

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.

Date: Friday, 23rd January, 2015

Time: 9.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for Absence.
2. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
3. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
4. Declarations of Interest
5. Questions from Members of the Public and the Press

For Discussion/Decision:-

6. Minutes of the previous meetings held on 12th and 18th December, 2014 (herewith) (Pages 1 - 67)
7. Scrutiny of Rotherham's Plans to address Child Sexual Exploitation (report herewith) (Pages 68 - 82)

For Information/Monitoring:-

8. Scrutiny Review on Supporting the Local Economy (report herewith) (Pages 83 - 91)
9. Scrutiny Review - Urinary Incontinence (report herewith) (Pages 92 - 99)
10. Issues Referred from the Area Assemblies
11. Youth Cabinet/Young People's Issues
12. Work in Progress (Chairs of Select Commissions to report)

13. Call-in Issues - to consider any issues referred for call-in
14. Date and time of next meeting - Friday, 27th February, 2015 at 9.00 a.m.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
Friday, 12th December, 2014

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Currie, J. Hamilton, Middleton, Parker, Read, Sims, Vines, Watson and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Sansome.

67. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor C. Read asked whether he should declare a personal interest in the subject matters of this meeting's agenda, because he has a close relative who is a serving officer with the South Yorkshire Police. The Monitoring Officer replied that it was not necessary for the personal interest to be declared and that Councillor Read would be able to participate fully in the meeting.

68. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14TH NOVEMBER 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 14th November, 2014 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

69. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

70. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from the public or the press.

71. MEETING PROCEDURE - MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Councillor Parker referred to the allocation of Members' questions and asked why he had been assigned to ask question 11 (regarding the effectiveness of local authorities to deal with the child sexual exploitation agenda). Councillor Parker stated that he had not seen the question before and felt that it was 'feeble'.

The Chair referred to the process of assigning questions to the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, and reminded Members that there had been two dedicated planning sessions organised prior to the meeting, to facilitate scrutiny of the matters before the Board and the Board had agreed to submit all questions in advance so these could be sent to witnesses. All Members had had the opportunity to participate in these sessions and submit their questions.

Councillor Currie stated that he would ask question 11 during the meeting,

in his capacity as Chair of the Self Regulation Select Commission.

72. SCRUTINY OF ROTHERHAM'S PLANS TO TACKLE CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Further to Minute No. 59 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 14th November, 2014, consideration was given to the following sessions that had been incorporated as Day One.

73. EXPERIENCES FROM AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECTOR IN ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Further to Minute No. 59 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 14th November, 2014, Members undertook the scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation, arising from the contents of the report by Professor Alexis Jay.

Session One : Experiences from and implications for the Local Government Sector in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation

The objectives of this session are to:-

- understand the challenges faced by Local Authorities in tackling Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE);
- gain external perspectives on Rotherham's situation and to learn from best practice elsewhere; and
- understand the specific role that elected members can play in tackling CSE effectively.

The meeting welcomed Councillor David Simmonds (Deputy Leader of London Borough of Hillingdon), Chair of the Local Government Association Children's Board and Member of the Improvement Board of Rotherham Borough Council)

1.1 Councillor Simmonds opened by stating that Child Sexual Exploitation is not a new issue. From his personal experience, he recounted that Levi Bellfield (who was the killer of schoolgirl Milly Dowler), was a resident in Hillingdon and there were suspicions that he had been involved in the sexual exploitation of children. Whenever such traumatic events happen, it is inevitably that people are angry. As elected members, you will want to ask questions about what was known and by whom, why events happened and what was preventable.

Councillor Simmonds suggested that no-one is ever entirely on top of the issue of CSE. He gave examples of recent cases of grooming and exploitation which are consistent in practice. However, each reflected local 'unique' factors, with its own features and elements. Local authorities

around the country will also be struggling to identify and tackle CSE. Sometimes the complexity of issues is not always reflected in the media.

With regard to the specific role of scrutiny and the elected members engaged in that process, Councillor Simmonds suggested that the first set questions (for today's meeting) could be perceived as defensive because they concentrate on the things others are doing. It is important that there is recognition and understanding of the corporate parenting role of elected members and their moral and legal responsibility for the care of children. The first question should be what are we (in Rotherham) doing about this?

Therefore, how should the scrutiny elected members help to correct matters and ask the searching questions? Scrutiny members must undertake a detailed reflection on their access to sources of information (for example - Annex A performance report). Information to be obtained and shared will include Ofsted reports, reports to the Council's Executive, the agenda and reports for meetings of the Safeguarding Board (not just meetings' minutes). Scrutiny should also consider the quality of debate and the questions being asked by the Safeguarding Board's members. Scrutiny councillors ought to sit in and observe the Safeguarding Board's meetings and find out the documents which are available to examine.

Scrutiny should adopt the triangulation approach – to be able to work out what is happening, councillors need to look at the issues from three or more different perspectives. Find out who are the people responsible (for service provision and decision-making) and what are the materials and details being reported.

Councillor Simmonds concluded by stating that the child sexual exploitation issue is a considerable challenge for scrutiny and it is in everyone's wider interests for local government to help Rotherham Council.

The meeting welcomed Councillor Ralph Berry (Lead Member for Children's Services, Bradford MDC)

Councillor Berry gave a brief outline of his experience as a former probation officer and social worker. He had been an elected member for Bradford MDC for 22 years. Child safeguarding processes have recently improved and it is now understood that exploitation features across many areas, for example in forced marriages, or the abuse of people with learning disabilities. In order to scrutinise and challenge the effectiveness of local authority children's services, elected members should equip themselves with the appropriate skills and understanding; challenge consistently and learn from elsewhere (citing taxi licensing in Sheffield as an exemplar of good practice).

Bradford MDC has invested in additional support for victims of exploitation – including the families of girls and boys who have been groomed. Efforts

are being made to broaden the understanding of staff and pupils in schools; one example is the use of a stage play as a learning method. The partnership with the voluntary sector is important, because victims may prefer to obtain assistance from those services – sometimes victims don't view the state (including local authorities) as being trustworthy to talk to.

Bradford MDC, alongside the Police, is examining cases of exploitation from the past. This is termed the 'cold case' method of looking at paper records to try and find historical cases where it may be possible to bring individual perpetrators to justice. It is recognised that behaviour patterns emerge of single men using computers; people in churches; scout groups etc. Some of these cases will come to Court over next few years (many are from the same residential areas). It seems that the Courts are beginning to issue harsher sentences for exploitation offences. Very often, perpetrators have a financial motive for being involved in exploitation. In his view, race and gender (of a victim) are not the primary motivating factors for this crime. Child sexual exploitation has become a very big issue for the country as a whole (a recent conference in London had attracted representatives from all areas of the country). Tackling the problem is very costly and it is resource-intensive to have to investigate all of the issues. There is still relatively little support for victims and their families. Within the NHS, there is only a loose framework of support services and some psychology counselling services.

Questions asked by Elected Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Q1 (Councillor Currie) What definitions of child sexual exploitation are used across local authorities, what are the differences between these definitions and/or is there a shared understanding of what child sexual exploitation is?

Councillor Simmonds referred to the statutory definition published on the NSPCC website, which states that :

"Child sexual exploitation is a type of sexual abuse in which children are sexually exploited for money, power or status. Children or young people may be tricked into believing they are in a loving, consensual relationship. They might be invited to parties and given drugs and alcohol. They may also be groomed online. Some children and young people are trafficked into or within the United Kingdom for the purpose of sexual exploitation. Sexual exploitation can also happen to young people in gangs."

Councillor Simmonds explained that children may be placed in exploitative situations, there is online grooming and children are coerced into sexual activity. However, definitions are not always useful. The scale of exploitation is very considerable and is evidenced by the extent of organised crime, as well as the number of prosecutions now happening. Rotherham Councillors should ask themselves "which of the elements of

the definition are happening in Rotherham and what are you doing about it ?”

Q2 (Councillor Sims) What are your personal reflections on what has happened in Rotherham and are there any lessons for local authorities to be learned from this experience, for local government in general and social care in particular?

Councillor Berry replied that, after reading the report by Professor Alexis Jay, he had found himself upset by the scale of inaction – he emphasised that he was upset for the whole of local government and it was not just criticism of Rotherham Council. The response has to be to ask difficult questions about the role played by elected members. There is a clear need to ratchet up the training for elected members. Bradford Council has 90 members, 900 looked after children and a population of half a million people. Councillors have a considerable responsibility. The Alexis Jay report infers that leadership was not working properly in Rotherham. Bradford has the hub system of regular meetings of care professionals, happening every day, to track every case. Councils must take leadership and safeguarding seriously. There are other local authority models from which to learn useful practices (eg: Slough, Doncaster). All members know what is happening in their communities and they must be the eyes and ears of these areas and be prepared to challenge inappropriate actions or attitudes within communities. The lesson is to keep it simple and straightforward. All children have to have the same level of protection. The top level officers must be well-experienced, especially the Director of Children’s Services and the Chair of the Safeguarding Board. Try and learn from others and share best practice. The systemic failure must go broader than the local authority. The Crown Prosecution Service and the Police must be involved. The Police practices of investigation are much better today than they were ten years ago.

Councillor Simmonds stated that the lessons to be learned are relatively simple – there must be systems in place to keep children safe, but elected members must ensure that all of the relevant people are doing the things they are supposed to be doing. The identification of a problem will come from the GPs or the Police or the local authority, who must all pick up on their shared responsibilities. This means that one or more of those three will pick up on the problem, ensuring that the problem case is not missed. Rotherham has to get this system in place - and elected members must ask “how do I know this system is happening and is effective ?” He suggested that regular Member briefing should take place, combined with their day-to-day observations of service delivery in their communities. Members may also want to have more regular meetings with social workers and with the Police. Both individually and collectively, elected members must have to reflect, so that they know what is happening. The system is often picking up on a problem when it is too late to act effectively. Councillors have to learn the lessons and make sure things as bad as this do not happen again.

Q3 (Councillor Read) To paraphrase the Home Affairs Select Committee, this is a crime that can happen anywhere, but in terms of support to victims and prosecution of offenders it is still a postcode lottery. What are your views on this? Do you think there is any reason to believe there are unique circumstances in Rotherham or is it similar to many other authorities in the country? Councillor Read referred to grooming taking place on the street (as described in Professor Jay's report) and questioned whether there were any current cases happening elsewhere.

Councillor Berry considered that there is a post code lottery and prosecution cases are now coming to Court. There is some good work taking place with the Children's Society (eg: the hand-in-hand project) and with other voluntary sector groups, which have legitimacy. Court staff may be able to provide some assistance with regard to support services. The Council should press for assistance via the mental health services. Councils should have good contacts with their local third sector agencies to be able to work effectively on the provision of support services. Some trends can be noticed in communities. Safeguarding has now improved and, for example, the movements of children in care are tracked. In other examples, perpetrators will prey on Eastern European girls, Asian girls and on people with learning disabilities. It is society's wider problem. Australia, for example, has organised a national enquiry about this type of exploitation.

Councillor Simmonds agreed that the provision of support for victims of sexual exploitation, as well as the incidence of prosecution of offenders, are indeed both a post code lottery. Furthermore, having accountability for prosecutions makes the role of elected members more important. The initial Police response is often "no, we will not do anything". It is difficult to avoid the feeling that the Police do not like having to admit the existence of a CSE problem "on their patch". So, elected members must have the role of asking that tough question - "is there the right threshold in our area to be able to move a case forward to prosecution?" He also affirmed that there are good examples of victims receiving counselling and support after a successful prosecution; however he made the point that early intervention and prevention would lead to better outcomes.

Q4 (Councillor Watson) From a Local Government Association perspective, which authority stands out as an example of good practice in tackling child sexual exploitation and why? Is there a local authority that stands out in its work with looked after children in this field?

Councillor Simmonds replied that no local authority would place itself on pedestal and say that it has CSE cracked. You can never be sure because CSE takes different forms around the country. He gave examples of children trafficked through Heathrow airport and on-line exploitation of children, demonstrating that child sexual exploitation can have a very wide geographical spread. There are cases in Oxfordshire,

Rochdale, East Yorkshire and North Yorkshire which also illustrate this point. So, find out from elected members elsewhere and ask them to tell you which practices give them confidence that the CSE problem is being solved.

Councillor Berry explained that local authorities must customise good practice to fit their own local circumstances in their areas and districts. High quality Personal, Health, Social and Economic (PHSE) education in schools is essential, so that young people learn about social matters and appropriate relationships. Parents ought to be involved as well, as much as possible, an approach which is known to be effective. He gave an example of a case being investigated after a pupil had made a disclosure of information during a class lesson in school, which eventually lead to a conviction. Schools therefore have a central role in solving the problem. Previously, it had been difficult to persuade head teachers to come to safeguarding conferences - but they all come to them now. Schools are taking CSE issues very seriously now. The Police will assign their best up-and-coming officers to safeguarding cases, enabling them to gain valuable experience in these investigations.

Q5 (Councillor C Vines) The recent thematic inspection of local authorities regarding CSE suggested that senior leaders and elected members 'have to show the political and moral courage to confront and tackle CSE wherever and however it occurs'. What do you think this entails? The Ofsted thematic inspection highlights that in some local authorities, Local Safeguarding Boards were not routinely holding all partners to account. What are your thoughts about how we can "guard the guardians"?

Councillor Berry described the 'Challenge Panel' system at Bradford Council, which involved a high level of challenge between the various agencies. A forthcoming case will involve learning from hindsight. It is important to learn as much as possible from the caseload, rather than simply trying to brand someone or some organisation as the scapegoat. The Chairs of the Safeguarding Boards must be rigorous, challenging people who are prepared to ask harsh questions. Sometimes it is necessary to deconstruct or demolish an issue or case and then rebuild it. There is no room for complacency. We have a duty to be aware of our lack of knowledge of certain things. Councils must engage in hard discussions with all sectors of the community. Years ago, the Bradford taxi drivers were not very forthcoming, but they are much better now. More and more people want to be involved in the CSE investigations. It is known that youngsters from Bradford are being taken on routes to other areas which have bad CSE records.

Councillor Simmonds stated that there is no such thing as a daft question. There is sometimes a conspiracy of silence amongst officers. Elected members have to challenge the professionals. Don't rely on the fact that a strategy may be in place – councillors must check what is actually

happening. Do we know what the guardians are doing ? Do the social workers actually visit the children ? Are the records being properly kept ? Do the children's homes inspections happen properly ? Are there Section 11 (Children Act 2004) audits of safeguarding standards ? Be rigorous. Councillors have to find out what is going on (the good and the bad) so that you can be more confident about your Council's safeguarding services.

Q6 What do you think is the role for local councillors in tackling Child Sexual Exploitation? What information should they be accessing on a regular basis and what questions should they be asking?

Response – these issues have already been discussed during consideration of the first five questions.

Q7 (Councillor Jane Hamilton) Specifically, what do you think are the challenges for executive members and conversely for scrutiny members?

Councillor Simmonds said "how do you know what is happening ?" When something goes wrong, the whole safeguarding system is dragged through the mire. Sources of information must be consistent with each other. Ultimately, there should be all-party debate of CSE, conducted properly, so as to bring rigour to the accountability for the process. If the Local Children Safeguarding Board reckons that the situation is bad and the Lead Member for Children's Services thinks all is well, then there is a problem - so scrutiny must dig deep to find out the true state of affairs. If a councillor is unfamiliar with children's services, do not always accept all of the officer advice. That is the time to ask the simple, dumb questions. There must be a sense of ownership of the questions being asked by elected members. You can ask whatever questions you wish.

Councillor Berry referred to the immense pressures on budgets for adult social care and for children's services. It's easy to be caught up in the accountability spaghetti of the Local Children Safeguarding Board, the Executive Cabinet, Ofsted and central Government Departments. To whom is the Local Children Safeguarding Board (LSCB) accountable ? It seems there ought to be a tidier way of doing things. The LSCB importantly has to be independent and the attendance of representatives of all agencies has to be regular and consistent.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board requested that written answers should be provided to the questions (numbered 8 to 13 inclusive) which were not able to be asked within the time available. The questions are:-

Q8 Bradford MDC has recently gone through an OFSTED inspection and your interagency hub was cited as working well – can you take us through how this works?

Q9 The Ofsted report suggests that the absence of statutory reporting arrangements in relation to disruption and prosecution, undermines the ability to monitor activity and provide critical challenge. What are your views on this and what could these arrangements look like?

Q10 Clearly schools have an important role in safeguarding; given the pressure on curriculum how can we better link in with PSHE teaching in schools? Given the dilution in the relationship between schools and local authorities, how can we keep schools on board?

Q11 What are your views on how effectively local authorities are resourced to deal with this agenda?

Q12 What are your views on the need for a national framework for dealing with Child Sexual Exploitation? Similar to that developed for tackling domestic abuse.

Q13 Are other areas commissioning reviews or reports similar to that commissioned by RMBC from Professor Jay? What approaches are being taken across the country?

74. SCRUTINY OF CURRENT SERVICES AND ACTION PLANS TO ADDRESS CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION IN ROTHERHAM

Session two: Scrutiny of current services and action plans to address Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham

The objectives are to:-

- ensure the action plan is robust and fit for purpose
- ensure governance processes are in place for monitoring its delivery
- determine whether the action plan is guiding effective improvement in practice

The following persons were welcomed to the meeting:-

- Steve Ashley, Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board
- Jane Parfremment, Director of Safeguarding, RMBC
- Phil Morris – Business Manager (Safeguarding), RMBC
- Jason Harwin, Rotherham District Commander, South Yorkshire Police
- Detective Superintendent Matt Fenwick, South Yorkshire Police
- Assistant Chief Constable Ingrid Lee, South Yorkshire Police
- Catherine Hall (Rotherham CCG – Head of Safeguarding)
- Chris Prewitt (RDASH - Head of Quality and Standards)
- Samantha Davis (Nurse - RDASH)
- Tracey McErlains-Burns (Chief Nurse - Rotherham Foundation Trust)
- Councillor Christine Beaumont, Cabinet Member for Children's

- Services, RMBC
- Warren Carratt – Service Manager, Strategy Standards and Early Help, RMBC

Comments from Steve Ashley, Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board

Steve Ashley commented that the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) has placed child sexual exploitation as a priority within its business plan. The LSCB has established a sub-group specifically tasked to consider the issues of child sexual exploitation. This sub-group deals with both strategic matters and with issues happening 'on the ground'. The District Commander of the South Yorkshire Police in Rotherham, Jason Harwin, has been the Chair of this sub-group, although that role will be assumed by Steve Ashley in January 2015. The reason is that it is essential that the sub-group has an independent overview, to be able to hold all agencies to account (and not to have a Chair who works for any one of those agencies). The action plan, prepared by the sub-group, is a substantial document (copies of the document can be made available for members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board). The action plan is based upon the contents of the sub-group's strategy document and its progress is reviewed every month. There is a 'Silver group' (of officers) which deals with all of the actions and their progress. The action plan has grown in size considerably during the last year, in response to recommendations from national bodies and also from local reports etc. The growth of the action plan itself needs review and will have to be honed down to a more manageable size. There will be a sub-group meeting next week (December 2014) to review priorities and identify new priorities.

All of the agencies have reviewed the way they deal with child sexual exploitation and that factor is reflected in the action plan. Previously, the practicality has been that District Commander Jason Harwin has meetings lasting three hours during which all agencies are held to account. This is a difficult task. But the strategy being used does fit all of the national guidance and Rotherham practice will continue in that way. All agencies are provided with copies of the minutes of sub group meetings (via the agenda of full LSCB Board meetings) and the agencies have the opportunity of questioning the contents of those minutes. Overall, some good progress has been made in the last twelve months.

During the following section of the meeting, Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board (and other Members in attendance) asked questions of the officers present.

Q1 (Councillor Hunter) Any of the CSE victims that got sexually transmitted diseases would have been treated by GU Med. Is it possible that their strict confidential measures on sharing information actually helped condemn the victims instead of protecting them? Was there any

reporting to the Local Children Safeguarding Board ?

Tracey McErlains-Burns replied that the GU Medicine service provides a confidential service. There is contact with professional colleagues whenever a CSE case crops up and information is shared between professional colleagues. It is important to develop confidence in the service. Together with the Medical Director, we will find an appropriate route for information sharing and this will leave the clinician with the time to get on with dealing with case and treating the person. It is necessary to develop information sharing (and keeping confidentiality), but it can be a lengthy, time-consuming process.

Q2 (Councillor C Vines) Risky Business supported 319 girls on either a one-to-one or group work basis over an 18 months period from April 2004 until October 2005. What action has been taken in regard to this number of known victims? How many of the perpetrators have been arrested and charged?

Detective Superintendent Matt Fenwick stated that the Police were unsure that 319 was the precise number of girls, nor had Professor Alexis Jay revealed how she had arrived at that number. The Police will work with partners to try and identify the precise number of victims. Already, with regard to the perpetrators, the Police have examined the files held by Risky Business and will be undertaking research into the background of people whose names are found in those files. On 25 November 2014, the Police also received a list of names from former employees of Risky Business. We are checking for any duplication in the two lists of names. In addition, much work is being undertaken on historical cases. The Police now have in place Operation Clover (187 victims) and Operation Mark (another 96 victims). These two Operations will benefit from a multi-agency approach, with the Police working alongside social care staff, third sector voluntary organisations and some former employees of Risky Business so that we are able to identify specific individual perpetrators. To date, some arrests have been made and individuals placed on bail. Further investigations are happening, too.

Q3 (Councillor Cowles) The section on perpetrators mentioned an Asian family involved with taxi firms and identified 50 people, 45 of whom were Asian, 4 white and 1 African-Caribbean. Why have these people not yet been arrested?

Detective Superintendent Matt Fenwick stated that the Police have read through the files and have compiled a list of names of potential victims and suspected perpetrators. There is examination of any action taken in the past, as well as assessment of the action which could be taken against perpetrators in the future. The Police have held discussions with Professor Alexis Jay about the cases she has identified in her report to assess if there are opportunities for further action. The Police have in place Operation Meadow, an overarching operation which allows the Police time to scope the various issues involved in the investigation of the

crime of child sexual exploitation.

Assistant Chief Constable Ingrid Lee stated that all aspects of the issues within Professor Alexis Jay's report will be examined and will be cross-referenced into Police Operations Clover and Mark. The South Yorkshire Police are engaging with other agencies and will look at issues of alleged misconduct in public office, both in terms of local authority personnel and Police personnel.

Q4 (Councillor Cowles) Who owns the Improvement and Delivery action plan 2014-15 and who is responsible for monitoring its actions? The document has target dates and some actions have substantially missed their target dates. There is much criticism of the RAG (red-amber-green) rating and the lack of retrospective action to bring the actions back on track. Senior people (in the organisation) just seem to permit the delays and the action plan is not being monitored with any rigour. It needs to be looked at more critically and find out why everything is running late.

Steve Ashley replied by saying that the Rotherham LSCB owns the Improvement and Delivery action plan and all agencies are responsible for delivery (via the CSE sub group of the LSCB). Many actions are continuing issues and there is a spectrum of where the success of any individual action may sit (in terms of an action's RAG rating). The RAG rating method is prescriptive and very often it is a matter of opinion as to which colour should apply to an action at one time. The usual interpretation of a "Green" rating, for example, is that that specific action may be continuing (and therefore has not yet been completed). Experience now shows us that a case is often never completed and that there will always be more work to do. The LSCB is satisfied that action plan has the correct governance in place. As LSCB Chair, I will be taking over as independent Chair of the CSE sub group, so that the sub group Chair official position does not belong to one of the agencies, whereby the agencies may be in position of having to hold themselves to account. The RAG method of rating and any individual action's RAG status should be treated cautiously.

District Commander Jason Harwin stated that much reactive work is happening at moment. Agencies need to be proactive, at first, so as to stop things (ie: more exploitation) happening. An individual action's target date may actually be a review date. The Improvement and Delivery action plan was intended initially just for internal use by the agencies. However, the document now needs to be shown to the public as visible evidence of progress and so that there is transparency.

Councillor David Simmonds added that he thought both this question and the answers to it were very good. Mr. Ashley has said that he is now responsible and he is confident that targets will be met and the difficulty of the various issues within the action plan are known. Therefore, as the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, you must ask

yourselves this question : “do you now have greater confidence that this matter is being dealt with properly ?”

Questions specifically about the Improvement and Delivery action plan are listed below:-

Action Plan (AP) ref 1.01 (Councillor Read) – Why is the vision and purpose still not clear? Do all partners understand the role they play in achieving this vision?

Steve Ashley replied by posing this question : “is there a one sentence vision for CSE and do we articulate it ... and am I happy that the strategy is laid out properly ? The agencies have developed a strategy of three strands of objectives and the action plan. There is not yet a single, simple strap line, but do we actually need to produce one.

Councillor Read further asked .. “is there a single partnership vision ? “

Divisional Commander Jason Harwin stated that it is a matter of terminology and that we do have a clear strategy and an action plan. We (the agencies) are here to prevent people becoming victims in the first place, to support those people who have been exploited and to bring perpetrators to justice. It is essential for the agencies to be more outward-facing to the public.

Steve Ashley offered the view that the first objective is an over-arching one and could stand as the vision of this partnership of agencies. If it is helpful to Members of the Borough Council, the partner agencies could come up with a single vision.

AP ref 1.10 (Councillor Currie) – What is the progress on the development of a single line of accountability for the work of the team? Will a single manager be appointed?

Steve Ashley explained that the LSCB pulls together collectively all of the agencies which are responsible. No single agency has overall control. All agencies have to work effectively together under my (S Ashley) chairmanship of the Local Children Safeguarding Board. Agencies are satisfied that there is a strong governance structure and a good action plan.

Jane Parfremment referred to the single line of management control and that Professor Alexis Jay’s report does not say what the responsibilities of this management control should be. I have made a clear statement of purpose for what we do about CSE victim support and help for families. It is still in draft form and we will consult on its wording with all agencies. There will be management control to oversee the activity of all social care staff, the Police etc. The co-ordinator and team managers have a role

here. In Rotherham, there is a multitude of other activity, historical investigations, all holding the Council to account. In consultation with partner agencies, the Council needs strategic leadership to pull all of the elements together and to answer questions on the way everything is to be linked together. The appointed person must be someone with good credibility and will have to be a good leader across the partner agencies. Consultation has taken place with Malcolm Newsam (Children's Commissioner) and interviews have been held. The appointed person, Suzanne King, will begin work on Wednesday next week, 17 December 2014 (part-time) and will begin work on a full-time basis in the New Year. The Council requires that additional capacity.

AP ref 1.14 (Councillor C Vines) Who is the body responsible for the scrutiny of the LSCB?

Steve Ashley stated that there is no over-riding, single scrutiny body. All partner agencies have their own scrutiny processes. As LSCB Chair, I have oversight and I am accountable to the Chief Executive of the Borough Council. If there is a complaint about my role, the RMBC Chief Executive will deal with that.

Councillor C Vines further commented that he is unhappy that the LSCB as a whole does not seem to be subject to adequate scrutiny.

Steve Ashley replied that the Chair of the Borough Council's Improvement Board is to scrutinise the LSCB in the future.

Councillor David Simmonds referred Members to the Department for Education document entitled "Working Together". Local authority members should satisfy themselves that there are adequate scrutiny arrangements. Why not attend LSCB meetings as observers? There are a number of ways in which the scrutiny process can happen.

AP ref 2.03 (Councillor Sims) Has training and development activity made a difference and what has been the impact on practice and outcomes? Which agencies have accessed the multi-agency training? There is particular interest in the health partner agencies and the way in which they identify training needs.

Catherine Hall (NHS) referred to the extensive amount of staff training which has taken place during the last few months. Training is usually geared to the needs of professional bodies (eg: midwives). Safeguarding colleagues have assisted in training as well. All staff, receptionists, colleagues in GP surgeries are being trained (with specific GP training). NHS Rotherham is now evaluating the delivery of that training so that staff understand issues, especially how they may contact people (eg: senior managers; partner agencies) about CSE and also of the need to report historical cases which they may uncover. We are also looking at additional training and the effects on victims of CSE, to find out why young people

might go back into an abusive situation and suffer repeated abuse. This latter issue requires psychological help and advice.

Councillor Sims asked about the levels of take-up of training.

Catherine Hall (NHS) could not quote exact figures, but stated that it is the intention of the Clinical Commissioning Group to have 100% take-up of training by staff. Catherine herself will assess training providers and the role they play. The data on take-up of training by the GP practices will be available for Members.

Steve Ashley commented that it is important to assess how much difference the training actually makes. We have done the post-training audit of effectiveness of the provision. The LSCB requires training to happen and all agencies have their own specific packages. Also, the LSCB will assess the amount of training as part of its performance management regime. This aspect is very relevant in terms of Health Services, as they have a number of different levels of training. Significant financial investment is being made in training and Ofsted has already made positive comments about this aspect of the Rotherham agencies' response to the Professor Alexis Jay report.

Warren Carratt stated that the LSCB Board receives quarterly reports on training, which can be shared with elected members. One example is the e-learning package. Citizens (general public) also have access to e-learning and approximately 2,500 local residents have gained access to that training since April 2014.

Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board requested that this data about the take-up of training should be shared with Members.

Warren Carratt continued by explaining the need to increase appropriate referrals and investigations of the training being given. Most of the feedback received is that working practices will improve because of training. It will take time to assess the effect of this training and there will be monitoring of progress over the next six months. The CSE sub group of the LSCB will be involved in this monitoring process.

Jane Parfremment referred to the training assessment report of eight local authorities (of which Rotherham Council was one). The CSE training in Rotherham has been termed "very useful" and has been effective in reaching the less obvious people and places, such as hotel receptionists. One example is of a hotel guest being caught in the act of exploitation, resulting in other perpetrators leaving the premises because their criminal activities had successfully been disrupted.

AP ref 2.06 (Councillor Steele) - what involvement is there with local schools and how are the Education Welfare Service working with them

around children missing from education?

Steve Ashley referred to the training provided for designated lead officers within the Education Welfare Service. Training can be targeted, for example, specifically for the lead/senior staff of special schools and for the governors of special schools. Lead teachers in the “healthy schools” project will have training; there is also more e-learning and the take-up of training is monitored

Councillor Currie questioned why the education partners were not attending today’s meeting.

Jane Parfremment stated that she was representing the Education Service today.

Members asked about CSE awareness-raising sessions and Jane Parfremment stated that, wherever possible, such sessions will be provided and will involve actual experiences without causing discomfort for any participant.

AP ref 3.03 (Councillor Steele) – Can you provide more information on engagement with parents and how this is done?

Jane Parfremment referred to the amount of voluntary sector learning taking place and every effort is being made to try and involve parents as much as possible. Some 1,100 parents have completed the e-learning package developed for parents and carers. The Parenting Worker has a specific role to work with parents of children at risk, concentrating upon the way in which parents may help and also involve the Police to report concerns (eg: saving clothing for use of DNA in identifying perpetrators). It is important that parents are confident in helping the Police.

District Commander Jason Harwin stated that the Police has commissioned funding for specific work with GROW (Giving Real Opportunities to Women) and this work is continuing. Whenever the Police receive information from parents, it is almost always very useful and it is equally important that parents are able to receive the correct level of support throughout the traumatic period of an investigation.

AP ref 3.05 (Councillor Jane Hamilton) - Actions in this section are not specific yet it is rated green – can you provide more detail on this and why it is rated green?

Steve Ashley stated that actions will be listed as ‘green’ because it represents continuing work which has begun and progress is being made, even though the action is not yet complete. We are uncertain as to whether the RAG rating system is always helpful and appropriate.

Jane Parfremment confirmed that the ‘green’ rating often indicates that

more work is required for the action point. Sometimes perpetrators change tactics and the action must continue (eg: perpetrators move away from hotels and onto the grooming of young people in fast food outlets). Agencies have to use continuous intelligence to make sure that actions are live and are being progressed correctly.

AP ref 3.06 (Councillor Sims) – This action has slipped so how is it being dealt with? How is work to engage ethnic minority communities being taken forward? The action date has been moved from May 2015 to November 2015.

Steve Ashley reported that the LSCB has received criticism for its lack of community engagement. It is imperative that the LSCB does begin effective community engagement. The LSCB will make use of a task and finish group to identify that the LSCB itself is engaging properly with all aspects/sectors of the community and not just with self-appointed people. The difficulty of this task is properly acknowledged by the LSCB and, as a consequence of the criticism received, it will be a priority of the LSCB.

Jane Parfremment stated that the dates have slipped (May to November 2015) because, whilst the May 2015 target was being achieved, the action has been re-assessed as a fresh priority, with a consequent revision to the new, later target date. In terms of community engagement, we have made contact with the Eastwood (Rotherham) community and officers have attended the Roma forum meetings. But we felt that the action plan for community engagement was altogether insufficient and we therefore need more time to complete the additional actions relating to this action point.

District Commander Jason Harwin stated that agencies are endeavouring to ensure that we do the right thing and, because we are public services, it is our daily business to engage with communities. That is important, even though some communities themselves resist our attempts at engagement. The Police have re-launched the system of any initiatives/investigations being post-code based, to ensure the accurate collection of information relevant to specific areas/districts. The Police also uses the Crime Stoppers to try and obtain as much information as possible which can be fed into the investigation of cases.

AP ref 3.09 (Councillor Currie) – There is no update on this item, what is being done, who are the community leaders and how are they identified? District Commander Jason Harwin stated that, again it is our daily business. We must have a continuous and sustainable process of community engagement. Some of the newer communities have cultural challenges (eg: marriage at age 14 years) and these are issues which have to be addressed by the agencies. The Police sometimes recruit officers from the communities, in order to help our understanding of issues.

Jane Parfremment stated that agencies have to be creative and work with

communities. There was an example of staff being approached, at an event for the 'Standing Together' campaign, by Asian woman community leader. The issue was about Asian girls not having the confidence or trust to speak to anyone within the statutory agencies. Eventually, we found a way of giving this lady some arms-length support, using her community role and standing to develop the confidence of young Asian girls to report the issues to the agencies. It is known that often, the workers themselves are reluctant to engage. There needs to be a way of increasing confidence overall in community engagement.

AP ref 4.02 (Councillor Wyatt) – In terms of intelligence from NHS partners, the Jay report makes little reference to this but there should have been information from A&E, Sexual Health services, general admissions, GPs or community pharmacy. How can we ensure this information is shared moving forward? Where is the intelligence available from these NHS services? Is there a system failure? Does it relate to confidentiality? We have seen better services made available for victims of domestic violence, so is it possible to make the same improvement for the victims of child sexual exploitation?

Tracey McErlains-Burns stated that the level of training and awareness is still evolutionary. During the last week of August (the time at which the report by Professor Alexis Jay was published), 500 front-line health workers participated in awareness training about identifying the signs and triggers of CSE and how to share that intelligence appropriately with other agencies. There will be more training provided in the future. It is important that colleagues have the confidence to report things they see and hear and the agencies have to rely on that. In addition, Health Service staff will have to adhere to their own individual professional standards. There is inter-agency training, eg: Police Superintendent Paul McCurrie has spoken to leaders of the nursing service. There is much awareness-raising amongst staff. The NHS Trust will be continuing with this training provision.

Samantha Davis (RDASH) stated that RDASH will ask direct questions of its service users. Sometimes, individual cases may involve uncovering historical issues (of abuse) for some of the people involved.

Catherine Hall (NHS) stated that, as at November 2014, the GPs training and GPs staff training have involved some 600 people, concerning the issues of CSE and awareness raising. We are developing a smart-phone App which will assist in the provision of training.

AP ref 4.03 (Councillor Watson) – with regard to return interviews from Safe@Last, why don't 85% take these up and for those that do, how are they followed up? What happens with the information?

Jane Parfremment stated that Safe@Last is an independent organisation contracted to carry out return interviews for children who have gone

missing, as soon as they come back. In the past, perhaps not enough of these interviews have taken place, perhaps because the specification was not clear enough. The Council has reviewed the interviewing contract specification and some of the interviews, so that we can develop an understanding of the reasons why children go missing. There is also increased awareness of the range of issues which may cause significant harm to children and young people; eg: bullying and online bullying. Agencies must know how best to support vulnerable youngsters so that they are not tempted to go missing. Regional meetings of the South Yorkshire local authorities are taking place in order to consider these issues. A new contract for the return interviews, which has an improved specification, will begin in April 2015 and will operate on a South Yorkshire-wide basis. Possibly, the previous contract did not make things clear to Safe@Last exactly what was required from that organisation.

AP ref 4.07 (Councillor Currie) – Can you give members assurances that risk assessments are up to date, if so why has it gone down to amber? Where is the data analysis that supports this? Is the data being shared by the various partner agencies ?

Steve Ashley stated that there has been regular auditing of the risk assessments during the past year. The LSCB is unhappy with some of the quality of the risk assessments, found during these audits and the LSCB is less happy with what has happened. Every CSE case that comes in (to the agencies) will henceforth have continuous assessment. Considerable funding has been contributed by partner agencies so that a great deal more work may happen in respect of the risk assessment process. The LSCB is looking forward to next year's scrutiny of this issue, to be able to see and examine how much improvement will have been made on the risk assessments.

Jane Parfremment stated that Members must have confidence in me (Jane Parfremment) being honest (in giving this answer). There is no bespoke tool available which will accurately assess risk. For any individual CSE case, the risk level will and does change suddenly overnight. The existence of good, solid multi-agency practices around these vulnerable young people will give all of you confidence (in the systems). The use of the multi-agency scoring process has been revised and amended to allow professionals to alter scores, as the scores have sometimes been based on other, non-numeric assessments. This revision has prompted everyone to think about the various factors which are affecting children and young people. Of 103 CSE cases, 80 risk assessments are now up-to-date and the remaining 23 are continuing and will be updated within ten days' time. These figures are acceptable, but we need to have better basic practice in place, so that the risk assessment process is as strong as possible.

Steve Ashley reported that, one year ago, the use of the numerical risk assessments was not good and the practitioners had no faith in that method. Now, it has become a worthwhile tool to use. However, the LSCB

must check all of those 103 individual cases so that we are sure that the work being done is relevant and appropriate. The assessments must check issues such as : “ when will each milestone be reached?”, “is there counselling and support provided?”. This is currently a sub-standard area of work which the LSCB is actively improving. The appointment of Jane Parfremment has brought a fresh approach which is “blunt and to-the-point” – and this is an approach which is bringing improvements. There is much more still to be done. It is a very difficult area of work to have to deal with. As Chair of the LSCB, I expect to be held to account for this (area of work).

Councillor Read commented that the progress of the risk assessments is an important aspect of CSE to be re-visited by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

AP ref 4.08 (Councillor Read) – Reference to the numeric scoring tool – is this working and if not why?

Members noted that this question has already been answered, within the AP ref 4.07 issue above.

AP ref 5.06 (Councillor Read) – With regard to the out-of-authority checklist – is this new and is it working? Jay recommendation 3 refers to use of out of authority placements. Ofsted tell us that; "Young people places further away because of their vulnerability to CSE do not always have sufficiently well-developed safety plans, risk assessments or robust responses to further incidents of concern." This seems a slightly different point to those addressed in the action plan. What steps are the council taking to address this and how will we know if it has been successful?

Jane Parfremment reiterated that it is important to have confidence in the system. It may be the case that past practice has been to choose the out-of-authority placement much too quickly. It is sometimes a false assumption that children are safer when they are at a distance from their home area. The local support services should be good enough to assist them and the Police will know the local area and any troubles within it. We can track a child/young person's history of going missing and, for example, if that young person has a problem with misuse of substances. The agencies' skills capacity and usage of resources is being assessed. Agencies must have the confidence and support staff must have confidence to provide assistance to these vulnerable youngsters. One of the Council's residential units is undergoing a change of purpose so as to be able to provide support for young people who have complex needs.

There will continue to be a need for out-of-authority placements. The checklist is there to help us make sure we comply with the new national guidance (issued in July 2014) and agencies must also make better use of our commissioning processes. The Police are developing intelligence about the way in which CSE perpetrators are targeting the children's residential homes. The Council is also providing support services for the looked after children; eg: the head teacher of the Virtual School will

assess the availability of the best school place for a looked after child. A small number of children continue to have out-of-authority placements.

At this point in the meeting's proceedings, the Chair Councillor Steele asked that written responses be provided for any question which time did not allow to be asked at today's meeting – a deadline of Tuesday 16 December 2014 was agreed for receipt of all of those responses.

AP ref 6.02 (Councillor Sims) – What is the progress on the Data Analyst post, how is it working? What is progress on the IT system?

District Commander Jason Harwin stated that the South Yorkshire Police have a dedicated ICT analyst within their team. Some excellent work is happening. The information and data mapping provides us with better intelligence about CSE perpetrators and victims, which will assist future investigations. Funding for the ICT analyst has been provided by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner for three years. There are also specialist analysts who are examining information available from beyond South Yorkshire, to help with the overall picture of the CSE issues.

AP ref 7.03 (Councillor Ahmed) – There is much conflicting information about the profile of offenders, specifically relating to ethnicity, please explain the real situation.

Detective Superintendent Matt Fenwick referred to the analyst's work which has helped the Police assess information on both CSE offenders and victims. Offender profiling has been completed in detail during October and November 2014. There are known offenders from these ethnic origins : White British, Asian, Pakistani, Eastern European and there are three offenders whose exact ethnic origin is still unknown. Most of the offenders are male, although two are female.

The following section refers to questions asked specifically about the Improvement and Delivery Action Plan

Q1. (Councillor C Vines) What assurances do we have that information is not being covered up, as it would appear to the layman that nothing much has happened since the report was published?

Steve Ashley that Rotherham Council finds itself under a huge spotlight and no other local authority has had this extent of external scrutiny. There have been several inspections of the Council and its partners imposed at short notice (eg: Ofsted; Independent Police Commission) as well as internal reviews. People are working tirelessly to put things right. It is our task to move forward under the scrutiny of the Children's Services

Improvement Board. Nothing is being covered up.

Councillor David Simmonds agreed that Rotherham has had the most ever scrutiny of a local authority. But, he continued, there is no substitute for a Council's own internal scrutiny, as long as the necessary systems and processes are properly in place. There was a wealth of opportunities in Rotherham to report effectively, but it appears that the dots were not joined up. Councillors have to ask questions and look at things and make sure that you are confident yourselves that nothing is being hidden.

Assistant Chief Constable Ingrid Lee referred to meetings with Professor Alexis Jay and other people who have contributed to her CSE report. There have been fifteen referrals to the Independent Police Commission, peer reviews, South Yorkshire Police staff have undertaken reviews at other Police forces and the investigation of historical cases is continuing. A seminar for all of the South Yorkshire Police districts, about CSE, has taken place and the Police will try and ensure good practice and consistency across the whole County. The Police also arranged a seminar for Rotherham Borough Councillors. There has been a review of public protection provision (involving 305 staff). The joint team approach is now in place at the Council's Riverside House. There has been the launch of the "Spot the Signs" campaign, encouraging victims to come forward. Police 'Operation Make Safe' has begun. An expert in CSE investigations, a Detective Inspector from the Thames Valley Police, has been seconded to provide assistance to the South Yorkshire Police. Relevant legislative provisions are being used in Police investigations : including the Risk of Sexual Harm Order; anti-trafficking legislation. Currently, there are 45 ongoing CSE investigations in Rotherham.

Jane Parfremment stated that an extensive amount of work is being done and that there is a huge desire to change things and improve. If there is a perception that nothing is being done, then we need to communicate our progress much better to the outside world. There is much hard work taking place across all agencies.

Q4. (Councillor Read) The Alexis Jay Report will have re-opened painful memories for many people who were victims of CSE, many of whom we as an institution will be aware of. What proactive steps have the council and its partners taken to offer support to these people?

Steve Ashley stated that the LSCB does not itself commission support. At a recent meeting of the Council's Health and Wellbeing Board, the Council's Director of Public Health has been asked to list the amount of support which is already available for victims and to state the way in which the Council's allocation of £120,000 for victims will be used. A telephone help-line is being established as well. Meetings have been held with Councillors Doyle and Beaumont and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the new Director of Public Health is to be appointed. Work has begun on this and a Joint Group will be set up, with a jointly agreed plan established to monitor what is being done. One of area of

difficulty is being able to truly establish the size of the problem, the number of people/victims affected and the resources required.

Jane Parfremment stated that the document “the needs analysis of the safeguarding required” (and its terms of reference) is available for circulation. This document will help us to produce a base of evidence which in turn is used to attract resources. The CSE sub group (of the LSCB) has resources allocated until 31 March 2015 and the LSCB will agree to commit further resources to 30 June 2015, which will ensure that the work on the support for victims will make progress.

Councillor Read asked about the identification of the victims of the historical CSE cases.

Samantha Davis (RDASH) stated that RDASH will check with its clients as to whether there are any historic abuse issue to be dealt with.

Steve Ashley pointed out that agencies do realise that some people may not wish to be approached about support, nor would they wish to receive any help. Often, it just requires the people/victims themselves to come forward and seek support. Again, there is much work for us to be doing with regard to victim support.

The Chair, Councillor Steele brought the morning’s proceedings to a close by thanking everyone for their contributions. He reiterated the requirement for written responses to the questions which had not been asked at the meeting.

75. SESSION THREE - IMPLICATIONS FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES IN ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

Councillors Ahmed and Wootton did not attend the afternoon session.

Councillors Finnie and Reynolds did attend the afternoon session.

The objectives for this session were: -

- To secure effective partnerships for the future;
- To determine new processes, how embedded and how successful they are;
- Focus on the action plan for the future – for Rotherham.

The Criminal Justice Agency representatives in attendance were: -

- Jason Harwin, Chief Superintendent, South Yorkshire Police;
- Matt Fenwick, Detective Superintendent, South Yorkshire Police;
- Ingrid Lee, Assistant Chief Constable, South Yorkshire Police;
- Barbara Petchey, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor;
- Michelle Buttery, Chief Executive and Solicitor, Office of the Police

and Crime Commissioner;

- Alan Billings, South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

Questions were asked by members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to determine the preparedness of the criminal justice agencies to respond to CSE in Rotherham.

Councillor Wyatt asked: What do you see as the principle barriers in delivering services to tackle CSE?

The Assistant Chief Constable explained that the issues were much bigger than solely focussing on CSE, it was more relevant to speak about how the whole picture of Child Abuse would be tackled. A much greater focus on prevention would be the key to protecting children from harm. Prevention could not be measured. South Yorkshire Police would ensure it continued to do everything possible to encourage people to come forward and be confident to come forward to report these crimes.

It was also important to attract staff into key posts who genuinely cared and were passionate about what they do. This included staff skilled in working with the internet and other technology that made abuse 'hidden'.

South Yorkshire Police could not focus on any specific community or group as these crimes were not just committed by one group. Focussing on only one would prevent the Police from seeing things taking place in other areas.

The budgets of the Police and Voluntary Sectors were shrinking. This could impact on victim and perpetrator programmes.

Better use and development of shared IT systems would remove a lot of barriers.

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor referred to public confidence in the criminal justice system as being key. Successful prosecutions were cyclic in that they meant it was more likely that victims or members of the public would be confident to come forward. There were high levels of passion and commitment in the Services. The CPS Lawyers were extremely dedicated, hardworking and committed. Positive news stories should be shared to get the message out there to celebrate successes.

Councillor Steele: What work takes place between the key agencies to maximise the potential for successful prosecutions?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor saw this as critical for successful outcomes. However, this work was not in the public domain. Agencies spoke together all of the time to constantly share information. This enabled the CPS to know the amount of casework coming forward and give them the ability to ask for further resources if necessary. Work

relating to child abuse was always prioritised. Casework could be lengthy: a lawyer had worked for two-years' full-time on a recent case before it came to court. The 'Gold' meetings that took place were multi-agency.

The Court Service ensured that victims and witnesses were able to give their best evidence through support and the use of special measures where possible, such as giving evidence to Court via a live DVD link so they did not have to physically attend the Court.

The Detective Superintendent outlined how the interactions between the agencies worked very strongly. In the past they had been very isolated. The Multi-Agency Support Hub at Riverside House represented completely co-located teams, including the voluntary and charity sector. Weekly multi-agency meeting chaired by a Deputy Superintendent were held. Cases relating to CSE and sexual crimes were difficult to prosecute for a number of reasons. Victims did not always see themselves as victims. In some cases, disruption activities relating to corollary activities including drug and motoring offences would be pursued.

Councillor Currie asked: How is the victim supported throughout the process, in particular, through the commissioning of support packages?

The Detective Superintendent described the role of the Adult and Childrens' SARCs, which were units and organisations that managed victim support and arranged pathways for guidance, counselling, independent advocacy and victim support. This happened regardless of whether a case went to court, or not.

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor spoke about the role of intermediaries to provide children with the help they needed to present the best evidence, and ensure that they could understand and answer questions. The care of witnesses was deeply embedded into Services using the 'No Witness, No Justice' campaign.

The Police and Crime Commissioner explained his role as taking a step back to review provision. He shared concern for victims and wanted to look at how it felt for the victim in reality. The PCC was consulting on victims' needs, where there were gaps in provision and where things were not working properly. An amount of £235k was available for organisations providing a range of things. The Police and Crime Commissioner was looking, as part of his role, at whether the right organisations were being supported to do the right sort of things.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked: What work takes place with front line officers to secure the necessary evidence?

The Chief Superintendent spoke about the protocols that existed within

South Yorkshire Police from the first contact by a victim, to identify and ensure the case was managed properly. Training had been provided on getting the best evidence through working with witnesses and forensic examinations. Daily briefings took place within the Force on hotspots, victims and disruption plans.

He stated that South Yorkshire Police was serious about learning; it dealt with CSE on a daily basis and briefings were provided on what was working. The Force took part in Peer Reviews on sharing practice. Scrutiny took place on a daily basis – and in his view, the majority of the time South Yorkshire Police got it right. It was important to recognise successes and ensure the Force was challenged to learn better. A pilot training programme for Sergeants was undertaken over a three-day period and tested their decision making on case studies on CSE. This had been recognised nationally as good practice and had been cascaded across the country.

Councillor Sims asked: How is all of this reflected in the Action Plan?

The Chief Superintendent explained that the Action Plan had been written to ensure that South Yorkshire Police were not just reacting but ‘so what’, including are we identifying those responsible and pursuing through the courts?.

There were a number of Action Plans and these had been collated into one single Action Plan that the Force referred to.

Councillor Read asked a supplementary question on the action plan and information provided by Sargent Taff that said no current cases that fitted the media-portrayed stereotype (e.g. Asian Males 25+) (Section 7).

The Chief Superintendent explained that there were current offenders matching the profile of Asian Males aged 25+ and charges had been brought.

The Detective Superintendent explained the role of the VASOR Unit that constituted the local Violent and Sex Offender Register. The current split was 50/50 between violent and sex offenders and 260 VASOR were resident in Rotherham. They were managed in the community and had stringent conditions and monitoring applied to them. None of the offenders under VASOR met the profile outlined above.

The following questions were asked directly to the Police and Crime Commissioner:

Councillor Read asked: How do you hold the Chief Constable to account to be sure he delivers on the commitments in the action

plan?

The Police and Crime Commissioner outlined his meetings with groups across all of South Yorkshire. A Conference on ending Violence Against Women and Girls had taken place in the Sheffield Town Hall and had been over-subscribed. At the conference, victims of child abuse and domestic abuse were present to give their stories. Absorbing this sort of information from victims of crime enabled the Police and Crime Commissioner to have honest and frank discussions with the Chief Constable, including the availability of resources.

His role was to check that the things that were said to be happening were translated into action and happening on the ground. It also included having an honest and frank discussion about levels of resourcing available and performance.

The Chief Executive and Solicitor for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed her support for the Action Plans; referring to the Briefing Note submitted to the meeting. Success was defined by victims' feelings about the service they were receiving. The Police and Crime Commissioner had an overview of a huge area; including the Criminal Justice Board and CSE forum. The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner was unprecedented and enabled him to seek out the enablers and components of what success looked like in this area.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked: What resources have been targeted at tackling CSE and what are your plans for the future as, surely, a long-term plan needs to be in place?

The Police and Crime Commissioner spoke about a significant refresh or review of Police and Crime Plan. It needed to be more specific about CSE and reflect the immediate priority of cases and also identify additional resources to support this work.

The Detective Superintendent outlined the staffing that had been in place since 2010 when there had been 4 Officers working on CSE. This had grown to 10 in 2012 and 20 in 2013, including three Sergeants, sixteen DCs and allied professions. By April 2014, 65 professionals were solely dedicated to CSE cases. Authorisation had recently been granted to extend to a further 65 posts to protect vulnerable people.

Councillor Watson asked: How will victim support be commissioned to deliver on this agenda to ensure that agencies work with victims throughout the prosecution and post-trial processes?

The Police and Crime Commissioner described how he needed to work to ensure that the right number and efficient organisations were in place. A piece of work to commence in the New Year would involve calling all providers together to get a full picture of what is provided and whether

there were any gaps in provision. The Police and Crime Commissioner outlined his focus and priority was the victims who had been lost sight of.

The Chief Executive and Solicitor for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner referred to the performance framework in place for recipients of grant funding. Whilst bidders for grant funding needed to satisfy criteria to be successful, there was less emphasis on evaluation at the end of their funding period to evaluate the outcomes from the funding. This would be incorporated in the future.

Councillors C. Vines and Parker asked a question about who held the Police and Crime Commissioner to account.

The Police and Crime Commissioner referred to the Police and Crime Panel and, ultimately, the electorate.

Councillor C. Vines asked a supplementary question about governance and how the Police and Crime Commissioner did not have to implement the recommendations of the Police and Crime Panel, which meant that his confidence in the role was very low.

Councillor Steele referred to the legislation that governed this area. What happened in South Yorkshire was consistent with all legislation.

Councillor Parker asked a supplementary question about how good scrutiny of the role of Police and Crime Commissioner was. He described how, in his view, the meeting had been subject to vetted questions and how Members had been gagged from asking questions. He was not confident to tell his constituents and members of the public that he had any confidence in the criminal justice agencies here represented. He shared concerns about a case of a young victim being arrested whilst the perpetrator was still at large. Why had this been allowed to happen and what were the police doing about it?

Councillor Steele, Chairperson of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, referred to the process in which questions had been gathered for the meeting, and how they had been assigned to all members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to ask. All members had been emailed on two separate occasions asking for questions in advance. Two planning sessions had been held for all OSMB Members to prepare questions and ensure that the issues being considered were effectively scrutinised. There had been no vetting or gagging – the process had been notified to all Members well in advance of the meeting. Elected Members not wishing to respond or engage in the process did so at their discretion.

Councillor Steele stated that in his opinion, more information had been gained by preparing questions in advance than would otherwise be the case.

The Police and Crime Commissioner urged Councillors C. Vines and Parker to contact him directly with any questions they wanted to ask and he would ensure that they received a response.

Councillor Parker responded that this method would not allow the information to be available to members of the public.

The following questions were asked directly to Barbara Petchey, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor:

Councillor Read asked: Can criminal proceedings be brought without the consent of the victim? How likely is it that we will see more "victimless" prosecutions in the future? Councillor Read referred to the West Yorkshire model.

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor referred to the difficulty of getting cases through the Court system. These included the different legislation pre- and post-2004. The 2003 Act had brought up to date how sexual offences and offenders were dealt with. Offences which occurred prior to May 2004 had to be brought under the old legislation (from 1956). This posed real problems for historic charges of CSE and child abuse.

Working with victims also brought challenges as they were often groomed and under the influence of highly manipulative and devious men. This meant that persuading the victims to come on board and stay on board with a prosecution was often fraught. Victims' credibility would often be poor with juries, perhaps due to previous convictions, drugs, chaotic lifestyles and difficult behaviour. This can often be observed by others to be "deviant and bad".

She gave example of witnesses giving inconsistent or contradictory evidence. Despite this, the Crown Prosecution Service had been able to prosecute in these cases. Experts were used to advise the prosecution barristers on how to present to show how the apparently irrational behaviours of a young person were normal in the circumstances.

She explained that because of the complexity of cases, prosecution could often take years. There needed to be a shift from the credibility of the victim to the nature of the offending; it was not the victim in the dock.

However, in answer to the question, yes there had been victimless-prosecutions previously.

The Detective Superintendent confirmed that there had been two recent victimless-prosecutions heard by the Sheffield Crown Court – one was successful and one collapsed due to the level of evidence presented. The successful case had been an intended prosecution case without a victim. At the last minute the victim came forward and this aligned with forensic evidence and CCTV. Although they were possible, they were very

difficult to achieve.

Councillor Middleton asked: Could prosecutions be secured based on the DNA of children that had been born as a result of CSE? The Jay Report had stated that 104 children had been born as a result of CSE.

The Deputy Crown Prosecutor, the Detective Superintendent and the Assistant Chief Constable confirmed that this would be possible but consent would need to be given by victims to collect their DNA for the purpose of prosecution. The Multi-Agency Support Hub would enable the sharing of information between the Police and Health, which should significantly improve the ability for swifter and better access to information with services like sexual health and midwifery.

Councillor Steele asked: Is there a tension between the need for professional separation of the Police and the CPS and the need for close working to secure the right evidence?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor confirmed that there was healthy tension between the distinct and different roles. The Police owned investigations. There was a role for the Crown Prosecution Service in advising this process. Both Services shared a common objective to see perpetrators brought to justice and it was in neither Partners' interests to put weak cases before the Courts.

Councillor Wyatt asked: What early investigative advice can be provided to the Police?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor described how the Service was looking to embed a lawyer into one of the Public Protection Units in the New Year. This would be an exciting new development and would test the concept out. This professional would play a critical role in guiding and steering investigations from an early stage.

Councillor Parker asked: How many times in the last year had the CPS declined to bring prosecutions when presented by the police with cases of suspected CSE? Also, how were the Criminal Justice Agencies responding to alleged marriages within the Roma community of teenaged children between 12-15 years old?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor did not have data available regarding how often the CPS had declined to bring prosecutions relating to CSE.

She committed to gathering this evidence and reporting back.

The Chief Superintendent confirmed that all marriages must comply with the UK's laws.

The following questions were asked directly to the representatives of the South Yorkshire Police:

Councillor Currie asked: What is different now in terms of culture, competences and development of staff?

The Detective Superintendent described the impact of reports of the National Crime Agency and the Jay Report in shifting cultures. If perpetrators could be identified the Criminal Justice Agencies would work together to prosecute them. The effect of the Jay Report and its publicity had meant that training had become focused for all levels from Detective Inspector to CSE frontline staff and trained specialist officers. CSE was the Force's number one priority. An internal and external media marketing campaign had begun on spotting the signs of CSE on a consistent basis. Focus groups had been started so that all Officers were fully aware of CSE. The Force was certainly on the right track culturally to better respond to CSE.

Councillor Sims asked: How do you know you have changed attitudes on the front line and how has this translated into improved outcomes on the streets?

The Chief Superintendent explained that feedback from victims was really important. It would also mean that better intelligence was fed into the system. Were prosecutions successful? No agencies wanted anyone to be a victim. All agencies knew the signs so intervention could happen earlier. All relevant partners and third sectors were involved.

Councillor Sims asked a supplementary question: had the allegation that victims involved in CSE had made a lifestyle choice been ended?

The Chief Superintendent explained that learning had taken place over the previous two years and all agencies knew that the victims had not chosen to be victims in CSE.

Councillor C. Vines asked: Is the ultimate measure of your success the number of arrests and prosecutions? How are you performing in this area?

The Assistant Chief Constable did not believe that arrests and prosecutions were not necessarily an accurate measure of success. Victims must be at the heart of everything the Force did. Victims may not

seek to give information to enable a prosecution. Prevention was a much better measure. Prevention work with hotels had taken place. This measure of success would not be captured on any statistics. Sometimes, it was not possible to prosecute sexual offences but there was often a whole raft of other offences and criminal activity that could be pursued. Whatever the outcome was, the Criminal Justice Agencies had to ensure that victims were confident to come forward.

To the beginning of November, 2014, Rotherham had seen 26 prosecutions involving 24 offenders.

Councillor C. Vines asked a supplementary question: Why was this not being projected to the public? Elected Members speaking to members of the public were picking up the message that the public thought that nothing was happening. It was not in the local press.

The Assistant Chief Constable agreed that these cases did not necessarily make the headlines. The Force would continue to use social media but was unable to publicise ongoing investigations.

The Chief Superintendent confirmed that the issue of media releases were discussed at the Chief Executive Group for Rotherham. More releases were coming forward.

Councillor Watson asked: How do you strike the balance between disruption activity and gathering evidence in cases of suspected CSE?

The Chief Superintendent described how risk assessments were used, along with prevention activities and securing evidence for a conviction were important. Actions were taken against offenders for other offences.

The Assistant Chief Constable explained that the Force would look at all other safeguarding issues as well, recognising the different and specific roles for frontline and specialist staff.

Councillor Wyatt asked: How many abduction notices have been issued in the last 12 months in Rotherham, and to how many individuals / in relation to how many children? How does this compare to Doncaster and Barnsley?

The Assistant Chief Constable did not have the information to hand but would be able to provide outside of the meeting.

The Chief Superintendent confirmed that Abduction Notices were used successfully.

Councillor Read asked: The councillors' briefing note makes

reference to "CSE suspect risk assessment and Disruption Plans", highlighting 32 people of "high risk", with an initial focus on the ten highest risk individuals. What can you tell us about how these risks have been assessed, what they are and what action you are able to take?

The Chief Superintendent described the role of Offender Management that existed between the wider partnership and the powers that existed. This included pursuing other criminality not on the Police's thresholds, including tenancy issues. Police briefings included tracking incidents in a certain locality.

Supplementary questions were asked to the Criminal Justice Agencies represented:

Councillor Parker asked: Was it the case that the disruption process with hotels would just transfer the issue to other areas?

The Assistant Chief Constable confirmed that the Force was continually refining what they did to be on top of any changes. The key was in educating everyone in the Borough on what to look out for and to be confident in reporting issues.

Councillor Currie asked: Would the Action Plan continue to be positive and all partners engaged?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor, the Assistant Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commission spoke about their respective roles in the Action Plan. The CPS attended forums where their role could provide added value but could not attend meetings where the agenda did not cover criminal justice issues. The Assistant Chief Constable referred to the role of protecting vulnerable people to prevent actions and support victims. The Police and Crime Commissioner spoke about his role in preventing silo working and ensuring that tackling CSE was a top priority.

Councillor Sims asked: Was there the ability to support juries listening to CSE cases?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor stated that juries could not be coached in any issues as this could undermine their role in ensuring a fair trial. However, public education about the issues involved in CSE, expert witnesses to explain the impact of post-traumatic stress disorder and CSE issues would secure prosecutions. Judges also had a role in ensuring that victims were not intimidated by the defence team.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked: What role could evidence from social media play in securing convictions?

The Assistant Chief Constable explained that some social media was open to access and other areas closed. There was legislation and powers to access closed social media but this was not a straightforward process. There was a dedicated internet team in South Yorkshire. Social media was used in evidence all the time. If there was no permission to use the evidence it could be hard.

Councillor C. Vines asked: Were shrinking budgets having an impact on the affordability of the calibre of staff that you can recruit?

The Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor confirmed that the CPS was not currently recruiting. It was clear that there was no shortage of talent out there who would love to join the Service.

Councillor Steele thanked the representatives of the Criminal Justice Agencies for attending the meeting and for their responses to the questions that had been put.

76. SUMMING-UP OF KEY ISSUES FROM DAY ONE

The Scrutiny Manager summarised the key points from Day One of the Scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle CSE.

Key issues that had been identified in the Scrutiny sessions with the individual agencies were: -

- Are all matters reflected in action plans?;
- Was Scrutiny effective enough to hold Agencies to account?;
- Was there scrutiny on whether practice on the ground was being improved?;
- Personal, Social and Health Education – role and importance in Schools;
- Greater public understanding;
- Further posts being recruited to and single management structures;
- Risk assessments – Social Care and the Police;
- Support to victims;
- Changing trends and behaviours – staying ahead of changing trends of perpetrators and offenders;
- Effectiveness of scrutiny arrangements;

- Communications;
- Things not captured in Action Plans – commissioning and commissioning activities;
- Community engagement;
- The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's role in understanding data. This would be taken forward as a smaller sub-committee to compliment the work of the Corporate Improvement Board.

Councillor Steele thanked Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and other Elected Members represented for their attendance and contributions to the questioning and discussion process.

77. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on Thursday 18th December, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m., to facilitate the continuing scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
Thursday, 18th December, 2014

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Currie, J. Hamilton, Middleton, Parker, Read, Sansome, Sims, Vines, Watson and Wyatt.

Also in attendance were Councillors Reeder, Turner and M. Vines.

77. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

There were no issues referred for call-in.

79. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The member of the public did not wish to ask a question.

80. SCRUTINY OF ROTHERHAM'S PLANS TO TACKLE CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

The objectives of this session were:-

Session 1: Support to Victims and their Families

Objectives:-

- To understand the long term plans for support to victims and their families and to ensure they are fit for purpose
- To test out evidence from the previous session with advocate organisations and to understand how it is working in practice
- To determine whether universal services are working to support victims and their families

Representatives from the following agencies were in attendance: -

- Zlakha Ahmed, Apna Haq
- Hayley Fisher, Victim Support
- Karen Goddard, Barnados
- Steve Oversby, Barnados
- Bina Parmar, Safeguarding Lead, National Working Group
- Sue Greig, Public Health Consultant, RMBC
- Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioner, RMBC

Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioner, and Sue Greig, Public Health Consultant, gave the following powerpoint presentation on the commissioning of immediate and longer term post-abuse child sexual exploitation support:-

Background

- Post-Jay report the Leader of the Council announced funding of £120,000 for immediate commissioning of post-abuse Child Sexual Exploitation support. This was to fund services up to the end of March, 2015
- A Needs Analysis is in development to inform longer term commissioning

Immediate Support to June, 2015

RMBC

- GROW £20,000
- Women's Counselling/Pitstop for Men £42,000
- South Yorkshire Community Foundation £20,000
- Contingency £11,000
- Rotherham Women's Refuge £27,000
- Total £120,000 funding

Plus

- Child Sexual Exploitation Co-ordinator £53,000 in Youth Start revenue funded

Immediate Support to March 2015

Partners

- Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group - Increased capacity in Child and Adult Mental Health Services - £200,000

Police and Crime Commissioner

- Funding of 2 additional IDVAs £80,000

Helpline

- Helpline commissioned from NSPCC
- Single number 24/7
- Confidential e-mail
- For victims and survivors of child sexual exploitation abuse
- For all ages
- Listening, supported and referral
- To June, 2015 £20,000

Child Sexual Exploitation Needs Analysis

- To understand the scale and nature of child sexual exploitation in Rotherham
- To understand the needs of victims (child and adult, current and

- historic)
- To understand the triggers, motivations and needs of perpetrators
- To make evidence based recommendations to inform the development, provision and commissioning of services and programmes to prevent and protect victims and to pursue perpetrators
- Phase 1 November-December, 2014: focus on post-abuse support

Gap analysis on modelled need vs current capacity

Evidence base on effective interventions

- Phase 2 December 2014-March, 2015: incorporate learning into complete Needs Analysis to support holistic 'prevent, protect and pursue' child sexual exploitation agenda
- From June, 2015 for 3 years

A co-ordinated commissioning approach jointly with partners Rotherham Council/Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group/Police and Crime Commissioner

Needs-led, outcomes focussed commissioning

Rotherham Council £180,000 per annum for 3 years

Includes helpline, post-abuse child sexual exploitation support, specialist counselling and advocacy

Voice of the Victim/Survivor for Longer Term Commissioning

- Existing commissioned services to capture the voice of Service users
- Co-ordinated plan in relation to wider consultation in development
- Acknowledged not easy to capture voices

Questions were asked by members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on the presentation and on the plans for support services to victims.

Councillor M. Vines – Do the services you offer give the victims the strength and confidence to go to the Police and report the people who have put them through this awful crime?

Hayley Fisher, Victim Support, stated that they had found that consistent support was key so as to build trust and a rapport with the victim/survivor. An enhanced service was now used, project managed by Hayley. The difference of this service was the time spent to build up the rapport and the commitment given to the individual which helped build up the trust. This was often a difficulty with the victims in that they had been let down so many times before.

Karen Goddard, Barnados, reported that a lot of the children that came through to Barnados were actually not acknowledging that they were in

an abusive relationship and not willing to work with statutory agencies (or any agencies) so workers could be working very hard to make contact with the young person. It had to be done in an informal and non-threatening way and when they do feel confident, start to broker meetings with the Police and break down the barriers. It was not just a case of getting a young person to see a worker once and they would start talking but a long process. There had been quite significant success over the last year with quite a few disclosures from young people in Rotherham that Barnardos worked with.

Sue Greig, Public Health, stated that from the needs analysis work, being open and trusting seems to be the most important thing to get young people in to talk to someone. It may be years later that specialist therapeutic intervention is what people are seeking. It may take quite a bit of time and that just what heard so far from the various agencies that are working with survivors that there can be quite a pattern of contact and then go away and then come back. Just having an organisation that people know they could come back to that will listen was crucial and needed to be built upon.

Zlakha Ahmed, Apna Haq, reported that they offered support around domestic violence and with Asian young girls aged 16+ years. They did not work with anyone younger than 16 unless it was in conjunction with another organisation.

There were serious issues because in terms of Rotherham, it was the Pakistani community and the majority of Asian girls on the whole were not supposed to have boyfriends and dating and when there were those type of difficulties the young women did not feel they could share. On the few occasions females had come forward their parents had been involved and, because the response had not been really thought out, the parents had taken them back to Pakistan.

Bina Parmar, National Working Group, stated that there was clearly a lot of work taking place around therapeutic interventions and care of victims of CSE. She is working with a number of Local Safeguarding Children's Boards and a member of Rotherham LSCB CSE Sub-Group, so pleased to see a lot of work is taking place. Having read the Strategy and recently provided feedback on the need for therapeutic intervention and longer term is not really well reflected in the strategy. It would be useful to reflect that in the Strategy because doing ourselves an injustice.

It has previously been acknowledged that there is a need for longer term victim intervention for young people and adults that had been identified as victims of CSE. What is also being seen, is a gap between those who do meet thresholds for intervention and those who do not. What we find is that victims of CSE are identified through indicators and often have to meet statutory thresholds

Something needs to be acknowledged when thinking about support and

care for young people and victims of CSE. Those that do not meet those particular thresholds there is work be done to minimise those risks from escalating into harm.

Risk assessments – might be talking about later on. Young people often categorised into different markers of risk – high, medium and low risk. We need to think how we work with young people who are rated low risk as well; because it gives an opportunity for intervention and prevent them from becoming victims of crime.

We need to allow professionals to make that professional judgement around that young person. We know that risks change rapidly due to chaotic lifestyles of those young people. There needs to be multi agency and a holistic risk assessment to understand the risks to the young person and their families.

Steve Oversby, Barnados, stated that Barnados was not commissioned by Rotherham but was a partner with Rotherham. We probably put about £75,000 of our own money into Rotherham to help around CSE. We have done that since September, 2013.

Risk assessment and professional judgement around the young people – it is about good quality sharing information around children and young people from all agencies and quite difficult thing to do sometimes. Sometimes it is soft information that comes from outside the CSE hub.

From Barnardo's perspective, our work in Rotherham is about early intervention and prevention and supporting young people that go through some of these difficult times. Probably worth pointing out that Barnados opened its first CSE Service in Bradford in 1994 so we have a long history on providing CSE services. An offer was made to visit its work in Bradford. Whilst Bradford it is not perfect because it is not an exact science, but it is an historic multi-agency project with a track record of change and development.

If you do not get the voice of the child you do not have a child centred approach to the work you are doing and you will probably fail and we have evidence from the work we have done. It has to be child centred. We have developed our services based on that.

Bina Parmar – It is really important to have the voice of the young person when thinking about plans for their future. It would be helpful for the voice of young people to be represented at strategic level as well and that has been considered as part of the sub-group. Not necessarily a young person themselves but ensure that there is representation listened to and valued at that strategic level. None of us are experts in the field of CSE apart from the young person and need to learn from them.

Support for victims – think of all the stuff staff have to deal with as well as the victims themselves. They are dealing with very traumatic cases.

Build some specialism in amongst the staff, not only case supervision but trauma supervision.

Councillor Middleton – Do any of you have any ideas how to prevent CSE as opposed to treating it once it had happened?

Steve Oversby – From our perspective when look at the work we do in Rotherham fundamentally we want to turn our attention to the 4a's assertion outreach. If you want to try and tackle this you need to get initial contact with children on their terms and on their turf. Go out to find the young people. We want to be out there and do early intervention with young people which not badged "CSE". That is where attention needs to be because that is where early intervention happens. That is where multi-agency groups need to work together and with the community groups; they are the ones that will help with the information.

Bina Parmar – the prosecution of offenders is number one for the Police and Crown Prosecution Service but also has to be a multi-agency response; Safeguarding is everyone's business. Need to be sharing that little bit of information that might form the bigger picture. For example, the Police need to be utilising the Legislation better and engaging with Licensing much better because there are disruption activities. There might not be enough evidence to prosecute but use disruption activities. When identify areas of concern scrutinise what is being done to disrupt activity in the area and the perpetrators.

Prevention – need to do more to build the confidence and resilience of young people to be able to identify risky situations. Need to be doing more training for professionals in identifying risk and building confidence of professionals to escalate concerns that are not meeting the thresholds. More intensive community engagement. There has been a great deal of work done in trying to raise the awareness in Rotherham and South Yorkshire, more than many other parts of the country. Need to build on that work. Communicate with parents and young people to build confidence and foster parents and in a residential setting. Lot more to do for prevention, education and awareness.

Scrutinise process and arrangements – more needs to be added to the Strategy. I think there needs to be a CSE Co-ordinator at strategic level driving the Strategy forward. I am not sure whether the CSE Co-ordinator is operational or strategic – the 2 are very different. There are lots of very committed and dedicated professionals but all have their day jobs and it needs to be driven forward by a strategic co-ordinator and not just on a time limited basis.

Chrissy Wright – There is, as part of the Safeguarding Group, a Gold Group and the Silver Group which is the operational group. There is a multi-agency body where hotspots are identified and information shared. We know in schools prevention and learning work is taking place through the CSE Teams. Disruptive activity is very high profile in Rotherham so

just do not get somebody on CSE you can actually prosecute them on various things to disrupt their activities and lifestyles. Multi-agency work is in place.

Councillor Wyatt – It has been mentioned that young people with learning disabilities have been targeted by perpetrators of child sexual exploitation. This is an especially vulnerable group; what services are being commissioned to support/education/inform those with learning disabilities in the Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council area?

Sue Greig – We do know that there is an additional risk factor through the Needs Analysis. It is not jumping out as a high number at the moment but know from other evidence that there is likely to be an increased risk. On the prevention side of that work, is the programme of awareness raising across the Borough and will include special schools where will reach those young people. It is an area we need to develop further and need to develop intelligence on how much these children with learning developments are over represented in the cohort. We are looking to support and been exposed to these issues. Something people more aware of and working on.

Deputy Leader – This is why support for the victims and survivors is important and why we should look at it. If we manage to prevent it, it is a good outcome.t. However there are victims that been through it and we need to look how we can help those and action prosecution.

At the centre of this is the victim and what support they need to go through that process. There are a number of investigations and the National Crime Agency investigation starts today. Those victims will start to get increased commitments about these investigations. They will have numerous interviews to go to and may have to move house for safety. Support to victims is very important to get successful prosecution going forward.

The Needs Analysis has already highlighted a gap in that very practical support. A lot of money has gone into the therapeutic support but how can we offer that very practical support in attending interviews, access to benefits and moving house. Barnardos in Bradford have been very involved and they have a model that we should look at how to provide a “buddy” to help them get through and secure successful prosecutions. Strategic co-ordination has been identified as an issue with a CSE Strategic lead being appointed by the Council. I think it will be very welcome in bringing some of these issues together and ensuring all agencies are working together.

Councillor Parker – Identified 3 lots of funding which totals about £360,000 initially to get into the swing. Also stated that over the next 3 years about £180,000 per annum to spend on CSE in Rotherham. In your opinion do you consider that is enough? Have you identified

funding from anywhere else post the 3 year term?

Disruption does concern me. I cannot see the point of doing it to stop something happening at a particular point in time, if, they will move somewhere else which puts the individual or other individuals still at jeopardy. What are you putting in place to assist the victims when you are disrupting to ensure that perpetrators just not going somewhere else?

Chrissy Wright – The funding of £360,000 is partnership funding across Health and the Police and Crime Commissioner. For Rotherham Council, we have identified a need for £180-£200,000 per year for the next 3 years. We have done what we call market testing and talked to providers and looking at the costs already it is a ratcheting up of the £120,000. We think it is enough but of course we will review this constantly over the 3 year period against the performance and value for money. The reason it is for 3 years, apart from the fact that at any point may be issue about termination, we can actually review it and recommission and seek to have another model or different provider etc. so we are able as service develops, we are able to understand better what the needs are and what will cost going forward. At this moment in time we feel it is right amount of money.

Disruption – What is found that perpetrators tend to have family base in a place closely connected to their community and them physically moving away from an area is uneasy to them and yes they would go and do it elsewhere but this is a national issue not just Rotherham and there is a very close sharing of information across the national region.

The perpetrators are profiled and followed and understood. Information is shared and sitting at the higher CSE group, I can witness the passion of the Police to stop this.

Sue Greig – Investigation and the importance of doing this in partnership not least with the voluntary and community sector. I think we need to remember that Rotherham Women's Counselling Services we can use that Service at the moment because of Lottery funding not just funding from local government, police etc. The voluntary and community sector have an important part to play in this.

Councillor Parker – That worries me what you just said. The Women's part of it saying Lottery funding to run it now that could run out straight away. My concern is regardless of that will you have enough money to run the Service properly?

Sue Greig –Really need to plan and keep coming back to Elected Members with the intelligence so are planning as a whole community.

Bina Parmar – Disruption – I agree I would love to lock the perpetrators up unfortunately Child Sexual Exploitation is not actually an offence In

Legislation and quite difficult to prove as have to rely on other offences or have evidence that a sexual crime has been committed.

Unfortunately the Crime Prosecution Service's fundamental test has to be passed. There is a need for disruption activity to take place before sexual offences have been committed/proved.

Alongside disruption there has to be confidence building and resilience work with young people and build confidence amongst universal services to identify early signs and indicators so they can report any concerns before the crime has been committed.

There are a lot of things to be done with the Crown Prosecution Services about implementing the new Guidelines which were published last year which talks about have specialist prosecutors and training of prosecutors. South Yorkshire have had prosecuted a number of Child Sexual Exploitation cases and trafficking cases. I think there needs to be much more done in terms of works with the Crown Prosecution Service.

Steve Oversby – Disruption is good way to bring perpetrators but proving is difficult. Some of the young people will never get to Court unless support is given so that is where our history and experience comes in. One example at Bristol Court case recently the Judge said that about 50% of the young people and 50% perpetrators would never get to Court without the support of Barnados. Support has to be the key.

Councillor Ahmed –There may be some children who do not hit the radar in terms of Needs Analysis, however, may do with a bit of intelligence and information gathered from CAMHS for example. How are we working with other Services to gather that data because surely there is a pattern of behaviour? Will we be taking that into consideration?

How do we gather the voice of young people and their wishes and feelings? What services are involved (for example Victim Support?) Is the referral process and helpline aware of different cultural needs? Are we going to put a young person at risk if make a referral? Would they make a referral to a specialist service?

Sue Greig – In terms of how we are working with the Needs Analysis looking at early risk factors, yes we should very much look at that. We have a joint intelligence group we have pulled together to support the Needs Analysis from Health, Police, and Council. We have lot of input from a whole variety of voluntary and community sector organisations and draw on their intelligence, do quantitative work or presence in service and see issues such as self harm. Also we are trying to pull together the soft intelligence in terms of bringing some of this to life and looking to pull together case studies illustrating the different journeys people can take and how we need to pick them up early. This needs translating into more robust pathways looking at all different service areas which might pick up risk and vulnerability at an early stage and map through someone presenting at A&E, mental health services etc., how would it track through

to what lower level of support to pick up early intervention would be put in at earlier stage. Not all the pathways are connected at the moment and that work needs to be strengthened.

There is a huge awareness across the community. There was a really powerful event organised by the voluntary and community sector on 5th November with 150 people coming from a variety of voluntary and community sector organisations. They were asked at that point to pull together and feed through to commissioners the voice and influence information and that is still coming through. So organisations out there working with young people and parents are still in dialogue and feeding information through.

We are considering having some focus groups specifically targeted with victims and survivors that we cannot reach through the voluntary and community sector to pull through voice and influence work. We are also looking to commission specific work around Barnados and the ethnic minority aspect and the experience of child sexual exploitation and draw on evidence from elsewhere and in that the whole diversity of Barnardos and ethnic minority.

We know that some groups are over represented in our service and some under but there are still issues in those communities. We want to pull together the voice and influence work that has happened and still happening but more co-ordinated and will feed into the final report to inform what we commission.

At all levels we are listening to young people's voices. Also consideration could be given to peer support in this area. An approach that has been used in a number of areas where people that had those experiences support others and that was an area we would be interested to pursue and find out what other areas doing.

The victim and survivor voices at the strategic level and how build that in and respond to that.

Chrissy Wright – The helpline was 1 of the most important things. Anyone can ring it. In terms of referral, we have done a lot of work around those pathways to go through the helpline to the various different specialist services.

Zlakha Ahmed – In terms of our experience over the years we were supporting a number of adult women that had gone through child sexual exploitation at a younger age many which had not been in Rotherham. At other times we did awareness raising with Pakistani men abusing Pakistani girls. Also had Pakistani women that had been abused by white men.

One of the cases we were involved with was a 16 year old who disclosed at school about a boyfriend that was abusing her. It was referred to

Social Services but initially, when had meeting with Social Services, they said to us as an organisation that they had not met with the girl because they felt we were the experts. In terms of the work, we want to do that work but we have to make sure we have the resources.

We need to make sure within agencies that they understand what the different issues are in terms of diversity and BME. They need to understand arranged marriages and domestic violence. We are having a day's training and talking about taking it into the Council about child sexual exploitation and diversity issues.

Survivors – It is important that agencies like us are worked with to ensure the BME voices that are missing at the moment are brought forward and that there is confidence building work in our communities to enable young girls to come forward.

Bina Parmar – We have been talking about girls and young women but need to remember the boys and young men are exploited and will always need services and may present in different ways. Need to think about different models, about grooming and exploitation, not just in Rotherham but wider as well. On line exploitation of women is needs reflecting in the Strategy. There are different communities and different groups of young people and we need to think about a more diverse workforce so young people can relate to the workers and disclose and feel trust in the workers.

Councillor C. Vines – It is nearly 4 months on from the Jay report. Just what has been achieved? Still have perpetrators at large. Seems all that has happened is produced a report. We need action and not talking shops. Why do we still have the perpetrators on the street? These girls meet them day in day out. I want to know if agencies are working together are they doing something and what action is being taken?

The Chairman – I think this is directed to the Crown Prosecution Service and Police.

Councillor C. Vines – Has there been an increase in the number of victims coming forward, if any since, since the publication of the Jay report?

Zlakha Ahmed – We have had a number of disclosures where young women have not given their names.

Deputy Leader – In terms of the Council response, those agencies, particularly the Women's Counselling Service, saw a large number of referrals. This was something we have to be aware of and there needs to be more work done on what the barriers are for BME women in coming forward.

Steve Oversby – We have not had an increase of referrals. From Barnardo's perspective, we have seen 47% increase in the numbers across the country and that has to be because we have put more resources in but not in every locality. There are support mechanisms in every locality. I can see in long term the number gone up.

Hayley Fisher – We did see an increase but not vast increase. It is instilling that confidence. For example historical sexual cases I know some agencies mentioned not just dealing with children but dealing with adults. For me as an organisation it is about not being precious. There are a lot of pressure on resources and so actually voice your boundaries and be really confident of what you can give. Duplicated services can be quite damaging as well and it is about working together and more than ever now.

We do work hand in hand with CPS and Police and have a very good relationship with the Witness Care Unit because we were still seeing children walking through Court doors with no support. The advanced and enhanced service is about time and backing up the referrals in advance and offering the support they need.

Councillor Currie – What resources are in existence currently, both universal and bespoke services?

How is the vulnerability of victims being addressed by services?

Do the services provide support for the families of the victims? If so how?

Do you have confidence that the links between the services and different needs are understood? Does the DSG contribute any resource to the commissioning process?

Chrissy Wright - Detail on the different strands would be provided.

There is money for Prevent in schools A member of the CSE team is based in schools. The prevent elements are financed from revenue budgets. The post-abuse support has been funded through other funding streams. has been a special pot of money.

Councillor J. Hamilton – What are the challenges to providing the correct support to victims and their families?

How do survivors who no longer live in Rotherham access support?

How do we know?

Chrissy Wright – Every council had to look within themselves with regard to this. Survivors that no longer live in Rotherham can come and access Rotherham support services but you would hope within their own locality there have been support measures put in place.

The national media is on it at the moment and should be services in place in every locality in the country.

Councillor Read - How are the voices of victims being heard and assisting with the commissioning process?

How are the advocates gathering and using evidence from victims to feed into the commissioning process?

Objectives:-

- Victims and survivors are not a single community, their needs are defined individually, how is this informing the commissioning arrangements?
- How effectively is this area of work reflected in the CSE Action Plan?

Councillor Sansome – Is the transition from Children’s to Adult Services being built into the commissioning of services?

Chrissy Wright – Yes the targets are more detail in that but work that we have commissioned in the immediate is from 0-25 years and beyond a Family Service. Yes the transition from Children to Adult is there but the range of some of the victims identified in Jay report are now adults so have to have the whole age range.

Councillor Parker – You said that the number of people coming forward at risk the Police looking at prosecuting 150-200 live cases at the moment. In your estimation, as the people dealing with the situation from voluntary sector, what kind of figures are you actually looking at and is that a reasonable assessment?

Steve Oversby – In Bradford it was 120-200. The Jay report statement of 1,400 did not surprise me.

I would suggest Rotherham is no different to other local authorities. The key is the work done in terms of prosecutions and disruption and bringing the perpetrators to Court. In terms of proactive work all that were are talking about today will take Rotherham forward. This is not short term; it is long term so there will be difficulties in funding and capacity but fundamentally important to embed on that Strategy. Everyone can write action plans but they have to be escalated.

Councillor Wyatt – You said about seeing children walking through doors of Court unsupported. That is not my experience of the Court as evidence can be given by video link etc.

Hayley Fisher – It is very rare but is still happening. It is to do with the Court listings. For me it is exploring the way work with the Crown Prosecution Service but the point I was really getting at was sometimes you do pick up referrals for children that go to Court not for child sexual exploitation but about sexual violence and had no support. As part of our role we do have a Witness Service and being the voice of children and young people and vulnerable children going to Court but there is still the assumption that under a certain age there will be video link. What we have done in South Yorkshire what was not happening that children who

go to Court have a demonstration of the video and equipment before they give evidence so there are lot of constraints to me. The project was funded through the Police and Crime Commissioner and was a key element with children getting to Court without any support and did not know what to expect and did not know that services could sit with them; sometimes an intermediary has not been identified. It is a very long journey from reporting to getting to Court but the Court case is such a big element to those young people and it can be difference between going to Court and going through to reporting. I do take on board what you are saying but it does still happen.

Bina Parmar – From a national perspective I would echo it does happen far too often. One young person said that the Court process was worse than the exploitation itself. More common for young people than children because they are not identified as vulnerable and in need of that support; especially those with learning difficulties and communication problems. The guidelines published last year does call for early consultation between the Police and the Crown Prosecution Service and identifies the needs of young people but that is not happening.

Chairman – Do you believe the project with Police and Crime Commissioner is covering that point? Do you think there are enough resources into that?

Hayley Fisher – I can only encourage what the voluntary sector is doing through the Witness Service. I have a team of individuals, myself and 3 workers, assigned to the project. Part of the need for the project put in place was to do with creating for children and young people and vulnerable young adults. We work with the Crown Prosecution Service. It was very individual to the South Yorkshire area so they can identify vulnerable people at a very early age and play the role they should be playing within the Courts. For example the Police do have a role to play because they should identify the vulnerability of the witness and drive the special measures through and sometimes that is not happening. It is getting to know these referrals in advance and can do homework before. I feel more confident and bringing back that voice of the witness and not assuming what that witness found because at a particular age should look at what they need. Had very good response around South Yorkshire with this.

Councillor C. Vines – What is the main source of your funding?

Steve Oversby – Our funding comes from public donations and all aspects of Barnados fund raising activities which allows us to decide what we want to do. 1 of our key strands over the last 10 years has been child sexual exploitation.

Local authorities fund Child Sexual Exploitation Services so in some parts I have funding from local authorities. We would match fund and put money into the local authority. We came to Rotherham and South

Yorkshire because we felt there was a need here and put our resources there. So we do get some statutory income as well but most of free funding comes from the public.

Zlakha Ahmed – Currently our services are domestic violence and supporting people. Because we were aware of this issue we put a bid into the Police and Crime Commissioner about awareness raising but we did not get it. 2 years previously we put bid into Rotherham United Football Club in terms of men and attitudes to women and sexual exploitation and again did not get funding. There is an issue in terms of voluntary sector.

Councillor Currie – How much funding comes from the Schools Forums and the Designated Schools Grant?

Chrissy Wright – None

Councillor Sims – What direct links do the voluntary sector have with the Crown Prosecution Services to report back issues raised about children and vulnerable young people not being identified and referred to the voluntary sector at an early stage?

Hayley Fisher – Our Divisional manager of South Yorkshire sites on the MOG and CPS Group which is across South Yorkshire and she feeds through all our concerns.

Because we have a Witness Service which based in all Courts around South Yorkshire we have a very good relationship with Court Managers.

I have had some feedback from the Crown Prosecution Service but not in relation to the direct concerns because that is still getting raised but we are gathering as much information as possible and do that at highest level. It has been fed through but have had no direct feedback to she is on their backs because we need answers and be confident that a young person turning up and chose not to have support not that they had not been given the option of support.

Councillor Currie – Is there a shared vision?.

I would like to see a political lead for CSE who will take it forward. I think need that accountability.

Deputy Leader – I think there is an issue around accountability but to all of us as Councillors without exception. We have a role and you as Scrutiny have a role. I think one of the issues around this is multi-agency and covers a range of issues so I think one person can lead but need all the people to take it up within their portfolios e.g. Housing. It's important that Services looks at how it can help victims. In terms of going forward a lot sits with Children Services. We have the CSE Strategic lead that has been put in place which is very welcome and in terms of lead members there is Children Services Member. Just in terms of commissioning and

post-abuse commissioning, I will be political lead for that until March until in place then I think it sits with Adults and our Adults Member lead and Children Member lead have joint Member meetings. They have already had a meeting about child sexual exploitation and may pick up some of the issues around transitions. We have current victims that are children, some of the survivors are adults and responding to their needs which may be different to current victims who are children.

Councillor C. Vines – We had the Police last week and did ask them similar questions There is no legislation for CSE as such. Victims are seeing the perpetrators daily and need to get them off the streets. We need to go back to the Police and say why not look at all offences to get them off the street.

Steve Oversby – From a national perspective the NWG is doing a lot of work influencing the Government in terms of Legislation and changes for young people. It is very difficult for the Police in relation to the current law. Just taking child prostitution out of the Legislation would be a good starting point. There is a lot of training for the Police what we are doing in Rotherham to try to help them in relation to understanding the case and young people when being interviewed at an early stage because it can be quite daunting for the children. Agencies are working at a more local level with the Police and greater understanding for Police Officers to be skilled in relation to working in this area.

Bina Parmar – one of the issues in terms of building confidence, the Police are doing disruption activity and prosecuting cases where they can. But there is the lack of communication about that activity given to the agencies that are working with the young people so they can feed it back to the young people as to whether it led to prosecution or not. Unfortunately that is not happening at the moment.

Councillor J. Hamilton – Do most of your referrals come from the Police What support do you give the victims when gone to Court and the prosecution has fallen down? How do you continue with the support?

Hayley Fisher – In the voluntary sector we do get the majority of referrals through an automatic data transfer but we are a referral organisation so can people can self-refer. We have a statutory line you can ring. We have branches in the community in every South Yorkshire area and Witness Services for all areas. We do receive referrals from a lot of other agencies like the NHS, our partner agencies such as Barnardos. The support that we offer the project that I manage at the moment offers is I so pre-trial support, support at the trial and post-support. We do have some commissioned services with the voluntary sector so can look at the counselling side. We work alongside Youthstart that offers the therapeutic side of the counselling etc. so our door never closes for a victim/survivor. If a need is still identified then signposting would come in.

Councillor J. Hamilton – What proportion that go through Court do you take forward?

Hayley Fisher – I would say a good 30% because some need less service because they are supported in Court. We do have our community services there so if need ongoing practice/emotional support that support continued through and when Court case is done that is a whole different level of support needed. Looking at resources in the community and see what the best organisation is for the victim's needs. It might not be the voluntary sector at that time but about working multi-agency and giving the victim/survivor what they need.

Councillor Parker – We now have a multi-agency hub in Riverside which is dealing with CSE. Are you involved in that as outside agencies? Do you think it would be advantageous in that hub and to be dealing with this?

Steve Oversby – We are involved in the hub. We have a worker and have done so since October, 2013. I think it is right we should not forget the agencies working outside the hub as well. I do think when we did our annual report back in October, 2013, before the Jay report, one of the key things we were saying the development of the hub and identifying a model was key to the success of the CSE Service.

Zlakha Ahmed – We looked at the hub but it was not practical because of the number of staff we have. We work quite closely and interact that way.

Councillor Wyatt – In terms of focus on the offender and the work of the organised crime group (OCG); is this being looked at?

Sue Greig – OCG use and work at national level, which Probation is involved in as well, about therapeutic responsibility of offenders. A lot of work is going on about tackling this and trying to bring into local work.

Bina Parmar – a local Police Officer within South Yorkshire is trying to explore this type of behaviour by going in and talking to them.

Councillor Ahmed – Support for staff, . Within the supervision are we ensuring we are gathering information and if there are additional training needs identified that will be put in place?

Sue Greig – It is a really important issue. I think it points to the need across the network support not only victims but it is sometimes small organisations that find themselves as the trusted organisation and they need that support. It was Social Care, Safeguarding but also about emotional health supervision. A lot of strengthening could be done for the local mental health services and local therapeutic interventions by workers who are the right people to provide it because they have the relationship but they themselves need that support because they are carrying real difficult and complex stuff. The Clinical Commissioning Group has commissioned a psychologist short term to work across Child

and Adolescent Mental Health services specifically around CSE and what she found herself doing the support particularly in Adult Mental Health. Trained psychiatrist and psychologist clients doing more support to the workforce. Need to extend that more into the voluntary and community sector and range of networks because we know there is a need for that multiplicity and support to the workers and organisations.

Councillor Ahmed - Need to look at offering specialist provision and I hope can look at that for our staff and some of the services.

Bina Parmar – I actually said the need for therapeutic support and intervention and that longer term support was not reflected very well in the action plan. I took it upon myself to provide feedback to the sub-group and not reflected in the Strategy. I have fed that back and it has not been acknowledged. A lot of activity is taking place and would be useful to reflect in the Strategy.

Summing Up

Bina Parmar – From a national perspective I think Rotherham is actually quite proactive in their response to child sexual exploitation and been under a lot of scrutiny and been under the spotlight and received a lot of criticism. From the short period I have been involved in the work of Rotherham I have seen a positive response and dedicated professionals working as hard as they can to improve the services for victims and those potentially at risk still. Lot of work to do and I will continue to be involved in trying to support that work from what I learn nationally. Acknowledge that been a lot of positive work taking place.

Steve Oversby – I think there has been work ongoing over the last number of months. I think there is a drive and strategy. On the ground we can see changes taking shape and helping to start provide good quality support to children and young people and encourage that pro activity will continue.

Hayley Fisher –The main focus for the voluntary sector is to continue to work together as an organisation with the multi-agency organisations and keep going forward and see what changes we can make and work hard at identifying that and being in the public eye in terms of making yourself aware of the services out there and not be precious but identify the needs of victims and awareness at an early stage.

Zlakha Ahmed – It has been mentioned that the Strategy does reflect the diversity strand. I have been invited today as expert. If look at the journey over the last 2 years it started with women survivors then children. Would still welcome the Strategy having a bit more focus on the BME strand.

Chrissy Wright – In terms of the work done, it has been done in a short period of time. I think it has been successful in getting the immediate

post-abuse support set up, help line was a very positive step going forward and has heightened our national profile which is good for Rotherham and the victims and survivors in Rotherham.

Longer term commissioning is very important and has to be with the strands of prevent in there. Intend to get it as right as possibly can to improve the outcomes for victims and survivors. The voice of victims and survivors are very important.

Sue Greig – Child sexual exploitation is not my specialist area but my learning from this so far is the importance of partners working together and often the voluntary and community sector has the trust and credibility. The statutory partners have the duty and responsibility and goes back to the mention of a shared vision which will be so crucial to this and if do not do it in partnership we will miss an opportunity to commission cost effective, sustainable and robust programmes for the future.

Deputy Leader – The immediate support had gone in very quickly and building on the good work of the voluntary and community sector organisation that are already out there working with victims and survivors. We have heard about the long term process and I think that is where our focus is now i.e. how get that process right, how bring it together and the fact that doing it in the absence of national framework. We are doing this as Rotherham and I think it is a really good pace but a process that will happen over the next few months and all have a role in how that goes forward.

A key point is the victims/survivors voice really at heart of that process going forward. I know it is very hard to hear their voice but it can be heard and prior to today I asked for feedback about victims/survivors in terms of support. I think Barnardos make a really interesting point around the approach to victims/survivors around their individuals and everybody's individual needs will be different and have different perspective and will be at different times in that journey so I do like their points to approach that everybody is individual. Holistic intensive and long term and I will take that back. Huge direct feedback I have from victim/survivors - there are positive stories, there are people accessing counselling support, and there is a support worker in Sarah Champion's office.

What we have heard is that there are gaps in the analysis: there is a need for practical support with advocate/buddy that still needs to be addressed and particularly as investigations progress, how we can support those survivors of the historic cases in particular. With very practical support 20-30 have gone through the process. We do not always get it right and still got a long way to go. Probably question how reach out to survivors, how do we make survivors aware of the support available, how do we provide support when sometimes that individual does not know they have been a victim of the crime or sexual crime? I think in terms of being honest, there are still things not happening.

Coming from survivors their voice is important but they always have lot of input into this particularly in helping each other and peer support and helping current victims as well. I know some local authorities looked at peer support and put that in place. How use that in effective way and help other victims.

I think we have the immediate response now over the next few months how progress that and get long term solution and how get it right.

Session 2 – What Next?

The Chairman welcomed everyone back to the meeting for this second session of Day Two and outlined the objectives which were:-

- To explore the wider implications of the Jay report
- To test out the Council's direction of travel and pace of change to ensure it is appropriate and timely

The Chairman invited questions from this second session today and welcomed Dr. Anne Hollows, Principal Lecturer in Social Work from Sheffield Hallam University, and Mr. Joe Smeeton, Principal Lecturer in Social Work from Nottingham Trent University, who were experts in social care/social work.

Councillor C. Vines – From what has emerged from the Jay Report, what would be your advice and recommendation for Rotherham's best way forward?

Mr. Smeeton pointed out that the information arising from the Jay Report had been overwhelming and had been difficult coherent understanding of what had taken place. However, child sexual exploitation should not detract staff from other work that needed to still take place as this could lead to multiple disadvantages. The detail of the Jay Report in itself had helpful in that it had focused on one issue. However, the danger of all the focus being on this one issue could mean that once it had been tackled that other matters that have been neglected then emerge.

Social work was about understanding communities and understanding individuals and children and being able to respond to individual needs, whether this be in relation to child sexual exploitation, physical abuse, emotional harm or neglect.

What had been seen in the past was a performance management response to social work, which tied up some of the Social Worker's time filling in forms or entering data onto a computer. The child or young person must be the centre of the situation and this could only be achieved by freeing up the Social Worker to allow them to analyse the situation.

The Jay Report and the subsequent Action Plan addressed many complicated issues, but the worry was this was more task focus and not

on the children themselves.

Councillor Currie - What are your reflections on the Jay Report and the implications for Social Work as a whole? For example on recruitment and retention, frontline practice, multi-agency working or learning and development?

Dr. Hollows expressed her concern and the moves in social work to change. In the current climate social work was about promoting 'relationship best practice' to get away from the tick box processes.

The biggest impact on any person's life was on relationship building with people and a Social Worker's role was to build a proper constructive relationship with professional boundaries.

Reference was made to a pilot project "Hope for Children and Families" funded by the Department for Education and the model which could be used with serious cases and meant collecting information in different ways.

Another initiative in Wakefield "Signs of Safety" allowed for social work to take place with families.

Dr. Hollows confirmed she had spoken to a few Social Workers in Rotherham who explained that they felt well supported by the Council, that good morale existed within teams, but that the public perception and opinion were such that some staff felt victimised.

Social Workers in Rotherham needed space to be able to do their day job and not just the "Jay Job". Many of the staff in Rotherham had the capacity to be very good Social Workers, but needed the space with appropriately managed workloads to be able to build relationships with families with more complex difficulties.

In a supplementary question Councillor Watson pointed out that one of the concerns had been around the difficulty in recruiting staff in light of budget reductions and asked how the Council could make sure it recruited the right staff in Rotherham?

Dr. Hollows explained the Council needed to have clear strategies in place with clear lines of professional support, ongoing learning which would attract people which would lead to a stabilisation of the workforce

The Council needed to hang onto its more experienced staff and develop more student placements. The more the Council could offer the more people would wish to be recruited. The Council was in need of good Practice Teachers for its up and coming younger staff.

The social work framework was worth investing into and some good information was available which provided a coherent continuation of professional development strategies, which could be offered as part of the

recruitment process.

Mr. Smeeton also reiterated that the situation in Rotherham had not a bad story to tell. Its workforce strategy was strong now it offered post qualification education. Since 2010 its workforce had stabilised and staff were being retained. This in itself was a good story to tell and should be promoted.

The myth of Local Authorities that there is a large number of highly qualified social workers was incorrect. The truth was that highly qualified social workers working in child protection burnt out so quickly and eight years appeared to be the average period when a person remained in such a post, with many leaving the profession and moving onto other employment.

The Council needed to look after the staff it had, nurture and train them. One of the risks is that there are vacancies in child protection work and some of the most inexperienced workers may be recruited to these posts. The newly qualified Social Workers were the least able to cope and were unable to sustain overburdened and over stretched workloads.

Councils could not avoid some of the more serious cases happening, however, professional staff could not be governed trying to avoid the one off difficult situations.

Councillor Sims – Clearly as Elected Members we are responsible for the allocation of scarce (and diminishing) resources in Social Care. Given that the work around child sexual exploitation is so resource intensive, in directing resources towards tackling this, how do we avoid overlooking other endemic and complex safeguarding issues for example neglect or domestic abuse?

Dr. Hollows pointed out that the Council could not avoid either. From research and experience domestic abuse had the most devastating effect on children's lives, which often lead to them to be victims or perpetrators in the future.

Neglect clearly had implications in the history of those involved in child sexual exploitation and it was not just the Council's responsibility to deal with the problems and the costs.

Citing recent research, this kind of situation affects both boys and girls; it had implications for policing and relationship education in schools and the prevention agenda as a whole.

More recently the media coverage on the Birmingham civil injunctions offered a window of opportunity to pause and think about operations.

The catching of criminals was the job of the Police not the Local Authority. The role of support to those at risk was a partnership approach

with therapeutic intervention operating at two levels. There were nowhere near enough therapists available, but the funding of this was not the responsibility of the Local Authority, but the Health Service.

Mr. Smeeton confirmed that was a need for good planning and understanding the needs of children, who required a different response from the relevant team. Some needs were very complex which required attention from teams already overstretched.

Good social work was community based, with staff understanding needs and having local knowledge. Removing children was not only tragic, but very resource intensive and very intrusive when children were missing from home. Families required support and a good Social Worker would engage with the family and move towards reducing the high risk elements associated with the concerns by intervening earlier

In a supplementary question Councillor Sims asked if a highly qualified Social Worker should be providing support on a 1:1 basis with a family.

Dr. Hollows pointed out that the role of the highly qualified Social Worker was in fact to connect with the family, be authoritative, offer them the care they required and work with them to achieve change.

There was a stigma attached to social work intervention and often when a Social Worker visited a family they could be hostile and on guard and the actual entering of a property or the parking of a car were often very stressful. It was the newly qualified Social Workers who were placed in this situation that found this very uncomfortable to start with and it was just not a case of learning the signs about child abuse.

Mr. Smeeton confirmed the skills of social work were such that often it was the more experienced staff that were required initially to identify the plans for moving forward. However, may not be the best person to deliver the service.

Councillor Read - We have been told that there is not a failsafe risk assessment tool and that good solid multi-agency practice has to be trusted to make professional judgements of levels of risk in relation to child sexual exploitation (and other safeguarding issues). What does good basic practice look like and how do we measure its effectiveness? What does this good practice look like across all the different agencies?

Mr. Smeeton explained that the answer had already been answered by Dr. Hollows, but pointed out that good practice relied on identifying signs of safety, for staff to have a good evidence base in order to balance their strengths and views. This systematic approach was well developed in places such as Derbyshire and the Hackney model was very strong.

Dr. Hollows explained that Social Workers needed to become somewhat sceptical so that they did not take everything at face value and be more

able to make a judgement on how evidence fitted. The importance of making professional judgements was stressed with this being a staged process in determining what were the issues, what strategy was required to put it right and the method of evaluation.

Social Workers needed to be able to dig deeper in order to understand family dynamics more. Social work staff were under pressure with very few resources and often there was incorrect matching of resource, which was wasteful and not helpful.

In a supplementary question Councillor Read referred to the effectiveness of social work and suggested that there was a clear need for better understanding of good practice.

In a supplementary question Councillor Currie made reference to risk assessments and how these could be inadequate if they were not reinforced by the Police and asked that these elements be social work driven.

Mr. Smeeton explained that risk must be measured when there was unmet needs and when problems were identified it was how these could be managed. Triaging cases could deflect a lot of referrals and this had been demonstrated at Oldham.

Dr Hollows cited an historic example that she was aware of the police using a new risk assessment tool to assess domestic abuse. Consequently there was a massive increase in referrals to the front desk that meant only the most serious were being dealt with. There are parallels to be drawn with how CSE is addressed.

There is an argument that the level of risk should be set very low; with a first tier which is not necessarily social care, to intervene. The Youth Service were invaluable and a powerful agent to sieve out those cases where child sexual exploitation was first suggested.

Getting to the real sources behind child sexual exploitation were resource and finance intensive. It was, therefore, suggested that a pilot project could work with a particular team to look at the options and work qualitatively to enable staff to get to the real detail. No true picture could be gained from simply relying on numbers.

Councillor J. Hamilton – In Rotherham, along with many other authorities, we have recently developed a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub with co-located teams of Police, Social Care staff, Health Workers etc. From your perspectives how do they work in practice?

Mr. Smeeton explained that collaborative working enabled agencies to communicate better and to avoid any gaps emerging in practice. The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs did this well and were in a better

position to triage relevant cases. Some Hubs still experienced some difficulties and whilst they were a very good tool, encasing Social Workers in a call centre situation needed to be avoided.

In a supplementary question Councillor Sansome asked how staff could be prevented from focusing on their own agendas or a silo situation?

Dr. Hollows pointed out that the investment had to focus on a shared agenda to avoid staff experiencing difficulties of sharing information in a multi-agency team. On a positive note working as part of a multi-agency team did take more effort, but provided ownership of particular cases. The quality of the shared information had massive advantages in what were very difficult circumstances and added value to the contributions of professional staff and allowed for the knowledge to fit together.

Councillor Steele - Much has been made of the changing trends of exploitation – increased use of technology etc. – how do we need to take to ensure that Social Care staff (across the board) are alert to these developments?

Dr. Hollows pointed out the need for constant information flows and one way of doing this was for one officer to be responsible for an information bulletin to all staff who could provide the relevant research and disseminate information.

Mr. Smeeton was in agreement that staff must be kept informed and kept abreast of any new developments.

Councillor Read – In the evidence we received last week, we heard about the unwillingness of victims to engage with statutory Social Care and how perhaps we need to consider more ‘creative approaches’. In your broad experience of working in Safeguarding and working with victims of sexual abuse how do you think this can be achieved and what needs to be changed to facilitate this?

Dr. Hollows explained that its all about Social Workers having time and the skills to engage with young people and their families with assistance from the Youth Service, who may be in a better position to work alongside young people.

Shared skills were important because once a child reached the age of twelve from experience they became more difficult to communicate with, which was where the role of the Youth Worker came in. The majority of complaints from Social Workers were around how form filling, particularly around foster placements, and how this was taking up the majority of their time.

Councillor J. Hamilton – Moving forward, in your view how can agencies work together to best support victims and their families?

Dr. Hollows explained that nothing would be solved overnight. Support groups were excellent for families and young people and enabled them to engage with specialist provision. There would be no ill effects for the future if the signs were spotted quickly.

Sweden had done a lot of work with positive sexual re-education, especially around positive loving and respectful relationships and how best to avoid violent and abusive relationships.

Any specialist support had to be tailored to an individual's needs and carefully managed, especially for those involved also with drugs.

Cognitive behavioural therapy could assist before bigger problems were addressed. It was very important for a person in need to talk to experts, but there was no magic wand that could assist with every problem.

Mr. Smeeton reiterated that no single therapist could deal with all cases. Often difficulties were not just with children, but were within families and needed some form of re-adjustment.

Councillor Watson - The Jay Report highlights difficulties in engaging with minority communities. How can we support Social Care staff to undertake this work rigorously and appropriately? What are the implications for learning and development?

Dr. Hollows believed Social Workers had lost the art of working within communities and much of this work needed to be developed. Social Workers of Asian origin were in a better position to help shape the work within certain communities.

Social Workers in Rotherham were working really hard, especially in the Roma Community around the issue of sexual exploitation. There was some evidence of good cohesive work taking place in Sheffield within communities.

From an outsider looking in the events highlighted by the media in Rotherham were terrible and the antics of some politicians and activists were appalling. There was a need for a good media strategy to promote the good things taking place in Rotherham including in social work staff.

Mr. Smeeton also pointed out that social Workers needed to be accessible and have a proactive element to support with a clear steer of their roles. Staff wanted to work and see that they were doing a good job, which could be better achieved by them talking to communities and schools and not retreating to an office behind a desk.

In a supplementary question Councillor J. Hamilton asked when the transformation changed for Social Workers to be more introverted and whether this came about when child sexual exploitation was happening?

Mr. Smeeton believed the changes started to occur around the late 1990's when the inspection regimes meant that Local Authorities were heavily performance managed and judged on targets about quickly cases were dealt with. This culture meant that the quality of work undertaken was not measured, but quantity of work was. That's changed with the Working Together Guidance that has been recently issued. Rotherham had been inspected so many times in the past few years and had previously been judged to be performing well, but it was about meeting timescales but not necessarily quality of care for children and young people.

After commending social workers for the jobs they do; Councillor Parker asked a supplementary question: whilst social workers, council officers and police had to take their share of the blame for what had happened; did they think that there had been undue political influence at a national and local level which had contributed to the problem?

Dr. Hollows referred to the comments of Professor Nigel Darton which talked about politics of child protection; it mediates between the family and the state and provides the framework for legal intervention when there are concerns about child protection. However, when there are child deaths or other tragedies, the strength of anger and hostility by the public was often directed at social work staff; denying that society has a wider responsibility to protect its children

These were issues that Social Workers had to deal with on a daily basis and they were damned if they did and damned if they did not act. There are some social worker who are poor at what they do but the vast majority of Social Workers were very good at their job.

In terms of child sexual exploitation this was much bigger than any one individual and was happening not just in Rotherham, but nationwide.

Mr. Smeeton pointed out that this was like paralyzed anxiety about whether they would appear on the front page, held responsible for crimes someone else committed and very often politicians made tragedies more likely. As risk is that social workers revert to very process driven, risk averse practice.. There was a clear need for a different way of engagement with a need for more analytical and creative thinking.

Social Workers' time needed to be freed up to enable them to use their initiative and step outside the box. Social Workers needed to be able to use their own common sense and follow their instincts and not take people at face value.

In a supplementary question Councillor Parker asked about the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub and if there was less chance of a concern being acted upon?

Dr. Hollows referred to thresholds and the potential for something to slip through the net, when one single person had not checked on a particular

detail. There had been child deaths when the correct information had not been established, but however, if operating properly, a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub should minimise this risk.

In a supplementary question Councillor Currie asked about giving Social Workers the opportunities to get out into their communities; do with the Newly Qualified Social Workers shadowing their more experienced counterparts. Reference was made to the Hackney model and how Rotherham could benefit?

Dr. Hollows could pinpoint to a number of different models which could work in Rotherham and regardless which model was chosen there needed to be a coherent strategy and approach that the Local authority and partners signed up to.

Councillor Sims – Much has been written about the vulnerabilities of children in care and care leavers and the targeting of these groups by perpetrators. What can be done to increase the resilience of these young people to minimise risks?

How can we increase the awareness and understanding of residential care staff?

How can we increase the awareness and understanding of foster carers?

Mr. Smeeton could not give one answer that covered all the areas above and pointed out that looked after children were often a transient population with every attempt made to keep a young person out of care. When comparing the percentage of looked after children across other European countries, England's number was much smaller at 0.6%.

Very often the young people looked after by the Local Authority had more complex needs and not only were difficult to engage, but were also more vulnerable. These young people needed the right placement as soon as possible with the full aim of maintaining some kind of stability. Only a good assessment by a good worker would find them the right placement which would lead to a decrease in their vulnerability.

Research undertaken on looked after carer leavers indicated that those in a less stable environment found it difficult to form relationships and any level of trust. Those in a loving and well cared for environment were more likely to achieve.

When looking at budgets residential care was very expensive and the default option was often the cheapest. Only by improving the quality of care offered would those most in need improve: research shows that those in more settled placements were less vulnerable, which in itself was more cost effective.

In a supplementary question Councillor Sims asked about following rules and the appropriateness of their implementation.

Dr. Hollows explained about the legislation and guidelines that applied to foster care and referred to a new course being offered at Hallam University for Advanced Practice for Foster Carers and Looked After Children, which would enhance practice in any job role in this field.

Mr. Smeeton pointed out that these key people in the either the roles of foster carer or residential worker needed to be skilled and take over the parenting role by offering care and protection to vulnerable people. There was a need to unpack some of the more procedural information and get down to ground roots level and get working.

Those young people leaving care were often left feeling more vulnerable and very often were the victims of abuse as they were left isolated, rehoused into areas they were not familiar with and with little or no support.

Talk to the leaving care team; talk about what support networks are in place to reduce vulnerabilities of care leavers.

Councillor Middleton – How can we raise the awareness of these risks in social work training and ongoing professional development?

Mr. Smeeton referred to the need not to have a knee jerk reaction response to training on child sexual exploitation as this was not the only issue that would give rise to concern.

Social Workers needed to have an ongoing package of refresher knowledge and ensure they were given to right kind of support to ensure the job they trained for could be undertaken properly.

Councillor Sansome – the latest OFSTED report was critical of our “front door” and high number of inappropriate referrals which negatively impacts on the timeliness of decision making. In terms of developing good practice how can we shift this?

Dr. Hollows stated that only by having an Early Intervention Strategy could referrals be properly sieved and dealt with by the appropriate agency.

Mr. Smeeton pointed out that the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub could deal with some issues by working together, especially with schools and teaching staff.

One area of good practice was for a Social Worker to be assigned to a school and visit on a regular basis and have informal conversations.

Dr. Hollows was aware of Learning Support Workers in schools picking up on all manner of things and referred to how in Europe many schools all

had their own Social Workers to provide support and be more locally available for assistance.

In a supplementary question Councillor Sansome asked about the hierarchical structures and skills and how these could be increased?

Dr. Hollows explained that there was no coherent model in place in the U.K. and again referred to models in Sweden and the arrangement of having a School Nurse and a Social Worker in each school. There was also a school in Parsons Cross that had gone down the route of having a School Social Work Service, which was an interesting possibility.

Mr. Smeeton pointed out that certain models were difficult to sustain and resource as each Local Authority's makeup was different.

In a supplementary question Councillor Watson referred again to Ofsted and if measurements were taken of caseloads what was deemed as too big and whether there was a need for more social work staff.

Mr. Smeeton pointed out if the inappropriate referrals could be decreased or weeded out, then this would free up social work time and all for more community based work to be generated.

There were lots of systematic processes within different teams and often ruined relationships with families.

On referring again to the Hackney model comparisons could be drawn with how much time was spent referring, which would lead to improvements particularly in Rotherham around the workloads of newly qualified social work staff.

There was a need to retain good quality social work staff and they needed to learn to manage workloads. This placed at risk those cases that were not allocated and left the Authority in a no easy win situation. The role of allocating work should lie with the first line manager and have the ability to manage caseloads better. This would lead to good quality assessments, good planning and allow staff to be in a better position to close cases down.

Dr. Hollows referred to the expectation on social work experience progressions and the ability and benefits of seeing a case through to the end.

Mr. Smeeton advised that the process needed to be looked at systematically in order to meet the needs of a child and their family and for a consistent approach in often difficult circumstances.

It was also suggested that a further meeting take place involving a smaller Working Group of the Board to look at the draft report that would be produced.

Key issues that had emerged included:-

- Role of support to victims and the importance of support to secure prosecutions.
- Whether support in courts was working.
- Whether the voice and influence of survivors was being implemented.
- Risk assessments and intervention with Children and Young People's Services for those young people not at risk or low risk, effective pathways and the risk analysis process.
- Ongoing needs analysis.
- Long term commissioning process.
- Review of the Action Plan of Child Sexual Exploitation.
- Support for the workforce.
- Reaching out effectively.
- How Scrutiny could be effective going forward.
- Role of the Youth Service.
- Role of Schools.
- Performance management and measures of efficiency.
- Positive outcomes around management.
- Communications and key messages.
- Therapeutic work and accessibility.
- PSHE skills in schools.
- Availability of funds.
- Transition of leaving care to independent living and appropriate counselling.

The Chairman advised the Board that there was a need to consider how this piece of work by Scrutiny went forward with some concrete recommendations.

The Board suggested that consideration be given to visiting other Local Authorities to see how best practice was being implemented to increase knowledge and understanding.

Resolved:- (1) That everyone be thanked for their attendance today.

(2) That the Scrutiny Team be thanked for all their efforts in the arrangements and preparations for the two day sessions.

(3) That consideration be given to any further comments being passed to the Scrutiny Manager for inclusion up to and included the 6th January, 2015.

(4) That a draft report be produced and considered by a small working group prior to the report being finalised.

81. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Friday, 23rd January, 2015 at 9.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1. Meeting:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
2. Date:	23 January 2015
3. Title:	Scrutiny of Rotherham's Plans to address Child Sexual Exploitation
4. Directorate:	Resources

5. Summary

Attached as Appendix 1, Members are asked to comment on the draft report and recommendations of the scrutiny review of Rotherham's plans to address child sexual exploitation.

6. Recommendations

That OSMB:

- a. Receives the draft report;**
- b. Comments on the report and recommendations (outlined in Section 2 of the report);**
- c. Agrees that the report, as amended, is forwarded to Cabinet; the Children's Improvement Board and Corporate Improvement Board for consideration.**

7. Proposals and Details

- 7.1 At its meeting of September 3 2014, the Cabinet referred the action plan emerging from the Jay Recommendations to OSMB for consideration. However, in order to understand current practice and the future planning and delivery of services across agencies and sectors; OSMB agreed at its meeting of November 14, 2014 that a more in-depth scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation was required.

- 7.2 The scrutiny session took place over two full days on Friday 12 and Thursday 18 December 2014.

The first day examined the experiences from and implications for the local government sector in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation; examining current performance and action plans, how agencies in Rotherham work together to tackle CSE; and how criminal justice agencies in Rotherham address CSE.

The second day focussed on how agencies can provide timely and appropriate support to survivors and their families; and lastly a panel of academic witnesses, commenting on the wider implications of the Jay Report.

- 7.3 As part of the preparation for the scrutiny review, OSMB agreed that two planning sessions were organised for OSMB Members. External facilitators were used for these sessions to provide independent advice and challenge. These planning sessions were used to identify and agreed objectives and questions for the two-day scrutiny. Anecdotal feedback from Members who participated in this preparation was very positive.

To ensure that priority areas were addressed sufficiently, OSMB agreed the process for submission of questions. These were to be submitted in advance and sent to each of the witnesses to ensure that questions could be answered at the relevant session. This included the Member questions devised during the earlier planning sessions.

In addition, all Council Members were written to with the review schedule and asked if they wished to submit questions to any of the sessions. A dedicated 'slot' was allocated at the opening session of each day for these to be asked.

- 7.4 At the end of each day, a summary of key issues was given. These have been incorporated into the draft recommendations as outlined in Section 2 of the report. Members' comments are sought on these recommendations.

- 7.5 In order to ensure that the recommendations are incorporated in to the improvement activity of the Council, it is proposed that these are fed into the Corporate and Children and Young People's Improvement Boards as appropriate.

8. Finance

The financial implications of the recommendations have not been considered as part of this review.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

See report

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implication,

The recommendations from this review will be fed into the Corporate and Children and Young People's Improvement Boards

11. Background Papers and Consultation

See Section 3.2 of the report

Contact:

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser (Scrutiny and Member Development), direct line: (01709) 822765

e-mail: caroline.webb@rotherham.gov.uk

1 THE PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) has undertaken a review of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation (CSE).

Professor Jay's Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham (1997 – 2013) states that for far too long the Council, alongside other agencies, failed to protect an estimated 1400 children from sexual abuse and exploitation.

The scale of the challenge ahead to rectify these failings is considerable. In response to Jay and the recent OFSTED inspection, Rotherham Council has initiated a comprehensive programme to transform its governance and culture; organisational capacity and service delivery as well improve immediate support to victims. This is in addition to the ongoing work to address CSE outlined in its detailed action plan incorporating the Jay's recommendations, and the other improvements identified in previous reviews and inspections.

The Jay Report reinforces the need for accountability, transparency and openness. Alongside the external challenge of the Improvement Boards, Overview and Scrutiny Members share a responsibility to hold decision makers and service providers to account. Therefore, in order to understand current practice and the future planning and delivery of services across agencies and sectors; OSMB agreed that a more in-depth scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation was required.

The purpose of the review therefore is to scrutinise the plans that are in place to make sure that historic failings are not repeated and Rotherham children and young people are kept safe. As Scrutiny Members, we want to be reassured that the lessons learnt are translated into sustained improvements across the board. To this end, the recommendations from this review will be fed into the Corporate and Children and Young People's Improvement Boards.

In summary, the aim of the scrutiny review was:

- To challenge the plans to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation and ensure that the direction of travel and pace of change is appropriate and timely
- To gain external perspectives on Rotherham's situation and to learn from best practice elsewhere
- To understand the long term plans for support to victims and their families and to ensure they are fit for purpose
- To understand the specific role that elected members can play in tackling CSE effectively

The scrutiny session took place over two full days on Friday 12th and Thursday 18th December 2014.

The first day examined the experiences from and implications for the local government sector in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation; examining current performance and action plans, how agencies in Rotherham work together to tackle CSE; and how criminal justice agencies in Rotherham address

CSE.

The second day focussed on how agencies can provide timely and appropriate support to survivors and their families; and lastly a panel of academic witnesses, commenting on the wider implications for social care and social work practice.

The recommendations from the review are detailed in Section 2 of the report. Section 3 outlines the planning of sessions; lists the background information circulated to Members and witnesses. Specific issues emerging from the two day sessions are in Section 4 and Section 5 of the report respectively.

Detailed minutes were taken from each of the sessions. These are appended to the report as Appendix A and Appendix B.

We would like to thank each of the witnesses for contributing openly and generously giving their time.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Prosecutions

- a) To restore victim and public confidence it is vital that justice is seen to be done. We urge the Police and Crime Commissioner to make available all necessary resources both for "historic" and "current" investigations;
- b) Recognising that prosecution can be a lengthy and often traumatic process for the victim; asks that the PCC and CPS examines what more can be done to better prepare victims for court proceedings;
- c) As a priority, asks the Council to ensure that all necessary support is given to survivors (for example peer or "buddy" support) in order to help them to assist the police;
- d) Following the recent example of Birmingham Council obtaining injunctions against men to protect vulnerable children at risk of sexual exploitation, that the Council explores if similar measures can be taken in Rotherham

2. Improvement and Delivery Action Plan

- a) Urges the LSCB to consider, as part of their review what further actions need to be taken to ensure minority communities are effectively engaged with (with particular relevance to the Roma community);
- b) Asks that an evaluation of the LSCB work with taxis / hotels / takeaways is undertaken to ensure that it is as effective as possible;
- c) Urges all Rotherham Schools to sign the Rotherham Standing Together pledge and review their own policies in order to be aware of the issue, particularly in respect of the PHSE curriculum;
- d) Asks that the LSCB evaluates the effectiveness of its work with schools to ensure that it is robust and fit for purpose;
- e) That the LSCB review the section of action plan on out of authority placements in light of the comments of the Director of Children's Services that in some cases care can be better provided locally. The Director is asked to report back to members if additional resources are required in order to ensure that social workers can dedicate enough time to individual victims / at risk young people.

- f) Welcome LSCB appointment of an additional staff member to undertake audit of cases and audit of risk assessments
- g) Support the Director of Children's Services' proposal for a "statement of purpose" for the CSE unit and clearer line management structures to ensure that this service effectively focuses on the young people who need it most.
- h) Ensure that there is adequate "early help" available - for example through the Integrated Youth Support Services - for young people who do not meet statutory thresholds

3. Post-abuse support:

- a) Welcome the steps taken by the Council to date to support victims in the immediate term. Urge that plans to deliver longer term support are delivered as soon as is practically feasible.
- b) It is vital that victims' voices are used to help shape future support, recognising that this support may be more wide ranging than 'simply' therapeutic support. We endorse the Public Health's Consultants suggestion that focus groups of survivors are directly involved in designing what support is required. We recommend that this approach is reflected in the commissioning of services.
- c) Reflecting the complexity of services required to support survivors in the longer term; urge that the range of post-abuse support is considered in addition to therapeutic support, including peer-to-peer and buddying.
- d) Endorses the Leader's immediate identification of funds for post-abuse support. However, asks that further reports be brought back to Members at the earliest stage should these be not be sufficient to meet identified need.

4. Governance:

- a) Welcome LSCB commitment to open meetings to public, and to produce a publicly accessible version of the action plan;
- b) Urge that the Cabinet Member for Children has a standing item on the action plan on her delegated powers on a monthly basis;
- c) OSMB forms a sub-committee to scrutinise aspects of the multi-agency response (working with the Improvement Boards to determine respective areas of responsibility and avoid duplication);
- d) That OSMB recommends to the Member Training and Development Panel that drawing on best practice from other authorities and Local Government Association, that the corporate parenting and safeguarding elements of the Member Development Programme are revisited to ensure that they are sufficiently robust and fit for purpose.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 Preparation

As part of the preparation for the scrutiny review, OSMB agreed that two planning sessions were organised for OSMB Members. This focussed areas of questioning and objectives for each of the sessions.

External facilitators were used for these sessions to provide independent advice and challenge. We would like to thank Ed Hammond, Head of Programmes, Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) and Tim Young, (Associate at CfPS; LGIU; and Frontline Consulting) for their assistance and guidance.

To ensure that priority areas were addressed sufficiently, OSMB asked for questions to be submitted in advance and these were circulated to each of the witnesses to ensure that questions could be answered at the relevant session.

All Council Members were written to with the review schedule and asked if they wished to submit questions to any of the sessions. A dedicated 'slot' was allocated at the opening session of each day for these to be asked.

3.2 Supporting papers

An information pack was circulated to Members in advance of the meeting. This included:

- Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board Child Sexual Exploitation Action Plan 2014/15 2nd Quarter report, RMBC
- Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board: Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy 2013-16, RMBC
- Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham (1997 – 2013) – Alexis Jay OBE
- National Child Protection Inspections: South Yorkshire Police 12 – 22 May 2014, Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary
- Inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers – Rotherham (November 2014) OFSTED
- Thematic inspection to evaluate the effectiveness of local authorities' current response to child sexual exploitation: The sexual exploitation of children: it couldn't happen here, could it? (November 2014) OFSTED f
- House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee - Child sexual exploitation in Rotherham: some issues for local government
- House of Commons Home Affairs Committee - Child sexual exploitation and the response to localised grooming: follow-up
- Agenda and minutes from the Improving Lives Select Commission meeting of 22 January 2014 (this meeting examined the emergent Improvement and Delivery Plan, and asked key partners to account for their performance).

3.3 Written submissions

Written submissions were also requested from a number of invited witnesses who were unable to attend. At the time of writing, not all of these have been received however, given that OSMB have made an ongoing commitment to review this work, any salient information can be taken into consideration in due course.

3.4 Witnesses

Session 1: Experiences from and implications for the Local Government Sector in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation.

In attendance:

- Cllr David Simmonds (Chair of LGA Children's Board; Member of RMBC Improvement Board)
- Cllr Ralph Berry (Lead Member for Children's Services, Bradford MBC)

Session 2: Scrutiny of current services and action plans to address Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham.

In attendance

- Steve Ashley, Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board
- Jane Parfremment, Director of Safeguarding, RMBC
- Phil Morris – Business Manager (Safeguarding), RMBC
- Jason Harwin, Rotherham District Commander, South Yorkshire Police
- Detective Superintendent Matt Fenwick, South Yorkshire Police
- Assistant Chief Constable Ingrid Lee, South Yorkshire Police
- Catherine Hall (Rotherham CCG – Head of Safeguarding)
- Chris Prewitt (RDASH - Head of Quality and Standards)
- Samantha Davis (Nurse - RDASH)
- Tracey McErlains-Burns (Chief Nurse - Rotherham Foundation Trust)
- Councillor Christine Beaumont, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, RMBC
- Warren Carratt – Service Manager, Strategy Standards and Early Help, RMBC

Session 3: Implications for Criminal Justice Agencies in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation

In attendance:

- Alan Billings, South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Michelle Buttery, Chief Executive and Solicitor, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner;
- Ingrid Lee, Assistant Chief Constable, South Yorkshire Police;
- Jason Harwin, District Commander, South Yorkshire Police;
- Matt Fenwick, Detective Superintendent, South Yorkshire Police;
- Barbara Petchey, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor;

Session 4: Support to victims and their families

In attendance:

- Zlakha Ahmed, Apna Haq

- Hayley Fisher, Victim Support
- Karen Goddard, Barnados
- Steve Oversby, Barnados
- Bina Parmar, Safeguarding Lead, National Working Group
- Sue Greig, Public Health Consultant, RMBC
- Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioner, RMBC

Session 5 – What Next?

In attendance:

- Dr. Anne Hollows, Principal Lecturer in Social Work from Sheffield Hallam University
- Mr. Joe Smeeton, Principal Lecturer in Social Work from Nottingham Trent University

4 FRIDAY 12TH DECEMBER – DAY ONE

4.1 Session 1: Experiences from and implications for the Local Government Sector in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation.

Objectives:

- To understand the challenges faced by Local Authorities in tackling Child Sexual Exploitation
- To gain external perspectives on Rotherham's situation and to learn from best practice elsewhere
- To understand the specific role that elected members can play in tackling CSE effectively

Issues arising from this session reiterated the moral and legal responsibilities of Members as corporate parents to ensure the children in the Borough are safeguarded and those who have a role in safeguarding children; whether police, schools, GPs, social care; are doing this effectively.

It was suggested that Members had to understand which elements of CSE are happening in Rotherham and what is being done about it (and by whom). It is the role of scrutiny members to ask the challenging questions of the executive and partners. However in doing so, members must have access to timely and appropriate information and not just rely on the reassurances of officers as had happened in the past. As the 'eyes and ears' of communities Members are uniquely placed to triangulate data from a range of sources, including service users, to see whether these concur or are at variance with the information provided.

It was suggested that in the myriad of accountability structures (described as 'spaghetti') that it is easy to assume that someone else is taking the responsibility for oversight and challenge. Both witnesses stated that scrutiny councillors should be asking questions of the Safeguarding Board; Lead Member and key agencies to 'reality' check what is happening in practice.

Other issues raised included the role of member development to provide elected members with a thorough knowledge of children's safeguarding issues. By understanding the complexities; Cllr Berry argued that Members are better placed to provide effective support and challenge. It was also suggested that as part of this members could learn from practice in other authorities.

4.2 Session 2: Scrutiny of current services and action plans to address Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham.

Objectives:

- To ensure the action plan is robust and fit for purpose
- To ensure governance processes are in place for monitoring its delivery
- To determine whether the action plan is guiding effective improvement in practice

This session scrutinised the latest CSE action plans. All key partners who contributed to the CSE sub-group were present at the meeting. The minutes refer to the detailed questioning of the action plan.

As the LSCB Chair, Steve Ashley was questioned at length about the ownership of

the improvement and delivery plan; the clarity of outcomes and timescales. Assurances were given about how agencies are held to account for their targets and performance. As a commitment to transparency and accountability, plans to hold future meetings of the LCSB in public were welcomed.

OSMB concurred with the Steve that a review of the action plan should be undertaken. Members raised the following issues:

- The ongoing challenge of community engagement, particularly with new migrant communities;
- Support for the Director of Safeguarding proposals that a "statement of purpose" for the CSE unit and clearer line management be developed to ensure that this service effectively focuses on the young people who need it most
- Evaluation of the effectiveness of awareness raising and training interventions; specifically with health professionals; taxis and hotels
- The effectiveness of risk assessments; and specifically for looked after children based out-of-authority (in light of OFSTED comments that "Young people placed further away because of their vulnerability to CSE do not always have sufficiently well-developed safety plans, risk assessments or robust responses to further incidents of concern...")

Other key issues raised in these discussions include:

- The initial steps to support victims was welcomed, however, it was recognised that further work was required to develop a comprehensive package of support, which is able to respond to individual need – including the need for advocates and peer-support. (This would be explored further on Day Two.)
- Ensuring the that the action is publically accessible;
- Issues of governance, particularly strengthening oversight of the Lead Member for Children's Services to 'own' the action plan in terms of relevant Council services;
- The importance of providing public reassurances that prosecutions were being actively pursued in 'historic cases';
- Challenges of communicating successes in order to counter public perception that "little was happening";
- How is support provided to young people who do not meet 'threshold' for services and ensuring that there is adequate support available through the Youth Services;
- Early intervention and the ongoing engagement of schools

4.3 Session 3: Implications for Criminal Justice Agencies in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation

Objectives:

- To secure effective partnerships for the future
- To determine new processes, how embedded and how successful they are
- Focus on the action plan for the future – for Rotherham

The session explored the extent to which the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), Police and Crown Prosecution Services were working effectively together.

The PCC outlined that steps being taken by his office to tackle CSE including:

- Holding South Yorkshire Police to account
- Planning, priorities and funding (announcing additional resources)
- Victim's Commissioning

The PCC highlighted that the Police and Crime Plan was being reviewed to ensure that CSE was reflected as a priority; and that he would hold to account the performance of the Police in this area.

The importance of ensuring the victim's voice was central to the commissioning of post-abuse services was reiterated; with the PCC giving assurances that this was being addressed. It was noted that an evaluation of current post-abuse support was being undertaken to identify gaps and ensure that needs were being met; in effect the 'right' organisations were being supported to provide the 'right' services.

Whilst the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub is in its infancy, the Police were confident that it had already led to better information and intelligence sharing. Questions were asked about the work with front-line officers to test if the strategic commitment to tackle CSE was reflected in day-to-day police work.

Ms Petchey outlined the complexity of cases coming to court; highlighting the difficulties in bringing historic prosecutions. The importance of providing advocates or 'buddies' to ensure that victims going through the court process were adequately and appropriately supported was restated.

As with the first session, the importance of providing public reassurances that prosecutions were being actively pursued in 'historic cases' was reiterated. Not only would that restore public confidence but may lead to other victims coming forward. Members sought confirmation that action was being taken to bring perpetrators to justice. As part of this, assurances were sought that the process for identifying risk was robust and disruption activity meant that potential risk to victims was minimised rather than 'shifted' elsewhere.

5 THURSDAY 18TH DECEMBER; DAY TWO

5.1 Session 4: Support to victims and their families

Objectives:

- To understand the long term plans for support to victims and their families and to ensure they are fit for purpose;
- To test out evidence from the previous session with advocate organisations and to understand how it is working in practice;
- To determine whether universal services are working to support victims and their families.

The witness from the National Working Group and Barnardos commented that

Rotherham was working as hard as they can to improve the services for victims and those potentially still at risk and they were encouraged that changes were taking shape.

The immediate work undertaken by the Council and partners, to provide counselling support and care to victims, was recognised. The process to commission longer term services was underway and Members were able to question the process and how the voice of the victim was to be included. This was welcomed, although some of the witnesses suggested that post-abuse support should have a greater emphasis in the strategy.

Issues emerging from the discussions included

- The need to have consistent support so as to build trust and a rapport with the victim/survivor; this may be across a range of agencies but recognising that those in the voluntary sector may be in a better position to engage;
- The difficulties of engaging with young people, both boys and girls, who may not acknowledge that they were in an abusive relationship and were unwilling to work with statutory agencies (or any agencies);
- A recognition that the work undertaken with victims and those at risk, needs to be tailored to meet individual needs;
- Ensuring that post-abuse support is responsive to the needs of the victims; including a range of interventions including peer support, advocacy to specialist therapeutic interventions;
- The immediate need to provide practical support victims going through prosecution process (for example buddying, support with housing etc);
- Working with the CPS, Court Services and victim support services to ensure that witnesses and victims are appropriately identified and supported through the court process;
- Ensuring that Members are notified at the earliest stage, if the resources allocated to post-abuse services are not sufficient.

Following earlier discussions about risk assessments, particularly with cases perceived to be at 'lower risks', there was a view that early intervention could prevent risks from escalating into harm given that risks change rapidly due to often chaotic lifestyles. Reiterating the earlier contribution of the Director of Safeguarding, it was stated that professionals needed to make that professional judgement around that young person to understand the risks to the young person and their families.

Members probed about how young people with additional vulnerabilities, for example mental health issues or learning disabilities, were captured in the needs analysis. It was recognised that further work would need to be undertaken in this area.

Similarly, Members asked if agencies understood what the different issues are in terms of diversity and BME; with established communities as well as new arrivals. It was felt that this was a strand that required strengthening in the action plan.

Questions were asked about appropriate training and supervision to ensure that staff dealing with these traumatic issues, were also well supported.

5.2 Session 5 – What Next?

Objectives:

- To explore the wider implications of the Jay report;
- To test out the Council's direction of travel and pace of change, to ensure it is appropriate and timely.

The witnesses were both asked from their perspective as experts in the field of social care, following the publication of the Jay Report, what would be your advice and recommendation for Rotherham's best way forward? The complexity of working in this area was reiterated – as cited in the Jay Report, victims often had multiple needs and as themselves or their families, experienced multiple disadvantage; for example neglect, domestic abuse or poor mental health. It was important that social work understood the individual needs and responded to them holistically.

Citing the recent civil injunctions taken out by Birmingham City Council, it was suggested agencies had to think creatively about how to minimise risk. It was felt that this was an interesting example of disruption activity which protected vulnerable young people.

Many of the points raised in the discussion echoed earlier contributions. These included:

- Ensuring that the level of risk should set an appropriate level to prevent escalation from low risk to harm;
- Having a range of interventions available, based on individual need and level of risks;
- Importance of awareness raising and early intervention in schools; particularly through curriculum work;
- Links between social care and schools;
- Value of multi-agency safeguarding hubs and models for sharing information and allocating resources
- Alongside this ensuring that there is an effective Early Intervention strategy is in place to ensure that referrals are properly 'sieved' and dealt with by the appropriate agency;
- Ensuring that the risk assessment process is 'nuanced' and able to make professional judgement based on individual and family circumstances;
- Ensuring that there is a range of post-abuse support in place based on individual need.

In considering the wider issues of social care and services to vulnerable children, young people and their families, Mr Smeeton and Dr Hollows made some general observations:

- The Council needed to look after the staff it had, nurture and train them. Newly qualified Social Workers were the least able to cope with 'high-end' child protection work and were unable to sustain overburdened and over stretched workloads;
- The importance of post-qualification support - Rotherham was thought to be

strong in this area;

- The importance of appropriately managed workloads and adequate supervision;
- Ensuring that performance management is based on the quality of work and not simply, ticking boxes. Rotherham had previously been judged to be performing well in inspection, but it was about meeting timescales but not necessarily quality of care for children and young people;
- The current climate meant that social workers were often anxious about whether they would find themselves in the midst of a media-storm; there was a risk that social workers may revert to very process driven, risk-averse practice;
- Ensuring that stable placements were secured for looked after children as soon as possible and networks of support are in place for care leavers.

Appendix A:

Minutes from OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
Friday, 12th December, 2014

Appendix B:

Minutes from OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
Thursday, 18th December, 2014

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
2.	Date:	23rd January 2015
3.	Title:	Response to the Scrutiny Review on Supporting the Local Economy
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

This report outlines the Cabinet response to the Scrutiny Review – Supporting the Local Economy, undertaken by Improving Places Select Commission chaired by Cllr Emma Wallis.

The response was considered by Cabinet on 14th January 2015.

6. Recommendations

That OSMB:

- a) Receive and note the response from Cabinet to the Scrutiny Review (Appendix 1)
- b) Request that the first monitoring report of the implementation of the review be presented to Improving Places Select Commission in 6 months' time

7. Background

The review was conducted by a group from the Improving Places Select Commission, chaired by Cllr Emma Wallis. It took place between November 2013 and May 2014.

The Objectives of the review were:-

- To analyse the impact of changes to local government finance – particularly business rates.
- To analyse how the Council can create the right conditions for growth in the private sector
- To influence the development of the Growth Plan for Rotherham, which in turn feeds into the City Region Strategic Economic Plan (SEP)
- To develop a whole Council approach to increase business rates in Rotherham

The scope of the review was kept narrow as it was anticipated that the review could expand to cover a wide range of issues thus diluting the impact of its recommendations and extending the time it would take to complete. Members therefore agreed to focus on the following lines of enquiry during the review:

- What is the impact of an increase/decrease in business rates on the Council finances?
- What is the impact of this on the local economy?
- How can the Council support economic development and what should be in the growth plan? What different models can be adopted?
- How are supply chains supported?
- What incentives can be offered to local businesses?
- How do we evaluate success? How have others achieved it?
- Impact of funding
- What are Rotherham's growth areas?
- What specifically is the approach to Tourism?
- How can the following services be used to generate business investment?
 - Asset Management
 - Transport
 - Planning
 - Housing
- How do we impact on the most deprived areas of Rotherham?

The group interviewed a wide range of witnesses during the course of their work; including Council Officers, the Chamber of Commerce and from the private sector.

The Group produced 13 recommendations, covering a range of issues relating to the Rotherham economy.

Officers have reviewed these recommendations and their responses are set out on the attachment to this report.

Officers agree, in whole or part, with all the recommendations and in a number of cases they have already been implemented. However, some of them will require further consideration and require either policy considerations and/or financial considerations. It is proposed to defer these and bring them back to Cabinet when further work has been carried out.

8. Finance

There will be costs to delivering the recommendations, although it is difficult to put a precise figure to these at the current time.

For example, there is insufficient capacity in the RiDO and Economic Development teams at the current time to deliver the recommendation to prioritise all town centres. To do so would require additional staffing, with associated costs.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The main risk is the potential impact of the national and international economy on Rotherham, which the Council will not have much influence on being able to mitigate

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Supporting the economy is a key corporate priority for the Council and a key element of the Sheffield City region agenda.

The Rotherham Growth Plan will help deliver:-

- 10,000 net new private sector jobs over the next 10 years
- Create 750 additional new businesses over the next 5 years
- Increase gross value added (GVA) for the Rotherham economy

11. Background Papers and Consultation

RMBC Finance were consulted on the report.

Officers from Human Resources, Asset Management, RiDO, Planning, Scrutiny and Economic Development were consulted on, and contributed to, the response, a copy of which is attached.

Contact Name:

Simeon Leach, Economic Development Manager, Ext 23828
Email simeon.leach@rotherham.gov.uk

Cabinet's Response to Scrutiny Review on Supporting the Local Economy

	Recommendation	Cabinet Decision (Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)	Cabinet Response (detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)	Officer Responsible	Action by (Date)
1	The Economic Development Team within the Council should ensure that the emerging Growth Plan is focused around two key objectives – income generation and employment creation, with very clear actions for achieving this	Accepted	<p>The Growth Plan focuses on delivering more jobs (10,000 net new private sector jobs over next 10 years); with support to ensure they are accessed by local residents wherever possible.</p> <p>It will also drive businesses starts (750 new businesses over 5 years) and increased inward investment; both of which will increase the business rates receipts for the Council.</p> <p>Detailed actions to deliver these outcomes will be the next step once the Growth Plan has been approved by the end of March 2015</p>	Simeon Leach	April 2015
2	Targets and outcomes should be developed for this plan that are smart – suggestions include number of businesses accessing services, the number of young people accessing apprenticeships, the number of new entrants to post compulsory education and the number of over 16s gaining accredited qualifications.	Accepted	<p>Targets within the Plan are still under development/ consultation, but it is intended they will be smart, and focussed on a relatively low number of high priority outcomes for the borough.</p> <p>Some or all of the proposed outcomes will be in the final Plan, although this will be dependent on the outcomes of the current consultation process.</p>	Simeon Leach	April 2015

3	The Economic Development Team should ensure that the growth plan is jointly owned by local partners and that it is strongly linked to the Local Plan.	Accepted	<p>The draft Growth Plan has been widely consulted on during its development, both within the Council and with external partners. Official consultation on the draft Plan is taking place during December/January, with all relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Once approved and “live” the Plan will be monitored through the Economy Board of the LSP, comprising public, private and community/voluntary sector representatives</p> <p>The plan has strong links to the Local Plan – the policies in both plans have been developed to encourage growth and regeneration and the employment target figures are reflected in the number and type of sites allocated for future employment development in the emerging sites and policies document.</p>	Simeon Leach	April 2015
4	They should also ensure that it is communicated effectively to partners and stakeholders, as part of an ongoing campaign to “talk up” Rotherham and its achievements. These stakeholders should include the Sheffield City Region structures and the private sector.	Accepted	<p>RiDO are currently looking at ways to build on the good press that their support of local business already receives</p> <p>RiDO will work closely with the Comms Team to ensure that Rotherham’s achievements are promoted across both Rotherham and the wider City Region</p>	RiDO & Comms Team	Ongoing
5	The Planning Board should identify, in the first instance, its top ten development sites and focus on these in its policies and plans. Within this the identification and delivery of a strategically important site should be the number 1 priority for Rotherham to remain competitive.	Partially accepted	The sites required to achieve the aspirations of the growth plan in relation to employment generation, including a strategically important site, have been included within the local plan. These sites will be available for development once the Sites and Policies document has been adopted (2016) – some of the sites are currently within the Greenbelt.	Bronwen Knight	Ongoing

			<p>As all the sites have been assessed for deliverability through the local plan process they should all be attractive to the market.</p> <p>While it is essential that we bring forward our “most deliverable” employment sites, as identified in the Local Plan, it is difficult to prioritise them into a top ten.</p> <p>The Economic Plan identifies both major employment and housing sites, as taken from the Local Plan. The next piece of work is what we as a Council can do to assist in bringing these forward</p>		
6	The Council should consider prioritising all town centres and giving a policy mandate for this to happen.	Accepted	<p>National Planning policies direct all town centre uses to existing town centres in the first instance using a sequential approach and we strongly implement these policies when dealing with planning applications. The Local plan also provides an overall strategy for prioritising our town centres and draft policies in the Sites and Policies DPD provide detail of how this should be carried out</p> <p>Raising the profile of the planning issues around promoting town centre development is welcomed and should be promoted throughout the Council.</p> <p>There is currently insufficient resource within the RiDO and Economic Development teams to replicate the level of support they provide to Rotherham town centre.</p>	Paul Woodcock	Ongoing

7	The Council should consider how Elected Members could input to the development of Council Policy, particularly with regard to economic growth, by utilising the wide range of talent and expertise that exists within this pool. Elected members can further assist with the promotion of Rotherham.	Agreed	<p>It is essential to the success of the Rotherham economy that policy has input from all relevant stakeholders, including Members.</p> <p>Further work is required to identify the best way that this can be achieved</p> <p>Activity will link with the proposals through the Corporate Improvement Board and the Transformational plan.</p>	Carole Haywood	TBA
8	RIDO should work with partners to ensure that access to Regional Growth Fund is maximised	Agreed	<p>RiDO has assisted clients to secure over £4.5m of Sheffield City Region Regional Growth Fund financing. This is over 60 per cent of the £7.2m awarded to Rotherham companies in total. This funding is set to leverage a total investment of around £46m creating over 500 jobs.</p> <p>This support can be replicated for any future rounds of RGF or other funding sources</p>	Tim O'Connell	Completed
9	The Council should aim to establish a multi-disciplinary "Task Force" with the key purpose of providing a co-ordinated holistic approach to generating investment and economic growth in Rotherham, for the benefit of its local businesses, communities and residents. The focus should be on working both internally, and in partnership with the private sector in Rotherham, to include a range of projects in terms of size and value. The external business support process should be led by RIDO as a recognised brand within Rotherham.	Agreed	<p>There are a number of existing groups which already, fully or partly, cover this remit</p> <p>The "Major Projects Group" leads on developing and delivering those projects with a potential major economic/regeneration impact (Cabinet Member attends this group where possible)</p> <p>The Economy Board of the LSP, which has both a private sector chair and majority of members, has responsibility for the strategic development of the Rotherham economy and delivery of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>The Business support process is already led</p>	Karl Battersby	Ongoing

			by RiDO, which is a well thought of and recognised brand. In future the majority of business support funding will be at City Region level and RMBC need to ensure that they maximise the impact this has at a local level.		
10	The Task Force should include Planning, Asset Management, Housing, Transport, Education and potentially Health partners. These functions will be included on the basis of a unique drivers approach for each project. In line with recommendation 7 above specific councillors (with specific expertise) and ward members should be included in this approach. This model could be adapted for individual projects, with bespoke task groups set up for larger projects including provision for specific expertise to be co-opted.	Agreed	Covered in response to recommendation 9	Karl Battersby	Ongoing
11	This Task Force should be responsible for ensuring that the strategy should identify land supply, link into work on the Local Plan and also the following issues, with the aim of maximising long term value for the Council's assets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Use of capital and borrowing to develop sites and premises b) The approach to the development of this land – some sites for area based regeneration initiatives c) The development of existing smaller sites and premises for developing local businesses 	Agreed	Covered in response to recommendation 9	Karl Battersby	Ongoing

12	<p>The Council should consider how to develop a business friendly culture amongst all its staff – skills development and training issues and also the possibility of setting growth targets for employees where appropriate. A key element of this would be to raise awareness within the Council of the changes to business rates and the importance of them in terms of generating income for the Council.</p>	Partially agreed	<p>Any training would need to be targeted on those who are most likely to be able to influence business growth/development. For some it will just be raising awareness about the importance of encouraging business start-ups, inward investment etc. and also informing colleagues of how successful (or not) we are in this area. Growth targets could only be applied where this is part of the person's core function.</p> <p>The issue of how all Council can/should contribute to economic growth in the borough has been raised previously and was an item at an M3 briefing session during 2014</p>	Phil Howe	TBA
13	<p>The Scrutiny function in the Council should consider looking further at the following issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The development of aspirational housing and associated services/communities in Rotherham b) Work with schools and training providers/colleges around the 16+ skills agenda to establish stronger links with employers and to engender an enterprising and aspirational culture. c) Potential for developing employment initiatives based on the experience of Manchester and elsewhere 	Deferred	<p>Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and the Scrutiny Select Commissions will determine the future work plan to be prioritised and undertaken.</p>	Deborah Fellowes	TBA

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting	Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
2.	Date	23/01/2015
3.	Title	Urinary incontinence scrutiny review response
4.	Directorate	Public Health

5. Summary

This report outlines the Cabinet Reponse to the Scrutiny Review – Urinary Incontinence, undertaken by the Health Select Commission chaired by Cllr Judy Dalton.

The response was considered by Cabinet on 14th January 2015.

6. Recommendations

That OSMB:

- a) Receive and note the response from Cabinet to the Scrutiny Review (Appendix 1)
- b) Request that the first monitoring report of the implementation of the review be presented to Health Select Commission in 6 months' time

7. Proposals and details

Dr John Radford, Director of Public Health was tasked with collating a multi directorate response to the recommendations within the urinary incontinence scrutiny review reported in October 2014.

Background to the review

There were three main aims of the review which were:

- 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 an overview of current continence services and costs, and plans for future service development.
- To identify any areas for improvement in promoting preventive measures and encouraging people to have healthy lifestyles.

Summary of findings and recommendations in the report

The review focused primarily on prevention rather than the costs of current service provision, but recognised that preventative work contributes towards achieving savings for services, for example by reducing admissions to hospital or residential care. Centralisation of continence prescribing has improved outcomes for service users and future service development with greater emphasis on prevention should also produce both further savings and better outcomes. Awareness raising of the importance of good bladder and bowel health and being physically active, plus doing pelvic floor exercises as a preventive measure, could lead to fewer people having their quality of life diminished through urinary incontinence and result in lower future demand for services.

The review conducted was a spotlight review and formulated six recommendations as follows:

- 1 RMBC Streetpride and partner agencies such as SYPTTE should ensure all public toilets in the borough are clean and well equipped to meet the needs of people who have urinary incontinence, including suitable bins for the disposal of equipment and disposable products.

Response - SYPTTE have confirmed that the toilet facilities provided by SYPTTE at its Interchanges meet the requirements recommended in Urinary Incontinence Scrutiny review. All SYPTTEs toilet facilities are appropriately maintained, regularly cleaned and re provisioned with consumable products throughout the day including weekends to ensure a pleasant customer experience.

Response – RMBC Facilities Management have confirmed that toilet facilities in Rotherham have suitable waste disposal systems are cleaned regularly to meet the needs of people with urinary incontinence.

- 2 RMBC Sport and Leisure team should establish greater links with the Community Continence Service in order to support people to participate in appropriate sport and physical activity.

Response – *Active Rotherham agree to work more closely with the Community Continence Service and take further guidance on how to improve the pathways to physical activity from the service. Suggestions include literature for patients and information on suitable exercises for pelvic floor to be added the new Get Active Rotherham website which is currently under development.*

- 3 RMBC Sport and Leisure team should liaise with other sport and leisure activity providers to consider building more pelvic floor exercises into the Active Always programme and wider leisure classes

Response – *Active Rotherham will include pelvic floor exercises into their existing “active always” provision. Public Health will also raise the importance of pelvic floor exercises at the next Rotherham Active Partnership meeting and long term conditions subgroup which covers most activity providers across the Borough. If there are any training requirements identified, these will be considered and delivered to the Rotherham Active Partnership members to ensure the exercises are embedded in all services.*

- 4 There should be greater publicity by partner agencies, coordinated through the Health and Wellbeing Board, to reduce stigma associated with incontinence and to raise public and provider awareness of:

a) the importance of maintaining good bladder and bowel health and habits at all life stages (through media such as screens in leisure centres and GP surgeries, further website development, VAR ebulletin and a campaign during World Continence Week from 22-28 June 2015)

b) healthy lifestyle choices having a positive impact on general health but also helping to prevent incontinence, such as diet, fluid intake and being active

c) the positive benefits of pelvic floor exercises as a preventive measure for urinary incontinence, including the use of phone apps for support

d) the need to include the impact of incontinence due to medication, such as diuretics, within a patient's care

Responses –

SYLTE offered the opportunity to use Rotherham Interchange to promote health issues in either road show or poster display format.

Public Health offer the opportunity for key messages to be included on our Public Health TV screens as well as encouraging Pharmacies to consider prioritising incontinence as one of their Public Health Campaigns for 2015. Information will also be included on the Get Active Rotherham website to raise awareness and confidence of patients with urinary incontinence.

It is recognised that the wide distribution of this review should also result in an increase in awareness of the needs of those experiencing urinary incontinence.

- 5 RMBC Neighbourhoods and Adult Services should work with care homes to encourage more staff to participate in the training offered by the Community Continence Service and to increase staff understanding of the impact of mobility, diet and fluid intake on continence.

Response – NAS

Neighbourhood and Adult services have previously offered incontinence training to care home staff but this was not taken up and as a consequence the training was cancelled. It is unclear if there was a need for training or if this is already being met by the Community Continence service support to Care Homes. Further information is being sought and NAS Learning and Development Team are happy to provide further training if necessary.

- 6 That the Health Select Commission receives a report from Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group in 2015 on the outcomes of the project considering future service development of the Community Continence Service.

Response –

The CCG have been forwarded the Health Select Commission report and will be invited directly to attend the Commission and report back their findings.

8. Finance

The responses which require additional resources are either low or no cost. The integration of the recommendations into ongoing activities will ensure that financial commitments are minimal and activities are joined up to maximise impact.

9. Risks and uncertainties

There is currently uncertainty regarding the need for incontinence training within care homes and other community settings. This will need to be further explored before training is offered to reduce risk of wasted resources.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Health and Wellbeing

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Scrutiny review: Urinary Incontinence: Review of the Health Select
Commission *May – July 2014*

SLT paper – 9.12.14

12. Keywords: Urinary incontinence, healthy lifestyles, care homes

Officer: Rebecca Atchinson, Public Health Principal

Cabinet's Response to Scrutiny Review Urinary Incontinence

Recommendation	Cabinet Decision (Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)	Cabinet Response (detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)	Officer Responsible	Action by (Date)
1. RMBC Streetpride and partner agencies such as SYPTE should ensure all public toilets in the borough are clean and well equipped to meet the needs of people who have urinary incontinence, including suitable bins for the disposal of equipment and disposable products.		<p>It is highlighted that Streetpride are not responsible for public toilets.</p> <p>Response by SYPTE</p> <p>They have confirmed that the toilet facilities provided by SYPTE at its Interchanges meet the requirements recommended in Urinary Incontinence Scrutiny review. All SYPTEs toilet facilities are appropriately maintained, regularly cleaned and re-provisioned with consumable products throughout the day including weekends to ensure a pleasant customer experience.</p> <p>Response by Asset Management – Facilities Team</p> <p>They have confirmed that toilet facilities in Rotherham have suitable waste disposal systems are cleaned regularly to meet the needs of people with urinary incontinence.</p>	<p>Dave Whittle SYPTE Centre Manager – Interchanges and Retail Tel: 01709 515833</p> <p>Kim Phillips</p>	January 2015
2. RMBC Sport and Leisure team should establish greater links with the Community Continence Service in order to support people to participate in appropriate sport and physical activity.		<p>Response by Active Rotherham</p> <p>They have agree to work more closely with the Community Continence Service and take further guidance on how to improve the pathways to physical activity from the service. Suggestions include literature for patients and information on suitable exercises for pelvic floor to be added the new Get Active Rotherham website which is currently under development.</p>	Steve Hallsworth	January 2015

<p>3. RMBC Sport and Leisure team should liaise with other sport and leisure activity providers to consider building more pelvic floor exercises into the Active Always programme and wider leisure classes</p>		<p>Response from Active Rotherham</p> <p>They will include pelvic floor exercises into their existing “active always” provision. Public Health will also raise the importance of pelvic floor exercises at the next Rotherham Active Partnership meeting and long term conditions subgroup which covers most activity providers across the Borough. If there are any training requirements identified, these will be considered and delivered to the Rotherham Active Partnership members to ensure the exercises are embedded in all services.</p>	<p>Steve Hallsworth</p>	<p>January 2015</p>
<p>4. There should be greater publicity by partner agencies, coordinated through the Health and Wellbeing Board, to reduce stigma associated with incontinence and to raise public and provider awareness of:</p> <p>a) the importance of maintaining good bladder and bowel health and habits at all life stages (through media such as screens in leisure centres and GP surgeries, further website development, VAR ebulletin and a campaign during World Continence Week from 22-28 June 2015)</p> <p>b) healthy lifestyle choices having a positive impact on general health but also helping to prevent incontinence, such as diet, fluid intake and being active</p> <p>c) the positive benefits of pelvic floor exercises as a preventive</p>		<p>Response by SYPTE</p> <p>They have offered the opportunity to use Rotherham Interchange to promote health issues in either road show or poster display format. Information to be shared with the Urinary Incontinence Team.</p> <p>Response by Public Health</p> <p>Public Health offer the opportunity for key messages to be included on our Public Health TV screens as well as encouraging Pharmacies to consider prioritising incontinence as one of their Public Health Campaigns for 2015.</p> <p>Information will also be included on the Get Active Rotherham website to raise awareness and confidence of patients with urinary incontinence.</p> <p>It is recognised that the wide distribution of this review should also result in an increase in awareness of the needs of those experiencing urinary incontinence.</p>	<p>Rebecca Atchinson</p>	<p>January 2015</p>

<p>measure for urinary incontinence, including the use of phone apps for support</p> <p>d) the need to include the impact of incontinence due to medication, such as diuretics, within a patient's care</p>				
<p>5. RMBC Neighbourhoods and Adult Services should work with care homes to encourage more staff to participate in the training offered by the Community Continence Service and to increase staff understanding of the impact of mobility, diet and fluid intake on continence</p>		<p>Response by NAS</p> <p>Neighbourhood and Adult Services have previously offered incontinence training to care home staff but this was not taken up and as a consequence the training was cancelled. It is unclear if there was a need for training or if this is already being met by the Community Continence service support to Care Homes. Further information is being sought and NAS Learning and Development Team are happy to provide further training if necessary.</p>	<p>Rebecca Atchinson / Nigel Mitchell</p>	<p>January 2015</p>
<p>6. That the Health Select Commission receives a report from Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group in 2015 on the outcomes of the project considering future service development of the Community Continence Service.</p>		<p>Response by Public Health</p> <p>The CCG have been forwarded the Health Select Commission report and will have been invited directly to attend the Select Commission and report back their thought and findings.</p>	<p>Rebecca Atchinson</p>	<p>January 2015</p>