

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham. S60 2TH

Date: Wednesday, 13th July, 2016

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 37)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 38 - 50)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 51 - 55)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 56 - 87)
5. Reports for Information (Pages 88 - 140)
6. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 141 - 152)
7. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 153 - 160)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
17th March, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Burton, Elliot, Fleming, Godfrey, Hunter, Khan, McNeely and John Turner.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mallinder, Parker, Rose, M. Vines, Victoria Farnsworth (Speak-up) and Robert Parkin (Speak-up).

78. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Fleming declared a personal interest as he was an employee of the Sheffield Teaching Hospital Foundation Trust.

79. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

80. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Information Pack

Health and Social Care Integration

The discussion paper was important in context of the Select Commission's brief.

BCF Q3 Return

The cover report contained key information. The return template to the NHS England could be found at

(<http://modern.gov.rotherham.gov.uk/documents/s104800/BCF%20Appendix%20A%20%20BCF%20Quarterly%20Data%20Collection%20Template%20Q3%2015-16%20FINAL.pdf>)

Care Quality Commission Guidance Documents

Any comments to be forwarded to Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer.

B. General Practice

Contracts

Further to Minute No. 41 of the meeting held on 22nd October, 2015 (Interim GP Strategy), it was noted that the Gateway procurement had concluded. The Gateway CIC had retained the contract so there would be no changes.

Chantry Bridge patients had been dispersed to other practices. Only one patient had raised an issue with the Clinical Commissioning Group who had then worked with the patient to get them into a practice they were happy with. There were still some patients who had not yet registered with another practice but the CCG were confident that this was primarily because they had left the area.

Treeton GP Practice

The Clinical Commissioning Group had met with the developers regarding a new medical centre on the Waverley site. They were keen to explore options for the community in that area but were mindful that Treeton was at capacity and work should progress as soon as possible. The developers were meeting regularly with the Planning Service and, subject to planning permission, the CCG were looking to an opening at the end of 2017.

YAS Quality Account Feedback

Members were thanked for submitting their comments with a reminder to those who had not done so yet of the 18th March deadline.

Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Plan

The deadline for comments was Friday, 18th March.

Adult and Older People Mental Health Transformation

It was hoped that an update would be submitted to the April Select Commission meeting.

Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee Meeting held on 26th February, 2016

The powerpoints were available from the meeting which provided good background information for the national picture. The information contained therein included:-

- NHS England Specialised Commissioning and National Service Reviews
- Regional Strategic Overview including delivering the Five Year Forward View and Sustainability and Transformation Plans
- Care Quality Commission – their approach to inspection and regulation and how they work with Overview and Scrutiny Committees
- Further work around delayed transfers of care (DTC) could be included in the work programme for the Joint Committee

81. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:- That, subject to the following clerical corrections, the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 21st January, 2016, be agreed as a correct record:-

Minute No. 72 (Overview of Public Health/Spend the Public Health Grant in Rotherham)

Health Challenges in Rotherham – should read “Rotherham women 81.4 years”

and Value of the Ringfenced Grant – should read “2014/15 - £14.175M”.

Arising from Minute No. 72 (Overview of Public Health/Spend the Public Health Grant in Rotherham), attention was drawn to the fact that the figures did not add up to 100%.

82. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST QUALITY ACCOUNT

Tracey McErlain-Burns, Chief Nurse, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Quality Ambitions 2014-16

- SAFE Mortality – Reduction in HSMR (Hospital Standardised Mortality Ratio) year on year
- SAFE Achieve 96% Harm Free Care (HFC) with zero avoidable grade 2-4 pressure ulcers and zero avoidable falls with harm
- CARING & RELIABLE Achieve improvements in all Friends and Family responses
- RELIABLE Achieve all national waiting times targets i.e. 18 weeks, cancer and A&E

Quality Improvements 2015/16

- 100% of unpredicted deaths will be subject to review
- From a baseline of 120 we will reduce the number of patients with a LOS>14/7 (length of stay greater than 14 days)
- Improved reporting of the deteriorating patients
- Reduce noise at night
- Increase the number of colleagues trained in Dementia care and reduce complaints
- Improve complaints response times
- Meet stroke targets

So how have we done?

Mortality

- Rolling 12 months HSMR
December 2014 = 99.28
November 2015 = 108.06
(March 2015 – 112.48)
- SHMI (Standardised Hospital Mortality Index) July 2014 to June 2015
111.64

Harm Free Care

- Achieve minimum 96% Harm Free Care with the following percentage reduction on the 2014/15 baseline (No. Trending at 94.85%; a 0.5% improvement on the previous year):-
- 70% reduction in avoidable pressure ulcers grade 2-4 (yes – 74% achieved)
- 50% reduction in avoidable falls with significant harm (yes – 57% achieved)

Family and Friends Test (FFT)

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/03/16

- Achieve and maintain a minimum 95% positive (FFT) score – in-patients (yes – 97% achieved)
- Achieve and maintain a minimum 86% positive FFT score – A&E (yes 88% achieved)
- Achieve a 40% FFT response rate – in-patient areas (yes 41% achieved)

4 Hour Access – National Comparison

Period	TRFT Performance	TRFT Rank (of 140)	England Avg (Type 1)	No of Trusts >95% (Type 1)
April	93.3%	53	89.8%	31
May	97.3%	9	92.5%	45
June	97.1%	16	91.5%	53
Q1	95.7%	23	91.1%	44
July	93.7%	73	92.5%	55
August	88.6%	113	91.5%	44
September	93.9%	46	90.1%	34
Q2	92.1%	79	91.45	43
October	92.5%	44	88.6%	21
November	93.7%	29	87.1%	14
December	85.5%	82	86.6%	14
Q3	90.5%	58	87.4%	12

Other Improvement Priorities

- 100% of unpredicted death reviews – yes
- Reporting of the deteriorating patient – yes
- Noise at night - ?
- Dementia training – yes (61% of TRFT colleagues have had first level dementia training)
- Complaints performance – no
- Stroke targets – yes (improved proportion with AF anti-coagulated on discharge; proportion admitted directly to Stroke Unit and spending 90% of their time on the Stroke Unit; proportion scanned within an hour. Business case for allied health professional ESD team supported)

Other items to be covered in the Quality Account/Report

- Staff and patient survey results
- Listening into Action work
- Environmental improvements
- Community transformation
- Progression from the CQC action plan to a Quality Improvement Plan
- Serious incidents and Never Events
- Data quality
- Workforce

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- 4 hour access - performance had deteriorated from Q1 to Q3 and was an area of concern for the Trust
- There were a number of reasons for not meeting the A&E national target the majority of which had related to workforce matters within the Emergency Department and more recently delays in waiting for access to beds. There had been recruitment of consultants, middle grade Doctors and nursing colleagues and the use of a number of locums in the Emergency Department
- The Trust Board received an Operational Performance report and Integrated Performance report (available on the Trust's website) which provided the detail about how long patients were waiting; it did not give a number for those waiting but an indication could be provided outside of the meeting
- Those patients whose hospital stays were longer than 14 days were often elderly who were admitted during the Winter period and took longer to recover from their conditions. There was the chance that some, as it got nearer to their expected discharge date, might get a hospital acquired pneumonia due to their long length stay, or not being able to achieve a discharge plan for that patient which required multi-agency responses
- At the time of the 2015/16 Quality Account, a baseline had been set of 120 patients with a long length of stay. As of August, 2015, the Hospital had been below that baseline. An ideal target of 70 had been set which enabled the Trust to manage its bed base effectively. There had been no reduction in the number of beds across the particular time period; the figure of 70 had been calculated on the reduction of bed places previously. The reduction had been achieved with no more than 70 patients in hospital with a long length of stay and it had been planned to open beds over the winter period. That Ward remained open at the moment
- The steady increase in November had been a combination of factors. There had been pressure on A&E and work was taking place with colleagues to change the systems of working and in doing so recognised that more work was required to improve the internal systems particularly in recognising what the expected day of discharge was and how that was communicated to other agencies
- When talking about planning a patient discharge, the Hospital would often refer to the EDD (Expected Date of Discharge) which was one measure when the patient was considered, usually by the medical clinician, as being medically fit for discharge. What the Trust was trying to do currently was identify a date at which point a patient was:

- (a) considered medically fit for discharge
 - (b) socially ready for discharge and may well include readiness of other partners to support the patient and family, and
 - (c) therapeutically ready for discharge particularly if Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy colleagues might be involved
- The Trust did not have any trained psychologists; the only areas where there was some active psychological intervention was within some of the Cancer pathways. However, a number of the community-based colleagues had extensive communication skill training which took account of some psychological therapies but no training in psychological therapy techniques
- The Trust had the benefit of a Community Unit on the Hospital site should a patient require ongoing rehabilitation of a non-acute nature. There was also access to intermediate care beds through work with Social Care colleagues. If the Trust had particular pressures and had a number of patients that no longer needed to be in hospital, then work would take place with Social Care and the Clinical Commissioning Group for spot purchase where a bed was purchased for a period of time in an alternative but suitable accommodation for the patient. This would be discussed with the patient's family. If families strongly disagreed with the proposal it may lead to a slightly longer delay in that patient's transfer
- Internally the Trust's target was to have no more than 20 patients in hospital who had a long length of stay and were medically fit for discharge. The presentation showed that the Trust had been having around 30-40 patients in hospital who were medically fit for discharge with an average length of stay beyond being medically fit of about 10 days. However, in the last couple of months there had been no significant increase in those numbers
- A range of mechanisms had been used to gain the patient's opinion. Trust Governors held surgeries and had spoken to many patients, families and visitors to the Hospital. The report was submitted to the Council of Governors with a management response. Further information about the Governors surgeries would be forwarded
- Friends and Family Test – still difficult to obtain responses in the Emergency Department despite trying various means. The dip in response rates and scores in C&F services was in relation to the School Nursing Service but had improved since the survey was changed from a four point to a six point scale.
- The Trust worked with a company, Dr. Foster, and through the use of Dr. Foster data sets were able to analyse mortality by diagnosis, by weekend, by day of the week and also looked at crude mortality and compared its mortality rates with other Trusts. There was a depth of data which the Quality Alerts and Mortality Group analysed on a

monthly basis and more recently the Medical Director had presented a report to the Board which was available on the Trust's website

- The Health Care Support Workers in the community were working on pressure ulcer avoidance
- The Trust measured data outliers on a daily basis by speciality; the Executive Team knew how many the Trust had. Currently there were approximately 20 patients who had been moved from 1 area to another
- There were currently 29 consultant vacancies within the Trust, many of which were being filled by locum colleagues. 5 consultants had successfully been recruited recently. The newly recruited Head of Medical Workforce would assist with the plans to make the Trust attractive to new recruitment. In some areas there were particular national shortages and district general hospitals of Rotherham's size would always struggle to compete when there was a large teaching hospital not too far away
- There were currently approximately 30 registered nursing vacancies, 22 at Band 6, and 8 at Band 5. The overseas recruitment programme had been suspended with the Trust investing in the development of the colleagues already recruited
- Additional Health Care Support Workers had been recruited together with a further 20 apprentices. There was a workforce improvement programme taking place but inevitably the use of locum and agency colleagues did not give the sense of loyalty to the organisation as that of its own workforce
- Universities still had more potential nurses apply for places than there were training places available. It was not yet understood what the impact of the changed bursary system for potential nursing students would be
- Currently there were 140 student nurses on placement at the Trust together with 50 allied professional students. Previously placement students had reported a positive experience and Tracey actively engaged with them from the beginning to help them see the benefits of working at Rotherham Hospital
- Agency nurses were currently still used where there were vacancies and, where there was long term sickness combined in a particular area with perhaps maternity leave. The Trust was currently investing in its own workforce even if that meant the opportunity to recruit over its establishment as it gave the benefit of continuity of care for the patient, commitment from a substantive colleague and a reduction in the financial burden of using agencies

- The annual staff survey changed slightly each year. The Trust had the option to survey all colleagues or only a sample of 850. Last year it had chosen to sample all colleagues and received a mid-40% response rate. It included staff morale in a number of different ways including support for line manager, whether the individual was considering leaving the Trust, whether they had reported an incident and whether they felt they had received feedback etc.
- At the moment data quality with regard to the length of time it took before a Ward requested medication for a patient to be discharged was received was not formally reported
Following the meeting the information below was provided for HSC
The target was to turn the script around in under 120 minutes. The average turnaround once the prescription arrived in pharmacy was 98 minutes. This was monitored monthly and reported to the division of support services.
- There were a number of things that enabled colleagues to progress their career. There were opportunities for Health Care Support Workers to become Registered Nurses by going to university, however, the numbers were very small. There may be an opportunity for Health Care Support Workers with regard to assistant practitioner roles
- The intent, whether medical or nursing colleagues, was to recruit the Trust's own workforce and reduce agency costs. It was becoming increasingly difficult to attract some agencies as a consequence of the implementation in agency caps and therefore the reduction of the hourly rate that was paid to individuals. The Trust projected that it would continue to recruit nursing colleagues, vdrive out the use of agency combined with increasing its internal bank. Similarly for medical colleagues, the strategy was again to recruit substantively and avoid the need for agency colleagues. It could be difficult to recruit Doctors in certain areas due to national shortages and, therefore, anticipated that there would still be some reliance on agency and locum doctors. In terms of working together and savings, as a Working Together Partnership, the Trust would be looking to circa £30M savings through procurement given the amount of budget the Working Together Partnership had
- The Trust currently did not utilise self-medication in the Hospital. The majority of patients who were admitted to Hospital had their medication administered by nursing colleagues. A few patients would self-medicate whilst in hospital but it was a question as to whether there should be an increasing opportunity to self-medicate. The benefit of a patient being involved in self-medication was that when they went home they knew more about their medication. However, not many patients would be able to self-medicate when they went into hospital. Work was taking place with the new Chief Pharmacist to try and have more technical pharmacy input to help patients understand

their medications for when they returned home. There were some instances when patients were ready to go home but were waiting for their take home drugs to come back to the Ward. This could be a cause for concern

- There were some patients who had sufficient medication at home who had had no changes to their medication and would have been able leave the hospital sooner. The new Chief Pharmacist, Medical Director and Chief Nurse were currently putting together an improvement plan for medicines management. It would focus not only on medicine safety whilst in hospital but also increasing patient understanding of medication when in hospital and shortening the period they waited for medication once told they could go home. The aim would be to seek to try and achieve increased numbers of patients having an understanding of their expected date of discharge sooner in their hospital stay and, once clinicians had agreed with the patient and family the date to work towards, an obligation to prepare a prescription that could be taken to the Ward before the patient was in the position of having a long wait

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

(2) That the draft Quality Account document be submitted to members of the Health Select Commission for their consideration.

(3) That the Select Commission provide feedback to the Foundation Trust in accordance with their timescales.

83. UPDATE ON BETTER CARE FUND

Jon Tomlinson, Interim Assistant Director Commissioning, gave the following update on the Better Care Fund:-

Background

- The Select Committee has previously received updates about progress with the Better Care Fund (BCF)
- Rotherham has successfully established robust governance and submitted returns to NHS England in a timely manner
- The BCF remains a key vehicle for integration between the NHS and local authorities
- The original BCF plan was developed around 2 years ago
- NHS England recommend that partners review their plans to ensure that progress is maintained and that funds are effectively targeting the right areas
- An initial review has been carried out on our plan and the outcomes are as follows

BCF Review

- The original BCF plan had 72 lines of funding and 15 themes
- The revised plan has 33 lines of funding with 6 broad themes
- The 6 themes cover:-
 - Mental Health
 - Rehab/Re-ablement and Intermediate Care
 - Social Care Purchasing
 - Case Management and Integrated Care Planning
 - Supporting Carers
 - BCF Infrastructure
- Each theme has then been rag rated in relation to strategic relevance, service specification in place, performance framework in place and are there any performance issues
- There are then recommendations about each service within the theme
- The schedule of reviews have been programmed and will take place between now and October dependent on priority
- These reviews cover 18 BCF schemes and where there are funding or performance issues or where there are concerns regarding strategic relevance

Other BCF Development

- A joint visioning event has taken place between the NHS and RMBC to further strengthen work around integration
- Our latest submission confirmed that national targets are being met
- We continue to perform well against a number of the metrics
- The BCF has increased by £1.3M from £23.2M to £24.5M
- Additional funding will be invested in Community Services
- New integration measures were introduced for the Q3 submission
- Further planning guidance has been received during February and March and officers are responding to it
- A BCF Service Directory is almost finalised

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Currently in the Assurance period for the 2016/17 plan. Guidance had been received regarding what was required to meet assurance in terms of the plan and it was currently being written. The second stage of the Assurance process would be updated shortly with the final plan being submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board for sign off on 20th April and NHS England on 25th April
- In order to achieve Assurance, it had to been ensured that the Plan was responding to the Key Lines of Enquiry. It was a fairly extensive process at the moment and was being reviewed through the BCF Executive by senior managers of both RCCG and RMBC to ensure the budget submitted in April responded effectively which would gain Assurance. The plan would be assessed and there would be a decision taken as to whether or not it was in full compliance and doing the right things to meet the needs of the citizens in the area. If not,

some support would be offered. In terms of reviewing and assurance of the plan, the Local Government Association, Monitor and others took part in the assurance and there was mediation across all the plans to ensure they were acceptable

- The needs of carers, whether adults or young people, needed to be responded to. It was the plan's ambition to ensure it responded to all carers and supported them
- The Health and Wellbeing Board was responsible for the governance of the plan. One of the Board's key responsibilities was to ensure it was an effective plan and whether it was an effective and integrated service. There was then a governance system with involvement of Board and senior managers as well as a strategy group, executive group and an operational group. The operational group included all the managers who were involved in delivering the projects/schemes and services. It was proposed that the strategy group develop into a programme board to ensure that the integration plans were progressing effectively. Each group had its own terms of reference
- There was multi-agency support in terms of supporting young carers as well as a multi-disciplinary response. There was a joint post in CYPS and the CCG for commissioning services
- There was much more detailed information available for the 6 BCF themes
- Generally speaking all the Indicators were performing pretty well
- All the organisations in the care system welcomed feedback to improve where partners needed to be and had to be prepared to decommission as well as commission if something was not effective
- Much of the Care Act talked about early intervention and preventative services. Every Rotherham pound had to be spent effectively consideration had to be given as to whether some of the things being delivered were effective and did they need to be changed
- It was difficult to give a timeline as to when data sharing across IT systems of health partners and social care would include Mental Health. The data sharing that was described in terms of the BCF at the moment was with regard to a particular cohort of citizens. In terms of extending it, consideration would be given as to how the work had moved forward but would look to using the NHS number as the main indicator

- The locality pilot was very much part of visioning events. The original visioning event had been held in early December at which time the locality discussions were already taking place. The visioning events were agreeing a high level set of outcomes to achieve across the system of which part of would be good locality working
- The 7 day Service was progressing well and being monitored through the BCF Executive. The Social Care Team that responded to requests for assessment was in place and had been since December.

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

(2) That the Chair liaise with Adult Social Care with regard to the scheduling of future agenda items in the 2016/17 work programme.

84. ROTHERHAM DONCASTER AND SOUTH HUMBER NHS FOUNDATION TRUST QUALITY ACCOUNT

Karen Cvijetic, Head of Quality and Patient Engagement, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Quality Report

- Nationally mandated
- 2015/16 was the eighth quality report

Care Quality Commission (CQC) Ratings (September 2015)

- Overall rating – requires improvement
- Safe – requires improvement
- Effective – requires improvement
- Caring – good
- Responsive – good
- Well-led – good

What the CQC said we do well

- Learning Disability Services
Solar Centre – commended by patients and carers
88 Travis Gardens – outstanding for caring
- Adult Mental Health Services
Mental Health Crisis Teams – rated overall by CQC as Outstanding
Mulberry House – introduction of the 'Perfect Week'
Doncaster Perinatal Service
Rotherham dedicated service for deaf patients with mental health problems
- Children and Young Peoples' Mental Health Services
Safeguarding Advisor in post and training at a high level across all services
Out of hours duty system provides excellent coverage of emergency/crisis calls

Peer Support Workers assist with transition to Adult Mental Health Services

- Drug and Alcohol Services
Peer Mentor Scheme developed including training packages to provide service users with the skills and knowledge to become Peer Mentors
Peer Mentors from New Beginnings worked across the services in Doncaster and three had progressed into paid employment
- Older People's Mental Health Services
Community-based services for Older People rated as Outstanding for Caring
Young Onset Dementia Day Care offering carer respite and patient engagement
Male Carers Support Group for patients with Huntingdon's Disease
Cognitive Stimulation Programme – support patients with cognitive functioning
Kings Fund advice and guidance to make Wards Dementia Friendly

Our Approach and Response

- September, 2015 – immediate actions were taken and action plan drafted following initial feedback from CQC
- November, 2015 – Trust Quality Improvement Plan developed following receipt of draft CQC reports
- December, 2015 – Executive Director leads identified for all quality improvement actions
- February, 2016 – Trust Quality Improvement Plan shared at Quality Summit
- March, 2016 – action plan submitted to CQC

Governance Arrangements

- Published CQC reports to the Board of Directors' meeting on 28th January, 2016
- Monthly action plan updates to Board of Directors
- Monitoring and oversight by Executive Management Team (EMT)
- Divisional action plans monitored through Trust Board of Directors' Sub-committees
- Divisional-level action plans to address local issues and share learning

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/03/16

Patient Safety

Quality Metric	Baseline 14/15	Aim	Q1 15/16	Q2 15/16	Q2 15/16
Patient Safety					
		Aim to Reduce Major/ Moderate Medication Errors to 0 by March 2018			
Number of Serious incidents	88		24	17	18
			2015/16 forecast: 82		
Number of Trust reported suicides/suspected suicides	21		4	5	2
			2015/16 forecast: 18		
Number of Trust reported suicides/suspected suicides expressed as a rate per 100,000 England population	0.05		0.01	0.01	0.01
			2015/16 forecast:0.01		
Number of Grade 3 pressure ulcers	29		2	0	4
			2015/16 forecast:8		
Number of Grade 4 pressure ulcers	5		0	0	0
			2015/16 forecast:0		
Number of restrictive interventions	Not reported in 14/15		417	301	345
			2015/16 forecast:1436		
Number of falls (serious incidents)	2		1	1	2
			2015/16 forecast:4		

Number of medication errors	45		8	3	Reported quarter Retro-spective
			2015/16 forecast:32		

Patient Experience

Quality Metric	Baseline e 14/15	Aim	Q1 15/16	Q2 15/16	Q2 15/16
Patient Friends and Family Test					
Percentage of service users/patients who would 'be extremely likely/likely to recommend our service to friends and family if they needed similar care or treatment'	95.6% (Q4 14/15	To achieve % above national average	84.7%	87.3% (July/ Aug 2015)	88.3%
Complaints					
Number of complaints received	124	Aim to reduce by 5% (117 in 15/16)	33	24	34
			2015/16 forecast:114		
Percentage of complaints 'upheld'	17%	Reduce by 5% (16% in 15/16)	9.1%	12.5%	Reported Quarter Retro-spective
			2015/16 forecast:10.5%		
Annual Community Mental Health Survey					
Score for 'overall care received in the last 12 months' (CQC annual community mental health survey)	7.3 (about the same as other Trusts)	Aim to be 'better than other Trusts'	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	7.2
Score for 'were you involved as much as you wanted to be in agreeing what	7.9 (about the same as	Aim to be 'better than other	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	7.7

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 17/03/16

care you will receive?" (CQC annual community mental health survey)	other Trusts)	Trusts'			
Score for 'were you involved as much as you wanted to be in discussing how your care is working' (CQC annual community mental health survey)	9.1 (about the same as other Trusts)	Aim to be 'better than other Trusts'	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	7.7
Percentage of service users who responded to annual community mental health survey	26%	Aim to increase response rate above national average	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	Annual survey results published Autumn 2015	32%

Clinical Effectiveness

Quality Metric	Baseline 14/15	Aim	Q1 15/16	Q2 15/16	Q2 15/16
CQUIN					
Percentage of CQUIN achieved in Mental Health and Learning Disability Services	96%	Aim to achieve 100%	100%	100%	Reported quarter retrospective
Percentage of CQUIN achieved in Community Services	100%	Aim to achieve 100%	100%	100%	Reported quarter retrospective
Percentage of CQUIN achieved in Forensic services	100%	Aim to achieve 100%	100%	100%	Reported quarter retrospective
Clinical Audit					
Percentage of clinical audits rated as 'Outstanding'	To be developed in 15/16	To be developed in 15/16	22%	25%	0%

Percentage of clinical audits rated as 'Good'	To be developed in 15/16	To be developed in 15/16	33%	25%	50%
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Finally

- Receive Select Commission's comments for inclusion in the Quality report – May, 2016
- Report to Board of Directors – 28th April, 2016
- Report to Council of Governors – 13th May, 2016
- Report to Monitor – 27th May, 2016
- Review by Audit Commission – April/May, 2016

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised/clarified:-

- The Learning Disability Service had received a rating of 'Inadequate'. The CQC were concerned that the staffing levels in North Lincolnshire were not safe in the community team. To mitigate that, a business case had been submitted for additional funding as the staff in that team were based on the funding received. A business case had been submitted to the North Lincolnshire CCG the outcome of which was awaited
- The issue within the Adult Mental Health Community Teams was the care record planning. Plans were in place, as could be seen through the action plan, had been rapidly escalated and hopefully resolutions put into place
- The difference between the 2 Community Health Teams – 1 was the Mental Health Services. In Doncaster Community Services were also provided e.g. End of Life Care, District Nursing, School Nursing, Health Visitors. The other was specially Mental Health Community Teams
- The Inadequate rating related to staffing issues; there had not been any comments in the CQC report that they had found clients wrongly allocated
- CQC reports do not split outcomes by locality but where it was possible, the data would be separated so as to give actions specifically for Rotherham
- As well as investigating the root causes of falls, any possible underlying cause was also investigated to ascertain if there was a medical condition. The majority of falls were by elderly people on Wards. If necessary work would take place with Acute Care colleagues to ensure medical care was taken

- The reporting of medication errors had now changed. The number of medication errors that were moderate or above where RDaSH had had involvement with the service users involved had fallen drastically. Pharmacists went onto Wards, worked across all the Community Teams, looking at how medication was prescribed, was it recorded properly etc.
- There was no trend particularly with minor medication errors. An assessment had been conducted and reported to the Clinical Governance Group. If there were any areas, the pharmacist would go to the Wards or Community Teams to address the issues
- When looking at medication errors, the organisation was trying to focus on the areas that were of higher importance; if you got the bigger areas correct it would help with the minor areas. RDaSH had focussed on the moderate severity or above where there may be harm to patients, so that improved the practice across the board including a reduced number of minor areas. Using resources more wisely to get the better impact across the organisation
- RDaSH had been involved in the Children's Looked After and Safeguarding CQC action plan and had attended monthly meetings with the CCG, Acute Care Trust and other partner organisations to implement the action plan. That action plan was hopefully being signed off shortly as being complete and RDaSH's actions as an organisation had been achieved. RDaSH was also part of the MASH where it had a member of staff sat within the team.
- RDaSH continued to hold events around CSE and awareness raising as well as Safeguarding training (adults and children), Domestic Abuse Compliance Level 1 and an e-learning package commissioned for Level 2
- There had been 2 reported suicides/suspected suicides in Quarter 3. However, it was not confirmed as yet whether they were in fact suicides as unexpected deaths were now classed as pending review until the outcome from the Coroner's Office was known
- For each serious incident, not just an unexpected death, the Trust would undertake a formal serious incident investigation and a member of staff appointed who had not had any dealings with that service user. The Trust had to report to the CCG and were monitored. The outcome was shared within the organisation and a 6 monthly learning matters bulletin available on the Trust website which included lessons learnt from a serious incident, complaints etc. by themes
- If a serious incident involved a specific clinician and the investigation identified additional training needed for that clinician that would be dealt with. There were things the Trust were going to improve e.g. care records. The Trust's Clinical Commissioning Audit Team and the

Internal Audit Service had been commissioned to undertake an audit. As a first step supervisors were to check through the 1-1s with each clinician i.e. did all the clinicians' cases have a current meaningful care record

- Delayed discharges in care were reducing. Q3 5.1% - had been 6.9% at the end of last year. Some of the reasons for the delays were due to family choice. The majority was in Older People's Mental Health Services and transferring into care homes, making sure the adaptations done at home etc. before the Service user transferred. Service users and families could choose not to accept the first place they were offered. The Trust worked closely with the Council to get the adaptations done as quickly as possible
- A number of service users and families used the Patient Advice Literacy Service (PALS). The Service talked to a person where required and linked them up with someone to help them. It was important to make sure service users and carers could access advocacy services to support them
- Each complaint received was subject to a similar process as that of serious incidents. All were investigated, all received a response from the Chief Executive and all included actions. The top themes were communication/information available so the Trust had carried out a lot of work to make sure that the information given about the service was correct. Work was needed with Service users as sometimes there were higher expectations than the Trust was able to meet and/or commissioned to deliver
- The Trust had ways of collating information including the Your Opinion Counts forms, Services worked with Service users to collect patients' stories, information was published in Learning Matters and there were regular patient stories to the Board. A number of the Services had twitter feeds so the information was collated and tailored to the needs of the population. There were Facebook pages, Services going out and collecting stories, the Health Bus and there had been a young person's event held recently in the CAMHS service
- That was a monthly publication, Trust Matters, which shared good practice both within the Trust and of the joint partnership working. That was provided to all the Trust members and available on the Trust website

Resolved: (1) That the presentation be noted.

(2) To agree a date for receiving the draft Quality Account.

(3) That the Health Select Commission submit their comments agreed by the date agreed with RDASH

85. WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, advised that consideration was required as to the 2016/17 scrutiny work programme and priorities. Cabinet, SLT and Commissioners would all have a view as well as Scrutiny Members.

The Select Commission had had a clear brief for the 2015/16 Municipal Year to scrutinise Health and Social Care Integration and work towards ensuring sustainable high quality Health and Social Care Services.

A lot had been achieved through the Better Care Fund and the Members' Working Group for Adult Health Transformation but there was still a lot of further work to take place.

Members should consider whether they wished this to continue to be a priority for the forthcoming year as the wider changes began to take place.

In 2015/16 the Select Commission had also:-

- Taken a more detailed approach with sub-groups on the Quality Accounts
- Been part of the consultation on the Clinical Commissioning Group's plan as well as the refresh of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Members might wish to ensure the action plans for the Strategy were being implemented next year
- Scrutinised progress on the Interim GP strategy

Mental Health had clearly been identified as a priority in the past for the Commission and ongoing transformation both for adults and older people; CAMHS could be included next year.

Sub-regional scrutiny of the NHS Commissioners Working Together initiative was also being developed

An e-mail would be sent to all the Select Commission Members with suggestions for the 2016/17 work programme and requesting further ideas.

Resolved:- That Health Select Commission Members give further consideration to the 2016/17 work programme and pass any suggestions to the Chair and Scrutiny Officer by 31st March, 2016.

86. UPDATE FROM IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION

Councillor Ahmed reported that the Select Commission had not met since the 3rd February.

One of the areas the Commission would be focussing upon in the 2016/17 Municipal Year would be the scrutiny of CSE Services. Following the meeting in April she would give a detailed update.

87. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES

No issues had been raised.

88. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 14th April, 2016, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
14th April, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Sansome (in the Chair); Councillors Burton, Elliot and McNeely, Vicky Farnsworth (Rotherham Speak-Up) and Robert Parkin (Rotherham Speak-Up).

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Housing, was in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fleming, Godfrey, Mallinder, Rushforth and John Turner.

Due to the number of apologies received the meeting was not quorate.

89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

90. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

91. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) Adult and Older People's Mental Health Transformation
RDaSH have arranged two further public engagement sessions on developing new models of care in Mental Health Services to be held on 10th May, 2016, at Liberty Church, Station Road, Rotherham S60 1JH. Full details were available if anyone was interested.

Commissioners Working Together Partnership
Pre-consultation with the public was underway. The first full meeting would be held towards the end of May.

The link to the website for more information is:
<http://www.smybndccgs.nhs.uk/>

92. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17TH MARCH, 2016

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 17th March, 2016, were noted.

Arising from Minute No. 82 (Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Account), it was noted that:-

- further information received after the meeting had been included in the Minute regarding performance on processing prescriptions

- a remainder to those that had not as yet submitted any comments and thanks to those that already had
- TRFT Governors' Surgeries – normal communication of the surgeries was through press releases, the TRFT website, social media and referenced in communication messages. The February session had not been as actively communicated as in the past due to the uncertainty that it would go ahead due to Governor availability. However, the Trust had held limited surgeries both on the main Hospital site and the RCHC with Governors having the opportunity to speak to patients/visitors/staff and gather feedback

Arising from Minute No. 84 (RDaSH Quality Account), it was noted that the draft document had not yet been circulated to stakeholders for feedback.

93. ACCESS TO GPS SCRUTINY REVIEW

Terri Roche, Director of Public Health, and Jacqui Tuffnell, Head of Co-Commissioning, provided an update of the action being taken for each of the Scrutiny Review's twelve recommendations.

The Review had taken place between September, 2013 and March, 2014, with the aims being:-

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

Further scrutiny of the initial response from partner agencies had been carried out in January, 2015 and a mini survey with GP Practice Managers undertaken at their Forum meeting in May, 2015.

The majority of the actions in response to the twelve recommendations fell to the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS England. Many had now been either completed or included within the Interim GP Strategy. There was also a workforce strategy.

Three were aimed at the Health and Wellbeing Board and, although it was clear the Board would not lead specifically on any campaigns, it had a role in bringing partners together to ensure consistent messages were

delivered. One of the ways in which this would happen would be through a revamped website, due to be completed by the end of May, 2016, and a Twitter account now set up to keep the public and stakeholders updated on partners' activity and health and wellbeing initiatives.

Consideration was given to Appendix 1 which contained the Cabinet response to the recommendations. Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- Improvements in telephone systems were taking place, for example informing people where they were in the telephone queue and additional capacity at busy times such as 8.00-9:30a.m.
- Efforts should be made to gain the support of the large number of private sector employers within the Borough to encourage their employees to keep their GP appointments as part of the prevention and care agenda
Prevention formed part of the quality contract and work took place with Public Health in terms of an element of associated funding which was increasing the number of Healthchecks that took place. Public Health could work with NHS England to make sure members of the public took up the national Health Screening Programme. Primary Care needed to be supported in the wider sense and may be work with voluntary and community sector who worked with particular groups
- Are you now confident that all practices were engaging effectively with their patients? Are there any hotspots around? Any issues within any individual GP practices?
There were some contracts that had struggled with Patient Participation Groups and a lot of work had taken place in connecting them with the more successful ones. Healthwatch Rotherham was also helping to support them
- Although recommendation 5 was originally rejected had it been revisited given the national specification has not yet been developed?
The Service was in place but the national specification awaited from NHS England
- The Winter Communication Plan was updated and produced annually
- The comments associated with the recommendations would be helped greatly if they contained numerical information and clearly defined data that supported the comments
- Would there be an analysis of data regarding trends in the "do not attends" and the evaluation of the impact of the campaigns?
Linking to the Quality Contract, the sharing of the Key Performance Indicators with the Commission would pick up this point. Also the GP lead for quality in every practice would meet monthly at the CCG with

the CCG Clinical lead. The practices were being clustered based on their demographics and they would be expected to be progressing. It was only recently that all the data had been pulled together to show where each practice was on the map. The cluster information would be shared at the Primary Care meeting in terms of KPIs which would include non-attendance, A&E attendance, workforce and how they were doing with regard to the Quality Outcome Framework. All the information was in the public domain but there was only Rotherham pulling it altogether in one map so a comparison could be made between practices

- Do you ever envisage returning to “sit and wait”
There had been a lot of discussion and public engagement with regard to “sit and wait”. There were pockets of the public that would like it but the majority wanted to be seen at an appropriate time and within 5 minutes. There was a very stretched workforce within Primary Care and there were examples of where no-one had turned up for “sit and wait” so was problematic in managing capacity. From an efficiency point of view, appointments were a more efficient way of managing a practice
- Repeat prescriptions included review dates which were often missed. Whose responsibility was it to ensure the review was undertaken?
Work was taking place with practices currently. There were a number of services which were reliant on review dates and reliant on the patients returning for blood pressure checks etc. Work was taking place with regard to having the technology in place for the bring forward systems
- Consideration within the Strategy as to how to reward good practice or recognise good practice amongst employers
There was a balance between what the employees would want to share and how that could be recorded versus being able to record it. It was a good idea to make sure that all the campaigns were better distributed and provide evidence on the importance of allowing people the time to attend their appointments and screening. The awarding of good practice was by trying to get more people involved in the Workplace Health Charter and looking at the health and wellbeing of their workforce in the broader sense – from policies, access to healthier options in the canteen and getting the workforce to own it

The report was noted and requested that a future update be submitted once the Strategy had started to embed.

94. URINARY INCONTINENCE SCRUTINY REVIEW UPDATE

Rebecca Atchinson, Public Health, presented an update on the progress to date on the Scrutiny Review’s six recommendations.

The Review had taken place during May and June, 2014, and had identified recommendations which cut across the Council's Directorates. The main aims of the Review had been:-

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

Progress had been challenging due to the changes in staffing within the Council over the last six months as well as technical problems with the uploading of information to the Public Health TV systems since September, 2015. Plans were now in place to move the activity forwards particularly in the area of prevention and early support agenda.

Rebecca introduced Kristy Barnfield and Joanne Mangnall from the Community Continence Service.

Consideration was given to the Appendix which contained the Cabinet response to the recommendations. Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- My GP surgery never had their television on
This was really disappointing and a challenge. As part of Public Health's wider training attempts were being made to try and integrate the messages into the wider pieces of work that were being carried out. A different range of ways had to be tried of encouraging both staff and the public to integrate messages that might be challenging and might not be the first thing that came to mind in their consultation with individuals. As well as Public Health messages, there was currently a piece of work being undertaken in recognising the different types of roles there were in GP practices other than a GP to be shown on televisions in surgeries. It was a missed opportunity if practices were not turning on their screens
- Did the incontinence card give access to a toilet that shopkeepers may have? Was there any feedback on how successful it had been?
It was an alert card that anyone could carry but it was at the individual establishment's discretion as to whether they honoured the message on the card. The disabled toilet access was always by way of the Radar key scheme. It was known from patients' report back at clinic that there were certain shops, particularly in places like Meadowhall, that had declined patients the use of their toilets and patients were alerted in subsequent clinics sessions of areas where it might not be honoured. If a patient had a very severe bladder problem they would be told to use the Radar key, however, the number of disabled toilets was very low. If someone had a problem with faecal incontinence

they would always be guided to use the Radar scheme because they had washing facilities

There were opportunities for the Council to provide information on all of the toileting facilities across Rotherham to say have you considered x y z and pass that information and challenge back. However, it was about getting all of the contact details of who had responsibility for each of those facilities as sometimes the organisation did not have responsibility for their own toilets

- What was the timeframe of when the televisions were likely to be coming to the GP practices?

It was planned for it to be up and running by the end of the month

- Will we be doing anything with SYPTE concerning the screens and promoting the issues around urinary incontinence? Have we taken up SYPTE's offer of promoting the health issues either for incontinence issues or Right Care, Pharmacy First etc.?

There was an opportunity as to how Public Health shared its health measures around broader issues as well as including incontinence related issues with services such as SYPTE. The challenge was to ensure if they did not have the mediums like Public Health TV, how they were provided with access to information that they could display within their passenger areas to signpost people to further information. There was a very good website which contained resources but there was a charge so further discussions were required. The blanket approach of using Public Health TV had been used but there was an acknowledgement that there were further opportunities to get the message to the areas outside of that scope

- It would again be appreciated if there could be some clear data as to what progress/updates there had been to ascertain how successful they had been

- Could you give some information about the training and the research project carried out by the Community Continence Service? How do you intend to promote training and the research around incontinence?

The training that was undertaken in Maltby was in one of the care homes focussing on the correct use of incontinence products. If they were not used correctly residents were at risk of developing skin breakdown and pressure damage. It was also known that incontinence products could be used inappropriately instead of a resident being taken to the toilet which was degrading to the individual and increased costs to the NHS. The training focussed very much on when to use a product, when to change a product and how to use it correctly and had been very well received by the staff. The problem in undertaking the training was that the turnover of staff in care homes could be quite rapid. Work had taken place with Council Officers to deliver a year's planned training which was circulated to all the care homes. Staff were evaluated at the end of each training session. The

uptake could be quite sporadic; there could be a session that was fully booked on the day and then poorly attended due to sickness in the care home.

The CCG had funded a two year Project Nurse post which had focussed on specific areas of continence care e.g. catheter related infections which could be life threatening for a small percentage of patients. That work focussed very much on the inpatient setting looking at reducing the usage of/looking at alternatives to catheters and raising awareness so that patients were alert to particular triggers that could indicate that they had a problem. A patient information book had also been developed from that work and was now issued to all patients that were discharged from hospital with a catheter. This aided smoother transition to Community Services

The other elements of the work related to referral pathways and looking at how patients accessed further help for continence problems which were very broad. A lot of the discussion in the Review had focussed around pelvic floor exercises but they would only address one specific element of continence problems; anyone who presented with a continence problem required a complete assessment because there could be sinister underlying pathology. The worker had identified a number of areas that required focus, on the assessment process and directing patients and had also looked at patients who were presenting at A&E with continence problems. A high percentage of patients presented at A&E with urinary tract problems which was a very simple condition and did not warrant attendance at A&E. Further work was required to understand why this happened

- There was reference in recommendations 4 and 5 regarding training and the previous offer by Neighbourhoods and Adult Services for incontinence training to home care staff not being taken up. Was there any further information?
Colleagues in Neighbourhoods and Adult Services had stated that they had established that there was a training need, however, once it was set up there was no take up. One of the challenges was that sometimes people wanted training to be delivered in individual settings which was not feasible financially. There was ongoing training from the Community Continence Team when they were having contact with settings albeit may be not through planned training sessions
- Should a person applying for a job in a care home have to produce certain certificates to show competence in that field before they were actually accepted as an employee?
Care Homes did take up references but it was not thought that there was a requirement on the level of certificates that had to be produced. We do need to try and set some examples of good practice and minimum standard.

- Could you not get one person from the Home to come to a training session and they go back and train the others?

That approach had been tried previously, "link post", but it only worked in a very small percentage of Homes and where they had a member of staff in employment at that Home for a long period of time. It was often found that someone nominated as a link person that came to one of the sessions would have left by the time of the next session so the knowledge could not be taken forward. In some Homes there were staff that took the key role in liaising with the Community Continence Service on the delivery of pads into the Home, the monitoring of deliveries and co-ordinating assessments and would really like to adopt that approach widely but unfortunately the experience to date was that it not been effective

- Does the Home have to pay for the pads? Should they not be charged?

The pads were provided free from the Community Continence Service to the Home. If a resident was in a nursing bed the registered nurses in the Home should undertake a Continence Assessment prior to the issuing of pads. If the resident was in a residential bed, the Community Nurses would work with the Home to undertake an assessment prior to issuing pads. The aim was always to assess and treat rather than just use pads

The Service had to provide pads free of charge as part of the health care package but it was not an unlimited numbers of pads; they were capped at a certain number over a 24 hour period and that very much depended upon on the level of incontinence the person was demonstrating

- Rotherham Foundation Trust was taking part in a national audit of inpatient falls compliance with Best Practice in reducing risk of falls in Acute Care and one of the things on the checklist was multi-factorial risk assessment. It was positive that the Hospital had ticked yes to three of the questions which were linked to continence - do people at risk of falling as an inpatient have an assessment of continence and toilet issues? Suggested actions where problems with continence are identified? And possible modification of any medicines that people were taking that could reduce their risk of falls? If a patient had had this assessment and issues identified would there would be follow up to your Team possibly for support and assistance?

The Community Continence Team had four full time equivalent Nurses and possibly had to treat approximately 12,500. The Team was not involved in inpatient continence assessment but worked very closely with key staff in the inpatient setting to develop a standard operating procedure which guided the staff through a Ward-based continence assessment and gave them a very clear referral process onto the Team.

The training package was open to Foundation Trust staff as well as Community and Nursing staff and nursing homes.

Rebecca, Kristy and Joanne were thanked for their presentation.

The report was noted.

95. DRAFT CARERS STRATEGY

Sarah Farragher, Adult Social Care, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

The Carers Strategy

- The Strategy is being co-produced
- There are now members of the Carers Forum on the group alongside officers from RMBC, Health and the voluntary sector
- The Strategy is progressing well and is on track for sign-off at the Health and Wellbeing Board in June
- Plan is to launch during Carers Week
- Carers Strategy Group will become the delivery group
- Carers information booked to be produced

Pledges

- That every carer in Rotherham is recognised and supported to maintain their health, wellbeing and personal outcomes
- That carers in Rotherham are not financially disadvantaged as a result of their caring role
- That carers are recognised and respected as partners in care
- That carers can enjoy a life outside caring

Carers Forum

- Re-launched in January, 2016 and operating independently of the Council

The Strategy was still in draft form and would be submitted to the June meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board for sign-off. It would be launched during Carers Week.

Jayne Price, Carers Forum, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Rotherham Carers Forum

- An independent voice for Rotherham's informal carers

Over the years:-

- Long established forum – step up by dedicated and enthusiastic carers and professionals
- Been actively involved in supporting carers: meetings, information, Carers' Week, Carers' Rights Day etc.
- Changes over the years e.g. bases, officers

- Partner groups developed e.g. Carers 4 Carers, Rotherham Parents Forum Ltd. and Lost in Transition

Forum

- The Forum was a successful group which provided a place for carers to meet, listen to guest speakers, share experiences and provide a platform for informal carers
- Health and Wellbeing partners provided the resources for the Carers' Co-ordinator at Carers' Corner

Recent Challenges

- In 2014 the Carers' Co-ordinator resigned from RMBC
- Carers' Corner relocated to the RAIN building
- Where was the Constitution?
- No available assets
- Low attendance
- Many people believed that the Forum had folded

Challenges

- "Challenges are what makes life interesting and overcoming them is what makes life meaningful"

Big Task Ahead

- The Forum needed a Constitution
- Assets needed to be freed up and a new bank account opened
- The status needed to be clarified as independent
- The word needed to be out that we are still in business

Hard work paid off

- Interim Officers were elected as a Steering Group
- An interim Constitution was adopted
- A new bank account was opened
- We managed to get a cheque re-dated
- We had a fantastic re-launch with great feedback
- Our first funding bid has been successful

Where are we now

- Monthly meetings with full agendas
- We are a 'critical friend' and 'co-productive'
- Working with partners e.g. RMBC, Crossroads especially Carer Resilience, Alzheimer's Society, Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group, Barnardo's Young Carers, Age UK Rotherham, Carers 4 Carers, Rotherham Parents Forum Ltd. – providing an 'Umbrella Forum'
- Current work involves:-
 - An active contributor in the Carers' Strategy
 - Being a lead in Carers' Week 2016 (1st-6th June)
 - Being a member of Rotherfed

Our wish list

- Get more carers involved and find the hidden ones
- Redeveloping and re-launching the Forum has been hard work and work needs to be shared to be sustainable
- The Forum's own resources are not an infinite pot – redevelopment has been on a beg and borrow basis – support is much needed and always welcome
- Look at employing staff as work so far has been voluntary
- Move from 'interim' to permanent
- Be in a position where we can pass a fully operational and successful Forum onto future carers

www.rotherhamcarersforum.co.uk

Rotherham Carers Forum email:

enquiries@rotherhamcarersforum.co.uk

Discussion ensued on the presentations with the following issues highlighted:-

- The Midnight Memory Walk for the Hospice is on the 11th/12th June. It would be an opportunity for carers to encourage other carers they met on the walk to be part of the Carers' Forum
- How would you reach hidden carers? Some carers may be reluctant to attend meetings
During Carers' Week, Carers 4 Carers would be going into the Hospital giving general information and looking for hidden carers. There would also be a stall at Tesco's. Through being there and starting up a conversation with people in an informal setting it might be possible to identify those hidden carers. It was hoped to do a Carnival for Carers outside the RAIN building with various tables and people presenting how they could make carers' lives better. The theme for Carers' week this year was building carer friendlier communities.

The Forum was considering how to reach those that would not attend meetings. One of the ideas was to actually go on line and build the community online so it could be an information hub and two-way forum where people could ask things. Times were a lot different now with the financial constraints but attempts were being made to address those issues

- Young carers would be some of the hidden carers and there may have to be a different way of reaching young carers than there would be for adult carers. Would the Forum's Facebook page be geared towards the young carers?
The Carers' Forum had a Facebook page which currently had ninety-one members. The Forum was looking to attract people to join and

also to send news/any relevant information via this method as it was a good way of getting out to the young carers who tended to use social media

The Carers Strategy was in draft and did not contain all the young carers' information due to it not being ready in time. There was some extra work to be included that had been carried out by Paul Theaker alongside Barnardos

When previously presented it was stated that the Strategy was about people caring for adults regardless of their age. It was the future intention for it to become a Strategy for all Carers, including parent carers; the Carers' Forum covered all carers

- Are you confident that the delivery of the plan will be performance managed against the action plan?
There was an action plan attached to the Strategy. It had not been presented to the Commission because it currently contained actions but not the accountabilities; by the time it went to the Health and Wellbeing Board it would have all the actions and responsible Officer
- Was the role of triangle of care approach been considered?
The principles of the triangle of care in terms of the Act that the carer was part of everything had been embedded all the way through the Strategy
- Was there any resilience work done about carers with GP?
There was a lot of work going on with the GPs at the moment. There were Carers Resilience clinics taking place which were specifically targeted at GPs. This would go into the handbook that accompanied the Strategy
- Can you give more detail around the Carers Pathway?
The development of the Carers Pathway came under the "we will" so the final action plan would have the detail of how that would be done. Some of the issues the Directorate were working through was a number of things that the Carers' Forum would like to lead on but it was a voluntary organisation so a need to balance how the management of that was supported

The latest draft of the Better Care Fund referred to a jointly commissioned carer service

- Can you give some detail around the Carers Needs Assessment?
At the moment the Assessment was something carried out by Social Workers or Social Care Workers based historically on how things had been done. Through the implementation of the plan, Assessments would be carried out by more people and recognised by more so it would not have to be a Council Officer to enable the carer to get a service

- Frequent reference was made to “Carers Assessment” but at the time of Scrutiny Review the document was “Carers Need Form” and “Care Plan”. Members of the Scrutiny Review recommended that that name be used rather than Carers Assessment in light of the feedback from the carers who had felt that it was an assessment of them and their ability to care rather than picking up on the support they needed as carers. Has there been any discussion on that?
We will change it

Sarah and Jayne were thanked for their presentation.

The report was noted.

96. RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW: CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES - MONITORING OF PROGRESS

In accordance with Minute No. 65 of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, Paul Theaker, Operational Commissioner, Children and Young People’s Service, and Ruth Fletcher-Brown, Public Health Specialist, reported on the current progress of the Scrutiny Review’s twelve recommendations.

A full Scrutiny Review had been carried out by a sub-group of the Health and Improving Lives Select Commissions between September, 2014 and March, 2015.

NHS England’s Future in Mind Report was published in May 2015 setting out a clear national ambition to transform the design and delivery of a local offer of services for children and young people with mental health needs. The Rotherham CAMHS Transformation Plan was developed in response to the Report and encompassed all local emotional wellbeing and mental health transformational developments. The response to the Scrutiny Review was, therefore, aligned to the local CAMHS Transformation Plan and the response to the Scrutiny Review was monitored through the CAMHS Partnership Group as part of the overall plan.

RDASH had been undertaking a whole CAMHS service reconfiguration and would be complete by June, 2016. The reconfiguration included the establishment of clear treatment pathways, a Single Point of Access and locality workers linked with locality based Early Help and Social Care Teams as well as schools and GPs.

Consideration was given to the Appendix which contained the response to the recommendations. Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/highlighted:-

- Part of the Select Commission's work going forward into the new municipal year could be a deep dive into recommendation 4 (whole school pilot) to ensure it was meeting its target
- The new Workers were now in place (recommendation 6). They would be contacting Schools from Friday, 22nd April and making the links with partners
- There had been a deterioration in the wait for an appointment. As of 8th April, 153 young people were waiting for an appointment into CAMHS (recommendation 8). The target was 95% of young people seen within 3 weeks – 28% at the moment. There was now a weekly meeting in place with the Assistant Director of RDASH and was monitored on a weekly basis. Part of the feedback was in terms of some of the reconfiguration work and staff not being in post but was something that the CCG and the Council were looking at very closely
- Why had that target not been met? Was there a particular period in the year? Any reason why that particular month slipped behind the target?
Not particularly. There were periods e.g. end of school term when a number of referrals came through from schools. The information received was that it was primarily down to the Service reconfiguration not being in place. They had employed agency workers until September so even though all staff would be in post, there would be the additional agency workers to deal with the backlog
- Was there a duplication in cost? What kind of costs were we talking about? Once the new staff were embedded the Commission would like to see some figures. The Commission would be concerned if the desired outcomes were not achieved after the extra finance
There was additional cost in terms of agency workers between now and September. The Service was commissioned by the CCG so the cost was not known but could be requested and further scrutiny would be welcomed. The whole structure would be filled by June so the number was expected to reduce
- Officers were requested to check the communication regarding the reconfiguration - was there any feedback to the Commission concerning the number of new posts which were being put into place through the restructure and the timescale against the Service RDASH was committed to provide? Was the Commission made aware that there may be slippage in Service because of the reconfiguration against the delivery aligned with the cost?

- How valid were the dates in recommendation 9? Should there be new dates given the restructure would not be complete until June 2016?
The restructure of RDASH had had an impact and that had been one of the factors in not meeting certain deadlines. Advice would be appreciated as to whether the Commission would wish the dates to be revised
- One of the things that had become apparent from the meeting with the Youth Cabinet was the regularity of involvement. Would it possible for there to be regular input from the Youth Cabinet concerning the website? It would help if the young people had greater ownership because they would have on the spot information to feed in whereas if it went into CAHMS there were a lot of people it had to go through before inclusion on the website (recommendation 10)
- Could you tell me how seriously they have listened to GPs' concerns?
In terms of the CCG, it was the GP Leads in terms of commissioning. There was a lead GP around Children's Mental Health. A number of the issues that the Council had had with regard to access to CAMHS, young people not meeting thresholds, the bounce back etc. had been echoed by the GPs
- Were the routine assessments carried out face-to-face in a clinic situation or were they carried out over the telephone?
It was one-to-one with the young person
- Three pathways – can you just reassure us that the three will meet up together at the end? I think it is key that it does happen.
Yes
- This is an area of work of service that had been difficult over a long period of time nationally and I just wondered from your perspective what do you think are going to be the barriers in achieving the progress we would like to achieve and was there anything you think that the Council could or should be doing to try and take things forward more effectively than perhaps done in the past?
From a Public Health point of view a priority would be the Early Intervention and Prevention Work and really investing to save by prioritising some of that work. The Future in Mind document that came out last year had a really strong focus on Early Intervention and Prevention and was looking at the transformation of CAMHS services across the board. Quite often, when thinking about the CAMHS Service, you only thought about the provision by RDASH when in actual fact everyone who had contact with children and young people had a role in terms promoting emotional health and mental wellbeing. When the local transformation plan was signed off Councillor Roche had been very keen that early intervention and prevention was a strong theme and there had been a disappointment within the Council that some of the money was not recurrent funding for prevention. This was something that would continue to be raised with the CCG

- Locality work and model – would this include links to School Nurses?
As part of the CAMHS partnership work there was representation from School Nursing. In terms of linking with the locality workers, School Nurses and other partners, there were a series of meetings currently taking place to look at the issue and how they would link together with schools and other services
- Was June too early to evaluate the benefits of the locality working model?
Yes it was too early for a full evaluation but the Council was very conscious that it needed to keep on top of the locality work and model in terms of its development and the contacts being made with schools etc.
- For workstreams such as the Family Support Service and the community approach how would the Council manage those against prevention and early intervention?
In terms of the whole community approach, that was linked in with the schools to include that. A group consisting of schools and Officers would go out quarterly to monitor action plans as well as speaking to the community groups or partnerships the schools were working with

Councillor Roche commented that there would shortly be a requirement for local authorities to report their annual spend on Mental Health as a discrete budget heading.

He also raised concerns regarding Head Teachers' involvement in the ongoing suicide prevention work.

Paul and Ruth were thanked for their attendance and presentation.

The report was noted.

97. QUARTERLY BRIEFING WITH HEALTH PARTNERS

The minutes of the meeting between the Select Commission and Health partners held on 25th February, 2016, were noted.

98. HEALTHWATCH ROTHERHAM - ISSUES

No issues had been raised.

99. DATE OF FUTURE MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 16th June, 2016, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
6th April, 2016

Present:- Councillor Hamilton (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Elliot, Hoddinott, Jones, Pitchley, Rose and Taylor and co-opted member Mrs. J. Jones.

Councillor Currie was in attendance for item 48.

Apologies for absence were received from: - The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Ahmed, Cutts, Jepson, Read, M. Vines and Smith and co-opted member Mr. M. Smith.

46. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No Declarations of Interest were made.

47. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

48. COMMUNICATIONS

Councillor Hoddinott provided feedback to the Improving Lives Select Commission on the visits of inspection that she and Councillor Ahmed had undertaken on behalf of the Commission (Minute No. 33 of the previous meeting held on 16th December, 2016, provides a progress update).

Councillors Ahmed and Hoddinott had received training from Brian Durham in December, 2015. Councillor Hoddinott had visited Cherry Tree, Liberty House, Silverwood and St. Edmund's Children's Residential Homes as a lay person. Informal feedback had been provided following these visits. Councillor Hoddinott thought that it was important to keep abreast of the Regulation 44 reports in order to triangulate information observed in her informal visits.

Councillor Hoddinott reported to the Improving Lives Select Commission the issues she had noted during her programme of visits: -

- Record keeping and communication;
- Transport available to looked after children living in residential homes, a minibus, often broke down and disappointed the children who could not go on their trips and visits because of this;
- Looked After Children often reported feeling stigma attached to using taxis and the minibus. These were not always the most appropriate methods of transporting small groups/individuals;
- Looked After Children and young people were enterprising and often requested, and were granted, free tickets from attractions;

- Physical resources within homes were sometimes disappointing;
- Councillor Hoddinott had found standards at two residential homes to be not those she would expect for Rotherham's Looked After Children;
- Décor was tired and furniture was not homely;
- Councillor Hoddinott had reported these issues and was reassured that an urgent officer response would follow;
- Some educational arrangements were not appropriately challenging for the young people involved;
- Some residential homes did not have adequate 'likes' and 'dislikes' paperwork;
- Staff reported uncertainty in the Service;
- All wanted long-term high quality solutions for children living in the residential homes;
- It would be important for the Corporate Parenting Panel to continue to receive residential home visit updates, including after the elections.

Councillor Hamilton thanked Councillors Hoddinott and Ahmed for their work and update. She welcomed the visits and that two Councillors were involved. She would wish the visits to continue after the election in a similar way, as this method of visiting was sustainable and allowed two Elected Members to build on-going relationships with the residential homes and their children and staff.

Councillor Currie, member of the Corporate Parenting Panel, thanked Councillor Hoddinott for her update. He informed the Improving Lives Select Commission of the work of the Corporate Parenting Panel and the regular presentations that the committee received from young people. He described how a recent presentation had focused on the looked after children survey that had concluded 'listen to us'. Councillor Currie reminded all Members that corporate parenting was everyone's responsibility.

Resolved:- That the update received be noted.

49. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 3RD FEBRUARY, 2016

The minutes of the previous Improving Lives Select Commission held on 3rd February, 2016, were considered.

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

50. SCRUTINY OF THE 'PREVENT' ELEMENT OF THE CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION DELIVERY PLAN 2015-2018

Councillor Hamilton, Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed Officers in attendance to provide an update of the 'Prevent' element of the Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Delivery Plan (2015-

2018). The Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme had focussed on the steps taken to address CSE in the Borough. The Prevent actions would be taken to explore the wider issues of governance and performance management as a whole.

The Officers with responsibilities relating to the prevent theme in attendance were: -

Gary Ridgeway, Assistant Director, CSE Investigations;
Jo Smith, CSE Support Services Co-ordinator;
Kay Denton-Tarn, Healthy Schools Consultant;
Anthony Evans, Education and Skills Manager;
David McWilliams, Assistant Director, Early Help and Family Engagement;
Jo Abbott, Assistant Director for Public Health;
Phil Morris, Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board Business Manager;
Leona Schofield, Communications.

The Prevent theme included: -

Prevent children and young people from becoming sexually exploited through effective leadership, governance and a wider culture embedded within organisations and communities that recognises the root causes of CSE, the signs and risk indicators and do all they can to tackle them.

Councillor Hamilton invited questions from the Select Commission members on each strategic objective within the plan.

1.1 Establish a clear view of the CSE profile in the Borough to ensure that the Health and Wellbeing Board undertake informed commissioning of service provision.

Councillor Pitchley asked how the action point to commission post support services was progressing in the early stages? Would the project be extended again?

Gary Ridgeway explained how his Service was working with 21 adult survivors in respect of a court case. Whilst it was anticipated that some would drop out of the very difficult process, none had. All 21 individuals had been able to give evidence with mostly positive outcomes for the individual. A learning event had been commissioned. Work within the Roma community was also underway. Dance was important to the community and would form the basis of a project working specifically with the community.

The project could not be commissioned beyond June, 2016.

Councillor Hoddinott asked about the development of the profile relating to current CSE? How did this compare to Jay's analysis of more historic

abuse? What did the hard to reach profile look like? Was outreach work taking place for Asian children?

Gary explained that the Service had identified 130 children and young people at risk who were showing some identification of CSE. It was important to emphasise that there were not 130 victims of CSE, nor give them a badge of victim. The 130 individuals had been shown to demonstrate triggers relating to CSE. Just under 30 were boys. A significant number came from the Roma community. Work was taking place to review all multi-agency records for the individuals identified was continuing to develop family profiles. This would be used to perform acid-based commissioning exercises to create services that responded to needs. This should be completed by the third week of April. The independent Analyst needed a 4-6 week turnaround time to report back on the completed profile.

Work on all types of CSE was taking place: -

- 'Journey' was responding to on-line grooming;
- The Roma community was forming a separate work stream;
- Sessions provided through the Lifewise Centre were being explored;
- Work was continuing with the Pakistani community to engage girls and women.

Councillor Hoddinott thanked Gary for his honest answer. It was important to recognise that victims of CSE could come from any community / background.

Jo Smith, Commissioner, explained the single-point of contact that was available through Apna Haq.

Councillor Hamilton asked about the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and when it would be available.

Jo Abbott explained that the data was being refreshed by the Children's Data Team and the first draft would be available in July or August.

1.2 The public understand the signs and symptoms of CSE and raise concerns early, alerting statutory services where necessary. Awareness campaigns include a clear message that CSE is a crime and will not be tolerated.

Councillor Pitchley asked about the closed action – were partners confident that the message was fully out in communities?

It was explained that this related to engaging an external agency. It had been agreed that this would be delivered in-house by partners working together. There had been high profile cases and issues since December, 2015, and Services had continued to promote awareness campaigns. An

umbrella communications plan was being developed that would link in with the wider Plan. The Rotherham Standing Together Plan was expected in September, 2016.

Furthermore, CSE was high on both the national and local agendas and there were many examples of collaborative working.

Gary Ridgeway explained that there was a strong commitment across Partners, including strong messages around length of sentences reflecting the severity of the crime. Interviews following the Clover trials showed partnership working and the emphasis on the role of GROW and the YWCA. An aspiration would be for the public to see and be confident in the whole system, rather than just the police or council being in the spotlight. The Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board would shortly be asked to appoint their CSE Sub-Group to take responsibility for the communications strand.

Councillor Jones asked whether any pre and post-analysis had been undertaken on the Plan? There were still members of the public who were not aware of CSE, and what the acronym stood for.

Jo Abbot responded that there was awareness of CSE in the general population, but individuals were not confident about who to report to. This was improving. For the work with the Roma community three key messages were being developed for all agencies to use.

Gary Ridgeway explained the monitoring of social media and opinions about CSE in Rotherham and that it was showing hopeful signs in terms of attitude changes and awareness improvements.

David McWilliams explained the importance of showing positive examples and being a child-centred Borough. Protecting vulnerable young people through a very positive message.

Councillor Hoddinott agreed how important the action was. She was anecdotally aware of an answer in a sex and relationship education lesson that missed an opportunity to explain to young people what an abuse relationship could involve.

Jo Smith knew that some of the population remained in denial about CSE, some parents did not identify issues and tended to not be aware of it. Grooming methods were constantly evolving and people's awareness always needed to be developed.

Jo Abbott referred to the good evaluation of the theatre education addressing complex relationship issues with a young audience.

Kay Denton-Tarn explained that early work with young children about friendships had evolved to ensure that it covered how 'nice could mean grooming'. 'Alright Charlie' had been commissioned and the evaluation of

'Chelsea's Choice' performed to over 3,000 young people of secondary school age and 73 vulnerable families showed a keen change in understanding. A full overview impact was expected after July, 2016.

Councillor Hamilton asked about what had moved on from the Action Plan – why was the update not reported?

Gary explained that the CSE Grooming Sub-Group would consider the most recent update before it would be presented to the Improving Lives Select Commission as was agreed protocol. The Improvement Plan represented the next stage.

Councillor Hamilton asked whether the awareness raising campaign had been completed with the Borough's Schools?

Kay explained that the first three paragraphs were in place and that future issues would be updated.

Councillor Hoddinott asked how many referrals had been generated from the audience members of 'Chelsea's Choice'?

Kay explained that Barnardo's Representatives were invited to each performance and they had reported that at least one person spoke to them after each performance. Referrals to school would be a confidential matter and not reported.

Councillor Hoddinott asked how the Service could be confident that referrals were appropriately moved on and sign-posted to partner agencies?

Kay felt that this was tackled through universal prevention and the education provided through the session would give individuals the skills of how to identify and avoid CSE and know where to go to get support.

Councillor Hoddinott wanted further reassurance that 'Chelsea's Choice' was appropriately addressing the pertinent issues.

Gary Ridgeway felt that the complexity of the issues meant that large numbers of referrals were unlikely to come forward from audience members. Proactive work taking place in parks was also not expected to generate massive referrals due to the issues involved. However, both were expected to raise awareness.

Jo Smith believed that awareness would be demonstrated by future reductions in reports. It would be down to the Services to adapt prevention work accordingly if this was not realised.

Councillor Hoddinott asked who and how this long-term analysis was conducted?

Gary stated trends would emerge over two to three years. The Jay Report provided a baseline. CSE trends within Roma and Pakistani communities would emerge over the next nine-months. The Annual Profile would be the responsibility of the CSE Sub-Group. National CSE recording methods had been agreed as fit for purpose.

David McWilliams agreed with the thrust of Councillor Hoddinott's question. 'How much do we do?', 'How well do we do it?' and 'Is anyone better off?'. Longitudinal factors needed to be developed to look at the third question.

Councillor Hoddinott asked that a recommendation from the Improving Lives Select Commission focus on what the outcomes would be in 2/3 years.

Councillor Hamilton asked what would happen if funding was not available to sustain work?

Kay had offered the performance of 'Chelsea's Choice' to all secondary age providers for free due to the funding available. She was now asking whether they would now pay for this whilst exploring sustainability with Safe@Last and RCAT student performances. If funding was available then she could assure that providers would receive the same level of funding, or, if funding was not available, offer a range of options if schools needed to self-fund.

1.3 Intelligence, including 'soft' intelligence, about historic and current incidence and risk of CSE is timely, shared between agencies and treated with respect.

Councillor Elliot asked about the lack of a reporting line – can children and members of the public still contact the services and what happens to this information?

Gary did not feel that a local reporting line was as important as the public were more aware of the national lines and they had well established systems. Referrals were promptly passed to Rotherham agencies from the national lines. Why re-invent a well-established process?

Councillor Elliot asked how the information sharing process was being analysed? 'Some good progress' was not a well quantified amount.

Gary explained the weekly performance monitoring at intelligence meetings. Issues were being dealt with at a lower level. Early Help colleagues were deploying to build the culture of early intelligence gathering and action. A company was developing an App to collate

information provided by members of the public although funding was required to take this through further development.

Councillor Hoddinott asked about the phone App and on-line reporting. The 101 number was a concerning method of reporting due to call waiting times and treatment of soft intelligence. Was SIM information fed in?

Gary explained that it was known that SIM information needed to be fed in, but it had not yet happened.

Councillor Jones asked for a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding for information sharing between Social Care and the Police. He was aware through another role that the Police have provided some information, but it was not complete.

Gary was aware of the 'proportionality test' and sometimes information did not meet the threshold and was not shared with other agencies. Weekly multi-agency intelligence meetings were seen as very productive.

Councillor Hamilton asked whether there was a flow chart to show how information was cascaded amongst partners?

Gary was aware that it was being considered by the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board's CSE Sub-Group at their next meeting.

1.4 All children and young people in Rotherham understand what healthy, respectful relationship are and can recognise the damage and the dangers caused by sexual bullying and exploitation (including on-line) to both victim and perpetrator.

Councillor Taylor asked about the prevention work relating to healthy relationships. This version of the Action Plan covered resources in schools, the January version of the plan spoke about meeting with all headteachers. What was the rationale behind the change?

Kay referred to competing priorities within schools and how CSE had been delegated to PSHE Leads, who Kay met with regularly. This was non-statutory work and it was important to support Schools on what they were able to do, rather than force them into specific workstreams.

Gary explained that the Plan was to drive activity and the Sub-Group felt that it was no longer relevant and had now morphed into something different as it had been debated.

Councillor Pitchley asked about 1.4.3 and the loss of the e-safety post. How would the discussion be progressed with the loss of the postholder? However, 1.4.5 refers to the e-safety officer having a role in ongoing work.

Kay explained that the activity referred to had been undertaken before the

postholder had left.

Anthony Evans explained how plans had been developed through the City Learning Centres to provide packages that schools could buy-in relating to e-safety topics. The DSG was no longer top-sliced by the Local Authority and this had changed the relationships in place. Schools could buy-in the Local Authority, go to the market or provide services in-house.

Councillor Pitchley spoke about her knowledge of how e-safety settings had been by-passed in a school. How was this being addressed?

Gary explained that eight themes had been identified for the CSE Sub-Group, one of which was e-safety due to its prevalence in grooming.

Councillor Hoddinott felt disappointed that the DSG funding for CSE had been removed. How was this risk being managed?

Anthony Evans explained that a traded offer to schools was being developed around school improvement matters; subsequent income would support other services. PSHE support would be separate to this, the Safeguarding Forum would launch a product in June that schools could purchase to support attainment outcomes and staff training.

Councillor Hoddinott felt uncomfortable with the concept of creating a marketplace for children's safety and awareness. Sex and relationship education and Safeguarding should be an integral part of education. However, she did appreciate the political landscape's drive towards academisation.

Councillor Rose asked about the 'all children and young people in Rotherham to understand...' statement. How were children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities being reached?

Kay described the work with special schools and how professionals identified whether the children accessing the mainstream provision was appropriate on a setting-by-setting basis. Kay committed to sharing lessons learned with all special schools.

Gary Ridgeway explained a recent conviction that was very close to a victim-less prosecution in the case of very serious sexual crimes against a young person with LDD.

Councillor Hamilton asked why the Early Help action had been rated as green?

David McWilliams spoke about the refresh that had taken place. Referrals had been streamlined. Now there was just one referral route and referrals had increased. Internal panels and integrated teams were in place, where

they had previously operated as separate services. A delay in physically producing the strategy was being addressed. The revised strategy would go out to consultation in May.

1.5 Potential perpetrators (children and adults) are identified early in range of settings, including schools, youth clubs, young offender institutions and prisons.

No questions raised relating to this strategic objective.

1.6 Organisational leadership and governance creates a culture in Rotherham where the causes, signs and symptoms of CSE are understood and identified and responded to quickly, effectively and with a determination to do the right thing in response.

Councillor Hoddinott asked about the culture and actions of individuals. Were whistleblowing policies in place?

Gary was aware of two whistleblowing policies that were available.

Jo Abbott explained the launch of a national whistleblowing resource system.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether there was a route for victims' families to raise complaints?

Jo Smith explained the Children and Young People's Services' Directorate Complaints procedure – this was a well-documented procedure.

Councillor Pitchley asked whether mapping of hot spots relating to complaints and whistleblowing was continuing and how this was reported to relevant Ward Members?

Jo Smith explained that this should be covered by Complaints Officers in the future.

David McWilliams agreed that this would prove a fruitful way of analysing reports and hotspots and thought that it was worthwhile to pursue.

Councillor Hamilton asked about Section 11 Audits.

Gary confirmed that they were reported to the CSE Sub-Group.

1.7 All Partners recognise the diversity of all communities in Rotherham and ensure services are responsive to need.

Councillor Jones asked about Community Reference Groups. Who took part and how were they selected? How could the Roma community get involved?

Gary explained that three meetings had taken place and attendance had dropped throughout. A broader community engagement plan was required and would be discussed at the full Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board. Gary would chair the Roma forum. He had asked to speak to the Council of Mosques and was awaiting their response. Representatives of commissioned charities outnumbered members of the public attending the meetings that had taken place.

In summary: -

Councillor Hamilton noted that a number of actions had been marked as being completed. What would the Action Plan look like in the future?

Gary referred to the Children and Young People's Plan, which had been in place for a few months. The action plan was taken at a moment in time to support the workings of the partnership. If it was agreed by the CSE Sub-Group the actions would be moved to the wider CYPS Improvement Plan. Gary anticipated that the Improving Lives Select Commission would wish to look at the Improvement Plan if it incorporated CSE strategic objectives.

Councillor Hamilton asked how the Action Plan would feed into the Improvement Plan?

Gary did not have authority to sign off the Plan himself and it would not be signed-off unless chief officers were satisfied that no actions or workstreams would be lost.

Next steps: -

The Improving Lives Select Commission collated their thoughts from their consideration of the Prevent theme within the CSE Delivery Plan. The following points were agreed as priorities: -

- The gap in identifying Asian victims must be addressed;
- The Communications Team should look at the complexity of grooming, and involve victims and survivors in this work;
- Agencies need to identify the 'So What' question/parameters for monitoring;
- The use of phone Apps and online reporting should be supported to bolster the role of soft intelligence;
- Intelligence sharing – assurances were requested around information sharing across agencies – and proportionality thresholds for information sharing;
- Analysis of the resourcing in Schools and partners' contributions to

Safeguarding and e-safety. A report was requested on how schools were buying-back the traded service officer;

- The role of complaints and whistleblowing- how was information triangulated, and how would this be reported to Members;
- Reporting the ratings in future action plans. Issues relating to accuracy were relevant. Some strategic objectives had been rated as green where progress was unclear;
- New action plan – ensure that there is continuity with the old action plan.

Resolved:- (1) That the 'Prevent' element of the Child Sexual Exploitation Delivery Plan, 2015-2018, be noted.

(2) That the questions put forward to accountable officers by members of the Improving Lives Select Commission, and the Select Commission's comments relating to future versions of the prevent theme Action Plan be noted.

51. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION - WORK PROGRAMME (2016/2017)

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny and Member Training Officer, introduced the report outlining options for consideration for the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme for the 2016/2017 Municipal Year. She asked that Members consider the issues and indicate a priority.

During the 2015/2016 Municipal Year, the Select Commission's focus had been on CSE: - the emerging strategy, the first version of the plan, work in schools and work with victims. Some Members had attended a meeting in Birmingham to look at the Council's approach to CSE and how they ran their Select Committee hearings. The focus would move to Safeguarding Boards - their audit and their work programmes would be progressed in the next Municipal Year, including scrutiny of Safeguarding plans.

A presentation on Early Help had been presented in November, 2015, and this would be looked at again in terms of savings identified and targeting interventions at an early stage to prevent cases escalating during 2016/2017.

Children missing from home and education would also be a focus.

Performance information would be taken on a quarterly basis. This would focus on the aspiration to create a child-centred Borough.

Domestic Abuse and the impact on children and young people would be considered.

Apprentices and apprenticeships for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities.

Resolved: - That the identified priorities for the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme for the 2016/2017 Municipal Year be noted.

52. COUNCILLOR JANE HAMILTON, CHAIRPERSON OF THE IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION

Councillor L. Pitchley, Vice-Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, wished to place on record the Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission's thanks to Councillor Jane Hamilton for all of her hard work and commitment to the Select Commission at both the formal meetings and preparatory work outside, at what had been a very pressured time for Rotherham over the past twelve months. Councillor Hamilton was due to retire at the local elections in May, 2016, following twelve years as a Borough Councillor.

53. DIANE THOMAS, CENTRE FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY

Councillor Hamilton, thanked Diane Thomas, from the Centre for Public Scrutiny, for her commitment and support to the Improving Lives Select Commission's work over the past twelve months.

54. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 15th June, 2016, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
24th February, 2016

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Cutts, Godfrey, Gosling, McNeely, Pickering, Reeder, Sims, Smith, Whelbourn, Whysall and Wyatt, together with co-opted members Mrs. L. Shears, Mr. P. Cahill and Mr. B. Walker.

Also in attendance - Councillor Sims (Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety) and Mrs. D. Thomas (Centre for Public Scrutiny).

Parish Councillors P. Blanksby (Wales Parish Council) and D. Smith (Dinnington Parish Council), attended for consideration of item 44.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buckley, Jepson and C. Vines.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

41. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

42. COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the Select Commission placed on record their appreciation of the services to this Council of the Director of Streetpride, Mr. David Burton, who would be retiring in the near future. Members wished Mr. Burton a long and happy retirement.

43. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 20TH JANUARY 2016

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 20th January, 2016, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

(2) That, with regard to Minute No. 38 (Rotherham Town Centre Masterplan), the draft Masterplan be reported to the next meeting of this Select Commission.

44. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF LITTER AND FLY-TIPPING (TASK AND FINISH GROUP)

Further to Minute No. 39 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 20th January, 2016, consideration was given to a report, presented by Councillor A. Atkin (Chair of the Task and Finish Group), concerning the work of the Litter and Fly Tipping Task and Finish

Group, which had now completed its review of the problem of the increase of litter and fly tipping within the Rotherham Borough area. The review was one of a number of reviews of service areas within Environment and Development Services, identified by the Commissioners and Elected Members as priority scrutiny reviews to take place during 2015/2016.

The report stated that the review had been undertaken against a background of annual revenue budget reductions for both street cleansing and enforcement duties and also the perception that enforcement was not necessarily effective in changing behaviour in respect of reducing littering and fly tipping.

Members considered the contents of the full report of this scrutiny review and its recommendations.

The Select Commission's discussion of this item highlighted the following salient issues:-

: the proposal to establish an officer post of 'Love My Streets' Co-ordinator is now the subject of further consideration (after one unsuccessful attempt to fill the post); the post has an available budget and is to be considered further by the Chief Executive; the role of the post will be wide-ranging and will include the development of partnership working;

: there is scope for the further development of partnership working between the Borough Council and Parish Councils and the avoidance of duplication in dealing with the problem of litter; the possibility of Parish Councils employing their own litter wardens who would be trained in the role and authorised to issue fixed penalty notices to people who deliberately drop litter;

: the current review of enforcement by the Borough Council and the possibility of deploying more multi-skilled enforcement officers at street level; such a role was not considered to be appropriate for the Police Community Support Officers;

: the suggestion that elected members (either Borough or Parish) should be trained and authorised to issue fixed penalty notices would not be progressed;

: the street cleansing revenue budget for 2016/17 (which is subject to Borough Council approval on 2nd March, 2016) may essentially be the same as that for 2015/16, but may have a slight reduction;

: whether there is scope to reduce the fees charged to the licensed private sector housing landlords (ie: within the Council's selective licensing areas) for the collection and disposal of bulky waste items; there was some evidence that fly tipping may increase whenever there are changes of tenants and furniture, materials, etc. have to be disposed of; a fee reduction may possibly serve to reduce the incidence of such fly tipping

on these occasions; it was noted that there was currently no budget subsidy available, within the Council, to meet the cost of any such reduction in fees;

: the selective licensing (of private sector housing landlords) has produced improvements in the Dinnington area, although the problem of empty homes persists, eg: the gardens of empty homes are sometimes used as dumping grounds for refuse and the problem remains if the absent landlord is unable to be traced; the Borough Council's Strategic Housing Team is reviewing the most effective way of engaging with private sector landlords, to try and resolve the various issues relating to empty properties;

: the problem of fly-tipping along country lanes, away from built-up areas and centres of population; a suggestion that small items of commercial waste should be permitted to be disposed of at the Borough Council's waste recycling sites; the Waste Management Task and Finish Group has been examining this issue, including the possible introduction of additional fees and charges which may enable these sites to be opened during longer hours; the probable causes of fly-tipping were discussed (eg: certain waste not being accepted at waste recycling sites; the reluctance of some people to pay fees for the disposal of specific types of waste); these complicated issues are the subject of continuing analysis;

: different ways of involving the wider community in litter clearance (eg: volunteering for litter picking days); the provision of appropriate support for volunteers, as well as the co-ordination of their work; a budget is available for the provision of support to volunteer groups, eg: for the disposal of refuse;

: organisations such as Rotherfed (the Rotherham Federation of Tenants and Residents) could be asked to inform the Borough Council about the community groups which may be interested in participating in community clean-up and litter-picking events;

: the Rotherfed organisation offers environmental grants (eg: of £250), although there is currently a low take-up of them; Members requested details of this system of grants;

: whether there is scope for contracts with private sector organisations for enforcement duties; it was noted that such organisations prefer to operate within town centres rather than more rural areas;

: litter 'hot spots' and the use of closed circuit television systems (eg: within town centres and at shopping precincts) to assist with enforcement; ensuring that local businesses are responsible for clearing litter from the streets and public spaces fronting their premises; it was noted that some businesses are more responsible than others and there are some which fund the provision of street litter bins;

: the deployment and effectiveness of street cleansing resources within the Rotherham town centre was highlighted;

: the importance of high-level campaigning (eg: the Tidy Britain Group) and the possible involvement of schools; specific cleansing for events, eg: the 'Clean for the Queen' initiative, celebrating the forthcoming 90th birthday of Queen Elizabeth II; various 'spring clean' and clean-up events were being arranged during the period March to June 2016;

: the problem of litter on principal roads and highways and whether it would be possible to close such roads, temporarily, to assist street cleansing operations; sometimes the expense of traffic management schemes and partial lane closures (necessary for the safety of the workforce on the highway) served to limit the number of occasions on which such street cleansing took place;

: the use of mobile and covert cameras to try and prevent fly-tipping in rural areas;

: whether it would be possible to extend the Rothercard system, by the introduction of a small fee, to persons who do not currently meet the criteria for Rothercard; members requested further information about this issue;

: principal local authorities (eg: Borough/District/County Councils) are responsible for keeping clean all public land and roads within their boundaries, apart from roads which are the responsibility of the Highways Agency; the Borough Council cannot transfer its statutory duty and responsibility for street cleansing to other organisations (eg: Parish Councils), even though it is permissible to use agency arrangements for the carrying out of the actual work on the ground.

Thanks were expressed to all of the Elected Members, co-opted members and officers who have contributed to the work of this Task and Finish Group.

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

(2) That the scrutiny review report of Litter and Fly Tipping, together with its recommendations, be supported and be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and to the Cabinet and Commissioners for further consideration.

(3) That, further to resolution (2) above, the Improving Places Select Commission supports the proposal to appoint an officer to the post of 'Love My Streets' Co-ordinator (as referred to in the recommendations of this scrutiny review).

(4) That, whilst acknowledging the limitations imposed by the reducing public sector revenue budgets, the Improving Places Select Commission encourages the increasing use of co-ordinated working and partnership working between statutory and community/voluntary organisations, in terms of effective and consistent street cleansing.

(5) That Elected Members be informed of the various events being organised in respect of the 'Clean for the Queen' initiative during 2016.

45. IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

Discussion took place on the draft work programme for the Improving Places Select Commission for the 2016/2017 Municipal Year. The following suggested topics were discussed:-

(a) a broad theme concerning the commercialisation of some of the Council's services, including income generation (eg: business rates);

(b) a scrutiny review of RIDO (the Rotherham Investment and Development Office);

(c) Air Quality throughout the Rotherham Borough area;

(d) a cross-cutting review of the contribution of the scrutiny function to the achievement of the outcomes in the Council's improvement plan;

(e) a cross-cutting review of the impact of service changes and budget reductions on specific Council services, highlighting the way in which services may operate in the future (eg: the youth service);

(f) the possible re-establishment of the Recycling Group (a working group of Elected Members considering the wider benefits of and encouraging increases in the recycling of waste materials).

Members acknowledged that the use of the Task and Finish Groups by this Select Commission, during 2015/16, had been successful and ought to continue.

Resolved:- That, taking into consideration the suggested topics now discussed, a further report on the 2016/2017 draft work programme be submitted to the next meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
26th February, 2016

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Hughes, Pitchley, J. Turner, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Also in attendance : Councillor Atkin (Task and Finish Group Chair, in respect of item 114).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck, Cowles, Hamilton, Mallinder and Sansome.

110. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

111. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

112. ADULT SERVICES BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 DECEMBER 2015

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Interim Director of Adult Social Services containing the forecast outturn position for Adult Social Services to 31st March, 2016, based on actual income and expenditure to 31st December, 2015.

The report stated that the forecast is for an overall overspend of £1.038 millions against a net revenue budget of £69.111 millions. The principal budget pressures are due to the increase in demand for services mainly in respect of direct payments and residential care placements. These pressures are being reduced by non-recurrent grant funding plus a number of actions including reviews of high cost placements and efficiency savings targets to ensure tight financial management.

Members' discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

- specific budget pressures (eg: demographic pressure, as people live to and older age; the introduction of the national living wage);
- the measures being taken to manage expenditure on Adult Social Care effectively during the current financial year have been put in place and will be included in future budget monitoring reports;
- the use of Task Groups to review spending and cost effectiveness on specific issues (eg: direct payments) and ensuring that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health is briefed regularly on the progress of the Task Groups' work;

- the increasing costs, nationally, of adult residential care placements;
- the residential care service providers which have contracts with the Council are all required to pay at least the minimum wage to their employees;
- a regular review is undertaken of the use of agency staff within Adult Social Care (Members requested further details about this matter).

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

(2) That the latest financial forecast against budget for 2015/16 and the actions being taken to mitigate the budget pressures facing Adult Social Services, as described in the report now submitted, be noted.

113. RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 71 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 11th December, 2015, consideration was given to a report presented by the Interim Corporate Risk Manager containing the main areas of progress with the Council's Risk Management Strategy. The report stated that, in response to the criticism of the Council's approach to risk management, as expressed in the report by Louise Casey (January, 2015), the subsequent Corporate Improvement Plan for the Council included the following actions designed to re-invigorate risk management:-

- : produce a revised risk management policy and strategy;
- : roll out new risk management arrangements to managers, the Cabinet, Scrutiny Members and to the Audit Committee;
- : complete a new strategic risk register; and
- : complete new operational risk registers.

Members noted that there were several key elements of further work required, including:-

- : the need to refine further the Council's risk management approach – a process which may possibly take several years;
- : actions needed to embed risk management throughout the Council, especially in terms of service planning;
- : the future proposals for the overall responsibility for risk management.

Discussion took place on the following salient issues:-

- the regular reporting (at intervals of six weeks) of the Council's risk register to the Senior Leadership team, chaired by the Chief Executive;

- the use of ‘Sharepoint’ computer software, so that all risk registers may be shared by Directorates and be available online;
- there are risk registers now in place for each individual Directorate and they are being monitored regularly;
- sharing the risk registers with this Council’s partner organisations and developing a specific risk register for the partnership arrangement itself;
- each Directorate has an officer undertaking the role of ‘risk champion’ and together they attend meetings both to share information and to avoid the pitfalls of silo working; it was suggested that the risk champions from each Directorate should report periodically to the appropriate Select Commission;
- the sharing of good practice in risk management across the Council;
- a specific reference to child sexual exploitation and its absence from the Council’s risk registers until 2013/14;
- the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Budgeting is currently the lead Member for Internal Audit and Risk Management and the newly-appointed Assistant Chief Executive will have the officer responsibility for risk management.

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

114. SCRUTINY REVIEW - LITTER AND FLYTIPPING

Further to Minute No. 44 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 24th February, 2016, consideration was given to a report, presented by Councillor A. Atkin (Chair of the Task and Finish Group), concerning the work of the Litter and Fly Tipping Task and Finish Group, which had now completed its review of the problem of the increase of litter and fly tipping within the Rotherham Borough area. The review was one of a number of reviews of service areas within Environment and Development Services, identified by the Commissioners and Elected Members as priority scrutiny reviews to take place during 2015/2016.

The report stated that the review had been undertaken against a background of annual revenue budget reductions for both street cleansing and enforcement duties and also the perception that enforcement was not necessarily effective in changing behaviour in respect of reducing littering and fly tipping.

Members considered the contents of the full report of this scrutiny review and its recommendations.

Discussion took place on the following specific issues:-

- the importance of both education and enforcement measures in attempting to reduce the amount of littering and fly tipping; such measures are labour-intensive; it was noted that budget reductions and the consequent staffing reductions have produced a consequent reduction in the number of prosecutions for both littering and fly tipping;
- the proposal to establish an officer post of ‘Love My Streets’ Co-ordinator is now the subject of further consideration (after one unsuccessful attempt to fill the post);
- whether it would be possible for public information messages encouraging a ‘cleaner Rotherham’ to be displayed periodically on the electronic information screens now located adjacent to some of the principal roads in the Borough area.

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

(2) That the scrutiny review report of Litter and Fly Tipping, together with its recommendations, be supported and be forwarded to the Cabinet and to the Commissioners for further consideration.

115. NEW HOMES BONUS - GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Head of Policy, Improvement and Partnerships concerning the Council’s draft response to the Department for Communities and Local Government consultation on the future of the New Homes Bonus. The deadline for responses to this consultation was Thursday, 10th March, 2016.

The report stated that this consultation was technical in nature, seeking views on options to change the New Homes Bonus, including: reducing the number of years in which current and future payments are made from six to four; the introduction of a “deadweight” threshold for payments; and disallowing the New Homes Bonus for houses built after planning appeals, which will take effect in 2017/18, with major changes from 2018/19 onwards.

The stated aim is to better reflect local authorities’ delivery of new housing and save £800 millions on the New Homes Bonus budget. Savings on the bonus, according to the consultation document “will be redistributed with the local government settlement, in particular to support authorities with specific pressures, such as in Adult Social Care budgets.” Specifically, based on the Chancellor of the Exchequer’s Autumn statement and the November, 2015 spending review, the savings will part fund a £1.5 billions increase in the Better Care Fund.

Members debated the following issues:-

- the Council's protocol of requiring all Government consultation documents to be considered initially by the scrutiny process (this protocol will feature in the new terms of governance for the Council);
- Local authorities must have a Local Plan in place in order to ensure receipt of the New Homes Bonus;
- this Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy, from 2017/18 onwards, may have to be reviewed and amended as a consequence of the proposed changes to the New Homes Bonus;
- this Council's response to the consultation on the New Homes Bonus shall be consistent with the response to the Government's earlier consultation on proposed changes to national planning policy (Minute No. 87 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 22nd January, 2016, refers);
- it was clarified that the standard definition of 'affordable homes' refers to residential properties which are priced (for sale/purchase) at 80% of their actual market value;
- the prevalence of brownfield, industrial and contaminated land within the Rotherham Borough area, some situated in remoter, 'out-of-town' locations; the requirement for the construction of the necessary infrastructure to ensure access to such sites means that they will probably be more costly to develop;
- affirmation of the Council's suggested response, as now reported, that the New Homes Bonus should be allocated in cases where development has been granted on appeal, after initial refusal of an application for planning permission by the Local Planning Authority.

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

(2) That the draft response, now submitted, be endorsed and the comments and views now expressed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be considered further by the Council's Executive and/or by the Commissioners, for inclusion within this Council's response to the Government's consultation on the New Homes Bonus.

116. WELFARE REFORM, BENEFIT SANCTIONS, AND TACKLING POVERTY AND INEQUALITY

Further to Minute No. 136 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 20th May, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Head of Policy, Improvement and Partnerships and by the Policy and Partnerships Officer, providing an update on key developments with the Government's welfare reform, as follows:-

- : developments following the scrutiny review of the Government's sanctions and conditionality regime in Rotherham, reported in March 2014; and following commissioning by the Government of Matthew Oakley (former Economic Advisor to the Treasury and later Head of Economics and Social Policy at the Policy Exchange), his report published in July 2014";
- : the new set of welfare reform proposals introduced by the Government after the General Election of 7th May, 2015, including the Welfare Reform and Work Bill currently before Parliament;
- : the Household Benefit Cap and the consequent issues affecting the Child Tax Credit;
- : child poverty and 'life chances';
- : Government proposals in respect of young people aged 18 to 21 years who are in receipt of the Universal Credit; the proposals include the removal of the automatic entitlement to housing benefit for people in this age group;
- : the Government announcement (July 2015 Budget) of a National Living Wage for people aged 25 years and over.

The report also outlined the strategic approach being taken by this Council, alongside its partner organisations, to tackling poverty in the Rotherham Borough area.

Members discussed the following salient issues:-

- the passage of the Welfare Reform and Work Bill through Parliament; the probable date on which this piece of legislation would receive Royal Assent was not yet known;
- issues affecting Rotherham households (eg: those households which will be affected by the benefits cap)
- the probable impact of the proposed legislation on this Council's Housing Inclusion Strategy and the Housing Revenue Account;
- the scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' sanctions and conditionality regime (Minute No. 136 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 20th May, 2014 refers); the aim of the organisations within the Rotherham Partnership to establish a local working protocol and whether this could be achieved as part of the Sheffield City Region devolution process;

- whether the Department for Work and Pensions may allow the mandatory reconsideration process to be carried out locally, instead of via the decision-making/processing centre in Hanley, Staffordshire;
- the role, function and effectiveness of this Council's welfare reform steering group – the desirability of effective partnership working with other appropriate organisations; involving both Executive and Scrutiny Elected Members in the work of this steering group;
- the specific impact of the Government's welfare reform on young people aged 18 to 21 years; the difficulty of assessing the likely impact until the Government's reform has been implemented in full;
- whether there is an accurate figure available of the number of apprenticeships available in the Rotherham Borough area;
- whether information is yet available about the Sheffield City Region devolved skills budget; Members acknowledged the advantages of there being a single organisation responsible for the co-ordination of the adult skills agenda;
- it was noted that, with effect from 1 April, 2016, the back-dating of housing benefit claims will be restricted to four weeks
- there is already specific monitoring, by this Council, of the effects of welfare reform upon people in Rotherham, given the concerns about multiple deprivation and child poverty; these aspects will feature in the future reports submitted to meetings of Elected Members;
- it was also acknowledged that the recommendations of the scrutiny review of the Department for Work and Pensions' sanctions and conditionality regime, as referred to above, have effectively been negated by subsequent changes in legislation; however, the implementation of the review's recommendations does still have relevance in the context of the welfare reform and should still be monitored (for example, the information about benefits sanctions, as published by the Department for Work and Pensions, is not always clear and helpful);
- it was noted that the independent review of the operation of the Jobseeker's Allowance sanctions, undertaken by Matthew Oakley (July 2014) and referred to above, had contained similar recommendations to this Council's scrutiny review, referred to above;
- future reports to Elected Members, about the welfare reform, should include reference to the Financial Inclusion Strategy of this Council;

- there was value in the Council collecting its own statistics, as well as anecdotal evidence of the impact of welfare reform on individual households, in part because it appeared that the Department of Work and Pensions' own figures are not yet precise;
- the intention of Government is to implement the welfare reform in stages across the country during the next twelve months, to ensure implementation throughout the whole country by March, 2017); however, there has been no specific implementation date yet announced for the Rotherham Borough area;
- specific support, in terms of understanding the practicality of the welfare reform and the Government's concept of 'life chances', may ultimately be required by people who have learning difficulties and also by people who do not have immediate access to ICT services and to the Internet, etc.;
- specific concerns relating to child poverty and the likelihood of the enactment of the Welfare Reform and Work Bill ultimately resulting in the repeal of the Child Poverty Act 2010; it was noted that the House of Lords and the House of Commons appeared currently to have differing views about this issue.

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

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board shall continue to monitor the key developments with the Government's welfare reform and the appropriate officers shall submit progress reports to the Management Board at intervals of three months and such reports shall include relevant statistics for each electoral Ward of the Borough area.

117. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues to report.

118. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board expressed its gratitude to the members of the Rotherham Youth Cabinet, Commissioner Newsam, Scrutiny officers and other officers of this Council and also to the representatives of the various organisations who had all participated in and contributed to the Children's Commissioner Take-over Day meeting, concerning mental health issues affecting children and young people, which had been held on Tuesday evening, 23rd February, 2016.

119. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12TH FEBRUARY, 2016

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 12th February, 2016 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

120. WORK IN PROGRESS

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

Councillor Pitchley, Vice-Chair of the Improving Lives Select Commission, reported that the Select Commission will continue to consider issues affecting the Rotherham Safeguarding Children Board and the detailed scrutiny will be undertaken by sub-groups.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

Councillor Whelbourn, Vice-Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission, reported that the recent meeting of the Select Commission had considered the following matters:-

Litter and fly tipping – report of the review undertaken by the Task and Finish Group;

Improving Places - scrutiny work programme 2016/17 – suggested topics include a review of the commercialisation of Council services (eg: the Rotherham Investment and Development Office).

Health Select Commission:-

It was noted that the Chair of the Health Select Commission, Councillor Sansome, was today attending a meeting of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which was being held in Leeds.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
18th March, 2016**

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

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

121. DEBORAH FELLOWES

The Chairman referred to the recent retirement of Deborah Fellowes.

The Board wished to record their appreciation of Deborah's hard work on their behalf and wish her well for the future.

122. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

123. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

124. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues to report.

125. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, reported that following the Children's Commissioner Takeover Challenge Day on 23rd February, 2016, a meeting had been set up for with the young people on 6th April, 2016, to discuss the recommendations and produce a report.

The report would be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at a future date.

126. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 23RD AND 26TH FEBRUARY 2016

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 23rd and 26th February, 2016, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

127. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST DECEMBER 2015

Further to Minute No. 19 of the Cabinet/Commissioner meeting held on 15th February, 2016, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Interim Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services, containing details of progress on the delivery of the Council's current year Revenue Budget for 2015/16 based on performance to 31st December, 2015. The Revenue Budget currently forecast an outturn of £8.816m (+4.3%) above budget. The forecast outturn position had deteriorated by £197k since the November 2015 monitoring report.

Key pressures contributing to the forecast overspend (£8.816m) were:-

- Additional needs-led demand pressures within Children's Services partially mitigated by reduced forecast spend in Neighbourhoods and Environment and Development Services
- Subject to Commissioner approval, £5.326m one-off funding could be made available to help mitigate the current forecast overspend to support the forecast overspend in 2015/16
- The continuing service demand and agency staffing cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children across the Borough and the strengthening of Social Work and management capacity;
- Demand pressures for Direct Payments within Older People and Physical and Sensory Disability clients and clients with Mental Health needs

A moratorium on all 'non-essential' spend was in place with Managers closely scrutinising orders to ensure they met the 'essential spend criteria' before orders were placed. Managers were also scrutinising the daily spend analysis reports which provided details of orders placed the previous day and provided an opportunity for orders to be challenged, reprioritised or rejected before the contractual commitment was incurred. Staff within the Procurement Team were also closely reviewing orders being placed and, where appropriate, making further enquiries to ensure spend met the 'essential' criteria.

A number of 2016/17 budget savings proposals had already been agreed (some only requiring Officer approval through delegated powers) which would also contribute towards in-year savings in 2015/16. As the proposals materialised, their impact on the forecast outturn would be reflected in future revenue budget monitoring reports.

Additionally, the financial impact of any decisions to release staff through voluntary severance or voluntary early retirement would be factored in to future budget monitoring reports at the earliest opportunity. It was expected that these decisions would reduce the current forecast overspend.

In order to deliver on the tighter deadlines being imposed to finalise the Council's Annual Accounts, it was proposed that next month's revenue monitoring report, April 2015 to January 2016, would be the Council's 2015/16 Estimated Outturn report which would be considered by Cabinet on 11th April. In the event that anything was identified during the initial period of closing down the annual accounts in late March which was sufficiently material to warrant alerting Members urgently, a separate report would be produced for consideration.

Members' discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

- The Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive were keen for forensic accounting and reporting of agency and consultancy spend to gain a better understanding of when and why they were used and alignment to workforce planning
- The estimated outturn report would be submitted to the 11th April Cabinet and then to the Board
- The budget saving for the Imagination Library, agreed in the 2015/16 budget setting, would not be fully implemented due to contractual notification termination
- Although the HR Payroll Service Centre was showing an overspend position this was being offset
- There would always be a need for agency staff in areas principally staffed by manual workers to cover holidays and sickness absence. This was mainly within waste, highways, construction, building cleaning and catering services
- The Commissioning Agreement Framework had recently been re-let and Duttons were the Authority's preferred supplier. However, they had a hierarchy of agreements with suppliers they used. There had been a separate procurement exercise for Social Care and Social Workers and had their own separate Commissioning Framework Agreement
- There was generic working across Highways and the gritting teams; it was not known if the same arrangement was in place for Waste
- It was not known if the agencies supplying staff used zero hours contracts. It was suggested that the Authority should consider having its own bank of staff they could call upon as and when required
- Was it cheaper to pay someone overtime or use agency staff?

- The Government had proposed that from 2017/18 the closing down of public and private accounts be brought forward to the end of May. The Authority was on course to meet this requirement and estimates would be used much more; KPMG were very much supportive of the approach. The accounts would be subject to audit in July. Rotherham had a strong track record on delivering accounts with no major adjustments
- Adult Social Care was a national issue. The aim of the Better Care Fund was to move people through the system more effectively and seamlessly, tried to manage the demand on the A&E and hospital services and prevent progression to Adult Social Care. The Government had introduced the Adult Social Care precept for the 2016/17 financial year which the majority of local authorities who had Social Care responsibility had taken up to help mitigate some of the financial pressures in adult social care
- It was known that the funding the precept would generate would not be sufficient
- Additional capacity had been required within Legal Services to deal with the enquiries, investigations and requests for information arising from the Jay and Casey reports. This was to be reviewed by the newly appointed Assistant Director of Legal Services. There had also been additional business support costs as the senior management team had increased. This was to be reviewed by the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive
- If the information required to fulfil a Freedom of Information request did not exceed 18½ hours it was provided free of charge
- Income targets were reported within the budget monitoring report

Resolved:- That the forecast overspend and the need to maintain continuous close scrutiny of spend to significantly mitigate the current forecast overspend be noted.

128. CYPs BUDGET MONITORING

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services, stating that, as part of its performance and control framework, the Council was required to produce regular reports for the Directorate Leadership team and advisors to keep them informed of forecast financial performance on a timely basis such that where necessary, actions can be agreed and implemented to bring spending in line with the approved budget for the financial year. The submitted report contained details of spending against budget by the Children and Young People's Services Directorate covering the first ten months of the 2015/16 financial year, April 2015 to January 2016, as well as the forecast costs and income to 31st March, 2016.

Members' discussion of this report highlighted the following salient issues:-

- The Directorate had a much better understanding of cost drivers and a grip on expenditure. A lot of work had been undertaken on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) alongside the change programme - poor quality services cost much more
- Rotherham's spend was considerable more than its statistical neighbours on children looked after in the care system. Over the last 7 years whilst nationally costs had increased for children looked after in the care system by 11%, in Rotherham they had increased by 84%
- Far too many children were placed outside the Rotherham boundary
- The "Be a Hero" fostering campaign had generated enquiries. 18 potential foster carers were currently undertaking assessment plus receipt of 16 expressions of interest. If approved, they would add to the growing numbers of foster carers who fostered for Rotherham, however, the payment rates need to be addressed as they were currently not competitive
- Some of the additional costs for the leadership posts had been built into the Council's MTFS whilst some were one-off with a known end of contract date
- The Government's announcement about an all academy system could have far reaching implications especially if a school chose not to buy back services from the local authority
- The Directorate's developing MTFS was distinct from what had been agreed with corporate colleagues; CYPS was looking at a 5 year transformation
- The investment had made a difference so far which had been confirmed by 3 Ofsted visits, however, there was much more work to do to embed quality consistently. The Directorate had worked on the critical areas such as the front door (Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)) which was where the referrals came in and the Council had to get that right
- More funding had been put into CSE investigation (Evolve) – Ofsted had confirmed that it was working much more effectively
- The Authority was still accountable for the care provided by independent foster carer agencies. All children had an allocated Social Worker and there was oversight by the Independent Reviewing Officer. Legally they were still the Local Authority's responsibility

- The Virtual Head budget had lost some grants and had an overspend of £121k. It had been 1 of the budget lines that had suffered when schools had delegated the centrally held funds leaving the Directorate with the budget pressure. The Virtual School was about supporting children in care with their education and children in the care system; compared with their counterparts nationally they had always performed poorly but in Rotherham that situation was worse. Use of the Pupil Premium Plus for children in care more innovatively and building expenditure requirements into the MTFS were being explored
- Rotherham's virtual school was deliberately more generous than other areas. The statutory requirement under the Children and Families Act was to have a virtual head teacher only, however, Rotherham had advocates for primary, secondary and post-16 to engender a sense of ambition for the children in the care system
- As at the end of January, 2016, there were 185 children in in-house foster places and 130 with independent foster carers. The independent foster placements cost approximately 3 times more than a local authority foster carer. The independent foster carer agencies tended to take the more complex children as they were equipped/resourced and the carers trained to manage the more complex behaviour of the more damaged young people. Rotherham was looking to develop a training scheme for its own foster carers in an attempt to bring more children back to Rotherham
- Independent foster carers were independent private sector organisations that set their own rates. The cost was driven by demand and the amount of supply in the market and, as the Authority had contracted supply locally, they could charge what they wanted. Quite often the Directorate found itself searching for an emergency place for a child for which the costs were exorbitant. It was the Local Authority's gift as leaders of the system to develop the market and a sufficiency strategy and ensure that it delivered. On 14th March the Cabinet had approved the introduction of 21 foster carer agencies operating and conducting their business in Rotherham which would send a signal to providers that the Authority was open for business.
- An additional 29 Social Workers had been added to the establishment. The Authority had had to be smart about retaining its existing Social Workers; an annual retention allowance had been put into place which had stabilised the workforce. The additional allowance and wage structure had been built into the MTFS, therefore, the recurrent assumption was there as part of planning going forward.

- A way of managing demand as well as reducing the number of looked after children was to intervene early before the needs of the families escalated. The new Early Help Service, stepping down from Social Care to Early Help, was starting to gain some traction with Early Help Panels introduced from 9th February. Since then, 99 children (39 families) had been stepped down which eased the pressure on Social Workers. Caseloads would continue to be monitored with a target range of between 16 and 22 that Social Workers could operate safely with the complexity of the cases also being taken into consideration. The knowledge that Social Workers would be supported by the organisation, lower workloads and Early Help, helped with the recruitment drive
- The Directorate had a 5 year plan that not only talked about bringing it within budget but saving against where it was now if operated in a much more efficient way with strategic commissioning and productivity. However, some investment was required for that to happen

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

(2) That the following recommendation, as contained in the report now submitted, be supported by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

To re-affirm the Directorate Leadership Team Resource Management Group will drive forward actions which are already in place (without causing any significant adverse impact on service delivery):

- An ongoing 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;
- Continue negotiations with partners about commissioning and joint levels of funding;
- Tight control of non-staffing budgets;
- Implement any 2016/17 budget savings proposals at the earliest appropriate opportunity (i.e. subject to clearance through appropriate approval mechanisms) both to guarantee full year effect of the saving in 2016/17 and contribute to mitigating the forecast overspend in 2015/16;
- Propose any further measures which may be implemented to help mitigate the current forecast overspend for 2015/16, and

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board notes:

- The basis, including caveats, on which the current forecast is based;
- The Children and Young People's Services Directorate Leadership Team Resource Management approach to budget control and efficiencies;
- The Directorate Sufficiency Strategy for Looked After Children and Care Leavers' plans to reduce the costs specifically in the area of Looked After Children.

129. FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

The Chairman introduced the March-August, 2016 Forward Plan.

It was noted that the format of the Plan was to change from the start of the 2016/17 Municipal Year and would include expenditure and exempt decisions that required 28 days' notice to allow representations to be made.

The revised Plan would be submitted to a future meeting.

130. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission

The Commission had met the previous day and had received presentations on:-

Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Account
Better Care Fund
RDaSH Quality Account

Improving Places Select Commission

Councillor Whelbourn reported that the Commission had not met since the last update.

Improving Lives Select Commission

Councillor Hamilton reported that the next meeting was to be held on 6th April, 2016.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

The Chairman reported that he had recently met Shokat Lol, Assistant Chief Executive. The new Democratic Services Manager would take up the post in April.

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

There were no issues referred for call-in.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
21st April, 2016

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hughes and Reynolds.

132. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

133. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

134. IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION TASK AND FINISH GROUP'S REPORT ON WASTE MANAGEMENT

Councillor Beck, Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission, presented the findings and recommendations of a Scrutiny Review undertaken by the Commission into Waste Management.

A Task and Finish Group had been established and considered options in relation to Household Waste Recycling centres, re-use facilities, collection of bulky items, green waste collections, kerbside collections of bric-a-brac and collection of commercial waste.

Listed within the report were both the original terms of reference of the Review and the ten recommendations arising therefrom. A copy of the full report of the Review was included with the documents submitted.

During discussion of the report, Members raised the following salient issues:-

- Opportunities for income generation through the collection/disposal of commercial and non-domestic waste;
- Possibility of an additional service with a third sector provider would be welcomed
- Efforts would be made to encourage more residents to compost green waste
- Making it as easy as possible to dispose of waste at Household Waste Recycling Centres would help reduce flytipping together with enforcement action

Resolved:- That the report be noted and forwarded to Commissioners and Cabinet for their consideration.

135. 2015 EDUCATION PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Karen Borthwick, Assistant Director of Education and Skills, presented an overview of the educational outcomes of children and young people in primary and secondary schools for the academic year ending in the summer of 2015.

Pupil outcomes in Rotherham had increased year on year in many areas. Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 outcomes were still below the national average for a number of Indicators, however, the gap to the national average had reduced significantly. Early Years Foundation Stage and Key Stage 4 outcomes had exceeded the national average for a number of years.

The report set out further information under the headings of:-

- Early Years Foundation Profile – Gender, Free School Meals
- Early Years: Key Priorities
- Key Stage 1 – Phonics, Gender, Pupil Premium. Assessments
- Key Stage 2
- Key Stage 4

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- It would be possible to ascertain the benefits (if any) of children receiving free school meals with regard to their performance in examinations due to the children in Key Stage 1 currently receiving the meals. There was no current evidence to support this issue
- Rotherham mirrored the national patterns of different performance for boys and girls (with girls outperforming boys). The report was generic and covered the whole of the Borough of which there were some areas of outstanding performance. The challenge that all schools faced was ensuring that both genders achieved well and were excited by learning. Schools were aware of the issues and had action plans in place. There was evidence of where specific action had taken place improvements had been made
- The responsibility for careers education and the guidance element of the curriculum rested very much with the school. It was important that the school developed appropriate information and guidance for young people, raising their aspirations and making it clear about the pathways into apprenticeships, vocational work or onto further learning and employment. The Local Authority was very much focussed on developing enterprise and also linkages with employers. It worked as part of the Sheffield City Region developing links

between schools and employers with the aim that all schools would have a link to an employer

There had been a good response across the whole City Region but specifically in Rotherham with some of the first schools picking up that opportunity where the school would be linked with an employer so that employer could engage with the school in terms of the education offer and information, advice and guidance. It also gave a real insight into the Labour Market Information about the growing opportunities for young people within the labour market. Special schools had also taken up the opportunity and this was starting to influence some of the employers about their attitude to working with and offering employment opportunities to children with SEND

- The Local Authority was aiming to ensure that schools had an opportunity to meet with employers on a fairly regular basis to share information about the emerging curriculum and making sure that it had relevance to the local economy and the economy of the future within Rotherham
- It was essential that a Local Authority had good relationships with schools and academies in order to undertake its Safeguarding responsibilities and to ensure that there was a vibrant successful learning environment across the Borough
- The Authority's performance at KS2 was significantly better than it had been. Over the past five years the performance had improved greatly in terms of comparison with the rest of Yorkshire and the Humber and nationally. The gap on national performance had been closed considerably and the outcomes improved for children and young people
- Overall performance in the early years indicated that children were making good progress. It would be difficult to make comparisons next year due to the criteria for assessment changing
- The number of schools that were falling below the floor (the basic level which the Government said schools should reach) had declined, therefore, the quality of education across the Borough had improved
- The report was a general overview of performance across the Borough. A separate more detailed report would be required for specific performance of children from BAME groups
- All schools were expected to track the outcomes of Pupil Premium (PP) and include such on their website. There was evidence of good practice with PP and a review group had been established with the more successful to share the good practice

- It was a huge challenge for schools in ensuring consistency of progress/monitoring of children. Central Government had moved away from the very centralised and organised approach with levels and national curriculum. The local authority was no longer in a position to dictate the use of assessment techniques or how schools collected or recorded. Work took place with schools and academies to share good practice but it was for them to make those decisions

It was suggested that a meeting take place to consider the new assessment framework which would be implemented this year in detail, possibly with some Head Teachers, as this would probably be their biggest challenge looking to understanding what the new assessment framework would look like, how their performance would look and how their performance would be measured and recorded

- Initial Inspection judgements were confidential but as soon as they were in the public arena there would be no difficulty in including Ward Members into the notification. The number of inspections this year had been much lower than previously
- The White Paper set out an aspiration that local authorities would not have the responsibility for running schools; responsibilities for school place planning, supporting the most vulnerable children and being a champion for Children and Young People and Families would remain. It would be useful to look at the White Paper and its implications. A number of local authority areas had expressed concern about being able to deliver some of the expectations contained within e.g. ensuring the right number of school places for children in the right places.

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

(2) That a meeting be scheduled to consider the implication of the White Paper for the Borough as part of the Scrutiny work programme.

136. ADULT SERVICES BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 JANUARY, 2016

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Interim Strategic Director of Adult Care and Housing containing the forecast outturn position for Adult Care and Support to 31st March, 2016, based on actual income and expenditure to 31st January, 2016.

The report stated that the forecast was for an overall overspend of £0.051m against a net revenue budget of £69.782m. The principal budget pressures were due to the increase in demand for services mainly in respect of direct payments and residential care placements. These pressures were being reduced by non-recurrent grant funding plus a number of actions including reviews of high cost placements and efficiency savings targets to ensure tight financial management.

Members' discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

- Acknowledgement that it would be useful to have someone who was in receipt of direct payments as part of the Direct Payments Task Group
- Consultation was taking place with other local authorities in similar positions to that of Rotherham to learn from their experiences
- It was the aim to have a fully integrated Children's and Adult Services. It was essential colleagues in Children's and Adult Services worked together positively. Discussions had taken place between the two Strategic Directors to set the approach and tone
- The estimated cost for Rotherham arising from the Living Wage was estimated to be £3.3M. The 2% precept would raise half. This issue would need to be addressed as the Authority faced significant pressures from a number of areas and would grow
- The review of all residential care placements within Learning Disabilities was underway and hopefully would be completed shortly. There were currently nineteen out of Borough placements. There were monthly performance meetings of the Adult Care Development Programme which were reported to the Cabinet Member and Commissioner Myers
- There were severe budget targets and there was confidence that they would be met although it was acknowledged that there were significant variations amongst the budget headings particularly for Physical and Sensory Disabilities. Dedicated officers were reviewing this budget heading and progress was being made

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

(2) That the latest financial forecast against budget for 2015/16 and the actions being taken to mitigate the budget pressures facing Adult Social Services, as described in the report now submitted, be noted.

(3) That a further report be submitted on Physical and Sensory Disabilities particularly in relation to the projected variance of the budget.

137. COMMUNITY ASSETS AND MAPPING UPDATE - ADULT SOCIAL CARE

The Interim Strategic Director of Adult Care and Housing, presented an update on the work that had been undertaken to date and set out the scale of the challenge and the need to invest in an integrated approach to improve the Authority's offer for Community Assets in Rotherham.

As part of the Adult Social Care Development Programme, there had been a specific piece of work around Community Assets which had formed one of the five key areas of work within the Programme. The Community Assets Board consisted of a multi-agency approach and was responsible for delivering on the required outcomes for Adult Social Care.

Frank Markham, Enabling Services, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Thriving Communities

- Under the Care Act, a move from assessing people for services and packages of care to assessing how the local authority could improve their outcomes for leading a quality life
- That must entail utilising community assets to provide people with the opportunity to “thrive” and not just “survive”
- Our obligation is not met when we put in place homecare to address a need arising from an inability to do a daily living task
- We have to go beyond this but not through using even more resources but using community assets and services and resources provided by other organisations
- We can achieve this by working in partnership and improving our offer to customers which gives them more choice and control over their lives
- To achieve the outcome of Thriving Communities we need to have a rich mix of activities within our communities and encourage participation and engagement from all

Information Sharing

- So we know we need to improve the way we share information and get smarter at what we do
- We know that we have lots of activity within Rotherham and lots of good practice but we are not very good at sharing our information
- Over the last seven months Adult Social Care have concentrated on looking at what Rotherham has to offer in respect to community groups, voluntary groups and what the use of the assets we have

Our aim is for a seamless system but at the moment this is what we hold:-

- Lots of data about activities within communities in different formats and different systems
- We cannot continue to operate in a fragmented way – it is not helpful to officers and does not provide the best services for the citizens of Rotherham

How do we move forward?

- By having an integrated approach and investing in one system that holds all information including a visual element
- We need to share information between colleagues and partners and take ownership for keeping our information up-to-date and then promote this with our customers and citizens of Rotherham

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 21/04/16

- The report set out what we want to achieve and why
- The scale of the task needs to be acknowledged and we will be appointing officers to start this piece of work within the next few weeks (Information and Advice Officers)

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

- There should be a corporate approach to community assets. The Community Assets Board was one of the project boards under the Adult Social Care Development Programme and had representation from across the Council, Health Services, the third sector and community groups. There was a commitment to ensuring Members were at the forefront as they had the links and the knowledge
- Really good links had started to be built with the Social Prescribing Team at Voluntary Action Rotherham and within the Council. It was recognised that there was a need to build on that work. Corporately, isolation and isolation had been mapped and will start to layer so know where to target and focus energies
- It would be useful for Members to have access to the overarching directory to provide input as well as gain information. Once the Link Workers and Information Advice Workers were in post it would be helpful for them to report back to the Board
- The software purchased for the MASH would provide an integrated approach and the sharing of data between Children's, Adults, Health (including GPs) and Mental Health Services. It was hoped to also build Connect to Support into the system

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member, Adult Social Care and Health, agreed with the integrated approach to community assets as being the way forward and there had been a series of meeting between the various Directors.

He also shared concerns about the software purchased which was initially being run in Children's Services and would then be shared with the other Directorates

Resolved:- That the report and actions to date be noted.

138. RESPONSE TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STARTER HOMES REGULATIONS

Nick Ward, Housing Development Manager, presented the Council's proposed response to Central Government on proposed changes to national planning policy. Responses were required to be submitted by 18th May, 2016.

The Government had committed to building 200,000 high quality starter homes exclusively for young first time buyers under the age of forty to be sold at a minimum of 20% below the open market value and subject to the buyer occupying the property for five years.

The consultation document set out a number of questions on which views were sought. Appendix 1 of the report submitted set out the consultation questions together with the proposed response.

Consideration was given to the proposed responses with the following issues raised:-

- There should be reference to the declining industries in Rotherham and the wages that went with them and, as a result, the Starter Home may not be appropriate. 15% below the open market value may be too high for the Rotherham area
- The Government appeared to be backing away from their Localism agenda
- Council houses were needed
- Had consultation taken place with the Equalities Team with regard to question 17?
- Clarification that “local area” as referred to in question 18ii was probably at Ward level due to the number of fluctuations across a Borough

Resolved:- (1) That discussion take place with the Equalities Team with regard to question 17.

(2) That subject to (1) above, the Council’s proposed response be endorsed for submission to Central Government before the consultation deadline of 18th May, 2016.

139. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

No issues had been raised.

However, it was noted that there was a review taking place into Area Assemblies.

Resolved:- That the outcome of review of Area Assemblies be submitted to this Board in due course.

140. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser, reported that Councillor Sansome and Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, had met with the Rotherham Youth Cabinet to discuss the findings of the recent work undertaken at the Children's Commissioner Takeover Day. Discussion had taken place on the recommendations arising out of that meeting and work was taking place on the report which was hoped to be submitted to the Board early in the new Municipal Year.

The Youth Cabinet had had input into the procurement process for the 0-19 contract around the Mental Health Services particularly in relation to access to School Nurses.

Councillor Sansome reported that one of the concerns that the young people had had at the Takeover Day was a number of questions they had raised which they felt had not been answered as clearly as they would wish. It had been discussed that officers from the areas concerned should meet with them in the evening to address concerns.

141. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH MARCH, 2016

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 18th March, 2016 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

142. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission

Councillor Sansome reported that the Commission had met the previous week and received updates on:-

Scrutiny Review of Access to GPS,
Scrutiny Review of CAMHS
Scrutiny Review of Urinary Continence Service

Improving Places Select Commission

Councillor Beck reported that the Commission had met on 13th April and discussed:-

Town Centre Planning document
Housing Tenant Involvement Strategy

Improving Lives Select Commission

Councillor Hamilton reported that at the last meeting the Commission had scrutinised the Prevent agenda. Recommendations on the performance management and governance would be forwarded to the Commissioners and Cabinet for consideration.

A number of areas had been identified that the Select Commission would like to take forward for the new Municipal Year which included Missing from School and Home, Domestic Abuse particularly the effects on children and young people and performance monitoring of Children and Young People's Services.

Audit Committee

Councillor Wyatt reported that the Committee would be meeting the following week and would complete its auditing process of all the Directorates with the "deep dive" into Economic and Development Services and the Assistant Chief Executive reporting on risk management going forward.

143. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

144. SCRUTINY IN 2016/17

The Chairman referred to it being Councillors Hamilton and Whelbourn's last meeting before their retirement as Councillors.

He placed on record his thanks for all their hard work, commitment and efforts on behalf of the people of Rotherham and wished them well in their retirement.

He also reported that he had met the Chief Executive and the Senior Leadership Team. A lot of work was being carried out with regard to pre-Scrutiny. He felt this would be the ideal opportunity for Scrutiny to influence Cabinet decisions and, whatever the outcome of the election, this course of action should be pursued.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
27th May, 2016

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Clark, Cowles, Elliott, Mallinder, Sansome, Julie Turner and Walsh.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Price and Wyatt.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Price and Wyatt.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions.

4. IMPROVING ACCESS TO CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Assistant Chief Executive which detailed the findings of a spotlight scrutiny review undertaken by the Rotherham Youth Cabinet (RYC) in respect of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) in Rotherham. The review was undertaken as part of the Children's Commissioner's Takeover Challenge initiative, which involved young people taking over a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

It was reported that the key focus of the young people's attention was on services provided by Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust (RDaSH), following a major reconfiguration resulting in a new service model for CAMHS). The RYC were keen to explore how that reflected their recommendations for service improvements following publication of the "Mind the Gap" report.

The review had led to eleven recommendations based on the following key issues:

- Improving access to services – opening hours, waiting times and locations
- Using information to improve services
- Ensuring young people have a say in their treatment and care
- Effective services with measurable improved outcomes for young people using services
- Factual information about mental health to reduce stigma

- Improving visibility of school nurses in schools and access to support
- Agencies sharing good practice to improve services

Members welcomed the report and recommendations from the Rotherham Youth Cabinet and indicated that it would be necessary for the Health Select Commission to monitor the response received and the subsequent implementation of the recommendations.

Discussions ranged from the scale and variety of mental health problems amongst young people and how good practice could be shared in future. In endorsing the report, the Board heard from a young person who had been involved in the review and shared her personal experience of a referral to CAMHS, which, in her view, should have been much quicker and could have helped to avoid a deterioration in the condition.

The Chair thanked the Youth Cabinet and support officers for their hard work and report.

Resolved:-

- 1. That the report be received and endorsed.**
- 2. That the final report and recommendations be submitted to Commissioners and the Cabinet for consideration and response.**
- 3. That, when received, the response of Commissioners and the Cabinet to the recommendations be referred to the Health Select Commission.**
- 4. That the thanks of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be conveyed to the Rotherham Youth Cabinet and young people who participated in the review process.**

5. CONSULTATION - LIBRARY STRATEGY AND FUTURE SERVICE OFFER

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment and presented by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services, which sought the Board's views on the consultation documents and proposals in respect of the Library Strategy and future service offer.

It was reported that the draft Library Strategy 2016 – 2019 proposed a vision for Rotherham libraries where:

- Libraries were well used, cost effective and responsive to changing customer needs, available technologies and resources;
- The services offered and enabled would reflect the needs and make up of Rotherham communities;
- Rotherham's children, young people and families would enjoy reading and develop their knowledge and skills, so that they would be able to improve their quality of life and have an opportunity to realise their full potential; and
- Library buildings would be recognised as community hubs, offering welcoming spaces and providing access to modern digital technology.

Savings proposals underpinned the draft strategy and had been developed to ensure that the service could have a sustainable future with a reduced annual budget, with the available financial resources being targeted to best meet the needs of residents.

It was verbally reported that since the consultation had started in March 2016, approximately one thousand responses had been received, with 84% in agreement with the vision for the Library Strategy and 93% in agreement with the proposal to keep sites open. In that time, 72 people had offered to help or volunteer in libraries. It was noted that 78% of respondents could access the internet, but 64% of respondents did not want to opt for e-correspondence.

The Board were interested to note that 62% of non-users were not aware of the services offered in libraries and 22% would not use a library even if they did know. No respondents to the consultation were aware that the council lends e-books, which can be downloaded. Other comments received included "Fines put me off" and "Riverside House is out of town".

Members highlighted accessibility as a concern which had not been given sufficient attention in the past and indicated that the comments about Riverside House being out of the town centre and anecdotal feedback in respect of the locations of other libraries across the borough suggested that libraries needed to be co-located with other services in places that are well positioned. It was also suggested that businesses should be encouraged to provide their services from libraries and a specific example in respect of IT services was cited as being an area of opportunity. Other examples of film clubs, travel agencies and credit unions were also referred to as potential partners for libraries in future.

It was noted that increased use of 'click and collect' was changing the role of the mobile library, which was proposed for withdrawal within the consultation. Figures collated suggested that 400 people use the mobile library, but three-quarters of those using it would be able to access the same service from existing static sites.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the need to generate as much feedback to the consultation as possible and emphasised the future of libraries as being “Buzz, Not Shush”. In response, Members described their passion for the provision of library services and the enthusiasm of their constituents for the services provided.

In summary, the Chair indicated that the Board’s comments should be noted in respect of the consultation. Furthermore, it was expected that the outcome of the consultation and final proposals would be subject to pre-decision scrutiny before final determination by the Cabinet.

Resolved:-

- 1. That the progress report on the consultation on the Library Strategy and future service offer be noted.**
- 2. That the Board’s comments in response to the questions posed by the consultation on the Library Strategy and future service offer be noted.**
- 3. That the Library Strategy and future service offer be subject to pre-decision scrutiny prior to any final decision by the Cabinet.**

6. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

It was reported that no issues had been referred from the Area Assemblies.

7. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

It was reported that there were no issues arising from the Youth Cabinet or Young People.

8. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 21ST APRIL, 2016

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 21 April 2016, be approved as a true and correct of the proceedings for signature by the Chairman.

9. WORK IN PROGRESS (CHAIRS OF SELECT COMMISSIONS TO REPORT)

Councillor Sansome, Chair of the Health Select Commission, reported that he had attended a meeting Sheffield on 23 May 2016 in respect of the ‘Working Together’ programme, where it was reported that a public consultation on work streams would take place from September 2016. Furthermore, the Commission had also submitted statements on the

Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust and the Rotherham Foundation Trust Quality Accounts. Councillor Sansome announced that a briefing would be held on 31 May 2016 for new members to enable them to understand the activity and remit of the Health Select Commission.

As Councillors Clark and Mallinder had been appointed as Chairs of the Improving Lives and Improving Places Select Commissions at the Annual Meeting on 20 May 2016, they did not have any matters to report to the meeting.

Resolved:-

That the activities of the Select Commissions be noted.

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

It was reported that there were no issues from the Cabinet which had been referred for call in.

11. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

It was confirmed that the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board would be held on Friday, 1st July, 2016, commencing at 9.00am.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
16th February, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Cowles, Cutts, Elliot, Ellis, Jepson, Jones, Khan, McNeely, Parker, Pitchley, Reeder, Rose, Sims, Smith, John Turner, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Currie, Hoddinott, Middleton, Pickering, Roche, Sansome and Whelbourn.

MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION.

Councillor C. Read, Leader of the Council, welcomed Stuart Booth, Interim Strategic Director, Resources and Transformation, and Derek Gaffney, Chief Accountant, to the Seminar. A presentation on Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) had been prepared for Elected Members following a question and discussion at a recent Council meeting.

Stuart Booth explained that The Capital Budget (programme) covered the money spent investing on buildings, infrastructure and expensive pieces of equipment: -

- Buying, constructing and improving physical assets;
- Also includes grants and advances made to the private sector/rest of the public sector for capital purposes (e.g. advances to housing associations);
- Assets needed to have a life of more than one year.

Councils finance capital spending through: -

- Revenue budgets – known as **direct revenue financing**;
- **Capital receipts** – money received from the disposal of capital assets is used to repay debt and finance new capital borrowing;
- Councils can **borrow** money to pay for capital assets as long as it is affordable borrowing;
- **Grants and contributions** from Central Government or other organisations;
- **Major Repairs Reserve** is a special reserve that provides capital funding for housing (HRA only).

In April 2004, CIPFA introduced 'The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities'.

- This provided a framework for councils to judge whether capital investment was affordable, prudent and sustainable in the year in question and future years;
- This is a statutory document and councils were required by the Local Government Act (2003) to have regard to it;

- Councils have to prove they are complying with the Prudential Code by a series of prudential indicators set locally and approved alongside the Council budget.

The Council has spent monies on capital in the past. Some had been paid for immediately by capital receipts and capital grants. The balance was the **borrowing need**.

The **Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)** indicated the Council's need to borrow and was calculated from the Balance Sheet. It includes borrowing facilities within the Council's PFI Schemes and Finance Leases.

The CFR (excluding borrowing facilities within the Council's PFI schemes and Finance Leases) was repaid (charged to revenue) over time and the mechanism for repayment was termed the **Minimum Revenue Provision**.

Councils were statutorily required to annually approve their MRP policy and ensure that they had made a prudent amount of MRP.

Four options are included in the statutory guidance but other approaches were not meant to be ruled out, provided that they are fully consistent with the statutory duty to make prudent revenue provision.

The decision on what was prudent was for the individual council to determine, not the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council had an approximate £800m borrowing need, including PFI projects and was under-borrowed by around £170m to £180m. Against this figure as the cost of borrowing was not competitive against investment returns where there was no immediate need to use the funding. Rotherham was under-borrowed by around 22% (excluding PFI projects), and this was felt to be a desirable position. The majority of councils were under-borrowed by 15-18%. This position would need to be reassessed when there was a change to interest rates.

Over the previous 18 months or so options for reducing the impact of the MRP charge on the Revenue Budget had been considered culminating in the initiatives brought forward through Commissioners and finally for approval by Members at the July 2015 Council meeting.

Technical Accounting Adjustments – the first initiative was re-profiling the MRP chargeable to the Budget on pre-2007/2008 debt.

Changing profile on pre-2007/2008 debt moving to an annuity basis for charging over the life of the assets – 50 years at 4% (previously the charge had been on a 4% reducing balance basis to be paid over approximately 500 years).

The revised approach had a short/medium term revenue benefit although the debt was being paid over 50 years rather than the longer period.

Repayable over shorter period but:

- **Considered a better reflection of the economic benefit to current and future Council Taxpayers;**
- **Ensures current and future Council Taxpayers pay amounts comparable in real terms taking account of time value of money.**

When backdated to 2007/2008 there was an overprovision amounting to £34.782m – reflected in statutory accounts 2014/2015.

Discussions with the external auditors KPMG had provided an understanding on how the amount could be utilised.

The agreed position was that the overprovision would be held within ‘unusable’ reserves on the face of the Council’s Balance Sheet and the Council could take an annual MRP holiday each year up to the amount that would otherwise have been charged in that year, until the £34.782m has been used.

This approach was agreed by the Audit Committee (24th November, 2015), Managing Director Commissioner (14th December, 2015) and full Council (27th January, 2016).

Graphs demonstrating the MRP projection on the old and new schedules were shared. The crossover point was met at 2030 when annual charges under the new schedule would become higher than those under the old schedule. Charges under both schedules were equalised at 2053.

Technical Accounting Adjustments – the second initiative was the application of uncommitted capital resources to reduce the Council’s underlying need to borrow.

Examined whether uncommitted capital resources could be used to reduce the MRP chargeable to the revenue budget.

£6.262m was identified and applied to the 2014/2015 budget, as approved by Council in July, 2015.

The savings generated in 2014/2015 were £4.536m and transferred into the Transformation Reserve and earmarked for the 2015/2016 budget to fund childrens’ placements.

The residual savings of £0.883m were included within the 2016/2017 budget.

A table showing the financial implications of the initiatives in 2016/2017, 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 was shared.

Questions and discussion followed and the following questions were raised: -

- Councillor Parker asked whether the Council had to pay tax on capital assets? Did the Council have a £800m need or was there £800m available to borrow? He asked about the amount that the Council was under-borrowed. Stuart explained that no tax was paid in relation to the Council's capital expenditure activities. The Council had a total borrowing need but was under-borrowed by approximately £180m against that need.
- Councillor Elliot asked about the previous structure that had seen debt structured over 500 years. It appeared that, by altering the structure of the MRP profile maximum pain would be experienced by the Council twice, first in the early stage, which had already been gone through, and later in the new model. Stuart explained that the previous overprovision was being compensated for in the revised schedule which produced short to medium-term benefits negating the earlier cost.
- Councillor John Turner asked for more information about the Council's PFI liabilities and whether any grant had been received. Stuart explained that the Council received specific Government grant funding towards the cost of the PFI liabilities.

Councillor Read thanked Stuart and Derek for their informative presentation and responses.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
16th February, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Sims (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Burton, , Cutts, Elliot, Ellis, Hughes, Jepson, Jones, Khan, McNeely, Parker, Pitchley, Reeder, Rose, Smith, Taylor, John Turner, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cowles, Currie, Evans, Fleming, Godfrey, Roddison, Sansome, Watson and Whelbourn.

PREVENT.

Councillor Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, welcomed Officers to the seminar on Prevent, the duty on local authorities to safeguard children, young people and vulnerable adults from being drawn into terrorism.

The officers who were in attendance: -

Carol Adamson, Community Engagement Officer, RMBC;
Inspector Brendan Pakenham, South Yorkshire Police HQ Prevent/
Channel Manager;
Steve Parry, Neighbourhood Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour
Manager, RMBC;
PC Zuleika Ahmed, South Yorkshire Police.

Carol delivered a presentation that outlined how Elected Members could recognise the signs that someone was at risk of being radicalised, how they should report their concerns and the support channels that existed to safeguard vulnerable people.

Carol played two video clips that showed scenarios of how different individuals were at risk of becoming involved in different types of terrorism. The clips showed how the statutory agencies responded to the risks and put in place a tailored support plan for the individuals. One scenario showed a school pupil at risk of becoming drawn into Islamist extremist ideologies. The other showed an adult male who was at risk of being drawn into far right extremism and crime as a result of becoming disengaged with society and criminal acts being committed against his family members.

The presentation provided a reminder of the different types of terrorism and looked at how, well before people were drawn into terrorism-related crimes, grooming takes place in communities or on-line to recruit people. Vulnerable adults, children and young people anywhere in the UK may be vulnerable to being groomed and exploited in this way. Risks and concerns in relation to Rotherham's communities and organisations include:

- People being drawn into far right extremism;
- People travelling abroad to join ISIL or to take part in conflicts;
- Vulnerability of Kurdish communities to fundraising by the PKK - a proscribed organisation;
- On-line posting and re-posting of information supporting terrorism or inciting hatred;
- Hate crime;
- Risk of publically owned resources and venues being used to disseminate extremist views;
- Potential to alienate communities who felt unfairly targeted by the extremism agenda;
- Workers and community representatives could potentially not identify or report Prevent related concerns.

There was a distinction between individuals who were actively involved with terrorism and grooming/encouraging others to take part, and those who were being groomed to take part in terrorism and had not yet committed criminal acts/were on the edges of criminality.

The Prevent duty placed an obligation on agencies to respond to concerns. The governance of Prevent was considered by the Safer Rotherham Partnership and the Local Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adults Board. The Channel programme was a multi-agency way of supporting individuals in an open process before their vulnerabilities to being groomed were exploited in a serious way.

Ways of reporting concerns: -

- In an emergency, ring 999;
- The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub should be contacted if concerns related to a child;
- Adult Safeguarding (via Assessment Direct) should be contacted if a vulnerable adult was involved;
- If a child or adult was not in immediate danger, but it was believed that a crime may have been committed, then the Police should be contacted on 101.

The importance of reporting any concerns about identifying a vulnerable individual/individual susceptible to being drawn into terrorism at as early a stage as possible was reiterated. Agencies had a statutory obligation to respond appropriately. Reporting was not criminalising an individual but helping to prevent terrorism and ensuring their safety.

Discussion followed and the following questions and answers were raised:-

Councillor Pitchley asked how long had Prevent been running? How many people had been helped and how many do we know we were not engaging?

Insp Brendan Pakenham explained that the Prevent Duty came in on 1st July, 2015. The need for Prevent, and the numbers accessing Police Prevent support, had escalated because of the context and international events. Rotherham was comparable in risk to Doncaster and Barnsley, whereas Sheffield was categorised as a higher Tier Two risk. The Police Prevent team had dealt with numerous enquiries within the Duty and other concerns had been responded to by Adult and Child Safeguarding.

It was known that there was under-reporting of events. Nobody could afford to leave any stone unturned. If issues were caught in the early stages it was possible to make an impact. All engagement with individuals was positive and conducted as a partnership.

Councillor McNeely explained that she had complained about attendance of Elected Members at Safer Rotherham Partnership meetings in the past. If this meeting was the lead/governance of Prevent, how confident could we be that attendance was sufficient? Steve Parry described the root and branch restructure of SRP governance and how it had removed two layers of meetings. The SRP needed to be confident that the right people were attending the meeting. On paper there was a good structure but it was the people within it and their commitment that delivered results.

Councillor Elliot asked what was being done about the people who were drawing those in to radicalisation? It was likely that they had been radicalised themselves. Do we criminalise them, or do they get support too? Insp Pakenham replied that if a criminal act was in the early stages support could be offered. The internet was either a friend or a foe and could trap individuals into crime, sometimes unwittingly. Any criminality was dealt with formally whereas the pre-criminal stage would be dealt with via Safeguarding.

Councillor Reeder asked how the information about Prevent and the support available was shared? She had learnt some information from training through her job in the care sector. Members should have been informed before now. Brendan agreed that more could always be done. The central Prevent Team was small and it was 'front facing' teams that were often the ones to identify issues. It was important for the Prevent Team to empower front line staff to be confident to share their experiences and gut feelings.

Carol Adamson explained that all front line staff had been asked to complete e-learning packages that were available on the RMBC e-learning portal educating them about Prevent. This is also available to Elected Members

Councillor Parker felt that most parents were behind the use of the internet compared to their children. How can parents identify if their child was involved in criminality? Insp Brendan Pakenham explained that parental responsibility included parents engaging with their children and talking to them. He reminded Members about privacy and control settings that parents could set on their home computers and internet access. Internet search histories ensured that there was always a footprint left of any activity.

Councillor Khan asked how the Prevent team were working with religious establishments? Insp Brendan Pakenham confirmed that his team had worked with establishments within the faith and voluntary sectors, including parishes and their committees. The work and relationships went very well. In 2013 a pre-criminal case was identified and the individual was helped and had turned around in two years. Prevent was building relationships, but it was always possible to make improvements.

Councillor Yasseen thanked the officers for their presentation. She felt that the process needed to be carried out carefully or individuals and communities may not respond positively. Through Prevent, teachers were feeling that they were being asked to spy on children. In addition, she asked why Rotherham had not been graded as a higher priority, as Sheffield had been. Rotherham's context, community cohesion and a sad recent racially/religiously motivated murder highlighted there was a need. Insp Brendan Pakenham confirmed that Prevent was not spying, it was safeguarding. Prevent and anti-terrorism should be spoken of in the same way as CSE and people should be expected to engage. Democracy allowed people to protest and only the Home Secretary had powers to ban this. Hate Crime was an early sign of community cohesion problems and Insp Brendan Pakenham always encouraged people to report them.

Councillor Sims thanked Carol for her informative and interesting presentation and all Officers in attendance for their responses to the questions raised. She urged Elected Members to take away the information about how to report concerns and also to complete the e-learning modules on the issue.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
1st March, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Yasseen (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Atkin, Beaumont, Buckley, Elliot, Ellis, Godfrey, Hughes, Jones, McNeely, Pitchley, Roche, Rose, Sims, Smith, Steele, Taylor, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Currie, Cutts, Fleming, Jepson, Reeder and Watson.

LIBRARY STRATEGY AND FORTHCOMING CONSULTATION.

Councillor Yasseen, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services, welcomed those in attendance at the seminar. She spoke about the importance of libraries in the community – they were one of the few services that people felt they owned. She had loved her local library whilst growing up and knew that others often found them to be a sanctuary, and they were one of the few places that were free to use.

She introduced the officers in attendance: -

Elenore Fisher, Customer and Cultural Services Manager;
Rachel O'Neil, Customer Access Manager;
Zoe Oxley, Library and Customer Services Manager;
Paul Woodcock, Assistant Director, Planning, Regeneration and Culture.

Elenore explained how the provision of library services was a statutory requirement and local authorities were required to provide a 'comprehensive and efficient service'.

Rotherham's Library Service had previously undergone a major review in 2012. Further changes since had included the merger between libraries and customer services, the opening of the Library@Riverside, customer service centre improvements/upgrades, the provision of e-books and the provision of free WiFi in all libraries.

Rachel O'Neil explained that Rotherham's Library Strategy 2011-2015 had ended and a new Library Strategy 2016-2019 would shortly be consulted upon. The draft strategy included five areas to continue taking the Library Service forward: -

1. Rotherham's libraries would be well-used, cost effective and responsive to changing customer needs, available technologies and resources;
2. Services offered reflect, and will continue to reflect, the needs and make-up of Rotherham's communities;
3. Libraries will inspire Rotherham's children, young people and their families to enjoy reading and develop their knowledge and skills, so that they are able to improve their quality of life and have an opportunity to realise their full potential;

4. Libraries would be located in the heart of Rotherham's communities, library buildings would be recognised community hubs, offer welcoming spaces and provide access to modern digital technology;
5. Staff will help to bridge the digital divide by supporting Rotherham's communities to get online and explore all the benefits that being online brings.

Elenore explained that the draft 2016-2019 Strategy has informed current potential budget savings proposals. She confirmed that no decisions regarding these proposals could be made, or savings released, until after an appropriate consultation period had ended. Savings would be achieved over three-years.

1. Creation of a centralised team (no impact on customers);
2. Consultation on withdrawal of mobile library;
3. Consultation on changes to the Booklink service;
4. Relocation of Maltby Library to Maltby Joint Service Centre;
5. Alternative ways of delivering services within communities.

As a statutory Service, there were specific requirements for consultation, as confirmed by colleagues in Legal Services. There were currently no proposals for closures of static sites or reductions in their opening hours. However, changes to hours may be suggested through the consultation process; this had happened in previous public consultations.

The Service was already working with volunteers and there was further work to be done to develop work with schools, universities and parish and town councils.

Zoe Oxley explained that there were also savings proposals in relation to Customer Services. As a non-statutory service these did not have to undergo such detailed consultation, but it was felt that, as a merged service, it was appropriate for the consultation to follow a similar path.

2016-2019 savings proposals in relation to Customer Services included: -

1. Withdrawal of face-to-face cashiering at Riverside House;
2. Introduction of on-line benefit claims and risk based verification;
3. Support required to use digital services;
4. Introduction of appointment based service.

Subject to approval by Cabinet on 14th March, the Library Strategy and proposed changes in relation to Library Services and Customer Services would undergo consultation between 17th March – 13th June, 2016. As wide a range of methods as possible would be used: -

- Online via www.rotherham.gov.uk;
- A dedicated email address would be set-up to receive comments and questions;
- A paper-based questionnaire would be available at all libraries and customer service centres;
- Drop-in sessions would be held;
- 10% of the Borough's population were regular library users, work would be undertaken to target non-users in high footfall areas;
- The Youth Cabinet would be asked to respond to the consultation;
- Town and Parish Councils would be asked to respond to the consultation;
- Targeted consultation would be undertaken in the Maltby area.

The next steps: -

- Report to the Cabinet on 14th March, 2016;
- Consultation to take place between 17th March – 13th June, 2016;
- Re-draft options, including the definition of 'core offer', based on consultation responses;
- An Equalities Impact Assessment would be undertaken;
- Proposals would be presented to Members in July as a Key Decision;
- An implementation plan would be confirmed.

Discussion and questions followed, and the following issues were raised: -

Councillor Whelbourn asked that the proposals be considered by Member Scrutiny. He also felt that Area Assemblies should be included in the consultation process.

Councillor Steele noted that two people had responded about libraries in the wider budget consultation process. He also asked what trade union consultation relating to paid staff and the use of volunteers had taken place? How did other South Yorkshire/Yorkshire councils use volunteers?

Elenore explained that other authorities had in the past proposed to close certain libraries unless community groups stepped in to run them. This had led to judicial review processes. It was not proposed that libraries would be run by volunteers, they would continue to be run by the Council, Rotherham wanted to use volunteers to help enhance the Service. Library staff were saying that they wanted to do more and make their libraries the hub of the community. To do this they needed time and any help to release them would be useful in achieving this.

Councillor Elliot asked about the consultation process and asked whether school children and Rotherham's toddler groups would be contacted. Councillor Elliot was aware that people not using libraries now could intend to use them later. The current 10% of the Borough using libraries may not always be the same 10%.

Councillor McNeely agreed that it was important for libraries to inspire children and families, and this also covered schools, governors and school staff. Libraries were not always accessible to parents, especially those with low levels of literacy. Sometimes libraries were not physically accessible. Libraries located in schools would be convenient as many adults and children were already there.

Councillor Ellis was concerned that the Library Service was being asked to do too many functions. She also felt that the role of volunteers was limited and they could not be expected to provide advice and guidance on Benefits, for example. The Library Vision needed to be clear.

Elenore confirmed that the core offer would be clear and available so that everyone involved in the Service could articulate it. Customer Services were provided in the Joint Service Centres only, and volunteers would not be working in these specialist functions. The core offer would inform people what they could expect if they walked into a library or a customer service centre; consistency was important.

Councillor Atkin explained that he was a regular library user, along with his family members. He wanted to place on record his thanks and appreciation to the staff at Wath Library for their work on the Wath Christmas Festival. They were responsive to the Wath community's needs, including working flexibly to accommodate the festival timetable and provide themed activities for the children. He asked whether community transport could collect people from their homes and drop them off at a library/libraries and then take them back home again? This would mitigate against the proposed loss of the mobile library. Would the LAC Council be asked as part of the consultation?

Elenore had had initial conversations with Community Transport and they were willing to consider this. She was working with Children and Young People's Services to consult with children on the proposals.

Councillor Rose used Swinton Library for her surgeries. The resource was very well used by people for advice and computers, right up until closing time. There was a lot of space in the building – was it all being used to maximum capacity?

Councillor Ahmed asked that Children's Centres also be included in the consultation to ensure that the core offer included early help for children, young people and their families. What was the take-up rate of e-books?

Elenore confirmed that the core offer would be very specific and Children's Centres would be included in the process. Secondary school library champions were keen to work with the Service

E-books were currently 1.7% of total loans and needed further marketing. E-magazines were popular. Additional e-books would be purchased so that the Service had the equivalent of a small library within the next few years.

Councillor Beaumont endorsed Maltby Library for their work within the community and how they reached out to the community. She asked whether there would be space and capacity to continue to deliver these services and maintain excellency if the library was based within the Joint Service Centre?

Councillor Godfrey had not seen the plans for the proposed relocation.

Elenore explained that a plan was being drawn up for stakeholders to visualise the proposed layout. There was a fairly large space in the Customer Service Centre that could be well utilised if the library was moved there.

Paul Woodcock recognised that there was an appetite for consultation and really welcomed this.

Councillor Yasseen agreed that the session was really pertinent for Rotherham's aspirations of reaching out to the 90% not currently using the Library Service. There would be a further session for Members as part of the consultation process. She thanked the Officers for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
15th March, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Buckley, Burton, Cowles, Elliot, Ellis, Godfrey, Hughes, Khan, Mallinder, McNeely, Reeder, Russell, Sansome, Sims, Julie Turner, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Ahmed, Currie, Hamilton, Hoddinott, Jepson, Pitchley, Watson and Whelbourn.

INTEGRATION OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE IN ROTHERHAM

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, welcomed those in attendance. He spoke about the poor health picture in Rotherham with many residents not in good health and the significant differences between the most deprived communities in the town. People in Rotherham lived longer with ill health.

Within that context there were Government funding cuts requiring the Local Authority to look carefully at the services it provided; the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) would also be facing similar cuts in 2016/17.

Strong relationships had been built with Health partners through Officers, the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Health Select Commission with both the CCG and Rotherham Foundation Trust (RFT) independently stating that relationships were the best they had been for 15 years.

There was now a strong desire to move forward with integration. It was the Government's aim to increase personalisation to give people more choice and have an integrated Health and Social Care Service.

The Chair introduced the officers in attendance: -

Jon Tomlinson, Assistant Director Commissioning (Adults)
Sarah Farragher, Interim Change Manager;
Prof Graeme Betts, Interim Director, Adult Care and Housing

Jon and Sarah gave the following presentation on the priority areas from the Adult Social Care perspectives for integration of health and social care in Rotherham:-

Desired Outcomes

- Shared vision for what the services look like
- Pooled resources
- Integrated/co-located services
- Utilising shared technology
- Reducing dependence, promoting self-serve and increasing resilience

Priority Work Areas

- Pilot integrated locality team
- Improved intermediate care
- Single point of access
- Ongoing review of the Better Care Fund

The Integrated Locality Team

- One lead co-ordinator jointly funded (overseen by a joint steering group)
- Team to include community nurses, therapists and mental health, assessment and care management and social prescribing
- Staff work exclusively with the locality population
- Serves practice populations and designated care homes
- Co-location one locality access point of access
- Integrated service specification
- Integrated care planning

Intermediate Care – the ambition(s)

- Development of an intermediate care centre of excellence
- Cater to a wider customer base to maximise independence
- Reduce residential care placements and hospital admissions
- Combine intermediate care with Extra Care, Assistive Technology, health services

Intermediate Care – the model

- Consolidate and share resources (building and staffing) to reduce duplication and provide excellent services
- Build on the strengths whilst improving the accessibility and reach of the services to maximise impact
- Reduced complexity of systems and processes
- Improved availability of social work and therapy resources through more flexible seven day working

Single Point of Access Proposed Principles

- Single point of access for health and social care for Rotherham (customer or patient tells us once)
- Covers RMBC, TRFT, RDASH
- Triage/assess based on customer outcome not service provision
- Operates on a 24 hour a day 7 day a week basis
- Does not replace professional to professional contacts

What Adult Social Care can contribute

- Social Care inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary input with particular emphasis on
 - Information and self-serve
 - Safeguarding/Making Safeguarding Personal
 - Mental Capacity
 - Carers services
 - Input into Continuing Health Care

Best Interest Assessments
DOLs
Assessment and support planning

Adult Social Care Outcomes (must be Care Act compliant)

- Reduction in citizens being bounced around the system
- Maximum choice and control for citizens to remain as independent as possible
- Keeping people safe when needed and doing this in a personalised framework
- Good support for carers
- Timely assessments, reviews
- Promoting wellbeing

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

The Chair was in favour of the locality model described within the Council but was aware that Area Assemblies had their own localities as did Children and Young Peoples Services.

Sarah Farragher stated that as part of the restructure consideration was being given to two locality models. The RFT had seven localities, RDaSH two and the Therapists had three. The Council would be looking at working around one of the seven that the Trust had identified but wanted to ensure alignment. This would be established during the pilot period.

Prof Betts reported that in reality there would always be different boundaries but it had been made clear that the Authority's resources would be used to support that approach and there would be more named workers.

Councillor McNeely agreed that the services should be available 24/7 as a common reason for an elderly person to go into care was due to their concern regarding the support available in the evening/during the night.

Prof Betts reported that very few elderly people were actually in residential care. It was important to think about the options available as to how people were supported to stay in their own home rather than the straight choice of going into residential care.

Sarah Farragher acknowledged that some parts of the service were currently not available 24/7. In order to achieve a fully integrated service, the availability would increase in stages in recognition of the need for support.

Councillor McNeely asked if the complex would definitely be situated on Doncaster Gate as this would be a problem to the elderly due to its position on a hill. How would it impact on the facilities already on the site?

Sarah Farragher reported that three different integration projects had

been presented. The perfect locality was based around the locality of the District Nurses which was Doncaster Gate.

Councillor Burton asked if the multi-disciplinary team would be a single point of access for people and whether the team would include the voluntary and the informal sector?

Prof Betts agreed that it was absolutely right that the voluntary and informal sector, carers etc. were reflected in the locality approach otherwise it would have a narrow focus of people being discharged from hospital and would miss out on people before they reached that point. All were working together with the aim of locality way of working.

Councillor Burton stated that multi-disciplinary teams and co-location had been considered before but had encountered problems with pooled budgets/resources, differing priorities of agencies and management. Had account been taken of past experiences in the new proposal?

Prof Betts agreed that budgets, shared priorities/outcomes and targets were issues for large scale integration and would have to be addressed.

Councillor Mallinder asked if Assessment Direct and CARATS would be built into the future plans?

Councillor Mallinder queried who would be the lead agency for the localities?

Sarah Farragher reported that a three way split on funding had been agreed for a designated Manager. It was planned that the Manager would report to a steering group made up of all the partners.

Councillor Reeder queried whether facilities such as Addison Road would be affected by the proposal?

Prof Betts replied that there was no mention of the Addison Road facility in the proposal. Nobody was talking about shutting it at the current time but users and carers in the wider community would be consulted on the services they needed in the future. Work would take place on building on the good things that were in place and how they could be taken forward at the same time as being mindful of a range of issues including duty under the Care Act.

Councillor Ellis asked for assurance that the evaluation of the pilot had a proper timeline and was conducted by someone independent of the project

Councillor Ellis queried what happened if one of the key funders, in view of future funding cuts, decided that the project was not one of their priorities?

Councillor Elliot sought clarity whether the co-location for the pilot at Doncaster Gate would include workers from areas such as Learning Disability, Physical Disability, head injuries or would it just focus on elderly people and people with mental health problems?

Sarah Farragher reported that, in terms of the population served by the pilot locality, from the Local Authority's perspective it would expect that anyone who had social care or health needs in that area would be picked up by that "perfect" locality. If any additional support was required it would be provided. The majority of the resources going in were around the older people as it came from a model that RFT had put on the table.

Councillor Elliot referred to those who were social funded and health funded and queried if it would affect access to fairer charging? Would people be charged whether they had health funding or social funding?

Sarah Farragher stated that it was the desired outcome of CHC funding that recipients would not know they were moving between the two charging schemes.

Councillor Elliot queried if there had been a risk assessment and an equality impact assessment conducted of the call centre system?

Assessment Direct was a call centre model with very experienced staff. Work was already taking place to move towards social care with triage and assessment behind the call centre. It was hoped that there would be a multi-disciplinary team to look at the needs of the person and ability to support quite quickly.

Councillor Elliot asked, in the case of someone who had a Social Care Assessment, who was not receiving a service but had a known disability, would they still be reviewed or would only those who received a service be reviewed?

Sarah Farragher replied that the Social Care Assessment would state whether a person was eligible for a Social Care Service but might still have involvement of a District Nurse or therapist. Just because a person had social care needs did not preclude them from the social care model.

Councillor Reeder asked what benefits/difference there would be from the Service?

Sarah Farragher reported that currently the Department had to refer clients who were passed around the system until they received what they required. If all agencies worked together the client would be screened and assessed as to who the best person was to support them. It would hopefully improve the efficiency of services.

Councillor Burton asked who would supervise the multi-disciplinary teams?

Prof Betts stated that the importance of supervision had been re-emphasised and discussions had taken place with RDaSH on this issue. It was absolutely critical that it was built into the proposal.

If the co-ordinator was not from a social care background then professional supervision from one of the Social Care Teams would be offered. Every profession would have a clinical lead into their professions.

Councillor Mallinder queried if there would be any affect in the way a person received care because of their health needs?

Sarah Farragher replied that it would depend upon where the funding came from. If the person had a package of support which was assessed and provided on behalf of Adult Social Care, it was chargeable and was quite often a mixed package. There was a need to improve the relationship with the CHC teams to ensure the right package and charge was provided.

The Chair thanked Members for their attendance.

APPOINTMENTS PANEL
17th March, 2016

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Commissioner Newsam, Councillors Lelliott, Parker, Steele, C. Vines and Mr. I. Thomas.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES

Following a national advertising and search campaign, preliminary interviews involving Commissioner Newsam and an assessment centre involving Elected Members and Stakeholders, the all-party selection panel today met to interview the two shortlisted candidates for the post of Deputy Director of Children and Young People's Services.

The panel have selected Ms. Melanie Meggs as their preferred candidate.

Ms. Meggs is a highly experienced senior Children's Social Care professional and is currently employed by Derbyshire County Council as Service Director (Early Help & Safeguarding). Ms. Meggs experience in Children's Social Care spans 30 years and she is currently responsible for a large multi professional workforce spanning a full range of early help and safeguarding functions which also incorporate cross agency teams.

Resolved:- That Ms. Melanie Meggs be appointed Deputy Director of Children and Young People's Services.

**APPEAL PANEL
21st March, 2016**

Present:- Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors McNeely and Roche.

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 those paragraphs, indicated below, of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to an individual).

APPEAL - D1/03/16 - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/03/16 against her dismissal from her post.

Resolved:- (1) That the appeal be upheld.

(2) That the long term sickness procedures would again need to be applied if a return to work in May 2016 is not achieved or sustained.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
24th March, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Sims (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Cutts, Elliot, Jones, Khan, Mallinder, McNeely, Pickering, Reeder, Sansome, Julie Turner, Whelbourn and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor M.Clark), Councillors Beaumont, Buckley, Currie, Ellis, Fleming, Godfrey, Hoddinott, Jepson, Read, Roche and Watson.

HIGHWAY WORKS INVESTMENT 2015/2016 UPDATE AND 2016 WORKS PROGRAMME.

Councillor K. Sims, Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, introduced Colin Knight, Network Manager, Neil Ayrton, Senior Network Maintenance Officer, Richard Jackson, Principal Network Management Officer and Karen Hanson, Community Safety and Streetscene, to the seminar. The officers had prepared a presentation about the background issues relating to highway works, and an update in relation to the 2015/2016 works programme in particular.

Colin Knight provided some background detail about network management issues: -

- The road network constituted the Council's biggest asset;
- Main roads were assessed monthly. Estate roads were assessed six-monthly;
- There was a management asset plan in place for the road network, in addition the asset condition plan;
- In the 2015/2016 year, £3m was available for Highway Network maintenance for estate-type roads: -
 - This represented 80 schemes and 25km/15m of roads improved;
 - All roads were RAG rated and the roads that had been rated as amber would be prioritised for works;
 - Elected Member and customers were able to suggest roads for consideration.
- Network Management co-ordinated with utility companies to ensure that works undertaken by the Council did not take place when they were due to be utility works that would disrupt the road surface;
- It was anticipated that there would be an annual Members' seminar to appraise Members on the network plan, consider community engagement works and receive suggestions for future works;
- The Council's multi-hog would be in each area once every 3/4 months;
- Colin urged Elected Members to meet their local Ward Highway Inspectors;
- The risks of not addressing potholes were considered, and included the higher costs of 'reactive maintenance';

- Elected Members and members of the public were able to email their suggestions to streetprideAssessmentDesign@rotherham.gov.uk or complete the online form for non-hazardous issues available via the Council's website http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/info/200083/roads_highways_and_pavements/937/report_a_pothole or be telephoning (01709) 336003 for hazardous/emergency issues.

Councillors raised the following questions: -

Councillor Whelbourn thought that the subject must form part of the Member induction programme following the 2016 local Borough elections. He asked whether there was a plan following the anticipated loss of the Business Rate Support Grant?

Colin explained that it was still early days and he was awaiting further information. A plan for footways was required as they were a developing concern. Estate roads remained a priority at the present time.

Councillor Atkin commended the system in a previous year. Both of his suggestions were taken on, repaired well and his constituents were happy. He had a great relationship with his Ward's local inspector and there had only been one example of a job not being completed when it was due to be. The delay was down to a reasonable reason – but Ward Members should have been kept in the loop.

Councillor Atkin asked about roads that had been surface dressed in the past and now really required attention. Was there a better system now available?

Colin confirmed that the method had not been used for many years due to quality and procurement costs. The product available now had vastly improved and had been trialled over a year and continually assessed. The Borough had two really good examples of improved road conditions completed to a high standard using the new method. The method formed part of the ongoing maintenance plans for estate roads.

Councillor Julie Turner asked about how surface water deteriorated road surfaces. Some drains in the Whiston area were blocked with leaves, soil and growing weeds. She asked whether it would be useful for her to identify further examples?

Colin agreed that it would be as it would aid the monitoring and recording system used by operatives in their regular inspections and help to achieve better value for money.

Councillor Elliot felt that road condition breakdowns often happened where previous utility work had taken place and that it was more cost effective to concentrate on these small areas.

Colin explained that the Council must statutorily receive notification of utility works – sometimes utility companies were digging up where no notification had been received. He asked that if Members saw them working but had not received notification to get in touch with his team. Utility companies could work immediately if there was an emergency, but had to retrospectively notify the Council.

Councillor Mallinder had had really positive contacts with Colin's team and thanked them for this. She had a persistent road issue in Dinnington relating to road condition, signage, and staffing changes.

Colin agreed to pass this feedback on to the Teams involved and committed to inform Members of staffing establishment changes.

Councillor McNeely's Boston Castle Ward incorporated the Town Centre and there was a risk that this could be at the detriment to the Ward's residential areas.

Councillor Yasseen felt that Boston Castle's residential area was neglected due to Town Centre works/spend. The Town Centre belonged to all people and areas of the Borough, not just the Boston Castle Ward.

Councillor Reeder agreed that Gerard and Godstone Roads were in dire need of attention.

Colin confirmed that in-cab technology was in place to identify potholes and log them as jobs. Teams on the street were empowered to address a pothole without a Highway Inspector's authorisation.

Councillor Reeder reported an issue on Herringthorpe Valley Road that was very serious.

Colin explained the balance that needed to be struck between half-width and full-width repairs. The benefit of Members going out with Highway Inspectors would be to point these issues out. The Council would need £80-90m to address all red and amber roads. It was therefore considering any new innovations to address potholes.

Councillor Pickering, as fellow Ward councillor, agreed that the road required attention.

Councillor Reeder asked whether the multi-hog was being used to capacity?

Colin explained that the multi-hog was currently out of repair. It worked well on smaller areas but was less efficient for larger spaces.

Councillor Sansome commended his local Highway Inspector. He asked about work carried out by contractors and asked who picked up the cost when their work was not up to standard?

Colin explained that third party work carried out must be guaranteed for two or three years. Contractors were monitored on their performance and fined if appropriate.

Councillor Khan raised service roads in his Ward and referred to investment into Eastwood to improve the environmental scene. Some resurfacing works had never been completed although there were white circles around road condition issues. On Fitzwilliam Road a good number of potholes had been reported. Most had been addressed, but there was a lot of cracking still. It did not give the right impression of the Borough.

Colin committed to look at any suggestions made and he had looked at requests for Eastwood and was very happy to meet with the community.

Councillor Pickering asked about utility company repairs that were not always consistent. Some works started and came to a stop. When would they re-start?

Richard Jackson reported a meeting about the area, including access requirements for the crematorium and cemetery that would need to be done out-of-hours so as not to inconvenience the groups using the area. Richard would feedback to local Ward Members about a completion date.

Councillor Whelbourn asked that staff names and designations be put into the Council Year Book.

Colin agreed that there was a communications plan for the wider Directorate and organisation to improve customer experience.

Karen Hanson explained that the Service had absorbed vacant posts that were not backfilled and that the time was right to provide clarity on posts and functions to stakeholders. She thanked Members for their positive feedback on quality and would make sure it was fed back to staff.

Councillor Reeder referred to a previous communication that informed Members where the multi-hog was going to be operating at any given time. This was useful, could it be reinstated?

Colin agreed that this would be possible.

Suggestions of roads to be considered were made and the RAG system was demonstrated. It was suggested that this could be used as a surgery tool when constituents raised issues of concern.

Councillor Sansome asked what the timescale for consideration was?

A communication would be sent out in June about the roads that would be addressed.

Councillors in attendance raised 24 estate roads across the Borough for consideration for maintenance work.

Councillor Sims thanked the Officers in attendance for their informative presentation, responses to the questions raised and for demonstrating the database.

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

(2) That detailed information about where/when the multi-hog would be working be circulated on a continuing basis.

(3) That contact details of the Highway Inspector for each area and where/when Members could join them on an inspection be circulated.

(4) That the staffing establishment changes be shared with Elected Members in due course.

COUNCIL SEMINAR 5th April, 2016

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Councillor Maggi Clark, Currie, Elliot, Ellis, Mallinder, McNeely, Pickering, Pitchley, Reeder, Rose, Russell, Sansome, Sims, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cowles, Cutts, Godfrey, Hamilton, Jepson, Price and Roddison.

MENTAL HEALTH

Councillor Roche, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, introduced Teresa Roche, Director for Public Health, and Ruth Fletcher-Brown, Public Health Specialist, to the seminar. The Officers had prepared a presentation on mental health issues to increase members' knowledge of mental health/ill health, increase their understanding of commissioning and providers of the service, the Council's role and provide guidance and assistance to signpost people to help and support.

Mental Health definition referred to all people: -

"A state of well-being in which every individual realises his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to her or his community." World Health Organisation, 2014.

- One in four people each year suffered from a mental health problem in the course of a year;
- Half of all life-time cases of mental illness began by the age of 14;
- Suicide was the single biggest cause of death in men aged 20-45 in the UK;
- Mental illnesses accounted for 23% of ill health in England – the largest proportion;
- One in ten children between the ages of one and fifteen had a mental health problem;
- People living with mental illness today had the same health and life expectancy as the general population in the 1950s;
- People in Rotherham self-reported less favourable well-being scores compared to other areas of England;
- However, Rotherham had lower than average hospital admissions than the England average;
- **Commissioners** – Lead commissioner was the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (some adult and child services were commissioned by RMBC);
- **Main providers** - RDaSH, GPs and The Rotherham Foundation Trust;

- Public Health's role in mental health: -
 - Mental health promotion;
 - Mental illness prevention and suicide prevention;
 - Improving lives, supporting recovery and inclusion;
- There was strong evidence to focus on mental health: -
 - Improved physical health and life expectancy;
 - Better educational achievement;
 - Increased skills;
 - Reduced health risk behaviours such as smoking and alcohol misuse;
 - Reduced risk of mental health problems and suicide;
 - Improved employment rates and productivity;
 - Reduced anti-social behaviour and criminality.
 - Higher levels of social interaction and participation.
- Local government's role in public health was brought in by Section 2B of the National Health Service Act, 2006, as amended by Section 12 of the Health and Social Care Act, 2012). Local councils were expected to take appropriate steps to improve the health of people living in their area.

Rotherham activities in relation to mental health: -

- CAMHS transformation;
- Rotherham Youth Cabinet Manifesto;
- My Mind Matters website – support for young people;
- Metal Health First Aid and Suicide Prevention Training;
- Workplace Wellbeing Charter;
- Dementia Friendly Communities;
- Suicide prevention;
- Supporting those bereaved by suicide;
- Supporting Children and Young People who Self-Harm – Rotherham Self-Harm Practice Guidance.

Care Guidelines for universal workers on suicide prevention: -

Concern
Ask
Respond
Explain

Future activity: -

- Delivery of Local CAMHS Transformation Plan including whole school pilots;
- Suicide prevention social marketing campaign;
- Rotherham Mental Health Prevention Plan;
- Roll-out of Dementia Friendly Communities;
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy – mental health workshop.

Questions followed the presentation: -

Councillor Currie asked whether all schools had taken up the programme of suicide prevention activities? Is CAMHS' waiting list reducing? What efforts were taking place to ensure it was being reduced?

Ruth responded that she had presented to all safeguarding leads on the Suicide Community Response Plan. A Headteachers' meeting was planned for later in the month to advise them of the Plan. The Plan had been activated as a case study in some schools, including working with adults in a school community. All schools that Ruth had worked with were very positive and welcoming.

Ruth believed that targets were quite tight for CAMHS and that they were improving.

Councillor Roche asked Governors to encourage their headteachers to attend.

Councillor McNeely asked what in-depth involvement GPs had? She was concerned that this could lead people to jump from £50 unemployment benefit to £110 sick pay.

Ruth explained that GP's were the first point of contact and all agencies relied on their clinical expertise.

Councillor McNeely asked whether a review could be undertaken on the provision of sick notes for mental health issues.

Terri agreed to ask NHS England as the Commissioner, this could not be done locally as do not have access to clinical notes. It was important to believe and trust the individual in the first instance.

Councillor Mallinder asked whether there were any differences between maintained and academy schools in terms of interaction?

Ruth had found all schools willing to work with her; one was reluctant initially but was now on board. The Educational Psychology Service was well thought of by schools, including bereavements and sudden bereavements within school communities.

Council Ellis asked whether training for front line staff was sufficient. School staff often felt isolated and unable to spot signs. Where was responsibility for this held within schools? There was the possibility that things could not be given sufficient status if not held in the high Senior Leadership Team. Parents of children who had committed suicide had been positive about their contribution to developing the service – they had added thoughtful contributions and Councillor Ellis would like them to be represented on the Boards for this work. They had an insight into these issues, they should have an input equal to professionals.

Ruth explained the suicide training package called Safe Talk, which took 3.5 hours through an external provider. Assist – applied suicide training – was open to schools to attend. Some schools had requested bespoke training on suicide identification and high risk individuals. RDASH and CAMHS were re-launching their service model for locality workers. Agencies were due to identify training needs and report back to CAMHS as holders of the training budget to deliver training to schools. Workforce Development Strategy had found that training was piecemeal across the agencies and a questionnaire was going out, including to schools, asking what they had had and what they needed for the future.

Six schools were signed up to the Suicide Response Plan and whole-school approach with CAMHS transformation money where the headteacher or assistant headteacher was leading. Ruth was reassured that all of the safeguarding leads in schools were aware as the meeting/presentation had generated several phone calls for additional help. Services were keen to involve families who had been through this and invitations to join had been circulated.

It was suggested that the Health Select Commission look at the outcomes of the pilot.

Councillor Atkin was aware of an example where CAMHS had signed-off a GP referral without speaking to the child, this was a poor outcome.

Ruth was aware of these sorts of situations and thought that closer working between CAMHS and Schools, including a shared appreciation of one another's roles and priorities, would work for a better outcome for children and young people. There was a CAMHS issue log for things like this example, which was reported to the CCG to raise it as part of their regular meetings.

Councillor Sansome referred to prevention work in schools and lessons learned in previous schemes. He asked what private sector employment were doing? The council and health service often had to pick the tab up when people needed support.

Ruth explained that there was a five-year lottery funded project called 'Mind Your Own Business'.

Councillor Yasseen asked about equalities and prevention. Who did targeted prevention work? Service users tended to be women, not men. Within BME communities suicide had been very rare and now seemed to be increasing in an abnormal way.

Ruth explained the workings of the Suicide Audit Group who looked for trends and patterns. Work was developing a method, means, access to a GP and mental health services and getting the message out to people using information cards. A campaign to men would go to the different venues that men may access.

Councillor Roche thanked the Officers for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**APPEAL PANEL
18th April, 2016**

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

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

APPEAL - D1/04/16 - ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HOUSING

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/04/16 against her dismissal from her post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
19th April, 2016**

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Astbury, Atkin, Elliot, Jones, McNeely, Pitchley, Russell, Sansome, Taylor, Watson, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Currie, Fleming, Hoddinott, Jepson, Lelliott, Reeder and Roddison.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

Councillor G. Watson, Deputy Leader, welcomed Mrs. Sue Wilson (Head of Service, Performance and Planning) and Mrs. Vicky Schofield (Head of Service, Safeguarding and Quality Assurance) who gave a presentation about the Quality Assurance Framework for Children and Young People's Services. The presentation highlighted the following information:-

(i) The importance of Quality Assurance

- Management oversight, checking and challenging practice of staff in Children and Young People's Services Social Work teams;
- Feedback and learning;
- Senior Management accountability – line of sight from strategy to operations;
- Drive up practice quality, procedural compliance and use of professional judgement;
- Understand practice trends, thematic areas for improvement and impact, show improvement journey;
- External scrutiny and service ownership.

(ii) Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) reporting in September 2014 -

- Senior managers do not ensure that they have sufficient oversight of the quality of practice;
- Poor performance management and limited quality assurance processes have contributed to the Council's lack of effective action to address deteriorating performance;
- Managers are not sufficiently involved in the oversight and quality assurance of practice;
- Subsequently, Ofsted recommended that the Council should undertake effective performance management and quality assurance arrangements and ensure that they are well understood; the previous quality framework was not sufficiently embedded into the organisation.

(iii) The Council's actions taken since the Ofsted report (of September 2014)

- A Quality Assurance Framework for Children and Young People's Services was launched in September 2015;
- This was underpinned by a specific framework for children's social care;
- Recruited Interim Auditors to provide capacity and experience to begin to undertake routine audits;
- Appointed to the permanent post of Head of Safeguarding and Quality Assurance.

(iv) The Quality Assurance Framework

- Making secure positive outcomes for this Borough's children, young people and their families;
- Deliver quality services for this Borough's children, young people and their families;
- Comply with external frameworks and regulations (ie: Ofsted / Working Together to Safeguard Children);
- Embed agreed service standards across Children and Young People's Services ; ten key standards have already been established;
- Monitor and evaluate this Council's quality and performance against the agreed standards;
- Ensure workforce development impacts directly and improves the quality of practice based on the findings of the monitoring and evaluation being undertaken;
- Make lasting improvements across all services.

(v) Elements of the Quality Assurance Framework

- Monthly Team Manager Audits;
- Monthly Senior Manager re-audits (use of the Ofsted service definitions);
- Beyond Auditing;
- Safeguarding Quality Assurance visits;
- Observation of Practice;
- The role of the Young Inspectors;

(vi) Team Manager Audits and Re-audits

- Monthly audits are undertaken by all team managers within Social Care and the Early Help Service);
- These are rated in line with the 4 grading criteria from Ofsted;
- The results of these will be published in a monthly Quality Assurance report;
- A sample of these audits are then re-audited by a senior manager, this approach is to establish the joint understanding of "good" case work – the process examines whether good judgements are being

made; issues of concern and learning needs are identified in this audit process.

(vii) Safeguarding Quality Assurance Visits

- Every two months the Director of Children's Services, the Deputy Director, the Lead Member and the Head of Safeguarding undertake a joint visit to an operational front-line staff team;
- Talking with staff, observing practice, audits of cases are examples of activity undertaken; there are now five auditor posts.

(viii) Beyond Auditing

- Six key areas of practice – what makes the difference; 3 ways to practice “how” to get right outcome for children and families; 3 areas to identify “what” the Council is achieving for children families;
- Focus on working with teams to improve practice - learning conversations;
- The pilot phase concluded during March, 2016;
- Proposals to adjust the current approach – particularly around records, reporting and moderation of audits;
- Launch of a new programme approach to Beyond Auditing, early in May 2016.

(ix) What information is available from the Audits ?

- There is inconsistency in the improvement journey across the service (eg Duty and Assessment, Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub and child sexual exploitation); other areas are less good,
- Compliance with statutory and local guidance is an improvement (visits, assessment timescales);
- Although performance is improving, it is acknowledged that the quality of practice now needs to improve further.

(x) The Next Steps

- Routine monthly reporting shared with stakeholders;
- Links to training and development and the broader workforce developments;
- Principal Social Worker to work with staff and develop further their practice;
- Improve and embed the Beyond Auditing Programme Approach;
- Improve consistency of auditing approach across Managers and Services.

Members raised a number of specific issues during discussion:-

(a) The importance of the audit process and the depth of investigation; it was noted that Ofsted performs both an inspection function and also a process of improvement visits to aid in securing improvement in service performance; there will be peer reviews of various aspects of Service performance taking place at different times in June 2016 (leadership, management and governance) and in October 2016 (Looked After Children services);

(b) Audits and reviews of the Services take place on a frequent and regular basis, although the specific arrangements and dates are not usually announced to staff beforehand; whenever children and families are to be included within the visiting process, they will receive appropriate prior notification of the arrangements, in order that their consent may be obtained;

(c) Action to be taken in respect of concerns arising from an audit and/or inspection; cases are audited by managers (eg: 27 cases were scheduled for audit in February 2016 and 24 audits were completed; the three remaining cases had to be scheduled at a later date); this detailed auditing process ensured that any issues of concern became apparent and were identified at an early stage and corrective action could be taken quickly, with the safeguarding of children and young people as the paramount consideration;

(d) Members asked for assurance that the Senior Leadership Team within Children and Young People's Services were aware of the disadvantaged circumstances of some families resident in the Rotherham Borough area;

(e) The importance of the assessment process itself being of the highest quality; the quality checking will include bench-marking the performance of this Council against that of other similar local authorities; the systematic collection of information from the auditing process will be used to inform future practice and the training and development of professional staff;

(f) Elected Members will continue their scrutiny role, principally via the Improving Lives Select Commission; Service Directors continue to be challenged to improve Service performance by the Government-appointed Commissioners to the Council; a new Performance Board is being established during May 2016, to be chaired by the Lead Member for Children and Young People's Services;

(g) The improvement process for Children and Young People's Services continues and will ultimately lead to the return of powers to the Council; the extent of improvement will be assessed as part of Ofsted's re-inspection approach to those local authorities which had been assessed as inadequate during the original inspection.

Resolved:- That Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Schofield be thanked for the very informative presentation.

APPEAL PANEL
26th April, 2016

Present:- Councillor Commissioner Ney (in the Chair); Councillors Gosling and Whelbourn.

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 those paragraphs, indicated below, of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to an individual).

**APPEAL - D2/04/16 - ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S
DIRECTORATE**

The Panel considered an appeal by D2/04/16 against her dismissal from her post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
24th May, 2016

Present:- Councillor Yasseen (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Cowles, Elliot, Jones, Khan, Sansome, Bird, Allen, Cooksey, Cusworth, Fenwick-Green, Marles, Sheppard, Short, Walsh and Williams.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Councillor Maggi Clark, Hague, Hoddinott, Jepson, Pitchley, Price, Reeder, Roche, Julie Turner, Watson, Andrews and Ireland.

LIBRARY STRATEGY AND CONSULTATION - UPDATE.

Councillor Yasseen, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Working and Cultural Services, welcomed Members to the Seminar and introduced Elenore Fisher, Customer and Cultural Services Manager, and Zoe Oxley, Manager, to the seminar to provide an update on the Library Strategy and consultation position.

Councillor Yasseen explained that, currently, 90% of Rotherham's population did not use their libraries. Councillor Yasseen thought that they were fantastic resources, hubs and homes for community groups and a place of exchange. Consultation would be taking place across the Borough until mid-June, 2016.

Elenore provided some background information to the Members present: -

- The provision of Library Services was statutory in the 1944 Act where it was set out that a 'comprehensive and efficient' service needed to be provided for all who wished to access it;
- There were local and national conversations about what this meant in the twenty-first century.
- The Library Strategy was considering an assessment of local need, making proposals and conducting Equality Impact Assessments;
- The Library Strategy was incorporating/encouraging '**buzz not shush!**' to create a service that creates a sense of anticipation, customers who desire to return and inspire reading and an enjoyment of reading;
- Library buildings were to be seen as community hubs where access and help with ICT could be sought;

Savings proposals were considered and the following were being consulted upon: -

- Withdrawal of the Mobile Library: -
 - Currently used by 300-400 people, 150-160 of which only used this provision;
 - Promotion of the local book drop service could mitigate the loss of the mobile library;

- Book Link took books to people in their own homes, residential care homes etc;
- Move of Maltby Library to the Maltby Joint Service Centre;
- Working with volunteers to enhance services, to support paid staff to concentrate on service development and promotion activities;
- Removal of face-to-face cashier services at Riverside House and promotion of cashier paypoints;
- Online Benefit Claims System: -
 - Visible presence of Officers in libraries asking service users if they needed help to use the IT system;
 - Remove drop-in system and encourage use of appointments.

The saving proposals would achieve a budget saving of £474k over three years. Consultation on the proposals would run between 17th March – 13th June, 2016. Consultation relating to Maltby's proposals would run until 27th June, 2016.

- Consultation would be available on-line;
- Via the inbox: - libraryreview@rotherham.gov.uk;
- Paper forms via libraries;
- Drop-in sessions;
- High-footfall areas would be targeted to try to solve the mystery of why only 10% of Rotherham's population used the library services;
- Youth Cabinet would be consulted;
- Town and Parish Councils would be consulted;
- All Schools would be consulted.

Following consultation a 'Core Offer' would be created and a Member decision would be sought.

Councillor Cooksey asked how user friendly libraries were these days? What areas does the mobile service cover – children, older people etc? Have the local press been involved, e.g. – articles about reading?

Elenore Fisher – buildings should always be user friendly. Asset Management Review of 17 locations/buildings taking place to ensure they are fit for purpose. Consultation started at same time as Purdah and consequently press releases would be released now the election period had ended. People most concerned about the potential for closing – the Service had retained best of 20 years ago, and built on it.

Councillor Eliot asked whether the online library would be expanded?

Elenore said yes – available 24/7, 365 days a year and the longer-term aim was to create an e-book service that was the equivalent of a small library.

Councillor Bird – asked about online benefit claims and how people who could not access or who did not have the skills to access would do this. Would they be left out?

Elenore – all libraries have computers that are available for people to use. Tablets also being used. Most common service request was introduction to ICT.

Zoe explained that floor walkers would have the remit of identifying and helping people who were making specific claims.

Councillor Cusworth – asked whether the Booklink Service was done online? People do not always have access to the internet at home.

Elenore – met with Interim Strategic Director to ensure the Services were working closely together. Workers visiting homes take their ICT with them.

Councillor Cusworth asked what would other people not accessing services do?

Elenore agreed to look into the specific situation raised. Keen to place collections where people go to. The Library Services was as much about reading as it was physical resources.

Councillor Allen referred to the drop-in sessions and asked whether local Councillors could attend to learn about issues.

Elenore – yes.

Councillor Allen asked about the 150 users of the mobile service who do not use other services. Will these be supported to use other methods?

Elenore – yes, many had completed consultation and any changes that were approved would start an ongoing conversation for these service users to support them to use other methods.

Councillor McNeely asked for all Elected Members to be aware of where the drop-in sessions are so that consideration could be given to Members doing surgeries at that time.

Councillor Walsh – asked about libraries as a community hub and focus. He thought that this was a good idea, but a lot of communication revolved around social media. Can Officers create an online community library?

Elenore – yes, this should be developed as an aspirational idea.

Councillor Atkin – remembered Wath Library from 1970s as a community hub and important community resource. He referred to library honesty/trust schemes and asked who would log the books in/out? BT were decommissioning a lot of telephone boxes – can these be used as mini community libraries?

Elenore – yes, I have seen those schemes, they were not a library but did disseminate books. Interesting challenge as they did not tend to be issued. A cover page asking readers to pass on was an idea to implement the scheme and get more people using and reading.

Councillor Jones – can libraries incorporate other services. Invite local schools? Reading with an author, get children involved. Do we keep data on what people check out in each area – to predict the types of books people are interested in?

Elenore – profile information about customers is used. The profile changes throughout their lives – peaks and troughs depending on their life events. Does vary from place to place. Schools do go into libraries for class visits – depending on size of the room.

Councillor Yasseen thanked Elenore and Zoe for their informative presentation and asked her Elected Member colleagues to join in the consultation and help to represent as much as possible what their local communities needed and wanted from their Library service.

Agreed: - That the information shared be noted.

**PENSION EARLY RELEASE APPEAL PANEL
26th May, 2016**

Present:- Councillor Sir Derek Myers (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and Lelliott.

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 AGAINST A DECISION NOT TO RELEASE PRESERVED
PENSION BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS**

Further to Minute No. 18 of the meeting of the Early Release/Flexible Retirement Panel held on 15th February, 2016, consideration was given to an appeal against the refusal of the application for release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of 2010 Rotherham Limited.

Resolved:- That the appeal be upheld and the actuarial reduction of benefits shall apply in accordance with current practice.

EARLY RELEASE/FLEXIBLE RETIREMENTS PANEL
26th May, 2016

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors Alam and Read together with Commissioner Sir Derek Myers.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck.

1. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

2. FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT SCHEME - REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Regeneration and Environment Services.

Resolved:- (1) That the application be approved.

(2) That future reports in respect of flexible retirement applications shall include statements from the employing Service Director which confirm whether or not the overall business plan and strategy are supported and whether there is any impact upon service delivery.

3. FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT SCHEME - FINANCE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Finance and Customer Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

4. FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT SCHEME - FINANCE AND CUSTOMER SERVICES

The Panel considered an application for flexible retirement from an employee in Finance and Customer Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

**5. EMPLOYEE REQUEST TO INCREASE CONTRACT HOURS
SUBSEQUENT TO FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT - REGENERATION AND
ENVIRONMENT SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for an increase in contract hours, subsequent to flexible retirement, from an employee in Regeneration and Environment Services.

Resolved:- That the application be refused.

**6. RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE
GROUNDS - REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SERVICES**

The Panel considered an application for the release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Regeneration and Environment Services.

Resolved:- That the application be refused.

**7. RELEASE OF PRESERVED BENEFITS ON COMPASSIONATE
GROUNDS - HOUSING AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**

Pursuant to Minute No. 17 of the Panel's meeting held on 15th February, 2016, the Panel gave further consideration to an application for the release of preserved benefits on compassionate grounds from a former employee of Housing and Neighbourhood Services.

Resolved:- That the application be approved.

8. VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE APPLICATIONS

The Panel considered applications for voluntary severance from employees in the following Services which were subject to the Council's 'All Service Review'. It was noted that all of these applications had been supported by the Council's Senior Leadership Team and that the posts would be deleted from the establishment.

- Children and Young People's Services – Early Help and Family Engagement (2 posts)

- Finance and Customer Services – Information Digital Service

- Children and Young People's Services – Business Support

Resolved:- That the applications be approved.

9. RMBC SENIOR MANAGEMENT REVIEW

As part of the Commissioner protocols, Commissioner Sir Derek Myers considered an application for a redundancy payment in respect of a senior management position which was being deleted from the Council's establishment as part of the current review.

The Commissioner approved the redundancy payment, as detailed within the submitted report.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
Friday, 27th May, 2016

Present:- Councillor Lelliott (in the Chair); Councillors Alam, Allcock, Allen, Atkin, Beaumont, Clark, Cooksey, Cowles, Cusworth, Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Jones, Khan, Marles, McNeely, Reeder, Rose, Rushforth, Sansome, Simpson and Walsh.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrews, Elliott, Elliott, Hague, Hoddinott, Jarvis, Jepson, Roche, Roddison, Senior, Sheppard, Short, Tweed and Watson.

PROTESTS.

Councillor Lelliott, Cabinet Member for Jobs and the Local Economy, welcomed Elected Members and Officers in attendance and thanked all for attending.

The Officers in attendance: -

Karen Hanson, Assistant Director, Community Safety and Street Scene;
Damien Wilson, Strategic Director, Regeneration and Environment;
Police Officer Phil Reeves, Tactical Adviser;
Chief Inspector Ian Charlton;
Superintendent Jason Harwin;
Waheed Akhtar, Voluntary Sector Liaison Manager;
Mandy Atkinson, Communications Officer;
Tracy Holmes, Communications Manager.

A brief update was provided to the Elected Members in attendance in relation to a protest planned in Rotherham Town Centre on 4th June, 2016.

- Numbers in attendance on behalf of Pegida was expected to be around 300;
- Pegida was known to be a well-ordered, low-risk group;
- It was possible members of other Right Wing groups could attend to join;
- A counter demonstration of Unite Against Fascism was expected in the number of 500 people;
- Representatives of the Rotherham Defence Campaign may also be represented;
- The march was planned for two days prior to the expected start date of Ramadan;
- Pegida's route was still subject to negotiation/confirmation and would consist of a 'silent walk';
- Unite Against Fascism had requested to follow Pegida's route;
- It was likely that some barriers would be in place;
- It was important to protect all groups' right to Free Speech;

- South Yorkshire Police were able to police this event within their existing resources. The required threshold whereby they could ask the Home Secretary to consider banning the event had not been met. The Home Secretary's powers only extended as far as being able to ban a march. She was not able to ban/prohibit assemblies.

Questions followed the information presentation, and the following were raised: -

Councillor Khan had met with Muslim Youth and they had reported some outstanding issues to him. What lessons would be learned from previous experiences to improve outcomes? Would CCTV be deployed, along with additional policing capacity?

Answer: - CCTV would be used to support the police operation on the day. Protest Liaison Teams will be on the ground, although the dialogue with the groups started weeks ago. South Yorkshire Police's aim would be to protect people and property. Protest group representatives would be asked to point out the agitators on the day to mitigate the risks. Case law around containment - Sections 12 and 14 – met criteria to have defined areas for any assembly.

Councillor Khan asked whether there was a role for Councillors within this?

This would be considered at a Ward level.

Councillor McNeely asked about All Saints' Square and the assembly points and timings. Would there be barriers put up to protect members of the public to going about their private business?

Answer: - South Yorkshire Police were working with the protest groups and had given them a deadline to determine and notify their route. If they did not respond to this within deadline their route would be determined.

Work would be undertaken to minimise the use of barriers wherever possible.

Councillor Alam was concerned about the disruption to the general public and businesses. Businesses will be impacted on one of their busiest days of the week. Could Section 12 be used to arrange marches elsewhere. He agreed and supported individuals'/groups' right to march, but not with the current disruption experienced.

Answer: - It was agreed that marches happening regularly compounded the impact on business and town centre users month after month. Changes could only happen if legislation was altered.

Councillor Sansome asked when is 'Enough Enough'? Continued marches would lose the town centre shoppers, which will cause businesses to lose money. Who pays this back?

Karen Hanson confirmed that early discussions with town centre businesses and users had taken place. The Council had asked for accounts of the marches' impacts and these would be recorded to build an evidence base.

Councillor Keenan referred to businesses that had failed due to the protest marches. She reported an example of hearing the Police stigmatising a group of protestors.

Jason Harwin said that this was not acceptable and asked for the incident to be reported. A policing aspiration would be to have only SY Police in attendance at marches, unfortunately there was not enough staff so Officers from other areas were drafted in. They were trained and many had been to previous marches and knew the area. Additional Officers being rota'd on prevented them from doing other things. The impact on staff was cancelled days off and a knock-on to their day jobs.

Councillor Jones was aware that the relevant Acts allowed local authorities to determine where marches and speeches took place. He was concerned about the potential for the protests to be hijacked by individuals not associated with the main groups. The marches were having a massive financial impact on town centre businesses. Trading could be changed to a Sunday as a way of minimising their losses as a result of Saturday marches.

Jason Harwin confirmed that Pegida had been fully compliant with any direction given by the Police. Some groups did come to fight and they had been prevented and the Police could take action when criminal offences were committed. Impact on businesses and shoppers happened regardless of where the protestors were. The Police would try and restrict against the un-proportionality of intent. It would be necessary to lobby MPs to get legislation on changing trading hours.

Councillor Alam asked if lessons had been learned from Birmingham's experiences of directing protestors away from the main retail areas.

Answer: - Birmingham's protest group/s had asked for the outskirts by choice.

Councillor Sansome asked whether this event could be hijacked by other Far Right Groups?

Jason Harwin confirmed that other groups were holding protests on the same day in other areas of the country, which could reduce this possibility.

Councillor Lelliott thanked all for attending and the informative presentation and discussion. She asked Members to get in touch with Damien Wilson and Karen Hanson if they wished to make any accounts relating to past marches' impact on Rotherham. These would constitute the evidence base for submission to the Home Secretary.

Agreed: - That the information shared be noted.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
31st May, 2016

Present:- Councillor Watson (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Allcock, Allen, Andrews, Atkin, Beaumont, Bird, Clark, Cooksey, Cusworth, Cutts, Elliot, Elliott, Ellis, Fenwick-Green, Khan, Marles, McNeely, Price, Rushforth, Russell, Sansome, Short, Simpson, Julie Turner, Walsh, Williams, Wilson and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buckley and Roche.

ADULT SOCIAL CARE

Members received a presentation from the Interim Strategic Director of Adult Social Care, the Assistant Director, Adult Social Care and the Assistant Director, Strategic Commissioning which contained an update about the Adult Social Care Development Programme.

The presentation and members' subsequent discussion highlighted the following salient issues:-

- The Adult Social Care Development Programme was a comprehensive programme to modernise adult services and deliver significant savings;
- The programme require major decisions and significant changes in what the Council must do and how the Council do it;
- Elected Members must be aware of the challenges the Council faces, the decisions taken so far and the decisions that will need to be taken in 2016;
- Vision and strategy for adult social care;
- The challenge which the Council has to address;
- The ambition that adults with disabilities and older people and their carers in Rotherham are supported to be independent and resilient;
- The desired outcomes for these groups are that they should live good quality lives and their health and wellbeing are maximised.

- For most people, this entails remaining in the community with family and friends accessing mainstream services (people most dependent are those aged 85 years and over) – having access to a range of community services (eg: community assets and premises);
- It is essential there is a partnership involving the statutory organisations and the wide range of voluntary, community and faith groups and clubs
- Sign-posting to appropriate, available services;
- Prevention and intervention;
- Pro-active services, some will provide one-off support;
- A key element of the strategy is re-ablement and rehabilitation – people must remain as independent as possible;
- Provision of mainstream services, rather than special or separate services;

- develop Extracare Sheltered Housing and supported living;
- provide better personalised and integrated services
- provide support for carers (Care Act 2015 requirement).

- Comparison with other local authorities; this Council has too many residential placements at too high a cost, with an over-reliance on traditional methods of care (eg: day centres); important to improve home care services;
- need for better provision of advice to people at the first point of contact, rather than involve people in time-consuming costly assessments which ultimately may result in there being no need for a care package;
- reduce costs at least to the local authorities' average (eg: respite care for people with a learning disability is provided at a high cost when compared to other local authorities);
- Re-ablement service is 50% more costly than that of comparable local authorities and the cost of 'down-time' (ie: no contact with clients) is a strain on Council resources;
- Adult Social care Programme Board has been established (with broad representation of membership – local authority, health service, community and voluntary sector);
- The role of the Programme Board is to provide overall governance, hold the Project Board Chairs to account and ensure progress is being made;
- Link workers have been appointed;
- Build on existing initiatives eg Social Prescribing and link activity between community and formal care;
- Funding for community connectors who will engage with older people and sign-post them to community services (plus the GISMO on-line service being developed with Voluntary Action Rotherham);
- Staff teams being restructured within the Council, in order to deliver the new approach; integration of local authority and health service teams;
- Radical change must ensure that the Care Act 2015 requirements are being implemented
- Ensuring 7-days per week working, which has already been introduced at the Rotherham hospital;
- Home-based approach – eg: direct payments, changes in day care services.
- Keep streamlining services and adopt and implement best practice;
- Intention to close Netherfield Court;
- Emphasis on the needs of the individual;
- Importance of the Safeguarding of Adults (peer review of services; implementation of strategy; role of the Adults Safeguarding Board);
- Appointment of Sandie Keene as Independent Chair of the Adults Safeguarding Board;
- Carers strategy - imminent completion of the consultation process;
- National Development Team for Inclusion – support for people with learning disabilities;

- Proposals to be prepared around respite care and use of alternative models such as Shared Lives;
- Making the system of direct payments easier for clients to understand and use;
- Continue to engage Elected Members in visits and in discussions about local initiatives eg Potteries and Addison .

Discussion items:-

(a) The extent of privatisation of care (including health care) in Rotherham – it was explained that many elements of care are retained in house by the Council; the Council must review this in the future, based on quality and cost, in the light of a national trend towards privatisation;

(b) People who may be at the early stage of diagnosis, (eg mental health and possible autism) and the waiting times for assessment – a shortage of local services and consequent need to access services elsewhere; the level of provision of support for adults with mental health issues; the counselling services available and help for people suffering extreme stress; there are concerns that appropriate help is not always available; The best approach is prevention and early intervention. Lower-levels of service should be available at an early stage and be available quickly and faster than the more extensive, later assessments; link workers will help sign-post people to services available within the community (eg RDaSH services); the disadvantage of service integration is that mental health services often focus on acute cases and not as much on the early preventative support which could prevent a person's situation from becoming worse; efforts are being made to re-focus the service; there is no need for a patient to be at crisis point in order to gain access to an appropriate service.

(c) the existence of any small businesses (micro-enterprises) which may provide adult care services; very few such enterprises were now in existence, although an increase was anticipated in the future (officers were asked to provide relevant details);

(d) Promotion of the Rothercare services, which is valuable in responding to incidents which occur during the night and outside the usual office hours; discussions are taking place with the service provider in terms of future service development and promotion; the service should be streamlined in accordance with demand; individuals in receipt of care will be subject to an assessment of their risk/care needs during the night;

(e) the frequency and costs of the assessment of clients, especially for people who may have a learning disability; the early, initial assessments are extremely important enabling clients to be sign-posted to the most appropriate services; people who receive a package of support will have their circumstances reviewed at least annually and changes in circumstances will result in more frequent reviews; it is also important that financial savings are achieved;

(f) the importance of the various mental health services, psychological intervention, early diagnosis of problems and the prevention of suicide; discussions are taking place with RDaSH about possible service transformation; this process also involves the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group; discussions and consultation are still at quite an early stage and the need for change is acknowledged;

(g) the alignment of medical GPs to residential care homes and the ratio of GPs to people living in residential care homes; the primary care needs of patients will be of paramount concern for service commissioners and providers; there will also be discussions with the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group about this issue; (details of GP and patient ratios are to be provided separately);

(h) the provision of public transport, especially bus services, is a serious concern for people who rely heavily on this mode of transport; appropriate means of transport should be available, although there are commercial considerations; discussions will continue with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive;

(i) the system of placing people into residential care, both elderly people and also younger people who may have specific needs such as a learning disability; it is preferable that people should live independently in their own homes, with residential care being the least preferred option; the use of the Shared Lives project will assist this process;

(j) discussion about the traditions and culture of care of the elderly; the Assessment Direct telephone number (01709 822330) aims to provide a single point of contact; partnership working between the Council and health services is important;

(k) review of resources for Adult Social Care – the Government-appointed Commissioners to the Council will ensure the thorough review of resources; compliance with the requirements of the Care Act 2015 is an imperative;

(l) the dominance of the private sector residential care homes; the commissioning of services has to be effective and there is regulation from the Health and Care Quality Commission; service providers exist in the public, the private and the voluntary sectors and there are good and bad practices in each sector; (information about private sector providers will be issued separately).

Members thanked the officers for a very informative seminar.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
4th March, 2016

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor M. Dyson

Councillor R. Frost

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor A. Jones

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor C. Vines

Councillor E. Wallis

Sheffield City Council

Councillor J. Armstrong

Councillor S. Mair-Richards (**in the Chair**)

Councillor J. Otten

Co-opted Member

Mr. A. Carter

Mr. S. Chu

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillors G. Jones (Doncaster)

Councillors C. McGuiness (Doncaster)

Councillor J. Campbell (Sheffield)

F44. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

“Can the area assemblies have all crimes reported not just a selected few. 2/3rds of the crimes are not reported to the area assembly i.e. assaults, domestic violence, fraud, drug possession etc.”

44.2 The Police and Crime Commissioner responded in writing indicating Area Assemblies were Council meetings. He understood that each Area Assembly was responsible for setting its own agenda and requesting the information required.

44.3 South Yorkshire Police provided detailed crime information at its “Partners and Communities Together” (PACT) meetings. To find your local PACT meeting contact the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner at info@southyorkshire-pcc.gov.uk and they would provide details of the next PACT meeting.

44.4 The Chairman reported that this was a matter for Rotherham and would be referring the content to Councillors Sims and Yasseen, relevant Cabinet Members with responsibility, to discuss with the various Chairs of Area Assemblies.

F45. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

45.1 Mr. Alan Carter, Co-opted Member, had submitted the following question:-

“The Sheffield First Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership Board meeting on 20th November, 2015, was informed that the community trigger was a new power contained in the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 and was advised of the criteria for applying its provisions.

My recollection of the meeting was that it was specifically agreed to raise awareness with Elected Members (of the Sheffield City Council) and inform them when a Community Trigger had been initiated in their area and also to broaden the publication of Community Triggers to include leaflets in libraries, give them to registered social landlords to distribute and to speak with Voluntary Action Sheffield and also with GP surgeries.

(Note I am given to believe that these actions subsequently may already have been followed up in Sheffield but only members who sit on the appropriate Partnership Boards (or their equivalent) in each of the four Districts may be privy to this information.)

I did wonder at the time of learning about this relatively new provision if the system might provide to be somewhat bureaucratic, costly and not necessarily sustainable in the longer term. However, I also wondered if similar publicity arrangements to those commenced in Sheffield had indeed been made across South Yorkshire and also, if the matter was considered to be of sufficient importance, if it might also be possible for a report about Community Triggers to be brought to our attention in order to raise Panel Members’ general awareness as community representatives of the availability of the statutory provision?

Furthermore, I contemplated whether the two Independent Members of this Panel (along with our Elected Member colleagues) might also benefit from a more detailed knowledge about the prevalence across South Yorkshire to date of Community Triggers since their implementation. Might it be possible, therefore, for this information and some up-to-date statistics and an assessment of their value (or otherwise) to you on a County-wide basis to be made available to all members of this Panel in assisting with the determination of your priorities as our Police and Crime Commissioner?”

45.2 In response to the question, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner had produced a report giving an update on the introduction of the Community Trigger (CT) within the South Yorkshire Partnership. The report was distributed to those present.

45.3 Mr. Carter expressed his surprise that no cost had been incurred operating this system and believed some form of cost element must have been borne, but thanked the Police and Crime Commissioner for his answer.

45.3 Councillor Otten asked the following questions:-

(a) "Do you accept the conclusions of the HMIC report published on 18th February, 2016 into the effectiveness of South Yorkshire Police and what steps are you taking to ensure its recommendations are implemented?"

(b) "Do you recognise the concerns expressed on page 8 of the PEEL: Police effectiveness 2015 A national overview report regarding the degradation of community policing? Have you evidence that those concerns are not well placed in South Yorkshire given recent changes to neighbourhood policing structures?"

45.4 With regard to question (a), the Police and Crime Commissioner supplied an answer in writing which confirmed:-

"I do accept HMIC's conclusions as did the Chief Constable.

The Force had detailed action plans in place for addressing the recommendations made by HMIC and he would monitor these through his Governance and Assurance Board.

As he had said in a recent public statement, HMIC reports were useful for him when he held the Force to account. They helped him see more clearly the areas that needed greater attention.

The report concentrated on how effective the Force was at preventing and investigating crime and anti-social behaviour, tackling serious and organised crime and protecting victims and the vulnerable. It was a mixed picture of 'good' and 'requiring improvement'.

He was pleased that the Force was considered 'good' at preventing crime and anti-social behaviour and keeping people safe. Keeping people safe was the overall outcome of the Police and Crime Plan that he produced each year.

It was also good news that the Force was 'good' at tackling serious and organised crime and fulfilling national responsibilities including cyber-crime. The report acknowledged that South Yorkshire had some very experienced and capable officers.

But the Force would have to work at improving the way it investigated crime more generally and managed offenders. The latter would require greater co-operation with other agencies. However, the Commissioner noted that victim satisfaction levels remained above the national average. He also noted the strain that had been placed on the Force due to cuts in grant and, therefore, in numbers. We needed to find more savings from areas other than the workforce if the good work was to be built upon.

I shall be particularly concerned to ensure that the Force this more carefully about how it protected from harm those who were vulnerable and those who became victims of crime.

He was very pleased that the report recognised the steps that had been taken to improve the Force's response to child sexual exploitation. It stated clearly that there was now strong leadership in place and it was 'well prepared' to tackled child sexual exploitation.

But more needed to be done to understand domestic abuse and help the victims and their children.

Protecting the vulnerable would be a key priority for the renewed Police and Crime Plan which he would be publishing in a few weeks' time. We need to expand our understanding of who the vulnerable were.

There was also growing categories of victims that needed sensitive help such as those suffering domestic abuse or those caught up in modern slavery and trafficking. We are only just beginning to recognise the scale of the problem.

The Commissioner would use the report to focus the attention of the Police on those areas of growing concern."

45.5 In a supplementary question Councillor Otten thanked the Commissioner for his answer which was very thorough and he accepted and agreed with what had been said. However, the HMIC report referred to had some quite specific recommendations and raised concern that the Force was not being sufficiently effective in protecting the vulnerable and supporting victims. There were specific recommendations and he was not seeing specific responses to those. It may well be that the Commissioner was including these in the Police and Crime Plan.

45.6 The Police and Crime Commissioner replied that he accepted the report of HMIC and gave him some idea of where the Force was performing well and where it was not performing well. The Commissioner would take the report to various forums that he had with the Police – 1:1 meetings with the Chief Constable, Senior Leadership Group and the Governance and Assurance Board where they would be discussed in some detail and hold the Force to account and ask them what they were doing about it. If there were specific things in the report that the Panel

was not sure about or would like more information, it could be brought to the Panel and show exactly what was being done but otherwise be assured that the areas HMIC were particularly flagging up such as domestic abuse and weaknesses around that up would be pursued through those various meetings.

45.7 The Chair pointed out sharing information with the Panel would be useful.

45.8 With regard to question (b), the Commissioner reported in writing that-

"I am committed to neighbourhood policing and it was his intention, in conjunction with the Chief Constable, to maintain the number of PCSOs there was across the Force.

The people of South Yorkshire valued highly visible, dedicated police teams who knew an area well, supported by locally based PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers).

During 2015 the Force moved to more flexible multi-skilled Local Policing Teams ('LPTs') which maintained the commitment to local policing and also provided greater resilience and more operational responsiveness at busy times. HMIC recognised that the new structure was not yet firmly embedded.

Further evaluation and review of the Local Policing model was planned for the next financial year. As part of the review, we will be consulting with the public (and partners) to better understand their policing needs and how responsive the re-modelled policing service feels."

45.9 In a supplementary question Councillor Otten asked the impression he had got from the HMIC report was that they had seen the transition in terms of neighbourhood policing happen in a number of Forces and asked if it was known what the impact that transition had had on effectiveness? The Commissioner indicated that there would be further evaluation and review coming in the new financial year which suggested there had been some evaluation and therefore what were the results.

45.10 The Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that essentially what was being talked about was neighbourhood policing and the future of neighbourhood policing at a time of austerity and cuts. The numbers of Police Officers were fewer and, therefore, action had to be taken around that. The previous response teams and previous neighbourhood teams were now combined into local policing teams with a neighbourhood focus and fewer numbers. That had been rolled out across South Yorkshire, district by district, and was really only just being embedded and settled in. It was probably too soon to know exactly what the consequences of that had been. It was known that there had been teething problems in some areas and that had had to be looked at and

see what was needed in terms of resources. The Commissioner would hesitate to form a more mature judgement at this moment in time.

45.11 The Chair explained that at her own Safer Sheffield Partnership meeting discussion had taken place about Local Policing Teams with reflected many of the issues being raised. She would endeavour to share the presentation that was provided with Councillor Otten.

45.12 Councillor Frost referred to their being adverse publicity this week in the media following a Freedom of Information request about response times answering 101 calls. The report said that times had trebled in the two years to 2014/15 and 50,000+ calls had been abandoned. Since then the Commissioner had reported that staffing issues at Atlas Court have been rectified. He, therefore, asked would response times have reduced for 2015/16, was the procurement process for the new ICT contract on schedule and when would the public be able to report incidents and concerns by email and social media.

45.13 The Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that members of the public could already contact the Force by e-mail and social media. As far as the new ICT contract was concerned, it was going according to schedule and at the point where the contract would be signed and sealed in April. It did mean then that there would be a period of design of the system and consultation around that and would be towards the end of the year before the new technology was in place. There was recognition that the technology was not fit for purpose in Atlas Court and the new system was identified and costed in the Capital Programme at £12 million over two years.

The staffing levels at Atlas Court was a judgement call against a background of cuts and the numbers had been allowed to go too low at one point so additional had staff been brought in. Staff had been recruited and were on twelve weeks training courses and would be in place as from June.

The volume of calls had increased, which was worrying. Attempts would be made to deflect some of that demand because 30% of the calls were not related to policing matters.

Before 2015 the response times were an average of 30 seconds; it was now 1 minute 34 seconds which was not good enough.

45.15 Councillor Frost in a supplementary comment was pleased to learn that some of the callers were signposted in the right direction and the calls were not abandoned.

45.16 Councillor Wallis apologised for not following the correct procedure, but was not present when the finalised member question procedure was approved and because the events which gave rise to the question had arisen less than 48 hours previously. She was given

permission to ask her query which related to how on Tuesday afternoon she learnt via media reports that the Police and Crime Commissioner had established or was going to establish a Policing Panel to look at protests in Rotherham. The fact that this learnt of this via media reports concerned her slightly and it also concerned her because how could the Police and Crime Commissioner to account when Members were learning about such important matters after the event. Councillor Wallis, therefore, wished to ask the Police and Crime Commissioner, bearing in mind that this Panel had been set up in response to recommendations of a commissioned report following agitation within the community by groups who were widely regarded in Rotherham as seeking to justify the unjustifiable, could he give her assurance that members from those particular groups would not be on the Panel that had now been established.

45.17 The Police and Crime Commissioner reassured Panel Members that Rotherham was told in advance about this and apologised if this had not been passed on. He confirmed there had been a number of marches in Rotherham, and other places, by some far right groups that have caused a great deal of disquiet in those places. Not only had they disrupted businesses in the centre of town, but disturbed members of the public who were trying to be in the centre of town and caused real tensions within communities.

The march in September, 2015 caused particular disquiet in Rotherham and as a result a review was requested with two members on the Panel drawn from the Ethics Panel, the Chair and Iman Mohammed Ismail. Following the review a report was produced with recommendations. The principal recommendation was that a Policing Protest Panel be set up which would meet with the Police in advance of any march/demonstration planned and give some advice so that the policing of the event would be proportionate.

The Panel had yet to be established and there was to be a meeting shortly with the Chair of the Minority Communities Panel and the Ethics Panel to consider the membership. It was essential that this group be as independent as possible.

45.18 In a supplementary question Councillor Wallis was reassured by the comments and it was not widely shared that this Panel was for the whole of South Yorkshire, which was welcomed. However, she still sought reassurance that no members on the Panel would be drawn from groups who have previously sought to organise a boycott of South Yorkshire Police as this was not felt to be appropriate.

45.19 The Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed he would pass the comments onto the two Chairs, who were of good judgement and would make sensible recommendations about the Panel's membership.

F46. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 27TH JANUARY, 2016

46.1 Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel held on 27th January, 2016.

Action:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27th January, 2016, be approved for signature by the Chair subject to the following amendments:-

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

(3) That the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel supports the proposal, now submitted by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, increase in Council Tax for 2016/17 is £5 for a Band D property (a 3.3% increase) to £153.16. This is equivalent to an increase of 10p per week.”

F47. PUTTING SAFETY FIRST - SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN 2013/17 - (RENEWED MARCH 2016)

47.1 Consideration was given to the refreshed version of the Plan previously submitted in March, 2015 (Minute No. 37 refers).

47.2 The Plan was a key document that set out, on behalf of the public, the priorities for the Police for the year ahead. Having listened to the views of a wide range of stakeholders including community groups, local authorities and the voluntary sector, the Police and Crime Commissioner had identified all shared a similar view with respect of being safe and feeling safe.

47.3 There was a consensus to retain the existing priorities for South Yorkshire of Protecting Vulnerable People, Tackling Crime and ASB and Enabling Fair Treatment. However, there was recognition of the need to change emphasis in some of the outcomes in order to reflect new and evolving policing and crime demands identified through consultation with the public and partners as well as results from needs/threats assessments.

47.4 After the Police and Crime Commissioner had completed summary of the report, Members of the Police and Crime Panel asked the following questions:-

- When would the report from Professor Drew be published and could this be shared with Panel Members.

- Publication of the strategic priorities and the shifting of resources by other public organisations following comments previously made.
- Giving fair treatment for all, meeting service delivery and ensuring a visible Police presence, which was an older person's perception that visibility was reducing.
- Concerns that the Police Protection Unit was being disbanded.
- Managing the issues given that 80% of Police activity was not related to crime.
- Positive outcome of Operation Clover and paying tribute to bringing some of the perpetrators to justice.
- Increased reliance on technology and the proposed training on twitter and whether consideration should be given to including other Police Officers.
- Confidence levels in the Police and the decreased levels of confidence in Rotherham and how this could be restored.
- Advice provided by the Independent Advisory Panels and how participation in the Police Cadets could be encouraged from the minority ethnic communities
- Staff acting according to their respective codes of ethics and professional practice which was welcomed.
- Increasing staff confidence and dedication from officers.
- Funding to acquire the capital assets, equipment and infrastructure that were needed to deliver policing services in South Yorkshire and added concerns about the insufficiency of mental health placements with the burden falling on the Police.
- Force collaboration whether this be locally, regionally or nationally and the need to respond to challenges and ensure any devolution was efficient, effective and sustainable.
- Devolution of power to the Sheffield City Region and the continual monitoring of how this would be policed in the future.
- Collaboration across the public sector and partnership working and the need for a flexible approach.

47.5 The Police and Crime Commissioner gave an undertaking that he would continue to listen to the views of all those involved in the design and delivery of policing and crime services to inform priorities and assist in commissioning services that contributed to the delivery of the outcomes identified within this Plan and asked for any additional feedback.

Action:- (1) That the report be received and the detail noted.

(2) That the Panel submit any further comments to the Police and Crime Commissioner on the Police and Crime Plan 2013/17: Putting Safety First before the 14th March, 2016, deadline.

(Mr. S. Chu, Independent Member, declared a personal interest in that he was the Chief Executive of a local charity)

F48. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER'S PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY

48.1 In accordance with Minute No. 22 of the meeting held on 16th October, 2015, the Police and Crime Commissioner presented a report on the engagement activity he had undertaken over the last twelve months as well as the engagements he would be focusing on over the coming months.

48.2 The focus of consultation over the Summer months and early Autumn had focussed on priorities for the Police and Crime Plan 2016/17. This was in the form of attendance at events and meetings.

48.3 In December, 2015 and January, 2016, a consultation exercise had taken place seeking the views of South Yorkshire residents to an increase in the Council Tax precept by 10p per week or £5 per year for Council Tax payers (3.7%). The consultation took the form of an on-line survey which was promoted via the media, social media, the Federation of Small Businesses and the engagement data base of around 5,000 contacts.

48.4 The Chair sought clarification on the 63% of respondents and as advised that this was from a total figure of 117, amounting to 66/67 respondents being in favour.

48.6 The Panel were in agreement with the improvement proposals for the Partners & Communities Together ('PACT') meetings by re-branding them as Community Engagement Meetings and forging closer links and it was also suggested that the member of the public that had submitted a question earlier today also be informed of the progress.

Action:- That the report and the Commissioner's commitment to engagement activity be noted.

F49. COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE AND UPDATE

49.1 Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser to the Panel, presented a report on the handling of complaints received against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

49.2 The following complaints had been resolved:-

1. A complaint about the nature of South Yorkshire Police's response to a robbery.

As this complaint was an operational matter it had been referred to South Yorkshire Police. The complainant had been informed that had happened.

2. The IPCC had now returned to the Panel stating that they did not intend to investigate the two complaints regarding the former South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

49.3 It was noted that should the Panel feel strongly enough that the two complaints about the former Police and Crime Commissioner should be investigated, this could be initiated by way of a Sub-Committee, but there was no evidence to suggest criminal offences had been committed.

49.4 The Chair suggested that a report be submitted to the next meeting to give greater clarity to the Panel on what it could and could not do with regards to complaints. The new Police and Crime Bill could well address the issues in relation to Police and Crime Commissioners and Deputy Police and Crime Commissioners and this detail should be included as part of the report.

49.5 Mr. Carter made a helpful suggestion in whether or not the Panel should be consulted or offer any advice on complaints coming forward. This was to be considered in more detail.

49.6 Stuart Fletcher, Legal Adviser to the Panel, also submitted proposed revisions to the current Complaints Procedure.

49.7 As previously discussed, it was proposed that the initial handling of complaints be delegated to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The remainder of the Complaints Procedure was unchanged.

49.8 Some Panel Members shared views about the handling of complaints, but were advised this would be revisited if it was found to be unsustainable.

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

(2) That the proposed revision of the Complaints Procedure be approved – immediate.

(3) That a further report be submitted to the next meeting on what the Panel could and could not do with regards to complaints.

F50. DATES OF FUTURE MEETING

Action:- That the next meeting take place on 15th April, 2016, and commence at 11.00 a.m. in Rotherham Town Hall.

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
11th March, 2016

Present:- Councillor K. Sims (Rotherham MBC - in the Chair); Councillors R. Miller (Barnsley MBC) and Councillor C. McGuinness (Doncaster MBC), together with Mrs. L. Baxter (BDR Joint Waste Manager), Mr. A. Gabriel (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC), Mr. L. Garrett (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

Also in attendance : Councillor T. Fox and Mr. A. Black (Sheffield City Council) – attending at the invitation of the Chair, in respect of item 25 below.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E. Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC) and from Mr. D. Burton (Rotherham MBC), Mrs. G. Gillies (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. M. Gladstone (Barnsley MBC).

18. RETIREMENT OF COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

The Joint Waste Board was informed of the impending retirement of the following Members and officers:-

- a) Councillor Kath Sims, whose term of office ends in May 2016 and who is not seeking re-election to Rotherham Borough Council;
- b) Mr. David Burton, Director of Streetpride, Rotherham MBC, who is retiring on 31st May, 2016; and
- c) Mr. Adrian Gabriel, Principal Waste Officer, Rotherham MBC, who is retiring on 31st May, 2016.

Agreed:- That the BDR Joint Waste Board places on record its appreciation of the services of Councillor Sims and of Mr. Burton and Mr. Gabriel and they all be wished long and happy retirements.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

20. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH DECEMBER 2015

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 11th December, 2015.

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

21. MATTERS ARISING

The following matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board were discussed:-

(1) (Minute No. 13 – BDR Manager's Report) – a report about the waste compositional analysis will be submitted to the next meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board, to be held on Friday, 10th June, 2016;

(2) (Minute No. 13 – BDR Manager's Report) – it was agreed that consideration be given to the production and broadcasting of a 'virtual tour' film of the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, with public viewing available via either the Internet web site and/or You Tube;

(3) (Minute No. 13 – BDR Manager's Report) – it is expected that the revised Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA.3) will be finalised and signed during March 2016.

22. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager, concerning the Internal Audit review of the contract procedures relating to the operation of the BDR waste treatment facility at Manvers, Wath upon Dearne, undertaken during 2015 by officers of the Rotherham MBC Internal Audit Section. The ten recommendations of the Internal Audit review were detailed within the submitted report.

The Internal Audit report stated that the overall control environment is adequate and there were no fundamental concerns which would warrant consideration for inclusion in the Annual Governance Statement. However, implementation of the report's recommendations should enhance the control environment and provide an increased level of assurance to management.

Members discussed the contents of the Waste Treatment Facility action plan which contained details of the way in which the responses to the ten recommendations of the Internal Audit review would be actioned.

Discussion took place on the requirements of recommendation 6 of Internal Audit review report, concerning the checking of 100% of the weighbridge weight tickets. It was agreed that, in order to avoid any duplication of effort, the Internal Auditor be asked to confirm the period of time during which the requirement to check 100% of the tickets should apply.

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

(2) That a further report, updating the Waste Treatment Facility action plan and detailing the extent of compliance with each of the recommendations, be submitted to the next meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board to be held on 10th June, 2016.

(3) That the response of the Internal Auditor in respect of recommendation 6 of the action plan be reported to the next meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board.

23. BDR MANAGER'S REPORT

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager submitted a report which highlighted and updated the following issues relating to the Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI), for the period December 2015 to February 2016:-

: further details of the changes at senior management level within Rotherham MBC;

: information about the number of tonnes of waste processed and the contract performance in respect of the recycling and diversion of waste materials;

: complaints received about the operation of the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, during the period 3rd July, 2015 to 31st January, 2016; it was noted that the majority of complaints relate to the noise of site operations; some complaints are made via the Environment Agency and it was known that several complaints originate from the same local neighbourhood situated near to the site; it was noted that the Environment Agency is to undertake a noise impact assessment of the site;

: the health and safety compliance details and accident report for the period 3rd July, 2015 to 31st January, 2016; details of the RIDDOR reportable incidents will be provided for Elected Members; reference was made to the number of 'close-call' incidents and further information about trends per calendar quarter would be provided at the next meeting of this Joint Waste Board;

: Ferrybridge facility – fuel deliveries and electricity export, July 2015 to January 2016; a further explanation was requested about the figure for September 2015, which was comparatively higher than other months;

: Grange Lane facility at Wath upon Dearne;

: Communications – meetings with various community groups and the publication of a media report about the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne, which had been published in the Rotherham Advertiser newspaper on Friday, 5th February, 2016;

: the continuing review of the insurance policies, to try and reduce the level of premiums;

: the review of the Inter-Authority Agreement, to provide more clarity and remove some historical information, is almost complete and the expectation is that the revised agreement will be finalised and signed during March 2016;

: after completion of a tender exercise, Romaine have been appointed as financial advisers to the BDR Private Finance Initiative;

: glossary of terms relating to waste management and the Joint Waste PFI.

Discussion also took place on the national issue concerning the possible inclusion of incinerator bottom ash from the waste incineration process in the calculation of recycling performance at the waste treatment plant. It was noted that the Chair of the Sheffield City Region (Sir Steve Houghton, Barnsley MBC) has written a letter to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs requesting clarification of this issue. The BDR Joint Waste Board suggested that all four of the principal local authorities of South Yorkshire should send a similar letter to the Secretary of State, in order to confirm the County-wide consistent and unified approach to this matter by those local authorities.

Agreed:- (1) That the BDR Manager's report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That details of the Environment Agency noise impact assessment of the waste treatment facility at Bolton Road, Wath upon Dearne be reported to a future meeting of this Joint Waste Board.

(3) That a report detailing the number of accidents and 'close-call' incidents occurring at the waste treatment facilities be submitted to every meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board.

(4) That the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager ensure that the four principal local authorities of South Yorkshire send the letter to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, concerning the waste incineration process and the response of the Secretary of State be reported to a meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board in due course.

24. RISK REGISTER

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI risk status report (risk register), as at March, 2016.

The BDR Joint Waste Board was informed that Rotherham MBC had recently changed the Corporate Risk Register format and that the JCAD system, previously used, was no longer supported. Consequently, a spreadsheet is now maintained and reported on corporately within Rotherham MBC. The open risks from JCAD have been transferred across to the new format and new risks have been added (eg: the risk of fraud; the risk of contractor default).

The method of scoring the benchmark effects, which was different from the method previously used on JCAD, was explained. The 'red, amber, green' method of reporting the status of each risk will also be used.

It was also noted that the BDR Joint Waste Steering Committee will be organising workshops about the preparation and use of the risk register.

Members of the BDR Joint Waste Board noted that the risk register will continue to be an evolving document. Each successive report to meetings of the Joint Waste Board will describe the progress with and status of each risk and provide information about risks which have been able to be removed from the register and those new risks which are being added to the register. It was suggested that any status 'red' risks should be highlighted early and prominently within the report.

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

25. BARNSELEY, DONCASTER, ROTHERHAM AND SHEFFIELD WASTE STRATEGY 2016 TO 2021

Further to Minute No. 26 of the meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board held on 12th December, 2014, the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Manager gave a presentation to the meeting about the Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Waste Strategy 2016 to 2021. The presentation included the following details:-

: All of the four of these principal Councils have individual waste strategies;

: Best practice recommends the review of these strategies every five years;

: The Strategy will outline the priorities that are most important to the residents of these local authority areas;

: The Strategy's priorities are influenced by external factors:-

- Political (e.g. new legislation)
- Financial (e.g. budget restraints)
- Consultation with residents, local businesses, statutory bodies (e.g. Environment Agency) and with other stakeholders.

: The Waste Strategy is needed:-

- To provide a clear direction
- To contribute to the aims and objectives of the Waste Management Plan for England 2013
- Because the Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Council's current waste strategies would benefit from being reviewed.

: Joint working between the four local authorities will be beneficial because:-

- All of the authorities are working towards the same overarching strategy;
- Efficiencies and savings will be made;
- Best practice - working towards common goals in the future;
- Waste is a cross-boundary strategic planning matter;
- Co-ordinated development and use of infrastructure.

Preparation of the Waste Strategy is timely, because:-

- Previous strategies need to be reviewed
 - Barnsley 2007 - 2030
 - Doncaster 2009 - 2025
 - Rotherham 2005 - 2020
 - Sheffield 2009 - 2020
- Devolution and the Sheffield City Region.

Key Strategic Priorities (KSP)

- KSP A – the aim to encourage and inspire children and adults across Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield to make less waste by reducing, re-using and recycling more.
- KSP B – The four Councils will work together more closely to deliver value for money services.
- KSP C – the local authorities will work hard to deliver and maintain a dependable and reliable service to all customers and residents.
- KSP D – the local authorities will continue to explore how technology can be used to improve recycling and waste services.
- KSP E – the local authorities will be pro-active to influence decision-making on waste at European, national and local level, to drive investment into infrastructure within the Sheffield City Region economy.

Consultation on the key strategic priorities of the waste strategy will take place in June and July 2016. Adoption by the four principal local authorities of South Yorkshire between September and November 2016

Members discussed the following salient issues:-

- the contents of the consultation documents; it was noted that a report on this matter will be submitted for consideration by each of four principal local authorities of South Yorkshire during April 2016;
- the importance of close joint working between the four principal local authorities of South Yorkshire, acknowledging that there are differences in the various waste contracts in the individual local authority areas;
- governance arrangements, the inter-authority agreement (IAA.3) – the potential need for an inter-authority agreement between the four principal local authorities of South Yorkshire and the flexibility required for the operation of waste services within each of those four local authorities' areas.

Agreed:- That the contents of the presentation about the Waste Strategy 2016 to 2021, as now submitted, be noted and the outcome of the public consultation process about this Strategy be considered at a future meeting of the BDR Joint Waste Board.

26. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

27. BDR PFI BUDGET UPDATE 2015/16

Consideration was given to the Budget Summary, as at February 2016, for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI). It was noted that current expenditure remained within the agreed budget.

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

28. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- (1) That the annual meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on Friday 10th June, 2016 at the Town Hall, Rotherham, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

(2) That, if necessary, a meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held during September, 2016, on a date to be arranged.

(3) That a scheduled meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board be held on a date to be arranged during December, 2016.