

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.**

Date: Wednesday, 28th January, 2015

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 52 - 64)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 30 - 40)
3. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 58 - 122)
4. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 28 - 31)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 34 - 56)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 43 - 50)
7. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board (Pages 9 - 11)

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
Thursday, 4th December, 2014

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Dalton, Jepson, Kaye, Swift, Vines and Wootton.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Wyatt, Hunter and Whysall.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

57. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

58. COMMUNICATIONS

Joint Health and Overview Select Committee

The Chairman reported that he had attended a meeting on 28th November, 2014. There were major concerns from the attendees, some of which had been involved from the beginning, around the failure of NHS England to consult until the standards for Coronary Heart Disease had been accepted. They had been told that until the conditions were accepted, there would be no serious debate or consultation. This was creating a great deal of frustration.

They were also conscious that they had 4 surgeons at Leeds but not the workloads. It was a balance of retaining 4 surgeons/workload against a succession plan given the speciality/experience of the surgeons.

Information Packs

It was noted that a separate pack had been produced containing items for information. Should any Member have any issues to raise on the items contained therein they should be raised under Communications.

Access to GPs Review

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board had requested a special Health Select Commission meeting to discuss the response due to a lack of detail with how some of the recommendations would be actioned even though they had been accepted.

A special meeting had been arranged on 15th January, 2015, at 9.30 a.m. to which the Clinical Quality Commission, Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England had been invited.

Meeting with Rotherham Foundation Trust

The last meeting had been held on 24th November the notes of which were not available as yet. At the January meeting the Trust would give an

update on both their action plan and the Quality Account. They were applying to Monitor for the enforcement regarding governance to be lifted.

Seminar

A seminar was to be held on 9th December at 9.00 a.m. on the Care Act.

It was noted that Speak-Up had produced an easy read booklet on the Act.

Care Home Pilot – Waste Medicine Management

Discussions had taken place with Shona McFarlane, Director of Health and Wellbeing.

Medication in care homes was a complex matter delivered in partnership between the resident, their GP, the pharmacist and the care home. Most care homes operated a monitored dosage system or systems determined by the operating company many of which were national organisations. In setting up a contract, the Council required the home to operate a safe system of ensuring that residents received their medication correctly but the Council could not determine which specific system was used.

The key issue when delivering medication in residential care was safety and most homes found that a monitored dosage system resulted in a reduction in errors. The safety of the systems was not matched by flexibility and should someone not take their medication, or prescription change, the pre-filled cartridges were returned to the pharmacist to be destroyed which could result in wastage.

There were times when the prescription was completed incorrectly or the pharmacist did not complete the order correctly which could also result in waste when the homes had to send back the medication.

The in-house service operated 2 different approaches. Both were monitored dosages but for the home where there was 1 GP only, they had to be able to enter into an agreement to run an electronic version which resulted in a simpler to use system which could reduce waste. The Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group was hoping to move to a '1 care home 1 GP' system which should enable more homes to use the approach.

Minor Oral procedures

At the last meeting it was agreed that the Chairman would write to NHS England with regard to the issues raised by Members about the proposals.

1 Whether the proposals would have a significant detrimental impact on Rotherham Hospital.

NHS England had engaged with the Foundation Trust about the proposals and did not consider that there would be a significant detrimental impact on the hospital. The number of patients who would be treated by an oral

surgery specialist in the community represented a small proportion of the total number of patients treated in the Trust's Oral and Maxillofacial Department. The Foundation Trust would continue to play a major and vital role in the provision of oral surgery procedures but would have a greater proportion of complex cases to manage.

2 It is essential that the contract is awarded to a practice that is easily accessible by public transport.

Accessibility of the service was a primary consideration and this was assessed through the tender evaluation framework developed for the procurement. Bidders were required to include within their premises proposal a description of the public transport services serving the particular location.

3 It is also important that the successful practice is fully accessible for disabled people in terms of both physical access and information about their treatment.

The premises proposed by any potential provider would be assessed to ensure appropriate access for patients with disabilities. However, minor oral procedures would still be available at the hospital and this may be the most appropriate place for some patients. Some patient groups received their regular dental care from the Community Dental Service based at the Community Health Centre and they would also be likely to receive oral surgery treatment at the hospital. The patient clinical pathway took account of patients' other health conditions when deciding on provider and location for treatment.

4 If information is available about the number and location of dental practices who already offer such procedures without needing to refer patients to the hospital.

At present no dental practices in Rotherham held a contract with NHS England to provide the services.

5 What arrangements will be in place for ongoing monitoring of service quality in the new contract?

All NHS England dental providers were monitored to ensure a high quality service was provided. Qualified dentists were employed as dental advisers to the commissioning and contract management team and they had a key role in monitoring service quality, mainly through practice inspections and record card audits. Providers also had to carry out patient satisfaction surveys, annual audits and to implement systems that supported the provision of a quality service.

Resolved:- That the Commission's satisfaction with the response to the issues raised be noted and the proposals be supported.

59. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 23rd October, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd October, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signatures by the Chairman.

Arising from Minute No. 51 (NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group – Commissioning Plan 2015-16 – Transforming Community Services), it was noted that Joanna Saunders, Public Health, was the lead officer for the transforming of the 0-5 Child Services Partnership and would submit a report to the Select Commission.

It was also noted that the Foundation Trust would give an update on the Community Transformation programme to the January meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 54 (Health and Wellbeing Board Strategy Progress – Prevention and Early Intervention – NHS Health Checks) it was noted that Health Checks were aimed at everyone over the age of 40-74 years.

60. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

The Select Commission noted the minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 24th October and 12th November, 2014.

Councillor Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, informed the Commission that since the last meeting of the Board the Council, Clinical Commissioning Group and South Yorkshire Police had signed up to the Mental Health Crisis Concordat.

Progress on the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and plans for refresh would be presented to the Select Commission at its meeting in March 2015.

61. ISSUES FROM HEALTHWATCH

There were no matters arising.

62. CHANTRY BRIDGE GP REGISTERED PATIENT SERVICE

Richard Armstrong, Interim Director of Commissioning, NHSE, and Dominic Blaydon, Head of Long Term Conditions and Urgent Care, CCG, presented a report on the actions taken to date and those being considered by NHS England in order to ensure adequate, high quality future provision of GP services in the Chantry Bridge area of Rotherham.

Current services were located in the Community Health Centre on Greasbrough Road and were part of the contract with Care UK together with the Out of Hours Service and the Walk-in Centre.

Appendix A of the report provided a detailed account of the context and position regarding future provision as well as:-

- Introduction and background to the existing service
- Current position
- Demographic information
- Other Primary Care services at Chantry Bridge
- Engagement
- Procurement principles
- Risk management
- Next steps

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The service had commenced in 2009, commissioned at that time by the Rotherham Primary Care Trust to provide both a registered practice for patients as well as walk-in patients who chose to visit during the extended opening hours and for convenience due to its central location for people working in Rotherham
- The contract had been let for 5 years with an expectation that the practice list would grow to 5,000-6,000 people
- At the time of the contract coming to an end in May, 2014, the practice had a list of approximately 1,700 and Care UK still provided a walk-in service
- During the 2013 changes to the NHS structure the responsibility for Urgent Care Services (walk-in centre and out of hours) moved to the Clinical Commissioning Group. NHS England remained responsible for commissioning GP services provided to a registered list of patients
- Notification had been received that Care UK wished to withdraw from the provision of GP services but were willing to continue with the provision of out of hours services. Negotiations had resulted in an extension of the contract until September, 2015. This was timed to coincide with the opening of the new Emergency Centre at Rotherham Hospital but site issues have meant a delay to the opening date
- Barnsley Clinical Commissioning Group were co-commissioners for the out of hours service and had agreed to end their contract with Care UK in May 2015. Rotherham CCG would be receiving a paper from Care UK on the costs of continuing alone with out of hours
- Consultation with the registered patients had commenced to ascertain their preference. Options to explore would be whether there was a possibility of commissioning another practice in the area or another GP practice willing to take on the full patient list
- Need to ensure effective engagement with patients who were new arrivals/faced language barriers and patients with learning disabilities

or autism. It was noted that not many patient participation groups included disabled people

- 15% of the 1,700 lived more than 1 mile from the practice and travelled past other practices largely due to the convenience of extended opening hours
- If patients wished to stay registered in the area efforts would be made to re-procure through advertising the practice to any other provider who wished to take on the responsibility. Due to its small size, it would be expected to become a branch surgery of another practice
- NHS England felt that there was sufficient GP capacity in the area. Given the number of patients who actually lived out of the area it was highly likely that the majority would want to register with a GP closer to home
- The Community Health Services currently located in the building would not be affected by the changes in GP services
- The practice profile showed that 70% of the registered patients were of working age so would suggest they found the extended opening hours more convenient. There was a desire to see extended hours across the Borough and work was taking place with the Clinical Commissioning Group in looking at continuing provision for some form of walk-in centre and extending GP availability into the evenings and weekends. It was an aspiration for the future to commission services for longer periods of GP availability. GP practices were encouraged to submit a bid to the Prime Minister's Challenge Fund which was available to help improve access to general practice and stimulate innovative ways of providing primary care services
- It was not known why the patient list had not expanded. It could be that even though they may not be totally satisfied with their existing practice they could not be bothered to change. Also the service provider already provided the walk-in service for a patient whether they were registered or not so there was no incentive for Care UK to register more
- It was felt that there was still sufficient footfall for the pharmacy to be a viable business. A model being considered in terms of commissioning services from practices was looking at pharmacy services to relieve the strains on GP services and the hospital
- If practices took on more patients they would receive extra income, on average £120 per patient per practice
- If practices chose to close their patient list they had to apply to the Area Team and report why they had chosen that course of action. If it was found to be with no good reason, the application could be refused

or sanctions imposed in respect of the provision. Much of the GP practices chose to be open to register patients

- It was noted that the Friends and Family test would be introduced as from December for GP practices, to be reported monthly. This would be in addition to the national GP Patient Survey.
- NHS England did not allocate patients to a particular GP practice other than in situations where the patient was unable to choose.

Consideration was also given to a report to the NHS England and Health Scrutiny Overview Committee by Healthwatch Rotherham.

Healthwatch Rotherham had been approached by NHS England to help with the engagement around the future of the medical practice. 13 comments had been received regarding the practice relating to appointments/waiting times and other. There were some patients who had been signposted to the practice because of there being a "no boundary" approach and the extended opening hours but some were still reporting problems with appointment/waiting times to see a Doctor even though there were only 1,700 registered patients. Due to the location and layout at the Community Health Centre, many patients perceived the Walk-In Centre and Chantry Bridge GP practice as being one and the same. At the time of presenting the report Healthwatch had not received a response from Care UK who had been given a copy of the report.

Members requested further information from NHS England in order to inform their response to the proposals:-

- Information that NHSE had requested from Care UK with regard to the patient demographic profile and proximity to Chantry Bridge.
- Outcomes of the engagement with registered patients and the six GP practices within one mile of Chantry Bridge.
- An equality impact assessment/equality analysis

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

(2) That a formal response be submitted to NHS England South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw subject to receiving the information above and confirmation of the timescales.

(3) That the Select Commission's thanks and best wishes were given to Mel Hall, Chief Executive, Healthwatch Rotherham, who was leaving the position shortly.

63. CHILDHOOD OBESITY SCRUTINY REVIEW UPDATE

Joanna Saunders, Public Health, presented an update on the Childhood Obesity Review recommendations which had been considered by Cabinet on 16th October, 2013 (Minute No. 95 refers).

The re-commissioning of the Healthy Weight Framework (West Management Services) had commenced in May, 2014, following Cabinet approval (Minute No. 223 of 19th March, 2014, refers). The whole Healthy Weight Framework had been subject to review due to the budgetary pressures and the procurement process suspended at the end of July with all existing services extended to 31st December, 2014. However, the procurement had now been resumed and contracts would be awarded in the New Year.

Rotherham's Healthy Weight Framework continued to attract national interest and its specifications recognised as representing good practice in published papers and guidance.

Since the last update, progress had been made with work underway on a number of the recommendations:-

- Revised Healthy Weight Framework Service specifications now consistent with updated national guidance. Re-procurement would be complete and new contracts awarded across the whole Framework by January, 2015
- The new contracts would include a single point of access and web-based data management system which would ensure all patients were triaged into the correct Service and monitored effectively
- The new School Nursing specification included targets for referrals to Children's Weight Management Services
- Improvements in the relationship between Service providers and School Nursing to enhance their skills in identifying and referring young people
- The national Policy introducing free school meals to Reception and KS1 children had increased meals served per day
- The obesity performance clinic held in May, 2014, had led to enhanced collaborative working on the wider determinants of overweight and obesity with other Council services

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

- 2013/14 data recently published showed that Rotherham's rates had slightly gone up
- The data was always slightly skewed due to it being a different cohort measured every year
- Public Health England had started to look at trend data averaged on a three year basis to get a better picture looking at Y1-2-3, Y2-3-4 and Y3-4-5
- Over 1,000 children had achieved weight loss through the Service

- Children were very dependent upon their parents getting them to/engaging with the Service and a full family approach was best
- The height and weight measurements were carried out during the term after Christmas up to the Summer. All the results had to be uploaded onto the national system and analysed over the Summer holidays. Due to staff resources all schools were not done at the same time
- Schools were given an indication of when the programme would be coming to them and they wrote to the parents. Should a parent not wish their child to be included they had to opt out
- There were really good levels of coverage – high 90%. The measurements were taken sensitively and people were more comfortable with it taking place now it was more well established
- Currently there was no data connection between a child's height and weight and their attainment. The information could not be passed onto another provider but discussion had taken place as to the extent to which attainment could be broken down in relation to weight in the future
- MoreLife (Carnegie, Leeds) had been the provider of Rotherham's residential summer camp. Generally all the children that stayed achieved a substantial weight loss
- The Services commissioned by Rotherham were built on the model developed by the MoreLife Programme. It was a partnership arrangement between MoreLife and Places for People, Rotherham's leisure provider
- Only children in Reception (aged 4-5) and Y6 (10-11) were measured. The proportion of children who are overweight and obese increased significantly from Reception to Y6
- It was really important that physical and active lifestyles were promoted for the whole family as the children did not have the autonomy to go to playgrounds etc. without parental input and support. It was easier to influence behaviour when the child was younger
- The Carnegie camp was set in a former boarding school where a complete controlled environment could be created for a period of 5-6 weeks. The children ate normal foods with no snacking, sweets, meals ate at the table with others. The food was calorie controlled so the children learnt what was a normal healthy meal and incorporate it into family life when back home. Parents visited and were expected to engage in the education sessions and given a lot of information

about incorporating the messages into family life when the children returned home

- This year 19 young people had gone to the camp. It cost £3,500 per child who had to be agreed between 8-17 years
- In the summer holidays Rotherham also ran intensive support for obese children within the local delivery programme
- Single point of access was important. An assessment was made and a series of questions asked during the process of registration to ascertain what services would best meet their needs
- The funding had originally come from the Rotherham Primary Care Trust. It had been passported through to the Council as part of the ringfenced Public Health grant
- Free school meals had been introduced nationally for younger children and provided a good start in early years but families needed to be aware of the eligibility criteria for when children were older to encourage take up as not all families who were eligible did so

Resolved:- (1) That a further update be submitted by the Head of Health Improvement to the Select Commission in July 2015.

(2) That the Weight Management Service providers be invited to the July, 2015, meeting to talk about their services and development plans.

(3) That further information be provided regarding Recommendation 12 from the review and the points relating to schools that were considered by CYPs Departmental Leadership Team.

(4) That information about the eligibility criteria for free school meals be circulated to the Select Commission.

64. SUPPORT FOR CARERS SCRUTINY REVIEW UPDATE

Janine Moorcroft, Neighbourhoods and Adult Services presented an update on the above joint scrutiny review which had been undertaken by the Health and Improving Lives Select Commissions.

The report highlighted the joint actions agreed by the Select Commissions and incorporated actions from the Carers Charter action plan 2013-16 and the progress made on each.

The review had acknowledged the need for the recommendations to be contained within existing resources and, in the main, there were no financial implications. Now the guidance for the Care Act had been published, the working groups established had a clear direction of what they had to achieve and would be built into the action plan. There was a

further meeting arranged with lead partners in early January to look at the budgetary workstreams in relation to the Care Act.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Carers assessments and care plans were only done for those carers in receipt of social care. This had been acknowledged and would be fed back to the relevant workstream officer. The Care Act guidance would be considered to ascertain what changes were needed to the Carer's Needs Form and Care Plan.
- The update for recommendation 11 focussed more on public sector partners but this would be discussed at the meeting arranged for January, 2015 including all partners.
- Discussions were taking place about Carers Corner moving to the RAIN building next year on a part-time basis, as well as the introduction of a more flexible service in all communities
- It was still a challenge to monitor changes in the numbers of carers. The question was asked at over 75's healthchecks.
- Bi-monthly carers meetings were held.

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

(2) That the incorporation of the scrutiny review actions into the wider action plan be noted.

(3) That an update be submitted in 6 months.

65. ROTHERHAM RECOVERY HUB

Malc Chiddy, Drug Intervention Programme Strategic Manager, presented a report on the above.

The Council, in partnership with Lifeline (Alcohol and Drug 'Tier 2' provider service) had been successful in securing £875,000 capital funding from Public Health England to purchase and refit suitable premises as a Rotherham Recovery Hub to support recovery from drug and alcohol dependence.

The recovery services currently commissioned from RDaSH, alongside Lifeline and other services, would be relocated to the 'Hub' which was expected to be open from April, 2015.

The capital grant scheme was made available to support the recovery focus of the coalition government. Group work, housing, employment, training and lifestyle activities would be provided in a welcoming environment away from the main clinical treatment base offering some

respite for Service users and avoiding them coming into contact constantly with other active drug users.

There had been a substantial level of interest in the funding with over 200 bids submitted. Rotherham's funding allocation had been the single largest grant agreed.

The ex-Youth Offending Service building, 'Carnson House', had been purchased with the process of planning and redevelopment already underway. It was estimated that the premises would be open for use by 1st April, 2015 and fully completed by July, 2015.

Under the funding grant, the premises were owned outright by Lifeline but were to be made available for up to 20 years to Rotherham as a Recovery Hub. After that time the premises became a Lifeline asset to use or dispose of as they saw fit, however, the 20 year timescale could be reduced at any time by the Authority giving the appropriate notice.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- RDaSH would also be in the building
- A management group had been set up and had had its first meeting
- The Hub had to be made available for Alcohol and Drug Services in Rotherham for 20 years as a grant condition
- The building had been used by the Youth Offending Service for the past 20 years so no problems were anticipated from nearby residents and there was little concern regarding the present centres at Lifeline and Clearways.
- It was a recovery hub and not a drop-in centre – it was those during their recovery stage that would be provided support. There would be a programme of work covering debt management, employment, housing, ongoing health etc. with partners brought in to support
- Both Lifeline and RDaSH worked on recovery now and had ways of measuring such. It did not have to be total abstinence but massive steps towards it and getting their life back in order. The main subjects would be housing, training/employment and relationships which were the areas that helped with recovery
- Clients would be seen by a Clinical Worker regarding medication/injections away from the Centre – it would purely be recovery workers they saw at the Hub although the 2 workers would be in contact
- Success was measured by someone not coming back into treatment for 6 months

- Clients would be offered a 12 weeks recovery programme on a rolling basis but would not be expected to stay in the Service for more than 6 months. Exact numbers were being worked up and it was expected there would be an increase to those using services at the moment
- It would not be a 9-5 service. The building would be available for other services such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous in the evening. It was hoped to have evening and weekend sessions but it would not be 24:7 because of staff time. The focus would be on what was best for the service users
- Assurance had been received from the Planning Service that, due to the premises' previous use for more than 10 years, planning permission was not required for change of use

Councillor Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, stated that funding had been awarded due to the excellent innovative scheme illustrating joint work across a number of different agencies. He also reported that he would request that all relevant Ward Members were kept fully informed and involved with the scheme so they could allay any fears that arose from members of the public.

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

(2) That a visit to the premises be made once the project was up and running.

66. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- (1) That a special meeting be held on Thursday, 15th January, 2015, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

(2) That a further meeting be held on Thursday, 22nd January, 2015, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
8th January, 2015

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Cutts, Ellis, McNeely, Reeder, Sharman, Wallis, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Johnston, Rushforth and Smith.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Currie Cutts, Ellis, McNeely, Reeder, Sharman, Wallis, Whelbourn and Wyatt declared personal interests in Minute No. 44 (Housing Rent Increase) on the grounds that they were or had family or friends who were Council tenants.

37. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

38. COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman advised the Select Commission that Council had personally thanked those involved in the Scrutiny Review of Standing Orders.

The continuing work into the Constitution would, going forward, be led by Councillor Wyatt, who had replaced Councillor Watson on the Select Commission.

39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 23RD OCTOBER, 2014

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 23rd October, 2014.

Reference was made to Minute No. 32 (Previous Minutes) and Councillor Whelbourn sought clarification whether paper based complaints forms were still in existence. It was confirmed that complaints forms were available for relevant officers to print when required and a link to the complaint form would be circulated with the minutes.

Councillor Whelbourn asked if the Virement Policy had been circulated to Select Commission's Members as per Recommendation (4) of Minute No. 3 (Revenue Budget Monitoring) and was informed that the Virement Policy was part of the Financial Regulations documentation and a link to the relevant document would be circulated with the minutes.

Questions raised by Councillor Ellis relating to the savings within Adult Services and the attendance of the Director of Health and Wellbeing at the meeting would be addressed within the Revenue Budget Monitoring report on this agenda and the recommendation of the Chairman later in the meeting for a Sub-Committee of the Select Commission to consider some issues in more detail.

Councillor Ellis also made reference to Minute No. 34 (Capital Programme Monitoring) and the occupancy rate of the Borough's business investment units and was informed that this figure would be obtained and forwarded on.

However, it was noted that, following the request for additional information on the Government's requirement to provide universal Free School Meals to all infant aged school children, the purchase of different equipment had led to an increased number of school meals being supported since the commencement of the school year. It was anticipated that all equipment by schools would be purchased and installed within the budget of £600,000. It could not be confirmed at this stage where all the purchases for equipment had been made and if they were from local companies. However, this did coincide with a piece of work undertaken as part of a Scrutiny Review, but not yet completed, into commissioning and procurement which could provide some valuable information to the review of the commissioning framework and it was suggested that an early draft of the report be circulated.

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 23rd October, 2014 be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That the links to the complaints form and Virement Police and information requested on the occupation rate be circulated with the minutes.

40. CORPORATE PLAN OUTCOMES

The Chairman welcomed Jan Ordmondroyd, Interim Chief Executive, to the meeting and invited her to give an update on the Corporate Plan Outcomes.

The Interim Chief Executive advised the Commission on the reason for the delay in the report being presented.

The complexities of the data were such that this needed to be considered in light of other information coming forward and, therefore, needed further analysis to ensure the context of the report was as accurate as possible. The report would be submitted to the relevant meetings in the next few weeks.

Members of the Select Commission were satisfied with the information shared by the Chief Executive and were in agreement with the report being delayed to ensure the data was robust. However, it was pointed out that the correct route for the presentation of reports for scrutiny should be adhered to.

Resolved:- That the Interim Chief Executive be thanked for her explanation on the reason for the delay of the report.

41. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST OCTOBER 2014

Further to Minute No. 105 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th December, 2014 consideration was given to a report presented by Pete Hudson, Chief Finance Officer, which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2014/15 based on performance for the first seven months of this financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would overspend against its Budget by £2.976m (+1.4%); an improvement of £129k since the last report to Cabinet in October (August monitoring report).

The current forecast outturn excluded the costs of implementing recommendations from the Jay report and the Ofsted Inspection, and the costs which would be borne by the Council in respect of the Corporate Governance Inspection.

The main reasons for the forecast overspend were:-

- The continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough.
- Cost pressures arising from some schools converting to academies.
- Continuing Health Care income pressures and demand pressures for Direct
- Payments within Older People and Physical and Sensory Disability clients.

The moratorium on non-essential spend implemented on 2nd September was noted and would continue until the end of March, 2015. This would assist with reducing the forecast overspend.

Continued close management of spend remained essential if the Council was to deliver a balanced outturn and preserve its successful track record in managing both its in year financial performance and its overall financial resilience.

The costs associated with the report undertaken by Professor Jay amounted to £102,000 in 2014/15. This represented only the cost of engaging Professor Jay and her external staffing support..

Costs associated with the Corporate Governance and Ofsted Inspections were currently being quantified and would be included in the next monitoring report, which was due to be presented to Cabinet on the 4th February, 2015.

It was hoped that the Council could deliver a balanced budget with the overspends being aligned. The Council's revenue reserves would have to fund any additional costs.

Councillor Ellis referred to the costs associated with the inspections and asked for a guestimate, but was informed it was impossible to put a figure on this at this stage as information was still be collated.. The Chief Executive had written to the Secretary of State about the costs to the Council, but had yet to receive a reply.

Councillor Ellis also referred to the Council being responsible for accrued deficits when schools converted to sponsored academies and was informed that Clifton Comprehensive was not included in the Children and Young People's Services section of the report on Page 13 as the school would not convert to an Academy in 2014/15.

The Deputy Leader pointed out that the predicted overspend of £1 million had been raised with the Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services who had given Clifton Comprehensive until the end of January, 2015 to produce a spending plan to bring spending in line with the level of funding allocated. Only once the academy conversion took place would the Council be responsible for the deficit. There was no contingency fund to pick up these costs

The Select Commission noted the request for academy conversions along with child sexual exploitation to be added to the Corporate Risk Register.

Councillor Ellis also referred to Page 15 of the agenda pack and specifically asked for clarification of the £1.440 million which had been budgeted to be used from the Housing Revenue Account reserves and was informed the figure included vacancy management, carry forward from various projects and capital works.

The Select Commission noted the consultancy spend and suggested this be monitored closely as there was a potential risk for this to increase when expertise within the Council had been lost with staff retiring/leaving.

Councillor Ellis also referred to the cover arrangements and interim appointments within Children and Young People's Services and was informed, when asking about whether these were cost neutral, that some of the additional costs would feature in the forecasted overspend for this financial year and only one salary cost for the Director of Safeguarding was being paid. All costs needed to be collated and would be documented in the revenue budget monitoring report to Cabinet, but details would be circulated to the Select Commission for information.

Councillor McNeely noted the numbers of looked after children requiring placements had increased by seven since the start of the financial year and asked if parents were paid to care for their own children and whether the figures included costs the Council was receiving from other Local Authorities' children's placements.

The Deputy Leader confirmed that work was ongoing with the Director of Safeguarding, Children and Families to look at the costs of out of authority placements, particularly in light of the Jay Recommendations.

The Chairman suggested that this be included in a piece of work by a sub-group of the Select Commission and sought nominations.

Resolved:- (1) That the current forecast outturn and the continuing financial challenge for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2014/15 be noted.

(2) That a Sub-Group comprising Councillors Currie, McNeely, Reeder and Whelbourn look at various areas of concern, including out of authority placements and the Housing Revenue Account.

42. CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2014/15 AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET 2015/16 TO 2016/17

Further to Minute No. 105 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th December, 2014 consideration was given to a report presented by Pete Hudson, Chief Finance Officer, which provided details of the current forecast outturn for the 2014/15 programme and enabled the Council to review the capital programme for the financial years 2015/16 and 2016/17.

The budget process that led to the original Capital Programme for 2014/15 to 2016/17 ensured that the Council's capital investment plans were aligned with its strategic priorities and vision for Rotherham.

In order to maintain that strategic link, and make best use of the capital resources available to the Council, it was important that this programme was kept under regular review and where necessary revisions made. This programme was last reviewed in September, 2014, and had now been the subject of a further review, the results of which were reflected in the Directorate summary table presented as part of the report. A detailed analysis of the programme for each Directorate was attached as part of the report.

The financial implications of the Programme were reflected in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Treasury Management and Investment Strategy.

This updated programme had been prepared in light of the capital resources known to be available to the Council over these financial years and estimated on a prudent basis.

The Council was continuing to undertake a comprehensive review of its assets and buildings portfolio, with the aim to rationalise both its operational and non-operational asset holdings, which may contribute both a future capital receipt and a revenue saving.

The Chairman suggested that consideration be given to an all Member Seminar on the Corporate Plan Priorities and the Capital Programme and how the two married together.

Councillor Ellis referred to the Capital Strategy and the associated spend and asked that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board give some consideration to review the extent of the delegation of powers to officers.

The Deputy Leader confirmed that consideration was being given to capital and the budget setting process with officers and in particular the Capital Strategy. Approvals were being put in place for capital projects and options available and this could be undertaken in conjunction with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Councillor Whelbourn referred to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions and how it did not appear to be working as effective as it should be. Discussion had taken place at other meetings as to how it was being under-utilised and this was confirmed by the Deputy Leader who reiterated the powers of the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as part of the Access to Information Rules.

Councillor Ellis requested additional information for the report moving forward to identify which projects were on time and on budget. Officers confirmed this could be incorporated into future reports.

Councillor Ellis also sought further information on the detail of the new integrated housing management I.T. system and the programme for implementation of Phases 1 and 2 were outlined. This complex project had taken six dedicated staff to implement and once complete would give significant improvement to all systems for rents, repairs, estate management and integrated financial data. It was envisaged that all phases would be complete by the end of 2015.

Services were being delivered by the current system, but there was limited control of rent data. The implementation of the new system would completely replace the current system. A short briefing paper on the new I.T. system and where there may be gaps of information would be provided as per the request by Councillor Ellis.

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

(2) That the updated 2014/15 to 2016/17 Capital Programme be noted, in particular the following major additions to the Capital Programme and supplementary approvals to existing schemes:-

- New Central Primary School, Eldon Road. (Additional cost of £1.050m, Minute F5 Cabinet Member for Children and Education Services, 16th September 2014).
- Rawmarsh St. Mary's PRU (Cost of £0.069m. Works approved by the former Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services, Joyce Thacker, 23rd July 2014).
- Thrybergh Country Park Phased Improvements (Cost of £0.136m. Works approved by the Director of Internal Audit and Asset Management, Colin Earl, 5th November 2014 and reported to CSART, 27th November 2014).
- Aston, Aughton and Swallownest Phase 2 Drainage Works (Cost of £0.145m. Grant funding allocated by the Environment Agency.).
- Bailey House Renovation project (Additional cost of £0.034m approved by CSART, 23rd October 2014. Original project approval, Minute C34 Cabinet, 21st July 2010).

Where not funded by grant or by the service, the revenue implications from these schemes has been built into the Council's MTFs assumptions.

(3) That an all Member Seminar be arranged in due course looking at the Corporate Plan Priorities and the relationship with the Capital Programme.

(4) That Overview and Scrutiny Management Board give some consideration to review the extent of the delegation of powers to officers.

(5) That additional information be incorporated into the report identifying which projects were on time and on budget.

(6) That a briefing note be provided on the new integrated housing management I.T. system.

43. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006) (information relating to financial and business affairs of any particular person).

44. HOUSING RENT INCREASE 2015-16

Consideration was given to a report presented by Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, and Mark Scarrott, Finance Manager, which detailed the proposed housing rent, new build rents, garage rent and communal facilities increases for 2015/16 to go

forward for consultation, and subject to the outcome of that consultation to be presented at Cabinet for decision.

It was noted that wherever possible the Council had sought to restrain annual charge increases and Rotherham rents still ranked as some of the lowest in the country. Since 2002/03 DCLG had, however, required all local authorities to use a prescribed formula to calculate each tenants rent and to apply annual increases to actual rents to achieve the Formula Rent (Formula Rent was the rent set under rent restructuring). The formula rent from April 2015 had been revised and would now be linked to Consumer Price Index (CPI) which was consistent with other inflation measures used in policy by the Government including benefits and pensions. Applying this new formula for 2015/16 produced an average rent increase for Council tenants of 2.2%.

The Government expected that all similar properties in the same local area would have equitable rent levels, even if properties were owned by different social landlords. This process was known as 'rent convergence'. The Government set a target for authorities to achieve rent convergence by 2015/16. However, changes to the rent formula had removed the flexibility to increase rents by an additional £2 above the increase in formula rent where rent was below convergence, therefore, 2014/15 was the final year to achieve full convergence. Rents in Rotherham would not have reached full convergence.

The average rent for 2014/15 was £72.79 over 52 weeks. The proposed 2015/16 average weekly rent using the new Government formula, collected over 52 weeks would rise to £74.39, an average increase of £1.60 per week.

Total housing rent income generated through the proposed revised weekly rents was estimated to be £79.558m in 2015/16 assuming 120 Right to Buy sales, and voids and rent adjustments at 1.8%.

The Council completed the building of 132 new energy efficient properties in 2011/12. For these dwellings, the funding model assumed that rents would be aligned to the Council's existing rent structure based on these dwellings having a higher property value (than existing stock). These rents were assumed to be fully converged and were, therefore, set higher than those of the existing Council stock. Consequently the proposed average rent to be charged across these properties would be £96.40 over 52 weeks based on the new rent formula an increase of £1.93 per week.

Councillor Whelbourn, in considering the detail provided, expressed his concern at how rents for two similar properties could be different following tenant turnover and was advised that this was a recommended approach by Government following a property becoming vacant.

Councillor Ellis asked if any penalties could be imposed by the Government for not reaching convergence following the revising to the formulae and it was pointed out that the purpose of self financing determination was to give local authorities the resources, incentives and flexibility they needed to manage their own housing stock for the long term and give tenants greater transparency and accountability as to how the rent collected was spent on the services provided.

Councillor Ellis also asked if the thirty year business plan detailed any further strategic acquisitions to add to the Council house stock or if there was any way the new properties could be exempt from the right to buy scheme.

The Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods confirmed the receipt of two right to buy applications, but the conditions of sale were such that the capital expenditure on properties were to be recouped within a set timeline. Rotherham had not considered any options to transfer its housing stock to a housing trust like the model used in Selby, but it may well be something to consider for the future.

Councillor McNeely pointed out that the shortfall in housing rent could significantly alter/affect the thirty year business plan and was informed that the thirty year business plan had been refreshed to take into account the changes to the rent formula and investment plans to give indicative income and expenditure for the short, medium and long term. Key to the original Business Plan was the requirement to ensure that rents converge by the Government's target by 2015/16 and increase in line with national guidelines. Changes to the formula rent from April 2015 would mean that the Council would now not meet rent convergence which would result in lower levels of income and, therefore, impact on the investment plans within the HRA Business Plan.

Due to historical decisions to limit rent increases, Rotherham's rents were not scheduled to reach full convergence until 2016/17 on the existing formula. Under the new formula, Rotherham would receive approximately £4m less income than planned under the convergence process. This shortfall would obviously be compounded over future years within the 30 year Business Plan, and would have a significant effect on the previously predicted surpluses within the plan. Government guidance stated that where properties have not reached formula rent by April 2015 it was expected that the rent is moved up to formula rent when the property was re-let following vacancy. On average 1800 properties were re-let each year, adopting this policy would generate additional income of approximately £172k in 2015/16 and the Council were keen to look at this.

Councillor Reeder also asked about the right to buy rules for new properties and was informed that any tenant had the right to submit an application. There were no plans to buy back former Council houses from former tenants.

Resolved:- That the recommendations to the Cabinet Member on Monday, 12th January, 2015 be noted:-

- An average dwelling rent increase of 2.2% in accordance with Central Governments (DCLG) Rent Formula which results in an average increase of £1.60 per week collected over 52 weeks.
- An average rent of £96.40 for new build (energy efficient) council properties.
- That rents are set at formula rent when the property is re-let after vacancy.
- An increase in line with the Consumer Price Index of 1.2% for garage rents, communal facilities and the cooking gas charge.
- Note the draft Housing Revenue Account Budget for 2015/16.

(Councillors Currie Cutts, Ellis, McNeely, Reeder, Sharman, Wallis, Whelbourn and Wyatt declared personal interests on the grounds that they were or had family or friends who were Council tenants)

45. DISTRICT HEATING SCHEME CHARGES 2015-16

Consideration was given to a report presented by Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, and Mark Scarrott, Finance Manager, which detailed the proposed increase in charges for District Heating for 2015/16.

There were a range of heating schemes, but in general district heating charges were made up of two components, a weekly charge and a metered charge per kilowatt hour of heating used. Weekly charges for most schemes exceed the actual metered costs and hence 34% of all income received from weekly charges were returned to customers.

This report recommended an increase in kilowatt hour charges to more accurately reflect true costs. The impact of this on consumers of district heating was that some consumers would receive less of a rebate once actual personal charges have been calculated following individual meter readings.

The Chairman asked if there were any tenants suffering with fuel poverty and the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods Services confirmed there were significant problems with rent and would come back with further information on this.

Resolved:- (1) That the recommendations to the Cabinet Member on Monday, 12th January, 2015 be noted:-

- That there be no increase in the weekly charge for a further year.
- That the various proposed increases to the kilowatt hour charges outlined in Section 7 of this report be approved as a means of achieving full cost recovery.

- That to assist tenants, increases in the kilowatt hour charge be phased, as agreed at Cabinet on 16th January, 2013 (Minute C131(3)) and be achieved by 2016/17.

(2) That further information be provided on the fuel poverty/rent difficulties being experienced by some Council tenants.

46. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 19th February, 2015, at 3.30 p.m. at the Town Hall.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
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 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 led 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
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.

78. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

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

There were no issues referred for call-in.

80. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

81. 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 Barnados 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 to 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. 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 an 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 – A detailed answer 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-referral. 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 it is 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.

82. 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.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
26th November, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Gilding, Gosling, Sims and Whelbourn, together with co-opted member Mr. B. Walker.

Also in attendance : Councillor Beck (Cabinet Member for Business Growth and Regeneration) and Councillor Godfrey (Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods).

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Foden), Councillors Cowles, Finnie and Roche and from co-opted members Miss P. Copnell and Mrs. L. Shears.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

34. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

35. COMMUNICATIONS

Further to Minute No. 4 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 18th June, 2014, it was noted that the scrutiny review of dampness and condensation in Council housing properties is to be temporarily suspended. Members will be informed, at a future meeting, of the eventual continuation of this scrutiny review.

36. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15TH OCTOBER 2014

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

37. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

Further to Minute No. 34 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 27th November, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Senior Planner, summarising the progress on the preparation of Rotherham's Community Infrastructure Levy including the current consultation on a Draft Charging Schedule. Details of the Draft Charging Schedule were included in a separate document appended to the report.

The report highlighted the following subjects:-

- the Local Plan Core Strategy is now in place;
- definition of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- the continuing, though limited, future use of 'Section 106' agreements;
- recommended CIL rates, based on the ability of development to pay (a table of the various rates was included within the submitted report);
- the proportion of CIL able to be transferred to Town and Parish Councils;
- details of Rotherham's proposed Regulation 123 List for CIL (this Regulation requires local authorities to publish a list of infrastructure schemes to be funded from CIL);
- summary of responses to the consultation on a Draft Charging Schedule;
- CIL Regulations will come into force on 1st April, 2015;
- CIL funding will enable match-funding to be obtained for certain schemes;

Members discussed the following items:-

- Section 106 funding will continue alongside the CIL funding;
- definitions of certain developments (eg: industrial and retail uses, sometimes with car parking provision included);
- 'pooled' contributions (eg: towards the development of a new school), often including existing Section 106 agreements;
- there will be no time limits imposed in respect of the use of CIL funding;
- Town and Parish Councils being able to 'pool' their CIL contributions together, for the benefit of a wider area;
- use of CIL funding for the provision and maintenance of amenity open space;
- use of CIL for improvements to local infrastructure (e.g.: highway junctions) which may not necessarily be located within the same area of the Borough as the related development which is receiving the planning permission.

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

(2) That the progress being made with the preparation of Rotherham's Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule, including current consultation on a Draft Charging Schedule, as now reported, be noted.

(3) That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission detailing the proposed list of schemes to be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

38. CITY REGIONS UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 31 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 15th October, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager, providing additional information about the Sheffield City Region. Appended to the report was a briefing note about the role and work of the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority. Members also noted that a Council seminar had taken place on Tuesday, 25th November, 2014, about the Sheffield City Region, the Combined Authority and the Local Enterprise Partnership.

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

(2) That issues concerning the Sheffield City Region, the Combined Authority and the Local Enterprise Partnership shall continue to be considered as part of this Select Commission's work programme for 2014/15.

39. TRANSPORTATION - TRAMS/TRAINS - CURRENT ISSUES

The Select Commission received a presentation from the Transportation and Highways Projects Group Manager concerning the Tram-Train scheme proposed to link Sheffield, Meadowhall, Rotherham and Parkgate.

The presentation and Members' subsequent discussion included the following salient issues:-

- the UK Tram-Train pilot project;
- the reasons for the pilot project (originating from the coalition Government review report of May, 2011) – attempts to be made to improve the country's rail network;
- the proposed running of light rail vehicles on the heavy rail network – a system which is widely used on the continent;
- the Tram-Train route from Parkgate and Rotherham to Sheffield;
- connecting networks – Sheffield – Meadowhall – Rotherham - Parkgate;
- the tram-train vehicles will have almost the same appearance and livery as an existing Supertram (and will also display advertisements);
- modifications to signals and to the Rotherham Central railway station (including bridge height alterations at College Road); this scheme may begin during late 2015;
- the separate study of the limitations caused by the single track railway at Holmes Chord, serving the Rotherham Central railway station;
- alterations to the existing rail network, including the laying of sections of new rail track;
- the proposed electrification of the rail network between Doncaster and Sheffield (although funding for such work has not yet been confirmed);

- the first vehicle is expected to arrive for commissioning at the Sheffield depot during 2015 (the vehicles are being manufactured in Spain); although an element of delay is anticipated;
- funding contributions from local authorities and from Network Rail and Network Supertram;
- park-and-ride provision – which are not included within the pilot project and there are no formal plans for such a facility being provided at Parkgate;
- the provision of a new Tram-Track platform at Parkgate;
- the possibility of a new Tram-Track stop being constructed in the area near to the Magna Centre;
- the likely impact of the proposed HS2 high-speed rail system;
- the age of the current rail vehicles serving South Yorkshire;
- improvements required to the rail network serving the Dearne area;
- Members asked that details of the funding of the project be obtained from the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (including the estimated cost of passenger fares);
- cycles (other than folding bikes) will not be permitted to be carried within the new Tram-Train vehicles;
- the impact of the coalition Government's 'One North' project which aims to improve the transport links between the principal cities in the North of England (e.g.: the HS3 railway project).

Resolved:- That the details of the proposed Tram-Train scheme be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
25th November, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors Atkin, Clark, Currie, Godfrey, Gosling, Jepson, Kaye, Middleton, Read, Reeder, Sansome, Sharman, Sims and Smith.

SHEFFIELD CITY REGION ARRANGEMENTS.

Councillor D. Beck, Cabinet Member for Business Growth and Regeneration, welcomed Paul Woodcock, Simeon Leach, Lee Viney (Environment and Development Services Directorate Officers) and David Hewitt (Sheffield City Region) to the seminar. The Officers had prepared a presentation that consisted of three separate sections: -

1. New and current funding;
2. Economic priorities and growth plan;
3. Infrastructure – Sheffield City Region / Local Economic Partnership / Combined Authority.

1. New and current funding: -

- EU 2007-2013 Programme;
- EU JESSICA (ERDF) 2007-2013;
- National Regional Growth Fund: -
 - 6 Rounds since 2011 amounting to £3.2b in total;
 - Rounds 1 – 5 saw 430 projects supported at a total cost of £906m;
 - Round 6 had £200m available;
 - 14 Yorkshire and Humberside projects had secured £68m of funding;
 - Sheffield City Region unlocking business investment - £100k available to businesses to create a minimum of five jobs;
 - Council investment, including R-evolution (Harworth Estates) whereby the Council used its ability to borrow to stimulate speculative development.
- Sheffield City Region Investment Fund (SCRIF) – local growth deal: -
 - A framework of funding streams to deliver essential strategic infrastructure to increase economic growth and jobs in the Sheffield City Region;
 - Currently, there were 16 prioritised projects, including the Lower Don Valley infrastructure linked to Waverley and the AMP in Rotherham.
- European Union 2014-2020 funding programme: -
 - Approximately £177m for South Yorkshire;
 - There were calls for proposals – similar to current process but developed by the LEP groups;

- An endorsement was required before bidding.
- Local growth deals: -
 - Provide funds to LEPs for projects that benefit the local area and economy. Current areas of focus included: - Transport, Employment and Housing Sites, Better Skills (e.g. British Glass Academy), Business Support.
- Infrastructure Investment Plan (SCRIF): -
 - Will identify funding requirements for growth projects, infrastructure and consultancy-based.

Discussion followed and the following questions were raised: -

- What were the funding arrangements post-Yorkshire Forward? The funding picture had changed substantially since Yorkshire Forward was closed down and, in the main, less funding was available. Most of the new financial instruments were looking to be via the City Region and/or LEP route. Some funding had been accessed directly by businesses (e.g. Regional Growth Fund) or by the Council (e.g. Portas Pilot, HLF);
- Was there an appropriate skill-set in the local area to fill the new jobs that were going to be created? - Sheffield City Region's Plan was for 70,000 extra jobs. Locally in Rotherham the emerging plan was to create an extra 10,000. Assessment would be undertaken to assess the best opportunities and sectors to develop or introduce in Rotherham;
- The Sector used a large number of abbreviations;
- The vital importance of apprentices to the local area;
- Were the local jobs being created being filled by local people?

2. Economic priorities and growth plan: -

- The Council's Corporate Plan's Priority One was 'Stimulating the local economy and helping local people into work';
- Rotherham's Growth Plan detailed the sustainable growth of Rotherham's economy between 2015-2025: -
 - More private sector jobs;
 - More new businesses;
 - Themes included transport, housing, skills for employment and social inclusion;
 - Increased productivity/GVA (currently 83% of national average);
 - Signed up to by all Rotherham Stakeholders;
 - Feeds into and complements the SCR Strategic Economic Plan;
 - Use as a "bidding document" for external funding;
 - Agrees outcomes and outputs to measure progress against;
 - The draft Plan would undergo consultation and would be agreed by the LSP and the Council.

Discussion followed and the following questions were raised: -

- Was there enough capacity within the Service to achieve the Corporate Plan Priority? - It was highlighted that Economic Development in itself was not a statutory duty and therefore the amount of resources to put into this area was a matter of Council Policy and rested with Members to determine. In terms of the current resources, they were much smaller than in previous years (especially during Objective 1 and YF) and were at around half the levels of 4-5 years ago;
- What was in place to ensure the additional jobs created were at a higher skill level? - This was part of the economic plan and there was an objective and an aim, for example, the AMP.
- How was the finance divided? - It was explained that this was a difficult point to address as finance came from various angles, such as via Government directly to companies in the case of RGF.

3. Infrastructure Sheffield City Region / Local Economic Partnership / Combined Authority: -

- The **Sheffield City Region** consisted of nine South Yorkshire and Derbyshire authorities;
- It was charged with economic development, business support, general devolution and decentralisation.
- The **Combined Authority** consisted of the nine Leaders from the areas and constituted the accountable body for all public funds;
- It was the legal statutory body that ensured good governance and political leadership at the Sheffield City Region level, and also held the finance;
- It had a narrow economic focus and was not a 'super council'. Attempts to refer to the Combined Authority as a super council should be resisted as it gave an inaccurate picture.
- The **Local Economic Partnership** led on the economic growth agenda, including jobs and growth across the Sheffield City Region;
- The South Yorkshire LEP was one of the first wave of LEPs;
- It constituted a genuine private and public sector partnership;
- Board comprised of 19 members: a private sector Chair; 10 business representatives and 9 Council Leaders;
- SCR Sector Groups were a key mechanism for business engagement (including the Manufacturing Forum).

Discussion followed and the following questions were raised: -

- What were the Governance and Audit arrangements for the Sheffield City Region? - Only one delegation had been made to the Transport Committee, all other decisions were taken by the full

body of nine Leaders. The Combined Authority had statutory finance posts within its structure;

- The recent discussions in the media following the Scotland Independence Referendum regarding greater powers being held by the local regions, including additional Metropolitan Mayors being created;
- Did the Combined Authority, Sheffield City Region or the Local Economic Partnership have recognition within the European Union? – The European Union did not recognise LEPs in their constitution.

Councillor Beck thanked all of those in attendance and also thanked the Officers for their informative presentations and contribution to the discussion.

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

(2) That the slides from the seminar be circulated to all Elected Members along with further information about the Governance and Audit arrangements of the infrastructure.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
3rd December, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Doyle, Middleton, Vines and Wyatt.

APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Consideration was given to an application for employment for the post of Interim Director of Public Health.

Following a thorough process of consideration of work experience and questions by Panel Members including contributions by the Leader of the Opposition, it was agreed that the position of Interim Director of Public Health not be filled.

Resolved:- (1) That the position of Interim Director of Public Health not be filled.

(2) That further options for filling of the post be pursued, as agreed with Public Health England

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
9th December, 2014**

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors Astbury, Atkin, Clark, Currie, Dalton, Doyle, Ellis, Godfrey, Gosling, Johnston, Kaye, Lelliott, Pitchley, Roche, Sansome, Sharman, Steele, Swift, Turner, Watson and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Lakin, McNeely and Reeder.

CARE ACT (2014) UPDATE.

Councillor Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, welcomed Shona McFarlane (Director of Health and Wellbeing) and Nigel Parr (Development Service Manager) who gave a presentation about aspects of the Care Act 2014. The presentation and subsequent discussion highlighted the following salient issues: -

- The new legislation represents the most significant policy change, for adult social care, in the last 60 years;
- Changes will be made to the eligibility criteria (national eligibility criteria; people to remain living at home for as long as possible; a carers' eligibility criteria will also apply);
- Changes to financial framework ("care cap" cost of £72,000 per individual; Universal deferred payments scheme; non-payment; capacity of individual to make decision based on finances; local authorities to help individuals maintain their own 'care account');
- Move to information, advice and prevention – the duty for local authorities and partner organisations to provide advice and information (there is much information and guidance is already available from Central Government);
- Reablement and enablement – so that people receive assistance at an early stage;
- Emphasis on prevention (community capacity);
- Increase in carers' profile and rights to receive services; funding of carers' budgets; self-funders will be entitled to access support at local authority rates (further details are awaited);
- Safeguarding and the defined membership of the Adult Safeguarding Boards;
- Provider failure - Care Quality Commission regulatory activity;

- The Care Act 2014 replaces some existing legislation (eg NHS and Community Care Act 1990) and the majority of those previous statutory provisions are being incorporated into the new legislation;
- Financial pressures on the local authority – increased number of assessments to be completed, in addition to more carers' assessments; local authorities to receive the New Burdens Grant;
- Local authorities shall facilitate independent financial advice; more emphasis on advocacy;
- Disability Living Allowance – the impact upon an individual's finances;
- Scrutiny of finances (both local authority budgets and the management of care accounts);
- The impact of some care providers which charge 'top-up' fees;
- Key risks include the ICT infrastructure of the local authority, as well as the financial pressures;
- Timescales
 - January-March 2015 training and awareness-raising;
 - April 2015 - deferred payments information and advice; new assessments; carers' assessments
 - October 2015 - preparation for the implementation of the care accounts;
 - April 2016 - care accounts to be implemented;
- Carers of children with a disability – working alongside Children's Services to ensure individuals have a smooth transition to adult services (and avoiding duplication with adult services);
- ICT infrastructure – discussions with Northgate (the adult services' computer software system provider to this Authority).

Members of the Council will continue to receive briefing papers about the implementation of the Care Act 2014 and a further seminar will take place during March 2015.

The Officers were thanked for the informative presentation.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
12th December, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Hoddinott, Hussain, Steele and Vines.

APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

Consideration was given to applications for employment for the post of Interim Strategic Director of Resources.

Following a thorough process of consideration of work experience and questions by Panel Members including contributions by the Leader of the Opposition, it was unanimously agreed that Mr. Stuart Booth, currently the Council's Director of Finance, be offered the appointment on the basis of his experience, demonstrated competencies and vision for the role of the Strategic Director of Resources.

The permanent position of Strategic Director of Resources attracted an annual salary of £113,384 and, therefore, required the approval of Council. However it was noted that this full amount would not be earned due to the interim nature of the role.

Resolved:- That Mr. Stuart Booth be appointed Interim Strategic Director of Resources initially for a six month period.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
17th December, 2014

Present:- Councillor Dalton (in the Chair); Councillors
The Mayor (Councillor John Foden) and Havenhand.

**CLUB/PREMISES CERTIFICATE (LICENSING ACT 2003) - NAUTICAL
DECADES (FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE BRIDGE BAR), DUN
STREET, SWINTON**

Further to a Minute of the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 12th October, 2012, consideration was given to an application to vary a premises licence, under the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of the premises known as Nautical Decades, Dun Street, Swinton (premises which were formerly known as the Bridge Bar).

The Licensing Authority received representations from a local Ward Councillor, which were not withdrawn and the Sub-Committee considered those representations.

The Sub-Committee noted that the objector had requested deferment of the hearing to enable him to obtain a response to his Freedom of Information request made to the South Yorkshire Police. This request for deferment was notified to the representative for the applicant, who declined to agree to any deferment in advance of the hearing.

Prior to the commencement of the hearing, the applicant's representative stated his intention to make an audio-recording of the proceedings under the "The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014". The objector requested an adjournment, explaining that he required time to seek legal advice in relation to the question of the audio recording of the hearing.

He also explained that the Freedom of Information request to South Yorkshire Police had been made in order to obtain information relating to the subject premises which would assist him with his representation. As the South Yorkshire Police were unable to respond to this request until January 2015, he requested a postponement of the hearing for 28 days. The applicant's representative replied that he did not agree to an adjournment.

Members formally considered, in private, the request for the adjournment of the hearing on both grounds and concluded that no adjournment would be allowed because "The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014" clearly state that the recording of public meetings should be allowed to take place. Members concluded that no adjournment should take place on the grounds of delays following requests for further information made to the Police about the premises as the Licensing hearing Regulations did not appear to provide for an adjournment in such

circumstances. Furthermore, as the Police had not objected to the application, the Freedom of Information request would be unlikely to produce any useful material to support the objection. In addition, an adjournment would prejudice the applicant in that the determination of his application would be delayed. The objector left the hearing room at this point in the proceedings.

The hearing proceeded and Members heard from the applicant's representatives only. The Sub-Committee noted the amendments to the application in the form of a reduction of the hours previously applied for and as agreed with South Yorkshire Police and with the Council's Community Protection Unit.

The applicant did formally request that the condition "The licence holder shall ensure that Mr. Brett Jones is specifically excluded from any involvement with the management and running of the premises" shall be removed from the licence, as part of the premises licence variation process.

The Sub-Committee also noted the attempts made by the applicant's representative to contact and mediate with the objector, as encouraged within the Licensing legislation.

Resolved:- That the application for the variation of the premises licence for the premises known as Nautical Decades, Dun Street, Swinton (formerly known as the Bridge Bar) be approved as follows:-

- (a) To amend the hours for Regulated Entertainment, Late Night Refreshment and the Sale of Alcohol on Friday and Saturday, Christmas Eve, Boxing Day, the Sunday of a Bank Holiday weekend and any other day appointed to be a Bank Holiday, to 02.00 hours the following morning;
- (b) To amend the premises' opening hours on Friday and Saturday, Christmas Eve, Boxing Day, the Sunday of a Bank Holiday weekend and any other day appointed to be a Bank Holiday, to 02.30 hours the following morning; and
- (c) To remove from the premises licence the condition which states 'The licence holder shall ensure that Mr. Brett Jones is specifically excluded from any involvement with the management and running of the premises'.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
23rd December, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, Doyle, Hoddinott, Middleton and Steele.

APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

Following the retirement of the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services it was necessary to consider interim arrangements to cover the statutory role of Director of Adult Social Services whilst arrangements were made for a permanent replacement.

Consideration was given to an internal appointment to the post and following a thorough process of consideration of work experience and questions by Panel Members, including contributions by the Leader of the Opposition, it was unanimously agreed that Ms. Shona McFarlane, currently the Council's Director of Health and Wellbeing, be offered the appointment on the basis of her experience and demonstrated competencies.

Resolved:- That Ms Shona McFarlane be appointed Interim Director of Adult Social Services initially for a six month period.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
23rd December, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, Doyle, Hoddinott, Middleton and Steele.

INTERIM DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Following the retirement of the Director of Public Health it was necessary to consider interim arrangements to cover the post whilst arrangements were made for a permanent replacement.

Consideration was given to enter into a shared arrangement with Doncaster Council to enable Mr. Tony Baxter, the current Director of Public Health in Doncaster, to cover both the Rotherham and Doncaster Director posts.

Following a process of consideration of work experience and questions by Panel Members, including contributions by the Leader of the Opposition, it was unanimously agreed that Mr. Baxter be the appointed (shared) Director of Public Health on the basis of his experience and demonstrated competencies.

Resolved:- That Mr. Tony Baxter be the appointed Interim Director of Public Health until 31st March, 2015.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
24th December, 2014

Present:- Councillor Dalton (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley and N. Hamilton.

CLUB/PREMISES CERTIFICATE (LICENSING ACT 2003) - THE KINGFISHER PUBLIC HOUSE, 17 MARY STREET, ROTHERHAM

The Sub-Committee considered an application and certificate, submitted by South Yorkshire Police, for the interim steps which could be taken pending the full review hearing on Thursday 15th January, 2015 for the premises licence in respect of the premises known as the Kingfisher public house, 17 Mary Street, Rotherham. It was noted that the Licensing Act 2003 had been amended by the Violent Crime Reduction Act, 2006, with the insertion of Section 53A and Section 53B, which enabled the Police to instigate a fast track review of a premises licence where the Police considered that licensed premises may be associated with serious crime, or serious disorder, or both.

Accordingly, the Licensing Authority received representations from the South Yorkshire Police which were not withdrawn and the Sub-Committee considered those representations.

The Sub-Committee heard representations from Chief Inspector I. Womersley of South Yorkshire Police and from the solicitor for the Old Mill Brewery (the premises licence holder), as well as from the Designated Premises Supervisor of the Kingfisher public house. Those present also viewed CCTV footage of an incident which had taken place outside the premises in the early hours of Saturday morning, 20th December 2014.

Members were informed that the premises had been a cause for concern for South Yorkshire Police and its partner organisations for some time, with intelligence being gathered about the premises being linked to drugs and sexual activity. Information also linked some patrons at the premises with organised crime in the Sheffield area. A serious incident had taken place whereby a customer, having been refused service by the Designated Premises Supervisor, had started a fight with other customers at the premises. The Police attended in response to this incident and later questioned the level of co-operation of the Designated premises Supervisor. Members also heard that the premises had been the subject of a number of Action Plans and several visits from the Police Licensing Enforcement Officer and partner agencies to try and bring the premise into line. This approach had achieved some measure of success.

The Sub-Committee heard from the solicitor representing the premises licence holder who was of the view that the incident that had taken place (20 December) was not of such a serious nature as to warrant an expedited review of the premises licence. Any links to organised crime, referred to by the Police, were not established with the Kingfisher pub.

Members heard from the Designated Premises Supervisor relating to the incident at the pub and his level of co-operation with the Police investigation.

The Sub-Committee also took into consideration the Police CCTV evidence, which they viewed before making a decision.

The Sub-Committee gave due consideration to this expedited review of the Kingfisher public house premises licence, with specific reference to these licensing objectives: public safety; the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance. Members took particular account of the particular local situation of the premises relating to the area, location and geography and the serious nature of the crime and disorder which had taken place at the premises.

Resolved:- That, after due consideration of the application for expedited review and to the representations submitted, the premises licence for the premises known as the Kingfisher public house, 17 Mary Street, Rotherham, shall be suspended with immediate effect and until the full review of the premises licence has been determined in line with timescales laid down in the Licensing Act 2003.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
6th January, 2015

Present:- Councillor Hussain (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Beaumont, Clark, Cutts, Dalton, Doyle, Ellis, Godfrey, Gosling, J. Hamilton, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Kaye, Lakin, McNeely, Pitchley, Read, Rushforth, Sansome, Sims, Swift, Watson, Whelbourn, Wootton and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hoddinott, Reeder and Reynolds.

WINTER WEATHER RESPONSE

Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment, welcomed David Burton (Director of Streetpride), Stephen Finley (Principal Officer, Highways Maintenance), Colin Knight (Highways Network Manager), Adrian Gabriel (Principal Officer, Waste Manager) and Mandy Atkinson (Communications and Media Manager) who gave a presentation about the Council's response to the severe Winter weather conditions which occurred during the period from 26th to 31st December, 2014. The presentation highlighted the following salient issues: -

(a) Council Policy

Local authorities have a statutory duty (Highways Act 1980 and Traffic Management Act 2004) "to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that safe passage along a highway is not endangered by snow or ice." This Council's Winter maintenance plan is reviewed and re-published annually. The priority is to grit principal roads and other key routes within four hours. Previous years' experience has shown the importance of keeping the principal roads (mainly the 'A' roads) gritted in order to keep traffic moving. Other smaller, estate roads would be gritted afterwards. There is also a policy for the provision and distribution of salt bins around the Borough area.

(b) Winter Maintenance Budget

The current, annual revenue budget is £465,000 (funding the use of the gritting vehicles and the workforce placed on stand-by for Winter maintenance duties). This budget amount does not fund the cost of the rock salt, nor the cost of the workforce actually undertaking the gritting and Winter maintenance. There is consequently a £400,000 average deficit, as the average annual cost of Winter maintenance is some £875,000. The Winter maintenance reserve funding is contained within the Council's general financial reserves.

(c) Winter Maintenance Service

This out-of-hours service operates annually from November until March, including during the statutory holiday periods. Details of the workforce

were noted and there are ten gritting routes served by twelve gritting vehicles, two of which are spare vehicles. In order to comply with Driver's Hours Regulations, there are 40 drivers on a scheduled rota to ensure that vehicles can be deployed two hours per day, if necessary

(d) Weather Forecast and Gritting/Salting Operations

The Council subscribes to the 'MetDesk' Weather Forecast service and obtains the seasonal weather forecasts for the wider region (2-5 days forecasting), as well as a daily forecast specifically for the Rotherham Borough area. The daily forecast is provided at around 12.00 noon.

On Boxing Day, Friday 26th December 2014, the original daily forecast had detailed Wintry showers and rain, with cold temperatures overnight into Saturday 27th December. At 1800 hours on Friday 26th December, an updated forecast was provided by 'MetDesk', warning of the heavy fall of laying snow in two hours' time.

Officers reported on the gritting and salting operations which had been undertaken at that time. It was noted that the heavy rain had hampered the gritting operations, as the rain washes away the rock salt, thus reducing its effectiveness upon the highway surface. Overnight gritting operations focused on the strategic routes (which amount to some 14%-15% of the Borough's highway network) to try and ensure that these routes remained passable by vehicles.

From the morning of Saturday 27th December 2014, the precautionary gritting of highways continued (50% of the highway network). Later on the Saturday and also on Sunday 28th December, the Streetpride workforce dealt with enquiries from the general public and gritting took place on the non-principal road network as well as on the community/estate roads.

From Monday 29th December onwards, requests from the general public were responded to only on a priority basis, because the workforce provided support for the waste collection rounds and also replenished the contents of the grit/salt bins situated around the Borough area. The Emergency Services had asked for one vehicle to be freed (from Delves Lane, Wales) and every effort was made to ensure that routes to hospitals remained passable. Other reports and requests were dealt with on a reactive basis, generally within 24 hours. By New Year's Eve, Wednesday, 31st December 2014, the snow was already thawing. The very cold temperatures had continued and the further gritting of routes was therefore necessary. There was no indication of specific problems experienced by the bus companies, although some buses had been taken off their routes.

(e) Communications

The Council's on-call media officer took the first media call at around 7.00 am on the morning of Saturday 27th December 2014. The communications response started at that point, in liaison with key officers and with Cabinet Member. Over the period of the disruption, communications included:-

- Updates about key services (gritting / refuse) on the Council's website - including activation of the emergency banner which appears on every page and links to key information;
- Regular e-mail updates for all Members throughout the weekend on gritting issues;
- Updates on the Council's corporate Twitter account – including answering customer queries, in liaison with relevant officers;
- Out-of-hours media service and regular media updates – press releases agreed with key officers and Cabinet Members and distributed to all Elected Members.

It was noted that since the last severe weather event, the use of social media has grown significantly and this has posed new challenges within available resources, including dealing with a high number of customer enquiries and complaints via the Council's Twitter account. It was noted that some other local authorities allocate more resources dedicated to managing social media communications. Key officers would meet with the Cabinet Member to review the communications approach in relation to severe weather response, to identify where improvements could be made in the future. The discussion noted the importance of also addressing the public's perception of what is happening, as well as the reality of service delivery.

(f) Supply of Rock Salt

At the beginning of the Winter season, a supply of 5,000 tonnes of rock salt is stored in the salt barn at Hellaby (adjacent the M18 motorway). In addition, there is a reserve of a further 1,000 tonnes at Scotch Springs in Maltby. During the period from Friday 26th December, 2014, gritting crews used 1,400 tonnes of rock salt, supplies had reduced to 2,800 tonnes and the store will be re-stocked whenever the amount of rock salt kept at Hellaby reduces to 2,000 tonnes.

(g) Waste Collection

Members received detailed information about the impact of the severe Winter weather upon waste collection rounds during late December. All of the waste collection schedules had been completed, as planned, up to and including Christmas Eve, 24th December 2014. However, the severe weather conditions, including the snowfall on Boxing Day, had a detrimental impact upon the waste collection schedules from Saturday 27th December onwards.

Officers described the difficulties of the weather conditions, all around the Borough area, including icy roads, the limited impact of gritting, refuse vehicles having difficulty gaining access to smaller side roads and manoeuvring around parked vehicles. Initially, in an attempt to catch-up on missed collections, some of the refuse collection vehicles had been required to travel and assist with collection rounds in other parts of the Borough area. This extra travelling time had reduced the amount of time spent on waste collection and the backlog of missed collections was increasing.

By Friday 2nd January, 2015, there was a considerable backlog of missed collections. Senior Elected Members had been asked to approve a recovery plan enabling (i) some of the backlog of waste to be collected during the weekend (3rd and 4th January 2015) and (ii) regular collections to re-commence on Monday 5th January 2015. However, some areas of the Rotherham Borough had not received a waste collection service since before Christmas 2014.

The refuse collection workforce and vehicles continue to be managed carefully in order to reduce the backlog of collection in as short a time as possible.

(h) Collection of Recycled Waste

The pressure on the refuse collection service had necessarily had an impact upon the collection of waste for recycling. There would be an additional collection service for recycled waste on Saturday, 10th January 2015, to try and clear the backlog.

Members raised the following issues during the question and answer session:-

(1) The Council has previously undertaken a scrutiny review of the impact of Winter weather conditions and all of the review recommendations had been accepted (Minute No. C152 of the Cabinet meeting held on 22nd February 2012 refers).

It was confirmed that the Council's Winter maintenance plan is reviewed and re-published annually and that the outcome of the scrutiny review has been used to inform and improve the Winter maintenance services. The Winter maintenance plan operates alongside both the Severe Weather Plan and the Borough Emergency Plan. Principal roads and other key routes within the Borough area are gritted as the first priority. The scrutiny review had advocated the use of community resilience, snow wardens (residents) and co-operation with Parish Councils on snow clearing and gritting footpaths; these arrangements have subsequently been implemented.

(2) Members acknowledged the element of misfortune on Boxing Day, 26th December 2014, when the heavy rain had impaired the effectiveness of gritting operations. There had been some criticism from the public about the apparent absence of rock salt on the highway.

Officers explained that the vehicle's spreading equipment permits a more even spread of rock salt. The modern storage facility at Hellaby ensures that the rock salt is kept at its optimum moisture content. Both of these factors mean that the rock salt is not as visible, after being deposited on the highway, as had been the case in previous years. Vehicles travelling along the A631 Bawtry Road (Bramley/Hellaby) are not always gritting, simply because they are travelling to and from the rock salt store at the Council depot there.

(3) There was criticism of the Council's communications on 3rd, 4th and 5th January 2015 in relation to both refuse collection and the collection of waste for recycling. It was noted that some of the information briefings had not been forwarded to Elected Members in a timely manner. Key officers would meet with the Cabinet Member and review the communications approach in relation to severe weather response, to identify where improvements could be made in the future, including the way in which the social media response might be better resourced.

(4) Salt Bins located around the Borough area – Members asked whether there should be a review of the provision of these road-side bins.

The usefulness of the grit/salt bins was acknowledged, from the point of view of public safety and the perception of safety. However, at the same time there were significant limitations. One such limitation was the budget available to supply the bins and the resources required to keep them replenished with fresh supplies of rock salt. Furthermore, the rock salt was not always used for its intended purpose (spreading on the public highway and footpaths), but instead was sometimes used by residents within their own property. At times, supplies of rock salt had been stolen from the bins. One example cited was at Church Street, Wales, where a funeral had been disrupted by the Winter weather (the area did not have a salt bin). In such cases, it may be possible to make arrangements with the local Parish Council, or snow wardens, for the gritting of smaller roads and footpaths. Officers agreed to affix information notices about the snow warden scheme onto every grit/salt bin.

(5) Members made further comments about the communications process and also about the need to ensure that principal bus routes were gritted (eg: Rawmarsh and Thorogate).

(6) Members referred to the absence of gritting vehicles on certain principal roads (eg: the A633 Warren Vale, Rawmarsh; A629 Wortley Road and Upper Wortley Road). Reference was made to the customer service standards of the out-of-hours telephone response service. It was agreed that this issue should be reviewed. Members were informed of the hazardous conditions experienced on principal roads in other local authority areas (eg: the A630 Sheffield Parkway was closed, the M1

motorway was closed north of Nottinghamshire, the A631 was closed between Gainsborough and Bawtry).

It was reported that only a small number of requests had been received from the emergency services, throughout the severe weather conditions and that there had been no reported problems of patients being unable to attend hospital for important medical appointments.

(7) The importance of clearing the refuse collection backlog, during the next few days, was emphasised.

(8) Members questioned the priority of gritting on certain highways (eg: Glasshouse Lane, Kilnhurst) and on roads serving aged persons' homes. The priority of gritting principal roads and other key routes was once again confirmed. This priority would benefit any aged persons' homes which are situated alongside such roads. It was noted that the vehicle driver has sole responsibility for the gritting vehicle and its safety.

(9) Several Members made reference to specific issues affecting their electoral Wards and it was agreed that the effectiveness of communications and the provision of grit/salt bins should be the subject of review.

Members thanked the officers for their informative presentation. It was agreed that there will be a further review of the Council's Winter maintenance operations at appropriate meetings of Elected Members. All Councillors are to be provided with details of the waste collection recovery plan which had been approved at the beginning of January 2015.

LICENSING BOARD-SUB-COMMITTEE
14th January, 2015

Present:- Councillor Dalton (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Councillors Ellis, McNeely and Parker.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the Police Act 1997 and Paragraphs 3 and 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (business affairs and prevention of crime).

PROPRIETOR'S REQUESTS FOR INDIVIDUAL EXEMPTION TO LICENSED VEHICLE CONDITIONS

Consideration was given to reports, presented by the Licensing Manager, concerning requests from the owners of private hire operating companies for permission not to display (at certain times specified in the requests) the required Licence identification plate and signage on the Companies' licensed vehicles, as required by Section 75(3) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. Permission not to display such signs would constitute an exemption to conditions 3 and 5(2)(a) of the private hire vehicle conditions of licence.

Resolved:- That permission be granted in respect of the following vehicles:-

- (1) Posh Travel (operator : Mr. C. Lawton) – Jaguar XF registration YR63 LDA and Mercedes E350 registration KP10 ZCF (Minute No. 53 of the meeting of the Licensing Board held on 21st March, 2012 refers);
- (2) ABC (operator : Mr. J. France) – Jaguar S Type registration RV54 LKP, soon to change to private registration J5 NDF (Minute No. 28 of the meeting of the Licensing Board held on 14th November, 2012 refers);
- (3) ASAP Executive Travel Ltd., trading as Sheffield Executive (operator : Mr. P. D. Self) – Mercedes E Class Estate registration YB12 FXK (Minute No. 21 of the meeting of the Licensing Board held on 10th October, 2012 refers).

APPLICATIONS FOR THE GRANT/RENEWAL/REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE/PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS' LICENCES

The Sub-Committee of the Licensing Board considered a report, presented by the Licensing Manager, relating to applications for the grant, renewal and review of hackney carriage / private hire drivers' licences in respect of Messrs. T.P.D., N.A., K.K., I.Z.B. and E.Z.Z.

Messrs. T.P.D., N.A., K.K. (with a representative), I.Z.B. and E.Z.Z. (with a representative) attended the meeting and were interviewed by the Sub-Committee. Officers of the Council's Parking Services were also in attendance for discussion of the application relating to Mr. K.K.

During consideration of these matters, Members requested the provision of information from the South Yorkshire Police describing the Police protocol and practice relating to the issue of official cautions to offenders, in order that such details may better inform this Authority's decision making on hackney carriage and private hire licensing matters.

Resolved:- (1) That, further to Minute No. 27(5) of the meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee held on 15th December, 2014, the application for the grant of a hackney carriage/private hire driver's licence in respect of Mr. T.P.D. be approved, he be granted a licence for twelve months and he be issued with a stern written warning as to his future conduct.

(2) That the application for the grant of a hackney carriage/private hire driver's licence in respect of Mr. N.A. be refused.

(3) That the application for the renewal of a hackney carriage/private hire driver's licence in respect of Mr. K.K. be refused.

(4) That, with regard to the review of the hackney carriage/private hire driver's licence in respect of Mr. I.Z.B.:-

(a) the driver's licence be suspended with immediate effect for a period of seven days;

(b) Mr. I.Z.B. be required to undertake a course of training relating to the health and safety of the travelling public and subsequently to provide the Licensing Authority with written evidence of his having satisfactorily completed such training; and

(c) the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Licensing Board be informed of the outcome of the next vehicle inspection/testing of the private hire vehicle licensed to Mr. I.Z.B. (due to take place during May 2015) in order that they may determine whether the matter should be considered further by the Licensing Board (or its Sub-Committee).

(5) That, further to Minute No. 24(2) of the meeting of the Licensing Board Sub-Committee held on 10th December, 2014, the current suspension of the hackney carriage/private hire driver's licence in respect of Mr. E.Z.Z. be confirmed, the review of the suspension be deferred and the matter shall be considered further at a future meeting of this Sub-Committee.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
19th November, 2014**

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Dyson, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Councillor R. Sixsmith, M.B.E.

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Mayor R. Jones, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Councillor J. Sheppard, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Parker
Councillor T. R. Sharman (in the Chair)

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor R. Davison
Councillor T. Hussain
Councillor R. Munn

Co-opted Member:-

Mr. A. J. Carter

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor H. Harpham, Sheffield City Council
Mr. K. Walayat, Co-opted Member

J22. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Questions from members of the public would be incorporated into Minute No. 25 (Lessons Learnt) and will be formulated as part of that item.

J23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 29TH OCTOBER, 2014

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29th October, 2014.

With regards to the Minute No. J20 (Previous Minutes) Councillor Parker referred to the response by the Director of Legal and Democratic Services

about the recording of the confidential decision making session where the Panel adjourned and believed it to be factually incorrect. He had consulted the Legal Department and had been informed that personal notes were taken at the decision making session and were unavailable. He expressed his discontent with the response whilst pointing out that full minutes should have been taken.

With regards to the query as to whether the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel had made contact with the Chief Constable, the Chairman was now in receipt of a full response and the Chief Constable was present today to answer any other queries.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29th October, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

J24. INTRODUCTION TO ALAN BILLINGS, POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER AND WELCOME TO THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

The Chairman welcomed the new Police and Crime Commissioner, Alan Billings, to the meeting and extended an invitation for him to attend all future meetings of the Police and Crime Panel, along with the Chief Constable.

The Police and Crime Commissioner welcomed the opportunity to start afresh from the events that led to him becoming elected and to becoming more acquainted with the expectations of the Panel. He looked forward to establishing a good working relationship where frank and open discussion could take place. His aim was to re-establish the trust between the public and the Police Force and for this to be addressed, together with the Chief Constable.

He was very clear in his vision for putting the victims of child sexual exploitation first, whilst understanding what had gone wrong in the past and how this was going to be addressed in the future.

The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner was to hold South Yorkshire Police to account, particularly over child sexual exploitation, Hillsborough and Orgreave to make sure they were learning lessons and at the same time supporting them in carrying out their important role in protecting people and communities across South Yorkshire.

From talking to the public prior to the election it became apparent that the public valued neighbourhood policing and it was intended that wherever possible a close relationship would be maintained between ordinary Police Officers and Police Community Support Officers as this was where intelligence was gathered and remained essential.

The Police and Crime Commissioner was committed to ensuring that voluntary sector organisations in South Yorkshire, who helped to reduce crime or help the victims of crime, were properly funded. On this basis he intended to donate half of his salary to South Yorkshire victims' charities.

The Commissioner was committed to working with all communities to bring people together to face the challenges ahead and welcomed the opportunity to make a difference, to forget the past, and to use the past as a springboard for the future.

The Panel welcomed the salary donation news and asked whether this could also be gift aided and were advised by the Commissioner that in order to donate his salary he had to receive it first. He would be paying tax and would look into options for this to be gift aided.

In response to a question about whether or not he would be appointing a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, the Commissioner confirmed he would be considering a number of options and whether there was a need for a full time position.

The Chairman welcomed David Crompton, Chief Constable, to the meeting who was keen to endorse what the Police and Crime Commissioner had said. He was keen to attend future meetings of the Police and Crime Panel and requested that he be given an early indication as to when they may take place. Discussions would be open and transparent and where possible he would be flexible and make himself available.

South Yorkshire Police were also committed to dealing with child sexual exploitation and the work taking place should not be minimised. The Independent Police Complaints Commission were investigating a number of officers. The National Crime Agency were also setting up investigations to look through other criminal matters around child sexual exploitation as identified in the Jay Report.

It was right and necessary for independent organisations to look at what had happened to restore public confidence and faith and to ensure this did not happen again.

South Yorkshire Police did a fantastic job, but there were some serious issues that needed resolving.

Councillor Parker made reference to the information sharing session hosted by South Yorkshire Police at their training centre at Manvers, where it became apparent that information shared by the Police should at least have been shared not only with the Leader of the Council, but also the Leader of the Opposition. The withholding of certain information prevented opposition Councillors from scrutinising properly and holding those required to account. The Chief Constable, following consultation

with the Leader of the Council, agreed to look at the information sharing network in more detail to ensure it was effective.

Mayor Jones described the true role of scrutiny as she saw it and the role of the Police and Crime Panel in holding the Police Crime Commissioner to account. It was for the Police and Crime Commissioner to engage with the public and deliver improvement and for the Panel to measure how those improvements were delivered with support from the Chief Constable. This view was supported by the Police and Crime Commissioner and his Officers. Work had already commenced on the delivery of priorities and outcomes and the achievements against the Police Plan. The delivery against the priorities process would remain open and transparent.

In response to a comment about the work of South Yorkshire Police, the Chief Constable acknowledged that in the main staff did an excellent job, but that there were a number of officers that were being investigated by the Independent Police Complaints Commission. In order to move forward the Police Force were aiming to provide the best service for the citizens in South Yorkshire.

The Police and Crime Commissioner responded to the Panel by confirming his reflection to the scrutiny process was for all information to be provided. He asked that he be informed of any incidence where any information was denied or was not forthcoming.

Resolved:- That the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable be thanked for their attendance at the meeting and their attendance at future meetings welcomed.

J25. LEARNING LESSONS AND THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Further to Minute No. 19 of the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 29th October 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which highlighted where a number of public questions fell broadly under the heading of "learning the lessons from recent events" and it was, therefore, agreed to consider them as part of this item today.

On the positive side, it was clear that the Panel played its full part in ensuring that the voice of the public and, more importantly, the voices of the victims and their families were heard. Indeed, this was clearly instrumental in the final decision of the previous Police and Crime Commissioner to resign.

Public interest in the work of the Panel had been generated as a result of these recent events and it was of critical importance that this was now harnessed to further improve the work of the Panel and its working relationship with the newly elected Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was clear that the role of the Panel was to scrutinise the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner at a strategic level and not to become involved in the operational detail of the Police Force. Some of the concerns that have emerged have highlighted this as an issue.

The Panel also recently agreed to working protocols with the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committees for each of the four local authorities in South Yorkshire, to share information and practices with them.

The Panel adopted a pilot Task and Finish Group approach this year, and this would have been tested with its first main subject being that of Domestic Abuse. This had not been completed as a result of events of recent months and the effective suspension of the work programme for the Panel.

Other issues to consider included:-

- Resources required to effectively scrutinise the Police and Crime agenda.
- The role of the Police and Crime Panel in supporting the Police and Crime Commissioner to effectively deliver on his strategic priorities.
- Joint priorities for scrutiny and how these should be determined.

There was no doubt that the role of the public were key over the previous months, and the Panel took the decision to maximise the involvement of the public in its proceedings.

The new website was also now live and it could be used to generate a debate with the public about these issues, using the community forum facility which existed on it.

In terms of the powers the Police and Crime Panels have in these circumstances, the Home Affairs Select Committee had forwarded a specific recommendation to the Government regarding this. It recommended that legislation allowed for the recall of Police and Crime Commissioners if either the Police and Crime Panel made a vote of no confidence, or at least one of the local authorities take a vote of no confidence, where they represent at least half of the population of the police area. Clearly, both of these factors would have been triggered in the recent case of South Yorkshire.

The Home Office, in reply to the Chairman's recent letter, confirmed that "the Government will reflect carefully on these suggestions and recommendations, and those of Parliament, and the public more generally."

The Chairman invited those members of the public who were present today to ask the questions they had previously submitted.

(1) Wendy Zealand, South Yorkshire Neighbourhood Watch, asked having had the experience of being in place over the months of the past Police and Crime Commissioner post, and a lull to perhaps review their past work, would the Panel be making any changes as to its way of working when the position was filled again?

(2) Alan Kewley referred to a few members of the public attending Panel meetings over the past eighteen months to try to understand the main issues by asking questions from the public bench, but this had not been easy and on this basis asked, following the Police and Crime Commissioner by-election, would the Panel be willing to consider regular three-way discussions with the new Police and Crime Commissioner and representatives from community groups like Neighbourhood Watch, and how would they like to see these developing?

(3) Nigel Slack, Sheffield for Democracy, referred to the sixth report from the Home Affairs Select Committee, dealing with Child sexual exploitation and the response to localised grooming, included as an annex a draft Bill for the recall of Police and Crime Commissioners and asked what was the Panel's view on this draft and, with reference to the fact that it proposes recall petitions can only be triggered by this panel or the Local Councils, whether the powers for the public go far enough?

In terms of the P.A.C.T. meetings, whether holding a drop in session was the most appropriate in a supermarket, was the Chief Constable considering reinstating them and would this be widely advertised?

The Chairman suggested that, in terms of the public input to the meetings and whether three way discussions would be the best way forward, this be considered at the next meeting.

The Chief Constable confirmed there were no plans to change the format of the P.A.C.T. meetings at this stage and sometimes the way forward was for officers to be widely available to the public to answer queries in locations such as supermarkets. Dates were advertised via the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and it would be ensured that this would happen.

(4) Nigel Slack, Sheffield for Democracy, asked a further question about the appointment of a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and whether consideration could be given to the role on a part time basis.

Serious consideration would also be given by the Police and Crime Commissioner as to the most appropriate methods of public engagement and whether this included the appointment of a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Chief Constable responded to a query from the Panel regarding feedback from the Police on the frontline and gave his reassurance that direct feedback on proposals was received.

The Panel noted the access to information concerns and the need to divorce the strategic and operational elements. This meant that some of the information was difficult to interpret in order for the Panel to scrutinise more effectively. Separating the individual layers of information often demanded additional resources and was not as a result of a reluctance to share information from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

As part of the discussion Councillor Parker also expressed his discontent with the lack of powers on the right of recall for a Police and Crime Commissioner and particularly on meetings where it was suggested that minutes were not kept. This was not effective scrutiny and there should be careful management to ensure the Panel were provided with all the information they required.

The Chief Constable confirmed that information would be made available to the Panel in order to scrutinise the Police Force and the Police and Crime Commissioner effectively, whilst bearing in mind that this would be appropriate to the level of strategic operations taking place.

The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner would find it particularly useful if they were made to understand the type of operational information that Panel Members would wish to have access to and arrangements for that information would be provided where appropriate.

The Scrutiny Manager acknowledged the difficulties for the Panel in determining what information they required in order to obtain the right balance between strategic and operational matters. This could be improved on further and the barriers to information sharing via Community Safety Partnerships needed to be addressed. This would be considered further following discussions with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner with key priorities for scrutiny being identified. How best to take matters further would be developed with clear understanding of expectations.

As part of the discussion Councillor Parker expressed his concern with how Officers would know what information was relevant to the Panel and when this should be shared.

As a former Elected Member Councillor Parker believed he should have been provided with certain information, especially around the child sexual exploitation scandal, and had not. He asked how were officers going to decide what information should be circulated for consideration by the Panel and was informed that it was not for officers to decide on information coming forward, but was for the Panel to decide what information it would like to consider in order to carry out effective scrutiny.

The Panel were concerned that they were at risk of drifting away from their role, but believed that it needed to have a robust forward plan in place which would look at all the strategic priorities of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Police Plan. The forward plan would then take into

consideration the priorities, their progress, what engagement was taking place with the public and what the drivers were.

In the interests of transparency the public needed to be able to look at the democratic structures to show clearly the role of the Panel on the website alongside that of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Panel acknowledged that its own role and that the Police and Crime Commissioner had been clouded somewhat but wished for this to be rectified.

The Panel needed to be afforded the opportunity to share their views and for these to be taken on board and, as raised previously by Councillor Parker, for all discussions to be minuted.

Resolved:- That the matters set out in the report for discussion be taken on board as part of the forward planning work for the Panel.

J26. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel scheduled to take place on Monday, 8th December, 2014 be cancelled and a further meeting be arranged in January 2015.

**BARNSELY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
12th December, 2014**

Present:- Councillors M. Hussain and McNeely (Rotherham MBC), Councillor C. Mills (Doncaster MBC) and Councillor S. Howard (Barnsley MBC).

Officers present: Mrs. L. Clarke (BDR Joint Waste Manager), Mr. D. Burton (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R. Miller (Barnsley MBC), Mrs. G. Gillies (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. M. Gladstone (Barnsley MBC).

22. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Agreed:- That Councillor Mahroof Hussain of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board for the remainder of the 2014/2015 Municipal Year.

(In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor Hussain assumed the Chair)

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

24. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH SEPTEMBER 2014

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 19th September, 2014.

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

25. MATTERS ARISING

With regard to Minute No. K17 of the meeting held on 19th September, 2014, it was noted that there had been a successful interactive workshop held on Wednesday 19th October, 2014, entitled "Launch of the Rubbish Adventure", with grant funding provided by the Royal Academy of Engineering. The workshop had been held in order to provide information about the waste processes taking place at the BDR facility.

26. BARNLEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM - JOINT WASTE STRATEGY

Further to Minute No. 16 of the meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board held on 19th September, 2014, the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager reported on the progress being made with regard to the proposed over-arching Joint Waste Strategy, with the addition of individual action plans for each of the three constituent local authorities. This matter is to be discussed by the BDR Steering Committee at its meeting to be held on Tuesday 16 December 2014 and a progress report will be submitted to the next meeting of this Joint Waste Board. It was agreed that Members will also be issued with a briefing note after the Steering Committee meeting on 16 December 2014.

27. BDR MANAGER'S REPORT

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

- Governance
- Project Delivery
- Technical matters
- Legal
- Financial
- Communications
- Resources
- Health and Safety
- Other sundry issues

Discussion took place on issues of corporate social responsibility affecting the Shanks Company and Members requested that a report on this matter be submitted to the next meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board.

Members also agreed to undertake a visit of inspection to the Bolton Road site on Monday 19 January 2015. Details of this visit will be published in the Waste Matters newsletter.

Agreed:- That the report of the BDR Joint Waste Manager be received and its contents noted.

28. RISK REGISTER

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI transition phase risk register, as at 2 December 2014. Reference was made to:-

: Insurance – construction insurance is in place and insurance for the operations on site will be in place at the commencement of the contract; there are a limited number of companies which will insure waste management premises due to the number of fires and this is having an

impact on the premiums; consideration is to be given to reflecting the impact of the increased premiums in the risk register; potential control measures include fire safety training and records of employee training; other potential risks discussed were the volume of waste and the impact of service changes on levels of recycling.

Members requested that information explaining the details of the issues contained within the risk register shall be reported to the next meeting of the Joint Waste Board.

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

29. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

30. BDR PFI BUDGET REPORT 2014/2015

Consideration was given to the Budget Summary, as at November 2014, for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI). It was noted that current expenditure remained within the agreed budget. Reference was made to the costs of legal advice.

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

31. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- (1) That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday, 20th March, 2015, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(2) That the next following meetings of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday 12th June, 2015 and also during September and December, 2015, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.