph speed limit on the section of the M1 Motorway between Junctions 28 and 35a.

The Select Commission discussed the following salient issues:-

: the emergency services have concerns about 24-hours all-lane running of vehicles on motorways; in addition, there may be difficulties of access for emergency vehicles to accident sites, should there be all-lane running of vehicles on the motorway;

: a previous scrutiny review, undertaken by this Council, had suggested the introduction of a reduced vehicle speed limit on the M1 motorway in the Brinsworth and Tinsley areas, principally to try and improve air quality;

: a reduced speed limit might increase vehicle congestion and tailbacks on the motorway at Tinsley; Members questioned the supposed air quality benefits of reducing vehicle speeds;

: it is already common practice to regulate traffic flows by the use of

variable speed limits on the whole motorway network;

: comparisons were made with similar schemes on other motorways (eg: M42 in the Midlands);

: other European countries (eg: Germany) operate higher vehicle speed limits, without an excessively detrimental effect upon air quality (although speed limits reduce near to large conurbations);

: it was noted that there is an optimum speed for motor vehicles (at approximately 55mph to 60mph) in terms of fuel-efficiency and minimising the impact upon air quality;

: modern motor vehicle engines have improved fuel efficiency, which is less damaging to the environment.

It was noted that individuals are able to submit representations to the Highways Agency during the consultation process about the speed limit on the M1 motorway.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That this Council's response to the Highways Agency's consultation on a maximum mandatory speed limit for the M1 motorway between junction 28 (Mansfield) junction 35a (Chapelton) be approved insofar as this Select Commission is concerned.

48. LAND REGISTRY, WIDER POWERS AND LOCAL LAND CHARGES

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Planning Manager, concerning the consultation by the Land Registry, entitled "Land Registry, Wider Powers and Local Land Charges", affecting the Local Land Charges service.

The report stated that the Land Registry is proposing to take over the Local Land Charges Register and provide search information (a statutory duty of the local authority), whilst leaving local authorities with responsibility for completing enquiries of the local authority (via form CON29), effectively splitting the interdependent service currently provided by Local Land Charges. Such a proposal would reduce the income to local authorities from the operation of these services.

This Council's proposed response to the consultation was appended to the submitted report.

Members discussed the following salient issues:-

: standardisation of fees for local land charges;

: the proposed centralisation of statutory powers, currently exercised at a

local level;

: questioning the overall rationale of the proposals.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the proposed response to the Land Registry consultation, as now amended, be approved insofar as this Select Commission is concerned.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
26th March, 2014

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Dodson, Ellis, Gilding, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Johnston, Pickering, Roche, Sims, Swift, Wallis and Whysall; together with co-opted members Miss P. Copnell and Mr. B. Walker.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Foden) and from Councillors Read, P. A. Russell and Vines.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

During consideration of item 53 below (Private Rented Sector), the following Members declared their personal interests shown:-

Councillor Dodson – landlord of private rented sector property
Councillor Ellis – Chair of Robond
Councillor Godfrey – Member of Robond
Councillor Sims – Member of Robond
Councillor Wallis – Member of Board of Laser Credit Union.

50. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

51. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no issues to report.

52. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH FEBRUARY 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 19th February, 2014, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, with the addition of resolution (3) to Minute No. 46 (Local Plan – Consultation on Main Modifications to the Core Strategy) that the comments of this Select Commission shall be included in the consultation feedback.

53. PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR

Further to Minute No. 176 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 28th March, 2012 and Minute No. 164 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 30th March, 2012, the Select Commission received a presentation from Paul Benson (Private Sector Housing Officer) which provided an update of the progress with the action plan and recommendations of the scrutiny review of the private rented sector.

The presentation responded to the recommendations listed in the original report and the following activity was discussed as progress being made:-

Recommendations 1 and 2: Long-term sustainable action plan

- Private Rented Sector engagement strategy
 - Borough wide/local data; landlord forums; research; etc.
- Enforcement
 - Proactive and reactive
- Support to local agencies, landlords and agents
 - Bond and Rent in Advance schemes, floating tenancy support
 - Localised initiatives e.g. Eastwood, Dinnington and Maltby
- Resources
 - Only staff time available and energy efficiency funding used

Recommendation 3: Engage with landlords, tenants and councillors

- Landlord information
 - Borough wide and local forums; Borough Council website
- Research, analysis and consultation
 - Landlords understanding of the Green Deal, consideration of Selective Licensing in targeted areas
- Tenant support
 - Floating tenancy support
 - Key Choices support offered to prospective prs tenants
- Enforcement protocol
 - Encourage better management of properties

Recommendation 4: Landlord accreditation scheme

- Accreditation scheme considered in 2012
 - Unfeasible due to lack of resources and interest
- Promotion of national accreditation schemes
 - Local landlords informed of NLA/RLA national on-line accreditation schemes
- Alternative landlord recognition/support schemes considered
 - Selective Licensing and alternative voluntary landlord scheme

Recommendation 5: Enforcement action

- Enforcement Concordat
 - Action taken to deal with private tenant service requests; 780 inspections, 93 notices served with ten prosecutions during 2013/14
- Charging of enforcement notices
 - Average cost £200/notice
- Proactive and reactive enforcement work
 - Aligned with the deprived area agenda
 - Reactive service offered throughout the borough
- Houses in Multiple Occupation review completed
- In-house training for Community Protection Unit officers

Recommendation 6: Empty properties back into use

- Council Tax charges
 - Increased for properties over two years empty and charging for properties empty less than six months
- Undertaking 'works in default'
 - To reduce impact of blight on surrounding area
- Use of regulatory powers
 - Framework created for 'enter dwelling management orders' and enforced sale procedures
- Social Housing Provider assistance

Recommendation 7: Private rented sector agency support

- Eviction/repossession prevention tools
 - Housing Solutions
 - Homelessness Strategy
- Landlord incentive schemes
 - Rent in Advance scheme
 - Bond schemes
- Floating tenancy support
- Private Rented Sector properties free from hazards

Continued activity will focus on the following;

- Provide a decision on Selective Licensing
- Progress 'enter dwelling management orders' and enforced sale procedures
- Market Private Rented Sector properties through the Property Shop
- Consider a tenant reference scheme
- Continue to offer rent in advance, bond schemes and floating tenancy support
- Increasing the usage of Private Rented Sector accommodation to deliver/meet 'homelessness duty'
- Explore options for providing single point of contact within Benefits
- Introducing a short-term tenancy intensive intervention service

During discussion of this item, Members raised the following matters:-

: feedback from the public consultation exercise undertaken in respect of the proposed selective licensing scheme; costs to landlords of the licensing scheme;

: reference to the investment of public funds in the regeneration of parts of the Rotherham Borough area (eg: the Eastwood Village and Springwell Gardens area);

: the difficulties which some tenants have in affording the cost of property bonds;

: reference to private rented sector properties in various parts of the Borough area, including those properties which have blighted their surrounding areas;

: some Members expressed the view that a mandatory licensing scheme for landlords would be more effective than a voluntary scheme;

: legal proceedings (eg: use of enter dwelling management orders and enforced sale procedures); the process and timescale of entering cases for Court proceedings;

: use of accreditations schemes and the inspection of the condition of properties;

: reference to the selective licensing schemes operated by other local authorities;

: Members noted the reasons why a Borough-wide licensing scheme for landlords would be impractical.

: Members asked to be provided with the presentation slides, displayed at today's meeting.

Resolved:- (1) That the information contained in the presentation be noted.

(2) That a report on the outcome of the public consultation exercise about the Council's proposed scheme for the selective licensing of landlords be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, prior to being considered by the Cabinet.

(During consideration of the above item, the following Members declared their personal interests shown:-

Councillor Dodson – landlord of private rented sector property

Councillor Ellis – Chair of the Rotherham Bond Guarantee Scheme Limited (Robond), a Homeless Charity

Councillor Godfrey – Member of Robond

Councillor Sims – Member of Robond

Councillor Wallis – Member of Board of Laser Credit Union)

54. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14 - UPDATE AND FORWARD PLANNING

Further to Minute No. 5 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 19th June, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager, concerning this Select Commission's scrutiny work programme, including an update of progress on the delivery to date, summarising achievements and changes that have taken place.

The report provided details of future agenda items and potential themes for consideration during 2014/2015.

Members discussed various subjects which could be considered by this Select Commission and agreed that reports on the following issues be considered at the meetings shown:-

i) 23rd April 2014 - housing issues (including homelessness and housing repairs); personal injury insurance claims arising from accidents on housing land (Minute No. 45 of the meeting of the Deputy Leader and Advisers held on 17th February 2014 refers);

ii) 18th June 2014 – issues concerning Streetpride (eg: highway maintenance, nuisance of off-road motor-cycles);

iii) continuing consideration of the scrutiny review of supporting the local economy (eg: apprenticeships; localisation of business rates; transport issues affecting the Dearne Valley).

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That reports be submitted to future to future meetings of this Select Commission, as listed above.

55. EARLY FINDINGS FROM SCRUTINY REVIEWS

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager, containing an update of this Select Commission's two main scrutiny reviews being undertaken during 2013/14. The following salient issues, under consideration as part of these scrutiny reviews, were highlighted:-

(i) Homelessness (Minute No. 4 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 19th June 2013 refers)

- : refresh of the Council's homelessness strategy
- : 28 days rule
- : visits to 'crash pads' (emergency accommodation) and hearing evidence in group sessions
- : limitations of existing provision (lack of bed-spaces in Rotherham)
- : sub-regional discussions about hostel bed spaces (and availability of funding)
- : provision of out-of-hours services
- : need for improved standards in the private rented sector
- : temporary emergency accommodation (clothes washing facilities; transport of children to schools; neighbour issues);
- : gaps in provision (eg: for single females and for vulnerable young adults – the issue of 'sofa-surfing');
- : the impact of sanctions on benefits imposed by the Department for Work and Pensions;

: consideration of this scrutiny review by this Select Commission, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and by Cabinet

(ii) Supporting the Local Economy (Minute No. 20 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 4th September 2013 refers)

- : changes to local government finance, especially business rates
- : future reductions in the European Regional Development Fund
- : dependency on large organisations (eg: the local authority)
- : whole Council approach, as well as the local Chamber of Commerce and the private sector
- : the key role of the local authority, driving the local economy forward
- : job creation and the targeting of deprived areas
- : importance of land supply
- : importance of regeneration areas such as the Dearne Valley
- : investment in resources
- : area-based regeneration and mixed land use proposals
- : the Sheffield City Region must reflect Rotherham's priorities (forthcoming enterprise zone)
- : creation of a 'business friendly offer' and dialogue with businesses
- : integration of transport, education and housing
- : availability of apprenticeships
- : regeneration of outlying town centres within the Rotherham Borough area
- : consideration of this scrutiny review by this Select Commission, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and by Cabinet.

Resolved:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
18th February, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Barron, Beck, Burton, Dalton, Dodson, Ellis, Godfrey, Gosling, Goulty, Hoddinott, Jepson, Johnston, Kaye, Pickering, G. A. Russell, Sharman, Sims, Smith, Watson, Swift and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali and Beaumont.

JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT - UPDATE.

Councillor K. Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, welcomed all present to the Seminar. Chrissy Wright (Strategic Commissioning Manager), Miles Crompton (Policy Officer) and Sarah McCall (Contracting Officer) had attended the Seminar to deliver an update on how Rotherham's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) was progressing.

Councillor Wyatt spoke about the flexible nature of the JSNA and how there had been areas that had not been covered in the original document. These included domestic abuse and eye health, and links to the needs of emerging Roma and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender communities. These had now been embedded into the document.

Chrissy Wright outlined the statutory role of the JSNA: -

- The Local Authority and the NHS had a duty to assess the needs of the local population under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act (2007): -
 - Rotherham had conducted a JSNA in 2008 and 2011.
- The Health and Social Care Act (2012) stated that: -
 - Health and Wellbeing Boards were responsible for the JSNA;
 - JSNAs should inform Health and Wellbeing Strategies;
 - JSNAs should guide commissioning and service delivery.

In 2011 the JSNA was a fixed document. This meant that: -

- A large time commitment was needed to produce the Assessment;
- It was soon out-of-date;
- It was not possible to add or delete information;
- The print-run for the document was a significant cost.

The Health and Wellbeing Board had agreed a 'live' approach to the JSNA process: -

- On-line accessibility;
- Links and downloads could be added to the JSNA's usability;
- It could be regularly updated and revised;

- New content could be added when identified. Recent additions included domestic abuse, transport and the environment;
- Less time burden was required to bring it together.

A summary of the key issues within Rotherham's JSNA included: -

- An aging population was placing demands on services;
- The oldest age group had many people who were experiencing loneliness;
- Increased numbers of people aged 75 and above were living alone;
- There were high rates of disability and long-term conditions;
- There had been an increase in people with learning disabilities;
- Care needs were rising faster than the availability of carers;
- Rotherham had a growing ethnic diversity and a new migrant population;
- High levels of worklessness were in evidence, particularly for young people;
- There were rising levels of poverty, debt and crisis.

A demonstration of Rotherham's JSNA, which is openly available on-line, was shared: -

www.rotherham.gov.uk/jsna/

Discussion ensued during the demonstration, and the following points were raised: -

- Searching the JSNA for themes and topics of interest;
- A directory of assets would be added to the JSNA;
- Comprehensive consultation with stakeholders had taken place;
- The JSNA was structured to show seven key areas for clarity. These included: -
 - People;
 - Places;
 - Economy;
 - Staying safe;
 - Healthy living;
 - Ill health;
 - Services.
- Trends and predictions were also available through the JSNA;
- The JSNA would be used to inform commissioning;
- The JSNA acted as an 'attention raiser' for services and agencies;
- Ongoing updates and comments were accepted.

Discussion ensued, and the following points were raised: -

- **In a time of growing poverty and continuing cuts, was the JSNA an 'information-only' document, or did it have useful applications?** – The JSNA was the collection of evidence-based needs and highlighted the priorities that public bodies needed to address. The JSNA was also used as a tool for prevention and early intervention and for ensuring that value for money was achieved by focussing resources towards the greatest need;
- **Some of the information about health conditions could be general and not very detailed** – All areas of the JSNA that included summaries about health conditions would be updated regularly to ensure that they contained the correct information and contained useful links to external information and sources of help. A quarterly update of the JSNA would ensure that the information from 2011 was updated for 2014 and going forward;
- **Was Ward and area specific data available on the website, in particular information relating to life expectancy?** - Yes, statistical information was included in the JSNA, and there were also links to the information provided by the Office for National Statistics. Information about life expectancy in Rotherham was included under the 'health inequalities' section.

Councillor Wyatt thanked all for attending and thanked the Officers for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That the information pages of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment relating to mental health are reviewed and the information contained on them is revised.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
4th March, 2014

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Ali, Buckley, Dalton, Dodson, Doyle, Ellis, Hoddinott, Kaye, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell, Sangster, Sims, Swift, Whelbourn, Wootton and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clark and Jepson.

ROTHERHAM BETTER CARE FUND

Members received a presentation from Shona McFarlane (Director of Health and Wellbeing), Kate Green (Policy Officer) and Keeley Firth and Dominic Blaydon (Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS Rotherham) about the Rotherham Better Care Fund. This Fund was previously known as the Integration Transformation Fund and is designed to support better working together for people in receipt of health and social care.

The presentation included the following salient issues:-

: the Better Care Fund plan for Rotherham will cover the next five years (2015/2016 to 2019/2020) and has been approved by the Health and Wellbeing Board;

: the coalition Government is not providing any 'new' money for this initiative;

: there are six national conditions for the Better Care Fund, stating that local plans should:-

- i) demonstrate how it will be used to protect social care services
- ii) be jointly agreed between the council and Clinical Commissioning Group;
- iii) demonstrate how seven-day services will be provided to support patients being discharged and prevent unnecessary admissions;
- iv) demonstrate how local areas will improve data sharing between health and social care, based on the use of the patient's NHS number;
- v) demonstrate a joint approach to assessments and care planning; and
- vi) identify what the impact will be on the acute sector.

: there are already agreed joint priorities through the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, informed by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment; the Strategy will help in the delivery of the Better Care Fund local plan;

: the terms of reference of the multi-agency task group, established by the Health and Wellbeing Board, which is developing the Better Care Fund local plan;

: the nationally recognised definition of integration:-

'I can plan my care with people who work together to understand me and my carer(s), allowing me control and bringing together services to achieve the outcomes important to me' ('National Voices')

: the over-arching vision of Health and Wellbeing Board:- To improve health and reduce health inequalities across the whole of Rotherham;

: the Better Care Fund plan will contribute to four of the strategic outcomes of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy:-

a) Prevention and early intervention: Rotherham people will get help early to stay healthy and increase their independence;

b) Expectations and aspirations: all Rotherham people will have high aspirations for their health and wellbeing and expect good quality services in their community;

c) Dependence to independence: Rotherham people and families will increasingly identify their own needs and choose solutions that are best suited to their personal circumstances; and

d) Long-term conditions: Rotherham people will be able to manage long-term conditions so that they are able to enjoy the best quality of life.

: Better Care Fund local plans are required to deliver against five nationally determined measures:-

- admissions into residential care

- effectiveness of re-ablement

- delayed transfers of care

- avoidable emergency admissions

- patient and service user experience

- and, in addition, there is one locally agreed measure - 'emergency readmissions'

: Rotherham has also developed a set of 'I Statements' which demonstrate outcomes for individuals;

: details of the various outcome measures;

: the action plan includes twelve schemes agreed to deliver the Better Care Fund in 2015/2016 and are aligned to the four strategic outcomes of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy;

: the importance of measures to achieve prevention and early intervention;

: future expectations and aspirations – the success of the social prescribing pilot, which involves the voluntary and community sector in the care of people who have long-term medical conditions;

: the 'risk stratification tool' – computer software which helps in the identification of people, who suffer long-term medical conditions, who are most at risk of admission to hospital;

: helping people move from dependence to independence (encouraging people to self-manage their own condition);

: review of the care of people who suffer long-term medical conditions;

: the financing of the Rotherham Better Care Fund and the pay-for-performance element of the fund; details were provided of the share of funding for each of the twelve schemes being delivered in 2015/2016;

: NHS England will provide feedback on the Better Care Fund local plan, during March 2014, after which the final plan must be approved by Friday 4th April 2014;

: the Health and Wellbeing Board will ensure the implementation of the Better Care Fund plan in Rotherham and will also monitor the operation of the plan.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

: the importance of 'dependence to independence' and support for individuals to be provided by the voluntary and community sector;

: the pressures on hospital accident and emergency services and upon the out-of-hours service provided by GPs; development of the emergency centre in 2015;

: the contents of the Better Care Fund plan, the arrangements for joint commissioning and the review of services; the amount of funding to be transferred from hospitals and the acute care services to prevention and early intervention;

: whether the performance targets are sufficiently challenging;

: Members requested further details of spending on the Better Care Fund plan.

Members asked that they be informed of the contents of the feedback from NHS England on the Rotherham Better Care Fund local plan.

The officers were thanked for their informative presentation.

**APPEAL PANEL
19th March, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors McNeely and Whelbourn.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to an individual).

APPEAL - D1/03/01 - ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/03/01 against his dismissal from his post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**EARLY RELEASE OF PENSION BENEFITS
19th March, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar and McNeely.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to individuals).

EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS

The Panel considered an application for early access to pension benefits on compassionate grounds in respect of R.G.

Resolved:- That the early access of pension benefits in respect of R.G. be approved.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
25th March, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Ahmed, Atkin, Burton, Clark, Currie, Dalton, Dodson, Ellis, Godfrey, Hussain, Johnston, Kaye, Lakin, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Read, G. A. Russell, Sims, Wootton and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Jepson and Vines.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AVAILABLE FOR ELECTED MEMBERS.

Councillor J. Akhtar, Deputy Leader of the Council, welcomed Richard Copley, Corporate ICT Manager (Corporate ICT Team, Internal Audit and Asset Management, Environment and Development Services Directorate). Richard had prepared a presentation on the Information Technology that was available to Rotherham's Elected Members to assist them in their duties. Also in attendance were Dave Sissons and Andy Dickinson (Corporate ICT Team) to provide assistance to Elected Members on any specific IT issues they wished to raise.

Richard's presentation outlined the ICT available to Members in Rotherham, and provided further information about how it worked and the external rules and regulations that the Council had to adhere to.

External rules and regulations: -

- Security rules needed for different ICT technology was set by the Cabinet Office as a pre-requisite of membership of the Public Services Network (PSN). The Council needed to have access to the PSN in order to transact its business including in the administration of Blue Badges, Revenue and Benefits and elections business;
- One PSN rule is that Councils must not allow any of their documents to be stored (referred to as 'at rest') on an unmanaged end-point. Technology deemed to be safe was a Council owned and managed laptop or tablet device (including iPads) using the Good for Enterprise App. These were safe because the Council could remotely remove any data contained on a device should it be lost, stolen and so on.
 - The Cabinet Office's PSN security specialists had deemed MyMail to be an unsecure method for Officers and Members to access the Council's information, because documents and data could not be recovered if the technology was lost, stolen or compromised in some way.
 - The Cabinet Office had asked Rotherham to be an exemplar of this policy because Rotherham's 'Bring Your Own Device' policy whereby Officers and Members could access data securely on their own devices through the Good for Enterprise App.

Connecting in the Town Hall: -

- There were three networks in the Town Hall: Public, Private and Corporate: -
 - Rotherham-Public was available to external users for a maximum period of two hours. The network was available during extended office hours between 7.00 a.m. – 7.00 p.m., which prevented the network being used on the other nearby premises in the evenings and weekends.

IT used by Members in Rotherham: -

- Laptops;
- iPad (Apple) or other brand of tablet device – these could be Council-owned or owned personally (Bring Your Own Device policy);
- iPads/Tablets had been in use for one year and had drastically reduced the amount of printing that was done for committee meetings;
- Tablets did have limitations: -
 - Email management, document management, printing, writing lengthy documents and spreadsheets;
 - ‘Hybrid devices’ were available on the market that combined both laptop and tablet functions. They currently cost around £800, but prices would reduce;
 - All Elected Members had access to ‘Touch Down Machines’ – desktop computers in the Majority and Minority Party Rooms.

Some Apps used by Members (and Officers) to do their jobs: -

- Mod.Gov and Good for Enterprise both allowed the safe delivery of information via a secure bubble, Corporate ICT could remotely remove all of the data from the device if needed.
 - The Good for Enterprise App had access to email, calendar, contacts, intranet and filtered internet content;
 - Access to internet was available through both Good for Enterprise and the Safari option on the iPad. Access to the internet via Good was restricted, whereas Safari was unlimited;
 - The Good App had been installed a total of 75 times on devices belonging/used by Elected Members;

- One limitation of Good for Enterprise email management was that the mailbox size limit was quickly reached;
- However, this should become less of an issue as mailbox size was due to increase from 200mb to 2gb, and the maximum attachment size was due to increase from 10mb to 25mb;
- The Mod.Gov App was automatically updated, user friendly and had good annotation tools;
- Other productivity Apps did exist, but they meant that the Council's documents and data would be held outside the secure bubble so the Council were not able to promote these Apps without further security/control additions;
- Social Media platforms could be accessed on the iPads and on desktop computers or laptops) and an e.learning module was available on their best practice;
- In the App store it was possible for Elected Members to use the RMBC account or set-up their own Apple ID and purchase Apps and transfer them between devices.

Other IT developments: -

- VPN was becoming a tokenless system using 'AnyConnect' that was installed on upgraded laptops;
- Follow Me Printing could be used from a council laptop or desktop computer;
- It was not possible to print from iPads to Council printers, the intention of this was to reduce printing and costs;
- Business continuity was being considered and the use of Blackberry handsets was being phased-out and the use of devices that supported the Good for Enterprise App were being promoted;
- VOIP Telephony for Members was being developed with the aim that Elected Members would just have one land-line number that citizens could use to contact them. This would be an 01709 number so it would be a local rate call, and the number could be set to ring-out on any device Members had set it to. This also meant that Elected Members would not have to publicise personal numbers, could change which device rang and divert their calls to voicemail when they were not available;

- Conference Calling was available through Powwow Now and could be used to reduce traveling distances for meetings. Members could request a 'credit card' which had details on how to set-up conference calls;
- Ecasework was continuing to be used to track all casework. The system kept a list of cases and tasks and would automatically assign tasks to the relevant Officer in the Local Authority;
- The IT Service Desk – a separate telephone number for Members to contact would be published shortly;
- The IT Service Desk had a self-serve platform for reporting of faults – 'My IT'.

Discussion ensued on the information that had been presented and the following issues were raised: -

- **Not all members had chipped ID cards so could not use 'Follow Me Printing'** – This was noted by the Officers in attendance;
- **My Mail was a popular and convenient website used by a lot of Elected Members** – This was noted by the Officers, but the reasons why it had to be withdrawn still stood as the Council needed to maintain accreditation with the PSN. The Cabinet Office had been lobbied but had not changed their decision;
- **Information published on the Local Authority's Planning List was not available via the iPad but could be accessed on the laptop** – Officers agreed to investigate this issue;
- **One Elected Member asked for the information presented in the Seminar in a clearer and more easy to follow format;**
- **Making folders in the Good for Enterprise app for email** – Officers believed that this was possible to set up some limited folders and agreed to write and circulate instructions on how to set these up;
- **The technology available to Members who had opted to not have an iPad** – Members should continue using the technology they had as is. Laptops will remain an option for Members for the foreseeable future.
- **It would be useful if the Good App had word processing capabilities** - This could be developed if there were word processing apps that were compatible with Good's security and licensing. It may not be feasible to use an iPad to create a large/complex documents due to the limitation of iPads ;
- **Could Members' iPads be compatible with 3G or 4G instead of having to connect to the available Wifi networks?** – This would be cost prohibitive to take forward;
- **The procedure and protocols for accessing Wifi networks when out and about was considered. Different private establishments had different log-in and use procedures/policies;**

- **Members requested the ability to better manage emails via their iPads, including permanently deleting deleted items in a more efficient way, as they were currently having to delete each deleted email individually to create space capacity** – Officers accepted this but did suggest that Members access the touchdown machines in the Members' rooms to ease this problem;
- **An App for eCasework would be really useful** – Officers had asked for this to be developed and it was currently in the early development stage.

Councillor Akhtar thanked the Officers in attendance for their presentation and help in fixing individual Members' IT queries.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
14th March, 2014

Present:- Councillor C. Mills (Doncaster MBC - in the Chair); Councillors R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) and R. S. Russell (Rotherham MBC).

together with:-

Beth Clarke	BDR Joint Waste Project Manager
Adrian Gabriel	Rotherham MBC
David Rossiter	Rotherham MBC
Ann Todd	Rotherham MBC
Paul Castle	Barnsley MBC
Gill Gillies	Doncaster MBC
Steve Noble	DEFRA

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S. Ali (Rotherham MBC) and from Messrs. K. Battersby and D. Burton (Rotherham MBC) and Mr. P. Dale (Doncaster MBC)..

K29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

K30. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13TH DECEMBER, 2013

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 13th December, 2013.

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

K31. MATTERS ARISING

With regard to Minute No. 24(2) of the previous meeting, the visit to the Bolton Road waste treatment plant at Wath upon Dearne had taken place on Monday 3rd February, 2014. It was noted that Shanks Waste Management were willing to host an additional visit for any Members who had been unable to attend the previous visit.

K32. BDR MANAGER'S REPORT

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager submitted a report updating the progress of the following issues:-

(a) Bolton Road waste treatment site at Wath upon Dearne – the anaerobic digestion contract commissioning would begin later this year; the Rotherham Local Planning Authority has granted planning permission for working to take place on Sundays and also for the discharge of certain planning conditions;

(b) the waste treatment site at Ferrybridge – the plant commissioning date is to be early in 2015 and the full service commencement date is expected to be June, 2015;

(c) financial issues and the projection of a balanced budget for the current, 2013/2014 financial year;

(d) Shanks Waste Management, Magna Ltd. and BDR Waste have been awarded funding from the Ingenious grants programme to develop activities and materials for use at the Magna Centre, in schools and at the Bolton Road waste treatment site visitor centre, in order to try and encourage young people to consider waste engineering as a career;

(e) health, safety, quality and environment – the Joint Waste Board placed on record its satisfaction at the excellent site safety record of recent months, there having been no recorded accidents;

(f) Project Agreement – the revised redacted version will soon be published on the BDR Internet web site;

(g) Doncaster MBC is consulting about the development of a new waste transfer station to be located at Kirk Sandall;

(h) agreement for the Community Liaison Group to visit the Bolton Road waste treatment site.

Resolved:- That the BDR Manager's report be received and its contents noted.

K33. RISK REGISTER

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI transition phase risk register, as at March 2014. Reference was made to the increasing cost of insurance premiums.

Agreed:- That the updated information on the risk register be received.

K34. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Agreed:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended (information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Joint Waste Board)).

K35. BDR PFI - BUDGET UPDATE 2013/2014

Consideration was given to the Budget Summary, as at February 2014, for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI).

Agreed:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

K36. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 27th June, 2014, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(2) That the next following meetings of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 19th September, 2014 and on Friday, 12th December, 2014, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.