

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

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

Date: Wednesday, 4th March, 2015

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 28)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 29 - 32)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 33 - 49)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 50 - 140)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 141 - 149)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 150 - 156)
7. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 157 - 167)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
15th January, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Councillors Havenhand, Kaye, Sansome, Swift, M. Vines and Whysall.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dalton, Hunter, Jepson and Wootton.

67. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

68. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

69. COMMUNICATIONS

There was nothing to report.

70. RESPONSE TO ACCESS TO GPs SCRUTINY REVIEW

The Chairman introduced the Cabinet's response to the Access to GPs Scrutiny Review and representatives present who would respond to issues raised by Select Commission members. The representatives included:-

Richard Armstrong	NHS England
Carys Murray Cook	South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw, Care Quality Commission
Chris Edwards	Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Dawn Anderson	Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Jacqui Tuffnell	Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group

Recommendation 1. Patients' experiences of accessing GPs vary from practice to practice therefore NHS England needs to ensure that patients' views on access are reflected in the forthcoming Personal Medical Services contract re-negotiations and five year commissioning plan

Chairman – 1 of my concerns is the national GP survey. Whilst it gives the big picture I am concerned that in some of our practices we do not have that many responses. In some of the practices there are 30 responses which only have to have 1 or 2 patients who think differently on a certain day and it can switch a percentage. What are we doing to make sure we get big numbers in each practice?

Richard Armstrong – It is very complicated. The survey is run twice a year and Ipsos Mori, the company who conduct the survey do a detailed analysis of what has happened in the past. The survey has been taking place 6-7 years and they target those populations and practices to try and get a statistical and valid response i.e. where there were lower response rates they will survey more patients in that practice and will target in terms of trying to get a range of ages and sexes etc. They boost the survey every time for every practice to try and get that statistical validity. It was still dependent upon patients returning the surveys but there had been a fairly consistent response rate over the years fluctuating between 43-46%. It tended to be young minority ethnic communities for the lower response rate so there would be a big boost to try and improve that rate.

Councillor Sansome – Will the report come back here so we can see where the problems lay or where the best practice was that needed to be shared across other practices?

Carys Murray Cook – We are planning the Care Quality Commission inspection for Rotherham at the moment. There were 36 GP practices in the Rotherham area and we plan to inspect 18 of them in the first quarter of 2015/16. The inspections would be carried out from April onwards and we will be liaising with the Clinical Commissioning Group 2 weeks prior to the inspection starting regarding the practices we will be inspecting and notifying them. Following an inspection, a very detailed report was written which goes through our quality process and then made available to the public so will be available on our website.

Councillor Sansome – I think what is very key to this review, and the reason why it has been referred back, is that the people of the Borough need to see some clarification and conviction that this will be an exercise that people want. We need to see that it was something that all partners are taking as seriously as possible to make sure the care and treatment is there. The response we have given through our own individual input shows that we are serious and certain that we are going to improve access to GPs and the services they have got.

Councillor Kaye – Is the profile of the patients different within practices and is there a difference in an urban profile or a rural profile? When I visit my practice there are a lot of young people in there and lot of old people and I am looking for a % mix of that and whether that has an overall impression on what patients say and need from their GP

Richard Armstrong – There are different groups of patients who expect different things at different stages of their life. The biggest indicator of patient satisfaction of their experience of a GP is age. As the patient got older the way GPs offered services for that age range was quite convenient for them and, therefore, a much higher satisfaction levels than the younger population. The population that had the lowest satisfaction rate was 18-24 years from a minority ethnic background. They had the lowest satisfaction levels because they were expecting a different service.

They wanted something different from the practices other than what was usually provided. They wanted to be able to walk in, book in, have an appointment and leave and were less concerned with who they saw as long as they could be seen. We must try to get practices to provide a range of ways patients could be seen. As patients got older they normally wanted to see the same person but when younger and working they wanted appointments that were convenient.

Councillor Swift – We have done a similar survey at Treeton practice but not many people wanted to fill the survey in so it can skew the results.

Richard Armstrong – The GP survey is produced by Ipsos Mori. They design the surveys using GPs and academic professionals and have done a whole series of work with patient groups and individuals to ensure that the range of people can explain the questions they were seeking to get an answer to. They work on that throughout the year and keep refining and improving surveys so can normally see when a patient answered a question that is what they actually intended to say. Response rates were still an issue but we have tried to do everything we can – you can request the survey in different languages, by telephone etc. Most practices want to respond to their patients. Practices look at the results. We try to publish the results in a comparative way as well because GP practices do not want to be different from their colleagues.

Councillor Kaye – Can you explain the reinvestment of any funding released from one practice into primary medical care?

Richard Armstrong – Historically GP practices have been funded differently and the idea of bringing in new contracting arrangements in 2004 was to move to a more fair and equitable funding per capita. For a variety of reasons we got it wrong and as part of implementation there was a predominant variety in practices so there was an inequality in funding. There was some relationship between more underfunded practices in urban areas and more highly funded practices in more rural areas and the idea of moving to per capita and redistribution would mean some lost and some gained. We had been trying to do this since 2008 and still had a differential in funding between practices so the idea of successive Governments had been to say we would achieve fair funding between practices by this date. The commitment is we do not take funding out of GP practices but reinvest in the practice to buy in services and improvement in care. There was no relationship between how much money comes into the practice and how well that practice performed either in terms of service offer or satisfaction of patients.

Jacqui Tuffnell – We work with NHSE in terms of premia on services and what was happening across the wider community to ensure services are provided. We look to ensure better spend and medical services.

Chair – How will you look at cost in your inspection?

Carys Murray Cook –Our inspection was not just about arriving on the day; we do a lot of homework beforehand so we do send out comment cards to the practices and ask them to place them for patients to complete. We look at patient surveys, Clinical Commissioning Group data about the profile of patients and get a lot of other data as well. Patients/carers/relatives can also give us information about the practice. The practice should also be informing us of any Safeguarding incidents they have had within the practice and also any significant events so we should have some knowledge about those as well.

The inspection process went into a practice and left no stone unturned. We look at the practice and staff. We specifically look at patient themes of vulnerable, mental health illness, work age population, children, adults over 75 and those with long term conditions. The inspection itself would gather as much data as it could around those areas. The key to the inspection was to speak to all the staff in the practice and patients on the day. We like to speak to 8-10 patients on the visit about their experience and use of the practice. The process was very in depth. If inspectors did find anything within the Regulations that was not being met, then we can produce warnings and also take enforcement action.

Chair – When you do that do you then work with the Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS for future plans?

Carys Murray Cook - When we have completed the inspection of the GP practice we meet with the respective Clinical Commissioning Group to feed back the information on what we have found in that area.

Richard Armstrong – What would happen in most visits was there were some things to be addressed which could be improved and an action plan would be developed with the practice to work through to make the improvements/address the issues so by the time the Care Quality Commission went back some would have been addressed and improved and try and get continuous improvement in the practice. These would then be owned by the Clinical Commissioning Group in future work.

Chairman – What if there was a common theme amongst practices?

Carys Murray Cook – We would look at it on an individual basis and collaborative basis.

Councillor Kaye – What “teeth” did you have?

Carys Murray Cook – From our inspection we do not just take the practice’s word; we want to see it written down, to see policies, procedures and processes on how they captured feedback from patients, how they investigated their incidents, look at their outcomes, how they measured actions and implementation so it was a very robust process. Not just about them telling us but corroboration and evidence.

Richard Armstrong – Most GPs, Drs, nurses etc. have not trained for 10 years to deliver poor care to their patients and usually when you point something out to them they will address it themselves. As part of the developed action plan we will work with the practice to implement it. If the practice is working to try and implement it and were struggling there would be support to try and keep helping them.

If they did not recognise there was a problem, then we get into contract sanctions. If they did not co-operate we would serve a Breach Notice on them which is a warning which says they are in danger of losing their contract. Normally that is enough. If not, and we think it was sufficiently serious, we can withhold some element of the funding to them as a penalty. In terms of financial sanctions we can remove the contract saying to them in this case we do not think you are an appropriate provider and we will remove the contract. We have a duty to put a new contract in place. A practice must be registered with the Care Quality Commission for a Clinical Commissioning Group to hold a contract with them. If they did not listen the Care Quality Commission would deregister them and they could not hold a contract.

Janet Spurling – In relation to the minimum practice income guarantee (MPIG) was this generally in relation to GMS contracts?

Richard – PMS contracts before 2003 and into the GMS contract in 2003. Some practices took their historical income into their new contractual arrangements.

Across the country 50% of practices lost and 50% gained. The difference could be quite small in some places but in others very big and adjustments would be made for practices which have an atypical population. Where it was about the range of services they offered and services, if the Clinical Commissioning Group's wished to continue to buy these they would be explicitly commissioned and funded so practices may not see a change in funding but it would be commissioned by them. This enabled NHS England to see if the practice was funded fairly and all being treated fairly.

Councillor Kaye – Equality and the difference between different practices is that just within a geographic area or country wide in relation to funding?

Richard Armstrong – There was no divide across the country and it was nothing to do with how the funding formula worked. If you were trying to get a practice to improve you had to try and get a level playing field. When we talk about core funding this was the 55% of funding a practice got for baseline services. On top of that they received additional funding for enhanced services; funding through Quality Outcomes Framework; for premises costs; and for IT costs. If a practice said its funding had been reduced they were referring to the 55%. We are trying to get all the core funding equitable and anything released to invest in better services and care.

Chairman – Where are we with the 5 year area based commissioning plan?

Clinical Commissioning Group – The ability to have varying co-commissioning services has been incorporated into the 5 year strategy. NHS England was to discuss the strategy later that day.

Richard Armstrong – It is confirmed in the Clinical Commissioning Group's commissioning plan and an application for co-commissioning, access and improving access was highlighted.

Recommendation 2 – The continuation of the Patient Participation Directed Enhanced Service in 2014/15 should be used to ensure patients are well informed and empowered through the Patient Participation Groups to challenge poor access and suggest improvements. All practices should be encouraged either to participate in the PPDES or to establish other effective mechanisms for ensuring patient engagement

Councillor Kaye – I only found out this morning that my Doctor's practice had a website which contained all the information about the practice. I was unaware that that facility was available. I wonder whether there was a need for better publicity? It was a question of communication and how we meet nearly everybody's needs?

Richard Armstrong – Practices had been obliged to produce patient leaflets since 2004 and all the information should be within that leaflet. This was also checked by the Care Quality Commission on their inspection. We had been increasingly encouraging practices to use the internet to facilitate more access and make more information available. Having information available on the practice website was the best way for it – being able to book appointments, order repeat prescriptions and do more on electronic communication. Also had to recognise that not all patients wanted to do that and information was available through NHS Choices on the various helplines available. We could still do more to improve communications – NHS England to practices and practices to patients - and we will continue to work on that.

Carys Murray Cook – The Care Quality Commission looked at the information provided to patients and if it was not seen we give practices feedback.

Chairman – There was an original suggestion that NHS England look at developing an app. The demographic group that have said they were less satisfied were probably the group that would use it.

Richard Armstrong – It was part of the current Government's Policy to make more raw data available about the NHS but, rather than all do that, to allow commercial organisations to access that information and for them to develop apps, web tools etc. to put the data together. The 1 thing public surveys were not so good at was understanding the different sets

of data in order to tell you something additional to what the numbers said. There were already a number of apps that looked at GP improvement. They were available without the NHS spending any money. The data was made available for others to use.

Councillor Sansome – What did each practice offer when it put out the information online? Was it the same template which each practice had? Was there good practice issues and was there a local template?

Richard Armstrong – The contract specified what data had to be provided but not in what format. Some practices were better than others. The GPC provided a template for all practices that met the minimum standard. Those practices that were more pro active and probably looking for more patients and were better at explaining what they were and what they wanted and met the cost. There were organisations such as NHS IQ (Innovation and Quality), part of NHS England, whose job it was to support and innovate by supporting training to practices and how they could be better in responding to patients' needs and be more efficient in running their business. There was a whole programme of support which took best practice across the country. There was probably more that could be done to support those practices to access that but the tools were available.

Councillor Kaye – How many practices in Rotherham have availed themselves of that support?

Richard Armstrong – The relationship was between the practice and NHS IQ and not something NHS England would necessarily have information on.

Recommendation 3 – Although recognising the importance of clinical need, the expectations and preferences of patients are changing and practices should explore more hybrid and flexible approaches to appointments

Chairman – When this was discussed elsewhere 1 of the things mentioned quite strongly that there should be “sit and wait slots” at all practices. Having read your response the survey does not seem to support that.

Recommendation 4 – NHS England should maintain access to interpretation services for GPs with an emphasis on professional services, supported by training for GPs and practice staff to increase confidence in using telephone services where appropriate

Recommendation 5 – NHS England should review their current interpretation provision to see if economies could be achieved through signing up to Rotherham MBC's framework agreement which is open to partner agencies

Chairman – Having read the original response I would see this as 1 area that I felt disappointed in. Is anything actually going to happen? Have we a way to move forward?

Richard Armstrong – We inherited a whole range of different Interpretation Services and arrangements. One of the first things NHS England said was that we needed a master list and work commencing on defining a definitive list of Interpretation Services. 2 years later we are still waiting for that document. There was now a nationally agreed specification and the main players had been asked to procure a framework contract for the NHS people to use a group of providers who could meet that Service specification.

NHS England wanted a single Interpretation Service which covered your population and our population because they were the same patients. Richard needed to understand whether we could all use the same framework contract and have a Rotherham Interpretation Service that met all our requirements and gave access to our patients. Although the summary of details had only come out the previous week, NHS England were committed as a Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England to get a better Interpretation Services due to the wasted money between the 2 in buying different services.

Councillor Sansome – What was behind the statement and what did it mean and what services did it provide? I appreciate the feeling of being hamstrung by the delay in policy but the population needed to be clear what this meant.

Recommendation 6 – GP practices should regularly showcase best practice and share successes on providing good access to patients through existing means such as the practice manager forum and Protected Learning Time events.

Chairman – Were the events held frequently?

Richard Armstrong – The NHS met infrequently. There were a number planned across the north of England during February and March to try and showcase what practices were doing and learn from each other. However, the events only ever can get to 100 GPs at a time so was much more reliant on what the Clinical Commissioning Group had been and were doing,

Dawn Anderson – The Clinical Commissioning Group had a regular programme of events for GPs – there was a Protected Learning Time event that day – that took place bi-monthly. In between practices were encouraged to hold their own in-house events with the Clinical Commissioning Group monitoring what topics were being discussed. There was also a Practice Managers' Forum held on a bi-monthly basis with best practice as a standing item on that agenda. There was a regular programme of events and although the Clinical Commissioning Group scheduled items space was left for topical issues.

Recommendation 7 – Patient information and education is important, both generic information about local services and specific information about how their surgery works

Chairman – I think we have covered most of that in the previous discussion.

Janet Spurling – 1 thing that we have not really touched upon was around the growing numbers of people not attending for appointments. I know a lot of practices had information on their screens about missed appointments and when speaking with the NHS England at the time of the Scrutiny Review they said they were going to talk to practices and get a flavour of how they were doing in terms of non-attendance. There was a recommendation about a campaign to raise public awareness of the importance of attending appointments. Again this linked in with “sit and wait” slots.

Richard Armstrong – Data was not collected on missed appointments in a consistent manner and where there had been such an exercise it showed that the rate had not increased or changed. It was a bugbear for GPs that patients did not attend but also for many it meant that the 10-15 minutes of no patient meant they could catch up. We had to make the best use of the capacity available and sometimes having that free slot allowed the practice to get back on time.

1 of the reasons patients were less satisfied was because of longer waiting times. Clearly there was pressure on practices with the number of people going attending having increased. This was 1 of the main reasons why it was thought that the solution was to improve the access and convenience, increase capacity and to get more people who walked into GP practices to make better use of the practice nurses, doctors from hospitals, physiotherapists and other health professionals. The Prime Minister’s Challenge Fund was starting to demonstrate that with a whole new skill mix placed in and around the GP practice it could relieve some of the pressures and ensure patients still saw a clinician.

Carys Murray Cook – From a personal point of view it is around the sharing of what worked well across the board. From the inspections completed some quite innovative ways of working with other members of allied health professionals in health practices could be seen but what met the needs of the health population? Agencies needed to look at what the needs of patients were and how it was best met with the relevant development of staff within the practice. There were good examples of meeting patients’ needs such as dementia screening appointments.

Councillor Kaye – Was there any comparison with what happened in GP practices to dentists for example? Were missed appointments right across the board?

Carys Murray Cook – The Care Quality Commission also regulated dentists but the missed appointment rate, compared to GPs, was significantly lower probably due to there being a cost involved with dental care and a patient making contact with the dentist when they had a problem and wanted the pain to be relieved so they would make sure they attended that appointment. There may be some best practice to share but the best practice seen was about informing patients of the impact that missing their appointment would have upon the practice.

Another good example was online booking appointments.

Richard Armstrong – That had been showed through GP surveys on how practices could improve satisfaction. Those practices that made more use of online booking had higher satisfaction levels.

Councillor M. Vines – Do you have a lot of missed appointments because you were so long waiting for 1?

Richard Armstrong – I think undoubtedly if a patient could get the convenience and access they wanted it inevitably impacted upon their immediacy or need to see a doctor. Practices were encouraged to try and meet that need. There was evidence from the survey that showed that nearly every patient wanted to see their doctor but that if they were offered an appointment earlier to see the nurse and they take it they were more satisfied rather than waiting longer to see the doctor. Practices needed to understand that quite often the customer wanted to be seen conveniently rather than waiting longer and that an offer to see another clinician would be better.

Chairman – Was there any evidence of lower satisfaction rates with single handed practice?

Chris Edwards – The advantage of a single handed practice was that the patient saw the same doctor every time so tended to be more satisfied.

Carys Murray Cook – From personal experience single handed practices had a smaller population size but still may have other health professionals working at the practice so I would see no difference.

Richard Armstrong – The data showed 2 interesting things; 1 that a smaller practice had higher satisfaction levels but also had greater variability. It came down to what the patient was looking for – if they wanted to see the same doctor but there may be a longer waiting time.

Janet Spurling on behalf of Councillor Hunter – Receptionist were very often performing the role of a triage nurse over the phone which affected who got what slot in the GP timetable with many then going to A&E or the Walk-in Centre

Richard Armstrong – Most practices had tried to create a slight barrier between the Reception to enable privacy for the customer. Receptionists did what their employers requested of them. If patients had concerns they should be expressing it to their GP not the receptionist and more feedback to the employer might affect that. The data suggested the biggest factors influencing a patient were (1) can I get an appointment (2) whether they were timely are not (3) can I get through on the telephone (4) what was my experience of the reception. These had an impact on how patients saw their GP.

Janet Spurling on behalf of Councillor Hunter – The District Nurse Team's role was changing in a way that meant they may not enjoy the very close working relationship with GPs they currently enjoyed which could increase pressure on GPs (more home visits etc.) which meant they could be less available for appointments. Ultimately District Nursing being GP based but not based in GP surgeries could have a massive impact on working relationships to the detriment of the patients.

Richard Armstrong – Personally I think we need better links across all health professionals and those working in the community whether it be the District Nurse, Social Workers, physiotherapist etc. There needed to be a key relationship knowing that you are working with the same patients for whatever reason. Those services were not stitched together for local patient needs and would bring more efficiency.

Chris Edwards – In Rotherham there had been great changes made – integration of the Hospital and Community Trust and everything the Clinical Commissioning Group was trying to do to integrate Primary and Community Care. It was such a big task that it would take a couple of years to achieve but it was a priority. In Rotherham the Clinical Commissioning Group was GPs led so the duplication would be found. There was a thread throughout the planned integration of Primary Care, Social Care and Community Care.

Recommendation 8 – In light of the future challenges for Rotherham outlined in the report the review recommends that a proactive approach is taken by the Health and Wellbeing Board to mitigate risk to the delivery of primary care

No comments.

Recommendation 9 – NHS England should consider incentives to attract GPs to start their career in Rotherham following training in the area to help address the demographic issues of our current GPs

Chris Edwards – For every 100,000 patients in Sheffield there were roughly 70 GPs. In Rotherham there were 58. In Yorkshire and the Humber the average was 58. Rotherham had some very challenging communities which were difficult to attract GPs to; Sheffield attracted more. There was 1 big advantage in Rotherham in that there was a training scheme which had 14 registrar GPs training. Rotherham was the only 1 to have it fully staffed and was perceived to be the best training

scheme in the Yorkshire and the Humber. The Clinical Commissioning Group had tried to get the 14 GPs to stay and embrace Rotherham and feel a sense of ownership. Financial incentives had been considered but extra funding could not be attracted for such payments. Hull only had 40 GPs for 100,000 and Rotherham had more than Doncaster and Barnsley. It was still tough and Primary Care staffing levels were not where we would want them to be.

Recommendation 10 – Rotherham CCG should collect and analyse monitoring information to ensure services are resourced to meet peaks in demand during protected learning time at the new Emergency Care Centre from 2015

Chris Edwards/Dawn Anderson – NHS 111 carried out the call handling and gave the Clinical Commissioning Group a summary of calls. Regular discussions were held with the Walk-in Centre to ascertain if demand had been catered for. There were not seen to be any issues with that.

Recommendation 11 – NHS England needs to be more proactive in managing increases in GP demand due to new housing developments rather than waiting for existing services to reach capacity

Councillor Swift – I was at a meeting last week at Treeton Health Centre. We have patients coming from the Waverley development but we are full and they are building more houses in Treeton and Catcliffe (which does not have a surgery). We cannot manage the appointments because there are so many people wanting to come. We have planning permission to build a new health centre but it has been suspended.

Chris Edwards – When the Primary Care Trust was dissolved in 2012 1 of the final acts was to prioritise 2 capital projects – Dalton and Treeton health centres, and funding was identified to put new builds in. Dalton had progressed and I believe starting construction. Treeton was still being discussed. This was the responsibility of NHS Property Services who the Clinical Commissioning Group consistently challenged and would continue to challenge. It was the understanding that funding was identified 2.5 years ago.

Councillor Kaye – As a member of the Planning Board I am aware of the number of houses to be built on the Waverley site in the next 25 years. When and where would be a tipping point? When was it big enough to have its own practice?

Richard Armstrong – There was no magic number but clearly as properties started to be built then work should be taking place to plan when the ideal time was to put a GP practice in place. However, it was an economic decision for a practice as they needed sufficient patients to register with them to generate income which allowed them to employ staff, therefore, there became a point when it was the right time to make such facility available. It took 9 months to carry out the procurement so there should be planning at least a year ahead. 1 of the difficulties had always

been the inertia of getting patients to move and change facilities and had to find a way of overcoming that and encourage patients to register.

Councillor Kaye – Waverley was quite near the boundary of Sheffield. Would Rotherham work closely with Sheffield or be separate?

Chris Edwards – It would be a question for NHS Property Services. Should they be invited to a future meeting as to how they approached capital build across the piste? It would be beneficial to see the strategy they had for South Yorkshire.

Richard Armstrong – Patients had the right to register with a GP practice where they wanted to. It was not just planning and the Rotherham/Sheffield boundary but understanding what the patients wanted as well as what NHS England wanted.

Recommendation 12 – Rotherham MBC when considering its response to the scrutiny review of supporting the local economy, should ensure health parents are invited by the Planning department to be part of the multi-disciplinary approach to proposed new developments

Chairman – A meeting was already in place.

Richard Armstrong then drew attention to Potential Actions of NHS England as follows:-

- Increasing the overall supply of clinicians in primary care including
 - Increase the number of training places for GPs
 - Increasing number of doctors qualifying that wish to enter general practice
 - Changes to the induction and returner scheme to enable GPs to return more swiftly to the GP performers list
 - New models of care which meet demand differently including through widening skill mix (e.g. minor ailments services, direct physio access and e-consultations)
- Looking to extend the availability of general practice
 - Expanding the Prime Minister Challenge Fund pilots – exploring models for 7-day access to general practice (year 1: £50M established 20 pilots nationally (7 in north) covering 7M patients. Year 2: additional £100M available to expand number of pilot areas)
 - ‘Doctor First’ – this is now being used by some practices. This enables same day telephone triage with around 2/3s of patients being dealt with by phone
- Ambition of ‘Patient Online’ – providing the ability to book appointments prescriptions and view medical records online

- Right Care: clearer to patients and the population how best to access the right care to meet their needs
- Using 111 can direct people to get the right care which can include self-care
- Encouraging use of pharmacy as an alternative to GP
 - Feeling Under the Weather is a national campaign focussing on the management of winter illnesses
 - Treat Yourself Better is a national campaign led by the industry focussing on the management of illness without expectation of antibiotics
 - Pharmacy First is a national 'brand' used by many CCGs which encourages patients with some minor ailments to use the pharmacy. Patients who are exempt from prescription charges receive free medicines from the pharmacist

Councillor Sansome – I have been doing a lot of research on the services of actual access to GPs and 1 issue was that of a confederation where GPs, the CCG and NHSE are 1 body. I would like the opportunity to discuss whether there was an opportunity going forward in Rotherham.

Chris Edwards - The current landscape was a bit confusing – it went from a Primary Care Trust to NHSE doing Primary Care, the Clinical Commissioning Group and then NHS Property Services. As from 1st April, 2015, the Clinical Commissioning Group would be taking delegated responsibility for NHS England which would join up the Clinical Commissioning Group and Primary Care. There would be Rotherham people making decisions about Rotherham services. There needed to be continued work with the Council. Property Services was not included in the delegated responsibility.

36 Rotherham GP practices had looked at forming a confederation. Currently a Limited Liability Partnership had been formed which was a local vehicle that allowed the GP practices to bid for business together. The Clinical Commissioning Group had assisted and had given 1 off funding for the legal costs. They expected to form the Limited Liability Partnership by the end of January.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance.

Resolved:- (1) That a presentation be made to the June meeting on the Limited Liability Partnership.

(2) That the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England contact NHS Property Services with regard to their plans for the development of Treeton Health Centre and supply the Select Commission with their response.

(3) That NHS Property Services be requested to attend the June meeting to inform the Select Commission of their strategy for Rotherham.

71. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 22nd January, 2015, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
22nd January, 2015

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Councillors Kaye, Sansome, Swift, M. Vines and Whysall.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Havenhand, Hunter and Jepson.

72. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

73. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The member of the press present at the meeting did not wish to ask any question at this point in the meeting.

74. COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair thanked the previous Chairman, Councillor Wyatt, for his work on the Health Select Commission.

Yorkshire Ambulance Service

The Chairman reported receipt of correspondence, both written and verbal, from Unite and Yorkshire Ambulance Service regarding the performance of the service and industrial relations.

The Care Quality Commission was to inspect the Service in March and the Select Commission needed to decide how it would respond to the issues raised.

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Committee was to consider Yorkshire Ambulance Service at a meeting shortly and had invited Rotherham but unfortunately it clashed with the Council meeting. Apologies for not attending would be conveyed to their Chairman and minutes of the meeting requested to help this Authority decide how to consider the Service.

Councillor Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, reported that a performance update had been given to the Health and Wellbeing Board held the previous day. The report was available on the intranet. He had also had letters from Unite and had agreed to meet a representative of the union. It had been emphasised that he could not become involved in any trade union disputes but performance issues had been raised. Those issues had been conveyed to the Chief Executive of the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group asking that they be passed to the System Resilience Group. When a response was received it would be passed to the Chairman of this Select Commission.

Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Commission

Resolved:- That the Chairman, Councillor Watson, (Vice-Chairman as substitute) represent the Health Select Commission on the above body.

Care Quality Commission

The Commission was to inspect Rotherham Hospital shortly. There was an event on 17th February at the Holiday Inn commencing at 6:30pm for the public to share their experiences of the Hospital.

Incontinence Review

The Cabinet had accepted all 6 Review recommendations and the response would be further discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on the 23rd January with regard to monitoring arrangements. A copy of the response would be circulated to Select Commission members.

Refresh of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy

The Health and Wellbeing Board would commence scoping of the new Strategy at a workshop in mid-February and, following wider engagement with stakeholders, would be aiming to have the new Strategy in place by September, 2015.

**Health, Public Health and Social Care Round Up
Mental Health**

The NHS mandate for 2015-16 included the introduction of access and waiting time standards in Mental Health Services by March, 2016. 50% of people experiencing a first episode of psychosis were to receive a package of care within 2 weeks of referral and 75% of those referred to improving access to Psychological Therapies Services would be treated within 6 weeks of referral and 95% within 18 weeks.

New Models

A good summary contained within around the forward view for the NHS and new models of working and delivering health care.

Healthwatch

No issues were raised.

75. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 4th December, 2014.

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 4th December, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Arising from Minute No. 58 (Care Home Pilot – Waste Medicine Management), it was noted that the Clinical Commissioning Group had held an event on 19th January for voluntary and community sector groups

to try and understand the reasons why patients received medicines they did not require. The comments and experiences would help the team design a Medicines Waste Campaign for Spring 2015 and would inform their work in the area.

Arising from Minute No. 59 (Community Transformation Programme), it was noted that this item had been deferred to the March meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 62 (Chantry Bridge GP Registered Patient Service), it was noted that the information requested from NHS England had not yet been received.

Resolved:- (2) That NHS England be contacted regarding this matter.

Arising from Minute No. 63 (Childhood Obesity Review Update), it was noted that the Cabinet had approved tenders for the supply of Weight Management Services across six lots procured by Rotherham MBC as follows:-

- Lot 1: Children Tier 2 to be awarded to Places for People Leisure (value £170K).
- Lot 2: Children Tier 3 to be awarded to MoreLife (£128K).
- Lot 3: Children Tier 4 to be awarded to MoreLife (£76K).
- Lot 4: Adult Tier 2 to be awarded to Places for People Leisure (£120K).
- Lot 5: Adult Tier 3 to be awarded to Clifton Lane Medical Centre (Rotherham Institute for Obesity) (£300K).
- Lot 6: Single Point of Access to be awarded to Places for People Leisure (£50K, of which 50% will be retained by the commissioner to purchase licensed software and support marketing of the new framework provision)

76. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 3rd December, 2014.

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

77. MEETING OF HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION AND THE ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST

The minutes of the above meeting held on 24th November, 2014, were noted.

78. THE ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST - UPDATE ON ACTION PLAN PROGRESS

Louise Barnett, Chief Executive, Rotherham Foundation Trust, gave a powerpoint presentation illustrating the progress made on the 5 year strategic plan as follows:-

Option 1 – the preferred Option

- There was overwhelming support from the lead commissioner to retain locally run services for the population of Rotherham led and managed by the Trust
- There was a significant number of potential opportunities that would be realised through closer working and collaboration with other providers without recourse to merger

Option 1 – Financial Challenge and Progress

- Final Cost Improvement Programme for 2014/15 agreed in 5 year plan was £10.9M
- As at 30th November, 2014, Month 8, the Trust had delivered c£6.3M in-year against £6.1M plan
- Year end forecast at Month 8 was £10.1M and full year effect was £12.1M
- Month 9 on track and on target to achieve the full Cost Improvement Programme in-year of £10.9M including significant full year effect to support 2015/16
- All schemes were approved subject to Quality Impact Assessments with sign off by the Chief Nurse and Medical Director
- The Cost Improvement Programme for 2015/16 was currently £12.9M as stated in 2014/15 5 year plan for year 2
- This would be refreshed in line with sector business planning requirements
- Over performance in 2014/15 would support delivery of this requirement
- Capital spend was slightly ahead of plan in Month 8 but was being monitored and where possible consideration was being given to advancing schemes for next year
- Aims was to ensure a robust planned programme of capital expenditure to support Service delivery
- Reserves were being accessed to support delivery of the plan for 2014/15

Progress against Key Areas

- Clinical Speciality Reviews had been completed and the outcome would be shared with the Trust Board in January
- Emergency Centre Business Case agreed and expected to open in 2017
- Further work would be progressed during 2015/16 and the outer years to support the Trust's strategic direction to be a standalone Trust with collaboration

- Local context was compatible with national context – “Five Year Forward View” and the “Dalton Review” which supported local services and strived to achieve clinical and financial sustainability more broadly
- Benchmarking exercise undertaken with external input
- Identified opportunities for efficiencies compared with peer group
- Used to inform the cost improvement and transformation programmes for 2015/15 and beyond
- Importance of implementing Service Line Reporting and Patient Level Costing (PLiCS) to enable detailed understanding of cost base in 2015/16

Other Key Areas

- Monitor enforcement/undertakings
 - Electronic Patient Record enforcement lifted
 - Submitted documentation regarding Board Governance enforcement
 - Financial enforcement remained in place
- Board Director appointment since the last formal meeting
 - Simon Shepherd, Director of Finance
 - Chris Holt, Chief Operating Officer
 - Lynne Waters, Executive Director of Human Resources
 - Donal O’Donaghue, Interim Medical Director
- Winter pressures
 - A&E performance
 - Support from health and social care partners
 - Choose Well Campaign
- Sickness absence
- Recruitment and retention

Our Strategy and Goals

- Our Vision
 - To ensure patients are at the heart of what we do, providing excellent clinical outcomes and a safe and first class experience
- Our Mission
 - To improve the Health and Wellbeing of the population we serve, building a healthier future together
- Our Values
 - Respect, Compassion, Responsible, Together, Right First Time and Safe
- Our Strategic Objectives
 - Patients - Excellence in healthcare
 - Putting our patients at the heart of what we do
 - Care and compassion
 - Every patient and their family is special
 - Always ensuring we meet essential standards of care
 - Embracing the future and leading the way

Colleagues - Engaged, accountable colleagues
 Amazing colleagues delivering patient care every single day
 Ensuring that is a really great place to work
 Listening to you and supporting you to make decisions
 Developing you to be the best you can be
 Facing our challenges together

Governance - Trusted, open governance
 Being open and transparent about what we do
 Being responsible and accountable
 Learning when things do not go well
 Supported by clear policies and structures
 Always compliant giving patient's confidence in all we do

Finance - Strong financial foundations
 Using our money and resources wisely
 Better understanding the costs of delivering services
 Making savings safely and becoming more efficient
 Investing in quality and improving our facilities
 Value for money and planning for the future

Partners - Securing the future together
 Understanding the needs of our community
 Working with others to improve the health and wellbeing of our community
 Looking ahead
 Building partnerships to achieve clinical and financial sustainability
 Embracing innovation

Next Steps

- 2015-16 business planning process
 - Refresh of strategic plan to reflect newly introduced strategic objectives and aims for 2015/16 and beyond
 - Quality priorities, workforce, operational governance and financial elements
 - Build on feedback from partners, patients and colleagues
 - High level draft operational plan – 27th February, 2015
 - Final detailed operational plan – 10th April, 2015
- Achieve 2014/15 plan requirements for year 1

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Patients had not been surveyed specifically in relation to the quality of service since the start of the Strategic Plan but there were regular surveys as well as the Friends and Family Test so as to provide a line of sight year on year
- There was £10M in the Trust's recurrent funding. The Trust did carry out non-recurrent activities and the commissioners did give non-recurrent funding every year. Winter pressures were an example of

that funding although that issue may be dealt with differently going forward. A more detailed understanding of the cost base was required so Service line reporting and patient reporting had been implemented so exact costings would be known for particular procedures and make it easier to manage the funding. At the moment there was still an underlying deficit of £6-8M which needed to be added and was masked by a whole raft of things that the Trust did

- A&E had the accommodation/ability to cater for 55,000 attendances a year – it was actually seeing around 75,000 therefore working in a constrained environment. The new Emergency Centre was critical and would open in 2017 although there had been an assurance that by the Winter of 2016 the environment would be sufficiently developed. Work was taking place on the possibility of more space for the Winter 2015 to try and cope more effectively
- The 4 hour access target was a metric giving line of sight on performance in the Emergency pathway because patients needed to be seen, treated, admitted or discharged within 4 hours. Currently the Trust was not consistently achieving the 95% target and would be the subject of discussions with their Regulator who was fully aware of performance. The Trust had achieved Q1 and Q2 but not Q3. Although there was a commitment to achieve Q4, the Trust could no longer achieve the target for the year but was not alone in the wider national context. Actions had been put into place internally to improve the way it worked which should make a significant difference the benefit of which was already being seen. There were now days where the Trust was achieving above 95% but there were difficult days. That would remain the focus throughout the year
- Work was underway on the financial planning and would be submitted to Monitor on 27th February. Discussions would then take place and the plan submitted on 10th April
- The Trust had a deficit but not a debt. There was an underlying deficit but because the Trust was in surplus it continued as it was, however, there was a need to be mindful that whilst it appeared to be fine, once it had been stripped back, the Trust was actually living over its means. Continued monitoring would take place whilst still aiming to be in a position of surplus
- It was incumbent upon the Trust and a statutory requirement to deliver services to the population of Rotherham as a community provider. In light of budget cuts, the services had to be continued but in a more efficient manner. Currently there were a number of long stay patients in hospital but if there was more effective multi-disciplinary working with partners then the length of stay should be able to be reduced, relocating them into the correct setting quickly and thereby reducing the resources of organisations and capacity to provide the care. It was also hoped that the transformation of Community Services would

avoid people coming into hospital as often people were in hospital because there was no other alternative at the time of admission

- The Trust recognised the national challenges around the financial position but it was not planning to cease providing particular services as it had an obligation to provide them
- As part of the development of the Emergency Centre there had been a commitment to provide additional car parking and work was ongoing with bus companies with regard to routing. Work would also take place with the workforce and ensuring staff were flexible in terms of how they worked as the Trust increasingly moved to 7 days working. Other forms of transport would be encouraged e.g. car sharing and cycling. The Trust agreed to provide further information
- The Enforcement had been extremely challenging over recent times and there were still things that could be done to improve performance particularly A&E performance. The Emergency Centre would help take the Trust in a significant direction
- There had been intensive support from Health and Social Care partners during the Winter so far. The Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group had assisted when the Trust had raised concerns regarding the Walk in Centre and the ability for extra capacity had been provided to prevent people going to A&E which had made a real difference in managing the high spikes. GPs went into the Hospital 3 times a week to work as part of the multi-disciplinary teams to support long term patients to ensure the best possible care in the right place. With the assistance of the Hospital Consultants, senior GP, Head of Nursing in Communities Services, Social Services and Therapeutic Services, there was the ability to carry out focussed work and individual patient service which ensured the patient received the care needed very quickly. The Trust had also been provided with additional Social Workers and was really pleased with the package of support that had been available and felt very fortunate to have that level of co-operation from the local Health and Social Care economy
- Choose Well Campaign – need to keep getting the message out to the public
- The sickness absence rate was not good. Managers were being trained to manage this more effectively, strengthen the health and wellbeing offer to staff when not at work and take a very robust and supportive role. Sickness absence may impact on continuity of care and also leads to higher costs through the use of agency staff
- Recruitment and retention – there were national shortages in certain groups but the Trust continued to strive to recruit as many permanent staff as possible and was determined to ensure it had safe staffing

levels. There were approximately 20,000 nursing vacancies across the country. Rotherham continued with their recruitment campaign both nationally and internationally

- The Trust had faced a shortage of nurses and had done all it could to attract them to Rotherham. As many as the Trust could accommodate were recruited and there had been some very good student nurses within the organisation. It was acknowledged that there was more that could be in terms of unregistered staff, Health Care Assistants for example, who could be trained and not rely on agency staff. The market meant that nurses could go to agencies and work at a higher premium outside of their 'normal' working hours at another hospital. Successful investment schemes had been run attracting personnel to the organisation but ideally would like to reach a balanced position of staff working within the organisation consistently and able to do extra hours on the bank if they wished
- The Trust was very mindful and guided by NHS England in relation to whether it was appropriate and ethical to go abroad to recruit. The Spanish nurses were those that could not secure a job in Spain due to there not being sufficient positions, not because they were not competent. 2 of the Trust's experienced nurses had gone to Spain to interview the applicants and ensure they were fit to work in England and the Trust. Many of the nurses wanted to be able to secure jobs in the NHS and Rotherham's team had given assurance that the nurses were very impressive. They would start at the Hospital in the second week of February and would have a minimum of 2 weeks classroom induction to help them understand how the NHS worked and induct them into the process. The Trust was working with the Council to develop guides of local colloquialisms to help the nurses understand
- Every month the number of registered nursing vacancies were monitored and scrutinised at the Quality Committee. The Trust held between 30-50 registered nursing vacancies across the Trust per month and it knew that the local universities had an outturn twice a year so did its best to recruit new nurses to fill the vacancies. It had been identified that over the course of the next 6 months it would probably need to recruit 70 registered nurses to fill the vacancies and those that were likely to occur. A recruitment visit was to take place to Romania at the end of February as the Trust was led to believe from its recruitment agency that Spain would dry up in relation to surplus nurses shortly and it would be unethical to continue to recruit. It was hoped to recruit up to 30 nurses from Romania
- There was a NHS national staff survey which took place in the Autumn every year the results of which were anticipated in February/March. The Trust's own survey was also conducted in the Autumn and, whilst there was room for improvement, it had done quite well compared to other organisations. There needed to be continued

work with staff to ensure they were supported and had a good experience

- The Vision and Mission statements were reviewed annually. In terms of changes it was incumbent upon the Trust and others to work together and work through the Health and Wellbeing Board and outside that which all contributed to improving the health and wellbeing of Rotherham
- With regard to ex gratia payments i.e. small amounts of money claimed for compensation, the Trust took the stance that it was still public money and should not pay even small amounts without a full investigation. It was acknowledged that administratively it took time and cost for the investigation but it was still public money and if there were lessons to be learnt to avoid future costs that investigation should take place. The Ex Gratia Panel would consider whether an offer should be made and then would be reported to the Finance Committee and/or the Audit Committee.
- Patient litigation – the Trust contributed to the NHS Litigation Authority and was not out of line with other Trusts of its size in relation to litigation costs. It could be 6 years before the cost of a litigation was known. Rotherham's premiums to the Litigation Authority was what might be expected to see in a Trust of its size. Trusts without the 3 specialisms that Rotherham had - obstetrics, orthopaedic and A&E – may have lower premium and claims history as they were known as the 3 highest risk areas

Louise was thanked for her presentation.

Resolved:- (1) That the Trust attend Health Select Commission meetings twice a year to provide updates.

(2) That the Trust provide additional information about future plans for car parking on site.

79. THE ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST- HALF YEAR UPDATE ON QUALITY ACCOUNT

Tracey McErlain-Burns, Chief Nurse, gave a half yearly update on the Quality Account.

2014/15 Quality Objectives

– Safe – Harm Free Care

- The aim across the NHS was to get a 95% harm free care position. The national average across all England, including hospitals those which did not necessarily provide Community Care was currently 94%. The Trust had set itself a stretched target of 96%
- This time last year the Trust's position of harm free care was a little over 90%

- In November and October the Trust had exceeded 95%
- Safe – Mortality – Deliver a 4 point reduction in HSMR
 - It was believed that the Trust would be able to achieve the target and would be demonstrated at year end with a revision of the SHMI (Summary Hospital Level Mortality Indicator)
 - It would be a recommendation that the Priority be carried forward into 2015/16 as it was the original suggestion that it be a 3-5 years long term Strategy

Zero avoidable Pressure Ulcers Grade 204

- Primary focus on preventing avoidable pressure ulcers particularly in those patients living in their homes within the community
 - Still some progress to make within the Community
 - 94% rate in hospital
- Reliable – Achieve all national waiting time targets
A&E
 - Quarter 3 target had not been reached (see Minute No. 78), therefore, the year end position in relation to the emergency 4 hours target could not be met
 - Caring and Reliable – Friends and Family
 - Looked to increase the net promoter score for Maternity Services, Inpatients and A&E
 - The Test had been rolled out to all Services including Outpatients, Paediatrics and GPs
 - Current focus to drive the Test and get a representative view of Services, target 75%

2015/16

- The 2013 inpatient survey had been reviewed and would be repeated. The 2013 results along with the Friends and Family Test and complaints had generated a number of issues which had been considered by the Quality Assurance Committee. The Committee had recommended that the Trust look at improving the position and the number of patients whose condition acutely changed and the Trust needed to ensure that that acute change was picked up to prevent further deterioration whilst on the Wards
- Missed or delayed diagnosis. There was a national prerogative that the Trust ought to consider its rates of missed or delayed diagnosis. The Trust had signed up to the National Patient Safety website and made a pledge to improve patient safety and ensuring patients did not deteriorate in its care and did not delay or misdiagnose
- Discharge management and improving the care of patients with Dementia

- Complaints management – both Louise and Tracey managed the process very closely and read every complaint that was received with Louise signing all the responses. However, it was acknowledged that the process was not as effective as it could and there would be some quality improvement priorities set

Infection Control

- MRSA – there had been no cases during 2014/15. The Trust was getting better at preventing infection and increasingly knew how many people may come into contact with the Hospital Services who were carrying the bacteria without any ill effects
- When there had been examples of Norovirus in the Hospital it had been managed without rampant outbreak and contained within 1 or 2 Wards. This was a good marker of Infection prevention
- Clostridium Difficile – The Trust had been set a target of no more than 24 cases in 2014/15. There was currently the 24th case so it was likely that the Trust would exceed the target. The Chief Executive and Board had been advised and a meeting held with the Care Quality Commission and Monitor to make them aware. All cases were subject to a root access analysis which was then peer reviewed by Public Health England and the Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure the Trust had not overlooked anything. With the exception of 1 case they were suggesting that all of the cases were unavoidable and, therefore, if unavoidable it was difficult to know how the numbers could have been reduced

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- At the moment there were 25 vacancies across the Ward base but also vacancies in areas such as Outpatients and Endoscopy and approximately 50 Band 5 vacancies
- The vacancy level was higher as the Trust was looking at investing in development of Services such as a nurse leading the management of the Admission and Discharge of all patients from hospital
- Last year's recruitment campaign had been successful but approximately 6-10 nurses would leave on a monthly basis
- All of those nurses leaving were offered the opportunity of an interview with the Human Resources Director or Chief Nurse to understand the reasons for their resignation
- It was often found that nurses wanted to be in control of their rotas and when they worked which was why some choose to be agency nurses. Rotas were based around service needs first but with some flexibility for staff

- There would be approximately 3 nurses retiring a month. The age of a retiring nurse had reduced as many had protected their right to retire at 55 years of age
- The results of the national staff surveys and the national Inpatients and A&E surveys were public documents. It was not known when the results would be received but they were published by the Care Quality Commission

Tracey was thanked for her report.

Resolved:- That a year end report on the Quality Account be submitted to the April meeting.

80. SPECIAL SCHOOLS NURSING SERVICE

This item was deferred due to the report author being ill.

81. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 19th March, 2015, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
19th February, 2015

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Currie.

47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

48. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

49. COMMUNICATIONS

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser (Scrutiny and Member Development) reported that at the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 13th February, 2015, the subject of the Select Commissions' work programmes had been discussed in light of the appointment of the Executive Commissioners.

The Board had agreed, pending any instruction of statement of intent by the Commissioners, that future meetings of the Select Commissions should be considered on a case by case basis. The work commenced by the Commissions as part of the 2014/14 work programme should be completed, resources allowing, however the remaining areas of the programme not started be suspended for the present time.

In light of the above, the Management Board had taken the view that the budget review group and further work on consultation by the Self Regulation Select Commission should be suspended pending further details.

Councillor Ellis stated that were 2 areas of the Select Commission's work in particular that should not be lost sight of both of which had been alluded to in the Corporate Governance report. Firstly delegated decision making between officers and Members and those delegated powers to officers that were not reported and secondly the work of the review group on Standing Orders and looking at the different models of governance.

The Chairman agreed and suggested that they be passed to the Management Board.

Councillor Ellis felt that Scrutiny's role needed to be clearly set out in relation to the multi-agency response to address Child Sexual Exploitation.

Caroline Webb reported that one of the recommendations from the recent two day review work of the Management Board was to have a dedicated sub-group to look at the plans for the improvement activity that was being undertaken. The comments made with regard to ensuring information was communicated to Members and a clear direction of the activity taking place would be fed to the sub-group.

50. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8TH JANUARY, 2015

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8th January, 2015.

Arising from Minute No. 42(6)(6) (Capital Programme Monitoring 2014/15 and Capital Programme Budget 2015/16 to 2016/27), it was noted that a briefing note had not been provided as yet on the new integrated Housing Management IT system.

51. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST DECEMBER 2014

Further to Minute No. 131 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4th February, 2015, consideration was given to a report presented by Anne Ellis, Finance Manager, which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2014/15 based on performance for the first nine months of this financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would overspend against its Budget by £2.103m (+1.0%); an improvement of £873k since the last report to Cabinet in December (October monitoring report).

The current forecast outturn included the costs of implementing recommendations from the Jay report and the Ofsted Inspection to the extent known. It was an evolving picture with the proposed restructure of Children's Services currently out to consultation. If recruitment to the final structure commenced during February or March, there were likely to be additional costs incurred which were not currently reflected within the report. Costs which would be borne by the Council in respect of the Corporate Governance Inspection were still unknown; the Chief Executive had written to the Government asking for an estimation of the Inspection costs and a response awaited.

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.

- Additional costs of responding to the Jay report and Ofsted recommendations

The forecast outturn figure included in the report reflected staff cost savings for the staff who had left the Council during 2014/15 through Voluntary Early Retirement or Voluntary Severance together with the savings accrued through the moratorium on non-essential spend implemented on 2nd September, 2014, which would continue until the end of March, 2015.

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.

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.

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

52. RMBC "FACING THE CUTS, DELIVERING ROTHERHAM'S PRIORITIES" 2015/16/2016/17 - PUBLIC/EMPLOYEE CONSULTATION FINDINGS

Asim Munir, Community Engagement Officer, presented the key headlines from the recent 'Facing the cuts, delivering Rotherham's priorities' consultation that had taken place to help inform the Council's budget for 2015/15 and 2016/17 which had been active since 1st November to 31st December, 2014.

The consultation had been undertaken through input from a number of teams across the Council including Corporate Finance, Housing and Neighbourhood Area Partnerships and Engagement Service and Communications and Marketing. Rotherham residents and partner organisations had been asked to give their views on how the Council's budget should be spent and where reductions should be made on the following three priority areas:-

- Protecting our most vulnerable children and adults
- Getting people into work and making work pay
- Making our streets cleaner and better

The consultation had also asked whether people would support an increase in Council Tax.

The report set out the methods of consultation utilised and a summary of the findings for the consultation with the public, partners, voluntary and community sector and employees.

The impact of the findings would be mitigated through robust research methodology and analysis of findings, balancing qualitative and quantitative research methodologies distinguishing between respondents (such as Council employees, businesses, voluntary sector and the public) and a communication strategy that supported the consultation exercise.

All services would be encouraged to use the online forum as an integral part of their public consultation to ensure the momentum from the last two years was maintained. This would ensure that the response rate rose and improved as some momentum was lost between the last two budget consultation exercises when the online form was closed down.

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

- Work had commenced on linking the suggestions into budget saving proposals
- Feedback to participants would be provided once the budget had been agreed
- There had been a reduced response as to that previously but it was thought the timing may have had an effect – it had been scheduled for August, 2014

Resolved:- (1) That the headline messages arising from the analysis of the budget consultation be noted.

(2) That the development of a communications plan to ensure that the Council is proactive in communicating both the results and the impact on decision making to the public and employees be supported.

53. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 26th March, 2015 at 3.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
28th January, 2015**

Present:- Councillor J. Hamilton (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley, Burton, McNeely, Reynolds and Roddison.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Ahmed, Astbury, Clark, N. Hamilton and Tweed.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

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

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

38. COMMUNICATIONS.

The Senior Scrutiny and Member Development Adviser (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Resources and Transformation Directorate) reported that Ian Thomas, Interim Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services Directorate, would attend the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission to be held on 11th March, 2015. Ian had been due to attend the meeting that was cancelled because of inclement weather and he could not attend the re-scheduled date.

39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH NOVEMBER, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 5th November, 2014, were considered.

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

40. SCHOOL PLANNING, ADMISSIONS AND APPEALS UPDATE.

The Service Lead for School Planning, Admissions and Appeals was welcomed to the meeting to provide an update to members of the Improving Lives Select Commission on matters relating to his Service in Rotherham.

Department for Education Admissions Consultation: -

The Improving Lives Select Commission had considered the Department for Education's school admission consultation at their meeting held on 17th September, 2014 (Minute No. 24 refers). The Council was one of

444 stakeholders who responded to the consultation. It asked questions on: -

- **Priority for children eligible for the Pupil or Service Premium: -**

Rotherham's agreed response was that it should be optional to decide whether to adopt it or not, although this was not an issue in Rotherham where over 90% of pupils regularly received their first preference.

The outcome was that admission authorities had the option whether to implement this or not. Rotherham was to maintain current arrangements whilst retaining a watching brief and review arrangements if it became necessary.

- **Priority for nursery children eligible for the Early Years Pupil Premium, Pupil Premium or the Service Premium: -**

Rotherham's response was the same as for the previous question.

The outcome was that there would be no Statutory requirement to adopt this and could maintain current admission arrangements. Rotherham was to maintain current arrangements whilst retaining a watching brief and review arrangements if it became necessary.

- **Changes to the admissions consultation timetable: -**

Rotherham responded to say no significant barriers were envisaged from an amended timeline. Date changes to internal procedures would ensure a smooth transition and compliance.

The outcome of the consultation was that, for the 2015/2016 academic year, Rotherham would implement the necessary changes in preparation of the 2015/2016 admission round.

- **Admission of summer-born children: -**

Rotherham's agreed response was that this clarified the position for all parties.

The outcome in Rotherham would be that it would continue to be advised by medical and educational experts in relation to delayed entry to Foundation Stage Two.

- **Other technical drafting changes.**

Rotherham's agreed response was that the changes should be 'may' rather than 'must' to allow for a discretionary approach to meet local need.

The outcome was that local discretion could be maintained if required.

School place planning: -

The submitted report provided an overview of where additional school places had been created across the Borough, and how they had been funded. Basic Need Funding was received from the Department for Education to address capacity shortfalls. Section 106 Funding was received from developers to secure infrastructure was in place following new housing being built. Finance was provided at trigger points when housing had been sold.

There had been an increase of **1,110** permanent places created across the Borough between January, 2011 and September, 2014.

There were future permanent school places planned between 2015-2017 at the Eastwood Village Primary School, Cortonwood Infant School and Ellis Junior School.

Temporary increases in school places: -

There had been an increase of **195** temporary places created in the Borough in response to 'bulge' cohorts where demand had exceeded availability.

Potential new Schools: -

Two new primary schools were agreed at Waverley subject to trigger points being met from Section 106 contributions.

Should the Bassingthorpe Farm development come forward a Section 106 agreement would be required to build a new primary school.

School place summary for the 2014/2015 academic year school: -

There had been 3,280 applications for primary school places – 98% had been allocated one of their preferences (91.5% received their first preference, 5% received their second preference and 0.99% received their third preference).

- One school had been unable to accommodate their catchment area children;
- Four schools had been unable to accommodate siblings;
- Forty-two schools were unable to accommodate children in the distance category.

There had been 3,157 applications for secondary school places – 99% were allocated one of their preferences. (95.5% received their first preference, 3% received their second preference and 0.5% received their third preference).

Extra district import and export figures: -

Traditionally Rotherham was a net importer of pupils from neighbouring authorities.

Department for Education Basic Need Scorecard: -

The Department for Education had recently developed a scorecard for the use of Basic Need funding for school place planning. There was no benchmarking data available at this time to compare Rotherham's performance against other local authorities. The scorecard included: -

- Quantity;
- Quality;
- Cost.

Admissions: -

Annually, the Service processed 10,000 primary, secondary and in-year admission applications.

Admission Appeals: -

The Independent School Admission Appeal Panel had heard a group appeal for the first time in respect of admission to a Secondary School for admission in September, 2014. This process was scrutinised by the Local Government Ombudsman, who upheld that the appeal had been held in line with the Appeals Code.

During the 2013/2014 academic year, 442 school admission appeals were held.

School places overview by Learning Community: -

A briefing update was provided in relation to each of the Borough's learning communities.

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

- Councillor McNeely asked whether siblings would always be placed together in the same school? - The Service Lead explained how the admissions criteria worked. The Admissions Authority was able to project bulge years and made efforts to expand capacity in the Schools if physical space and funding was available.
- Councillor McNeely was aware of families, particularly with younger primary-aged children, who did not have access to their own transport but who still had to travel long distances to get to school.
- Councillor McNeely asked what happened to children who were on waiting lists? – The Service Lead confirmed that waiting lists for

Reception/Foundation Stage Two and Year 7 were maintained for the first term of the new academic year and thereafter they were disbanded and applications in-year were treated on a first come first served basis in line with the Admissions Code. Parents/carers had the right of appeal against any refusal of a school place. Independent Appeals Panels decided whether children had overriding needs to attend any school they had been refused.

- Councillor Roddison asked whether the Admissions Authority had ever objected to planning applications where local schools would not be able to cope with the additional demand? - The Admissions Authority was consulted on these matters and had raised concerns in relation to proposals for new developments in the past.
- Councillor Reynolds referred to development at Woodlathes Village where a school had been proposed but had not subsequently been built.
- Councillor J. Hamilton asked about development in the Rawmarsh Learning Community and why was Rawmarsh Thorogate being expanded when there were more local schools nearer which families living in the new development would have to pass to get to Thorogate? The Service Lead outlined how the decision to expand Rawmarsh Thorogate had been made based on the availability of space and the School's need for additional classrooms. Monkwood Primary School was also twice the size of Rawmarsh Thorogate already.
- Councillor J. Hamilton asked about issues at Wentworth Church of England Primary School not being able to accommodate children from the village. - The Service Lead explained how Admissions Criteria operated at the School, in conjunction with the Diocese. Distance criteria was such that children from out of the authority could live closer to the School than Rotherham children.
- Councillor J. Hamilton asked about the role of Pupil Premium in Rotherham's response to the admissions code consultation. - The Service Lead confirmed that the terminology 'may' rather than 'must' in the new Admissions Code would allow these matters to be locally decided to meet local need.
- Councillor J. Hamilton asked about place planning and the level of foresight the Local Authority had. - The Service Lead confirmed that the Admissions Authority had 4 years' notice for primary school demand, and 7 years' notice for planning for secondary school places.

Councillor J. Hamilton thanked the Service Lead for his attendance and presentation to the meeting and informative response to the questions asked.

Resolved: - (1) That the report and information presented in relation to School Planning, Admissions and Appeals be noted.

(2) That the Service Lead for School Planning, Admissions and Appeals inform the Improving Lives Select Commission on any issues of concern that arose in relation to the Service.

41. ROTHERHAM LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT, 2013/2014.

The Independent Chair of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board (RLSCB) and the RLSCB Business Manager were welcomed to the meeting to present the annual report for the period 2013/2014.

The Improving Lives Select Commission considered the annual report of the RLSCB each year. The 2012/2013 annual report was considered at the meeting held on 18th September, 2013 (Minute No. 22).

Councillor J. Hamilton, Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, raised how, as the report referred to the period 1st April, 2013- 31st March, 2014, it did not cover any of the more recent issues that the Council had experienced: the publication of the Jay Report and the Ofsted Inspection. In these circumstances and context, the report had a limited use. The Chair spoke about how the annual report could not be circulated until verified data had been received, which was usually the August following the end of the business year and due to the publication of the Jay report in August and then the Ofsted Inspection there was an understandable and unavoidable delay in submitting the report to the Improving Lives Select Commission.

As the report did not cover the post-Jay Report and Ofsted inspection, which had brought new consequences and processes for Children and Young People's Services Directorate, the Chair included a statement in the report to the effect that the content had been superseded.

The annual report included the following key priorities for the Rotherham LSCB within its Business Plan and in the 2013-2014 annual report: -

- **Child Sexual Exploitation: -**
 - Devastating effect on victims;
 - Significant increase in professional and community awareness;
 - Robust commitment and response required from all organisations, which had not always been the case;
 - The RLSCB had provided excellent training and awareness sessions for professionals;
 - The RLSCB had identified improvements that were required;
 - The Health and Wellbeing Board was assessing support requirements for victims and survivors of CSE.

- **Child Neglect: -**
 - Corrosive effect on wellbeing if not tackled from an early stage;
 - Neglect was the biggest category of those who were suffering significant harm in Rotherham;
 - Required a Child Protection Plan;
 - Multi-faceted issue requiring a multi-agency response;
 - A 2013 RLSCB review of cases of neglect – key messages were early identification, early utilisation of assessment tools and assertive interventions addressing the factors underpinning neglectful parenting;
 - The RLSCB were ensuring the review's lessons were implemented by sharing with all stakeholders at high-level strategic meetings.

- **Domestic Abuse: -**
 - Impacted on all aspects of wellbeing;
 - Correlation between Children on a Child Protection Plan and domestic abuse within the family, mental health and substance misuse;
 - In 2013, the Improving Lives Select Commission completed their scrutiny review of domestic abuse, with recommendations on developing more integrated services with clear protocols and pathways, and be more integrated at a strategic level;
 - Development of the Multi-Agency Support Hub (MASH);
 - Changed definition of domestic abuse to include young people aged 16-18.

- **Early Help: -**
 - The number of children in the Borough who were at risk of significant harm, had been taken into care or where there were concerns about them referred to more than one agency was high and rising;
 - Providing the right help at the right time for children and their families helped prevent problems from escalating;
 - The Local Authority had developed an Early Help Dashboard where caseload information from agencies was shared between Children's Centres, Targeted Family Support, Integrated Youth Support Service and the Learning Support Service;
 - The Early Help Dashboard included the ability to benchmark against regional outcomes.

- **Voice of the Child: -**
 - Listening to what children and young people said was key to understanding their needs, keeping them safe and providing effective services;
 - The RLSCB listened to the voice of children and young people via the results of the Lifestyle Survey, the Looked

After Children's Council, the Youth Cabinet and particularly their work on self-harm, advocacy support work for children on a Child Protection Plan.

The RLSCB had a budget financed by member agencies. Key contributors included Children's Social Care, Children's Health Services and the Police. The outturn of the 2013/2014 budget was a balanced position.

Opportunity was provided for members of the Improving Lives Select Commission and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to ask questions to the representatives about each section of the report: -

Councillor Burton asked about the significance of audits. - The Independent Chair referred to the Ofsted inspection report and the immediate need for an Improvement Plan. The changes were relating to the degree of scrutiny that the Board was giving. All agencies had agreed increases to the Board's available funding to allow more audits and more targeted audits against specific areas. In the past 6-8 weeks efforts had been concentrated on the 'front door' of Children's Social Care where referrals were made. In the past audits had not been sufficient in number, and when they did take place the reporting back process was verbal/informal. The Police Service was referring too many domestic abuse cases that did not meet the criteria for Social Care intervention, which suggested that this agency had not received sufficient training. Additional audits allowed the RLSCB to know what was happening and to measure what was improving.

Councillor Burton asked what the Independent Chair's opinion was on the outcome of the inspections. - The Independent Chair spoke about how the inspection was not a planned one; the inspection team had been directed to inspect Rotherham at short notice by the Secretary of State, which was unusual and demonstrated the seriousness of the situation. The Council, Children's Services and the RLSCB had accepted the outcomes of the inspection in full. The judgement that the RLSCB was inadequate was taken in the context that the Board could not be effective as it did not challenge Children's Services for inadequate performance. There were no grounds to appeal the outcomes or the overall decision for intervention. However, it would only be fair to expect future Ofsted inspections to follow-up and reassess the grading within the medium term.

Councillor McNeely asked about the financial reporting of a balanced position. She would have anticipated the budget to be over-spent given the complexity of cases and the context. - The Independent Chair outlined how the multi-agency budget was reached. It was spent according to strict criteria on limited items. The Independent Chair would expect to balance the budget each year and the only factor that would significantly impact on the budget was in relation to Serious Case Reviews. Any Serious Case Reviews undertaken would bring significant

additional commitments to the RLSCB and external funding would need to be sought in each instance. Broadly, the budget covered staffing costs and learning and development matters.

Councillor Reynolds asked what were the consequences of being judged to be inadequate? - The implementation of an Improvement Plan and monitoring the progress against it.

Councillor Vines asked whether the annual report could include information to show that it was now out-of-date/had been replaced. - The Independent Chair confirmed that this was displayed on the website but he could include a disclaimer on hardcopies to show the subsequent position.

Councillor McNeely asked about the figures relating to neglect. Did it include parental neglect only, or other adults and agencies in a child's life, as these people/organisations could also neglect a child's needs. For example, a school not providing a dedicated teacher for a pupil with autism. - The Independent Chair confirmed that it related to parental/carer neglect only when a child or young person had a Child Protection Plan, where criteria in the 'Working Together' Statutory Guidance had been met. This criteria was precise and Child Protection Plan status was the highest level within social care for highly vulnerable children and young people.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked about the statistics relating to the child protection category data on 'multiple categories' as it seemed high. – The Business Manager explained how a combination of abuse could be present, for example, physical and emotional abuse together, where multiple categories of abuse were met.

Councillor McNeely asked about the red rated indicators on page 18 of the annual report. - The Independent Chair spoke about the time limits relating to initial and core assessments. It had been a continuing area of failure for the Local Authority in the period of the annual report, 2013/2014. Any delay at these stages meant that a child or young person was potentially left with their needs and/or risks delayed and un-met. This performance was highlighted by Ofsted. Going forward, the two figures had now combined and Social Workers were required to undertake an assessment of a child following a report of concern within 45 days. The assessment deadline did not alter the fact that some children needed to be seen immediately and were seen immediately. The Independent Chair knew that improvements were being prioritised by Children and Young People's Services Directorate's new management, including timeliness and quality of assessments.

Councillor Reynolds felt that the locally agreed 35 days or national target 45 days was far too long. The Police would be called and attend immediately if someone was being assaulted in the street. - The Independent Chair outlined that where there was an immediate concern about a child's safety a police officer and a social worker would attend immediately. The target related to overall assessment.

Councillor Reynolds asked for confirmation that a child would receive immediate help if it was being assaulted. - The Independent Chair explained that all referrals would be assessed within 24-hours following referral. Emergency action was taken, and it was the longer term plan, which was assessed over the longer timeframe with a target of completion by 45 days. It was right that some assessments took an extended period of time as this work was often complex.

Councillor Burton asked about the impact on staff relating to timescales, staff vacancies, protected time and the availability and quality of supervision. Was it possible that demands and expectations on social workers were unattainable? The Jay Report spoke about the safeguarding of younger children following the Baby P report, had this caused other areas of safeguarding to be sidelined? - The Independent Chair confirmed that the RLSCB looked at training and workload of social workers. Rotherham, when benchmarked against other local authorities, had used less agency staff. Using agency staff was not an ideal situation in terms of quality or consistency. Rotherham had filled its posts well, but with a higher proportion of less experienced/ newly qualified staff. Nationally there was a problem with social worker numbers. This was not something that the national Political parties would prioritise in the same way they would with nurses, for example. The new management team was prioritising this. The social worker role was difficult and demanding, report writing was challenging but was a requirement of the role. The Independent Chair was satisfied that caseloads and workloads in Rotherham were being reviewed to ascertain whether they were within national guidelines.

Councillor Vines asked about the nature of the industry – it was impossible to plan how many referrals would be received. Therefore, it was management's role to respond to referral numbers and ensure that staff were appropriately deployed. - The Independent Chair confirmed that was the case; management needed to place resources in the right place at the right time to ensure children were safe.

Councillor Roddison referred to the role of admin support in freeing up social workers to concentrate on the front line. Was this work fully realised? When social workers had to concentrate on paperwork, they were less contactable and less available to the people who needed them. Delays could represent trauma to children. - The Independent Chair felt that this question should be made to the Interim Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked about what was being done to prevent suicides. - The Independent Chair referred to work initiated by the Director for Public Health on behalf of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Councillor J. Hamilton referred to the percentage of GPs who were aware of Child Sexual Exploitation. This had increased significantly over the year 2013/2014. - The Independent Chair felt that the awareness rate would have been much higher following the publication of the Jay Report. The Business Manager referred to Focus Groups being set up within Health sectors to ensure all staff knew about CSE.

Councillor Vines asked whether the supervision and line management culture was such that professionals felt confident to approach their line managers when they were unable to cope or out of their depth. - The Independent Chair felt that this question should be addressed to the Interim Strategic Director. There were significant changes and improvements taking place. Professionals needed to be supported; they would be the ones bringing these changes and improvements forward.

Councillor Burton referred to the interim leadership of the Council. This was concerning as it did not provide the stability that organisations needed. - The Independent Chair spoke about the unprecedented level and nature of scrutiny and coverage that Rotherham had experienced. He felt more confident at the current time that vulnerable children and young people would be identified and correctly helped when they were referred than he would have done one year ago.

Councillor Vines felt that strong interim management could play an effective role in the organisation, giving time to recruit strong permanent staff.

Councillor McNeely asked about the responsibility of the Local Authority Designated Officer. – The Independent Chair confirmed their line management structure and model of support.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked about the MASH. Who did it report to and who line managed it? What was the political management? The Bradford model had been seen as a success. - The Independent Chair explained the multi-agency nature of the concept. Rotherham's MASH was late in coming together. Staff were working in the same building but not co-locating and working as one team. Certain agencies were very reluctant to work together. The concept of the MASH was recognised as best practice across all national agencies. The RLSCB was reviewing through audit work the number of cases the MASH dealt with and had made recommendations.

Councillor Reynolds commented that he would like to ask the Interim Strategic Director about Rotherham's MASH ethos as he had visited it and had observed split working and received defensive responses to supportive questions.

Councillor Burton was aware that most abuse happened in the home by someone the victim knew and trusted. It would not be right to allow focus on this to be lost because of the spotlight on CSE. - The Independent Chair agreed with this. It was understandable that CSE was at the top of everyone's agendas. The previous Strategic Director had been misquoted when emphasising how serious other Safeguarding issues were, specifically referring to neglect. The Independent Chair confirmed that the other serious concerns would not be sidelined in Rotherham's correct drive to improve outcomes relating to CSE.

Councillor Reynolds outlined his conviction that Local Authorities must focus on addressing root causes, which would prevent issues at a later stage.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked about the RLSCB meetings and purpose. - The Independent Chair outlined the new focus of RLSCB meetings to focus on performance and outcomes, rather than forums for presentations and talking.

Councillor J. Hamilton asked for the report to be prefaced to show it was out of date following more recent events. In future years, she asked for the RLSCB annual report to be brought to the Improving Lives Select Commission earlier.

Resolved: - (1) That the report and information presented in relation to the 2013/2014 Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board annual report be noted.

(2) That the information shared regarding the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board following the publication of the Jay Report and the Ofsted Inspection outcomes be noted.

42. EDUCATION LIFESTYLE REPORT, 2014.

The Service Improvement Officer (Children and Young People's Services Directorate) was welcomed to the meeting to provide a presentation on the outcomes of the Education Lifestyle Survey, 2014. The Improving Lives Select Commission considered the outcomes from the Education Lifestyle Survey (formerly the Lifestyle Survey) each year. The Lifestyle Survey, 2013, was considered at the meeting held on 12th March, 2014 (Minute No. 55).

The Service Improvement Officer confirmed that the Survey results for 2014 covered the period prior to the publication of the Jay Report.

The submitted report outlined that the Lifestyle Survey was a valuable piece of consultation to capture the views of young people in Years 7 and 10 and asking their opinions on: -

- Food and drink;
- Health, activities and fitness;
- Being in school;
- Out of school;
- Young carers;
- Bullying and safety;
- Smoking, drinking and alcohol;
- Sexual health;
- Local neighbourhood.

In 2014, all 16 secondary schools participated in the survey, although one did withdraw their involvement due to the content of some of the questions. The issues were addressed but the School felt it was too late to reintroduce the survey.

Overall, **4,123 pupils participated**, representing a 63% participation rate. This was the highest participation rate ever since the Survey's start in 2006. Neighbouring local authorities had already approached Rotherham for support as the rate of participation was much more favourable here.

Additional questions had been incorporated in 2014 following requests from Public Health, the Police and the Healthy Schools' Consultant. The new questions concerned safety, sexual health education, internet safety, e-cigarettes and asking participants what they thought around alcohol, drugs and smoking.

All participating secondary schools received a copy of the overall Borough-wide report and their individual school report so they could see what their school results were and compare to the Borough-wide response. The Healthy Schools' Service received copies of individual school reports to identify which schools needed support in specific areas.

Individual school results were not shared publically but schools may choose to publicise their outcomes. The Survey was important for schools as a way of demonstrating to Ofsted how their pupils' voices influenced school matters, including curriculum.

The results of each survey were shared with a wide range of stakeholders: -

- Public Health;
- Healthy Schools Consultant;
- Safer Neighbourhood Partnership;
- South Yorkshire Police;
- South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive;

- Neighbourhood Crime Manager;
- Young Carers Provider – Barnardos;
- Locality Team(s);
- School Nursing;
- Families for Change;
- Youth Cabinet;
- Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board;
- Communications Team – the Service Improvement Officer aimed to release a quarterly good news story related to the Survey demonstrating how it was having a positive impact.

Overall, the 2014 positive outcomes were: -

- More young people participated;
- More young people said they had breakfast up to 80% in 2014 from 73% in 2013;
- More young people taking up the option of school dinners - up to 44% in 2014 from 28% in 2013;
- New question – 98% of young people had been taught either at school or at home about internet safety;
- Young people who said they had been bullied, reduced to 28% in 2014 from 38% in 2013;
- Young people reported that they had received help following being bullied increased significantly to 64% in 2014 from 26% in 2013;
- Young people reported they regularly drank high energy drinks down by 9% in 2014;
- Increase in the number of young people who said they had never tried alcohol up to 43.5% in 2014 from 41% in 2013;
- Reduction in the number of young people trying some type of drug.

2014 impact and outcomes: -

- Schools appointing Anti-Bullying Ambassadors – improvement with bullying rates, but also increase in those seeking help after being bullied;
- Specific action plan developed to monitor the safety in and around Rotherham Town Centre including the interchange – Operation Civilise – reportable incidents reduced by 32% in Quarter 3 (Oct to Dec 2014);
- Promotion event to show young people where they can go in school for confidential health advice;
- Young Carer's card now being piloted in 5 schools in Rotherham;
- 9 retail establishments had been issued with warnings about selling alcohol and cigarettes to under-aged young people;
- New questions added to the survey about young people's thoughts on smoking, drinking alcohol and taking drugs;
- Changes made to PSHE lessons in school using the data from 2013 survey around alcohol – targeted lessons to young people;

- RMBC Public Health Partnership joint working – targeting a community with prevention and education about drug use.

2014 areas for attention: -

- Pupils feeling good about themselves had reduced in a number of areas;
- Safety issues similar to 2012 and 2013 – Town Centre and Public Transport where pupils feel least safe;
- Local shops identified as a place where young people in particular Year 10 could obtain cigarettes;
- Young Carers slight increase in reported rates;
- Crisps had replaced fruit as the most popular snack at break time;
- Less young people say that they regularly participated in sport;
- Young people feeling their school council made a difference had reduced;
- Cyber Bullying was what young people felt was the main risk of using the internet;
- Sexual Health – number of young people not using contraception.

2014 areas for improvement: -

- Self-harm pathway had been developed for front-line workers who had contact with young people age (9 to 25);
- Young Person Forum (Youth Cabinet) were working jointly with the Police and South Yorkshire passenger transport in making recommendations to improve safety and perceptions of safety in and around Rotherham Town Centre and there would continue to be involvement in a transport user group;
- Smoking and Alcohol/Drug Strategy Groups to carry out work with young people against the peer pressure – questions added in 2014 for young people: – ‘Do you think it is OK to smoke, drink, use drugs?’ results show they do not in particular at the Year 7 age group;
- Substance Awareness week planned for 20th April 2015;
- Review of Young Carer’s Card scheme;
- Sexual Health strategy group had a priority to work with young people and consultation with Youth Cabinet had endorsed the approach of the strategy;
- Healthy School Consultant was working with each school PSHE Lead to highlight the priorities for each school based on their Survey outcomes.

Discussion followed on the information presented and the following questions were raised: -

- Councillor McNeely asked whether the outcomes showed which five Secondary schools were involved in the Carers' Card scheme, and also asked for a copy of the Card – The Service Improvement Officer agreed to provide this information;
- Councillor McNeely asked about school reception of smoking in general, and, more recently, e-cigarettes? - The Service Improvement Officer referred to a commitment to make all of Rotherham's Schools no smoking premises, including e-cigarettes and including the wider school grounds.
- Councillor Roddison asked to see the questions that were asked and the responses received. This information presented was a bit vague and made it hard to challenge the actions of agencies following receipt of the Survey outcomes. - The Service Improvement Officer agreed to email out the questions to the Improving Lives Select Commission and to include the questions in future years' reports.
- Councillor J. Hamilton noticed that a very high response of children and young people wanted more fun and interesting lessons. What was happening here? - The Service Improvement Officer confirmed that the results did go to Schools each year so they were aware of what was being requested. Since 2006, this answer had consistently requested more fun and interesting lessons. It could be the way that the question was asked and/or the answer options that were provided.
- Councillor J. Hamilton referred to bullying via social media. - The Service Improvement Officer confirmed that each School had a Healthy Schools Consultant who was addressing this. Fear of the internet was consistently reported. Future Surveys could ask pupils to provide more information about this in the 'other' box.
- Councillor Reynolds asked how widely the survey outcomes were shared. Did they go to the Police and did they act on them? – The Service Improvement Officer outlined the agencies who received the outcomes. The survey did go to the police and they did act on the outcomes in a positive way. For example, work between the police and individual schools was continuing to try to identify the areas where shops were selling cigarettes to children and young people. Councillor Reynolds commended this tangible action of the survey.

The Senior Scrutiny and Member Development Adviser referred to a presentation being provided at the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission on Town Centre safety, including young people's perceptions as taken from the Education Lifestyle survey.

Councillor J. Hamilton felt that the Action Plan as a document that showed how the Education Lifestyle Survey was used to inform services would be a useful document for the Improving Lives Select Commission to look at. It would also be useful to look at the previous year's response to compare the most recent year's outcomes to see what was changing, improving and getting worse.

Resolved: - (1) The Improving Lives Select Commission noted the actions of the Cabinet on 14th January, 2015, in noting the Education Lifestyle Survey report, 2014, and noting and agreeing the action plan which would be used to ensure that issues were actioned following completion of the survey.

(2) The Improving Lives Select Commission requested that future reports would include the questions and answers from the Survey from the current year and previous year so that the direction of progress and trends could be seen and monitored.

(3) That the smoking leaflets referred to regarding illicit tobacco be distributed to all of Rotherham's Elected Members to increase awareness and for potential circulation.

43. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 11th March, 2015, to start at 2.00 p.m. in the Rotherham 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 Councillor 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 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 helped 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 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.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
23rd January, 2015

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Currie.

83. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

84. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

85. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 12TH AND 18TH DECEMBER, 2014

The Chairman advised that the minutes of the meetings of the 12th and 18th December, 2014 should be deferred to the next meeting as comments from supporting organisations were still being received.

Resolved:- That the minutes be deferred to the next meeting.

86. SCRUTINY OF ROTHERHAM'S PLANS TO ADDRESS CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Consideration was given to a report presented by Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny and Member Development Officer, which detailed the draft report and recommendations of the scrutiny review of Rotherham's plans to address child sexual exploitation following the Board's agreement to a more in-depth scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation which took place over two full days on Friday, 12th and Thursday, 18th December, 2014.

The first day examined the experiences from and implications for the Local Government sector in addressing the challenges of child sexual exploitation; examining current performance and action plans, how agencies in Rotherham worked together to tackle child sexual exploitation; and how criminal justice agencies in Rotherham addressed child sexual exploitation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Colleagues in Democratic Services were thanked for their support to the scrutiny process given the considerable task in capturing all the comments and information shared at the sessions.

Councillor Parker referred to the absence of any recommendation about the opportunities for staff, either from the Council, Health or the Police to come forward with information without recrimination as part of the Whistleblowing Policy and was advised that this may be picked up via the Corporate Government Inspection Report once published. The profile of the Whistleblowing Policy needed to be promoted with a clear steer how staff could report in any concerns.

The Chairman asked the Board to consider whether or not they wished to include a specific recommendation about the Whistleblowing Policy or whether to allow Councillor Sansome, the Overview and Scrutiny Board Representative, to raise this as a concern at the next meeting of the RMBC/Trades Unions Joint Consultative Committee.

The Board were in agreement with allowing Councillor Sansome to raise this at the Joint Consultative Committee, as indicated above, as this was not an area that had been considered as part of the two day scrutiny sessions and had not featured in the discussions.

Councillor Wyatt reiterated his thanks to Democratic Services and Scrutiny Services for the value they added to the two day sessions and having not seen any outcomes asked how this supported the other work taking place.

The Senior Scrutiny and Member Development Officer confirmed that a meeting had taken place with the Chief Executive and the Children's Commissioner, who recognised the scale of the work and the improvement activity taking place and the need for the recommendations from the scrutiny sessions to feed into the process whilst avoiding duplication. A further meeting was to take place with the Director of Commissioning and Performance Management to go through the recommendations for any response and for any amendments to be proposed.

Councillor Read reinforced the need to have one action plan to tackle child sexual exploitation to ensure the same priorities/actions were being captured and for these to feed into the newly formed Children's Improvement Board.

Councillor Sims also asked that the word "historic" in the first recommendation of (a) be changed to "historical".

Councillor C. Vines expressed his concern over the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board and whether it was fit for purpose and was advised by the Chairman that he had met with the Independent Chairman who had agreed that the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be included on the membership of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board as an observer.

Councillor Read pointed out that Councillor C. Vines was right to be concerned about the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children's Board and that this should be flagged up by Scrutiny. It was noted that the Annual Report was to be considered by the Improving Lives Select Commission at its next meeting.

The Board suggested that the final version of the report be submitted back to the next meeting for consideration before it was submitted to Cabinet.

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

(2) That the comments raised be incorporated into the report for resubmission.

(3) That the updated report be resubmitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board before it was forwarded to Cabinet; the Children's Improvement Board and Corporate Improvement Board for consideration.

87. SCRUTINY REVIEW ON SUPPORTING THE LOCAL ECONOMY

Further to Minute C125 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 14th January, 2015 consideration was given to the report which detailed the response to the thirteen recommendations of the Scrutiny Review into Supporting the Local Economy.

The Review Group produced thirteen recommendations, covering a range of issues relating to the Rotherham economy and the responses were set out on the attachment to the report.

Officers agreed, in whole or part, with all the recommendations and in a number of cases they have already been implemented. However, it was noted that Recommendation No. 5 had been targeted at the Planning Board and this was incorrect, Recommendation No. 12 required further consideration as to how this could be set up and Recommendation No. 13 had been deferred as this could be fed into the Work Programme.

The Board noted the Growth Plan had been considered by the Improving Places Select Commission to indicate some of the work had already started.

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

(2) That the first monitoring report of the implementation of the review be presented to the Improving Places Select Commission in six months' time.

88. SCRUTINY REVIEW - URINARY INCONTINENCE

Further to Minute C125 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 14th January, 2015 consideration was given to the report which detailed the response following the completion of a scrutiny review of Urinary Incontinence Services in May – June 2014.

This review identified a series of recommendations which cut across the Council's Directorates, all of which were accepted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Health offer the opportunity for key messages to be included on our Public Health TV screens as well as encouraging Pharmacies to consider prioritising incontinence as one of their Public Health Campaigns for 2015.

Information will also be included on the Get Active Rotherham website to raise awareness and confidence of patients with urinary incontinence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) That the first monitoring report of the implementation of the review be presented to the Health Select Commission in six months' time.

89. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were none submitted.

90. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

There were none submitted.

91. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission:-

Councillor Watson, Chairman, referred to the two recent meetings which had considered the Scrutiny Review of Access to G.P.'s response, which would come back in June, 2015.

A half yearly update had also been received from the Rotherham Foundation Trust reflecting strong Board Management, their confidence in achieving targets in Quarter 4 and the extra G.P. capacity.

The Rotherham Foundation Trust had also provided an update on their action plan progress, highlighting survey responses, the CAMHS review, Chantry Bridge proposals and the watching brief on the Yorkshire Ambulance. A meeting was scheduled on the Ambulance Service, but this clashed with the meeting of full Council.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

Councillor Read, Chairman, referred to the previous meeting which considered the Growth Plan, along with recommendations around Enterprise Zones, the Living Wage and ensuring that local people have the correct skills for the jobs which were available.

David Burton had also attended to give an update on Winter Weather issues.

Councillors Atkin, Gosling and Sims were also nominated to conduct a spotlight review on the response to winter weather.

A safety in the town centre report was also to be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

Councillor Parker made reference to the Living Wage and commented on the limited enforcement action that could be taken by large companies who were not even paying the Minimum Wage.

Councillor Read pointed out that the Council had aspirations around the Living Wage, but acknowledged the limits that could be done with the current legislation.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

Councillor J. Hamilton, Chairman, confirmed that the meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 21st January, 2015 had been cancelled due to poor weather and the number of apologies received. The meeting would now take place on Wednesday, 28th January, 2015 to prevent any impact on the cycle of meetings and consider the Rotherham Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report.

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

Councillor Wyatt, Vice-Chairman, had nothing further to report.

Resolved:- That the information shared be noted.

92. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no call-in requests.

93. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board scheduled for Friday, 27th February, 2015 at 9.00 a.m. at the Town Hall will be moved. The date is yet to be confirmed.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
13th February, 2015

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed and Parker.

94. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

95. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

96. SCRUTINY OF ROTHERHAM'S PLANS TO ADDRESS CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Further to Minute No. 86 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 23rd January, 2015, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Senior Adviser (Scrutiny and Member Development) detailing the draft report and recommendations of the scrutiny review of Rotherham's plans to address child sexual exploitation.

Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board commented on the following specific issues:-

: the importance of effective partnership working between the Council, its statutory partners and also the voluntary sector, in tackling child sexual exploitation under a 'shared vision';

: how to find ways of avoiding the negative and ineffective habit of departments and organisations working in isolation, in 'silos';

: the need for improved communications between agencies, including the sharing of confidential and sensitive information;

: the need for clarity about the way in which the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board communicates with the general public about its role and function.

Members also debated the contents of the minutes of the two meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, which had been held on 12th and 18th December, 2014, to consider Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation:-

(i) Minutes of the meeting held on 12th December 2014

: it was clarified that the question about the apparent non-attendance of education partners (at the 12 December meeting) had been about the attendance of head teachers and representatives of academies and schools, rather than officers of Children and Young People's Services;

: Members questioned the use of risk assessments in tackling child sexual exploitation and suggested that further information be sought on how the thresholds are applied;

: a specific response, including up-to-date figures, was required to the question about the number of abduction notices which had been issued, by the South Yorkshire Police, in Rotherham, during the past twelve months (and how many children/young people were involved);

: Members acknowledged that the South Yorkshire Police would be unwise to publish information about current and continuing investigations of (any) crime, because such investigations may become compromised; however, it should be possible to publish the number of successful prosecutions relating to child sexual exploitation;

: Members asked whether there was a sufficient amount of support available for victims when Court hearings were pending in respect of the prosecution of offenders (it was acknowledged that the resources of the South Yorkshire Police may be limited in terms of notifying victims who may not ultimately be required to attend a Court hearing as a witness);

: it was noted that the provision of services to witnesses and also the victim support service both received funding directly from the budget of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

(ii) Minutes of the meeting held on 18th December 2014

: the Child Sexual Exploitation Needs Analysis – Members stated that the various questions which they had asked, during this meeting on 18 December 2014 and which have not yet been answered, should be addressed;

: Discussion took place on the reductions in the budget for the South Yorkshire Police Service, which will impact upon its ability to investigate new cases of serious crime; it was agreed that appropriate representations ought to be made to the Home Secretary (with a copy sent to the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, to the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel and to the three local Members of Parliament) about the implications of the reductions in the Police Service budget;

: Members acknowledged that the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) needed to continue operating effectively.

Members also asked a question about how children who go missing from care and are at risk of child sexual exploitation, are monitored.

Members concluded that a continuous and in-depth scrutiny of the response to the issue of child sexual exploitation, both by this Council and its partner agencies, shall be afforded the highest priority.

A short discussion took place on 'whistle blowing' and the response of large organisations to this issue. Using the recent media coverage of a case affecting the National Health Service, it was agreed that this Council ought to review and, if necessary, update its own 'whistle blowing' procedure, including a search of best practice being utilised across the public sector.

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

(2) That the report, now submitted, of the scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation, be forwarded to the Chief Executive for incorporation into this Council's improvement plans, as appropriate.

(3) That a sub-group, comprising the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission and one Member of the Opposition, shall be established and shall meet initially on a monthly basis to:-

(a) oversee the continuing monitoring and review of the recommendations and actions contained in the report of the scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation; and

(b) receive and consider information from relevant officers and agencies regarding the implementation of improvement plans in relation to child sexual exploitation.

(4) That the minutes (as now amended) of the two special meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 12th and 18th December, 2014, be approved as correct records.

(5) That the report, now submitted, of the scrutiny of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation, be distributed to all of the agencies and organisations which have contributed to the review.

(6) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board requests information on the impact of the budget reductions affecting the Police Service and the specific implications for the investigation of cases relating to child sexual exploitation, as part of its scrutiny of the Safer Rotherham Partnership.

(7) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes the commitment of the single Improvement Plan to track and monitor progress and improvements and insists that appropriate actions be taken and monitored in respect of Rotherham's plans to tackle child sexual exploitation.

(8) That a report be submitted to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on the Council's 'whistle blowing' policy.

97. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2014/2015 - PROGRESS UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 16 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 18th July, 2014, discussion took place on the overall scrutiny work programme for the 2014/2015 Municipal Year.

It was agreed that, pending any instruction or statement of intent by the Government-appointed Commissioners:

(1) the future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and of the four Select Commissions shall be considered on a 'case-by-case' basis;

(2) the work that already started as part of the 2014/15 scrutiny work programme would be completed;

(3) the work on the remaining areas of the 2014/15 scrutiny work programme shall be suspended.

98. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no items to report.

99. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Arrangements were being made for a meeting between Members of the Health Select Commission and members of the Youth Cabinet, to be held on Wednesday, 25th February, 2015, for discussion about Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS).

100. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 23RD JANUARY 2015

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 23rd January, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, further to item 96 above, the minutes (as now amended) of the two special meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 12th and 18th December, 2014, concerning the scrutiny of the response to Professor Jay's report about child sexual exploitation, be approved as correct records for signature by the Chairman.

101. **WORK IN PROGRESS**

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

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

(Councillor Currie apologised that he had not provided a briefing for his Vice-Chairman, prior to the previous meeting)

: continuing the monitoring of budget issues;

: the Select Commission has received an update on performance reporting from the interim Chief Executive and would be receiving further updates at a future meeting.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

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

: consideration of the process of pupils' admission to schools, the planning process and school admission appeals;

: consideration of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report, 2013/2014;

: consideration of the Education Lifestyle Survey 2014 (survey of Rotherham's school pupils);

: items for future meeting agendas include consideration of the response to the Ofsted inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, looked after children and also the implications of the Care Act 2014.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

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

: consideration, at the next meeting, of safety issues affecting the Rotherham town centre, including multi-agency responsibilities (especially the South Yorkshire Police and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE)) and the perception, especially amongst young

people, that the town centre is unsafe (this issue includes feedback from the Education Lifestyle Survey referred to above).

: future consideration of the Council Housing Investment Improvement Strategy;

: review of the provision of travel passes by the SYPTTE (matters concerning agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990);

: a spotlight review of the Council's response to Winter weather conditions (and including related issues raised by the Self Regulation Select Commission).

Health Select Commission:-

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

: consideration of issues affecting the Ambulance Service industrial dispute about response times – further specific details about the Service operations in Rotherham will be included in the Service annual performance report, to be published during May 2015;

: consideration of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), including the proposed meeting with the Youth Cabinet.

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

(2) That it be confirmed that the Select Commissions will not begin any additional scrutiny reviews until guidance and/or instruction has been received from the Government-appointed Commissioners.

102. CALL-IN ISSUES

The Chairman reported that notification had been received of the call-in of the decision of the Cabinet meeting of Wednesday, 4th February, 2015, relating to the Magna Trust Loan Renewal (Cabinet Minute No. 141 refers).

It was agreed that a special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held on Wednesday, 18th February, 2015, in order to consider this call-in issue.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
18th February, 2015

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors J. Hamilton, Sims, C. Vines, Watson and Wyatt.

Call in sponsors : Councillors Cowles and Reynolds;

Councillor Hoddinott (Deputy Leader).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Currie, Middleton, Parker, Read and Sansome.

103. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

104. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wyatt declared a personal interest in the subject matter of Minute No. 105 below, as being a volunteer helping at a charity fund-raising event (organised by a committee of volunteers) which would be taking place at the Magna Centre in the near future. Having declared his personal interest, Councillor Wyatt remained in the meeting to speak and vote on the item.

105. CALL IN - MAGNA TRUST LOAN RENEWAL

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and the call-in procedure was explained.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board considered Minute No. 141 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4th February, 2015 concerning the decision for the Council to provide an additional loan facility to the Magna Trust. The resolutions of the Cabinet were:-

“(1) That a short term Council loan facility to the Magna Trust of £250,000 be deferred.

(2) That the decision taken by the Chief Executive on 16th January, 2015, in accordance with her delegated powers, to provide Magna with an immediate additional £100,000 loan facility, to be drawn down by Magna on demonstration of need, be noted.

(3) That the appointment of an independent consultant to undertake a review of Magna’s business, to help to strengthen the Magna business plan and to assess the future viability of Magna, be approved and a report be submitted back to the Cabinet in due course.”

The written and signed call in request, dated 9th February, 2015, read as follows:-

“At the Cabinet meeting, Wednesday 4th February, 2015, the Cabinet agreed to continue funding Magna over the short term and to hire an independent consultant to provide further insight and information into the longer term viability of the business.

UKIP does not believe this is necessary and that additional expenditure on the services of an independent consultant is a further waste of public money.

There is sufficient experience within the Authority to analyse the financial position at Magna and the management in place can provide additional information with regard to future business and the supporting services required to allow the Council to make a fully informed decision with regard to the ongoing viability of this enterprise.”

Councillor Cowles, supported by Councillor Reynolds (present) and also by Councillors Cutts, Reeder, Turner and M. Vines (not present) explained the reasons for the call-in request and presented the objections to this proposal, with reference to the following issues and views:-

- a) The possible loss of employment at the Magna Centre would certainly be regrettable, however, there is no justification for this Council continuing to provide loans to the Magna Trust;
- b) Equally, there is no need to appoint an independent consultant to undertake a review of the Magna Trust's business, because this is just a very short-term study of the organisation and one which is capable of being completed by the Council's own finance officers;
- c) The Magna Trust must be asked to prepare its own business plan and not have an independent consultant prepare one on its behalf;
- d) The Council should not be making a decision on any grant for the Magna Trust until Council Members have seen and studied the Trust's business plan;
- e) The Council's proposed funding of the 'Man of Steel' sculpture is also questionable and which will be questioned later this year;
- f) This Council is only one of three organisations which provide funding for the operation of the Magna Centre; if the other two organisations are not providing funding for this latest issue, then why should the Council be doing so ?

- g) The Magna Trust is known to be fairly weak, financially and there are other concerns about the business which have not been included in the report which the Cabinet had considered at its meeting on 4th February, 2015;
- h) The Magna Trust is effectively two separate businesses : one is a visitor attraction; and a study of that business, over a period of time, shows that visitor numbers are reducing and further investment is needed to make the whole project viable; attractions and museums, such as this, always have to be providing something different, so as to attract both new and returning visitors;
- i) The second of the Magna Trust businesses is to do with corporate entertainment and is a business facing competition both from Rotherham United's New York football stadium and also from the Arena stadium in Sheffield. This Council itself has taken business away from the Magna Centre and instead often uses the New York stadium's corporate facilities;
- j) The Magna Centre has huge utility costs and conditions are usually cold within the vast building. It is difficult for these problems to be overcome and to continue developing the business;
- k) A repeat of the assertion that there is no necessity to appoint an independent consultant to undertake a review of the Magna Trust's business;
- l) The potential windfall income opportunities, which may help reduce the Magna Trust's loan obligations are in themselves only one-off, isolated opportunities and it is speculative to try and suggest that they will produce a substantial amount of income;
- m) As the report to the Cabinet meeting states, the Magna Trust has to develop a sustainable business model in the future, but there is no evidence that any long-term business has yet been secured; is the building suitable for hosting corporate entertainment ?
- n) This Council has previously provided a long term loan to the Magna Trust; however, this proposed short-term loan will not be a secured loan;
- o) Whilst there may be some potential for the building of a hotel in the vicinity of the Magna Centre, this Council has previously refused planning permission for a hotel near there (Premier Inn application);
- p) A member of the public had previously asked a question of this Council (circa 2013) about the ownership of land at the Magna Centre; however, that member of the public has not been afforded the courtesy of a reply;
- q) Again, any loss of employment and jobs would be regrettable and the study of the Magna Trust's business plan should be undertaken by finance officers of this Council; the study would take just a month to

complete; the Council is seeking to avoid any more 'bad news stories' in the months before this year's elections; the Council is being too political in its approach to this matter;

r) Financial and business information should be available from the Magna Trust, about its future plans; if the visitor attraction aspect of the business cannot be improved, it seems unlikely that the corporate entertainment element, on its own, would ensure the future survival of the whole business.

The Chairman invited the other Councillors supporting the call in request to make comments, as follows:-

i) Councillor C. Vines commented that it has taken some thirteen years for the Magna Trust to develop the corporate entertainment element of the business. Although the Council has a charge over the Magna Project Office, as security on its long term loan, there should still be more information forthcoming from the Magna Trust; the UK Independence Party members cannot support the council pumping public money into a thirteen-years-old business which is not operating satisfactorily; It is possible that the Magna Centre ultimately does have a future, but this council should not be propping the business up with extra funding year after year;

ii) Councillor C. Vines, quoting from the report submitted to the Cabinet meeting, commented that this Council is one of three members of the Magna Trust, alongside the Barnsley and Rotherham Chamber of Commerce and the Stadium Group (owners of the Retail World shopping centre at Parkgate). Why should it be only this Council which provides funding to the Magna Trust ?

iii) Councillor Reynolds referred to an article published in the 'Rotherham Advertiser' newspaper which stated that there were some 80 jobs at stake, at the Magna Centre. How many of these are full-time, permanent jobs and how many are short-term, casual and/or zero hours contracts ? The visitor attraction part of the business is not good enough, when compared to attractions such as Alton Towers (which is frequently updated and attracts many repeat visitors); the Magna Centre is very similar to the former Earth Centre (Conisbrough, Doncaster) and is not a good enough attraction.

The Chairman replied that it was not the purpose of this meeting to comment on articles and information published in the media.

The Elected Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board were invited to ask questions of the Elected Members responsible for the call in, as listed below:-

(A) Councillor Watson - in the light of the recently-published Governance Report (by Louise Casey), which is critical of some aspects of the Council's operations, such that the Council cannot move matters forward, is it better to appoint a consultant to examine the Magna Trust business plan, rather than this Council's officers ?

Response – Councillor C. Vines stated that the three partners of the Magna Trust (ie: this Council, the Barnsley and Rotherham Chamber of Commerce and the Stadium Group) should get together and undertake the work as a partnership; and the Magna Trust should prepare its own business plan.

(B) Councillor Wyatt - suggested that the procurement of an independent assessment (of the business plan) and the examination of the profit and loss of the business, seems to be reasonable and it is difficult to know why UK Independence Party are objecting to that ?

Response – Councillor Cowles stated that the interim Strategic Director of Resources and Transformation and his team of finance officers should be capable of undertaking this work; alternatively, a local firm of accountants would be able to complete the work quickly because it is not a lengthy, time-consuming job.

On behalf of the Cabinet, Councillor Hoddinott (Deputy Leader) attended the meeting to respond to the issues raised by this call-in request. In making her response, Councillor Hoddinott received advice from the Council's Finance Manager

Councillor Hoddinott's response to the call-in request:-

a) It is the intention of this Council to take a fair view of the Magna Trust, going forward and the Council is asking similar questions (ie: to the ones now being asked as part of this call in process). The Cabinet has decided to obtain an independent view of the Magna Trust's future business intentions, in order to make an informed decision about any future loan financing;

b) Consideration of a short term Council loan facility to the Magna Trust of £250,000 was deferred at the Cabinet meeting (4th February 2015), pending receipt of the independent consultants' report on the Magna Trust business plan, as well as further information and legal opinion about issues concerning land around the Magna Centre.

c) The Council realises the full extent of what is at stake with the Magna Centre – jobs and employment, as well as the future of the land and buildings;

- d) This Council's involvement with the Magna Trust has lasted many years; it is now important that the Council obtains an independent opinion about the Magna Centre's future business opportunities. The independent consultants will provide expertise which is not available to the Council in-house;
- e) Issues to be examined include the Magna Centre's current trading levels, the leisure and other events scheduled to take place at the Centre, as well as the method of structuring the company in the future;
- f) When the information about the business plan is available, the Government-appointed Commissioners to the Council will be asked to make a decision about it.
- g) The costs of the independent consultancy work will be relatively small, for a short-term contract, when compared to the cost of the Council possibly making another loan to the Magna Trust (ie: a possible loan of £250,000).
- h) It is preferable that the Council seeks to get a fresh pair of eyes (ie: an independent consultant) to study the Magna Trust's business plan.

The Finance Manager reported the following information:-

- i) The Magna Trust will provide the business plan and the independent consultants, to be procured by the Council, will examine that plan;
- ii) Officers are well aware of the current standing of the Magna Trust and understand its finances;
- iii) Two years ago, the Trustees were managing the Magna Trust and were not receiving any payment for that work; later, Mr. John Silker was appointed as Chief Executive and has improved the management of the business;
- iv) The possible development of a hotel and restaurant is being considered as one means of trying to attract more investors to the business;
- v) the independent consultants will need to look at the future business plans and the consultants will only be commissioned if the business plan suggests that radical changes ought to be made to the business in the future; if the business plan merely suggests continuing the business in much the same way as before, this Council's finance officers will examine and report on the business plan.

Councillor Hoddinott confirmed that the correct use of public funding is paramount in the Council's decision-making in this matter; the Council is making a small investment now, in preparation for making an informed decision later on.

The Elected Members responsible for the call in were invited to ask questions of the Deputy Leader, as listed below:-

(1) Councillor Cowles – Why should the Whitbread company be turned down by the Council (when applying to build a hotel), because they know their business, but instead a hotel is acceptable for the Magna Centre ?;

Response – both the Deputy Leader and the Finance Manager confirmed that this question ought to be asked of the Magna Trust; Chief Executive of the Magna Trust, John Silker is now talking to companies in the hotel and catering industry.

(2) Councillor Cowles – referred to the Council deciding to transfer some of its business to the New York football stadium and away from the Magna Centre; it seems that there is too much Council investment in the New York stadium and is it an issue that needs to be looked at ?

Response – Councillor Hoddinott acknowledged that there was a need to examine the Council's use of venues for events.

(3) Councillor Cowles – referred to the estimated cost of commissioning the independent consultants and asked the Deputy Leader to quantify the meaning of a “small sum” of money.

Response – Councillor Hoddinott stated that the Council will procure the independent consultancy, at an estimated cost of £15,000 to £20,000 depending upon the scope of work and the sophistication of business plan; the actual, definite cost will depend on the cost quotes eventually submitted to the Council.

(4) Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, Councillor C. Vines asked : “what do accountants know about marketing ?”

Response – the Finance Manager stated that the chosen consultancy will have to be a specialist in examining business plans and the viability of businesses.

(5) Councillor Reynolds - where is vision of the Magna Trust's new Chief executive and where is the larger, overall vision for the whole site ? what is the scope of the jobs available there ? Is there an option, for example, to shut down the whole business and instead use the land for social housing and re-employ the people there in construction work ?

Response – Councillor Hoddinott stated that the Magna Trust's business plan will contain information about the proposed future use of the Centre and the Council will ultimately assess the viability of that plan and decide on whether to make loans in the future.

(6) Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, Councillor C. Vines asked : concerning the three partner organisations' involvement, what discussions have the three partners had together and is there any agreement to share these costs between all three organisations (ie: this Council, the Barnsley and Rotherham Chamber of Commerce and the Stadium Group) ?

Response – Councillor Hoddinott explained that this Council takes the lead role and has the major financial share (in the Magna Trust); the Council is therefore taking this proposal forward on that basis; the Council has discussed the proposal with the other two partners, but ultimately this Council is taking this action on its own as the lead partner.

(7) Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, Councillor C. Vines asked whether this Council knows the views of the other two partner organisations on this issue and offered the opinion that this Council has only limited knowledge of the business.

Response – Councillor Hoddinott stated that, as the Council needs to know about the future of the Magna Trust's business plans, therefore the services of an external consultant should be engaged.

The Finance Manager also stated that the Council has had discussions with other members of the Magna Trust Board and with Trustees who have no links to the two partner organisations. Reference was made to the complicated inter-creditor deed (as described in the report considered by the Cabinet on 4th February 2015), with various funders being involved : this Council, the Big Lottery, the Department for Communities and Local Government, Yorkshire Forward, Lombard Property Facilities Limited, the Royal Bank of Scotland. It has not been possible for the Council to secure this latest loan on the Magna Centre property, although that is what happened when the car park land was released. The organisations (involved in the inter-creditor deed) have changed over the years: eg: Yorkshire forward was abolished by the coalition Government.

(8) Councillor Reynolds asked : why are the other two partner organisations not providing any funding ?

Response – (from both Councillor Hoddinott and the Finance Manager) the Council has had discussions with the two partners, but still does not know the reasons why. Councillor Hoddinott repeated that the Council, as the lead partner, must do what it thinks is right.

(9) Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, Councillor C. Vines asked : why are there no reports, nor minutes of the meetings between the Council and the two partner organisations ? Will the two partners be making any financial contributions to this (loan) ? Why is this Council carrying the whole burden ?

Response – The Finance Manager explained that informal discussions had taken place and that minutes had not been taken. However, there are minutes taken of all meetings of the full Magna Trust Board.

(10) Councillor Cowles – asked whether, in the event that the Magna Trust's business continues, will all of the three partner organisations receive dividends and/or a share of the profits ?

Response – The Finance Manager explained that, as a registered charity, the Magna Trust did not allocate dividends, nor make any profit-sharing arrangements.

(11) Councillor Cowles – asked why is it taking such a long time to obtain the report of the independent consultants ?

Response – Councillor Hoddinott explained that the procurement process does take time, but acknowledged that the Council needs to have the matter resolved as soon as possible, so as to make a decision (about the deferred £250,000 loan); three months (to receipt of the independent consultants' report) is the target, but ideally the matter needs to be sorted out sooner than that.

The next section of this Scrutiny meeting included further questions to the Deputy Leader and to the Councillors making the call in request and also a general debate and consideration of the call in of the Council's proposed additional loan to the Magna Trust, by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. Issues raised and discussed and further comments made were:-

(A) Councillor Steele – referred to the information, requested earlier in the meeting by Councillor Reynolds, about the number and type of jobs at the Magna Centre.

Response – the Finance Manager confirmed that a written response will be provided, later today, for all Elected Members present at this meeting.

(B) Councillor Wyatt – referred to the grant funding provided in the past to keep the Magna Centre in business; the report (to Cabinet, 4th February 2015) mentions the loans being repaid with interest at the end of the financial year, at the Bank of England base rate plus two per-cent; therefore, the Council is getting its money back, with interest; and then the loan is immediately renewed for a further year.

Response – The Finance Manager confirmed the details included within the report to the Cabinet : £195,000 is currently outstanding on the long term loan (with interest "rolled up") and yes, there are annual repayments of the loans, with interest and the loan is advanced again for the following financial year. The Council does not provide a direct subsidy to the Magna Trust; all financial support is in the form of loans, which the Magna Trust pays back with interest.

(C) Councillor Wyatt questioned that the Council cannot assume that the Magna Trust business must definitely continue ?

Response – The Finance Manager confirmed that the intention is for this Council to reduce its interest (in the Magna Centre) and the Magna Trust must set up a plan and pump funds back into the business.

(D) Councillor Steele questioned whether there was a specific timescale for that objective ?

Response – The Finance Manager replied that the Magna Trust's forthcoming business plan should indicate the probable timescale.

(E) Councillor Wyatt asked whether the Magna Trust currently has any money to re-invest in the business ? The arrangements for the inter-creditor deed are very complicated and the Council had attempted to simplify that matter several years ago. Why is this process taking so long ?

Response – The Finance Manager stated that the car park land had been released from inter-creditor deed, in a process lasting nine months and involving Government Departments searching for the necessary documents. Now that those contacts (with Government Departments) are in place, the Council is able to proceed with the wider deed settlement. The agents for the Magna Trust are fully briefed and are acting for the Trust in this matter.

(F) Councillor C Vines asked who paid the legal fees in respect of the release of the car park land ?

Response – The Finance Manager stated that the Magna Trust had funded those legal costs.

(G) Councillor C Vines stated that it wasn't a complicated task to find the ownership of land, as he had found the names of Lombard Property Facilities Limited (2009) and the Alliance and Leicester bank (2006) with relative ease.

Response – the Finance Manager confirmed that Lombard Property Facilities Limited and the Alliance and Leicester bank are both parties to the inter-creditor deed; there are also other parties to this deed. Councillor Hoddinott also referred to Yorkshire Forward's previous involvement, although that organisation no longer exists.

The Chair invited the Deputy Leader and the call in sponsors to sum-up their respective cases.

Councillor Hoddinott – summing-up, on behalf of the Cabinet

The discussion at this meeting has highlighted the complexity of this matter and therefore the need for the Council to consult with an 'outside expert'. Various loans have been made to the Magna Trust, using public money. The Council must make an informed decision and must therefore obtain that independent expertise and opinion. The Magna Trust's business plan will be submitted to this Council and the Council does not yet know the complexity and diversity of the plan's eventual proposals. The intention is to secure repayment of the remaining £195,000 of the long-term loan. As soon as the Magna Trust's business plan has been received, the services of an independent consultant will be commissioned, if such action is deemed to be necessary. That action involves incurring costs in the short-term, in order that the Council may make the correct decision eventually. The information and opinion, both from the business plan and from the independent consultants, are needed, together with assurances about the future of the Magna Trust's business, before the Council will consider making any further loans.

Councillor C Vines, summing-up, on behalf of the call in sponsors

The Council should receive and study the Magna Trust's business plan in the first instance and not provide any more money (loans) to the Magna Trust, including the deferred £250,000 loan. The examination of the business plan must be undertaken first of all.

Councillor Hoddinott clarified that that is the decision the Council is now making.

Councillor C. Vines stated that the call in sponsors are clear that this Council should not pay for independent consultants and that the Magna Trust must prepare and fund its own business plan.

Councillor Steele stated that the Magna Trust will provide the business plan and that this Council will commission the independent consultants only if it is deemed to be necessary.

At this point in the meeting, the precise wording of the decision of the Cabinet meeting was clarified (Minute No. 141 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4th February, 2015).

The Finance Manager confirmed that, as a consequence of the decision made by the Chief Executive on 16th January, 2015, in accordance with her delegated powers, to provide Magna with an immediate additional £100,000 loan facility, the Magna Trust has already drawn £75,000 of that amount.

Councillor C. Vines again asked who would be paying for preparation of the Magna Trust's business plan ?

Councillor Hoddinott repeated the previous answers that the Magna Trust will pay for and prepare its own business plan.

Councillor Reynolds stated that, although the Cabinet may ultimately make a decision, there should be no 'wriggle room' and all Elected Members should be able to read the contents of the Magna Trust's business plan.

Councillor Hoddinott explained that officers will eventually implement the decision of the Cabinet.

At the conclusion of discussion and summing-up, the Chair stated that there were three options available to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

- : whether there are exceptional grounds sufficient to refer the call in request to the Council;
- : to support the call in request and refer the decision back to the Cabinet for reconsideration by the Executive; and
- : not to support this call in request, in which case the Cabinet decision proceeds to implementation.

After consideration of and discussion about the call-in of the decision of the Cabinet, the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board decided, by majority vote, that they had no further concerns to raise about this matter and did not wish to refer the call in request to a meeting of the Council, nor to refer the matter back to the Cabinet.

Resolved:- That the call-in request in respect of the Magna Trust Loan Renewal (Minute No. 141 of the Cabinet meeting of 4th February, 2015) is not supported.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
14th January, 2015

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Foden); Councillors Atkin, Cowles, Gilding, Gosling, Lelliott, Roche, Sims, C. Vines and Whelbourn.

Also in attendance : Councillor M. Hussain (Cabinet Member for Environment) and Councillor D. Beck (Cabinet Member for Business Growth and Regeneration).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrews and from co-opted members Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

41. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

42. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications to report.

43. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH NOVEMBER 2014

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

44. WINTER WEATHER RESPONSE

Further to the minutes of the Council seminar, which had been held on Tuesday, 6th January, 2015, the Select Commission undertook further discussion about the Council's response to the severe winter weather conditions (snow, very low temperatures and ice) during the ten days' period beginning on Boxing Day, Friday 26th December, 2014.

The Chairman welcomed David Burton (Director of Streetpride) and Councillor Mahroof Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment, to give an update about the Council's response.

In moving forward, a number of different worksteams had been identified, each with different aspects and individual responses to the recent snow.

The Cabinet Member had asked appropriate officers to look at the individual worksteams and review which areas in the future should be identified as specific issues.

A 'lessons-learned' approach had identified to look further at operational responses and communications and to make any changes should the events of the festive period occur again.

Procedure dictated that the weather forecast would be checked over a five days' period, to look at the probability of bad weather and the need for precautionary gritting. On this occasion, from the five days' weather forecast, there had been no prediction of snow.

The managed response over the festive period involving skeleton staff working as it should have done, the problem being the snow that arrived had caused more problems than expected.

Rotherham's gritters were out working around the clock to keep the network clear and no strategic routes were lost. Sheffield City Council had closed the Parkway for a period of time and the Highways Agency was forced to close parts of the M1 motorway.

In terms of waste collection, this proved to be more a logistical challenge to recover, as there was a 25% increase in waste to collect during the festive period than the normal amounts collected at other times of the year. In consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member information was released about when deliveries would be caught up.

Waste was seen by the vast majority of people as being the most important service provided by the Council and the level of disruption was under-estimated. The Council's contact centre had ten times the number of calls it normally experienced and with hindsight it would have been beneficial to include in the Frequently Asked Questions Section about the recovery plan when routine waste schedules were disrupted. An improvement team was looking at how the process could be improved to ensure a quicker response in the future.

The Council's website emergency banner about waste collections may not have had the desired affect for informing the general public and a speedier update to get the messages across was required.

The social media feeds for the Council, normally handled by the Communications Team, were inundated with messages, and these had then to be directed to the Operational Manager. Managing public expectations was an area operational management were dealing with, to prevent confusing messages being relayed in the future.

Messages and Elected Member briefings were normally channelled through the Communications Team. The importance of ensuring Elected Members had the latest information was stressed, as they could be the main conduit between the Council and the general public. A clearer understanding of getting those messages out quicker was warranted.

Items for further consideration included:-

- If a similar severe weather event occurred, a daily meeting between operations staff should take place.
- Scripts for the contact centre and media messages needed to be agreed with the Communications Team.
- The frequency of updates needed to be slicker.
- An officer taking overview of the messages received for co-ordination.
- Consider alternative models of informing the public on websites, such as the one used by Derbyshire County Council with key links to relevant documentation.
- An agreed process for informing Elected Members.
- Internet communications need to be improved.
- Liaison with regarding the use of social media.
- The Frequently Asked Questions Section on the website required updating.
- Development of the Snow Warden Scheme and the policy on salt bins.

A briefing note based on the information above would be prepared and circulated to all Members.

During discussion, Members of the Select Commission raised the following issues:-

(a) there are parts of mainland Europe which have much more severe weather and heavier snowfall than the United Kingdom. Are there lessons to be learned from the severe weather response undertaken in other European countries.

This country does not have such severe weather with the frequency with which it occurs in Europe. Therefore, local authorities undertake much less investment in the required vehicles, equipment and materials, which may only lie idle if the weather is not so severe. In addition, the wetter snow often found in the United Kingdom is more difficult to plough and to clear and causes more problems at freezing temperatures.

(b) Officers were thanked for their explanations about the severe weather response at Area Assembly meetings. There were public expectations to meet in terms of the provision of salt/grit bins and also the publication of up-to-date information about changes in refuse bin collection days.

(c) The Winter gritting routes should be reviewed alongside the bus routes. Although many bus routes are gritted as a priority, some routes may have been missed by gritting vehicles because of recent changes to bus routes (one example being Christchurch Road, West Melton, another in the Whiston area). Members asked that this issue be investigated immediately.

(d) The collection of recycled waste (blue bags and blue boxes) had suffered as a consequence of the Winter weather, although collections had recommenced, as scheduled, as the weather had improved during the first week of January 2015.

(e) Members asked that this Authority's unit cost per dustbin, for refuse collection, be reviewed and compared with the costs of other similar local authorities.

(f) Although communications ought to be improved, both in terms of refuse collection and for the operation of bus services, the Select Commission acknowledged the efforts of the Streetpride workforce to ensure that the principal highway network in the Borough area had remained passable by vehicles, during the severe weather. There had been no serious accident nor injuries reported.

(g) Reference was made to the driver of the gritting vehicles and refuse collection vehicles having ultimate responsibility for the safety of the vehicle. Many side roads and estate roads had been impassable during the worst of the weather period in late December 2014.

(h) There was a suggestion that the use of the volunteer snow warden scheme, involving local residents, ought to be increased.

(i) Members considered that it is preferable to adhere to the scheduled days for refuse collection, for ease of understanding by the general public. It was noted that some refuse collection vehicles had been transferred to assist with the backlog of collection in other parts of the Borough area, resulting in a shorter amount of time spent on the collection of waste. The high winds during early January 2015 had caused litter and refuse to spread along residential roads.

(j) There had been very good assistance provided for aged persons' centres, to help elderly people cope with the severe Winter weather.

(k) There had been no noticeable impact upon schools, because the worst of the weather had occurred during the school holiday period and the weather had improved by the beginning of the Spring Term in January 2015.

(l) There should be further consideration of the disruption to bus services (eg: Manor Farm estate, Rawmarsh), both via this Council's Transport Liaison Group and also the Rotherham Bus Partnership, so as to improve communications with the travelling public.

Resolved:- (1) That the explanation of this Council's response to the severe Winter weather, experienced during late December 2014, be noted.

(2) That a scrutiny review of the Council's Winter weather response be undertaken by a review group comprising Councillors Atkin, Gosling, Sims and Read and the review shall consider the development of Elected Members' protocols about unexpected weather events, so as to assist in the dissemination of information to the general public.

(3) That a further report about the Council's Winter weather response, including communications with the general public, be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission.

45. ROTHERHAM GROWTH PLAN - CONSULTATION

Further to Minute No. 35 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member and Advisers for Business Growth and Regeneration held on 12th January, 2015, consideration was given to a report and presentation from the Economic Development Manager, concerning the draft Rotherham Growth Plan, for which there is currently a consultation process including relevant stakeholders and interested parties. The consultation period ends on Friday 30th January, 2015. The report described the ambitions of the Rotherham Growth Plan, which are:-

: stimulating the local economy and helping people into work;

: protecting the Borough's most vulnerable people and families, enabling them to maximise their independence;

: ensuring all areas of Rotherham are safe, clean and well maintained;
and

: helping people to improve their health and well-being and reducing inequalities within the Borough.

In addition, Members noted the principal themes of the Rotherham Growth Plan, which are similar to those of the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan:-

- Growing existing and developing new businesses.
- Skills for employment.
- Social inclusion and combating poverty.
- Employment Land and Housing.
- the Rotherham town centre.
- Transport.

The presentation included the following salient details:-

: the restructuring of the local economy so that it will be more resilient and building a strong private sector;

: the creation of more jobs which are accessible to Rotherham residents;

: development of high-level skills; raising productivity and wages; attracting new businesses to the Borough area, which have growth potential;

: the Advanced Manufacturing Park (Waverley) and the Dearne Eco Vision are important areas and unique developments within the Borough; all parts of the Borough area should benefit from economic growth; Rotherham should be a place where people want to live, work and visit;

: various statistics were displayed, comparing Rotherham with the Sheffield City Region local authorities and also with national data (eg: the percentage of school pupils achieving 5 GCSE A*-C passes has shown considerable year-on-year improvement for more than a decade; yet, Rotherham does not fare as well in terms of the higher Level 4 qualifications);

: the period of the Growth Plan is from April 2015 to 2025 and will link to the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan;

: bids for funding are made to the Local Growth Fund and the new European programmes;

: delivery of the priorities of the Local Strategic Partnership and of the Borough Council;

: Increased Gross Value Added (more money in local economy) for the Borough area;

: Growth Zones - areas where the majority of new jobs will be located and more housing constructed (eg: Dinnington and the A57 corridor; the Dearne Valley; more businesses attracted to the Rotherham town centre; the new Bassingthorpe Farm development; Templeborough and the Lower Don Valley as part of the Rotherham-Sheffield Economic Corridor);

: Transformation Projects (the Advanced Manufacturing Park Innovation District; the proposed HS2 railway station at Meadowhall; Rotherham town centre developments (markets; cinema; Forge Island; Rotherham College of Arts and Technology university campus and delivery of degree courses; Pithouse West leisure scheme (Rother Valley); the 'Man of Steel' iconic sculpture and the public campaign for 'Heart of Steel' donations of money;

: issues from the scrutiny review of the local economy : key objectives are income generation and employment creation; SMART targets; the emphasis on opportunities and qualifications for young people;

: the Rotherham Growth Plan is jointly owned by partner organisations and has strong links to Local Plan; it is necessary to communicate the details of the Growth Plan effectively to the Council's partners and stakeholders;

: Funding – the European Programme 2014 to 2020 (£160 m over six years); the Government's Growth Deal of £320 millions; the Sheffield City Region Investment Fund (SCRIF) and the Infrastructure Investment Plan (IIF) are to fund capital projects; the Rotherham Growth Fund itself and the Rotherham Economic Regeneration Fund (RERF);

: Both the Local Strategic Plan and the Borough Council will be asked to approve the Rotherham growth Plan; the Plan becomes effective on 1st April, 2015, with the development of projects and interventions;

: sources of funding will have to be identified and secured; the Growth Plan will be monitored and progress reports submitted to Elected Members at intervals of six months.

During discussion, Members of the Select Commission raised the following issues:-

(a) reference to the Government's creation of Enterprise Zones. The Rotherham Growth Plan does include areas such as Enterprise Zones.

(b) Members appreciate the intentions in respect of job creation and apprentice training; are there safeguards in respect of wage levels, payment of the living wage and the avoidance of 'zero hours' contracts. The intention is to attract high quality companies which will offer jobs for local people at acceptable remuneration levels and avoiding 'zero hours' contracts.

(c) the importance of the 'visitor economy' and ensuring that the Rotherham Borough area is marketed and promoted effectively for possible tourists/visitors. The Local Economic Partnership has a Sport and Leisure element and the establishment of a Tourism Advisory Group is under consideration. The Council's membership of the 'Welcome to Yorkshire' organisation may not continue. The Chamber of Commerce intends to establish a Tourism Partnership, based on the example at Barnsley. The Department for Local Government Yorkshire and Humber has also produced a visitor strategy for use by local authorities. Major attractions are important (eg: the 'Man of Steel' sculpture and the leisure development at the Pithouse West site.

(d) reference to the Rotherham College of Arts and Technology university campus and whether the Dearne Valley College is a viable alternative (the former nursing school premises are currently vacant).

(e) a number of textual corrections were mentioned.

(f) a question about the Dearne Eco Vision and planning controls in relation to new buildings (officers will reply after the meeting).

(g) the length of time during which job creation will occur, with delays to lead-in time for employers settling in Rotherham and the uneven creation of jobs. The creation of some 10,000 new jobs is anticipated, which will depend heavily on the timescales of substantial new developments (eg: the proposals in the A57/Todwick area under negotiation).

(h) the types of jobs which may be created (eg: in construction). Appendix 5 to the submitted report provides details of the different sectors in which the jobs may be created.

(i) Ensuring that the skills are available amongst the local workforce, so that employees are not brought in from elsewhere; the proposed university campus will help to develop people to achieve Level 4 and Level 5 qualifications. There must be work with local schools, so that pupils are made aware of training prospects locally. The Select Commission noted that the proposed university itself will provide an extra impetus for training, as has been the case with Barnsley and its partnership with the Huddersfield University. The existence of a student population and the consequent need for accommodation will benefit the Borough area. There will eventually be the organic growth of jobs.

(j) The training and study should be supplemented by learning in the workplace. The Rotherham Growth Plan is ambitious and the training centre at the Advanced Manufacturing Park, as well as the proposed university campus, must provide high skills training.

(k) To ensure the effectiveness of the Advanced Manufacturing Park and its impact on local employment, there must be emphasis upon the science-based curriculum in schools, because these are often perceived as being difficult subjects to study. Local authorities (including Rotherham) do ensure that appropriate staff visit schools and encourage the take-up amongst pupils of the stem science subjects.

(l) A suggestion that craft subjects, such as woodwork and metalwork, should also be taught in schools. The importance of the Advanced Manufacturing Park was again emphasised, in addition to the proposed development on the A57/Todwick site. It is vital that jobs requiring a diverse range of skills, in different employment sectors, should be available for local people.

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

(2) That the following issues now discussed by the Improving Places Select Commission shall be included in the consultation on the Rotherham Growth Plan:-

(a) The importance developing existing businesses and also attracting new businesses to the Rotherham Borough area;

- (b) Skills for employment and progression - to ensure that local people have the correct skills for the jobs which are available;
- (c) To ensure that there is local control over skills development;
- (d) The importance of social inclusion and employment prospects;
- (e) Obtaining the agreement in principle from employers to commit to payment of 'living wages';
- (f) The Dearne Eco Vision and clarification of planning controls in relation to new buildings;
- (g) Rotherham town centre – to include reference to the independent retail offer and to possible increase in the 'leisure offer' in the town centre, which will be part of the imminent review of the town centre masterplan;
- (h) To emphasise the importance of Transport links, including the HS2 high speed railway and the tram-train development between Meadowhall, Rotherham and Parkgate;
- (i) To include reference to the Enterprise Zones in the Rotherham Growth Plan.

**APPEAL PANEL
29th January, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Gosling (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and McNeely.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.

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

APPEAL - D1/01/15 - NEIGHBOURHOODS AND ADULT SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/01/15 against his dismissal from his post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
17th February, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Atkin, Beaumont, Clark, Cutts, Ellis, Godfrey, Kaye, McNeely, Pitchley, Read, Reeder, Sangster, Smith, Turner, Wallis, Watson and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jepson and Whelbourn.

ADVANCED MANUFACTURING INNOVATION DISTRICT.

Councillor D. Beck, Cabinet Member for Business, Growth and Regeneration, opened the seminar and thanked Members for attending. The information that was going to be shared in this seminar represented really good and positive news for Rotherham. The factors relating to the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District should be emphasised as good news for Rotherham.

Paul Woodcock, Director for Planning, Regeneration and Culture, and Simeon Leach, Economic Development Manager, Environment and Development Services Directorate, were welcomed to the seminar to provide information on the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation Districts (AMID), one of the UK's most important drivers of economic growth. The AMID represented the 'next generation' for whole industries.

An American Consultant, Bruce Katz, had visited the Sheffield City Region area and been involved in many presentations, workshops and seminars with agencies, landowners and members of the public. He commended the enthusiasm and energy surrounding the AMID. Bruce's visit had received national interest and had appeared in local and national press. Bruce believed that partners could further accelerate it and take it forward.

The AMID had a role in a number of key work streams and plans: -

- Key in the Sheffield City Region target of creating 70,000 net new jobs, many of them higher skilled;
- Key to the target of attracting more businesses;
- Key to the target of providing more higher skilled occupations;
- Key to the target of increasing higher productivity;
- The AMID would be a hot bed of economic activity;
- The AMID had good logistics – further improvements were possible.

There was evidence that each new job in a high tech area created five additional jobs. Although this was optimistic, other evidence did support that secondary and tertiary jobs were created in the local area. The employment density of the two Boroughs from Central Sheffield through to Rotherham and Parkgate was a hot bed of employment.

Challenges / areas for further work: -

- Currently there was no single 'master plan' to co-ordinate development: -
 - No controls on land use;
 - No controls on strains on infrastructure;
 - Housing sites – although being addressed at Waverley and Attercliffe developments;
 - Potential HS2 station at Meadowhall;
 - M1, air quality issues around Tinsley, and public infrastructure was not mature enough;
 - **An advanced plan was needed. Rotherham's solution was bus-based. There was a need to escalate this to the national level for increased awareness.**

Scale our vision: -

- Cultivate innovation;
- Infrastructure requirements;
- Accelerate development.

Bruce Katz's advice was to "be the best you can be. Don't copy [others] as you have something really special".

What are innovation districts?: -

- Industrial districts - Research parks (AMP) - Innovation districts included research capacity, jobs AND leisure, retail and living facilities, mixed-use.

The rise of innovation districts: -

- Clustering of firms;
- Transport and transit;
- Mixed-use of office and retail;
- Economic assets, physical assets and networking assets.

The Sheffield City Region AMID: -

- Unrivalled and growing;
- Advanced Manufacturing Park and the AMRC;
- Sheffield Business Park – 'Factory 2050';
- Connections between and to Rotherham, Sheffield and Meadowhall;
- "Don't be constrained by boundaries" was Bruce Katz' advice.

What is the Sheffield City Region AMID?: -

- World leading;
- Research-led manufacturing cluster;
- Partners were not promoting enough;
- The AMP was an acknowledged world-class facility, but how could we add value?;
- Do skilled workers want to work, live and play in the area local to the AMID?;
- Heavy industry;
- “Whole lifecycle servitisation” – further detailed was required on what this was/involved.

“Future economic prize”: –

- Devolved national funding was available;
- Retain talent in the local area;
- Training and employment for local people;
- Links to rest of the city region and to the rest of the world;
- **International significance;**
- The AMID could be compared to Media City and Tech City – the same ingredients were present.

What was next?: -

Need to involve partners and stakeholders to agree on our vision for the AMID: -

- Action plans;
- ‘Place making’ – planning and transportation;
- Investment;
- Energy;
- Scaling investment;
- Identifying and accessing funding streams;
- Identify current assets and potential Unique Selling Point(s);
- Further develop the vision;
- Obtain business buy-in;
- Master plan – what did development mean spatially?;
- Local Economic Partnership and Sheffield City Region support.

Questions and comments were asked following the presentation: -

Councillor Sangster – This is so future based, does it need its own planning regime? There appears to be nothing eco or green in the industries that have been linked to the AMID, both now and in the future. How did this work in conjunction with the Dearne Valley, is there an eco-vision there? The two areas needed to drive forward together.

Councillor Kaye – Employment? What type(s), on what wage, what qualification level would be required and would it be linked to the two Sheffield Universities? However, this is a South Yorkshire rather than Rotherham initiative. Rotherham needed to develop its own workforce. It was well placed to develop this as education outcomes in Rotherham were the best in South Yorkshire.

Councillor Foden – Had been to the AMID in the past. The facilities were cutting edge and the potential was huge: training for apprentices, links to the motorway, future HS2, old marshalling yards, road/rail potential.

Paul Woodcock responded to the questions and comments put forward: -

- Need to start on planning questions – how far can we go within the existing regime or was a discrete planning division needed? Should / could this be reflected in the Local Plan? There were lots of ‘placemaking’ elements to consider in the AMID.
- Eco and green was a vision for the Dearne Valley. The AMID had a different (but interlinked) focus and the industries represented were widespread, for example in the oil, gas and aviation areas.
- Employment and wages – in a mixed-use economy – would tend towards higher tech and higher end, meaning degree level and above. However, other jobs would be needed, such as security, transport, retail and catering. Service needs were under consideration and we need to consider the role of schools and skills.
- Other land for use was being considered, including the old marshalling yards, as the AMP and Sheffield Business Park would fill up.
- Apprenticeships at the AMP were expected to hit around 250 advanced placements per year. Local colleges were looking to provide degree-level courses in the area.

Councillor Beck stated that the AMP was not the only part of the plan. There were opportunities elsewhere. The planning stages still needed to be successful when working with Sheffield City Region and the LEP.

Councillor McNeely – Referred to how Sheffield was very good at overshadowing Rotherham. It was called the Sheffield City Region, rather than City Region. Boundary Mills and Magna were advertised as being based in Sheffield. Before companies came to the AMID it should be discussed with them that they were in Rotherham and should promote their businesses accordingly.

Councillor Beck confirmed that he had attended a meeting and was pleased to report back that promotion and signage for Waverley would state that it was in Rotherham.

Councillor Pitchley – Asked about the impact of the HS2 – had allowances been made in the AMID for this? If transport was the weakest link, what efforts were being made to develop and improve this?

Councillor Atkin – Was pleased to hear that the AMID was internationally important; the Prime Minister knew about it and had mentioned it in Prime Minister's Questions. Will there be a University of Rotherham? Promises had been made in the past for a Dearne Valley University. Would there be a light rail system if needed? Was there connectivity for freight railway?

Councillor Ellis – Agreed that it was galling for Sheffield to push Rotherham in terms of ownership. Unfortunately, that was the way it was. What was more important was to ensure that there were jobs with career pathways, support and mentoring was needed for entry level jobs and next-level jobs. Was there the right type of housing for Managers and Chief Executives to live in Rotherham?

Pau Woodcock responded: -

- Need to avoid brain-drain and losing big talent;
- Bigger cities had a brand which was recognisable (examples including Newcastle (Gateshead) and Manchester (Salford));
- The intention was to aspire for better transport solutions and the SYPTTE would need to be involved in these discussions;
- It was very early days in relation to the university proposal. Discussions were taking place between the universities and colleges, but there was no agreement to report yet;
- Career progression – in-work skilling was a focus for the AMID, allowing employees to move up the scale, which then opened up entry-level jobs.

Councillor Wootton – Described how he had visited the AMP in his Mayoral year in 2007. It was a real jewel in the crown and was superb. He hoped that it would continue and expand.

World leading companies were operating in Rotherham.

Councillor Turner – Raised an issue that the wind turbine generator spent a lot of time inactive. He had made complaints about this. He asked what the Conglomerates' attitudes were to fracking?

Councillor Beck confirmed that nothing had been discussed about fracking.

Councillor Ellis – Explained how the energy selling tariffs worked on a daily basis. If companies had not negotiated with the energy companies on a particular day, they could not generate or work on that day.

Councillor Beck thanked Paul and Simeon for their presentation and contribution to the discussion. Their information had been well received and all would look forward to updates in due course.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
30th January, 2015**

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Dyson

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Sheppard

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Parker

Councillor A. Sangster

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor T. Hussain

Councillor R. Munn

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor R. Davison, Sheffield City Council

Councillor H. Harpham, Sheffield City Council

Mayor R. Jones, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

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

Mr. A. Carter, Co-opted Member

Also in attendance:- South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner Dr. A. Billings; with officials of the Commissioner's Office : Mrs. M. Buttery (Chief Executive) and Mr. A. Rainford (Chief Finance Officer).

J27. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Councillor Alex Sangster (Rotherham MBC) be appointed Vice-Chairman of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel for the remainder of the 2014/15 Municipal Year.

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

J28. RESIGNATION OF INDEPENDENT CO-OPTEE

Members were informed of the resignation, with immediate effect, of Mr. Kash Walayat, an Independent Co-optee on the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel.

J29. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A member of the public asked the following question and confirmed that he had previously asked a very similar question at the meeting of this Panel held on 17th June, 2013:-

“Please confirm where Road Safety appears in these revised Policing priorities (and in the Police and Crime Plan), particularly Enforcement of 20mph speed limits in residential areas, which are being installed by local authorities, eg. Sheffield City Council, in response to public demand.

Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) revised its national guidelines to include exceeding a 20mph speed limit as an endorsable offence. But there's a perception that little is being done to enforce this locally, and that drivers can ignore this with impunity”.

In reply, the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner stated that the Police and Crime Plan deals with high level priorities. The South Yorkshire Police is required to take road safety very seriously and does fulfil that requirement. There are 20 mph speed limits now appearing in many side streets in the Sheffield area. The Commissioner also stated that the final version of the refreshed Police and Crime Plan has not yet been published and the Commissioner’s Office will look again at the inclusion of road safety issues within the Plan. Additionally, the Commissioner undertook to speak with the Chief Constable of the South Yorkshire Police about the practical policing approach to 20 mph speed limits. On 19th January 2015, the Commissioner had met with a group representing the interests of cyclists and they too had referred to the issue of 20 mph speed limits.

As a supplementary question, the member of the public asked about the way in which the public could be kept informed of progress with this matter.

The South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner replied that members of the public may contact his office and ask questions about Police issues. Another means would be to raise issues via the Neighbourhood Watch organisation, which holds meetings from time to time around the County.

J30. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH NOVEMBER, 2014

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 19th November, 2014.

Reference was made to the use of the phrase “*to forget the past*” within the text of Minute No. 24 (Introduction of the newly-elected Police and Crime Commissioner) of the previous meeting and it was agreed that

these words be deleted from the minutes.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th November, 2014 be approved as a correct record, for signature by the Chairman, with the inclusion of a clerical correction by the deletion of the phrase shown above.

J31. PRECEPT PROPOSAL FOR 2015/16

Consideration was given to a report, submitted by the Chief Finance Officer to the Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, containing information about the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner's proposed Council Tax precept for the 2015/16 financial year.

Attached to the report was a draft of the Police and Crime Plan setting out the strategic direction for policing in South Yorkshire and providing the information necessary for the determination of the revenue budget and Council Tax precept.

In presenting the report and the proposed Police budget for 2015/16, the Police and Crime Commissioner made historical references to 'interesting times' and 'challenging times', as well as to the current harsh financial climate for public authorities. The submitted report referred to the building blocks of the financial plan which lies behind the Police and Crime Plan. The funding for the Police Service has been reduced year-on-year by the coalition Government, during its tenure, placing a squeeze on local authority and Police funding. The Police Grant has also been reduced. The coalition Government has held money back at the centre of Government (often referred to as 'top slicing') for national priorities and schemes/projects.

Therefore, uncertainty has been created in the process of budget-making for Police services and an assumption has had to be made of approximately 3% budget cuts for the 2015/16 financial year. The provisional funding settlement was received just a few days before Christmas 2014, when the coalition Government announced a reduction of 5.1% in the spending available for public authority budgets. Consequently, there has been only a short time in which to respond and the task has been to find an additional reduction of £3 millions to the proposed budget for 2015/16. The total Police budget is approximately £240 millions per year. It is anticipated that a similar bleak position will continue after the General Election of 7th May, 2015.

There may be a need to draw on the financial reserves within the Police budget. The combined effect of the funding reduction and pressures mean that almost £17.5 millions will need to be found to balance the 2015/16 budget, ie: the original amount, plus the additional sum as a consequence of the coalition Government's announcement before Christmas 2014. The budget pressures (eg: wages and price increases) will have to be paid for

and the funding gap has to be bridged by making cuts, achieving savings or by generating additional income. Another option is to accept the coalition Government's offer of the Council Tax freeze grant, which would net an extra £547,000 of Government funding. There is also the alternative option of increasing the precept amount; such increase has to be below 2% otherwise a referendum would be triggered.

The argument for increasing the amount of the precept, instead of accepting the offer of the Council Tax freeze grant, is that this specific grant funding is for one single financial year and is not guaranteed in future years. The acceptance of the freeze grant brings uncertainty with it. Therefore, the preference is to raise the level of Council Tax level in order to raise the overall financial base of the Police budget. Hence the proposed 1.95% increase in precept and the avoidance of a referendum.

The submitted report refers to the task of finding £9.644 millions of savings (ie: the amount of reduction in funding made by the coalition Government). The South Yorkshire Police Force has reviewed its activities and the majority of these proposals have been identified by the Force's review programme "Diamond" which was established in 2010 with the aim of transforming policing by using resources more effectively. Other savings proposals were itemised in the submitted report.

The possibility of drawing upon the financial reserves within the Police budget is inadvisable because the reserves are not as substantial as the Service might wish. Some reserves are 'free for use', in that they have not been earmarked for any particular scheme; yet, other financial reserves have already been earmarked specifically for future capital schemes. The amount of 'free' reserves is approximately 2% of the total Police revenue budget and, as such, this amount is not at a prudential level.

Ideally, the Police Service must not take any more amounts from its reserves and ought to be trying to increase them. Amounts of money must be held in reserve for any contingency and because of the identified need for future spending on, for example, the outcome of the current Hillsborough Inquest. It is not yet known whether the total cost of this Inquest will have to be met from the South Yorkshire Police Service budget. Perhaps there may eventually be some subsidy provided by the coalition Government.

The submitted report detailed the full effect of the proposed budget savings. Some 85% of the Police budget is the cost of employees (personnel) and it is inevitable that the budget cuts will impact upon the number of people employed in the Police Service. The cost of employee overtime is a considerable factor. In every year since 2010, including the current 2014/15 financial year, there have been reductions in all levels of Police personnel, with the sole exception that the numbers of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) have remained constant and unreduced.

The question is whether the Police Force is able to retain people, especially to maintain the neighbourhood Policing policy (known to be a high priority for the general public of South Yorkshire) at the levels the public would like, given the reduction in funding. The solution is that the Police Service will achieve that objective only by making changes to the model of policing currently being used.

Together, the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable have written to all four of the South Yorkshire principal local authorities, sending documents which detail the proposals for "Securing the Future of Neighbourhood Policing". In brief, the proposals are to restructure the teams of uniformed Police Officers and to make better use of ICT technology in terms of Service delivery. Copies of these documents were distributed at the meeting to each one of the Police and Crime Panel Members present.

The proposals are intended to :-

- ensure that uniformed officers continue to respond to emergency '999' calls;
- have neighbourhood teams and the teams of uniformed officers combined under the same management and, for example, will receive the same briefings;
- align the shift patterns of the two sets of teams;
- increase the overall skills of both teams
- introduce the use of new ICT technology, so that reports may be prepared by Officers, using laptops in Police vehicles, which will ensure that Officers spend more time in the neighbourhoods instead of returning to Police stations in order to file their reports;
- ensure that the training of all Police personnel will be 'neighbourhood focused'.

There are no budget proposals to effect any change to the use of PCSOs, who are known and appreciated by the general public in the communities they serve. There is an existing trial of the new methods of working, taking place at Woodseats (Sheffield); there is good progress being made with the trial and the new methods of working are popular amongst younger officers. These changes will take time to become embedded in Police Service practice and, overall, should produce more visible policing.

In financial terms, the revised working arrangements will also produce the necessary amount of budget savings and ensure the retention of the neighbourhood policing system. In conclusion, the proposals detailed in the submitted report will enable the Police to achieve a balanced budget for the 2015/16 financial year.

After the Police and Crime Commissioner had completed his presentation of the budget report, the Members of the Police and Crime Panel asked the following questions:-

(1) (Councillor Parker) Does this Panel need to be provided with more information, to be able to approve the Commissioner's budget proposals ?

Response - The Police and Crime Commissioner expressed the view that sufficient financial information about the budget proposals had already been provided for the Panel Members. The full narrative of the Police and Crime Plan would be available soon.

(2) (Councillor Parker) The general public, especially Rotherham residents, are having to endure a variety of tax and rent increases which, all added together, produce a substantial total sum. Are the Police budget savings firm and guaranteed savings, or will the Commissioner seek further savings or precept increases in the future ? The Police sometimes has to spend a lot of money in employees' overtime; there is also the predicament of 'unforeseen circumstances', including the child sexual exploitation in Rotherham. It is very difficult to plan for the necessary savings.

In terms of the requirement to make sufficient savings in respect of price inflation - the European Union states have experienced some deflation and this factor may soon apply to the United Kingdom; therefore, the Police should carefully negotiate its procurement of goods, equipment and services so that costs can be reduced. The Police should look again at price inflation, in order that more savings can be achieved in that part of the budget.

Response - The Police and Crime Commissioner acknowledged that it was not possible to predict every eventually and therefore overtime costs are a specific budget pressure. Officials at the Commissioner's Office have advised that the budget proposals are based upon sound financial judgement. If there is any significant and unexpected budget pressure (eg: a number of public protest marches which require extensive policing), the Police Service is unable to levy an additional precept, but must instead make use of the 'free', unallocated financial reserves.

In terms of inflationary and deflationary effects, there was originally an incorrect assumption made about rising fuel costs and the subsequent correction adjusted those costs downwards. There was more uncertainty about wages' costs. The process of budget estimating, by its very nature, is always likely to contain some error.

The South Yorkshire Police participate in the joint purchasing of goods and equipment etc, together with other Police Forces, so as to enjoy better leverage in the negotiation of prices using single contracts with bulk purchases.

The Commissioner did not demur with Councillor Parker's view about the general public having to cope with an accumulation of different tax and rent increases. The general perception is that the public is prepared to pay the increased cost for improved policing, because people value the existence of good law and order in society.

(3) (Councillor Sheppard) With reference to the Police budget's reserves being maintained at a 'prudent, yet minimum amount', are there any statutory guidelines relating to a 'minimum amount' ?

Response - The Police and Crime Commissioner stated that there is no statutory guidance available. The Police Force is aware of the 'unknown costs' which will arise from the issues such as : child sexual exploitation, the miners' strike and the hearing about the incident at Orgreave, the Hillsborough Inquest. It may be the case that substantial sums of money will have to be spent, although some costs may ultimately be recouped from central Government (Home Department). The Commissioner is soon to meet the Home Secretary and discuss this very issue.

(4) (Councillor Sheppard) Organisations sometimes alternate between different work patterns and structures. There is an ethos of multi-tasking and generalisation, which is thought to be more efficient and perhaps a cheaper option. Yet, the organisational cycle later returns to a specialised approach. Is there a danger that the Police will just be re-active (to reported crime) rather than taking a pro-active approach to preventing and solving crimes ? Will this approach result in increased expenditure ?

Response - The Police and Crime Commissioner advised Panel Members to read the submitted documents about "Securing the Future of Neighbourhood Policing". The Police will still be specialists and provide specialised 'hubs' of Officers available to all policing teams in the neighbourhoods. As part of the trial of the new method of working, the Police force will be making a calculation of the time spent in the community, compared to the time previously required to return to Police stations for the completion of paper-work. There is an initial estimation that the new method will provide an additional 150,000 hours (equivalent to 74 officers), per year, of Police presence in the neighbourhoods, when compared to existing methods of working.

(5) (Councillor Hussain) The Panel ought to support the increased precept, because the Council tax freeze grant (offering just £547,000) will not be a sufficient amount to support the budget. Does the Commissioner have more details about the budget pressures?

Also – if 85% of the Police budget is spent on personnel and there is the necessity to make some £12 millions in savings, what will be the percentage reduction in Police personnel this year?

Response – On behalf of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Chief Finance Officer stated that the 2015/16 budget estimates include provision for an increase of 1% in wages' costs. The total savings to be made on employee costs by the Police Force are £2.1 millions. Another £2.4 millions of savings are also required, meaning that employee savings amount to £5.5 millions of the total of £7.7 millions of specific budget pressures.

The Chief Finance Officer also stated that, although inflation is reducing, the Police Force has still to contend with increases in some prices for goods and services, because of the obligations of existing, long term purchasing contracts. The Force must also fund its share of costs for certain national policing arrangements which affect the County of South Yorkshire. The specific number of reduced personnel, likely to be the consequence of the budget reductions, is not available to report at today's meeting, but the figure can be provided separately to Panel Members.

(6) (Councillor Parker) Doesn't the Police Service want to receive the Council tax freeze grant ? Is it the intention simply to avoid a referendum by increasing the precept by 1.95%, just 0.05% below the threshold for a referendum ? This decision has been taken deliberately in order to avoid the referendum and prevent the public from expressing their opinion about the Police budget. Generally, people get impression that local authorities and Police authorities are doing that all the time.

In reply, the Police Commissioner asked whether Councillor Parker was recommending that a referendum be held about the proposed increase in the Police precept for 2015/16.

Councillor Parker replied that the impression people will get is that these budget proposals are being made deliberately so as to avoid the referendum.

The Police and Crime Commissioner stated that the general public is not being prevented from "having a say". However, it is preferable that the Police budget proposals should ensure that the expense of a referendum is avoided. The cost of a referendum will inevitably be significant and should be contemplated only if a very considerable sum of money is needed for budget purposes.

Councillor Parker suggested that the people of South Yorkshire be given the chance to express a view on the Police and Crime Commissioner's 2015/16 budget proposals.

The Police and Crime Commissioner retorted that there are several different ways of gauging public opinion. The Commissioner is confident that there will be public support for the 2015/16 budget proposals.

The Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner stated that the required, statutory business consultation process about the budget proposals, 2015/16, has already taken place. The Commissioner's Office has also undertaken a public survey about the budget proposals and, whilst responses are still being received, the comments so far show that people are broadly in favour of the proposals.

Councillor Parker repeated his assertion that the budget information provided is incomplete and that the additional papers should be made available in advance of the Panel meeting, not during it.

The Police and Crime Commissioner stated that the information about "Securing the Future of Neighbourhood Policing" had been sent to the local authority Chief Executives two weeks ago and Councillors ought to have received it by now. The budget-setting timetable is determined by the coalition Government and Parliament and not by local authorities nor the Police and Crime Commissioners. The coalition Government had announced the provisional funding settlement during December 2014 and the final settlement is expected to be announced during February 2015. Public authorities are left in a difficult position when setting their budgets.

Councillor Parker stated his view that, consequently, the Police and Crime Panel is left with fewer facts on which to base its decision about the budget.

The Police and Crime Commissioner stated that local authorities must do their best with the information available.

(7) (Councillor Sangster) The public must be able to have confidence in the Elected decision makers.

Response - The Police and Crime Commissioner further stated that the budget contains £2.5 millions earmarked for services for vulnerable adults. There is a pressure on the Police resources which accommodate the public protection units, of which there are some, but not all in respect of the child sexual exploitation issue.

(8) (Councillor Sangster) The former methods of targeted and tactical policing are now being changed and the emphasis is being placed upon neighbourhood policing.

Is there a contradiction with those two types of policing : is one general and the other specific ?

Response - The Police and Crime Commissioner replied that the Police must allocate sufficient resources to investigate crimes such as murder, burglary, car theft etc. The future intention is to have multi-disciplinary teams which will be capable of providing a much more flexible service. All Police officers will have responsibilities within the communities they serve. They will be visible within communities even when they are not investigation a specific crime incident. The use of the new ICT technology, especially, will facilitate that new system.

The Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed the intention of the South Yorkshire Police to respond to organisational change. All policing is intelligence-led and there is the priority of making communities feel safe. The neighbourhood teams will be involved both in solving crimes and also making communities feel safe. The Police must assess the threat, the harm and the risk and deploy resources appropriately.

The Police and Crime Commissioner reported that although, in general terms, levels of crime are known to be reducing, there are still some specific crimes whose incidence is increasing. Police officers will spend a percentage of their time on crime investigation. A great deal of time will also be spent on work in neighbourhoods and in dealing with nuisance issues and anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Sangster offered the opinion that the acceptance of the Council tax freeze grant, from the coalition Government may perhaps serve only to corrode the budget base for the Police Service.

After questions and answers had ended, the Police and Crime Panel members voted on the contents of the submitted report about the South Yorkshire Police precept for the 2015/16 financial year.

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

(2) That the contents of the documents detailing the Police and Crime Commissioner's proposals for "Securing the Future of Neighbourhood Policing" (distributed to Panel Members at this meeting) be noted.

(3) That the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel supports the proposal, now submitted by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, to increase the Council Tax by 1.95% for 2015/16, which is equivalent to an annual increase for a Band D property of £2.83 (6p per week).

J32. REPORT OF THE LEGAL ADVISER - UPDATE ON THE OPERATION OF THE COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Consideration was given to a report of the Legal Adviser/Monitoring Officer, which provided an update on the handling of complaints received against the Police and Crime Commissioner, specifically both the former Commissioner and his Deputy.

It was clarified that there were no complaints about the current Commissioner and that all of the issues within the report referred either to the former Commissioner or to the former Deputy Commissioner.

In accordance with Regulation 6(1) of the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 the Panel had a duty to ensure it was kept informed of the handling of such complaints.

Since the previous meeting the following matters have been considered:-

1. A complaint that the former Deputy Commissioner had failed to deal properly with e mail messages from a complainant.

The response has been given that no further action would be taken; however, the complainant is in correspondence with the Legal Adviser.

2. A complaint about the former Commissioner, in respect of which the Legal Adviser had met with the complainants in May 2014.

The complainants had been invited to submit further details of the complaint, but have not done so. The complainants have been informed that the complaint will not be proceeded with.

3. A complaint about the former Commissioner, which is related to the complaint number 2 above.

Because the former Commissioner has resigned, this complaint will not be proceeded with.

The report stated that, after the publication of the Jay report on 26th August 2014, seventeen complaints have been lodged about the actions of the former South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner. Three of those complaints have been referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC), because the allegations related to the potential criminal offence of misconduct in public office. No determination has yet been made by the IPCC regarding these referrals. All of the complaints have been acknowledged and, other than those complaints referred to the IPCC, no further action will be taken because the former Police and Crime Commissioner has resigned from office. In addition a significant number of comments were received by the Legal Adviser, which did not constitute formal complaints and all of the comments have been acknowledged. It was clarified that, to date, there has been no referral of any issue to the Crown Prosecution Service.

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

J33. DATES AND TIMES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel shall take place on a date to be arranged, during late March, 2015.