

## **ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION**

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

**Date: Wednesday, 21st October, 2015**

**Time: 2.00 p.m.**

### **A G E N D A**

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 17)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 1 - 12)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 1 - 15)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 1 - 26)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 1 -11)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION  
24th September, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Elliot, Fleming, Godfrey, Mallinder, Parker, John Turner and M. Vines, Vicky Farnsworth and Robert Parkin (Rotherham Speakup)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Burton, Hunter, Khan, Price, Rose and Rushforth.

**26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Fleming made a Declaration of Interest in that he was an employee of Sheffield Hospital Trust. As the Declaration was of a personal (and not prejudicial) nature, Councillor Fleming remained in the meeting and spoke and voted on the items.

**27. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no members of the press and public present.

**28. COMMUNICATIONS**

(1) Yellow Cards

The Chairman reminded Members that they should raise the yellow card if they required clarification on any issue/terminology used.

(2) Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee

It was expected that a meeting would be held in October, 2015, on the issue of Congenital Heart Disease Services

(3) Treeton GP Practice

The Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group had met with NHS Property Services at the beginning of August and, in conjunction with NHS England, an options appraisal for the Treeton/Waverley site had been submitted to the Primary Care Sub-Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> September. Jacqui Tuffnell was to attend the next meeting of the Select Commission and would update on the outcome of the meeting.

(3) RDaSH

The Trust was to hold its third workshop on 25<sup>th</sup> September at the Unity Centre from 1.30 p.m.-3.30 p.m. to involve local people and partners in plans to transform Adult Mental Health Services across the Borough. RDaSH was particularly interested in hearing from those with direct experience of their Services including family members and carers.

(4) Terri Roche, Director of Public Health

Terri introduced herself to the Select Commission. She had been in post since 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

Public Health had a statutory responsibility to protect the health of the public and improve the public's health. The Department was organised into 3 domains:-

Health Care Public Health – work to ensure the Health Services worked with health providers to ensure they were the best they could be and ensured they reached the right people in the right ways to address inequalities;

Health Protect – emergency planning – not to deliver the services but to hold other organisations to account and ensure things happened e.g. working with NHSE to make sure Rotherham residents were taking advantage of preventative measures to make sure they lived a long and healthy life

Health Promotion/Education – work in partnership to ensure Rotherham residents had all the information they needed to make healthy choices

## **29. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 9TH JULY, 2015**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2015, be agreed as a correct record.

Arising from Minute No. 15(5) (Access to GPs and RDaSH CAMHS Reviews), it was noted that the CAMHS response would be submitted to Commissioner Newsam's 13<sup>th</sup> October meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 17 (Health and Wellbeing Board – Scrutiny Review of Access to GPs), it was noted that the outstanding part of the response in relation to the recommendations specific for the Health and Wellbeing Board had been discussed and an update would be submitted to the next meeting. Jacqui Tuffnell would be presenting the final Interim GP Strategy to the October Select Commission meeting which would address many of the points raised in the Scrutiny Review particularly GPs and practice workforce issues given the national media coverage regarding the shortage of GPs.

Arising from Minute No. 19 (Hospital Discharges), it was noted that the Quarters 1 and 2 data would be available shortly. Councillor Fleming also raised that he had asked for information relating to pressure ulcers.

Arising from Minute No. 21 (Health and Wellbeing Strategy), it was noted that the Commission had had the opportunity to comment on the draft Strategy. The final version would be submitted to the October Select Commission. It was evident that there was greater emphasis on mental health.

Arising from Minute No. (Provisional Sub-Groups for Quality Accounts), it was noted that the final sub-group memberships had now been confirmed.

**30. BETTER CARE FUND**

Lynda Bowen, Dominic Blaydon, Kathryn Rawlings and Sarah Whittle gave the following presentations on the Better Care Fund and potential developments from the recent Service review.

Lynda Bowen gave the following overview presentation of the Better Care Fund:-

**Better Care Fund Overview**

- Plan agreed by NHS England in January, 2015
- Formalised in a Section 75 Partnership Framework Agreement in April, 2015
- Strengthened governance

**What does the BCF Plan aim to achieve?**

- Better patient/customer experience
- Integrated service provision – seamless services
- More effective provision
- Fewer admissions to permanent care and unplanned emergency hospital admissions
- Shorter lengths of stay in hospital
- Effective reablement

**BCF Metrics**

- Reduction in non-elective admissions
- Permanent admissions of older people to care homes
- Delayed transfer of care from hospital
- Number of older people at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into rehabilitation

**Governance**

- Health and Wellbeing Board
- Strategic Vision
- Strategic Executive
- Operational Executive

**Current BCF**

- Complex Plan
- 72 lines of funding
- 16 workstreams
- 2 pooled funds
- Mixture of new and existing services
- Fragmented data collection
- Fragmented reporting lines
- Potential overlap/gaps in provision

**Review of Workstream 13**

First review of this workstream showed:-

- Lack of clarity
- Historic grants/funding lines
- Segments of Services funded from other budgets
- Diverse reporting and governance
- Overlap with separate funding areas

**Service Review Methodology:-**

72 funding streams each reviewed to identify:-

- Strategic relevance
- Areas for merging funding
- Areas for reallocating funding
- Services receiving funding from outside BCF
- Services that required detailed review

**Outcomes from the Service Review**

- Directory of Services
- Simplified structure for BCF
- Clear measures for metrics
- Revised governance for BCF services
- Recommendations for integrating BCF governance
- Recommendations for future integration and joint commissioning

**Key drivers for the new BCF Plan**

- Improving services for people of Rotherham
- Complementing transformational change underway in Social Care and with secondary and community health providers
- Integration with Children's Services
- Framed by:-
  - Role and requirements of NHS England and Better Care Fund Team
  - Ability to impact on metrics and meet performance targets

Discussion ensued on this part of the presentation with the following issues raised and clarified:-

- The 72 lines of funding was a narrative which stated where the Fund would make a difference to the Services that would be funded but there was no project plan as such for each of them. They were aggregated up to a project view for each of the workstreams. It was acknowledged that it was far too complicated but it had served a purpose. The BCF had had to be put together very quickly in the beginning so a pragmatic approach had been taken of what there was, what met the criteria and transferred into a plan
- The way that the metrics were measured was not entirely consistent with the preferred reporting that the CCG used and with CQUINS

- In response to the recent Government announcement in relation to domiciliary care and that providers needed to spend a minimum of at least 30 minutes with service users in their own home, Rotherham's providers did not make 15 minutes calls
- The Strategic Vision Group consisted of Commissioner Manzie, Julie Kitlowski, Chris Edwards, Graeme Betts, Sam Newton, Dominic Blaydon and Linda Bowden. The Group had had its first meeting and discussed ideas which involved the customer perspective and working with providers was an absolute part of the future work. There had been the realisation that the potential in Rotherham was enormous and there was the desire to roll it out. Providers themselves were having discussions about future transformation and had their own ideas about the future. There would be opportunities for other providers to join in that thinking
- There was an awareness that the current BCF did not reflect the whole change agenda and that it had been a pragmatic approach adopted at the time to meet the deadline. Although there was some fantastic work taking place, BCF was not the only change agenda and that was where the Vision Group came in so there was 1 Rotherham vision. There had been a fantastic approach from the voluntary sector who were keen to work with the smaller groups to help them through the change agenda as well as the bigger groups
- There had been no indication of what would happen to the Fund in 2016. It had been the pattern that any information was received at very short notice. Current funding was until the end of 2015 with no guidance on what would happen beyond that date. The services would not stop because there were other ways that could be considered for funding. The Comprehensive Spending Review for the next 3 years was due soon and had previously influenced how the BCF was structured
- Improvement outcomes were measured differently due to the different types of reablement. There was a keenness not to see customers receive reablement early on as a service until they were really in need of it. This was to ascertain how effective the service was at giving the customer confidence, independence and motivation. An ultimate measure was if reablement had kept people at home rather than going back into hospital or into permanent care
- The % of re-admissions to hospital following discharge would be supplied after the meeting  
*(TRFT supplied the following data at the end of the meeting:*
  - July – 11.88% patients admitted as an emergency within 28 days of discharge following an emergency admission.

- *July – 4.6% patients admitted as an emergency within 28 days of discharge following a planned admission)*
- It was not known if the Sheffield City Region would potentially have an effect on BCF. There were some services that overlapped into Sheffield for example the shared Advocacy Services. Discussions did take place with other regions within Yorkshire and the Humber and Sheffield about what they were doing and how they were combining services. What was missing currently were any links to any of the other employment/opportunities that the Sheffield City Region was offering
- Reporting was fragmented due to some projects/services already being in existence prior to BCF; they had their own way of assessing success which did not necessarily correlate with the way the Government BCF outcomes were to be reported as well as some using different reporting routes. Some reported to the Health-led groups e.g. System Resilience Groups, some to the BCF Operations Group and other to the Adults Development Board. It needed to be simple and clear. It was the intention to make a better service for the people in Rotherham and it was known that the patient journey was not always as smooth as it could be. Good work was also taking place outside the BCF
- Children's Services was another area considering moving to an ageless service and it did feel the transition from Children's to Adults was not as smooth as it should be, especially for Mental Health. The integration would be looked at very carefully
- Those Services that had integrated had done so with some success due to working in a slightly different way, talking about where one service stopped and another service started and whether they could be done differently. There were a number of learning points the biggest one of which was talking to Service users, voluntary and community agencies and not one Service trying to do things on their own in silos
- Primary Care was part of the BCF and the Chair of the CCG was herself a GP so there was a very direct link with Primary Care and engagement with the BCF. This was very helpful when looking at the delivery of the Services within the BCF at Primary Care level, talking to GPs, getting Social Workers into GP surgeries, risk strategies in GPs etc.
- There was a Performance for Payment element within BCF. If the targets were not met for non-elective/non-planned admissions it would mean a degree of the funding would be withheld and could not be used to distribute to the projects. However, this did not put projects at risk as there was a Risk Fund - it made no sense at all to plan to fail

- The Care Co-ordination Centre did not need to change as it was doing a good job. There was a separate workstream outside of the BCF which was looking at the customer journey from start to finish to ascertain the best way for those using the Service to get those Services in a simple and clear manner. Like all Services and customer journeys, the Care Co-ordination Centre role and function would be reviewed to check if it could be done in a different way/resourced differently
- Carers, the offer and strategy, and the Carers Emergency Scheme had a renewed focus. It was working well if you knew it was there and that was one of the problems – how did members of the public know they were carers and how to get the help to them. A Carer held a card and attempts were being made to flag that through to GP practices; some practices had a red flag on patient records denoting someone was a carer. There was provision for carers if they had a breakdown in care or needed to go into hospital suddenly/urgent care arrangements and the Scheme would arrange care. There was more money in the budget than was being spent. The infrastructure costs were covered so the Service had stability and as much flexibility as required to deliver the hours that could be provided for carers that had unplanned care needs, however, the message was not getting through to carers
- The Heads of Terms within the Section 75 Partnership Agreement clearly described what both partners, Health and Social Care, had signed up to with regard to mitigation and governance. In terms of mitigation, both parties planned together, delivered together and problem solved together. With regard to mitigation, in terms of future Service delivery, it was anticipated that it would only get stronger and clearer due to the commitment at the highest level and joint working which was starting to show through the specifics in terms of Service plans

At this point Dominic Blaydon, Head of Commissioning for Urgent Care, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group, took over the presentation:-

### **Directory of Services**

- Category 1 Mental Health
  - Mental Health Liaison Services
    - Dedicated Mental Health expertise provided to A&E 24 hours/day
    - Clinically led and operates from The Woodlands
    - Supports 16-18 year olds overnight and at weekends
    - Works alongside the Crisis Intervention Service
    - Links in with the Emergency Centre Development
- Category 2 Rehabilitation and Reablement
  - Home Improvement Agency
  - Falls and Bone Health Service



- Home Enabling Service
  - Community Stroke Team
  - Stroke Association – Community Integration
  - Community Neuro-Rehabilitation Service
  - Rotherham Equipment and Wheelchair Service
  - Community Occupational Therapy
  - Age UK Hospital Discharge Service
  - Good Practice: Integrated Falls and Bone Health  
Targets people over 55 years with fragility fracture  
Multi-factorial Falls Assessment and therapy input  
12 week Falls and Fracture Prevention Programme  
Follow-up exercise programmes commissioned by RCCG  
Patients under 75 years undergo bone density scanning  
Establish fracture probability and prescribe bone active tablets  
Follow up patients at 3 months, 6 months and 1 year  
Check modifiable risk factors and adherence to medication
- Category 3 Intermediate Care
- Rotherham Intermediate Care Centre
  - Integrated Therapy Team with physiotherapists and OTs
  - 3 residential units with 50 beds
  - Community Rehabilitation Service
  - Day Rehabilitation and Community Integration
  - GP contact for intermediate care
  - Intermediate Care Social Work Service
  - Specialist Mental Health OTs
  - Good Practice: Community Integration  
6 week programme led by Occupational Therapy  
Addresses social isolation and activities of daily living  
Access and utilisation of public transportation  
Development of social networks  
Leisure or recreational activities  
Educational and training activities  
Health and wellness promotion
- Category 4 Protecting Social Care
- Hospital Social Work Services
  - Supporting Direct Payments and Personal Budgets
  - Residential respite care
  - Supporting people with learning disabilities
- Category 5 Case Management and Integrated Care Planning
- GP Case Management
  - Integrated Rapid Response Service
  - Care Home Support Service
  - Otago Exercise Programme
  - Death in Place of Choice
  - Good Practice: Integrated Rapid Response

Merge Fast Response Advanced Nurse Practitioners and OOHs  
 Provides early supported discharge at home  
 Identifies stable hospital patients who can be supported at home  
 Respond to patients who are at risk of hospital admission  
 Co-ordinates care for up to 5 days  
 Supported by Home Care Enabling Service  
 Incorporates community rehabilitation

- Category 6 Supporting Carers

#### Next Steps

- Service review outcomes: options paper to be taken to BCF Executive in October
- Decisions to be taken on strategic priorities for future BCF based on review findings
- Service Integration – greater focus on joint commissioning and Service delivery
- Links with other transformational agendas especially prevention and early intervention
- Build on best practice
- Nominate lead and accountable officers

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

- Although there was no specific slide on carers, the Carers Service transcended many of the Services delivered
- Within BCF there was no funded service for supporting children who cared for adults. However, the new Carers Strategy would be more explicit in the provision for young carers as their needs were somewhat different to the needs of adult carers. There was a desire to separate them out
- There was no link between CQUINS and BCF targets. There was a cost element and they complemented each other but were both developed separately. CQUINS were agreed between the CCG and the provider but were not coterminous with the targets set by NHS England for the BCF. On the whole there was a reasonable compatibility although there was some work still to done. As both BCF and CQUIN were relatively new, it had taken some time for priorities and for the CCG to get them aligned. The Chief Executive of the CCG had been mandated to raise this with NHS England
- The issue of protective clothing in falls prevention and whether it reduced the potential for breakages was being debated as to its effectiveness. In Rotherham protective clothing such as hip protectors would be issued at times. Rotherham's Multi-Factorial Falls Assessment would assess whether protective clothing was

necessary. For those people in the residential care environment the Falls Team would carry out an assessment not just looking at possible interventions but also what types of protection they could recommend to wear. It was not always appropriate e.g. for someone with Dementia but other measures could be introduced and was part of the package they could consider

- The Bone Health Clinic not only administered medication but would identify whether there was an issue and give life choice advice and then prescribe medication. It would be dependent upon whether they felt the patient would comply. It was important that people with a learning disability receive clear information
- Patients would be followed up after 3, 6 and 12 months. It could be by way of a telephone call depending upon the level of risk. If the patient was on bone density medication there would be a follow-up process and it would be a similar process for the Falls Services to ensure the person complied with the rehabilitation programme
- The Intermediate Care Services supported those who were discharged from hospital to ensure Services got the pathway right to stop admissions in the first place
- There was a support process in place in Direct Payment as it was important that customers had control over their care packages. It was hoped to further develop health and social care integration packages which would mean that the customer would have much more control over the services going in. It was not sure how it would apply to those who were Autistic. A lot of work was required to be done within the organisations and awareness around Autism and how their needs were met
- There was an issue for those resident in Rotherham whose GPs were outside the Borough or those that had admissions to a hospital rather than Rotherham District. There was a mechanism in place but it was quite detailed and not specifically related to the BCF
- There had been substantial investment in Hospice Services over the last 3-4 years. There was now an Outreach Service and additional urgent response to enable 24/7 provision for those that were on their end of life pathway. It was essential that the Hospice worked closely with community nursing homes. Although great strides had been made it was really important to ensure that when people reached their end of life they had that choice to make

At this point Kathryn Rawling took over the presentation:-

**Alzheimer's Society**

What do Alzheimer's Society provide in Rotherham

- Dementia Support Workers offering emotional and practical support
  
- Memory Cafes
  - Held monthly at Dalton, Maltby Thurcroft and Wath upon Dearne
  - Provided an opportunity to meet regularly and talk about living with dementia in an informal social environment
  - Provided opportunities for people with dementia, families and carers to ask questions of professionals and learn from the experiences of others.
  - A dementia café will provide information about dementia and practical tips about coping with dementia
  
- Rotherham Unity Centre Memory Café
  - Brings together older people from the BME community including those living with dementia and their carers, from minority ethnic groups, in a relaxed atmosphere where they can meet others in a similar situation to themselves
  
- Social Outlets
  - Singing for the Brain – held monthly at Lord Hardy Court, Rawmarsh, and Davies Court, Dinnington
  
- Rotherham Carers Resilience Project
  - A new service working with Crossroads Care, Rotherham, to provide a Dementia Link Worker in all GP practices. The Society provided information and support for carers of people living with dementia in their own homes to build resilience and confidence and prevent and/or manage the risk of carer breakdown. This helped people to continue to live well with dementia in their own homes with the right support for their carers
  
- Rotherham Dementia Forum
  - Run by Rotherham Alzheimer's Society
  - The Forum brought together people with dementia, their carers and professionals so that they could influence the way services were provided in line with the needs of people with dementia and those who cared for them and also in the development of dementia friendly communities in Rotherham
  
- CrISP (Carers Information and Support Programme)
  - Aim of the programme was to improve the knowledge, skills and understanding of those caring for people with dementia
  - Programme facilitated peer support and shared learning experience led by training Society staff
  - CrISP included 2 courses:-
    - CrISP1 – a 4 session programme aimed at family members and friends who supported a person with a recent diagnosis of

dementia. The modules covered included understanding dementia, legal and money matters, providing support and care and coping day-to-day and next steps

CrISP2 – a 3 session programme covering issues that arose as dementia progressed. The modules covered including understanding change as dementia progressed, live with change as more help was needed and living well as dementia progressed

- National Campaigns
  - Dementia Friends
  - Dementia Friendly Communities
  - Dementia Action Alliance

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

- Dementia was a worldwide problem with someone being diagnosed every 7 seconds. The work of Rotherham Dementia Action Alliance was invaluable by raising awareness of dementia and the Dementia Friends Programme meant that the general public were far more likely to come forward to access services and actually ask for help but it was the tip of the iceberg
- People with dementia became socially isolated and did not reach out for help. Work done nationally and by the Alliance had the potential of increasing the needs as more people became aware. The more services that were out there prevented people going into crisis
- It was the aim of the Carers Resilience Programme to give people the support to cope and know about the Services available. GPs were being more challenged to increase the diagnosis rate. Some people were proactive and sourced help but 1 of the key symptoms for people exhibiting signs of Alzheimer's was they would not be aware that they were having problems at all and less likely to seek help
- There were approximately over 100 types of dementia which presented in different ways and it was a challenge for the families of people exhibiting and perhaps being in denial. People would go for the simple test at their GP practice and develop good ways of masking the issue. It was good for people to know about the test so they could be encouraged to go to their GP and the work of the Alliance also helped to get that information out into the public arena
- Loneliness was a big issue and if someone attended the services with their partner/family member and they then had a bereavement, the Alzheimer's Society would not prevent the surviving member from attending any more. At the Dementia Cafes attendees formed their own groups and participated in activities socially outside of the Cafes

- The Carers Resilience Alliance, funded by the CCG, was working with the Alzheimer's Society and Crossroads; the more partnership work that took place was for the greater good and could do more working together

At this point Sarah Whittle, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group, took over the presentation:-

### **Social Prescribing**

- Connects people with long term conditions referred through case management teams to sources of support in their community aiming to reduce social isolation
- 5 VCS Advisors employed by VAR linked to 36 GP practices work with referred people to find a service or activity that meet their needs
- 26 VCS organisations receive funding to provide a menu of 33 different services and activities
- Provides a gateway to a wider pool of VCS services that are not directly funded through social prescribing, predominantly provided by local community centres and groups

### Prescription

- Exercise/healthy lifestyles
- Self-management programmes
- Social and leisure
- Befriending
- Confidence building
- Learning/training
- Money – benefits, debts, fuel poverty
- Housing/adaptations
- Carers support
- Dementia support
- Transportation/mobility
- Advocacy

### Why are we doing it?

- Strengthening individuals, strengthening communities
  - NHS Efficiency Challenge – reduces pressure on NHS and Social Care
  - Improves outcomes for patients with long term conditions and their carers
  - Recognition that patients need support with non-medical issues – creates a wider range of options for primary care and patient
  - Shift of focus to prevention and early intervention – increases independence, resilience of individuals and communities
  - Supports integration and personalisation
  - Doing things differently – 'more of the same' is not an option

- Outcomes for Patients and Carers
  - Quantative and qualitative evidence points to a range of improvements for patients and carers
    - Improved mental health
    - Greater independence
    - Reduced isolation and loneliness
    - Increased physical activity
    - Welfare benefits
  - Social Prescribing represents an important first step to engaging with community based services and wider statutory provision]without Social Prescribing many patients and carers would be unaware of or unable to access these services
  
- Wellbeing Improvements
  - 83% of patients made progress in at least 1 outcome area
  - 20% reduction in A&E attendances
  - 21% reduction in in-patients stays
  - 21% reduction in out-patients
  - 3,500 patients referred
  - For every £1 spent at least £3 saving
  - The CCG benefits as it addresses inappropriate admissions
  - The GPs benefit as it gives them a third option other from referral to hospital or to prescribed medication
  - The voluntary and community sector benefit as it supports their sustainability
  - The patient and carers love it as it improves quality of life, reduces social isolation and moves the patient from dependence to independence

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

- Although there were pockets of social prescribing across the country, Rotherham was the only place in the country doing it on this scale. The 3<sup>rd</sup> year operation would be coming out shortly and would be slightly different with a focus on those aged under 80 than those over age of 80 but that did not meant there would be nothing for the latter category
  
- It had been extended into Mental Health Services where the Mental Health provider was actually referring people into the voluntary sector and hoping to discharge a number of people, who had been under Mental Health Services for a number of years, and give them the help to become more independent and be part of the community. It was currently a pilot in its first year but there were many other areas this model, working with the voluntary sector, could be used and have a choice/need to do things differently in the future

- Quite often a number of the schemes in the voluntary sector were geared towards those who were getting older and female rather than male. The assessor would carry out an independent evaluation of the needs of the client. There were a number of clients who had the beginnings of dementia and been through social prescribing and helped in the community such as having a chat over a cup of coffee. That was for both sexes. There were a number of projects for men as well as women

Resolved:- (1) That the progress made for the Rotherham BCF including more integrated joint working between Health and Social Care and revised and strengthened governance for the BCF be noted.

(2) That the proposed timescale for future developments within the BCF plan be noted.

(3) That the existing good practice arising from the Better Care Fund services in Rotherham be noted.

### **31. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The contents of the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2015, were noted.

Councillor Roche, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, informed the Commission:-

- BCF – The Board was moving forward and positively commended by the Commissioners in their half yearly report to the Secretary of State.
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy - Final draft would hopefully be approved at the Board meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> September
- Dame Carol Black had visited Rotherham as part of the National Obesity Service. Even though Rotherham had a higher percentage of overweight people than the norm, Rotherham was seen as a leader for Obesity

The Chairman reported that a number of questions had been received from Select Commission Members who had not been able to attend the meeting. They would be e-mailed to Councillor Roche with the responses submitted to the next meeting.

Arising from Minute No. 5 (Care Act Progress – cap on care costs), it was noted that a number of providers nationally had contacted the Government stating more time was required for planning purposes in regards to the care cap element of the Care Act and this has now been deferred. The cap would have allowed people to have their financial contributions to care managed so that when they reached the care cap (which was set at £72,000) it would then have allowed them access to funding from the local authority.



Local authorities would have been able to start to identify self-funders to enable offers of an assessment to be made and advice/information given. The introduction of the cap in 2016 would have meant these people potentially coming forward to the local authority, so the deferment means there may be unknown potential clients with self-funded care not getting the necessary information and advice they require.

The deferred payment scheme was a loan to be paid back at some stage against their property and the amount of money they could be loaned previously was very limited. Rotherham already had a scheme in place but the new scheme now made this available to everybody.

### **32. QUARTERLY MEETING NOTES**

The notes of the first quarterly meeting with health partners, held on 23<sup>rd</sup> July, 2015, were noted.

It was noted that the action plan in response to the CQC Children's Safeguarding inspection had been developed and was now on the website as part of the agenda pack for the 30<sup>th</sup> September Health and Wellbeing Board.

RDaSH had invited the Select Commission to submit input into their CQC submission. The Commission had submitted its CAMHS review report

### **33. YORKSHIRE AMBULANCE SERVICES - CQC INSPECTION**

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, presented a summary of the outcomes of the CQC Quality Summit for Yorkshire Ambulance Service held on 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2015. It highlighted that, although there were areas of outstanding practice, there were a number of areas for improvement. The overall rating for the Trust was "requires improvement".

Following a CQC inspection, a Quality Summit was convened to develop an action plan and recommendations based on the findings of the inspection team. A range of stakeholders were invited to the Summit to hear the findings and respond/contribute to the action plan

It had been previously been agreed by the regional Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee that Councillor Rhodes, Wakefield Metropolitan District Council, would attend the Quality Summit on behalf of Health Scrutiny as Wakefield Clinical Commissioning Group were the lead commissioner for the Service. It was proposed that Wakefield Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee would undertake any ongoing monitoring of improvement actions from the CQC inspection report with an invitation to attend such meetings extended to other Health Scrutiny Chairs from the JHOSC.

Resolved:- (1) That the Yorkshire Ambulance Service Quality Account sub-group consider the findings of the inspection and resulting action plans when they scrutinise the Quality Account.

(2) That Wakefield Metropolitan District Council lead on the follow-up work on behalf of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee ensuring all JHOSC members are brief and invited to future monitoring meetings.

**34. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES**

No issues had been raised.

**35. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- (1) That the planning meeting for the next commission meeting be held on Tuesday, 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2015, commencing at 3.00 p.m.

(2) That, in light of the Better Care Fund and the current review of the 72 funding streams, a special scoping meeting be arranged to give consideration to the review outcomes and issues that the Select Commission may wish to scrutinise in more depth.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
23rd September, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Hamilton (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Councillors Astbury, Beaumont, Cutts, Hoddinott, Jones, Rose, Taylor and M. Vines.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed, Currie, Jepson and Pitchley and from co-opted members Ms. J. Jones (GROW) and Mr. M. Smith.

**14.       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No Declarations of Interest were made.

**15.       QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**16.       COMMUNICATIONS**

Nothing was raised under this item.

**17.       SECOND IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION  
REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL**

Resolved: - That Councillor S. Ahmed be the second Improving Lives Select Commission representative to the Corporate Parenting Panel.

**18.       MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 22ND JULY, 2015**

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2015, were considered.

On page 8, the minutes recorded that a scorecard was being developed in respect of creating a CSE profile and would allow progress tracking. The scorecard had not been forwarded to the Improving Lives Select Commission and it was hoped that it would soon be available for consideration.

On page 10 of the minutes covering the conclusions and next steps for the Improving Lives Select Commission, the areas that the Commission had highlighted were noted. Councillor Hoddinott emphasised the need for recommendations to be made following consideration of the Delivery Plan.

Resolved: - That the minutes from the previous meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2015, be approved as a correct record.

**19. TACKLING CSE - DELIVERY PLAN**

Councillor Hamilton, Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed the Officers in attendance to present the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board's Child Sexual Exploitation Delivery Plan (2015-2018).

In attendance were: -

- Gary Ridgeway, Assistant Director for CSE Investigations and Chair of the Child Sexual Exploitation Sub-Group of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board (GR);
- Phil Morris, Business Manager of the RLSCB;
- Sue Cassin, Chief Nurse, Clinical Commissioning Group;
- Linda Harper, Interim Director for Commissioning and Performance, Children and Young People's Services Directorate;
- Jo Smith, Post-Abuse Co-ordinator, Children and Young People's Services Directorate.

Consideration of this item formed part of the Improving Lives Select Commission's focus on the work to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), including the strategic plans and documents agencies had created. The previous meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2015, had considered the overarching work to tackle CSE (Minute Number 12: - 'Child Sexual Exploitation – The Way Forward for Rotherham'). The CSE Delivery Plan was referred to at that meeting and had now been submitted for consideration.

Councillor Hamilton invited members of the Improving Lives Select Commission to ask questions on each section of the Delivery Plan document.

**1. Prevent – prevent children and young people from becoming sexually exploited through effective leadership, governance and a wider culture embedded within organisations that recognise the root causes of CSE, the signs and risk indicators and do all they can to tackle them (pages 20- 23): -**

Councillor Jones referred to the intention to produce a problem profile and annually update it. Surely this needed to be more regular at the present time. – Gary Ridgeway agreed that the document would need to be more regularly refreshed in the short term and confirmed that it was being refreshed in 'real time' whilst all of the strategy work was underway.

Councillor Beaumont referred to 1.2 and how it related to engaging a PR/marketing company to ensure that messaging was well constructed and targeted. – GR confirmed that it was an action to consider the feasibility/appropriateness of using a PR/marketing company, and this included exploring how this would be funded and the sustainability of the option.

Councillor M. Vines asked whether schools were taking part in CSE training. – GR explained that the levels of influence varied. Some schools were completely engaged, whilst others were determining their position. All headteachers would be brought together in the Autumn to discuss the curriculum work needed and the resources that were available. Gary confirmed that a school connected to live operations had responded well to working with the Council.

Councillor Hoddinott spoke about relationship education. Was the priority to engage with all primary schools as well as secondary schools? - GR confirmed that it was an aspiration and would be coupled with early help planning.

Councillor Beaumont – referred to the pilot awareness campaign and how it intended to engage one school from each phase. – GR confirmed that this had not happened yet and would form part of the discussion with schools this Autumn.

Councillor Hoddinott asked what has been learnt from previous campaigns and from speaking to victims and survivors? What had worked and what had not worked? - GR explained how it was important for the material to strike a chord with individuals and help them to come forward. Schools involved with the operations had been supportive and open and honest. Agencies were still learning what the nature of victims and exploitation in Rotherham looked like. There was no 'off-the-shelf' response available for marketing/promotional resources.

Councillor Hoddinott asked how victims and survivors were feeding in to developing promotional resources and training materials? – GR explained that he had witnessed victims and survivors sharing their experiences and it had caused them to re-live the experiences. Gary was clear that he did not want any victims to re-visit their exploitation for these ends. It was important that the voices of many survivors were heard to represent the range of victims, and also to ensure that it was a complete and cross-cutting part of the process.

Councillor Hoddinott reported feedback that the 'Spot the Signs' poster pictures did not reflect what happened to victims and, as such, did not resonate with what happened. Officers working on the campaigns really needed to hear the feedback so that campaigns helped to remove barriers to reporting not least for victims and survivors. Jo Smith – outlined an assertive outreach service programme of work to include CSE prevention. There would be two levels to the work, one at junior school level and the second aimed at comprehensive schools. The Services were talking to individuals and a range of groups. Influence was coming from more than one voice.

Sue Cassin explained the drama/theatre groups that were to be offered to Key Stages 3 and 4. Councillor Hamilton emphasised how important it was for the theatre groups to differentiate between age-groups and provide age-appropriate material.

Councillor Clark challenged the commonly-held view that CSE only happened in certain areas of the Borough. Evidence showed that this was wrong. How were Schools selected to participate? – GR explained that there must be a clear evidence for engagement. It would be wrong to pick schools only on their willingness to engage.

Councillor M. Vines asked whether the Local Authority could make a school engage? – GR would never want to be in that position. However, from the statutory position of an Academy, and that of a Safeguarding Board, there were no powers to enforce this. There were no schools in Rotherham not wanting to do their best for their children.

Councillor Hoddinott asked if the RLSCB had evaluated the pilot? - GR explained that this was a current issue and work was not at that stage yet.

There was confusion on the number of pilots that were taking place and which stage they were at.

Councillor Hoddinott referred to Section 1.7 that stated that the Improving Lives Select Commission would undertake an annual review of community engagement activity. – GR explained that it had been put forward by the ILSC as part of the work to produce the delivery plan.

Councillor Hamilton acknowledged how the Jay report paid reference to BME communities being victims of CSE. She did not feel that the Prevent area gave much time to the issues. – GR did not agree with this. The Delivery Plan was a live document and a detailed action plan. All victims, regardless of label, would show some form of vulnerability so it was better to refer to vulnerabilities in the plan.

**2. Protect – protecting children and young people who are at risk of sexual exploitation as well as those who are already victims and survivors (pages 24-27): -**

Councillor Hoddinott asked about Regulation 44 reports. How many had there been in the last year and where were they reported to? - GR did not know this personally but agreed to forward the information to the ILSC.

Councillor Beaumont noted that 2.5 was rated Amber. – GR confirmed that as of September 2015 the strategic objective had been judged to be amber because there was a risk of failing to achieve it and remedial work was required. It had not been rated as Red, which was for significantly off-track objectives.

Councillor Beaumont asked about funding. – GR confirmed that funding cuts were not being felt by the team, although this was causing pressures elsewhere.

Councillor Hoddinott asked what would be the procedure if a family was not happy? Was there an independent complaints procedure? How would issues be flagged? - GR – Confirmed that a complaints procedure existed, which included a multi-agency significant third sector organisation. There were Command and Operational groups providing a strong voice and advocate for victims and families.

Councillor Clark asked how looked after children complained if they were not happy with the support they were receiving? - GR explained that there was a review of support for Looked After Children, including the role that the Review Team played. Looked after children would be supported through multi-agency challenge to any issues in post-abuse support.

Councillor Beaumont asked whether there was evidence that schools were not reporting children and young people who missed education because of the pressure to avoid Ofsted scrutiny on falling attendance rates? – GR explained in order to have a practical multi-agency response it would be difficult to distinguish between missing and absent. Missing overnight was a clear trigger for CSE, although children missing for just an hour at a time could also be at risk. If a child was missing for an hour there was every chance that this would not be picked up. There was a dedicated Missing Persons Officer co-located with the CSE team. The IYSS Service undertook a return interview within 72 hours of a young person returning. It was important that agencies increased their ability to respond to missing.

**3. Pursue – pursue, relentlessly, perpetrators of child sexual exploitation, leading to prosecutions of those responsible (pages 28-29): -**

Gary spoke about the prosecution of offenders for other offences they had committed. Although it was positive because it disrupted activities, it did not deliver justice to victims of CSE. This ethos was a tangible presence within command groups, they wanted to pursue and prosecute CSE crimes.

Councillor Beaumont referred to the pending reduction in PCSOs and their re-location – would this have an impact on intelligence, community safety and so on? - GR acknowledged that PCSOs had a presence and role within communities. His view was that PCSOs were one element of the community able to spot and articulate risks and signs. There were lots of other professionals on the ground who should be keeping their eyes open to signs. It was also crucial for all members of the public to be able to report their concerns.

Councillor Hamilton asked about progress made on the witness support strategy. - GR explained how the RLSCB was keen for third sector agencies to be integral in providing links and support. This would support the police and social care. All meetings had an agenda item on how to identify the best support for victims. Cultural beliefs that responsibility sat squarely with statutory agencies needed to be challenged. Statutory partners could not afford to support that myth.

Jo Smith agreed that third sector organisations had a critical role to play in ensuring that the victim was the focus, regardless of whether or not a prosecution was pending. She was working on a new service specification for a tender process in November, 2015, to be up and running by 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2016. There were already services in place, but needs were changing.

Councillor Hoddinott referred to sections in Prevent and in Pursue on how people reported concerns. Was ringing 101 the right route to do this? Was there a better way of reporting? Adult Safeguarding had text and email reporting mechanisms. This did not seem to be in place for Children's Services. Were partners making it easier to report concerns? - GR agreed that this was a good suggestion. There was enhanced information sharing between the police, children's social care and licensing. Members of the public were asked to raise concerns through 101. Email and internet templates were being looked at by the CSE Sub-Group. Neighbours used this approach. There were issues relating to the treatment of different types of concerns: - urgent concerns that needed to be picked up immediately, and pieces of intelligence information that needed to be shared. It was possible that with electronic reporting an urgent piece of information may not be picked up quickly. Agencies would need to give the right guidance about what was urgent and what needed to be shared.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether Health Services were involved in data sharing? - GR explained that there were always more challenges for Health due to their confidential relationship with patients and their legal requirements around confidentiality.

#### **4. Proving Support – providing support for survivors of CSE, ensuring that their needs are met (pages 29 – 31): -**

Councillor Rose referred to the Transition/Adult Survivor Board at 4.3 and asked how it was progressing. She had heard from survivors that they were not getting support from 18 and feeling they had reached a 'cut off' point. - Linda Harper outlined work, along with partners' statutory responsibility to LAC until they were 25.



Councillor Hoddinott asked how voice and influence work was contributing to the design of support packages. – Jo Smith explained that the voluntary and community sector had been commissioned and this would feed into the needs analysis. Jo reported monthly on the work that had been undertaken and offered to report this to the next meeting.

Councillor Hamilton noted that section 4.1 concerned mental health services and an annual needs analysis to be undertaken to identify any gaps. It was known that mental health services were under strain, how sure were partners that they could provide the help and treatment that was really need? – GR stated the importance of recognising the full picture of mental health requirements so that services could be designed accordingly.

Councillor Hamilton asked what the reviews into service improvement partnerships referred to? - Linda Harper explained that it was a review of the current services that were being funded. The field work completed at the end of August and the report would be released at the end of September. The field work had involved Rotherham's Young Inspectors and voice and influence work. The aim of the review was to improve quality by sharing good practice and the focus had been to support providers to work together without competing.

**5. Ensure the participation of all children and young people and families – ensuring that the voices of children and young people are heard and listened to at all times (pages 31- 32): -**

Councillor Hoddinott stated that this also needed to include the involvement of adult survivors and also to ensure there was no cut off at the age of 18. It was important to reassure survivors that they are involved, whichever stage they were at. – GR explained about the RLSCB's Community Reference Group.

Councillor Beaumont asked for more quantitative information. – GR said that this would be provided through the Scorecard and the Thematic Reviews.

Councillor M. Vines saw that the Rotherham Standing Together Campaign was judged to be Amber. How far behind were they to completing? - GR outlined the ongoing discussions with a wide range of stakeholders on issues like: should the posters about CSE be visible to every person coming into Rotherham?; was this appropriate to victims and other groups like businesses and tourists?; should the posters be displayed in every public building?. It was important to listen to all stakeholders' opinions.

Councillor Hamilton asked whether the staff changes referred to at 5.3 were now sorted, and were the staff in place? – GR said this was a priority to take forward, along with decisions needing to be made around commissioning. This was expected to be delivered in November, 2015, and there would be one person who would be held accountable from then.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether there was any update on Elected Members being involved in audit activities? - GR described the role as part of the thematic CSE audit and understood that the ILSC were to have a Lead Member for CSE audit.

Councillor Taylor referred to 5.2 as he felt the language could be complacent as meetings with schools were not yet confirmed. - GR agreed that listening to victims and survivors was important in preventing future cases of CSE.

Gary thanked the Improving Lives Select Commission for the guidance, comments and questions that had been shared with him.

#### **The Improving Lives Select Commission's summary and next steps:-**

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, outlined the areas of discussion that she felt were a priority and prime for future investigation. She invited contributions from the Elected Members present.

The following future lines of enquiry were agreed: -

- A report would be provided to the next meeting on the work with the third sector in supporting victims;
- Schools – what activities were taking place? Which pilots were running? Was there more than one? Who was doing what? Was there a gap in primary school provision?;
- Raising awareness;
- Offender profile;
- Support for BME groups;
- Voice and Influence – The importance of the Improving Lives Select Commission in speaking with victims and survivors and progress monitoring of this work overall;
- Performance;
- Gaps in delivery plan around health partners – challenges with health around data sharing;

- Allocation of a Lead Member to work with the RLSCB on Audit;
- Transition issues and the 'drop off' that had been described by victims and survivors at the age of 18 between Children and Adult Services.

Councillors Clark and Rose had met and worked with victims and survivors and explained how keen the individuals were for their voices to be heard so that their individual stories were out there. There were issues to be considered relating to where the meetings would take place, respecting the victim and survivors' need for confidentiality and their need for safe spaces and potential on-going criminal proceedings. Councillor M. Vines endorsed the Women Against Grooming conference where two victims and three parents attended to give their accounts of living with CSE. It had been interesting to hear from family member perspectives.

Resolved: - (1) That the development of a multi-agency CSE Delivery Plan to deliver the strategic objectives of the new CSE Strategy be noted.

(2) That the next steps discussed for future scrutiny review into Child Sexual Exploitation be noted, and the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme be developed accordingly.

## **20. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE - UPDATE**

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, introduced this item by outlining the history of the Scrutiny Review into Domestic Abuse. The scrutiny review had most recently been considered by the Improving Lives Select Commission on 5<sup>th</sup> November, 2014 (Improving Lives Select Commission's Scrutiny Review of Domestic Abuse - Update to Response Presented in November, 2013, Minute Number 33).

It was important to consider the length of time since the fieldwork was undertaken, and since that time there had been austerity measures and changes within Rotherham's social care and the overall Domestic Abuse sector.

Domestic Abuse had been a key priority within the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programmes in the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 municipal years.

The Scrutiny Review into Domestic Abuse had been very thorough and considered a lot of evidence. Following completion of the review it had been subject to a six month monitoring report and then an annual review. By the eighteen month mark, most reviews were signed-off.

Submitted to the Improving Lives Select Commission was the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Review, the Cabinet decisions on each recommendation, and the updates on progress at November, 2014, and August, 2015.

Councillor Clark explained that she was on the review group; the work on the review had been long and complex, but very good. Also on the group were Councillors Russell, Ahmed, Burton and Lelliott, supported by Caroline Webb. Councillor Clark felt that it would be more effective to send the update to original Members for their feedback, given their greater knowledge of the process the review had taken.

Councillor Clark asked for an update on recommendation one. She felt that this was a key recommendation as it related to the Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs) being funded through mainstream budgets, rather than twelve monthly fixed-term contracts.

Jan Bean, Domestic Abuse Manager, confirmed that this recommendation had been achieved in November, 2014, through the retention of current service capacity. Two permanent IDVAs had been secured. She thanked the Improving Lives Select Commission on behalf of her team; it was much appreciated that the review had identified this as an issue. Additional temporary funding had been received from the Police and Crime Commissioner for a further two IDVAs for one year.

Councillor Clark referred to recommendation 5 that related to the creation of a golden number and/or a one stop shop for domestic abuse support, as in neighbouring authorities. She was aware of issues preventing this, including different risk assessments being used by different agencies. The review group felt strongly about the importance of this recommendation.

Councillor Clark also referred to the importance of dentists being engaged and understanding how and when they should refer patients as the review group heard that patients presenting with tooth loss and jaw problems could be due to domestic violence. It was found that dentists were not regularly referring in the same way that GPs did.

Councillor Clark was happy that the two IDVAs were not worried about losing their jobs every twelve months. This was a coup for the process of scrutiny reviews. She had attended training and open day sessions with the Domestic Abuse service and would recommend the experience.

Jan thanked the review group and said how appreciated it was. She also confirmed that GPs continued to be involved and refer, and Dentists had processes in place to refer their concerns about potential domestic violence.

Councillor Hoddinott was also pleased about the additional security for the IDVAs. She was concerned that the commentary to recommendation five stated that it had been completed whereas there was no golden number or one stop shop for domestic abuse support. This was misleading.

Jan explained that the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) would act as the golden number.

Richard Liversage, Detective Inspector in the Reputation Unit, explained about the restructure that had taken place in the Public Protection Unit. It included a Safeguarding Adult Team that responded to allegations of rape, care homes issues, neglect, so called 'Honour-Based' violence and so on. In high risk cases Domestic Violence Officers worked with IDVAs. The Officers in the Unit were all detectives and experienced investigators. In addition to responding to reports of domestic violence incidents, the Unit sought to reduce the risk as a whole by working with perpetrators.

Jan explained how co-location within the MASH meant improved information sharing at meetings and the ability to respond and refer quickly. Being co-located with the Police meant that they could be cited immediately.

Councillor Hamilton asked whether individuals and families at risk of/experiencing CSE could be identified easily by the Domestic Abuse team.

Jan explained that the focus of the Domestic Abuse team was Adult Safeguarding, however, risks were always assessed and the voice of the victim was always represented.

Councillor Hamilton asked for more information in relation to recommendation 17 where it stated that a pilot in perpetrator management had reduced domestic abuse reports to the police by 75%. Richard and Jan both confirmed that they had struggled to quantify the figure or identify where it had come from. It is possible that it related to a transcription error.

Richard explained funding bids that had been made and were unsuccessful. These decisions were appealed and rejected. Management of cases were now assigned wholly to one officer, rather than splintered to a number as in the past. Integrated Offender Management included working with offenders to address their behaviour and reduce the risks to victims and children.

As one document providing the MASH storyboard had not been included in the information that was sent to members, it was agreed that consideration of the sign-off of this report should be deferred to a future meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission. This would also allow the members of the original review group to see the updates and make any comments or ask any questions. Deborah Fellowes confirmed this

information had been received from the Domestic Abuse Team but due to administration issues this information had not been sent out with the update.

Councillor Beaumont referred to so called 'honour-based' violence and asked whether this should remain a focus of the Select Commission. Deborah Fellowes confirmed that it remained on the list of priorities and she would programme consideration of a report on the issue.

Councillor Hamilton thanked the officers for attending the meeting and for contributing to the discussion and answering questions. She felt that a deferral for further information and wider comment would be beneficial for all stakeholders.

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

(2) That consideration of signing off the scrutiny review be deferred to allow the original review group members to comment and the MASH story board attachment to be forwarded.

**21. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -**

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> November, 2015, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION  
2nd September, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Buckley, Cutts, Gosling, McNeely, Pickering, C. Vines, Whelbourn and Whysall.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, Jepson, Reeder, Smith, Wallis and Wyatt.

**10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

**11. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**12. COMMUNICATIONS**

No issues to report.

**13. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 1ST JULY, 2015**

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 1st July, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, with the inclusion of co-opted members Mrs. L. Shears, Mr. P. Cahill and Mr B. Walker in the list of persons attending the meeting.

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 9, it was noted that Councillor McNeely will attend the RUSH House meetings as a Ward Councillor in accordance with the wishes of the RUSH House Board of Directors.

**14. ROTHERHAM'S ECONOMIC GROWTH PLAN**

Further to Minute No. 45 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 14th January, 2015, consideration was given to a presentation from the Economic Development Manager and the Senior Economic Development Officer, concerning the establishment of the Rotherham Growth Plan.

The presentation and subsequent discussion highlighted the following issues:-

- Rotherham's overall economic performance compares favourably with other local authority areas within the Sheffield City Region, but there is a gap to national performance which needs to be addressed;

- Rotherham pupils' educational performance at GCSE level is good, but becomes worse at the further and higher levels of education;
- the Growth Plan will help in attracting more businesses with growth potential to the area; in turn, there will be more jobs created, accessible to local residents;
- the increased gross value added;
- it was noted that the Advanced Manufacturing Park, at Waverley, requires high-level skills for specific jobs; jobs across the whole Borough area will be available to suit a wide range of skills, making them accessible to all residents;
- as part of the restructuring of the Local Strategic Partnership, the Local Economy Board will become the Business Growth Board; this process will include an open invitation for people who wish to apply to sit on the Board;
- a total net jobs growth of 9,125 is expected over the lifetime of the project, which is spread over a range of sectors and includes decreases in medium-low technology, manufacturing and public administration;
- the vision of the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District for research and development-led enhancement of the Lower Don Valley, including major improvement to transport links within both the Rotherham town centre and the Sheffield city centre; this process would include the potential delivery of the Waverley Link Road;
- the Growth Plan's themes - grow existing and develop new businesses; skills for employment and progression; inclusion, well-being and employment; employment land and business premises; housing; the Rotherham town centre and other district centres within the Borough area; transport;
- there will be a focus on education and schools, to ensure a suitably skilled and enterprising future workforce for the Borough area;
- transformational projects for the Borough, identified in the Economic Growth Plan – higher education campus in the Rotherham town centre; development of the HS2 high speed railway and proposed interchange/station at Meadowhall; development of the Rotherham town centre, including the Forge Island site and the markets complex; proposals for a major leisure development at the Pithouse West site near to the Rother Valley Country Park;
- the importance of the higher education campus in improving attainment levels for Rotherham students at NVQ Level 4 and above;



- the development at Waverley will create income for the Council through increased business rates, plus the New Homes Bonus for any residential development;
- an update on the progress of the development of the Growth Hub was requested; (information will be provided for Members of this Select Commission);
- issues arising from the public consultation process which took place during the early months of 2015 : the Economic Growth Plan must have a vision unique to Rotherham, which will come out of the current consultation roadshows; some concern has been raised about sites for major developments, which had been removed from the Economic Growth Plan, subject to the outcome of the Local Plan consultation and approval; further development and monitoring of the Growth Plan's targets and outputs will be carried out by sub-groups of the new Business Growth Board of the Local Strategic Partnership;
- whether job losses within the Rotherham Borough area (eg: Tata Steel) might result in land becoming available for the development of light industries; (there will be discussions with the Company);
- the Economic Growth Plan is to be submitted to the Council meeting to be held on 16th September, 2015, for final approval;
- the importance of tourism as a means of generating income for the Rotherham Borough area was acknowledged, as was the recent establishment of a Tourism Forum with the Barnsley and Rotherham Chamber of Commerce; it was suggested that the Government-appointed Commissioners to the Council may wish to review the Council's involvement in local tourism issues;
- the comparative development of the Wath-Manvers area, from the late 1980s onwards was praised, although the consequent impact of the additional traffic was also highlighted; the need for improved transport links in this area was also discussed.

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

(2) That progress reports about the Rotherham Growth Plan be submitted annually to meetings of the Improving Places Select Commission.

## **15. WINTER WEATHER RESPONSE - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 44 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 14th January, 2015, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Highways Network Manager and the Principal Waste Officer, providing an update on the Council's response to the severe weather during the Christmas and New Year holiday period in late

December 2014 and early January 2015 and setting out the actions which have been taken to improve the Council's response to similar weather conditions in the future.

The Select Commission's debate highlighted the following issues:-

- the accuracy of the daily weather forecasts available to local authorities;
- the telemetry provided on the road-gritting vehicles, recording the routes which have been gritted;
- the hand-salting teams had not been on stand-by duty during the Christmas and New Year holiday period in 2014/15, but will be on duty during the holiday period in 2015/16; Members acknowledged that the salting teams had undertaken their work to a high standard in exceptional circumstances;
- the possibility of pre-salting residential and estate roads, prior to snowfall and/or ice;
- the impact upon waste collection; crews being deployed in areas in which it was deemed safe to travel; some waste collection rounds had been halted because of the severe weather conditions, with some roads being inaccessible because of icy conditions; the use of the recovery plan to clear the backlog of household waste collection; the Bartec system which provides management information about the waste collection vehicles and routes and also provided real-time information for contact centre staff about the backlog of missed collections;
- ensuring effective communication with the public; use of the Council's Internet website and of social media (eg: Twitter, etc.); the proposed re-refresh of the website pages and the use of banners to guide website users to specific information; publication of a bespoke web page for winter maintenance; publication of leaflets for distribution to the general public (eg: at the Rotherham Show);
- better communications with the bus companies, about the impact of severe weather upon bus services and routes;
- the criteria and protocol for the provision of roadside salt bins (there are more than 300 bin locations throughout the Rotherham Borough area); the use of the snow warden scheme, in partnership with Parish Councils (eg: Wickersley) and with volunteer members of the public (25 individuals are already registered); engaging with the community via newsletters and community groups (eg: Rotherfed);

- regular communication with and updates for Elected Members and with snow wardens, during the severe weather;
- communications and a single officer lead; clearer messages on the Council's website about priorities; use of e mail alerts;
- sharing information about Winter maintenance with Elected Members at workshops, with the Area Assemblies and with the Parish Council network.

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

(2) That the report be forwarded to Commissioner Manzie for further consideration, who shall be recommended to approve the proposed changes affecting Winter maintenance services, the Council's Internet website and communications, as detailed in section 7.4 of the submitted report.

## **16. TASK AND FINISH GROUPS - UPDATE**

Further to Minute No. 5 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 1st July, 2015, discussion took place on the progress of each of the Task and Finish Groups which had been established to consider the detail of the Council's 'Cleaner – Greener' agenda. The reports of each Group were:-

(a) Group 1 - Waste Management (Chair – Councillor Godfrey)

The two initial areas of enquiry are household waste recycling centres and the arrangements for green waste collection.

(b) Group 2 - Leisure and Community Services (Chair – Councillor Atkin)

This Group's initial area of enquiry includes the problems of litter and fly-tipping; this Group has invited members of the public to attend its meetings and explain local problems caused by these two issues.

(c) Group 3 (part 1) Network Management / Rotherham Town Centre (Chair – Councillor Rosling)

The first part of this Group's task is to assess the Rotherham town centre's night time economy and the regular problem of littering; this task has links with the Waste Management Task and Finish Group (above); this Group seeks to engage with town centre businesses and resolve the issues of early morning litter caused by the night-time economy; the Group has already begun the drafting of some of its recommendations.

(d) Group 3 (part 2) - Car Parking (Chair – Councillor Rosling)

For the second part of this Group's tasks, there has been a preliminary investigation about car parking charges and fees and parking enforcement, specifically affecting the Rotherham town centre.

Resolved:- (1) That the progress of the 'Cleaner-Greener' agenda Task and Finish Groups, as described above, be noted.

(2) That the work of the Task and Finish Groups shall be progressed in sequential order during the 2015/16 Municipal Year, enabling the tasks of one individual Group to be completed before the next Group's tasks begin.

**17. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission shall take place on Wednesday, 14th October, 2015, at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 1.30 p.m. (instead of 28th October, 2015).

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**18th September, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Cowles, Hamilton, Mallinder, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Also in attendance Councillor Whelbourn (Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hughes, Pitchley, Sansome and Julie Turner.

**C28        DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

**C29        QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**C30        ROTHERHAM LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - ACTION PLANS**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Principal Engineer (Drainage), stating that the Draft Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for Rotherham had been approved by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development at a meeting held on 4th March, 2003 (Minute No. 101 refers). The report stated that this Management Strategy had been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Flood Risk Regulations 2009, the Floods and Water Management Act 2010 and the Council's Strategic Environmental Assessment.

The draft Management Strategy had been forwarded to the Council's partners, stakeholders and to communities for public consultation. All relevant comments and information received by the Council had been included in the final Management Strategy.

Under the requirements of the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 and the Floods and Water Management Act 2010, the Council has new roles and responsibilities. The Council has a duty to produce and implement the Rotherham Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, as well as being required to provide a framework to deliver a prioritised programme of works, initiatives to manage flood risk in the area, and identify objectives and action plans required.

The Strategy was published on the Council's website in February 2015 and provides this necessary framework. The general principles of the Strategy are:-

- Community focus and partnership working
- Sustainability
- Risk Based Approach
- Proportionality
- Multiple benefits

The fifteen objectives of the Strategy were listed in the submitted report and included arrangements for scrutiny of the process. The updated Action Plan (as at April 2015) was included as an appendix to the report.

During discussion, Members raised the following salient matters:-

- : Although the Government Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs had provided initial grant funding for the new duties during the current 2015/16 financial year, there is no certainty that such funding will continue to be provided in future years;
- : The Lead Local Flood Authority is a statutory consultee for development proposals (planning applications) for large-scale development within the Borough area;
- : Members acknowledged the importance of flood prevention, to try and avoid the devastating impact of severe flooding (as happened in the Borough area in 2007) and also working with partner agencies such as Parish Councils;
- : The impact of climate change on flood risk;
- : The age of the drainage infrastructure (some dating back to Victorian times) and the consequent maintenance liability;
- : Autumn weather conditions and the problems of leaves falling from trees and being wind-blown into gullies;
- : The frequency of gully cleansing and the need for regular maintenance of all watercourses;
- : The Lead Local Flood Authority maintains an asset register of all watercourses within the Borough, because of the responsibilities of riparian owners for maintenance of such watercourses;
- : The example of the Whiston Brook (now renamed 'River') and the enforcement powers of the Environment Agency; it was confirmed that the maintenance of the main river is the responsibility of the landowner or riparian owner.

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

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes:-

(a) the Council's commitment in achieving its Objectives and Action Plans detailed in the Rotherham Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, as shown in the submitted report; and

(b) that all changes to the Council's Objectives and Action Plans will be subject to approval by Commissioner Manzie.

**C31 REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST JULY 2015**

Commissioner Manzie introduced the submitted report which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Council's Revenue Budget for 2015/16, based on performance for the first four months of this financial year, April to July 2015. The current forecast was that the Council could overspend against its Budget by £8.063 millions (+ 4.0%) after allocation of the £8,393,500 Transformation Reserve (as detailed at Appendix 2 to the report) unless effective action was taken.

The Interim Strategic Director of Resources reported on the key pressures contributing to the forecast overspend:-

i) the continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough, including both placement costs and strengthening Social Work and management capacity; and

ii) demand pressures for Direct Payments within Older People and Physical and Sensory Disability clients and clients with Mental Health needs.

When the 2015/16 budget was set by Council on 4th March 2015, approval was also given for an in-year allocation of the 'Transformation Reserve' to meet the likely significant additional costs facing the Council to enable the positive and effective addressing of the improvements required in the reports by Professor Alexis Jay, Ofsted and by Louise Casey, in order to establish a fit-for-purpose Council at the earliest opportunity.

Detailed within Appendix 2 to the submitted report was the proposed allocation of the Transformation Reserve, reflecting the investment required within Children's Services and Corporate Services, to help in the establishment of a fit-for-purpose Council. It is proposed that the most significant proportion of the Transformation Reserve will be allocated, as was always planned, to Children's Services.

The Council had approximately £6 million of one-off funding potentially available to contribute, subject to Commissioners' approval, which will help to mitigate the forecast overspend. This funding was the 2015/16 Minimum Revenue Provision savings (£3.936 million) and the New Homes Bonus (approximately £2.1 million) which was earmarked for the superfast broadband project, but which is no longer required for that purpose as that

project would be funded via the Sheffield City Region Infrastructure Fund (SCRIF).

Radical action and continued close management of spending was required urgently if the Council was to deliver a balanced outturn for 2015/16.

Actions already in hand to help minimise the forecast overspend whilst, at the same time avoiding any significant adverse impact on service delivery, were:-

- continual review of vacant posts to determine which can be 'frozen';
- a review of agency and interim staff contracts to determine if any planned end dates can be brought forward;
- a review of the financial commitments assumed in the forecast to determine if any are overstated;
- continuing negotiations with partners about commissioning and joint levels of funding;
- tight control of non-staffing budgets; and
- endeavouring to maximise income generation, including the flexible use of grant funding within any specified funding conditions;
- savings achieved from capital financing.

Members questioned the use of external consultants by the Authority (previously costing in excess of £3 million and had been the subject of a scrutiny review). It was noted that sometimes this practice is necessary, although the Council has begun to collate a complete list of the use of consultants across the Authority. The Council's Senior Leadership Team will monitor this list and, over time, the use of consultants will reduce as officers are recruited to mainstream posts. This factor also relates to the use of agency staff. It is acknowledged that this Council's current circumstances mean that higher than average use of consultants is inevitable. The data is now more accurate, enabling better control of management information and appropriate controls are in place in respect of spending on consultancy. There is a brokerage service for all Directorates to follow, prior to any hiring of temporary staff and/or consultants.

#### Adult Social Care

The Interim Director of Adult Social Services reported on the following budget issues:-



- the continual budget monitoring and the actions being taken to reverse the budget over-spending; establishment of a task group to undertake these tasks;
- Social Work assessments and practices have reviewed and amended, both to ensure that care packages accurately meet the needs of clients and also to control costs by stricter management;
- the management of specific budget pressures (eg: the review and audit of the direct payments system; capping the costs of home care packages; residential placements for elderly people; care packages for adults who have a learning disability; the need to reduce agency payments);
- one item of underspending was due to vacant social worker posts (such vacancies are not desirable because core services must be delivered);
- utilising the Resource Allocation System - a better system for social workers to use in respect of the assessment of clients as part of the Direct Payments system;
- ensuring better engagement with the providers of Adult Social Care services;
- review of individual care packages – instead of a routine review at intervals of one year, the care reviews must respond quickly to any client's changing needs; therefore, the intervals between reviews may be shorter, or longer, depending upon the circumstances of the individual client;
- clear instructions to all managers to prevent budget over-spending and identify budget savings.

Members raised the following issues and questions with regard to the budget for Adult Social Care Services:-

(a) What is a large payment care package (Adult Social Care) ? – one that is in excess of ten hours per week and this is the standard national benchmark; by comparison, a small care package is defined as one providing less than three hours care per week);

(b) Social Worker posts (Adult Social Care) – there ought to be better flexibility in the use of staff resources, to ensure that clients are not waiting too long for care package assessments;

(c) Higher Care Packages and the pressure on budgets; professional autonomy and control of budgets by management; also, the management of crises and urgent, immediate care requirements;

(d) The difference of social care and health care and an individual's capacity for independent living – practice and systems must allow professionals to use their training and expertise, but must not let procedures become shoddy, because there has to be sound budget control;

(e) In the past, there has been insufficient budget control of direct payments;

(f) It is possible to use systems such as Telecare, especially in cases where the clients have more mobility;

(g) The care provided for vulnerable adults is very sophisticated in the modern era, to enable people to live independently; alongside this sophistication is the pressure on public service budgets (both for elderly people and for adults with learning disabilities); it is appreciated that people suffering dementia will demand much more complicated care packages; the Council's own funding, allied with voluntary sector input and family support will all be factors in the mixture of care provision, again alongside strategic budget control; this Council's Adult Social Care service needs to attain this level of sophistication;

(h) The provision of lower levels of care (sometimes as brief as 15 minutes per day) is part of a model of social prescribing in accordance with a Clinical Commissioning Group initiative involving voluntary sector organisations; this initiative has had national recognition and it will be very valuable to continue this practice; it is important to continue providing appropriate care in order to prevent some clients returning to hospital;

(i) Direct Payments often give people a better way of life and control of their lives, therefore the system ought to be increased, as well as achieving effective budget control and reducing the cost to the public purse;

(j) The virement of money across budgets remains subject to control by the Commissioners and is in accordance with the use of resources methodology as recommended within guidance issued by the Local Government Association;

(k) Care Plan reviews will occur as people's circumstances change; clients' needs are different, therefore a much more proportionate approach is needed according to an individual's circumstances; the Council should be proactive and try and anticipate where changes or difficulties may occur as clients progress through the care system;

(l) partner agencies – discussions have taken place with Age UK, Voluntary Action Rotherham and Crossroads (amongst others); there needs to be a more integrated approach with these agencies, to ensure better value; again, there is the importance of being aware of people's changing circumstances.

### Children and Young People's Services

The Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services gave a presentation about the budget issues and pressures affecting the Directorate:-

- the expenditure profile is set in the context of the well-documented reports and publicity during the past twelve months, from which it has been identified that Child Protection Procedures were not robust;
- details of the revised management structure of the Directorate;
- the emphasis placed upon the safeguarding of children, because of budget pressures;
- more realistic and manageable caseloads for Social Workers;
- the recruitment and retention of Social Workers (the continuing difficulty of recruiting experienced Social Workers; the relatively high cost of agency Social Workers);
- the number of children and young people who are 'Looked After' (ie: in the care of the Local Authority) and also the number of children and young people who are the subject of individual Child Protection Plans;
- the developing role of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub;
- the progress being made within Children and Young People's Services in response to the issues raised by the Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) inspection – early indicators of performance show that improvement is being achieved and is evidenced by appropriate statistics;
- feedback from Service users is very powerful and is being used to inform service development and improvement ( the 'Jessica' quotation displayed, relating to the improvements to victim support services);
- use of management data to help improve service practices;
- recruitment of a worker for Parents Against Child Sexual Exploitation (PACE), within Children's Services, as part of support for victims;
- in-year budget pressures (eg: Dedicated Schools Grant; Legal fees because of the complexity of case work in respect of the safeguarding of children; post-abuse support for victims);
- the high number of children at risk who are placed outside Rotherham will be reviewed;

- children who have special educational needs pose another budget pressure;
- stronger governance to try and achieve better budget control within the Directorate;
- the importance of setting a realistic budget for 2016/17 and investing in preventative actions.

Members raised the following issues and questions with regard to the budget for Children and Young People's Services:-

(A) Looked After Children – there has been a consistent number in recent years and the budget has consistently been overspent – it was noted that there has historically been under-funding of this issue and unit costs are higher than in comparable local authorities; attracting more foster carers and reducing residential placements will help in controlling costs and lowering expenditure; the inherent pressure on residential placements for Looked After Children is acknowledged. The reality of the number of children in care (of the Local Authority) is acknowledged, but it is of course necessary to balance the budget; individual care packages have to be more streamlined to meet the individual's needs and be affordable for the Authority;

(B) There are corporate pressures on the budget which have not yet been properly addressed;

(C) Barnardos staff are not operationally accountable to the Council;

(D) A comment about the South Yorkshire Police resources which are needed alongside Children's Services and the impact of budget cuts affecting the Police;

(E) The importance and quality of Voice and Influence Services, in support of the Authority's Looked After Children;

(F) Ideally Looked After Children ought not to have residential placements beyond a 20 miles radius of the Rotherham Borough area; local authorities do accept the placement of Looked After Children from other Council areas, although the 'placing' authority has the financial responsibility for such residential placements; 54 of Rotherham's Looked After Children are currently placed beyond the 20 miles radius;

(G) A child/young person who is held in secure custody is defined as a child in care (a Looked After Child) and will be a high cost to Council budgets;

(H) There is a waiting list for only one provider in provision of counselling services and contracts for victims and survivors of CSE;

(I) GPs need to be aware of the support being made available for vulnerable people; appropriate information has been disseminated to GPs so that people are aware of the pathways; a detailed needs analysis will be used to inform the tender for future contracts for post-abuse support; the continuing investigations (post-Jay Report) may produce greater demands on these services;

(J) The importance of raising awareness, within all Rotherham's schools, of the threat of child sexual exploitation (Wales High School has a good example of raising such awareness amongst its pupils);

(K) The future budget must reflect the demands placed upon Children and Young People's Services; the development of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy will assist this process; the baseline financial position is growing; a sufficiency strategy in respect of Looked After Children will be reported to the Corporate Parenting Panel;

(L) The agencies which are part of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding must fund their own pressures.

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

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes:-

(a) the current forecast outturn and the continuing financial challenge for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2015/16;

(b) the actions already taking place to ensure controls on expenditure in the current year;

(c) the allocation of the Transformation Reserve as detailed in Appendix 2 to the submitted report; and

(d) the request for virement set out in paragraph 7.18 of the submitted report and any other subsequent virements required as a result of implementing mitigating actions.

## **C32 BUDGET 2016/17 AND MTFs PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board received a report and presentation, submitted by the Interim Strategic Director of Resources, providing an update on progress to identify potential budget savings for Commissioners' and Members' consideration, which will lead to the production of a draft Medium Term Financial Strategy by November 2015, in line with the timescales included in the Corporate Improvement Plan.

The report and presentation included details of :-

- the estimated financial challenge (funding gap) of £41.083m over the three years 2016/17 to 2018/19;

- (Appendix A) a summary of the budget for Council services in the current financial year 2015/16;
- (Appendix B) the potential pressures and investment requirements (especially Children's Social Care).

Members discussed the significant pressures on the budget for Children's Services (including the strategy for dealing with Children in Care), the Adult Social Care development programme and the savings targets proposals for Council services.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board also received a presentation from the Scrutiny Manager and from Mrs. D. Thomas (Centre for Public Scrutiny) about the need for effective scrutiny of the Council's budget proposals and of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The presentation emphasised that financial scrutiny is about testing how the Council makes choices about resource allocation and how well resources are used to deliver priorities/policy objectives. This process involves the consideration of how Scrutiny Members can be proactive about the Council's budget decisions, critically appraising choices and making recommendations about how to minimise the impact of budget reductions on outcomes. Reference was made to:-

- ensuring that Scrutiny Members receive sufficient information about budget proposals;
- Workshops for Scrutiny Members to be held early in October 2015, about the Council's budget proposals;
- the role of Members in putting forward the citizens' perspective;
- the non-partisan aspect of Scrutiny;
- the cumulative impact of other changes in public services (eg: Police, Health, Welfare Reform);
- the impact of the reducing provision of services and the expectations of the public.

Members noted the contents of the timetable of scrutiny workshops and meetings, over the course of the next few months, facilitating effective scrutiny of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and of the 2016/17 budget proposals.

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

(2) That the details of the presentations be noted.

(3) That the significant challenge to identify savings options to address the Council's funding gap and the level of savings proposed to date are both noted.

(4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes that Commissioner Manzie's "minded to" decision-making process will refer budget reports to the Scrutiny Select Commissions throughout the 2016/17 budget-setting process.

(5) That the timetable of the forthcoming budget scrutiny workshops and meetings, as now submitted, be approved.

**C33 ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES**

Consideration of this item was deferred.

**C34 YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES**

Consideration of this item was deferred.

**C35 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 24TH JULY, 2015**

Consideration of this item was deferred.

**C36 WORK IN PROGRESS**

Consideration of this item was deferred.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**  
**2nd October, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Cowles, Hughes, Mallinder and Julie Turner.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hamilton, Pitchley, Sansome, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

**37.           DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

**38.           QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS**

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

**39.           BUDGET 2016/17 AND MTFs PROGRESS UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Chief Finance Manager, providing an update on progress to identify potential budget savings to deliver the estimated minimum financial challenge of £41.083 million over the next three years. The savings proposals (attached as an appendix to the submitted report) are those which have been risk-assessed (RAG rated) as green and are therefore “able to implement with less direct impact on services.” Such savings require the Commissioners’ approval before being implemented.

The savings proposals, with the report appendix, excluded any lower impact savings proposals where further work is being undertaken to facilitate an informed decision, or which may be implemented by means of an officer decision.

The proposal is that, where it is appropriate to do so and where no consultation is required, the savings proposed in the appendix to the submitted report are implemented during 2015/16 in order to assist with mitigating the current in-year forecast overspend, as well as ensuring that the savings can be delivered with full year effect in 2016/17.

The submitted report contains the first tranche of 2016/17 savings proposals and future reports will contain additional proposals on a phased basis. The aim is to produce a draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) by November 2015, in line with the timescales included in this Council’s Corporate Improvement Plan.

Officers reported on the Directorate proposals and Members discussed the various issues, as follows:-



## (A) Neighbourhoods and Environment and Development Services

- Business Centres – support for start-up businesses (RIDO service) to assist new businesses in being viable; affordable rents for the lease of Council-owned premises (and analysis of the need for rent increases) – written responses were requested in respect of these issues;
- Previously, rent increases have resulted in tenancies being terminated by some businesses;
- Business centres are currently out-performing their budget targets;
- Council properties – market rent increases for commercial tenants;
- Knowledge of the demand for such properties being higher – it is a process of rent review, to a level of rent that the market will sustain;
- Concern about the viability of businesses within the Rotherham town centre – additional details were requested in respect of this issue;
- Ceasing the payments of churchyard maintenance to grants to Parochial Church Councils (last reviewed in 1988) - health and safety implications;
- The Council's closed circuit television systems – ensuring that ICT systems are up-to-date and compatible with CCTV systems; this proposal is subject to approval as part of the Council's Capital Strategy; the costs of this proposal are being calculated as part of the preparation of the business case; the proposed network is estimated to last at least 20 years, although it is acknowledged that ICT technology does tend to develop and change very quickly;
- Clifton Park – increases in various charges for services;
- Project Development – a budget often used as a means of attracting external funding;
- Community Safety (including the Safer Rotherham Partnership).

## (B) Resources (Human Resources, Finance, Legal, Corporate Services)

- Human Resources Service Centre;
- ICT Services (security of documents stored on the 'cloud'); whether there is any under-utilisation of facilities which could be offered to other public service organisations and earn income for the Council; (it was confirmed that this would feature as additional savings proposals later in the budget process); it was also questioned why financial systems are hosted elsewhere when significant capacity already exists within Riverside House;
- ICT Services provided for schools (which should be provided on a zero cost basis by the Council); whether schools would accept an increase in charges for such services, or procure these services from other providers; a strategic response on the wider issue of services traded with schools and academies is being prepared by officers;
- Business Support (and management support) – the current review taking place of business support;
- Charges to Academies for the administration of school admission appeals.

## (C) Public Health

- Review of out-of-area GUM (Genito Urinary Medicine) payments and local prescribing payments – intention to charge no more than the national tariff (rate of payment per episode of care); local authority duty to provide open access sexual health services; increasing demand upon specific services; Members requested details of the demand from Rotherham residents for such services, from providers located both within and outside the Borough area;
- Theatre and Health Education in Schools (contract renegotiation);
- School Nursing Service (budget reduction) – funding provided by NHS England for the delivery of immunisations and vaccinations for school pupils; extent of saving by the local authority, as Central Government provides this funding as part of the Public Health Specific Grant.

## (D) Children and Young People's Services

- Early Years and Child Care Service;
- Children's Social Care Management;
- Training provided for Private, Voluntary and Independent Early Years providers – income generation for the Council;
- Family Recovery Programme – early help offer; ensuring that vulnerable children and families continue to receive the necessary support; service support begins during pregnancy; reference to the independent report (2010) of Foundation/Early Years led by Frank Field MP;
- Locality teams (travel requirements).

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

(2) That the savings proposals, as detailed in the report now submitted be noted and officers asked to provide further information, in writing, about the various issues now discussed.

(3) That Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be informed of the capital expenditure proposal in respect of the Council's closed circuit television systems, including details of the expected life-span of the equipment and the financial savings expected to be made over the whole period of the project.

**40. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24TH JULY, 2015**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 24th July, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**41. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH SEPTEMBER, 2015**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 18th September, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**42. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held on Friday, 23rd October, 2015, commencing at 12.00 noon.

**APPEAL PANEL  
13th July, 2015**

Present:- Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Beaumont.

**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 - G1/07/15 - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

The Panel considered a grievance appeal by G1/07/15.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
15th July, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Councillors Beaumont, Buckley, Currie, Godfrey, Gosling, Hoddinott, Jepson, Lelliott, Parker, Read, Reynolds, Rushforth, Steele, C. Vines, M. Vines, Whelbourn, Wyatt, Pickering and Elliot.

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE DIRECTORATE.**

Councillor G. Watson welcomed Ian Thomas, Strategic Director of the Children and Young People's Services Directorate, to the seminar. Ian had prepared a presentation that provided an update for Elected Members on Children and Young People's Services.

- 200 statutory duties;
- Single accountable Chief Officer;
- Single accountable Member;
- Academies Act (2010);
- Ofsted findings 2014 – 19<sup>th</sup> November, 2014 – resulted in a finding of inadequate across the Board. Parallel CSE investigation;
- Ten recommendations and 16 areas recommended for improvement;
- CYPS now had an Improvement Plan – a single improvement plan covering CSE, Jay report, Ofsted single inspection framework, Ofsted CSE Thematic Inspection and Quality Assurance findings. Currently active and 56% of actions had been achieved;
- There was very little for early help below the social care threshold;
- Recruitment update.

Councillor Currie asked whether we paid enough and gave enough perks? He referred to Commissioner Ney's report.

Ian described his workforce as talented but not experienced. We can get there with coaching support. Ian saw it as part of his job to get them there. He acknowledged that social work was a grinding and stressful job.

Ian referred to the directorate structure. It now had a permanent top level.

Councillor Currie asked about the governance of the corporate school. He asked if it included Corporate Parents?

Ian was sad about the often dire life outcomes experienced by looked after children. Turning this around required long term planning.

Councillor Hoddinott saw that skills were important in the Devolution Agenda and asked where the capacity within the structure was. Where was the support and focus for 16-25 year olds?

Ian explained that it was in the next tier and was lead with an interest by youth workers. LA retained strategic responsibility for children with additional needs – often vulnerable – to provide from the age of 14. Ian believed we had the capacity there. Adult Community Education and Apprenticeships; Karen Borthwick was linking in with Paul Woodcock.

Commissioning structure was ran jointly with the CCG and it was not good enough. Fieldwork informing the inspection was undertaken in February. We needed to ensure that Health paid their way too.

Councillor Reynolds asked how we were going address skills gap?  
Ian Thomas explained the professional conversation whereby managers would have to address the issue of 'you are not good enough'. It would be easy to leave it but we are addressing this. People don't come to work to do a bad job. Identify what is happening; continuous professional development; capability procedure; due progress.

Councillor Wyatt referred to the inadequate findings regarding health. These had only been given a few paragraphs within Jay. Better Care Fund.

Ian explained funding for transitions. The young carers and disabled facilities grant. These sat mainly within Adult Services as the Lead agency. Health will make a contribution and has a duty to work with us and share information. Critical to share, alongside safeguarding duties.

Fieldwork from February but reported as though it was taking place today. Children's Trust Board, when reconstituted, will report to the Health and Wellbeing Board. Schools also contributing to the Board.

Councillor Parker asked that it people were not fit for purpose, when working with vulnerable children, at what point did you make a decision that what these people aren't doing was impacting on children. How do you prevent the impact on the children?

Ian explained the Misconduct and Gross Misconduct processes. Any proceedings would use due recourse as inappropriate usage would lead to summarial dismissal, which would be incorrect.

Councillor Parker asked how do you ensure that their incompetence is not impacting on the children?

Ian explained the intensive support, mentoring, buddying, management oversight. We would not leave an incompetent person to their own devices.

Councillor Hoddinott felt that councillors needed to look at how the relationship with health was working. For example recent data on the dental checks of LAC who had had a dental check in the past 6 months was shocking.

Ian knew this data and felt that it was wrong and undersold the situation. Not doing anyway near as well as we should be. Integrated joined up action plan. and an intense performance reporting would see the trajectory of improvement.

Ian was drawing up locality plans and would involve elected members and their local knowledge. These would involve 0 – 19 and up to 25 where children had disabilities, breastfeeding, immunisation, speech and language. Health visitors were coming into the LA in October.

Councillor Whelbourn recognised the locality structure. In the pas the intention had been to have them working and reporting into Area Assemblies. This never happened. Could have been unwillingness or instructed not to, etc. Is this a useful system?

Ian stated that it was useful. He had implemented this system in Derbyshire, along with named contacts. Engagement was high on his agenda.

Councillor Parker referred to the prosecution of parents where children were not going to school. Often this was because parents had not got their choice/s and selected to Home Tutor. It appeared to Councillor Parker that the Authority all but abandons the family. One visit per year and no advice. What was the difference between them not attending school and home tutoring?

Ian reiterated the parental right to home educate. Quite often parents pulled their children out of the system because they did not want them in the system. Absence and Home education were clearly different issues.

Safeguarding key statistics as at 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2015, were shared.

Councillor Currie asked whether the total numbers had increased due to the context.

Ian said that Rotherham's average was 72 per 10,000. The national average was 60.

Commissioner Newsam wanted a MASH in place and it has strengthened the front door no end. Police, LA and Health colleagues were working together. Implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015, following getting the challenge in January. They usually take 12-18 months to initiate. Decisions taken with 24-hours was at 90%. September, 2014, this was at 37%.

Caseloads were at 48 per social worker, meaning that it was impossible to work at least half of them. Caseload average is 16.5 and there was a maximum of 22 per social worker. There was good management oversight between complexity and numbers.

Councillor Steele asked whether we were fully staffed and what the position was with agency staff? Having 22 cases would mean one hour and a few minutes per client per week.

Ian explained that the range was between 16.5 – 27 per FTE social worker. There are Agency Staff employed, this is something we do not welcome or condone, it is out of necessity. Not good for the longer-term. There would be a recruitment campaign in September. Rotherham was not competitive compared to Barnsley, Sheffield or Wakefield in terms of remuneration. This was being developed, along with training and excellent Social Work Support is being offered.

Councillor Steele asked about the additional increase. Was this down to natural vacancies or long-term sickness? Do we pay professional fees?

Ian explained that we were covering vacancies when we increased the establishment. Covering vacancies, sickness and establishment.

Rotherham used to cover professional fees. Ian agreed to check this information.

Councillor Parker asked whether we kept Agency staff on. Did we employ them? What was the cost compared to employing permanently with agency? Did we ensure that we only employed the best agency staff?

Ian explained that there was a bidding war leading to some social workers leaving. Rotherham tried to retain on a permanent basis using the benefits of the LA pension, security, sick pay. Additional cost is about double for Agency social workers. This was expensive and we do not want it to continue. Working with TMP who did the 'Do it for Daniel' campaign in Coventry following Daniel Pelka's death.

Councillor Reynolds asked for the actual cost for the provision of Agency staff.

Ian Thomas agreed to provide this. When we went out to advert, the majority of applicants were newly qualified social workers. They could not practice alone as they needed supervision for the first year.

We were currently talking about the benefits and benchmarking through the summer and advertising in September. Rotherham did not expect to get experienced social workers for the rates that we currently paid. TMP were doing research on what stopped people coming to work in Rotherham.

Councillor Wyatt felt that it was not all about money. Were we providing the best ICT, parking, annual leave, study leave and so on?



Ian confirmed that a review was being undertaken on social worker facilities, including peer support. We need to ensure they get the right support. Meeting rooms, business support, close proximity to team manager, we are looking at everything.

Councillor Elliot wanted to encourage Social Workers and was aware of the competition with other areas. Salaries had initially been established through a job evaluation scheme – did this mean that you have to look at job descriptions? Impact on other social workers in Rotherham working in other services?

Ian confirmed that yes, the social work jobs are job evaluated. A review is being undertaken with HR as it was important to pay equally. Adult Social Care – will need to talk to SLT. There are differences in working in Childrens' Social Care compared to other areas.

Councillor Currie asked if we could operate as the Sheffield City Region? Are we looking at joint authority working to save money?

Ian confirmed that this happened in relation to adoption. An innovation bid had been submitted to the DfE. We participated in secondments with other LAs. Ian explained that he had written to all 22 Directors in Yorkshire and Humber to suggest a cap on paying agencies and measures to stop staff 'leap frogging'. This was being discussed.

Councillor Jepson asked whether there was a worry that staff who were not capable were going to work for agencies and could come back in to the LA?

Ian confirmed that conversations about sharing information were planned. Malpractice would be referred to the Health Professional Care Council.

Councillor Steele did not believe that it was possible to stop staff working at different local authorities to achieve better pay; directors did this. There were benefits to staff to work for agencies, including that they could pick when to work.

Ian was confident that if local authorities signed up to the initiative the aims could be achieved.

Councillor Elliot asked for the figures and information on a regular basis.

Ian confirmed that this would happen. He also urged Members not to be comforted only by figures. Also ask questions about experience and quality.

Councillor Currie asked if there was going to be a gold standard of supervision?

Ian said that there was a supervision tracker that would go out to talk to workers. If not being supervised they needed to tell Ian about it. Case management would be governed by the 10 standards issued.

Councillor Hoddinott asked that, as councillors, how do we get that line of sight and ensure that the quality is there?

Ian explained the aspiration of Customer Service Excellence and how we captured the experience of the child in our care. This included visiting homes, schools, social workers.

Ian explained the Liquid Logic new IT system. A tender normally takes 18-months, this was achieved in 3 months using work already done.

Councillor Reynolds thanked Ian for delivering quite a difficult presentation. It appeared to be mission impossible to complete with not enough money, not enough capacity, not enough correctly skilled staff. He felt that these issues needed to be on the record. It had been a very interesting presentation.

Councillor Watson explained the additional capacity that the LGA had put in to support Elected Members.

Councillor Wyatt thanked Ian for a really good update and asked for his main concerns.

Ian thanked the Members in attendance for their inquisitive questions. His main areas of focus were the stability of the workforce, interim staff and managers and Ofsted's review of the MASH on 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> August.

Councillor Watson thanked Ian for this presentation.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
21st July, 2015**

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark) Councillors Ahmed, Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Buckley, Burton, and Currie.

**TACKLING CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION - UPDATE FOR ELECTED MEMBERS.**

Councillor C. Read, Leader of the Council, thanked the Elected Members in attendance and welcomed four Officers to the meeting. The Officers in attendance were: -

- Ian Thomas, Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services Directorate;
- Superintendent Jason Harwin, South Yorkshire Police;
- Detective Inspector Matt Fenwick, South Yorkshire Police;
- Lee Miles, National Crime Agency.

The seminar was split into three sections and each agency – CYPS, South Yorkshire Police and the National Crime Agency – would provide information on their efforts to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation. Elected Members were asked to put their questions at the end of the presentations.

Ian Thomas presented first and covered the actions of Children and Young People's Services.

- New governance arrangements were well embedded. Governance must be about committing to actions;
- Restoring confidence of Members;
- Monitoring Local Safeguarding Children Board;
- CSE Adult Survivors Multi-Agency Programme Board
- Moral obligation to support survivors;
- Working closely with the police and health;
- CSE Commissioner Board.

Ian described that the team in the past had been broken. It had 86 cases, there was a lack of management oversight and was dangerous. Remedial actions had been taken and it now had a much smaller caseload to oversee. The team was dealing with the most high risk cases.

- Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Panel;
- Hotspots;
- Getting to terms with CSE and grooming, particularly with the advent of social media;

- Does not replace core child protection procedures, in addition to;
- CSE Early Help and Prevention;
- Heralded as best practice based on early intervention and prevention;
- Fundraising £240k, Eric Pickles agreed £250k over 2 years. Barnardo's, DfE, KPMG – massive coup. Grateful and represents the best in terms of a public/private partnership. Child protection issue, not a lifestyle choice;
- Other partners were Giving Real Opportunities to Women (GROW) and the NSPCC;
- CSE Champions – information and training.

Superintendent Jason Harwin detailed the outcomes of Operation Clover which had been marshalled in relation to the issues raised in the Jay Report. Seven individuals had been charged with 95 offences and there may be further charges to be brought. Trials would begin in December, 2015.

Lee Miles, National Crime Agency, spoke about Operation Stovewood, which was unparalleled in size. It was led by a Chief Officer and Lee was his deputy. The Operation was staffed by Senior Investigating Officers with managers, deputies and staff below them.

A written briefing note had been prepared for Members and other stakeholders to share and take away they wished. A balance needed to be struck between openness and transparency, and operational matters which needed to be kept confidential to not compromise proceedings. Lee could not go into detail at this stage.

**Stage One – Six month activity summary: -**

- Began in December, 2014;
- Establishment of the investigation;
- Review of relevant South Yorkshire investigations for local and national learning;
- Information gathering;
- Partnership working and safeguarding arrangements.

**Stage Two – next steps: -**

- Information gathering and analysis;
- Identification, reading, indexing, assessing;
- Transfer into electronic format;
- Prioritisation of investigations;
- Suspects who may be active;
- Those believed to have caused the most harm in the past;
- Other suspects.

**Stovewood would be victim focused and offender drive.**

Whilst there were other operational names of operations that were ongoing, everything sat under Stovewood.

- Funded by South Yorkshire Police;
- The NCA had their own governance structure and was accountable to the Chief Constable and the PCC;
- The NCA had the co-ordinating role across the current Operations.

**What Stovewood was not investigating: -**

- Police misconduct – as and when any issues relating to conduct matters were come across they were referred to the appropriate body;
- Other professional misconduct;
- Past failings in investigations or safeguarding duties;
- Stovewood was intended to investigate once as a combined effort.

**Summary of the NCA's activity: -**

Stage One – December 2014 – 4 key outcomes were achieved: -

- Quality assure all actions and activities – Review of relevant SY investigations;
- Risky Business files – transfer to electronic format and onto national police system. This involved handling 100,000 documents in 47 different crates and boxes. So far, the team had indexed about a third resulting in 3,300 actions and lines of enquiry;
- In addition, there were 37 boxes of safeguarding records. These were being scanned electronically and will be scrutinised for actions.

Lee Miles reiterated the NCA's commitment to working in a methodical and measured way as all stakeholders wanted the Operation to be successful and only need to be conducted once. The Jay Report's figure of 1,400 victims was thought to be accurate. Most of these victims were now adults. Partnership co-operation to be able to work with that amount of victims was significant.

Stage Two – Information gathering and analysis and prioritisation of investigations along with victim support (including engagement and management), lessons learned and information sharing arrangements.

**Stovewood priorities: -**

- Single bid to the Home Office;
- A quote from a survivor of CSE stated: 'Operation Stovewood is making a difference and tells the rapists there is nowhere to hide. There's no hiding place for them now that we, the victims and survivors, are coming out of the shadows to speak up';
- What does success look like? - victim satisfaction, criminal justice outcomes and public confidence.

Lee Miles referred to the leaflets that were available outlining the work of Operation Stovewood.

Superintendent Jason Harwin and Detective Inspector Matt Fenwick provided their presentation on the work of South Yorkshire Police: -

Between 01.06.14 – 31.05.15 1,779 child protection referrals were received. 194 (11%) were relating to CSE. Referrals could be for obvious abuse, or for concerns. Comparing Rotherham's referral data to South Yorkshire referrals did not suggest that CSE was any bigger of an issue in Rotherham compared to any other areas in South Yorkshire.

The crimes involved in CSE had seen an increase of 61% in the last 12-months. It was not possible to compare with other parts of the country. Detective Inspector Matt Fenwick explained that the number of operation names did not necessarily reflect number of investigations. As investigations progressed and widened enough they would become an operation and given an operation name.

Matt Fenwick explained the other types of disruption work that was undertaken. These could not be reported within CSE countering reports.

CSE is child abuse and it was not always right to publicise any outcomes as the often involved children, as both victims and offenders.

A stakeholder's briefing would be provided.

Matt Fenwick explained how victim-less prosecutions were used. Criminal justice agencies did pursue these if the victim would not/could not be involved using forensic and CCTV evidence, for example.

33 Abduction Notices had been served in Rotherham. Ten notices for people at risk of sexual harm were going through process.

Between 1<sup>st</sup> July 2014 – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015, 14 offenders had been charged, 3 reported on summons and 1 caution. This was not including Operation Clover.

Prosecutions took 20 months to reach a conclusion, on average.

Operation Makesafe was working with hoteliers, interchanges, transport providers and so on to raise awareness.

'Spot the Signs in South Yorkshire Say Something' was another awareness raising and education initiative.

Human Tracking Offences could also be relevant to CSE convictions.

Matt Fenwick referred to feedback from victims and survivors who were saying that they were finally being listened to. A twitter account led by victims in the local area was regularly stating that it was better to work with the Police now. This was really positive.

Victim profile was of known victims. There was under-reporting from minority communities relating to CSE.

Overall: -

- CSE represented 11% overall demand, meaning that there were lots of other demands also to be addressed;
- 72% of CSE referrals come from the Police;
- Offender profile – 83% were White European females in Rotherham;
- 13-14 was the average age;
- Secondary age was too late to start awareness raising.

Questions followed the Agencies' presentations. The following questions were asked: -

Councillor Currie asked whether the Rotherham LSCB could include a young person representative. Some agencies could let down others. Could the Local Authority support prevention through better planning, such as not locating services for children in known hotspots?

Councillor Reynolds thanked the representatives for their time and the presentations. A recent report covered on TV had shown that of 28 cases, only 2 had been judged as fit for purpose. Others needed more work or were poor. How did this contrast with the up-beat presentation given today?

Councillor McNeely asked about what would happen if the perpetrator was a parent. How would this be logged and responded to?

**Answers: -**

Ian Thomas explained that the Steve Ashley, the Chair of the Rotherham LSCB, had resigned as he felt he had taken the Board as far as he could, along with personal reasons. The position would be advertised for nationally and the postholder would work for around two days per week.

It was not typical to have a young person on the LSCB but work was taking place to replicate a shadow LSCB of young people. This would feed into the main Board and give young people the opportunity to be involved in outcomes.

A School Representative would sit on the LSCB for the first time and there would be a Rotherham Schools' Form representative on the Children's Trust. Schools were clear that they were a critical part of the solution. The overall mood was changing.

Salford University was undertaking a needs assessment on the prevalence of CSE and needs of minority communities.

Superintendent Jason Harwin explained that the HMIC inspection was in April 2015. The files that were audited were from the previous twelve months' and some from before the Jay report. There was only going to be one result and that was that the work was not good enough. Every month the Police and other agencies were getting stronger and better. There was additional staff, additional training to work alongside other services, Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub was allowing more timely assessment. A re-visit from HMIC for a de-brief was able to evidence that the Police were in a lot better position since April, 2015. The next report would be in February, 2016 and in the meantime the Police would ensure they were stopping current offences and prosecuting.

Chief Inspector Matt Fenwick explained about the orders that could be granted stopping suspected offenders associating with young people. Familial child abuse was not the same thing as CSE. Other types of abuse equated to around 90% of and also needed to be responded to and prevented.

Councillor Reynolds thanked the Officers for their clarification. Members of the public did not get to hear this sort of information and often had to rely on media sound bites.

Councillor Eliot asked what would need to be put in place so that children were safe from these people; what could be done for the rehabilitation of offenders.

Councillor C. Vines referred to the references of in the HMIC report about care homes. Were these Rotherham care homes? Commissioner Newsam's report had considered run away children. Could it be said that frontline police were being trained in responding to CSE but were not putting it into practice.

Councillor Sansome asked about the re-structuring tool and how it would impact on the Police's ability to track people down and the different types of information that can and cannot be released.



**Answers: -**

Superintendent Jason Harwin spoke about risk assessments and how they were used to stop offending.

Ian Thomas referred to the age-range of offenders. Some were children who needed support and prevent future re-offending. He also spoke about how the Police linked in to discussions about supporting children and young people who had run away at the Improvement Board. A key piece of work was to address this. Return interviews looked at why the event had happened and any relevant service development issues.

All front line staff had had training and were clear about the expectations on them.

Matt Fenwick outlined the restructure figures. The Public Protection Unit had been centralised and included 180 staff. There had been investment in the PPU and as of September, 2015, there would be 326 staff. The PPU was not solely charge with CSE, but also domestic abuse, child protection, so-called 'honour-based' violence and Female Genital Mutilation.

Ian Thomas confirmed that the Local Authority was incredibly vigilant around all care homes and was working to ensure there was an ethos to protect looked after children like our own children. Children who went missing was a real issue for the Local Authority. Jean Imray was leading on a new protocol for the Directorate. The function had been brought in-house to the Integrated Youth Support Service as the previous completion rate was only 48%. Return interviews would also be quality assured.

Councillor Hoddinott referred to the Operation Stovewood workshop that had taken place on the previous day and asked what work was being done with the voluntary and third sector? What about funding for voluntary organisations?

Councillor Pitchley asked whether alleged offenders were monitored in the twenty months their cases took to get to Court?

Councillor Wallis asked about the time lag between gathering and disseminating evidence in inspections. The HMIC report did imply quite strongly that South Yorkshire Police were yet to fully implement the recommendations of the 2014 and 2015 reviews. What was the progress and timetable? She was encouraged about all partners comments about the importance of recognising consent. Police Scotland had unveiled a hard-hitting campaign on the issues of consent. Could this be done here?

**Answers: -**

Lee Miles explained how there was a strategic co-ordination group with representatives from the voluntary sector. A single-bid across all agencies would be used to support the PPU to provide an Offer from the National Crime Agency. This was considered necessary to support the running and success of the PPU. The Home Office had confirmed they understood the rationale for this approach.

Jason Harwin noted the multitude of action plans, including governance arrangements. There were longer timeframes due to complexity of the required actions. Jason committed to returning to speak about this, but confirmed that it would not happen quickly.

Ian Thomas explained that the issue of consent was a real problem partly due to a lack of understanding between communities on what it was. PSHE lessons needed to cover this. Easy access to porn was unhelpful as it reinforced unhelpful boundaries.

Matt Fenwick said that South Yorkshire Police was always looking at what other police forces were doing for good practice. Frank discussions were needed on difficult and taboo subjects and these subjects should not be seen as something for other people to sort out.

Jason Harwin described the different levels of bail that existed whilst an alleged offender was awaiting trial. The Police had an intelligence briefing every week to monitor the situation and do everything possible to monitor offenders within the law. Plans involved other partners to monitor.

Matt Fenwick agreed that in certain levels of bail it was not permitted to take an individual's passport. Conditions on bail could be agreed by the Courts.

Councillor Read thanked the representatives for attending and their informative presentations and contributions to the discussion.

It was felt that there were still further questions to be raised that there was not time to raise today. Councillor Read said that there would be the opportunity to raise questions at meetings of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

It was agreed that a further Elected Member question-led session would be held in September, 2015.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL**  
**16th September, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Councillors Commissioner Manzie, Read, Roche and Sims.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. Vines.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that 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).

**ADULT SOCIAL CARE - FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT REQUEST**

The Panel considered two applications for flexible retirement from employees in Adult Social Care.

Resolved:- That the applications be approved.

**ADULT SOCIAL CARE - EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS**

The Panel considered an application for early access to pension benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee from Adult Social Care.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS**

The Panel considered two applications for early access to pension benefits on compassionate grounds from former employees of Children and Young People's Services.

Resolved:- That the applications be approved.

**ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - VOLUNTARY EARLY RETIREMENT**

The Panel considered an application for voluntary early retirement from an employee from Environment and Development Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT**

The Panel considered three applications for flexible retirement from employees of Environment and Development Services..

Resolved:- That the applications be approved.

**RESOURCES - EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS**

The Panel considered an application for early access to pension benefits from a former employee from Resources.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
22nd September, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Astbury, Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Fleming, Godfrey, Gosling, Hamilton, Hoddinott, Hughes, Jepson, Khan, The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Mallinder, McNeely, Parker, Price, Reeder, Robinson, Rushforth, Russell, Sansome, Sims, Smith, Taylor, Tweed, C. Vines, M. Vines, Wallis, Watson, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Currie, Pitchley and Rose.

**TACKLING CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION - FOLLOW-UP SEMINAR.**

Councillor C. Read, Leader of the Council, thanked all of those in attendance. He welcomed Ian Thomas and Jason Harwin to the seminar. This seminar was a follow-on from the previous seminar held on 21<sup>st</sup> July. It had been arranged to allow more time for Member questions which had not been asked the first time.

Jason Harwin provided an update on Operation Clover since 21<sup>st</sup> July when it was reported that there had been 7 arrests for 90 offences. Since then a further individual had been arrested. The total was 8 arrests for 110 offences. The cases had an expected trial date of December.

Councillor Wallis asked about improvements within the service to respond to CSE? The Council had been criticised for partnership working. This issue was wider than just the Council.

Ian Thomas explained about the use of 'CSE Champions'. This was being monitored and would be rolled out to wider council staff and Elected Members in due course.

There were independent investigations taking place through the National Crime Agency that may identify a vulnerability now, including crimes and victims needing support.

Councillor Parker referred to an incident that would be covered in the press in the coming days.

Jason Harwin was aware of this incident, mentioned in the Jay Report. He would report back as part a Stovewood update.

Councillor C. Vines knew that the MASH was up and running and fully operational. He asked whether it would 'speak' to the other ones in South Yorkshire?

Councillor Wallis further to Councillor Parker's question, there had been a Freedom of Information request implicating a number of RMBC Officers.

Ian Thomas explained that the Council had commissioned solicitors to look at potential failings of senior council officers on failure to protect vulnerable people.

He explained that the MASH had been open since 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015 and was working well; a better multi-agency response was being evidenced including strategy improvements and better outcomes from ensuing action. The MASH would refer and share information with any local authority.

Councillor Hoddinott asked about multi-agency response. What interventions were available to children suffering from exploitation? What was the quality and were we lacking in any areas?

Ian explained information sharing protocols and the memorandum of understanding. There were five live Operations and current CSE issues today. It was not just about historical issues that took place between 1997-2013, there are live issues today. It was assessed that there were 78 children at risk of CSE/ experiencing CSE.

There was a 'MARAP' where any practitioner with any concern could refer cases to. The Panel would review the risk and put the necessary arrangements in place.

Jason explained that joint visit of police and social care, including Barnardo's, took place. Strategy meeting covered what we would do as a joint service. Operations taking place took a significant amount of resources. Gold operational command met every 4 weeks on consequence management, including a high level of scrutiny. What was important was that the right outcome for the individual. Processes needed to go at the pace of the individual. Victimless prosecution was also being explored.

Ian explained how buddying was being looked at and considered. Some perpetrators were under 18. They were also seen as victims and Section 47 assessments undertaken on them.

Councillor Hoddinott asked about therapeutic support, buddies. What can we do to offer support? There were concerns about mental health services' capacity.

Ian explained that support for children was undertaken on a case-by-case basis. Plans were made for individual children. We were not there yet in having a broad range of interventions but were working with the CCG to provide this. The University of Salford were conducting a needs analysis to inform tender.

Councillor Read explained that a seminar was planned on 20<sup>th</sup> October about post-abuse support.

Councillor Alam asked if we were 'future-proofing' the work that we are doing in relation to mental health, BME, hard to reach and seldom heard. Are we supporting them?

Jason Harwin explained that this had been identified as a gap. Schools were so so important as they were in regular contact with the majority of our young people.

Ian Thomas had been meeting with marginalised groups and had recently met with REMA and Apna Haq. The Council had a partnership with Rape Crisis. The University of Salford had also met with marginalised groups and providers to inform their assessment.

Ian also explained that Councillor Wallis' work and promotion about issues relating to consent and lack of understanding of consent had been really important and the views provided had been taken on board by researchers.

A worker who spoke Eastern European languages was proving very valuable in connecting to Rotherham's new and emerging communities.

Councillor Russell said she felt as though she had de ja vu. Officers today had attended her scrutiny panel where all in attendance spoke about partnerships and Gold command was mentioned. This is a repeat of what I heard before. Why has it taken so long for things to come together? You tweeted it afterwards – it was a long meeting, a strong scrutiny review. I am glad that it is happening now, but at what a big price.

Jason explained that teams were new and additional resources had been put into place. We need to rebuild the partnerships. Some prosecutions took twenty months from start to finish. We were not going to see quick results. We need to share with the public to show we take seriously and do get results.

Councillor Ahmed spoke about the importance of working with parents in partnership. She asked whether there were any partners not engaging/where there are concerns?

Comic Relief had highlighted huge gaps where there were children with disabilities. Were services confident that children could be identified?

Ian referred to the Haringey judgement where information was shared unlawfully. Information could only be shared without consent where there was significant risk of harm. All workers were very aware and trained in this. Ofsted had found compliance overall with some gaps.

There were not many dissenters with partnership working. The Children's Trust was being re-established and the will was there. A Barnardo's project was starting later in the year – raising awareness, pathways and working in schools.

Councillor Ahmed asked whether schools were submitting more FCAFs and escalations to Tiers 3 and 4. Are universal service partners referring?

Ian explained that there was a long way to go to embed early help. It was not currently embedded. There were 235 FCAFs in place. This was where a universal agency took responsibility for actions with a family, often preventing Social Care becoming involved. In the past, schools had seen little value in completing a 13 page assessment. Services were moving to a slimmer version. Barnsley had 13,000 and Sheffield had 7,500 FCAFs in place.

Councillor Atkin referred to a profile that had been sent in 2014 showing offences by postcode and ethnicity. It showed that there were cases 'out in the sticks'. Can this be refreshed? It would be useful for new Members.

Jason confirmed that there was an annual refresh.

Councillor Atkin raised concerns about how SNTs were working. There appeared to be less people meeting less often?

Jason Harwin explained how policing had been deployed, including the use of technology to ensure that police spent less time in stations and more time in localities. The best eyes are those in local communities.

Councillor Clark asked about post-abuse support, including alcohol and drug abuse support.

Jason explained that this was a Public Health responsibility and demand and capacity would need to be monitored.

Councillor C. Vines spoke about a conference for Women Against Grooming that he had attended. He had found it informative and upsetting. Ingrid Lee and the Police and Crime Commissioner had also attended. Were there any plans to engage with these people and work with them in the future?

Councillor Read confirmed that yes, a big piece of work on post abuse support and what is needed was ongoing. Factoring in victim and survivors' voice was important.

Jason shared information about the Survivor and Victims' Panel and the massive amount of learning that was taking place on not getting things right first time. It was important that if individuals were part of an ongoing investigation that agencies were not coaching them.



Councillor Hamilton asked about the Prevent Strategy.

Jason Harwin outlined 'Make Safe'. South Yorkshire Police had received 46 referrals from hotels. These had resulted in 7 arrests. Without the community training these calls would not have been received.

Councillor Hamilton was concerned that the promotional material could be stigmatising Rotherham. It was important to promote the convictions.

Jason Harwin agreed that convictions would be publicised.

Councillor Wallis felt that it was really important that the Police were let get on with their job. Court Cases collapsing because external pressure was being put on them to speed them up would be awful for the brave and patient victims.

Councillor McNeely referred to the recent coverage of Apna Haq's contract. She asked which other providers were available with the same level of expertise?

Councillor Ellis felt that schools were pivotal and asked whether they were all on board? She shared an example of Area Assembly work that had not been successful.

Ian explained that, through a tendering process, Apna Haq had lost the contract for housing support. A rescue package to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2016, had been offered when they get Big Lottery Funding through VAR.

There were no dissenting voices in schools. If Ian saw that any schools were backtracking he would raise it with the appropriate governing body.

Councillor Read thanked all for attending and their contribution to the discussion. He explained that the seminar on commissioning support for CSE victims and survivors would be held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2015.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**APPEAL PANEL  
6th October, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Beaumont.

**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 - D1/10/15 - RESOURCES AND TRANSFORMATION**

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/10/15 against her dismissal from her post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR  
6th October, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Lelliott (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Beck, Buckley, Cutts, Elliot, Ellis, Godfrey, Hamilton, Jones, Parker, Pickering, Sims, Steele and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beaumont, Currie, Pitchley and Wallis.

**GULLIVER'S DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AT PITHOUSE WEST.**

Councillor Lelliott, Advisory Cabinet Member for Housing and the Local Economy, welcomed Julie Dalton of Gulliver's to the seminar. Julie had been invited to attend the meeting to outline Gulliver's intentions with the Pithouse West property.

Julie explained about the existing Gulliver's business and the intentions for its expansion to the Pithouse West property.

- Gulliver's was a family business and operated as a family business;
- The business had three existing locations;
- The existing business would finance the new location at Pithouse West;
- £30m project over 10-12 years;
- Gulliver's provided family theme parks and rides and attractions for families with children aged 2-13 years;
- It was intended that the Pithouse West site include indoor activities : - water play, play barn, nerf zone, theatre spaces;
- It was intended that the Pithouse West site include outdoor activities : - ecology and education, wildlife, forest classrooms, Gulliver's Gears motor mechanics, Jurassic Safari park, farm park including crop fields and a cookery school, nature walks, mountain biking, facilities for children's groups like Brownies and Guides, non-denominational wedding rooms and prayer rooms;
- The connectivity and close proximity to the Rother Valley Country Park was important and would enhance the offer;
- There would be a Dream Village offering respite care and care for terminally ill children. There would be adapted facilities for families to enjoy;
- Accommodation including hotel rooms designed for families, camping facilities, a spa and lodges. Some of the accommodation would be themed.

Employment: -

- When it was up and running there were likely to be 400 jobs at the Park. This number was likely to increase;
- Service was really important to Gulliver's;

- The Pithouse West site would include a service academy where employees from the other Gulliver's locations would come for continuous professional development. Talks were underway to secure nationally recognised names;
- Gulliver's employed people of all ages and at all stages from work experience, apprentice level to management development;
- Construction would be sustainable, done by in-house and local suppliers;
- A planning application would be submitted at the end of 2015. Dependent on the outcome, construction would start as soon as possible.

Discussion and questions followed Julie's presentation: -

Councillor Parker asked about the relationship with the Rother Valley Country Park, the financing of the project and employment for the local area.

Julie explained that purchase of the property was contingent on planning permission being granted. The Pithouse West property had sufficient land available to achieve Gulliver's aims. Gulliver's employed local people.

Councillor Ellis explained the Council's support for the living wage. Career pathways were also very important as upskilling was important to the success of the whole area.

Julie agreed. She had worked in service industries her whole life and did not see the industry as a second rate career choice. A number of Gulliver's management team had started on the shop floor and worked their way up. Gulliver's were undertaking a review on the living wage and its implications for the company. A minority of the employees were paid on the minimum wage.

Councillor Beck thanked Julie for her presentation and said how she had given confidence about Gulliver's markedly different approach. It was important that the local community were kept aware about the project, as it impacted on so many areas of the Borough from education to road infrastructure and jobs/growth.

Councillor Steele agreed that it was positive news for the Borough. He asked where the project would start and where suppliers would come from?

Julie explained that the theme park would come first and further developments would follow afterwards. Gulliver's bought locally and built locally. Julie's team had already spoken to two local suppliers through consultation/community events.

Councillor Elliot asked for more information about the facilities for disabled children and families.

Julie explained that some of the mainstream rides could be adapted for individuals with access requirements. There would also be bespoke facilities too.

Councillor Yasseen thought that everything she had heard sounded like a great opportunity for local people. She asked for more information on how Gulliver's worked with agencies such as Councils, Schools and the Job Centre Plus to support access to the facilities?

Julie explained about the Job Clubs that Gulliver's participated in to provide entry-level jobs and return to employment jobs.

Councillor Ahmed asked how Gulliver's would engage with smaller and less visible groups?

Julie outlined that this did happen and agreed to provide information to Councillor Ahmed outside of the meeting.

Councillor Lelliott thanked Julie for her presentation and contribution to the discussion and answers.

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

(2) That Gulliver's promotional leaflets showing their existing facilities be forwarded to all Councillors for their information.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL  
11th September, 2015**

**Present:-**

**Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council**

Councillor M. Dyson  
Councillor R. Frost

**Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council**

Councillor A. Jones  
Councillor C. McGuinness

**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**

Councillor C. Vines  
Councillor E. Wallis

**Sheffield City Council**

Councillor J. Armstrong  
Councillor I. Bowler (**Chair**)  
Councillor J. Campbell  
Councillor J. Otten

**Co-opted Member**

Mr. Alan Carter

**F11. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

11.1 A member of the public asked the following question:-

“As a layman and member of the public I have been led to believe and had the understanding that the police force as a whole was free of external influences with its mandate with respect to monitory, commercial political etc. influences. That is principal objectives were to “keep the peace” and “maintain the law” within society.

If you accept the above in principal could you explain why we are displaying on police cars the flag of a national organisation I believe within South Yorkshire only.”

11.2 Due to this question being of an operational nature, it was a matter for the Police Force and the Police Commissioner. The Chair had made the Commissioner aware of question and would respond direct to the member of the public.

**Action:- That the response to the question be reported to the next meeting.**

11.3 A member of the public asked the following questions:-

“(a) Please provide an update on the appointment of an additional independent member.

(b) Please add contact details on the agenda for submission of public questions e.g. e-mail address. There was also nothing mentioned on the agenda page that the meeting is to be webcast and extremely difficult to find out where you could access it.

(c) It is difficult to find details of public meetings on the Police and Crime Commissioner’s website e.g. dates, times, venues etc. Please clarify. In particular, 1 issue that was not mentioned were PACT meetings. These were agreed a few years ago to have local meetings with local Police Officers and various officers for members of the public to ask questions. We asked questions on this to the previous Police and Crime Commissioner and he did support them. They do still exist but not very well publicised so the public did not know when and where they were held.

(d) Your website has a Police and Crime Panel Sub-Committee which last met on 7<sup>th</sup> July, 2014. Please confirm if this still exists and if so who are its members and what is its function.”

11.4 With regard to question (a), the Chair reported that interviews were to take place later that day with, hopefully, an announcement being made as to the newly appointed independent member the week beginning 14<sup>th</sup> September.

11.5 With regard to question (b), the Chair agreed that it should be clear as to how a member of the public could submit a question.

**Action:- That Officers include on the agenda page details of how to submit a question together with a link to the webcast – Immediate.**

11.6 With regard to question (c), the Commissioner stated that he attended a number of public meetings by invitation; his Office would have to look at whether it was appropriate for them to be included on the OPCC’s website due to them not being meetings they had organised.

There was some confusion around PACT meetings in that they were Partners and Communities Together and not “Police” and should include the local authority, the Health Service etc. Police engagement at such meetings was currently under review with the Commissioner due to receive a report very shortly with the aim of ensuring attendance at meetings that were the most productive.

11.7 With regard to question (d), the Chair reported that there was a provision for a Sub-Committee of the Panel to be established to look at complaints. The Sub-Committee would consist of 3 Panel members and be convened as and when required. This would be clearer when the Complaints Procedure was refreshed.

## **F12. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 29TH JUNE, 2015**

12.1 Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime panel held on 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

**Action: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2015, be approved for signature by the Chair.**

12.2 Arising from Minute No. 3.2 (focussed scrutiny), the Chair proposed that an item be included on a future agenda looking at public engagement by the Commissioner.

**Action:- That a briefing be prepared by the Police and Crime Commissioner highlighting current engagement to enable the Panel to discuss current activities and recommend any additions or changes in engagement work.**

12.3 Arising from Minute No. 3.3 (independent co-optee Panel member), it was noted that interviews were to take place later that day.

12.4 Arising from Minute Nos. 4.4 (visit to Atlas Court), possible dates were now available for the visit of 22<sup>nd</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> October, 2015.

**Action:- Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, to circulate dates to Panel members and co-ordinate the responses – Immediate**

12.5 Arising from Minute No. 5.4 and 5.5 (Performance Framework), the Chair proposed that a workshop training session be held in advance of the October Panel to discuss performance monitoring, the measures that the Panel would be looking at in the Commissioner's Performance Framework and how they could be effectively scrutinised. A report would be then given to the meeting.

**Action:- That arrangements be made for a workshop session to be held in advance of the October Panel meeting – Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager – Immediate**

12.6 Arising from Minute No. 6.4 (Capital Programme), although there was inclusion in the budget monitoring report, a more detailed report on the Capital Programme specifically was required.

**Action:- That the OPCC submit a detailed Capital Programme report to the next Panel meeting**

12.7 Arising from Minute Nos. 7.5 and 7.6 (Complaints Procedure), it was noted that due to holidays/absences, the report had not been included on the agenda.

**Action:- That the revised Complaints Procedure be submitted to the October Panel meeting – Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser**



**F13. BUDGET MONITORING - FIRST QUARTER 2015/16**

13.1 Consideration was given to a report of the Chief Finance Officer relating to the budget monitoring for the first quarter of the 2015/16 financial year.

13.2 The PCC had approved a net revenue budget of £240M for 2015/16. This was the amount financed by Government grant and Council Tax income. The precept set by the PCC represented an increase of 1.95%; the level of Government grant fell by 4.7% compared to the amount for 2014/15.

13.3 Currently the budget monitoring was forecasting an approximate £3.8M overspend. The most significant issues behind the projected overspend were:-

- Costs of Police Officers, Police staff and Police pensions – forecast underspend of £6M partially offset by the cost of severance payments forecast to amount to approximately £3M
- Costs associated with the investigation of child sexual exploitation allegations – potential overspend of approximately £7M
- Provision of National Police Air Service – forecast to exceed budget by £0.7M
- Hillsborough Inquests costs – currently exceeded grant funding by approximately £0.4M
- Financial Reserves

13.4 South Yorkshire was dealing with a set of challenges and difficulties not experienced by any single force or Police and Crime Commissioner elsewhere in England and Wales. There were considerable uncertainties that could mean that the final outturn for 2015/16 was significantly different from that currently forecast.

13.5 Decisions of the Home Secretary in respect of Special Grant applications submitted by the Police and Crime Commissioner would be crucial in providing a degree of certainty about funding but would not be known until later in the year. Also the use of a “1% rule” may only have a marginal impact on the final outturn.

13.6 There were indications that the level of Government funding for Policing could be cut by up to 8% per annum from April 2016 as a result of the 2016/18 Finance Settlement due to be announced in December, 2015. This was greater than the 5% reduction assumed in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. If this were to be the case, there would likely be one-off costs that would require funding in 2016/17 from reserves including the potential for further severance/redundancy costs.

13.7 Dr. Billings, Police and Crime Commissioner, placed on record his thanks to the Home Secretary who had listened to the additional representations that had been made and had increased the amount she was prepared to give South Yorkshire for the first 2 years of the Hillsborough Inquiry. Although the Special Grant for the reimbursement of costs incurred in 2015/16 had been limited to £1M, she had also said she would be prepared to listen when applications were made for Special Grant funding.

13.8 Issues raised following the presentation included:-

- The new local policing model was being rolled out across South Yorkshire, following the pilot in Doncaster from which there would be lessons to be learnt, and the whole culture of the Police Force had to change. The new model brought together all uniformed Officers, Neighbourhood Teams and Response Officers together into one team requiring them to have a local neighbourhood focus and manage all matters within their own local policing team working to a common shift pattern. There would be new technology used which would enable them to stay in the neighbourhoods longer rather than having to go back to the Police Station. It would remove a lot of Officer costs but overall numbers were falling so all had to be managed carefully. This was one of the consequences of the continuing pattern of austerity and the fact that the Police was no longer a protected service with difficult choices having to be made. It was a coincidence that at the same time as South Yorkshire was moving to the new policing model it also had to reduce numbers.
- There had to be a move away from thinking about the four areas of South Yorkshire but 1 Police Force that responded to the needs wherever they were with the resources deployed appropriately.
- Based on the information available at the present time, the £11M Insurance Reserve set aside for potential Child Sexual Exploitation claims was at the correct level. However, it would be kept under review and revised accordingly.
- Members of staff, including civilians, had had to submit an expression of interest in redundancy. In order to minimise the impact on the 2016/17 revenue budget, given the very difficult nature of the challenges to be faced, it was considered to make the cost self-financing for the 2015/16 financial year. Two rates of redundancy

payment had been looked at and the enhanced rate selected due to the urgency. Not all expressions of interest had been successful.

- Hillsborough – a cost review exercise had been commissioned by the Commissioner of the law firms involved as well as auditors to look at the charges. The OPCC had been satisfied, as well as the auditors, that everything charged was legitimate and reasonable given the level of the Inquiry process. Once that external assurance had been received the Home Office had agreed to release funding. The eight Officers concerned had approached their own solicitors through their own staff associations. The Chief Constable's costs were separate and he secured his own representation and liaised with the Commissioner.
- Posts not being filled and the possible loss of expertise in particular areas was always a problem for the management for any organisation when downsizing. This was an operational matter for the Chief Constable.
- The Commissioner and Chief Constable had issued a joint statement calling for an end to the recent right wing protests that had taken place in Rotherham. Rotherham in particular was being hit on a frequent basis and at huge cost to the Force and highly disruptive to the people of Rotherham. The Force was seeking specialist legal advice to explore all options around the protests. The Home Secretary had recently stated that she would provide some of the costs to cover the EDL marches for the last year but would be subject to the 1% rule. £148,000 had been received but, given the difficult financial position faced by the Home Office and the Special Grant funding, it was unlikely that further grant money would be received particularly when there were the issues associated with the Hillsborough Inquiry. There may be potential funding towards the end of the financial year but would be dependent upon underspends elsewhere in the Home Office.
- Due to it being so early in the current financial year, the £3.7M projected overspend did not reflect the actions that had been taken by managers or the OPCC to bring expenditure back into line with budget. It was hoped that the position would improve but there was a range of very difficult issues that made the accurate forecast of the outturn position very difficult. South Yorkshire was facing a very difficult scenario financially for the next few years and could be much worse given the Spending Review.

**Action: That the Panel note the projected financial position on the revenue budgets**

**Action: That the OPCC submit a report as soon as possible on the costs associated with the Hillsborough Inquiry to enable a full understanding of the actions being taken in an attempt to mitigate any future impact on the Police budget**

**Action: That the OPCC submit the Capital Programme to the October Panel meeting.**

**Action:- That the OPCC submit a report to the October Panel meeting on the 2 different redundancy payment rates and the rationale for choosing the enhanced scheme.**

#### **F14. ANNUAL REPORT**

14.1 In accordance with the requirements of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act (2011), Dr. Billings, Police and Crime Commissioner, presented his draft 2014/15 annual report setting out how he had exercised his statutory functions as well as an overview of the work undertaken by the South Yorkshire Police Authority of its statutory functions between April, 2014 and March, 2015.

14.2 The main purpose of the report was to highlight performance against the functions of a Police and Crime Commissioner as set out in the Act and to demonstrate performance against the key objectives set out in the Police and Crime Plan.

14.3 It should be noted that the report included the following priority areas of the previous Police and Crime Commissioner:-

- Reduce Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour
- Protect Vulnerable People
- Improve Visible Policing

together with Dr. Billing's priorities for 2015/16 which were:-

- Protecting Vulnerable People
- Tackling Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour
- Enabling Fair Treatment

14.4 The reporting year was another very difficult year for all public services and Policing was not immune from the further significant cuts made by Central Government. The reduction in Government funding and the Service finding ways of running the service more efficiently had had the combined effect of £50M of cashable savings since 2007/08.

14.5 The Police and Crime Commissioner invited comments on the annual report and responded as follows:-

- The term anti-social behaviour covered a wide range of activity some of which may be the responsibility of the local authority. It was hoped that the new local policing teams would be better at managing certain aspects of anti-social behaviour working with other parent organisations, however, it had to be recognised that unless the Police engaged with those other partner organisation and brought the public with them, then some aspects of ASB would continue.
- Until publication of the Jay report, the scale of the problem had not been understood. A lot of work had taken place on changing the understanding in South Yorkshire Police, training Officers and co-locating Officers concerned with CSE with other professionals.
- Prosecution cases were being put together and would be taken to trial later in the year. However, it had to be recognised that some of the victims had been abused whilst quite young and were now in their late 20s/older and had new lives, partners and children. Some of them wanted to go to trial and bring the perpetrators to justice whilst others did not; some co-operated with the Police in bringing cases to trial and some did not; some victims and survivors were strong now but it was not known how they would be when they went to Court.
- A Victim, Survivor and Families Panel had been established and was helping with the training of Police Officers.
- Discussion would take place with the Chair of the Independent Ethics Panel as to whether it was appropriate for a member of the Police and Crime Panel to become a co-opted member. However, care would need to be taken so as not to confuse the scrutiny function.
- A review was underway of the use of the 101 facility and the ways in which members of the public could contact the Police. Satisfaction with the service appeared to have improved but that may be due to the volume of calls having reduced. Technology and additional staff resources were being considered.
- The growth in the use of legal highs, particularly on the part of young people, was very worrying and was on the Police's radar. A publicity campaign was being considered across South Yorkshire to alert people to the dangers and raise awareness. It was not known if the drug testing in custody suites was at a standard to cope with the legal highs.
- The use of body cams by Officers was an operational matter for the Chief Constable.
- The National Crime Agency was also involved looking at historic cases of CSE. The public's frustration was understood but there was a lot of work that had not been done previously to be done from which results would follow. Individual officers were being investigated on the

whole question of CSE particularly in Rotherham. A review by Professor John Drew had been commissioned for the whole of South Yorkshire to be absolutely clear about what was happening in Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield as well as Rotherham.

- Approximately one hundred Police Officers had been reported to the IPCC with the results of those investigations awaited. Twenty-four had been assessed in relation as to whether their misconduct needed to be investigated. The IPCC carried out a severity assessment and assessed whether the IPCC independently investigated, supervised or managed an investigation or whether it was given back to the Force to investigate. An Officer was not necessarily suspended – the decision was taken in light of whether they were front line or on restricted duty but not always suspended if there was no risk involved; it was at the discretion of those making the severity decision. The Vice-Chair reported that she had asked the IPCC for regular updates and it was her understanding that twenty-seven Officers have been served with Misconduct Notices. Forty-one instances were being investigated in relation to those twenty-seven Officers.

**Action: That any comments on the draft annual report be forwarded to the OPCC by 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 – Immediate**

**Action: That consideration be given to inviting the Chair of the Independent Ethics Panel to a future meeting to enable Panel members to gain an understanding of its work programme and forward plan**

**Action: That the OPCC give an update to the next meeting on Police Officers being investigated in relation to CSE**

**Action: That the OPCC provide an answer to Councillor Otten regarding drug testing in custody suites**

#### **F15. NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION INSPECTION - POST INSPECTION REVIEW**

15.1 Dr. Billings, Police and Crime Commissioner, presented a report outlining actions resulting from the HMIC's National Child Protection Inspection Post Inspection Review. It was noted that the review was not specifically about Child Sexual Exploitation but child protection issues in general.

15.2 As part of a rolling programme of child protection inspections of all police forces in England and Wales, HMIC had published an initial report in September, 2014, which found that South Yorkshire Police had an inconsistent approach to child protection and improvements to the care of children in custody. Following a post inspection review in April 2015, Inspectors were pleased to find:-

- Improvements to the Force's initial response when attending incidents involving children at risk
- Child protection had been prioritised and there was a strong desire to improve outcomes for children who were at risk of harm
- The Force was developing new joint working arrangements and structures to improve consistency across its four districts

However, Inspectors were concerned to find:-

- That although the Force had undertaken a review of arrangements with care homes and provided guidance to Police staff, this had not resulted in improvements in practice
- The Force was still failing to recognise risks to some children and work jointly with other agencies
- That recording practices remained poor which limited the ability of staff to make good decisions about children

15.3 In accordance with Section 55(5) of the 1996 Police Act required Police and Crime Commissioners to prepare comments on any of the HMIC's published reports that related to their Force and then publish in a manner they saw fit. Section 55(6) required a copy of the comments be sent to the Home Secretary (attached at Appendix A of the report).

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

- The Chief Constable had been requested to focus on all the areas highlighted in the report and to make improvements.
- The question of children's homes was a bigger issue in some districts more than others. A bigger piece of work was required giving consideration to the relationship between them and Child Sexual Exploitation trafficking etc.
- The Jay report had illustrated that a number of the vulnerable children were from children's homes as they were deemed as easy targets but it was clear that many also came from good homes with very caring parents. Agencies had to be very careful not to put all their focus onto one area. Grooming was increasingly moving from the streets to the internet which required a different response and Police Officers with different skills/training. New developments must not be lost sight of.
- The Police had not waited for the results of the investigation but had been making improvements. By the time of the report a number of the improvements required had been made.
- The Commissioner's role was to scrutinise the Police Force and ask what they were doing. It was easy for an organisation like South Yorkshire Police to become so focussed on the recent events that it

began to lose sight of what else might be happening. A learning organisation was one that did not simply focus on particular outcomes but must learn the lessons and be very careful. At the moment it should think about the general environment and context within which it was working. There was a big culture shift that had to take place not just in South Yorkshire Police but forces across the country.

**Action: That the report be noted.**

**Action: That the OPCC feed into the workshop session the Commissioner's relationship with the Police Force, current structure, the Governance and Assurance Board and information on what reports were routinely submitted to the Commissioner.**

**F16. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Resolved:- That meetings of the Police and Crime Panel be held as follows:-

Friday, 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2015 .

27<sup>th</sup> November

15<sup>th</sup> January, 2016

4<sup>th</sup> March

27<sup>th</sup> May

all to be held in Rotherham Town Hall commencing at 11.00 a.m.