

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 2nd July, 2014

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 62 – 76 and 1-12)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 27 - 31)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 57 – 68 and 1-8)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 66 - 74)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 32 - 42)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 75 - 77)
7. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 25 - 42)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
17th April, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Barron, Dalton, Goulty, Hoddinott, Kaye, Middleton, Roche and Wootton.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Beaumont, Havenhand, Sims and Watson, Robert Parkin (Speak Up) and Peter Scholey.

80. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

81. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no members of the public and press present at the meeting.

82. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) Response to Youth Cabinet

The response to the question from the Youth Cabinet (Minute No. 70 of 13th March, 2014) was attached to the agenda.

(2) Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee

2 reports had been published following the Leeds Children's Heart Surgery Services review – the Mortality Case Review and the Family Experience. The third report, Governance Review, would be published later in the year:-

Mortality Case Review Overview Findings

- Clinical management of the cases examined showed medical and surgical care to be in line with standard practice
- Case mix of surgical conditions and patients operated on was in keeping with comparable Children's Cardiac Surgical Units in the United Kingdom
- The cases reviewed were predominantly of high or significant complexity often with additional contributory risk factors

Family Experience Finding

- A number of themes around care planning and support for families emerged based on the views and experience of 16 children and their families

Both reports made recommendations that had formed the basis for an action plan that the LTHT and the Unit were implementing – Service development, audit programme development.

(3) Suicide Prevention Conference

The conference, held in Rotherham, had been attended by Councillors Beaumont, Dalton and Steele representing the Select Commission. It had been a well attended thought provoking event with some very good speakers. CARE about Suicide, the Guide to help universal workers prevent suicide, had been launched. The Chairman highlighted the work of the Youth Cabinet on self-harm which had been featured at the conference.

(4) The Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Accounts

The first draft would be circulated at the end of April/first week in May for Members to consider before the Trust attended the meeting in June.

(5) Healthwatch

It was proposed that there be a new standard agenda item "Issues from Healthwatch", either verbal update or written report, to enable Healthwatch to raise issues/concerns they wished to bring to the Select Commission's attention.

(6) Yorkshire Ambulance Service Quality Accounts

To be submitted shortly.

Resolved:- That "Issues from Healthwatch" be included as a standing item on future agendas.

83. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 13th March, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 13th March, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

84. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on (i) 19th February and (ii) 23rd March, 2014.

Councillor Wyatt, Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board, drew the Select Commission's attention to the following issues:-

- Rotherham Active Partnership (Minute No. S79) – 6 monthly reports to the Board with the sports agenda meshing more closely with the health agenda, including funding streams
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Consultation (Minute No. S81) – additional issues had been referred for inclusion within the document which was available on the website
- Peer Review (Minute No. S85) – the offer of a Peer Review had been taken up and may involve members of the Select Commission

- National Energy Action Fuel Poverty (Minute No. S86) – a lot of learning had come from the project
- Better Care Fund (Minute No. S87) – work in progress
- Novation to Healthwatch (Minute No. S88) – would allow Healthwatch to operate as a social enterprise
- Mental Health and Learning Disability Services (Minute No. S90) – a pilot was being run in Rotherham with RDaSH and South Yorkshire Police for those with mental health issues involved in the criminal justice system to ensure they were in the correct placement

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

85. RDASH - QUALITY ACCOUNTS

Karen Cvijetic, Head of Quality Improvement, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

What is a Quality Report?

- Coalition Government White Papers set out the vision of putting Quality at the heart of everything the NHS did
- Key component of the Quality Framework was the continuing requirement for all providers of NHS Services to publish Quality Accounts
- This was the opportunity to enable the OSC to review and supply a statement as to whether “the report was a fair reflection” of RDaSH services
- 2013/14 was the 6th Quality Report produced by RDaSH

2013/14 Quality Performance

- Care Quality Commission (CQC)
Registered with no conditions
- CQC Inspections
11 inspections of Trust services
3 of Learning Disability Services in Rotherham
1 Trust-wide inspection
- Compliant with essential standards of quality and safety reviewed
- CQC Mental Health Act Monitoring Visits
18 monitoring visits of Trust Mental Health Inpatient Services
7 monitoring visits of Rotherham Mental Health Inpatient Services
- Compliant with some minor improvement actions
- Commissioner-led Quality Visits
Adult Mental Health Community Services
Positive feedback
- Quality improvement Initiatives
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
Trust Quality Improvement Team

- Commissioning for Quality Indicators (CQUIN)
Patient Safety i.e. Safeguarding, Patient Safety Thermometer
Clinical Effectiveness i.e. Outcome Measures, Transitions
Patient Experience i.e. Patient/Carer Survey

Review of Quality Markers 2013/14

Three domains of quality:-

- Patient Safety
- Clinical Effectiveness
- Patient Experience

Plus

- Our people/staff

Examples of Quality Improvement Work

- Patient Experience
 - Respecting, involving and empowering patients
 - Improving care through patient feedback
 - Improving access
 - Making service/treatment information available
- Patient Safety
 - Changes in practice through lessons learned
 - Environmental safety/accessibility
 - Personalised care planning
 - Records management
 - Safeguarding
- Clinical Effectiveness
 - Access to supervision
 - Implementing evidence based practice
 - Staff engagement in clinical effectiveness activity
 - Development of care pathways
 - Development of outcome measures

Process for 2014

- Consultation with Select Commission
- Engagement with Trust Council of Governors – regular agenda item/draft Quality Report for comment
- Draft Quality Report to Trust Clinical Governance Group and Board of Directors

Quality Priority for 2014/15

- Clinical Leadership – developed by Board of Directors, Council of Governors and Business Divisions

Francis Declaration

- Trust Francis Declaration jointly signed off by Board of Directors and Council of Governors in December, 2013
- 4 Francis priorities for 2014:-
 - Culture
 - Engagement
 - Non-professionally quality staff
 - Whistleblowing

National and Public Health Priorities 2014/15

- Tier 4 CAMHS
- 7 day working
- Better Care Fund
- Closing the Gap
- Public Health – provision of Substance Misuse Services and possible retendering of services

Local Commissioning Priorities 2014/15

- Consideration of investment in priority areas following the outcomes of the reviews
- A review of Mental Health and Learning Disability Services
- A review of the Learning Disabilities Assessment and Treatment Unit and Community Services
- Development of a comprehensive CAMHS Strategy
- Development of care pathways and packages (Mental Health Payment and Pricing Systems)

Next Steps

- Receive Select Commission's comments for inclusion in the Quality Report – May, 2014
- Report to Board of Directors – 24th April, 2014
- Report to Council of Governors – 16th May, 2014
- Report to Monitor – 30th May, 2014
- Review by Audit Commission – April/May, 2014

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

- Review of the Learning Disabilities Assessment and Treatment Unit and Community Services was being conducted in conjunction with the commissioners looking at if there were the right number of beds, in the right environment, staffing levels as well as financial implications
- Development of a comprehensive CAMHS Strategy – currently RDaSH was not commissioned to provide the Inpatient Service. Work was taking place to ascertain how that could be developed. Work was taking place to review the full Service and Pathways. Seamless transfers were raised for transition. The Strategy could come to a future meeting of the Select Commission

- Another piece of work was around Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services and taking part in a pilot on Child and Mental Health
- The inspection regime and its ratings were in the process of changing to that similar to the rating used by Ofsted. The indications were that RDaSH would not be found to be "Inadequate"; it was hoped to be found "Good". It would be more in depth looking at leadership, quality, governance and services. RDaSH hoped to receive a "Good" rating and have had positive indications. Minimum standards were what was assessed
- Work was taking place on how to report whistleblowing figures as they were currently not published. Internally there were various methods that could be used to whistleblow as well as through the Care Quality Commission. There had been approximately 30 incidents of whistleblowing. The organisation was confident that the public were aware of the processes and were using them. Each incident raised by the CQC had been responded to and reported to the Board and Clinical Governance Group
- Work was taking place with commissioners and partners with regard to 7 day working to ascertain the possibility of sharing resources and locations/buildings in order to make the best use of what was available
- An identified area for improvement was around communications with GPs and thereby access into RDaSH services, information sharing between the 2 and data quality. A lot of work had taken place on communications with GPs including visits to practices, newsletters and health events and also on improving the Key Performance Indicators. A survey had recently been conducted with the GPs from which there had been very positive feedback. Due to the concerns there had been a contract query from the commissioners, but due to the aforementioned work, it had now been signed off as complete

Karen was thanked for her presentation. It was noted that she would supply the final report to Select Commission Members as soon as possible for comment

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

(2) That upon receipt of the final report, Members of the Select Commission forward any comments to the Chairman.

(3) That, upon receipt of comments on the final report, the Chairman and Vice-Chair submit to RDaSH on behalf of the Select Commission.

86. RTFT - PROGRESS UPDATE ON ACTION PLAN

The Chairman welcomed Martin Havenhand (Trust Chair), Tracey McErlain-Burns (Chief Nurse), Jan Bergman (Director of Transformation/Deputy CEO) and Kerry Tate Maskill (Communications Officer) to the meeting who were present to give an update on the Operational Plan 2014-16.

The following presentation was given on the 2 Year Operational Plan:-

Vision

- To ensure patients are at the heart of what we do, providing excellent clinical outcomes and a safe and first class experience

Mission

- To improve the Health and Wellbeing of the population we serve, building a healthier future together

Values

- Safe, Compassion, Together, Right First Time, Responsible and Respect will underpin the way we work and define the culture we wish to build within the organisation

Strategic Objectives

- Develop high quality and safe services that effectively met the changing healthcare needs of the population it served
- Achieve clinical and financial sustainability
- Work with partners across the local health economy to ensure sustainability of wider healthcare provision
- Ensure that it had the leadership capability and capacity to deliver the strategy and services
- Ensure that its governance arrangements were fit for purpose and help shape the behaviours that would achieve the strategy
- Meet its regulatory requirements
- Develop and maintain an appropriately skilled and engaged workforce to meet service needs now and in the future
- Develop a culture based on their values and behaviours

Trust Key Priorities

Strategy

- Develop 5 Year Strategic Plan
- Transformation Programme Action Plan
- Board Development Programme

Structure

- Appointment of CEO and Executive Team
- Clinical Management Re-structuring
- Board Committee Structure
- Assurance Framework
- Risk Management

People

- Staff Communication and Engagement
- People Performance Management
- Performance Management Framework
- Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- Governor Engagement

Operational Objectives

- To provide quality and safe health services
- To address the underlying financial deficit
- To successfully implement a £22M Cost Improvement Programme
- To produce and implement Clinical Strategies which:
 - Identify those services that sustain a stand-alone Trust
 - Identify those services for increased collaboration
 - Identify those services to be provided by other providers
- Deliver a Board Development programme
- Establish the Executive Team
- Implement Clinical Re-structuring
- Embed and sustain new Board and Committee structures
- Introduce and embed the Board Assurance Framework and Risk Management Strategy
- Develop a staff communication and engagement process
- Introduce the Trust Performance Management Corporate Report and monitor performance throughout the plan period
- Undertake performance appraisal for all staff by Q1
- Develop stakeholder engagement plans
- Agree a forward work plan with Governors

Quality Objectives

Safe

- Mortality
- Harm Free Care

Reliable

- Waiting Times

Caring

- Friends and Family Test

All Domains

- Nationally and locally mandated quality requirements

CQUIN

- 9 focus areas

Organisational Risk

- Quality of Care
- Commissioning and Competition
- Operational Delivery
- Cost Improvement Programme
- Workforce

Operational Challenges

- Unscheduled Care – in particular ageing population and increase in frail elderly demand for care
- Managing Long Term Conditions in non-acute settings
- Clinical Referrals Managements – delivering outpatient efficiencies
- Service Transformation
- Delivering 7 Day Working
- Commissioning Intentions
- Better Care Fund
- Any Qualified Provider
- Co-operation and Competition
- Collaboration and Integration
- Service Specification Development
- Clinical Service Sustainability
- Recruitment of Registered Nurses
- Development of motivated, engaged workforce

Conclusion

- Delivery of financial and operational plans was critical to ensure sustainability
- Engaging the workforce at all levels would be critical to delivery
- Effective leadership and ownership was required to challenge progress and performance
- Clinical Strategies would drive changes to deliver improved pathways for patients and subsequently improve efficiency
- Ongoing engagement with other local providers to explore opportunities for collaboration and partnership working was vital

Discussion ensued with the following further information provided to Members:-

- The breaches put in place by Monitor were not likely to be lifted until April, 2015
- 5 year Strategic Plan to be submitted by 30th June, 2014
- Consultation would take place on the 8 strategic objectives over the coming months as required by Monitor
- The Board had recently identified the key priorities that were “must dos” in order to provide the quality of care and services the public of Rotherham would want to be provided and to ensure the Trust functioned efficiently and effectively as a good quality organisation
- Throughout the recent difficult times, standards had been maintained in the quality of care in hospital and community which the staff and clinicians should be congratulated for

- The 14 operational objectives were distilled from the 8 strategic objectives
- Aim to communicate clearly and effectively with everyone who worked for the Trust so all were accountable for the delivery of the strategic objectives, therefore, all staff would have had a face-to-face appraisal by 30th June, 2014. Appraisals had been conducted in the past but had not been diligently implemented and were not about performance or connected with a follow through down from the organisation's strategic objectives. It was important that all staff understood their role in delivering the objectives
- The restructuring was almost complete with 4 Directors delivering the standard of care across the Trust
- The Trust's 2014/15 Quality Accounts would feature the 4 Quality Objectives – Safe, Reliable, Caring and All Domains. It also wished to focus on standards for patients with Learning Disabilities so LD CQUIN would also be included
- 2 new posts had been created in the Executive Team – Chief Operating Officer and Director of Workforce and Transformation. There was now a Workforce Committee within the Committee Structure. The Group leading on Employee Relations within the Trust had been reviewed with a view to a member of staff taking on the role of Chair rather than a Senior Manager. It was also suggested that consideration be given to a Trade Union representative sitting on the Workforce Committee
- The 5 year plan would be based on reviewing the specialities within the Trust, looking at best practice, working with partners and ensuring it was fit for purpose
- The Trust had to remove £22M from its budget over the next 2 years - £10.9M in year 1 and £10.8M in year 2. It was the intention and plan to make a surplus of £0.7M in 2014/15 with a further £2.2M in 2015/16
- It was key for the Trust to get out of the Monitor Special Measures and focus on issues that a Trust should focus on i.e. quality of patient care
- The plan predicted a 5% Cost Improvement Programme – ambitious as most Trusts predicted 3.5% - which meant it had to save £10.9M this financial year. The Trust planned to achieve £12.4M. The Transformation Programme established 3 months ago was well under way and to date had achieved £8.44M savings
- For the first time the Board had built in reserves – 1% contingency – plus £1.5M for Invest to Save

- The last 4 months had seen an improving financial position – at the beginning of the financial year there had been a £4.6M forecast overspend but that had recovered and was now likely to be £3.2M
- The 2 year plan addressed the key strategic and operational challenges and would also sit within the 5 year plan. They had been derived from the issues the Trust needed to monitor and ensure were being satisfied throughout the process
- A score card was produced for submission to the Board on a monthly basis and would be included on the website this would reference the operational challenges
- The hospital faced real challenges and the citizens and Members of Rotherham wanted to see it work and have good quality health care in the town
- Disappointment was expressed that reports from the Deloitte and PwC reviews had not been shared with the Select Commission previously. It was noted that the EMR report had raised the issue of the organisational culture with staff being afraid of voicing concerns. Those issues were being put right as the Transformation Programme moved forward. There would always be some that said they were not fully informed but there would be a supportive approach. The Trust would only succeed if it engaged with colleagues and supported them and there was a Board development programme including how they would engage and do things differently.
- Examples of the new culture of working included the Chief Executive having worked over the weekend to understand and experience the new initiative being implemented following the review of Emergency Care and see what it was like to work in that Department. Other members of the Executive Team regularly worked on the Wards at night to gain night staff experience. Staff had feedback that they did not appreciate the use of agency staff and had recommended that they be encouraged to join the Nursing Bank and work within the Trust. Within 3 days of receipt of that recommendation the Executive Team had listened and it had been announced that it would be implemented
- Patient pathways were the key to transformation and there would be reports by late summer. Many of the £8.44m savings had come from staff ideas rather than from the leadership team
- Would be helpful for the Select Commission to receive performance outcomes against the plan

- The cuts would mainly be against efficiencies and contract expenditure. The length of stay for patients within the Trust was average - within Surgery it was good but within Medicine not so good with patients staying 1 day longer than average. Working with Social Services would improve the situation. Each of the 15 workstreams were led by an Executive Lead or a Senior Manager and have a support team

Martin, Jan, Tracey and Kerry were thanked for their attendance.

Resolved:- That a special meeting be held on 25th June, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m. to consider the Trust's five year plan.

87. ACCESS TO GPS SCRUTINY REVIEW

Consideration was given to a report presented by Councillor Hoddinott, Chair of the Review Group, which set out the findings and recommendations of the above Scrutiny Review.

The 7 main aims of the Review had been:-

- Establish the respective roles and responsibilities of NHS England and GP practices with regard to access to GPs
- Ascertain how NHS England oversees and monitors access to GPs
- Identify national and local pressures that impact on access to GPs – current and future
- Determine how GP practices manage appointments and promote access for all patients
- Identify how NHS England Area Team will be responding to changes nationally
- Consider satisfaction data from the GP Patient Survey on a practice by practice basis and to compare Rotherham with the national picture
- Identify areas for improvement in current access to GPs (locally and nationally)

A full scrutiny review was carried out and evidence gathering began in October, 2013, concluding in March, 2014. It had comprised of round table discussions and written evidence from health partners, reviewing the National GP Patient Survey data, desktop research and fact finding visits to 4 GP practices.

The national and local pressures that impacted upon access to GPs were recognised. There was reduced funding, shortages of GPs and nurses and premises that were not always suitable for the increasing range of services now delivered at practices. Patient demographics with a growing and ageing population, coupled with the prevalence of ill health and long term conditions and local deprivation in some areas meant increasing demand. This required adequate resourcing to ensure good access to services for all patients.

Patients' experiences of accessing GPs varied from practice to practice with some long waiting times reported. Expectations and preferences were changing and it was a question of striking a balance between clinical need, patient expectations and convenient access with practices needing to work with their patients to develop systems that worked well for both.

The review had made 12 recommendations:-

1. Patients' experiences of accessing GPs vary from practice to practice, therefore NHS England needs to ensure that patients' views on access are reflected in the forthcoming Personal Medical Services contract re-negotiations and five year commissioning plan.
2. The continuation of the Patient Participation Directed Enhanced Service in 2014/15 should be used to ensure patients are well informed and empowered through the Patient Participation Groups to challenge pool access and suggest improvements.
3. Although recognising the importance of clinical need, the expectations and preferences of patients are changing and practices should explore more hybrid and flexible approaches to appointments, such as having part of each day for sit and wait slots.
4. NHS England should maintain access to interpretation services for GPs with an emphasis on professional services, supported by training for GPs and practice staff to increase confidence in using telephone services where appropriate.
5. NHS England should review their current interpretation provision to see if economies could be achieved through signing up to Rotherham MBC's framework agreement which is open to partner agencies.
6. GP practices should regularly showcase best practice and share successes on providing good access to patients through existing means such as the practice manager forum and Protected Learning Time events.
7. Patient information and education is important, both generic information about local services and specific information about how their surgery works:-
 - a. GP practices should ensure their practice leaflets and websites are kept up to date about opening times, closure dates for training and how the out of hours service works
 - b. NHS England should explore developing an App with practice information that people with smartphones and tablets can download

- c. Health and Wellbeing Board should consider developing a Borough-wide publicity campaign to raise awareness about the impact of not cancelling unneeded appointments
 - d. GP practices should work with their reception staff, patients and Patient Participation Groups to encourage patients to provide more information to staff when contacting the practice, enabling them to see the right person in the practice team
 - e. Health and Wellbeing Board should consider revisiting the "Choose Well" campaign to raise awareness of how to access local services and which is the most appropriate service in a range of situations
8. In light of the future challenges for Rotherham outlined in the report, the review recommends that a proactive approach is taken by the Health and Wellbeing Board to mitigate risk to the delivery of primary care.
 9. NHS England should consider incentives to attract GPs to start their career in Rotherham following training in the area to help address the demographic issues of our current GPs.
 10. Rotherham CCG should collect and analyse monitoring information to ensure that services are resourced to meet peaks in demand during protected learning time at the new Emergency Care Centre from 2015.
 11. NHS England needs to be more proactive in managing increases in GP demand due to new housing developments rather than waiting for existing services to reach capacity.
 12. Rotherham MBC, when considering its response to the scrutiny review of supporting the local economy, should ensure health partners are invited to be part of the multi-disciplinary approach to proposed new developments.

The Review Group and Scrutiny Officer were thanked for their work on this issue.

Resolved:- (1) That the findings and recommendations of the report be endorsed.

(2) That the report be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Cabinet.

88. HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, presented a progress report on the Select Commission's work programme and delivery to date together with future agenda items and potential themes for 2014/15.

Items suggested to date for the proposed programme for the Health Select Commission were as follows:-

Mental Health

Special Schools – Nurses and School Nursing Service

Commissioning Support Unit – Continuing Health Care

Items still to be considered but scheduled for June/July were:-

Continence

Better Care Fund – final action plan

Public Health Annual Report

Health and Wellbeing Strategy Workstreams – Poverty and Prevention and Early Intervention

Emergency Care Centre

Healthwatch

Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Accounts

Discussion ensued on the inclusion of Mental Health within the proposed programme and the broad spectrum it encompassed. It was suggested that a scoping paper be produced to establish which areas should be concentrated on.

Resolved:- (1) That the achievements made so far be noted.

(2) That Mental Health and Wellbeing underpin the Health Select Commission's 2014/15 work programme.

89. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- (1) That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 12th June, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

(2) That a special meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 25th June, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
12th June, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Dalton, Havenhand, Hoddinott, Vines, Whysall and Peter Scholey.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jepson, Kaye, Swift and Wootton.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

2. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no members of the public and press present at the meeting.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

LGIU Policy Briefings/Minding the Gap

Details of how to sign up for the briefings had been circulated to Members.

A further useful resource was the recently published A Cllr's Guide to the Health System in England which was available on the intranet under Member Learning and Development Resources.

Support for Carers Review

The Cabinet's response to the review was to be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 20th June. All 11 recommendations had been accepted and progress monitoring reports to be submitted to the Select Commission in due course.

Access to GPs Review

NHS England were involved in discussions with regard to Clinical Commissioning Groups being more closely involved in commissioning primary care with a range of models including joint or co-commissioning. There were mixed views on the issue such as the impact this may have on relationships between the CCGs and GPs as well as concerns regarding conflicts of interest. The Rotherham CCG had expressed an interest in managing GP contracts in their 5 year plan believing it would facilitate the development of system-wide care pathways needed to achieve efficiencies.

It was felt that this required further discussion as there appeared to be a conflict of interest.

Resolved:- That this issue be included on a future Select Commission agenda.

Health Conference on 16 July

There was one spare place from those booked by commission members; details available from Janet Spurling.

July Meeting

A ballot was currently underway for possible industrial action on 10th July, the diaried date for a meeting of the Select Commission. Depending upon the outcome, it may be that the date of the meeting would be changed. Members would be notified of the revised date and time.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 17th April, 2014.

Arising from Minute No. 85 (RDaSH Quality Accounts), it was noted that the document had been circulated to Select Commission members requesting comments by 20th June, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 17th April, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

5. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 23rd April, 2014.

Arising from Minute No. S95(b) (National Child Measurement Data) it was noted that a multi-agency performance clinic had been held to examine the issue from different perspectives. A set of actions to try and address the issues had been produced and look at alternative Performance Indicators. The outcome of the clinic had still to be reported to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the meeting be received and the contents noted.

(2) That the information arising from the performance clinic be forwarded to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

6. ISSUES FROM HEALTHWATCH

Nathan Batchelor, Research and Information Officer, Healthwatch Rotherham, reported the following:-

- The annual report would be available on 30th June. He thanked those who had contributed to the report

- The ‘Hear to Help’ Service, a free support service for hearing aid wearers in Rotherham provided by Action on Hearing Loss, a voluntary organisation, had unfortunately lost their funding. A number of comments had been received which had been forwarded to the Prevention of Hearing Loss and John Healey, MP, and had received an extension for a month. RFT had put in an alternative service to help residents but there was concern that there was no service provision in the Dinnington and Kiveton Park areas. Comments had been received from residents in those areas
- A report on RDaSH CAMHS services, put together by a number of parents and carers, would be available shortly on Healthwatch Rotherham’s website

7. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST QUALITY ACCOUNT

Tracey McErlain-Burns, Chief Nurse, and Hilary Fawcett, Quality Governance Lead, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Quality Account

- The focus of the Quality Account is on how we take assurance that the services we provide are safe, effective and enabling our patients, their families and carers to have a positive experience of care

Looking Back – our quality improvement for 2013/13

- Priority 1 – Patient Safety – Intraoperative Fluid management (CQUIN) - Achieved
- Priority 2 – Improving Data Quality - Improved
- Priority 3 – Review of Death Certificates - Achieved
- Priority 4 – Patient Experience – Dementia – Not achieved

Looking Forward – TRFT Quality Objectives 2014/15

- 1 – SAFE – Mortality – Deliver a 4 point reduction in HSMR
- 2 – SAFE – Harm free Care (HFC)
 - 2.1 Minimum 96% HFC
 - 2.2 Zero avoidable pressure ulcers grade 2-4
 - 2.3 Zero avoidable falls with harm
- 3 – RELIABLE – Achieve all national waiting time targets
 - 3.1 Cancer
 - 3.1.1 2 week waits
 - 3.1.2 31 days
 - 3.1.3 62 days
 - 3.2 A&E
 - 3.3 18 weeks

- 4 – CARING AND RELIABLE – Friends and Family (FFT)
 - 4.1 Achieve an A&E net promoter score (NPS) of 75
 - 4.2 Achieve an IP NPS of 83
 - 4.3 Achieve a maternity NPS of 83
 - 4.4 Achieve a 40% response rate for A&E, maternity and in-patients combined

CQC Inspection – all standards met

- Consent to treatment
- Care and welfare of people who use the service
- Cleanliness and infection control
- Requirements relating to workers
- Supporting workers
- Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision

Information Governance

- Information Governance Management – 66% (satisfactory)
- Confidentiality and Data Protection Assurance - 66% (satisfactory)
- Information Security Assurance – 66% (satisfactory)
- Clinical Information Assurance – 66% (satisfactory)
- Secondary Use Assurance – 66% (satisfactory)
- Corporate Information Assurance – 66% (satisfactory)
- Overall 66% (satisfactory)

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

- The mortality rates covered 3 principle measures:- Hospital Standardised Mortality Ratio (covered all deaths in hospital), SHMI (Summary Hospital Level Mortality Indicator) (covered all patients in the community if they died within 30 days of discharge from hospital) and RAMI (Risk Adjusted Mortality Index) (a different way of comparing hospital death rates within the service). A further area to be implemented in 2014 was Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease and Respiratory Disorders especially Acute Pneumonia and the introduction of respiratory bundles
- Infection Control – there had been 7 cases reported of Clostridium Difficile in September-October, 2013, with the precise cause not identified. Since then cleaning, cleanliness standards, cleaning of wheelchairs, changing of curtains and all practices in relation to infection prevention had been looked at. When the outbreak had occurred, the Trust had reverted to the very old fashioned process of isolation and converted a 14 bed into closed door isolation environment and prevented any further spread
- A NEVER event involved factors that the Department of Health described as ones that should never occur if a Trust had implemented all the safety bulletins that have been issued over the previous year.

Details of the event could not be given for possible identification of the patient but assurance targets set

- The CQC had highlighted earlier in the year, the risk that there might be underreporting on patient safety (this was the national picture that gave assurance that Trusts were reporting). It was thought that the CQC may be identifying that Rotherham had a different threshold in reporting compared to other Trusts
- Staffing levels had been monitored i.e. every shift and whether or not the staffing levels were correct. The Quality Account was reporting that on 8% of occasions the Trust had not met the plan for nursing staff levels despite bank nurses and agency staff. 122 applicants were being interviewed for 35 Band 5 nursing vacancies with permission to over-recruit due to the expected loss of approximately 10 nurses a month for natural reasons/retirement/promotion. If unsuccessful, consideration would be given to overseas recruitment because of the demand on Registered Nurses across England. The health and wellbeing offer was being strengthened and sickness management arrangements tightened up
- There was a full establishment of nurses in Community Services and Maternity. A review of the nursing establishment would be considered by the Trust Board shortly. There were some vacancies in the Health Support posts
- As services transferred out to Community Services, the workforce would have to transfer and recognition of the requirements in advance in order to develop competencies of staff but also more importantly confidence of the staff. It was very different working in the hospital to being in a patient's home
- The Accounts contained a number of targets some of which were national. There were potential penalties in that some of the targets were CQUIN targets or contracting for quality improvement. If the targets described did not improve, the CCG could financially penalise the Trust and 1 of the areas where that could be applied was in instances of infection. The £10M cost improvement proposals had to be quality impact assessed and signed off as not having an adverse effect on quality by the medical director and that was being managed. It was not known at this stage whether the CCG would impose any financial penalty. There was a process that if a CCG believed there was a risk to the target they would serve a Contact Enquiry in order to understand whether there were suitable plans in place to prevent the risk maturing. It was felt that the relationship between the CCG and Trust was such that they would be looking to re-invest in order to drive the improvement

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

8. BETTER CARE FUND ACTION PLAN

Tom Cray, Strategic Director, Housing and Neighbourhood Services, and Kate Green, Policy Officer, presented a report which provided a brief overview of the process undertaken to date, NHS England feedback and how the plan would now be implemented.

Discussion ensued with attention drawn to the following:-

- The Risk Register and a summary of each of the schemes which made up the programme were attached to the report
- The new Care Bill was ranked as a “red” risk as the final detail was awaited. Once known, the detail would have to be evaluated to ensure no deviation from what the intended funding outcomes
- 14 schemes – 4 have recently been introduced
- Original plan was RAG rated by the DoE, NHS England and Peer Review and reasonably well received with no red indicators but 7 amber indicators
- Subsequent submission in April addressed the issues highlighted as part of the Peer Review. A multi-agency officer group and a Health and Wellbeing Board task group established. It had now been approved
- There had recently been unsubstantiated information from the Department of Health regarding concerns at a national level about whether the plans were deliverable at a national level and a commissioning point of view and whether would be an adverse effect on a number of hospital trusts across the country. The Kings Fund had made comments about the concept of the BCF nationally. There had been denials by the DoH about the leaks but a letter has been sent to the CCG asking them to review the plan particularly because of the financial aspects of the plan and the potential effects on hospitals. The Local Authority was awaiting as to how the CCG would carry out a review and report to the HWBB
- There had been ongoing discussions with the CCG regarding the financial deliverability. It was not just a transfer of NHS services to the Local Authority but the accompanying resources as well
- The BCF had forced the CCG to be more open about their own 5 year plans and given the opportunity to look at how they impacted on the Local Authority plans and jointly meet the demographic pressures and the rising expectations of citizens. It had also demonstrated that some of the CCG plans had unintended consequences, estimated to be £5M. Negotiations had focussed on how the CCG “swopped” the

funding they had already received in light of them already having a plan agreed by the DoH

- A further concern which had been leaked to a national newspaper was how the targets affected the business plans of the hospitals. The letter received by the CCG had requested that they be certain that the provider understood the impact of the plans and that the plans had been properly catered for
- It had been emphasised that the CCG must ensure that a whole system approach be taken for any projects so as to avoid the transfer of cost/responsibility somewhere else in the system and to consider the potential effect of efficiencies on outcomes for patients or citizens
- The plan consisted of a series of projects where it was felt the most progress/difference could be made to the citizens of Rotherham within the timescale
- A pilot was to be developed that would enable the sharing of patient information amongst professionals with the appropriate consensus from the individuals concerned
- There had been mixed messages coming from the 2 Governmental Departments of Health and Communities and Local Government with regard to resources and their transfer as well as recognition that it would cause some tension. This had been the case in some parts of the country. The majority of authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber region had taken the same approach as Rotherham
- There was a need for more work to be done on reducing admissions to hospital particularly around falls prevention with care homes. They had equally been affected by the tightening of resources and a partnership approach was required
- The plan did not come into effect until April, 2015, but was currently in a pilot learning year

Resolved:- (1) That the final plan submitted to deliver the Better Care Fund report be noted.

(2) That the Select Commission monitor the plan at 3 monthly intervals.

(3) That consideration be given to inviting the project leads to report on their projects.

9. HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY - UPDATE ON POVERTY WORKSTREAM

Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, presented a report on the poverty theme of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, setting out the extent of the problem, its determinant factors and highlight some of the approaches being taken to tackle the issue.

The Poverty theme had the following outcomes:-

Priorities

- We will make an overarching commitment to reducing health inequalities particularly in areas suffering from a concentration of disadvantage

We will ask the Rotherham Partnership:-

- To look at new ways of assisting those disengaged from the labour market to improve their skills and readiness for work
- To ensure that strategies to tackle poverty do not just focus on the most disadvantaged but there is action across the Borough to avoid poverty worsening
- To consider how we can actively work with every household in deprived areas to maximise benefit take-up of every person

Attention was drawn to the following:-

- Much of the work was undertaken at a neighbourhood level as part of the Deprived Neighbourhoods initiative
- The 2010 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) had highlighted significant concerns in relation to a worsening position for Rotherham.
- Corporately, work was underway to develop a Building Resilience Strategy which would ensure a strategic multi-agency approach towards tackling the key underlying issues affecting poverty in the Borough. Its 4 overarching objectives were:-
 - Maximising access to sustainable, decently paid employment and relevant training
 - Inclusive economic growth that benefits all of Rotherham's communities
 - Helping people to thrive and fulfil their potential
 - Building social capital and helping neighbourhoods to flourish
- A new approach agreed by Cabinet and the Rotherham Partnership based on local leadership and a long term commitment from partners to tackle inequalities in disadvantaged areas. Cabinet Member and Strategic Director leads were identified for each of the 11 deprived

neighbourhoods (as identified through the 2011 IMD) as well as Area Co-ordinators with the remit of:-

- Developing a local rich picture
 - Putting in place governance and engagement strategies
 - Establishing an action plan
 - Making connections with the key players from other agencies to deliver the action plan
- Each priority area had been evaluated to assess progress with emerging issues set out in the report submitted. The following actions were recommended:-
- Children, Young People and Education – stronger links needed to be created between the Area Co-ordinators and the learning communities. Young people in deprived neighbourhoods were not achieving England and Maths to the Local Authority average and of the 16 learning communities predominantly those in the deprived communities were below the Local Authority average
 - Adult Skills – increased community engagement activity to build up the connectivity within a community. Consideration to be given to outreach support work in the geographical areas with targeted groups of greatest need. From the 2011 census, 40% of those in deprived neighbourhoods had no qualifications and only 19% had a Level 3 qualification or above
 - Employment – targeted action had been undertaken to tackle unemployment. Unemployment and inactivity had to be reduced in order to narrow the distance between neighbourhoods of entrenched worklessness and the City Region average
 - Health – ensure those working in deprived neighbourhoods were trained in Making Every Contact count, actively promote the availability of free school meals/Health Schools Meals Policies, distribute information regarding the dangers of cheap and illicit tobacco and Area co-ordinators to contact general practices to raise their awareness of local health provision in the community and provide community feedback to the practice. Smoking rates in Rotherham were higher than the England average for the general adult population, in pregnancy and for young people as well as the rates of overweight and obesity in adults. The percentage of Rotherham's adult population with increasing and high risk drinking was similar to the England average but had significantly higher numbers of hospital stays for alcohol-related admissions
 - Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour – improve the process for determining what local actions and resources should be applied to emerging problems

- Environmental – data showed that there had been a general increase in the number of complaints made about waste accumulations/flytipping but a marked reduction in complaints about dog fouling and litter.
- Community Engagement – all Co-ordinators to recognise the value of community involvement as a key method of raising aspiration and use community engagement as the focus of cascading information on adult education, employment, health and environment, increase resources, work closer with the Customer Engagement Team to target ‘communities of interest’ within the disadvantaged areas, improve links to schools within the 11 communities, closer links to environmental work and establish a ‘plan of engagement’

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

- “Ask me about the Flag” – in an attempt to improve fuel poverty, the Repairs contract workforce wore the badge for any tenant to ask them about their energy requirements. They could carry out boiler and thermostat checks, give energy saving advice, provide contact number for energy providers and refer people to specialist financial advice etc.
- 9 out of the 11 neighbourhoods had a specific priority relating directly to health inequalities whilst others had actions which impacted on health. There was very little mention of mental health and disability both of which were real barriers to employment. It was acknowledged that the main issues coming forward, and focussed upon, from the 11 deprived neighbourhoods related to Obesity, Alcohol, Smoking, Breastfeeding and Healthy Lifestyles. However, there were a whole raft of things taking place that were interlinked. Mental Health was 1 of the key priorities of the Better Care Fund (BCF) and actions that been taken under that heading would also impact on this workstream. It was also fair to say that mental health issues were not confined to areas of deprivation but occurred Borough-wide. The workstream was attempting to address a set of 5/6 priorities on a Borough-wide basis and working with people in those neighbourhoods to identify the issues that had arisen from the statistics and local people in order to devise a plan that should link up with Borough-wide issues. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy and BCF recognised mental health, loneliness, isolation, the need to support people, need to catch people early, primary and secondary care. They were not highlighted in the deprived neighbourhoods works as there was service provision on a Borough-wide basis
- Not a lot of work had taken place yet with regard to engagement with GPs. It was an area for development

Resolved:- That the progress made against the objectives within the Poverty workstream be noted.

10. SCRUTINY REVIEW: URINARY INCONTINENCE

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, submitted a report setting out the proposed context to the scrutiny review.

The award winning Continence Advisory Service provided clinical advice, support and treatment to people in Rotherham who experienced problems with bladder and bowel dysfunction. The Service was responsible for supplying disposable absorbent products to eligible patients and prescribing all continence related equipment such as urinary catheters and drainage bags. Staff also provided advice regarding bladder problems or whether Service users ought to be their product needs reviews.

Rotherham transferred the prescribing of continence appliances from GPs to the Community Continence Service in 2009 and was the only CCG/PCT to demonstrate a decrease in continence expenditure over the last 5 years. In the period 2009-2013, continence prescribing costs in England increased by 21.56% whereas in Rotherham costs decreased by 8.99%.

It was proposed that the Service be subject to a focused spotlight review to examine current work and future plans to try and prevent or reduce urinary incontinence and to educate people that healthy lifestyles could also help to prevent incontinence.

Desired outcomes of the review would be:-

- To ascertain the prevalence of urinary incontinence in the Borough and the impact it has on people's independence and quality of life
- To establish details of current continence services and costs and plans for future service development
- To identify any areas for improvement in promoting preventative measures and encouraging people to have healthy lifestyles

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

(2) That Councillor Vines be included on the review group.

(3) That an e-mail be sent to those Members not present to ascertain if they wished to be part of the review group.

11. REPRESENTATIVES TO WORKING GROUPS/PANELS

Resolved:- (1) That Councillors Wootton and Dalton (substitute) represent the Select Commission on the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel.

(2) That Councillor Havenhand represent the Select Commission on the Recycling Group.

(3) That representation be sought from those not present at the meeting to the Climate Change Group.

(3) That Councillors Steele and Hoddinott (substitute) represent the Select Commission on the Regional Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

12. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a special meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 25th June, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
Thursday, 8th May, 2014

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

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Beck, Godfrey and J. Hamilton.

68. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

69. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

70. COMMUNICATIONS

No communications had been received.

71. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27th March, 2014, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

72. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 28TH FEBRUARY, 2014

Further to Minute No. 241 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 30th April, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by Pete Hudson, Chief Finance Manager, which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2013/14 based on performance for the first eleven months of the financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would underspend against its Budget by £36k (-0.016%). This represented an improvement in the forecast outturn of £1.219M since the January monitoring report.

Delivery of this very positive forecast outturn would not have been possible without the early implementation of Cabinet's Budget Strategy to bring spend back in line during the financial year. This included both the implementation of the in-year moratorium on non-essential spend (October 2013) and the release of 126 staff through Voluntary Early Retirement/Voluntary Severance (VER/VS). Implementation of the moratorium on non-essential spend had adversely impacted on some services ability to deliver income targets (most notably ICT services), however, overall a slight underspend was still forecast.

Members were asked to note that meetings continued to take place with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) with regard to levels and timing of Continuing Health Care (CHC) funding. Details of progress to date were included within this report.

It was proposed that the next budget monitoring report would be the Council's 2013/14 Outturn Report which was to be presented to Cabinet in June once the Council's Statutory Unaudited Financial Statements have been prepared.

The Select Commission were advised of the forecasted over and underspends for each which were set out in detail as part of the report.

A discussion and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified where possible:-

- What was the effect on the budget when schools were in deficit and then sought academy status and how the future risk was mitigated.
- Liability on pensions when a school turned into an academy.
- Amazing achievement of a 97.1% collection rate target for Council Tax and the thanks to staff on maintaining and exceeding collection targets.
- Identification of unachievable budget savings targets and why these were still identified as savings going forward.
- Responsibility of Directorates and Finance Managers ensuring savings put forward were achieved and assurances that the monitoring process was taking place.
- Improvements in Children and Young People's Services year on year, but which were still reporting an overspend, which was being offset by bigger savings by other Directorates.
- Overspend on winter pressures and the impact on the budget of a harsher winter than that of 2013/14.
- Inherent pressure of winter maintenance which appeared out of kilter in terms of adequate budget provision and the potential for a spotlight scrutiny review on this area either by this Commission or Improving Places.
- Forecasted contribution to reserves from the Housing Revenue Account when the budget set indicated the need for a draw down from reserves and a request for the content to be explained in more detail.
- Number of Departments forecasting underspends and whether or not the budget allocations had been set appropriately and if these underspends could offset some of the services that were subject to budget cuts potentially calling into question accuracy of budget setting

Resolved:- (1) That the significant achievement of a balanced forecast outturn be noted.

(2) That the progress made to date in respect of Continuing Health Care negotiations be noted.

(3) That further financial information be provided on effect of schools in deficit seeking academy status and the future liability on pensions.

(4) That winter pressures and the Housing Revenue Account be added to the Work Programme for consideration and further investigation in the next municipal year.

73. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Consideration was given to a report presented by Colin Earl, Director of Audit and Asset Management, which provided details of the current Corporate Risk Register summary. The summary showed the risks associated with the Council's most significant priorities and projects and actions being taken to mitigate these risks.

The Council's key current risks continued to relate to the financial pressures faced by the Council, the impact of the Welfare Reforms, delivering effective Children's Services and economic growth. The report summarised the management actions that were being taken to mitigate these and other risks in the register and listed the risks in descending inherent risk order to emphasise the most significant.

A new risk relating to pandemics and communicable diseases had been added to the Register at the request of Public Health in recognition of the changing face of the Authority and its responsibilities.

Two risks had been removed from the Register:-

- Making the best use of properties and expanding worksmart – the aims had been sufficiently progressed to warrant its removal from the Register but would continue to be reviewed as part of the EDS top priorities/Risk Register.
- Financial impact of Mesothelioma claims to be paid through Municipal Mutual Insurance – the impact was now more clearly known and had been fully provided for.

It was noted that KPMG were carrying out an analysis of Risk Registers across the region and would provide a report on the comparison exercise in due course.

As had been noted in the previous report the impact of schools seeking academy status was affecting income by the ICT Team.

The Select Commission questioned whether or not the impact of the De-regulation Bill had been factored into the Risk Register and referred to the recent seminar held for all Members on Universal Credit as part of the Welfare Reform.

It was also noted that the Forward Plan of Key Decisions was presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Further information was also requested on the key lines of responsibility and accountability for those schools who had sought academy status and how safeguarding issues were monitored and also on the model of accountability and reporting mechanisms for Public Health.

Clarification was also sought on the financial impact of mesothelioma and the reasons for the removal from the Risk Register and whether or not schools not hitting targets or in dispute should be added.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the Corporate Risk Register summary attached at Appendix A be noted.

(2) That the current assessment of the Council's top corporate risks be noted.

(3) That the De-Regulation Bill and schools in deficit seeking academy status be considered for addition to the Corporate Risk Register.

74. WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14 - UPDATE AND FORWARD PLANNING

Caroline Webb, Scrutiny Adviser (Scrutiny and Member Development), presented an update on the progress on the delivery of its work programme, summarising the areas that had been closely monitored, achievements and changes that had taken place. It also proposed future agenda items and potential themes going forward into 2014/15.

Due to the Select Commission's monitoring role many of the issues already considered would continue to be scheduled at regular points throughout the municipal year, along with the 2015/16 budget setting process, equality impact of budget savings and workforce planning.

From previous reports winter pressures and more in-depth information on the Housing Revenue Account were suggestions that should be added to the programme moving forward.

The Select Commission were mindful of other Commissions seeking a theme to their monitoring role and it was suggested that "Budget and Performance" qualified in this instance as the 2015/16 budget setting process would feature heavily in the next municipal year. It was suggested that Directorates be encouraged to share information at an earlier stage in the process to enable more scrutinised involvement.

Resolved:- (1) That the achievements so far be noted.

(2) That the theme "Budget and Performance" be an adopted approach for the 2014/15 work programme with an earlier emphasis on the 2015/16 budget process.

75. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of this Select Commission be held at the Town Hall, Rotherham on Thursday, 26th June, 2014, commencing at 3.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
30th April, 2014**

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Ali, Clark, The Mayor (Councillor Barry Dodson), Lelliott, License, Read, Roddison and Sharman and Co-opted Member Ms. J. Jones.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buckley, Burton, J. Hamilton and Kaye and Co-opted Member Mr. M. Smith.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

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

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

59. COMMUNICATIONS.

There was nothing to report under this item.

60. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12TH MARCH, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 12th March, 2014, were considered.

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

61. SCHOOL PERFORMANCE.

Councillor G. A. Russell welcomed the Director of Schools and Lifelong Learning, the Head of the School Effectiveness Service and the Virtual Headteacher for Looked After Children (Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services Directorate) to the meeting. Councillor Russell thanked the Officers for authoring the reports and attending the meeting during a very busy time for the Service.

The Head of the School Effectiveness Service gave a presentation that outlined Rotherham's Schools' performance against key areas. The presentation updated the Improving Lives Select Commission on areas of progress and on areas where further improvements were required. The context to school performance had to be considered alongside the role of local authorities as set out in Section 13a of the Education Act (1996), the different types of schools and Ofsted's role as an independent quality assessor.

Early Years Foundation Stage Service: -

- There was a new Early Years Foundation Stage Framework;
- Many children in Rotherham joined the Foundation Stage below their age-related expectations;
- There continued to be a gap between Rotherham's performance and the outcomes achieved nationally;
- Areas where improvements were required included phonics and overall boys' attainment.

Key Stage One: -

- Key Stage One performance used to be undertaken by formal assessment, but was now through teacher assessment;
- The expected age-related performance was Level 2b;
- Boys' attainment was an area where improvements were required across Rotherham.

Key Stage Two: -

- Assessments at this stage were undertaken under 'exam conditions';
- Attainment at Key Stage Two was an area of significant underperformance in Rotherham;
- Outcomes suggested that children were not making progress quick enough through this Key Stage;
- Outcomes at the end of Key Stage Two were one measure used to judge whole school performance.

Key Stage Four: -

- Rotherham had demonstrated significant improvements over this Key Stage;
- Rotherham's GCSE performance achieved highly.

Key Stage Five: -

- This Key Stage constituted post-16 education, and included sixth-form provision;
- Performance at this Key Stage was complex and would warrant its own session to fully consider all of the relevant factors.

In summary: -

- Attainment and outcomes from across the five Key Stages were one of the ways that judgements were made about schools' progress;
- Rotherham was continuing to make good progress at Key Stage Four;

- Areas where further improvements were required to close the gap between Rotherham's performance and that achieved nationally were Key Stage Two and Boys' attainment and Literacy across all Key Stages.

Discussion followed the presentation and questions and comments were made: -

- **Why was Boys' performance lagging behind in Rotherham? Was this due to nature or nurture and what role did learning and assessment styles have? Was this the case nationally?**

Testing conditions were tending to favour girls' learning and remembering styles. Continuous assessment methods used favoured girls, whereas single end-of-year or end-of-school-career exams tended to favour boys' learning styles. However, some schools were bucking the trend and boys were outperforming girls, but this could be because girls were underperforming.

Boys matured later than girls and their learning styles favoured active styles of learning. Schools needed to ensure that their teaching and learning methods engaged both boys and girls.

Because testing was an annual event, significant changes were expected to attainment performance given the school amalgamations that were taking place, leadership changes and the use of Local Leaders of Education to drive school performance up.

- **Could action to raise the performance of boys lead to gender segregation in learning? (The Councillor who raised this question felt that it would be a negative development.)**

There was no movement towards gender segregated education in Rotherham schools. Schools and the Local Authority were using a range of strategies to ensure that all children performed to their best ability, including judging performance against national outcomes. School attainment was not the only performance measure used to judge schools. Children and young people did need qualifications to progress to the next stage of their life, but qualifications alone were not the only thing needed for successful adulthood.

- **What strategies were taking place to ensure that there were no underperforming or left behind ethnic and/or social class groups? There were groups that showed clear examples of educational disadvantage. What was being done to encourage disadvantaged communities to engage with education?**

This would be addressed in the section relating to the Pupil Premium.

- **Government messages were always clear that a child's first five years were crucial. Rotherham's performance was behind national performance in the Early Years Foundation Stage and Key Stage Two, but above in Key Stage Four. How was this the case; was it down to Rotherham's excellent secondary schools?**

Rotherham did have outstanding secondary schools whose performance was amongst the best in the country. Rotherham also had outstanding primary schools. Globally, trends had been identified that suggested large junior schools were not conducive to high outcomes due to leadership and management considerations. Rotherham's performance at Key Stage Four – GCSE level – had improved over the past ten to fifteen years. Rotherham's performance was closest matched to North Yorkshire, whereas the other South Yorkshire areas and statistical neighbours' performance was the opposite to Rotherham's.

- **What was considered to be a large primary school, and was this the same in other areas?**

400-500 pupils was considered to be a large primary school. Previous policies had been to limit pupil numbers within primary schools. Some areas had primary schools with 900-1000 pupils but this was not considered good practice.

- **How were services working together to ensure that children starting school had the best start possible?**

Rotherham's Early Years Service was developing better links to health, wellbeing and education.

Councillor Russell thanked the Officers for their attendance and contribution to the discussion.

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

(2) That the areas where improvements are required: Key Stage Two and Boys' attainment and Literacy attainment across all Key Stages be noted.

62. IMPACT OF THE PUPIL PREMIUM.

In addition to the Schools and Lifelong Learning Officers who had attended for the previous item, Councillor G. A. Russell welcomed the Headteacher of Broom Valley Community Primary School, and the Executive Headteacher of the Sandhill Multi-Academy Trust.

The Head of the School Effectiveness gave an overview of the overall attainment of pupils who were eligible for Free School Meals (FSM): -

- Attainment gaps persisted between pupils from deprived backgrounds and their more affluent peers at all stages of education, including entry into higher education;
- The highest early achievers from deprived backgrounds were overtaken by lower achieving children from more advantaged backgrounds by age seven;
- This gap widened further throughout secondary education and persisted into higher education;
- The likelihood of a pupil eligible for FSM achieving five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C including English and Maths was less than one third of a non-FSM pupil;
- A pupil from a non-deprived background was more than twice as likely to go on to study at university as their deprived peer.

The Pupil Premium: -

- Introduced by the Coalition Government in 2011;
- Eligible children were those looked after by the local authority, those who had been eligible for FSM at any point in the past six years (also known as Ever 6 FSM) and for children with parents currently serving in the armed forces;
- The Pupil Premium gave schools extra funding to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils from Reception to Year 11;
- In 2014/2015 the amounts of the Pupil Premium would be: -
 - Primary-aged pupils - £1,300 (increased from £900 during 2013/2014);
 - Secondary-aged pupils - £935 (increased from £900 during 2013/2014);
 - Looked-After Children - £1,900 per pupil.
- Schools were responsible for how the FSM Pupil Premium was spent, and had to publish how they spent the additional funding and how it had made a difference to attainment of eligible children;
- Local Authorities were responsible for distributing Looked After Children Pupil Premium to the schools and academies these children attended;
- Ofsted inspected how schools were deploying their Pupil Premium. It was unlikely that a school would be judged to be Outstanding if its disadvantaged pupils were not making good progress.

The Head of Service referred to the annexes submitted with the report. The information included: -

- Good Practice information on spending the Pupil Premium successfully to maximise achievement;
- 2013 performance for pupils who were eligible for the Pupil Premium including Key Stages One, Two and Four, and how these compared negatively to their more affluent peers' performance;

- The £ allocation of Pupil Premium funding to Rotherham schools during 2013/2014.

The Virtual Headteacher for Looked After Children spoke about how the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children was developing, along with the workforce available to support Looked After Children.

- The changing role of the Virtual Headteacher for Looked After Children: -
 - Accountable for the use of Pupil Premium through pupil progress interviews, interventions and impact assessment;
 - Would be accountable for passing the money on to schools and academies. Previously it had gone directly to schools and academies;
 - The role of the Virtual Headteacher was to become the fifth statutory role within a local authority;
 - In Rotherham the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children would be closely linked to Personal Education Plans (PEP) to ensure that a looked-after child was supported to achieve the targets within their PEP, which existed as part of their wider Care Plan;
 - Proposals about how the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children would be allocated were being drawn up, but included termly lump-sums being released to schools and academies after they had submitted monitoring and action plans that were specific to the child or young person's needs and had demonstrated appropriate use of funding and progress;
 - Both schools and local authorities would be accountable to Ofsted for the use of the funding.

The Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission thanked the Virtual Headteacher for Looked After Children for her presentation. Councillor Russell was pleased that the role was becoming statutory and also pleased with the clear outline given about the proposed deployment of funding to schools and academies alongside the use of robust PEPs to record children and young peoples' needs, targets and progress.

The two Headteachers had attended the meeting to give an account of how FSM Pupil Premium was deployed in their schools.

The Executive Headteacher of the Sandhill Multi-Academy Trust, spoke about how FSM Pupil Premium was used in his schools: -

- The use of the Pupil Premium sat within the overall ethos and vision of the Multi-Academy Trust, which was 'Learning How to Learn';
- Pupil Premium funding was used for things like music tuition as it removed the financial barrier that low-income children faced so they could explore their talent. The funding also provided access

to learning mentors, improvements to social skills and self-esteem, breakfast clubs, emotional support, parenting workshops, bereavement, family crisis, early years physiotherapy or physical development support and the school had a residential visit for each year of Key Stage Two;

- Named School Governors were responsible for tracking FSM childrens' progress compared to their more affluent peers national progress;
- It was not used to provide quality teaching and learning but to provide additionality;
- It was used to remove barriers and was not all spent at once. Some funding was kept in reserve throughout the school year to address issues as and when they arose, for example bereavement support;
- Children who received Pupil Premium were not segregated from their more affluent peers;
- The school did not identify individual children when it published information about the Pupil Premium.

The Headteacher of Broom Valley Community Primary School, spoke about how the FSM Pupil Premium was used in his School: -

- Broom Valley Community Primary School received £124,000 for 138 children, which equated to 35% of the school population during a previous financial year;
- Every professional working in every classroom knew the names of the children who were eligible for the Pupil Premium;
- Consideration was given to classroom structure and seating children receiving Pupil Premium together so that their needs could be identified and they benefit from the interventions;
- However, care was taken not to conflate FSM eligibility with automatic low attainment;
- All teaching needed to be good as a baseline. The FSM Pupil Premium was not used to fund extra teachers or teaching assistants;
- Pupil Premium funding was used to provide reasons or 'hooks' for children to come to school and enjoy it, which would lead to increased attainment;
- Broom Valley Community Primary School sought to ensure that there were children in receipt of FSM Pupil Premium on the School Council, Library Monitors, Reading Buddies and Play Ground Buddies. FSM-eligible children had been historically underrepresented on these bodies. The School aimed to increase the childrens' aspiration to be chosen for things and become involved;
- After School Club attendance had increased from 31 to 49 FSM eligible children;
- School Council representation had increased from 2/30 children – 7% - to 8/30 children – 27%;

- Parental involvement and the Achievement for All Strategy. A termly 40-minute meeting was held where a structured conversation took place to work with families to improve outcomes and encourage aspirations around education and learn what parents wanted for their child's education. 72 structured conversations had taken place with families as a result of the Pupil Premium;
- Provision of breakfast clubs to fulfil basic needs like hunger. Being hungry meant that children would not learn during the school day. Breakfast clubs enabled families to spend quality time together and improved childrens' attendance and punctuality;
- Pupil Premium funding had been used to buy P.E. kits and homework packs. Completion of homework had increased by 14%;
- Three walking busses were run by the School along with a rewards system for punctuality;
- The Pupil Premium was used for the benefit of the children and not for Ofsted. A recent Ofsted report had said that Broom Valley Community School was 'very much an inclusive school'.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised: -

- **What would happen when the Free School Meal entitlement was rolled out to all infant-aged children from September, 2014. Would all infant-aged children be in receipt of the FSM Pupil Premium and be eligible for the Ever 6 FSM?** – No notice had been given about what the plans would be following the universal infant entitlement;
- **What safeguards were in place to ensure that the Pupil Premium funding is targeted appropriately and not 'absorbed' into general budgets?;**
- **Sustainability – what would schools do if the funding scheme ended?;**
- **What could the Local Authority do to ensure the good practice that was demonstrated here was widely known?** – Being aware of good practice and ensure that all stakeholders know what good practice looked like;
- **Linking into Rotherham's Families for Change programme;**
- **Governor training on the importance of the Pupil Premium and their role in challenging the Headteacher on the deployment of the funding;**
- **What powers did the Local Authority have to enforce excellent practice for funding the Pupil Premium?** – The Local Authority could not enforce schools to spend the money in a particular way. However, good practice could be shared. There were consequences of not following good practice for using the Pupil Premium in terms of attainment outcomes and Ofsted inspection outcomes;
- **Training for Headteachers** – Two excellent examples had been shared today, but any number of headteachers could have

attended to share their good practice. Information and good practice was shared at a recent Joint Headteachers meeting, where over 90% of Rotherham's headteachers had attended.

The Chairperson thanked the Headteachers and Officers for attending the meeting and for the information they had provided and the passion that they demonstrated to improve outcomes for the children attending their schools.

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

63. CONSULTATION ON THE GOVERNMENT'S CHILD POVERTY STRATEGY.

The Policy and Partnership Officer (Policy and Research, Planning and Regeneration, Environment and Development Services Directorate) presented the submitted report that outlined the requirements of the Child Poverty Act (2010) and the current consultation relating to child poverty.

The report outlined the requirements and intentions of the Act: -

- The Act intended that less than 10% of children would live in poverty by 2020/2021. This was from a baseline of 18% in 2010/2011;
- In 2011/2012 17% of children were living in relative income poverty;
- The Act required the Government to produce a Child Poverty Strategy every three years, and for local authorities and their partners to cooperate to produce a local needs assessment and produce a joint local Child Poverty Strategy;
- Originally the Act had defined poverty as children living in households with less than 60% of the median income;
- Frank Fields MP's independent review stated that there should be a shift in focus from relative income measures of poverty to tackling root causes, along with a clear focus on the 'foundation years' of a child's life;
- Previous consultation that had been undertaken called 'Better Measures' related to issues of income, worklessness, parental skills, debt and family stability;
- The Child Poverty Act (2010) called for the creation of the Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission. The Commission's 'State of the Nation' report published in 2013 called for the working poor to be the focus of the future efforts to eradicate child poverty.

The report also considered Rotherham's context: -

- On the latest available figures, around 13,000 Rotherham children – one in five – lived in relative income poverty;
- 64% lived in a lone-parent household;

- An updated needs assessment was required as it was now estimated that 42% of the families were not in work;
- Rotherham's Early Help Strategy had a focus on preventative work with children and families and served as the primary vehicle for addressing and mitigating the effects of child poverty in Rotherham;
- Rotherham's Health and Wellbeing Board's Strategy had a specific poverty priority focussing on reducing health inequalities and improving skills and work readiness;
- A Strategy for building resilience in Rotherham was being developed and concentrated on four objectives related to sustainable employment and training, inclusive economic growth, helping people to thrive and fulfil their potential and building social capital and helping neighbourhoods to flourish.

A draft response had been prepared regarding the specific consultation questions that were to be used to shape the next three-year Strategy: -

1. To what extent do you agree that the draft strategy achieves a good balance between tackling poverty now and tackling the drivers of intergenerational poverty?
2. Considering the current fiscal climate, what is your view of the actions set out in the draft strategy?
3. At a local level, what works well in tackling child poverty now?
4. At a local level, what works well for preventing poor children becoming poor adults?
5. What more can central government do to help employers, local agencies and the voluntary and community sector work together to end child poverty?

A draft consultation response was included and the content of the response was discussed.

There was general support for the response. It was requested that the response to question two regarding the use of Pupil Premium funding be amended to reflect the information that was shared under the previous two items.

It was noted that the final response would be considered at the Children, Young People and Families Partnership meeting taking place on 21st May, 2014, before being submitted to the Department for Education on 22nd May, 2014.

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

(2) That the draft response, with the amendment to the section concerning Pupil Premium funding, be approved by the Improving Lives Select Commission and be passed on to the Children, Young People and Families' Partnership.

64. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION'S WORK PROGRAMME 2013/2014 UPDATE AND FORWARD PLANNING 2014/2015.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Senior Scrutiny Adviser: Member Development (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Chief Executive's Office Directorate) that outlined the activities of the Improving Lives Select Commission during 2013/2014.

The Select Commission had received a mid-year update on the 2013/2014 work programme at their meeting on 18th December, 2014 (Minute No. 42 refers).

The Select Commission had completed work on: -

- Children Missing from Education;
- Local Safeguarding Children Board's Annual Safeguarding Report and Business Plan;
- 'Working Together' 2013 guidance;
- Adult Safeguarding Annual Report;
- Update on Families for Change (outcomes);
- Annual Lifestyle Survey (2013);
- School places update;
- Outcomes for Looked After Children (based on the ten questions to ask document);
- Narrowing the Gap – the impact of the Pupil Premium;
- Key Stage Performance;
- Child Sexual Exploitation;
- Improving services for people experiencing domestic abuse;
- Carers' review – completed jointly with the Health Select Commission.

The intended item on poverty affecting children and older people had been absorbed into the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's work programme. A further report on anti-bullying was awaiting completion and would be presented to the Improving Lives Select Commission prior to the recess.

A suggested work programme for the Improving Lives Select Commission for 2014/2015 included: -

- Children Missing from education (update);
- Update on Child Sexual Exploitation;
- Neglect – effects on vulnerable children and young people;
- Outcomes for Looked After Children;
- Updates on Families for Change;
- Effectiveness of Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub;
- Annual Safeguarding Report and Business Plan (LSCB);
- Forced marriage (recommendation from scrutiny review of domestic abuse);

- Annual Safeguarding Report for Vulnerable Adults;
- Review of progress: scrutiny review of domestic abuse.

Given how safeguarding issues for children, young people and vulnerable adults was central to the issues in the suggested work programme it was suggested that 'safeguarding' become the common theme of the Select Commission. It was noted that the Improving Places Select Commission's central theme would be supporting the local economy, the Health Select Commission's would be mental health and wellbeing, and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's would be the Department for Work and Pensions and other programmes.

The Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme maximised the potential for scrutiny to have an impact and mitigated against the risk of using resources with little impact or outcome. The work programme needed to maintain flexibility to allow for uncertainties to be accommodated within the planning process.

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

(2) That the outcomes of the Improving Lives Select Commission during 2013/2014 be noted.

(3) That the suggested work programme for this Select Commission during 2014/2015 be agreed as the central theme of safeguarding.

65. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 11th June, 2014, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
11th June, 2014

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Roddison and Reynolds and Co-opted member Ms. J. Jones and Ms. N. Jones (observing).

Councillor P. Lakin, Deputy Leader, was in attendance for item 6.

Apologies for absence were received from: - Councillors Clark, The Mayor (Councillor Barry Dodson), J. Hamilton and Turner and from Co-opted member Mr. Smith.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

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

There were no members of the Public or the Press in attendance.

3. COMMUNICATIONS.

The Senior Adviser for Scrutiny and Member Development (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic, Resources Directorate) raised two communications under this item: -

- From September 2014, Improving Lives Select Commission meetings would start at 2.00 p.m.. Pre-meetings would take place before the meetings from 1.15 p.m., all members of the Select Commission were invited to attend.
- An Adult Safeguarding Awareness Induction Session was planned for 29th July, 2014. Invitations had been issued to all Elected Members and they were encouraged to attend.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH APRIL, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 30th April, 2014, were considered.

Councillor Buckley was in attendance at this meeting.

Resolved: - That, with the amendment to the attendance, the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

5. APPOINTMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES ON PANELS AND WORKING GROUPS.

Resolved: - That the following appointments of representatives from the Improving Lives Select Commission to the panels and working groups for the 2014/2015 municipal year be agreed: -

- Health, Welfare and Safety Panel – Councillor Russell (substitute Councillor Ali);
- Recycling Group – To be agreed;
- Environment and Climate Change Steering Group – Councillor Astbury.

6. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION: WORK PROGRAMME 2014/2015.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Senior Adviser for Scrutiny and Member Development that outlined the proposed work programme for the Improving Lives Select Commission during the 2014/2015 municipal year.

Further to Minute No. 64 of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 30th April, 2014 (Improving Lives Select Commission's Work Programme 2013/2014 Update and Forward Planning 2014/2015), the submitted report outlined the remit/terms of reference of the Select Commission as directed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the Council's Constitution. Also included was the proposed work programme for 2014/2015 based on agreement from the previous meeting.

The Improving Lives Select Commission had agreed to have safeguarding as its central theme, including: -

- Child Sexual Exploitation;
- Update on the 'Families for Change' and 'Early Help' programmes;
- Children missing from care and home;
- Safeguarding annual reports (Adults and Children and Young People);
- Update on the implementation of the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of domestic abuse services.

The submitted appendix outlined the full work programme and Members were asked to confirm whether they agreed that the issues were a priority for the Improving Lives Select Commission and whether there were any other areas they wished to include. The proposed work programme was consistent with the Council's key policy agendas and the Corporate Plan

Priorities. The work programme needed to be realistic and best focus effort and resources during a time of reducing resources and staffing.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised: -

- It was noted that the work programme for the Improving Lives Select Commission would be flexible to allow for consideration of any items that may arise out of urgency.

Resolved: - (1) That the Improving Lives Select Commission's terms of reference and the role of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be noted.

(2) That the work programme attached at appendix one be approved for 2014/2015.

(3) That it be noted that the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme during 2014/2015 would be flexible to accommodate any items of urgency, through the re-prioritisation of existing items.

(4) That all members and partners of the Improving Lives Select Commission be urged to bring forward any items of urgency that arose.

7. OFSTED INSPECTION READINESS: CHILDREN IN NEED OF HELP AND PROTECTION, CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER AND CARE LEAVERS.

Councillor Russell, Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed the Performance and Quality Manager (Performance and Quality, Neighbourhood and Adult Services) and the Service Manager for Strategy, Standards and Early Help (Safeguarding Children and Families' Services, Children and Young People's Services) to the meeting. The Officers had been asked to provide an overview to the Select Commission on Rotherham's readiness for Ofsted's new inspection framework of the services for 'children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers'. The update also included the outcomes for local authorities across the country that had already been inspected under the new framework.

The submitted report was referred to, along with a presentation that was displayed to the Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

- The new inspection framework came into existence from 19th November, 2013, and all local authorities would be inspected within a three-year period under the framework;
- The inspection focussed on local authorities' functions to 'help, care and protect children and young people, along with the overall effectiveness, leadership, management and governance of services;

- The inspection would be 'single-framework' and cover the local authority, but not partner agencies, including all of the functions of social care;
- The Services/functions that would be inspected included Early Help, Child Protection, Looked After Children, Fostering, Adoption, Care Leavers and Local Safeguarding Children Board;
- The inspection would include four 'Key Judgements': -
 - The experiences and progress of children who need help and protection;
 - The experiences and progress of children looked after and achieving permanence (including adoption and care leavers);
 - Leadership, management and governance;
 - A review of the effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board.
- The inspection methodology was considered in detail. The new Framework undertook inspections over a four-week period and included interviews and group meetings on site, scrutiny of key documents and case file audits. Emphasis would be given to the individual child's journey;
- Twenty-four hours' notice would be given;
- There were four judgement grades – 'Outstanding', 'Good' (which was the new minimum standard), 'Requires Improvement' and 'Inadequate'. The Service was aware of the differences in quality between attaining 'Good' and 'Requires Improvement';
- If any one of the key judgements were considered to be Inadequate, overall effectiveness could only be judged as Inadequate;
- The new grading structure matched the school inspection framework;
- The profile of inspections that had taken place under the new framework since November, 2013, was considered. 27 local authorities had been or were in the process of being inspected. Sixteen reports had been published. No local authorities had been judged to be Outstanding under the new framework;

- Key messages about preparedness had been taken from the local authorities that had already been inspected. These included having staff trained and ready to undertake file audits, ensuring that evidence was available to demonstrate children's journeys and IT infrastructure;
- The inspection had been described as 'the most detailed and exacting inspection ever'. The length of the inspection and the difficulties of co-ordinating the high number of inspectors (seven individuals, although sometimes nine) was challenging. The month-long inspection was a significant deflection from staffs' day jobs;
- Key themes had been identified in the outcomes of the local authorities that had been inspected, including ensuring the child's voice was captured and considered throughout the process, consideration was given to the feedback of experiences of children and families, engagement and attendance of Partners, and management oversight and performance management;
- The Officers shared the ways in which Rotherham was preparing for the inspection. These actions included: -
 - Ensuring that the required data-set was in place;
 - An inspection plan of actions covering the time when inspectors would be on-site;
 - Deep dive / mock inspection activity and implementing any actions identified;
 - Briefings to all stakeholders on the new inspection framework;
 - A training programme had been developed for social care staff and managers called 'Triple A';
 - Ensuring that the rich knowledge of social workers was reflected in case files;
 - Reflect when risk had been assessed;
 - Evidence multi-agency and partnership work;
 - Ensure that the thresholds for Social Care intervention were understood by all partners.

Discussion ensued and the following questions were asked by the Improving Lives Select Commission: -

- **How ready/confident was the Service for multi-agency working? Were there any difficulties in getting agencies together to work? How were case files chosen for audit and, given there were a number of auditors, how did we ensure that auditing was consistent? TripleA had been running since January – was all training for social workers and managers completed?**

The Service was assured that multi-agency working was embedded, as evidenced in Child Protection Plans and Child in Need processes. There was a potential detachment between what agencies think Social Care's threshold was and the actual threshold. 'Working Together 2013' Statutory Guidance applied. The Local Safeguarding Children Board was the body to challenge and scrutinise this aspect.

Case files were randomly selected by Ofsted. In preparation for the audit, Social Workers followed-up with an 'end of assessment process', including question and answers with the family and/or child. Often positive feedback was received following a Statutory Assessment/s. Independent Reviewing Officers also looked for rigour and challenged practice. The Service wanted to establish a norm for asking people their opinions. In addition, the LAC Council and the Lifestyle survey sought children's opinions.

TripleA was now a mandatory expectation of all social work staff. TripleA was starting 'Phase 2'. Rotherham had a 3% vacancy turnover, which was one of the lowest in the region and comparable to statistical neighbours.

- **How are we evidencing the voice of the child from engagement to exit from the service? How did this change for different age-ranges? Did training address this?**
- **Do we have a waiting list – if so, how do we safeguard this? Are Action Plans timely and specific, and do they match why the referral came in and reflect needs?**
- **Is supervision timely/monthly? Are actions being followed up in the next supervision?**

The importance of the child's voice was highlighted in the 2012 inspection. A piece of work looking at Child Protection processes had been undertaken. It could be very difficult capturing a child's wishes and feelings and making sure they were evidenced. Every document/plan that had been refreshed now included sections to ensure a child/ren's wishes were recorded, included and acted upon. Case studies could be provided to show examples of a child's voice and wishes being met.

Social care did not operate a waiting list. If a Section 47 investigation was required this had to be completed.

The Service could demonstrate that supervision was taking place and key issues were being discussed. Mock-inspection work was looking at this and exception reporting to the Strategic Director was taking place.

- **How much more work does this generate, could it be called an 'inspection industry'. Impact on staff. How can the Council support Officers going through this process?**

The inspections were focused on outcomes for children, young people

and families, and this was helpful. The new framework felt like a multi-agency assessment with only local authorities being held to account for some agencies they did not directly line manage.

Support staff were picking up the burden and supporting front-line staff.

The inspection framework was challenging but helpful and not demoralising. The new framework was tougher. There was a stable and consistent leadership, management and governance at the highest level of the Service.

- **Issues arising from the Self-Assessment?**

Consistency was the main issue as some things were not embedded everywhere.

- **How were positive stories about the Service publicised?**

Good news was collated into an annual report. Rotherham was being promoted as an employer of choice and there was a communication and media strategy in place to best promote the Service.

- **How do you ensure that multi-agency partners are engaged and contributing, for example Early Years or Schools/Academies?**

There had been some challenges relating to governance of academy schools, Officers were addressing this where issues had been highlighted.

- **Risks and uncertainties – ‘Requires Improvement’ and ‘Good’ – did the Service know where the differences lay in-between these judgements and how to achieve ‘Good’, and did the Secretary of State still have the option of external intervention?**

Yes, yes and yes!

The Deputy Leader thanked Members for the debate and challenge. The new inspection framework would change again later in the year and further updates would be provided.

The Chairperson thanked the Officers in attendance for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion. She emphasised the importance of the Service being ‘Ofsted-ready’. It was clear that all partners in Rotherham were committed to working together to improve outcomes for children, young people and their families in the Borough. From the presentation and discussion section of this meeting, the Chairperson was assured that the level of preparedness within Rotherham had been carefully thought-out and was of a good standard.

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

(2) That the progress made by Rotherham's Children and Young People's Services in preparation for an inspection under the new framework be noted.

8. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 9th July, 2014, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall (pre-meeting for all Members to take place from 12.45 p.m.).

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
25th April, 2014

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Sims.

121. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Currie declared a personal interest in Minute No. 123 (Access to G.P.'s Scrutiny Review) on the grounds that he was a Trustee for NHS Sheffield.

122. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

123. ACCESS TO GPS - SCRUTINY REVIEW

No communications had been received.

124. 2011 CENSUS - UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 160 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 19th April, 2013, consideration was given to a presentation by Miles Crompton, Policy and Partnerships, which highlighted:-

- The 2011 Census.
- Work Day v Resident Population.
- Ethnicity by Age.
- Residents Born Outside the U.K.
- Ethnicity by Residency.
- Main Community Languages Spoken.
- Pensioners Living Alone in Rotherham.
- Families with Dependent Children.
- Families with Dependent Children Without a Car.
- Tenure by Dwelling Type.
- Tenure by Age of Householder.
- Older Householders Ownership and Social Rent.
- Tenure by Car Ownership.
- Unemployment Rates by Age and Gender.
- Unemployment Rate by Qualification Level.
- Census v Benefit Count – March, 2011.
- Manufacturing Employment.
- General Health – Bad.
- Long Term Conditions or Disability – Limiting.

- Carers 20+ Hours.
- Change in Working Age Qualification.
- No Qualifications By Age.
- Graduates By Age.
- Travel to Work – Measured by Distance.
- Census Users/Requests/Applications.
- Census Actions.
- Future of the Census.

A question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and clarified:-

- Expertise within the Council and whether consideration had been given to offering this as a shared service.
- Issues arising from the scrutiny review and the feeding in of relevant information into the Local Enterprise Partnership around manufacturing, employability and skills.
- True ethnicity numbers in Rotherham.
- The need to support those people who were living longer in the future.
- Distinctions between certain categories and whether these could be subdivided by Ward.
- Definition of carers and whether these were paid or unpaid.
- Use of the census as a key source of information.
- Presentation of the relevant information to the relevant Select Commission and how some of this work could feature in work programmes moving forward.

Resolved:- (1) That Miles Crompton be thanked for his informative presentation.

(2) That the information contained be fed into the relevant Scrutiny Reviews.

(3) That a copy of the presentation be circulated to Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

(4) That this information be presented to the Self Regulation Select Commission and an invitation extended to all Members to be present.

125. HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY - SCRUTINY REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 60 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 23rd April, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Chair of Improving Places Select Commission, which set out details of the review group which was established to undertake a scrutiny review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy.

The review identified a wide variety of information, in different formats and locations, to assist people who were homeless or who were potentially becoming homeless. There appeared to be a lack of understanding with clients and with Members regarding the 28 Day Rule.

Information was provided about the amount of rent arrears owing compared with previous year's figures. The figures were comparable and the conclusion reached was that it is too early to draw any conclusions about the impact of the introduction of the Welfare Reform measures around "Bedroom Tax".

The number of emergency bed spaces was low and there was no direct hostel provision in Rotherham. There was also a lack of support for young people with learning difficulties in finding accommodation and employment.

Feedback from tenants who have used the crash pads was positive. Suggestions were made on how to improve the experience.

Rough sleeping was not a major issue in Rotherham. There was a 24 hour telephone service available, however if the person was not in the priority need category, then no immediate help could be provided.

Plans to repopulate the town centre through redevelopment of properties or new build, had been halted due to the effects of the economic downturn in the country. Discussions identified the need for any initiative to tackle the issue of homelessness would be better received if ideas were included at the planning/development stage rather than added on at a later stage.

Currently no comprehensive Empty Properties Strategy was in place which would address the issue of bringing private sector properties back into use. The Private Sector Housing Manager had limited resources and work consisted of providing advice to private property owners. Grants to bring empty properties back into use were available from the Home and Communities Agency, but only to social housing providers.

There was a Landlords Forum in operation, however, the members were not usually the ones with empty properties. Other forms of communications used to contact private sector landlords included the publication of a newsletter and the creation of a website on the Council's site.

A partnership between the Council and Action Housing, provided apprenticeship places to refurbish four empty properties for habitation by the apprentices. The option to extend this scheme to other housing associations could be explored.

The review contains ten recommendations in response to these issues which were set out in detail as part of the report.

The Board welcomed this report and found the contents enlightening especially around the quality of temporary accommodation.

It was also suggested that issues relating to education and location need to be factored in, alongside the revisions to typing errors highlighted by the Private Sector Housing Officer, Recommendation 3 to include implications of the Bedroom Tax, Recommendation 3 to include consideration by this Board before its submitted back to Improving Places, allocation of responsibilities particularly in relation to Recommendations 5 and 9, Recommendation 10 to be smartened and an additional Recommendation 11.

Resolved:- (1) That all those involved in the Review be thanked for their input.

(2) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(3) That the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy be endorsed.

(4) That the report of this scrutiny review be forwarded to the Cabinet for further consideration.

(5) That the Cabinet's response to the recommendations of this scrutiny review be reported to future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and then Improving Places Select Commission.

126. ISSUES REFERRED FROM AREA ASSEMBLIES

This was a standing agenda item and at this stage there were no issues to report.

127. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

There were no issues of concern to report.

128. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 21ST MARCH, 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 21st March, 2014 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

129. WORK IN PROGRESS

An update was provided by representatives from each of the Select Commissions.

Self Regulation:-

- Councillor Beck was to chair the review looking at new business.
- The meeting on the 8th May, 2014 would be looking at the work programme going forward and include the Census 2011 information.
- The Select Commission would be welcoming a new Chairman in the new municipal year as Councillor Currie had indicated his wish to step down and thanked everyone for their support.

Improving Places:-

- The Homelessness Review was to be presented to Cabinet shortly.
- Trips and slips on Council footways – this was to be brought back in twelve months time.
- The next meeting would focus on highways issues, repairs and maintenance.

Improving Lives:-

- The meeting next week would focus on pupil premium, school performance and child poverty.

Health:-

- The review of Access to G.P.'s was now progressing onto Cabinet.
- A meeting had taken place regarding the hospital budget deficit which had been attended by the new Chief Executive, Martin Havenhand. The position would be monitored and appropriate recommendations made. A further meeting would take place in June, 2014 where future plans would be looked at in greater detail.
- A review into mental health was also scheduled and scoped.
- A meeting was also to take place with the Regional Health Select Commission regarding Leeds Hospital and the report which highlighted concerns about mortality levels.

Resolved:- That the information shared be noted.

130. CALL-IN ISSUES - TO CONSIDER ANY ISSUES REFERRED FOR CALL-IN

There were no formal call-in requests.

131. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place at the Town Hall, Rotherham on Tuesday, 20th May, 2014, commencing at 9.00 a.m.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
20th May, 2014**

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck, Currie, Gilding, Read and Steele.

132. MR. LEWIS E. SOUTH - FORMER DEMOCRATIC SERVICES MANAGER

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board stood in silence as a mark of respect for Mr. Lewis E. South, formerly the Democratic Services Manager with the Council, who had died recently.

133. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

134. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

135. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2013-2014

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager, containing first draft proposals for the Scrutiny Annual Report for 2013/14. Members discussed the format and contents of this draft report and suggested various amendments to the text and issues to be highlighted.

The report has three sections each for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the four Select Commissions, featuring:-

- : the positive outcomes from previous scrutiny reviews
- : the work of scrutiny during 2013/2014
- : the scrutiny work programme for 2014/2015.

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

(2) That the proposed format of the Scrutiny Annual Report 2013/2014 be approved and the amended draft report be submitted to the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to be held on 20th June, 2014, for further consideration.

(3) That, subject to resolution (2) above, the approved version of the Scrutiny Annual Report 2013/2014 be presented to Council on the 2nd July, 2014.

136. SCRUTINY REVIEW - DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS - SANCTIONS AND CONDITIONALITY REGIME

Further to Minute No. 106 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 21st February, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager and the Policy Officer, describing the work of the review group, established by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Chaired by Councillor Whelbourn, which had undertaken a scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' (DWP) sanctions and conditionality regime.

The scrutiny review group had been established in response to a concern raised within Rotherham Partnership's Welfare Reform Steering Group, Chaired by the Leader of the Council. Evidence suggested that potentially unfair implementation of sanctions was taking place and making the most vulnerable families within the Borough, more vulnerable. The purpose of the review was to ensure the DWP's conditionality and sanctions regime is implemented fairly, consistently and flexibly, reflecting the needs and circumstances of claimants, with increased transparency and more effective partnership working. The areas of focus for the review were listed in the report.

The key findings of the review were grouped under four headings: Communication, Flexibility and Discretion, Vulnerable Claimants and Local Working Protocol. There is one main recommendation of the scrutiny review, directed to the partners on the Welfare Reform Steering Group, which is to establish a local working protocol with the aim of ensuring complete fairness in the process of implementing sanctions in Rotherham.

Members debated the contents of the report of this scrutiny review, including the need to publicise the report of its findings and recommendations. It was noted that the review report had been distributed to the various organisations (eg: Jobcentre Plus, Citizens' Advice Bureau) which had participated in the review. It was agreed that the report be forwarded to the three local Members of Parliament, to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and to the Shadow Work and Pensions Secretary and neighbouring local authorities, with the aim that this matter be considered by Parliament and the Commons Select Committee for Work and Pensions.

Concern was expressed about the unwillingness of the Work Programme provider organisations to participate in this scrutiny review. There was additional concern about the issue of accountability, at national level, concerning the operation of the DWP sanctions and conditionality regime.

Discussion took place on a number of case studies of benefits' claimants.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and the contents and findings of this scrutiny review be noted.

(2) That the report of the scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' (DWP) sanctions and conditionality regime, as now submitted, be referred to the Cabinet for further consideration.

(3) That the Cabinet's response to this scrutiny review be reported to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

(4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board shall continue its scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' sanctions and conditionality regime.

137. ISSUES REFERRED FROM AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no items to report.

138. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

There were no items to report.

139. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 25TH APRIL, 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 25th April, 2014 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

140. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission:-

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

: scrutiny review of mental health services;

: scrutiny review of continence services.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

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

: scrutiny review of improving the local economy;

: scrutiny review of procurement by the Council of goods and services from local suppliers.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

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

: review of the pupil premium;

: review of school performance, especially at key Stage 2;

: study of child poverty.

141. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
23rd April, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Ellis, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Johnston, Pickering, Read, Sims, Swift, Vines, Wallis and Whysall; together with co-opted member Ms. P. Copnell.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Foden) and from Councillors Astbury, Dodson and P. A. Russell; and from co-opted member Mr. B. Walker.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

57. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

58. COMMUNICATIONS

The Select Commission considered the following items:-

(1) The Chair thanked Members for their contributions to the work of this Select Commission during the 2013/2014 Municipal Year.

(2) Scrutiny review – dampness and condensation in Council housing properties : it was agreed that the review group shall comprise Councillors Andrews, Sims and Vines.

(3) Co-opted Member – it was agreed that Mr. Pat Cahill shall replace Mr. Terry Roche as one of the Rotherfed representatives co-opted to the Improving Places Select Commission; Members thanked Mr. Roche for his contributions to the work of the Select Commission.

59. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH MARCH. 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 26th March, 2014, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

60. HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY - SCRUTINY REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 4 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, containing the draft report of the review group established to undertake a scrutiny review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy. The report listed the various issues

raised during this review. The review report contains ten recommendations in response to these issues. Members noted that recommendation three is to be amended to state "that the proposed newsletter shall actively promote the benefits of private sector rented properties contributing to the reduction in the level of homelessness". Discussion took place on minor textual amendments to several other recommendations. One additional recommendation will be included in the report, relating to local authority investment in property assets which may assist in reducing the need to accommodate tenants in other local authority areas, with resultant cost savings.

Discussion also took place on the comparative cost of the local authority building new residential properties and the cost of refurbishing older properties.

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

(2) That the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy be endorsed and the various minor textual amendments, as now discussed, be made to the review report.

(3) That the report of this scrutiny review be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and to the Cabinet for further consideration.

(4) That the Cabinet's response to the recommendations of this scrutiny review be reported to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission.

61. PROPOSALS FOR MITIGATING THE RISK OF PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMS ON HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT FUNDED FOOTPATHS

Further to Minute No. 45 of the meeting of the Deputy Leader and Advisers held on 17th February 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Business and Commercial Programme Manager, providing an overview of this Council's approach to the management of Housing Revenue Account-funded footpaths. The report stated that the aim of this approach is to:-

: ensure compliance with revised accounting guidance for infrastructure assets to be adopted in 2015/16, as per Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy guidance;

: mitigate the costs arising from personal injury insurance claims on footpaths (outside curtilage of the property), funded by the Housing Revenue Account, because this issue is highlighted as an area of high risk by the Council's Insurance Section; and

: meet the corporate priority for maintenance of the highways infrastructure.

Local authorities are assessing the current value of their highways infrastructure, using the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) 2010 Code of Practice on Transport Infrastructure Assets. The purpose of this Code is to support an asset management plan based approach to the provision of financial information about local authority infrastructure assets.

A summary of claims received as a result of slips, trips and falls on Housing Revenue Account funded footpaths was included in the report. The need to continue to invest in reducing the costs of accidents via improved management systems, work environment and training is recognised and, consequently, the Council will implement a series of actions throughout 2014/15 to mitigate this risk.

The report listed three options being considered to mitigate costs arising from Personal Injury claims on Housing Revenue Account funded footpaths and achieve compliance with the CIPFA guidelines for Infrastructure assets, currently planned to be adopted in the 2015/16 financial year.

Option 1 (the preferred option) – comprehensive review of footpaths funded by the Housing Revenue Account and management system adopted;

Option 2 – pro-active assessment by Housing Champions;

Option 3 – reactive maintenance.

Members of the Improving Places Select Commission discussed the following salient issues:-

: the history of insurance claims, made against the Council, relating to slips, trips and falls and whether there was an identifiable trend of several claims affecting specific footpaths in particular locations;

: the estimated costs of the proposed maintenance inspection regime of footpaths and whether savings could be made;

: the estimated costs of the repair and maintenance of footpaths and whether the suggested budget is sufficient;

: whether, in the longer term, savings will be achieved in the cost of insurance premiums relating to the Housing Revenue Account funded footpaths;

: the process of identification of the footpath assets as being those funded from the Housing Revenue Account;

: the possibility of a similar exercise being undertaken to identify responsibility for the green spaces situated in residential areas.

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

(2) That a progress report about the maintenance of Housing Revenue Account funded footpaths, including details of the incidence and cost of insurance claims, be submitted to a meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission in twelve months' time.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
7th May, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Atkin, Beaumont, Currie, Dodson, Doyle, Ellis, McNeely, G. A. Russell, Sharman, Sims, Stone, Wallis and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clark, Dalton, Hoddinott, Jepson, P. A. Russell, R. S. Russell, Smith and Wyatt.

WELFARE REFORM: THE EXPERIENCE OF A HOUSING ASSOCIATION IN A UNIVERSAL CREDIT PATHFINDER AREA.

Members received a presentation from Peter Fitzhenry (Director of Housing Management, Golden Gates Housing Trust) about the Universal Credit and the experiences of the Housing Trust in a Universal Credit pathfinder area.

The presentation included the following salient issues:-

: the Golden Gates Housing Trust (based in Warrington) manages the public sector housing stock on behalf of Warrington Borough Council;

: Welfare Reform is a corporate priority for the Housing Trust, which is reviewing all of its policies and practices; examples were provided of the way in which the Housing Trust staff undertake estate management and support tenants (eg: helping tenants with their Internet-based business and communications);

: the Change 4 Life project;

: the difficulties of families and young people to find the cost of rent payments and of the various utilities' bills;

: people in receipt of Universal Credit often have difficulties with budgeting; the use of direct debts helped reduce some of these difficulties;

: Bedroom Tax – impact upon tenants; an issue has been the impact upon the ability of young people to afford to live in one-bedroomed apartments;

: there are 5,000 people within the North West Universal Credit pathfinder area; single people are the most common group who are in receipt of the Universal Credit;

: the Universal Credit 'lobster pot' syndrome – ie: 'once you are in (receipt of credit), there is no way out';

: many of the Housing Trust's tenants, who receive the Universal Credit, have accrued rent arrears with their tenancies; the change to Housing Benefits has caused complications for Housing Trust staff who try and help tenants manage their payments;

: Claimant Commitment and Sanctions – the imposition of sanctions for Universal Credit recipients who do not look for employment; sanctions imposed for delays in notifying the authorities' of individuals' changed circumstances;

: delays and confusion; the high cost of telephone calls to the Department of Work and Pensions;

: Government commitment to 'Digital by Default' – using Internet on-line communications (eg: for making the initial application for Universal Credit); however, weaknesses in the administration means that a paper-based system is still maintained for record-keeping;

: the importance of support from other organisations, such as credit unions and the Citizens' Advice Bureau;

: Universal Credit – case studies of young people whose have experienced very difficult circumstances in dealing with the Universal Credit;

: the North West Universal Credit pathfinder area will soon include several more of the local authorities within that geographical area;

: Universal benefits being introduced for pensioners, with effect from April 2017.

During discussion, Members raised the following issues:-

(i) The impact of 'zero-hours' employment contracts and tenants' ability to pay their accommodation costs, when continued employment is not guaranteed; the Universal Credit system continues to be complex in dealing with such circumstances;

(ii) Universal Credit and changing circumstances – the production of information leaflets to help tenants understand the system and the changes; the Housing Trust is in the process of altering its working practices so that staff are better able to assist tenants;

(iii) Department of Work and Pensions – there has been no sub-contracting of the administration of the Universal Credit system to the private sector; the Housing Trust has to raise its own funds, often by borrowing and does not receive any subsidy from public funds;

(iv) The 'lone working' policy of the Golden Gates Housing Trust – the Trust has a history of lone working, making best use of mobile communications to track the whereabouts of its employees;

(v) Department of Work and Pensions – the difficulty of sharing information with other public sector organisations;

(vi) Welfare Reform being a 'high risk' for the social housing sector – Housing Trusts often have to borrow money from banking sector lenders, to fund their operating costs;

(vii) the 'lobster pot' syndrome – Universal Credit has no back-dating of claims which produce an increase in the amount of benefit being claimed;

(viii) The capacity of Housing Trust staff to assist tenants, which may be limited by the complexities of the Universal Credit system and also by the limitations of Internet communications and ICT systems; reference to the lessons to be learned from the operation of the universal Credit pathfinder area;

(ix) The Housing Trust's collection of rents – rent arrears have increased for tenants who are in receipt of the Universal Credit;

(x) The Housing Trust is installing solar panels to some 1,500 residential homes (and may also expand this project to schools in the area) – the project has resulted in the creation of 20 jobs (electricians, roofers, scaffolders, labourers) for construction work and future maintenance.

A briefing note about the potential implications of the Universal Credit for Rotherham, produced by the Council's Welfare Steering Group, was provided for Members of the Council.

Members thanked Peter Fitzhenry for his informative presentation.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
31st March, 2014**

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor R. Sixsmith

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor P. Bartlett

Councillor J. McHale

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Akhtar (Chairman)

Councillor T. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor R. Davison

Councillor T. Hussain

Co-opted Members:-

Mr. A. Carter

Mr. K. Walayat

Apologies for Absence were received from:-

Councillor M. Dyson (Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council)

Councillor H. Harpham (Sheffield City Council)

J32. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(1) A member of the public asked would Elected Members please summarise their efforts to publicise these Panel meetings in their own Council areas to increase awareness and involvement by the public and community groups throughout South Yorkshire?

The Chairman advised the member of the public that he would consult with the Police and Crime Panel and respond to the question in writing.

(2) A further member of the public asked for updates please on initiatives to make the Panel's proceedings more user-friendly, as previously minuted?

E.g. Website development (J28), Guidance on Complaints Procedures (J30), Notice of Public Questions (written questions take precedence, but if time allows, should relevant questions from the public bench be considered, at the Chair's discretion?)

The Chairman confirmed that in relation to website development, this work was now progressing. It was also pointed out that the complaints procedure had been updated and was available on the Council's website. The procedure set out the arrangements for the consideration of complaints by the Panel alongside links to the websites of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Independent Police Complaints Commission.

With regards to questions from members of the public, the Chairman advised that the Panel's Terms of Reference had been revised to include the procedure for public questions and had no wish to deviate from the arrangements that had been formally agreed.

J33. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 31ST JANUARY, 2014

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 31st January, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 31st January, 2014 be agreed as a true record.

J34. SUB REGIONAL PRIORITIES - VERBAL REPORT FROM SCRUTINY PANELS

Further to Minute No. 19 of the meeting of the Panel held on 2nd December, 2013, Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, referred to the recommendation of the training session which was held in November, 2013 about the development of protocols in conjunction with the Commissioner, Community Safety Partnerships, Local Authority Scrutiny Panels and Criminal Justice Board.

It was suggested as part of this recommendation that Chairmen of the four Local Authority Scrutiny Panels or their representatives be invited to share their emerging priorities and work programmes to ascertain how a joint working protocol could be taken forward.

The Chairman introduced the various representatives from the South Yorkshire Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panels who each gave report on the work currently being undertaken.

Caroline Martin, representing Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, confirmed that the work programme for the Crime and Disorder Committee was to be agreed next week, but gave an update on the work so far on domestic violence and support for high risk victims, including

children, the perpetrator programme, performance of the Safer Doncaster Partnership and their work around anti-social behaviour, reductions in reoffending for youth offenders and the availability of support and legal highs. The work of the Crime and Disorder Committee was fluid and reactive throughout the year.

Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, representing Sheffield City Council, reported on the sub-regional priorities and confirmed that a report was received annually by the Safer Stronger Communities Scrutiny Panel around the work of the community safety partners. Plans for joint working were welcomed especially around the similar problems with anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Glyn Whelbourn, Chairman of Rotherham's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, confirmed that a report from the Safer Rotherham Partnership was received annually and during November/December consideration was given to specific issues of anti-social behaviour and changing policy across Rotherham, child sexual exploitation and domestic violence. A copy of the recent Scrutiny Review into Domestic Violence had already been forwarded to the Chief Constable and which could provide a platform for taking this joint work forward with a view to pooling resources across South Yorkshire.

Councillor Ralph Sixsmith, representing Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, shared information on the work that had already taken place around anti-social behaviour, ways to address child sexual exploitation and absconding behaviour. New governance arrangements were also now in operation in Barnsley and the Police and Crime Commissioner had been out to visit some wards where anti-social behaviour was an issue and resources targeted appropriately.

The Chairman summarised the information that had been shared at today's meeting and reflected that all four Local Authorities had similar problems with domestic abuse, anti-social behaviour and child sexual exploitation.

Resolved:- (1) That all those represented today be thanked for their information and input.

(2) That the information shared be noted.

J35. JOINT WORKING PROTOCOLS

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided the Panel with proposals to establish joint working protocols with the four Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees across Barnsley, Rotherham, Doncaster and Sheffield.

The Panel noted that all Local Authorities have a statutory requirement to establish a Crime and Disorder Committee whose purpose was to

scrutinise the work of the local Crime and Disorder Partnership. This did not have to be a standalone committee and many local authorities have subsumed this role within one of their existing Scrutiny committees or panels.

Members from these four committees and their supporting officers were invited to the Panel's development day in November, 2013. It was felt that there was ground to be gained by working closely together with these four committees and sharing information about work programmes to develop South Yorkshire priorities which can inform the work programme of the Police and Crime Panel. Access to local information about the performance of Crime and Disorder Partnerships was also felt to be crucial for the Panel in terms of triangulation of evidence it may receive in as part of scrutinising the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner. As such, in a report to the Panel on the 2nd December 2013, it was agreed that the following were required:-

- A clear understanding of roles and responsibilities between the partners be required and agreed through protocols.
- Local Authority Scrutiny Panels should share work programmes with the Police and Crime Panel to help with the development of South Yorkshire wide priorities.

It was hoped that the report would stimulate the discussions around the establishment of a joint working protocol between the Police and Crime Panel and the four Crime and Disorder Committees and could lead to a formal working arrangement.

The appendices attached to the report contain two examples of such working protocols and the Panel were requested to consider which elements of these examples would usefully be included in a first draft for South Yorkshire. It was then proposed to discuss this draft further with the four Crime and Disorder Committees prior to agreeing it in its final format.

Jo Sykes, an officer from Sheffield City Council and an Independent Member of West Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel, gave a brief overview of the success of the protocol serving West Yorkshire, how it assisted the Panel with recognising the needs and concerns of local communities, how it assisted with holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account, working in partnership at Panel Meetings, how to influence the Police and Crime Plan and the regular exchange of information and intelligence, co-ordinating work programmes and alignment of membership where possible.

The Panel welcomed the opportunity for joint working with the aim of pooling resources to tackle similar elements of concern such as domestic abuse, anti-social behaviour and child sexual exploitation, the sharing of good practice to avoid duplication and suggested that officers draw up a similar joint working protocol based on the evidence and success of the

two protocol examples submitted and for this to be presented for consideration at a future meeting once this had been shared with the four Crime and Disorder Committees.

Resolved:- (1) That a draft working protocol be developed and agreed with the four Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees.

(2) That the Joint Working Protocol be submitted to a future meeting for approval.

J36. POLICE AND CRIME PANELS - THE FIRST YEAR

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided details of a report from the Centre for Public Scrutiny entitled "Police and Crime Panels: the first year" and a helpful overview of the challenges identified during the first year of operation.

Reference was made to the issues highlighted in the report, particularly in respect of scrutiny and development of the budget and how the Panel may develop its work in these areas. The report also highlighted what good Police and Crime Panels looked like and some progress had already been made in this area.

The report also referred to the joint working protocols between the Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner and this Panel had established early in its formation a Memorandum of Understanding with the Police and Crime Commissioner and it was probably timely for this to be revisited.

Reference was also made to the tools and resources available to the Panel to ensure it remained effective and whether there needed to be further exploration of this in the future.

The Panel having considered the report were in agreement that the Memorandum of Understanding should be reviewed, that consideration should be given to joint working with further exploration about the resources available to the Panel and were confident that the work that had now commenced on the website would seek to improve communication and transparency.

The report also made reference to the role of Independent Members and the value of the expertise and perspective they provided alongside the background and knowledge of Elected Members with some further consideration being given to additional training.

The suggestion that Panel Members should receive quarterly finance, performance and risk monitoring reports against the Police and Crime Commissioner's priorities was welcomed and this was something the Panel wished to progress further.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and the contents of the CfPS report "Police and Crime Panels: the first year" be noted.

(2) That the Monitoring Officer be responsible for collating and submitting the recommendations to the Police and Crime Commissioner that would improve the scrutiny of his priorities.

(3) That the Memorandum of Understanding be subject to further consideration and review and any revisions agreed formally by the Police and Crime Panel.

J37. WORK PROGRAMME AND MEETING DATES 2014/15

Further to Minute No. 29 of the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 31st January, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, confirming details of the work going forward for the Panel and the dates for 2014/15.

Dates for the Task and Finish Groups would be confirmed going forward, especially around the Performance Management Framework and Domestic Abuse.

The next meeting would see agenda items on the refreshed Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner's response to the H.M.I.C. report on child sexual exploitation.

Resolved:- That the report be received and the contents/dates duly noted.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
2nd May, 2014**

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

No member present

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. McHale

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Akhtar

Councillor T. R. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor R. Davison

Councillor H. Harpham (in the Chair)

Co-opted Member:-

Mr. A. J. Carter

One member of the public was in attendance

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor M. Dyson (Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council).

Councillor T. Hussain (Sheffield City Council)

Mr. K. Walayat (Independent Co-opted Member)

J38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(1) A member of the public attended the meeting and made reference to Minute No. J32(1) of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 31st March, 2014. At that previous meeting, the same member of the public had asked: "Would Elected Members please summarise their efforts to publicise these Panel meetings in their own Council areas to increase awareness and involvement by the public and community groups throughout South Yorkshire ?"

The member of the public explained that the recorded decision within Minute No. J32(1) had been complied with, in that he had now received a written response to his question. Panel members were also provided with copies of this written answer.

The member of the public further explained that he had decided to attend today's meeting and ask the same question again to the Panel, because in his opinion he did not consider that the written response provided to him had properly answered his original question.

The Chairman of the Panel advised the member of the public that he should communicate with Panel officials again in writing, stating the reasons why the response provided did not answer his original question. In turn, the Chair agreed to have discussions with the officers responsible for the administration of the Panel about the original question, the written response provided and the further communication to be received from the member of the public. After that discussion, the Chairman will arrive at a judgement on the response provided and decide whether he considers it to be sufficient, or whether an additional response needs to be sent to the member of the public.

(2) Councillor R. Davison stated that he had received a question from a member of the public and wished to raise the matter at this meeting of the Panel, on behalf of that person. The Chairman advised Councillor Davison to submit the question in accordance with the Panel's agreed procedures, for consideration at the Panel's next meeting.

J39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 31ST MARCH, 2014

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 31st March, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 31st March, 2014 be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

J40. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The following information was noted, concerning matters arising from the minutes of the Panel's previous meeting:-

(a) (Minute No. J35) – Joint Working Protocols – the report will be submitted to the Panel's next meeting, to be held on 30th July, 2014;

(b) (Minute No. J36) – Memorandum of Understanding with the Police and Crime Commissioner - the report will be submitted to the Panel's next meeting, to be held on 30th July, 2014;

(c) (Minute No. J37) – Task and Finish Group for the Internet Website – the report is included on the agenda for this meeting (refer to Minute No. J43 below);

(d) Training for Members of the Police and Crime Panel – the Chairman asked that a report be submitted to the Panel's next meeting, to be held on 30th July, 2014, to facilitate discussion about the training needs of Panel members;

(e) (Minute J36) – Quarterly Finance, Performance and Risk Monitoring Reports – this issue is to be the subject of discussions between officers supporting the Panel and officers of the Police and Crime Commissioner's office, during May 2014. The report to be submitted to the Panel's next meeting, to be held on 30th July, 2014, will include details of the work of the Task and Finish Group established to consider this subject;

(f) (Minute No. J37) – Task and Finish Group about the issue of Domestic Abuse – to date, no members had volunteered to participate in the work of this Task and Finish Group; therefore, this subject will be discussed again at the Panel's next meeting, to be held on 30th July, 2014, when a further attempt will be made to establish the Task and Finish Group.

J41. REPORT OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - REFRESHED POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

Further to Minute No. J28 of the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 13th March, 2013, the Police and Crime Commissioner Shaun Wright presented the draft of his refreshed Police and Crime Plan, for the period 2013 to 2107, as required by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. The Act permitted the Police and Crime Commissioner to vary the Plan when required, allowing the Commissioner, in consultation with the Chief Constable and taking account of any recommendations from the Police and Crime Panel, to respond to issues and priorities which emerge during the life of the Police and Crime Plan.

After undertaking considerable public consultation during the past twelve months, the Commissioner has determined that his strategic policing and crime priorities, listed below, remain unchanged:-

- reducing crime and anti-social behaviour
- protecting vulnerable people (especially women and girls)
- improving visible policing

The Commissioner described the contents of the Police and Crime Plan, including the following salient issues:-

: Executive Summary and priorities;

: the Strategic Planning Process – taking account of national policing priorities and the requirements of the Government, via the Home Secretary and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary;

- : the National Strategic Intelligence Assessment and the Force Strategic Intelligence Assessment;
- : Operational Policing Priorities – child sexual exploitation; burglary; vehicle crime; violent crime; anti-social behaviour;
- : Policing Requirements for South Yorkshire – neighbourhood policing and working in partnership with other statutory agencies; the delivery of protective services; the management of risk;
- : the need to ensure value for money;
- : improving victim satisfaction, when solving crime (from October 2014, the commissioning of services to help victims of crime and anti-social behaviour recover from their experiences);
- : the proposed establishment of an Ethics Panel, during 2014/15, comprising independent members;
- : the need to tackle serious and organised cyber-crime (and cyber-enabled crime), which makes use of Internet communications;
- : the four policing and crime priorities identified as part of the scrutiny process: child sexual exploitation; violent crime / assaults; anti-social behaviour; domestic violence;
- : the policing and crime priorities identified by the partner organisations in South Yorkshire : the local authorities, Community Safety Partnerships and the Local Criminal Justice Board;
- : crime in South Yorkshire remains at its lowest level for 25 years; however, crime reduction throughout the country has begun to plateau, with some Police forces in England experiencing increases in recorded crime;
- : the Police and Crime Plan contained a range of crime-related statistics;
- : the Police and other agencies will have new responsibilities imposed by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014;
- : review of the South Yorkshire Police ‘101’ telephone service, enabling all agencies to have a consistent approach to tackling anti-social behaviour;
- : collaboration with other Police forces and using such collaboration to effect financial savings, as required by Government;
- : establishment of a Victims Commissioning Advisory Board;
- : introduction of the Victims’ Code;

- : ensuring the better management of offenders and effecting more restorative justice;
- : improving performance management within the South Yorkshire Police;
- : continuing to develop partnership working with other agencies and organisations;
- : introduction of the Mental Health Concordat;
- : encouraging more reporting of crime, especially by vulnerable people in the community;
- : improving visible policing – more uniformed officers; use of better technology and mobile working; important role of PCSOs; attempts to increase the number of Special Constables and other volunteer roles; maintaining neighbourhood policing;
- : the budget has £39 millions of reserves, a similar amount to many other Metropolitan Police forces; the proposed uses of the reserves are in three broad areas :
 - reducing future projects' revenue costs ('invest to save')
 - funding reductions in Policing capacity (organisational downsizing)
 - establish a fund for future innovative approaches to tackling crime;
- : the Community Safety Fund grant, previously issued by the Home Office, has ceased and this funding is instead included in the main Police grant;
- : details of the principles of commissioning and the new approach to commissioning of services;
- : reference to the scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner by this Police and Crime Panel.

After the Commissioner's presentation of his Police and Crime Plan, Members of the Police and Crime Panel asked questions and raised the following issues:-

(a) The PCSO officers contribute a great deal to their patrol area and gain much intelligence about crime within the area. It is a source of anxiety for the public that the PCSOs often have to move to a different area, having spent valuable time engaging with the local community. There is the example of a PCSO successfully tackling and reducing drug nuisance in an area of Sheffield; however, this PCSO has since been transferred to a different area. What is the Commissioner's explanation ?

Response – the Police force in the future will have to be a flexible organisation, which means that individuals may have to move positions and are not able to stay for a long time in the same geographical patrol area. The Chief Constable is currently preparing a tenure policy for the PCSOs and will report to the Commissioner later this year. The PCSOs

are a valuable resource, the use of which must be maximised; (nb: there will not be a similar tenure policy for Police officers).

(b) Establishment of the South Yorkshire Police force and numbers of officials; within the force, which senior and ranked officers are in charge of specific areas and services ? Is this information available ?

Response – Members of the Police and Crime Panel will be provided with a structure diagram of the South Yorkshire Police force.

(c) Members of the Police and Crime Panel commended the Commissioner on the quality of his report and Plan.

(d) The proposed Ethics Panel – will this body comprise independent people ?

Response – Yes, all of the members will be independent people and the recruitment process intends to attract the most capable applicants suitable for the role. The purpose of the Ethics Panel will be to hold both the Commissioner and the Chief Constable to account. The Commissioner himself will not be a member of the Ethics Panel.

(e) How does the Commissioner intend to use social media in order to engage with communities ?

Response – the Commissioner recognises the importance of the various social media and intends to make effective use of this range of social media for public communication. Social media is especially important for younger people, who often prefer to communicate in this way. It is also acknowledged that many older people still prefer face-to-face communication.

(f) Providing opportunities for voluntary and community organisations to bid for funding to help reduce anti-social behaviour. How will this process work ?

Response – The proceeds of crime money will be used for the distribution of this type of grant. In addition, some money will be allocated from the budget reserves. The South Yorkshire Community Foundation will be involved in the distribution of small grants (maximum amount of £500) to voluntary and community organisations. The grants will be distributed throughout South Yorkshire. The use of the commissioning budget for victims' support services will begin during the Autumn 2014. The victims' support services are to be provided by voluntary and community organisations.

(g) The South Yorkshire Police recorded the fifth highest volumes of total crime per 1,000 population of the 43 Police forces (2013 figures). Does this statistic reveal a level of under-performance by the force ? Given the amount of the budget reserves, should money be taken from those reserves to try and bolster the force's under-performing areas ?

Response – The level of budget reserves are not dissimilar to those of similar Police forces. The Police and Crime Plan includes details about the proposed use of the budget reserves. It is intended that the proposed

fund for future innovative approaches to tackling crime will utilise £2 millions of the reserves. A further £10 millions will be spent on the renewal of custody suites (an issue inherited from the former South Yorkshire Police Authority). The amount of the legal costs resulting from the Hillsborough football ground inquiry is not yet known. There has to be some provision for this amount within budget reserves, although the Home Secretary is currently considering a request for the Government to underwrite these legal costs. The continuing reductions in public sector spending dictate that budget reserves have to be used wisely. The reserves will be needed each year until at least the 2018/2019 financial year and the planned use of reserves is the most prudent way forward.

(h) Hillsborough football ground inquiry – Members of the Police and Crime Panel asked that they be informed, in due course, about the funding of the legal costs of this inquiry and of the eventual decision of the Home Secretary.

(i) Partnerships with other organisations and commissioning services from voluntary and community organisations. How does the Commissioner ensure that small organisations are not over-looked and how does he ensure that there is engagement with the correct organisations ?

Response – There will be the application of the commissioning principles and the commissioning approach, as detailed in the Police and Crime Plan. Organisations will be required to complete and submit performance reports, at quarterly intervals, which will ensure the careful monitoring of the use of public money.

(j) Members of the Police and Crime Panel again commended the Commissioner for the amount of useful information contained in the Police and Crime Plan. Reference was also made to the Commissioner's recent meeting with Cabinet Members of Rotherham MBC. Is it the case that the South Yorkshire Police force simply aims to achieve a better performance than other forces, but does not actually set any performance targets ? Would the Commissioner please provide an assurance ?

Response – Central Government has made certain changes to performance targets. However, as Police and Crime Commissioner, I believe in having performance targets and priorities firmly in place for the Police force, as well as regular monitoring of performance.

(k) Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary has referred to the under-recording of crime figures (as many as one in five crimes not being recorded). What is the opinion of the Commissioner about this issue ?

Response – Yes, there is under-recording of many different types of crime, both nationally as well as in South Yorkshire. This factor can undermine the way in which Police forces are able to respond to crimes. There is a possibility Central Government making changes to the way in which the data about crimes is recorded; this is perhaps a politically motivated action to try and show reductions in the level of crime and to justify reductions in budgets.

(l) The march and demonstration by the English Defence League which will take place in the Rotherham town centre on Saturday, 10th May, 2014. The South Yorkshire Police has explained its proposed method of policing this march/demonstration to Members of Rotherham MBC. However, Rotherham's Councillors are unhappy about having to surrender the town centre on that day. In the future, is it possible for the South Yorkshire Police to assess the way in which their policing of these events may affect the whole community, rather than only making decisions about managing the march along a specific route ?

Response – The English Defence League imposes additional pressures, by damaging community cohesion, damaging business because people are reluctant to come and shop in the town and the EDL march disrupts everyday life. It is abhorrent that this type of group activity takes place. The Police force tries to minimise disruption and also has to balance the issue of freedom of speech and expression. The policing of the march on 10th May will be an expensive exercise and therefore I have asked the Home Secretary to offset some of costs. The Police resources will be finalised just before the march begins. It is preferable that the Police force has the statutory powers and is able to contain this sort of demonstration and assembly.

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

(2) That the Police and Crime Panel receives the Commissioner's draft Police and Crime Plan, 2013 to 2017, as now submitted and shall provide its comments to the Commissioner by Wednesday 7th May, 2014.

J42. REPORT OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - RESPONSE TO THE HMIC REPORT ON CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Police and Crime Commissioner, Shaun Wright, containing information about the report of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) into South Yorkshire Police's Response to the investigation of Child Sexual Exploitation. The appendix to the submitted report contained the text of the response by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner to the HMIC report.

The report stated that the protection of vulnerable children in South Yorkshire, especially those at risk of child sexual exploitation, is a priority of the Police and Crime Commissioner. During 2013/14, the Commissioner approved significant financial investment, as well as extra resources for the South Yorkshire Police, to help tackle the problem of child sexual exploitation.

In August 2013, the Commissioner invited the HMIC to provide:-

i) an independent assessment of the effectiveness and resilience of the current arrangements in place within South Yorkshire Police to protect children from sexual exploitation; and

ii) recommendations for improvement.

The HMIC report, resulting from this assessment, was published on 11th November, 2013 and can be obtained from both the Commissioner's and HMIC's website (www.southyorkshire-pcc.gov.uk and www.hmic.gov.uk) respectively.

The report concluded that South Yorkshire Police had made considerable efforts to improve its child sexual exploitation response. However, HMIC considered that the force-led focus and commitment to this was not truly and consistently replicated in all districts. Although there were examples of good and effective practice (most notably in Sheffield), the approach taken to tackling this kind of offending varied significantly across the force's four districts. The report had concluded that there should be a consistent high standard, across the County, for the protection of all children in South Yorkshire.

The recommendations for improvement, arising from the HMIC assessment, were summarised in the report submitted to this meeting.

The Commissioner stated that:-

: child sexual exploitation remains a serious and complex crime, affecting all areas of the country;

: tackling this crime will remain a priority of the Police and Crime Commissioner;

: additional resources will be allocated during the next two years, to the extent that the South Yorkshire Police will move into the top quartile of Police forces in terms of spending on this issue;

: specific resources are now being allocated to the problem, examples being :-

- assisting victims (children and young people) to give evidence in Court
- mapping hot spot areas in the County, to assist the Police response to this crime
- introduction of the use of polygraph testing for alleged sex offenders
- increased resources for the management of sex offenders
- centralised unit within the South Yorkshire Police, in addition to Police staff in the four districts, to tackle child sexual exploitation.

The Commissioner reported that all of the recommendations of the HMIC assessment report have now been implemented within the required timescale. There will be a re-inspection of the South Yorkshire Police, against the report's findings, which is due to be completed before the end of June, 2014. This assessment will be undertaken as part of the national HMIC inspection of Child Protection.

Members of the Police and Crime Panel asked the following questions of the Police and Crime Commissioner:-

(a) arrangements for further reporting – the Commissioner will report further progress within his annual report, as well as providing details of the allocation of resources as part of the budget report;

(b) brief details were explained of the South Yorkshire Police Chief Constable's 'silver-gold-platinum' model of standards for Public Protection Units - future reports will describe the progress of the Police response to the crime of child sexual exploitation, against these standards;

(c) use of best practice operating in other Police forces, as well as sharing South Yorkshire's best practice with other forces – working arrangements are already in place with the West Yorkshire and the Greater Manchester Police forces; operations have also been assisted by the studies of the College of Police Officers; the Commissioner emphasised that, although the sharing of best practice is important, the investigation and solving of crime is the paramount duty of the Police.

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

(2) That the Police and Crime Commissioner continue to provide regular reports on the progress being made by the South Yorkshire Police to tackle the crime of child sexual exploitation and a full progress report be submitted to a meeting of this Police and Crime Panel in twelve months' time.

J43. REPORT OF THE TASK AND FINISH GROUP - WEBSITE PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Further to Minute No. J28 of the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 31st January, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by co-opted member Mr. A. J. Carter, concerning the production of an Internet website for the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel, which will be developed by the Online Team within Rotherham MBC, the lead authority for the Panel.

The submitted report sought approval to the recommendations made by the newly established Task and Finish Group, which had met on 8th April, 2014, about the options available for developing this website. The Task and Finish Group recommended approval of the development of a "galaxy" site (within the Rotherham MBC website), to include a pen portrait and photograph of every Police and Crime Panel member, as well as the political composition of the Panel. Another recommendation was for the testing of the draft website to be undertaken by representatives of the community, as agreed by the Panel.

It was noted that a similar "galaxy" website was being developed by the West Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel and had been suggested as an exemplar to follow.

It was suggested that the Panel should agree to the work continuing on the development of the website. However, the details about each individual Panel member ought not to be published until after the Annual Meetings of the four constituent local authorities, because of possible changes in the Panel's membership for the 2014/2015 Municipal Year.

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

(2) That continuing work on the development of a "galaxy" website for the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel, to be hosted by the Rotherham MBC website, be approved, in accordance with the details contained in the report now submitted.

(3) That this matter be considered further at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel, to enable decisions to be made about the following issues:-

(a) the inclusion of pen portraits and photographs of individual members of the Police and Crime Panel;

(b) the selection of a group of community representatives to test the prototype website;

(c) the need to investigate the way in which other media may be used to facilitate engagement and interaction with the community at a later stage; and

(d) ensuring that arrangements are in place for the future editing and maintenance of the Panel's Internet website.

(During consideration of the above item, the Chairman, Councillor H. Harpham left the meeting in order to attend a prior engagement. In his place, the Vice-Chairman, Councillor J. Akhtar, assumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting)

J44. COMPLAINTS

It was noted that two complaints had recently been received which would require consideration by the Police and Crime Panel.

Resolved:- That the Director of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer, Rotherham MBC, shall contact Panel Members and arrange a meeting of the sub-committee authorised to undertake the initial consideration of complaints, in accordance with the established procedure.

J45. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel be held at the Town Hall, Rotherham on Wednesday, 30th July, 2014, commencing at 1.00 p.m.