

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

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

Date: Wednesday, 22nd January, 2020

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 14)
2. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 15 - 32)
3. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 33 - 50)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 51 - 68)
5. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board (Pages 69 - 72)

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
10th October, 2019

Present:- Councillor Keenan (in the Chair); Councillors Albiston, Brookes, The Mayor (Councillor Jenny Andrews), Bird, Cooksey, R. Elliott, John Turner, Vjestica and Walsh.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jarvis and Williams.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Bird declared an interest pertaining to the item on the Trailblazer Mental Health Pilot as Chair of Governors at Rawmarsh Children's Centre and the Arnold Centre.

37. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There was no reason to exclude members of the public or the press from any item on the agenda.

38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

39. COMMUNICATIONS

World Mental Health Day

The Chair reminded everyone that this was celebrated on 10th October and wished everyone a good and happy day.

Be The One Campaign

The Director of Public Health provided an update on the campaign which had achieved 160,847 web hits since its launch in September 2019, including 27,720 to date in October. 68 pledges had been made, excluding those via social media. Very importantly, 373 toolkits had been downloaded. The video had been shown at two Rotherham United games, reaching around 34,000 people with another 743 viewings on the website. Three quarters of a million "shares" had been on social media and the aim was to reach one million. More badges were available if required.

Healthwatch Rotherham

The Chief Executive informed the Select Commission about recent work that Healthwatch had undertaken:-

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 10/10/19

- In support of World Mental Health Day a new men's mental health group had been formed which met on Tuesdays at Rotherham Titans and was having significant impact.
- The recent cluster of maternity issues at Rotherham Hospital had all been resolved satisfactorily bar one that would be discussed at a meeting between the service user, the Trust and Healthwatch the following week.
- Healthwatch had been working with Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and RCCG on the neuro-developmental pathway to try and reduce waiting times for assessment.
- Work on intermediate care and reablement would be commencing on behalf of RCCG through interviews with residents of Lord Hardy and Davis Court.
- Annual PLACE assessments had been carried out at Rotherham Hospital and the Hospice.
- Healthwatch Rotherham had won an award, along with their South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw partners, from Healthwatch England for outstanding achievement on engagement work on the NHS Long-term Plan. Rotherham in particular had high levels of interaction and input.
- The contract for the Healthwatch service in Rotherham had gone out to tender without the NHS complaints advocacy.

Information Pack

Contained within the information pack circulated to Members were the slides from the Respiratory Care Pack, further information from Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (RCCG) on engagement and a presentation about the proposed Target Operating Model in Adult Social Care.

40. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH SEPTEMBER 2019

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 5th September, 2019.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 5th September, 2019 be approved as a correct record.

41. SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL MENTAL HEALTH STRATEGY

Jenny Lingrell, Joint Assistant Director Commissioning, Performance & Inclusion (RMBC and Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group), delivered a short presentation to provide the Health Select Commission with an overview of the latest draft of the new Social, Emotional and Mental Health Strategy.

Initial actions had commenced in October 2018 with the development of robust data on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Sufficiency and would culminate in new provision being introduced in a

phased approach by September 2021. An action plan covering the six priorities was incorporated within the draft strategy and set out timescales to implement the Mental Health Trailblazer (see next item), which would pilot a new approach to delivering mental health support in schools and act as an enabler. The action plan would also be refreshed annually.

Social, Emotional and Mental Health Strategy

Context

- Provides a strategic framework to underpin activity
- Builds on the foundation of existing work and policy drivers but tries not to over-complicate
- Does not identify every activity or action in detail
- Has been co-produced with headteachers; and reflects the views of children and young people

Principles of Collective Responsibility for Children and Young People with Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulties

- Be based on the equitable use of resources which is affordable, with realistic expectations and clearly defined outcomes
- Be a whole Borough response which is informed by transparent information and data and knowledge of local and national good practice;
- Recognise the importance of early intervention and be family and person centred;
- Recognise the importance of collective responsibility, which includes education, health and care partners and is based on a shared understanding of what is expected of all parties;
- Provide a graduated response with thresholds to prevent escalation into expensive out of borough provision;
- Provide local and flexible solutions which are developed and managed by schools;

Vision

Rotherham meets the social, emotional and mental health needs of all children and young people through seamless access to the right services at the right time and a confident and resilient workforce

Priorities

1. **Sufficiency:** develop local education provision that responds to need – this will include flexible and specialist provision (special schools and specialist provision in mainstream)
2. **Seamless Pathways:** ensure that pathways to support are connected and aligned and develop a clear behaviour pathway that includes responses to attachment and trauma
3. **Partnerships:** develop and sustain robust inclusion partnerships that enable schools to meet need through a collective approach to responding to the needs of individual children

4. **Evidence-Based Approaches:** ensure that the local authority offer (from Early Help and Inclusion services) responds to need and is underpinned by evidence-based approaches and aligned with clear pathways
5. **Workforce:** develop a robust training and support offer, enabling professionals to feel confident in responding to the needs of children and young people with SEMH needs
6. **Outcomes Focused and Value for Money:** ensure that all activity can demonstrate a clear outcomes and value for money

The draft strategy and action plan were discussed with the following issues raised by Members.

- Would workforce training and support include training for NTAs and other such workers? Could it encompass understanding behaviours and being able to deal with them, especially regarding some of the challenges of complex behaviours of Looked After Children? – Yes, that was exactly the vision of what the outcome of the training should be, although it would be a significant undertaking. Training needs across the system, including schools, staff, parents and carers needed to be understood, with clarity on how these would be met. Who would be best to meet these needs could include the private sector, health and RMBC. Schools were buying in training and needed support to navigate through what was out there as it was probably confusing.
- Would train the trainer training be possible as there were some excellent Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs) out there who could potentially become involved? – It was confirmed SENCOs were involved.
- Would there a focus on prevention as although this seemed to be about early help or early intervention some innovative things were already happening in schools to help young people around their mental health? So would this support that development? - Going on to the Trailblazer next would probably bring that to life. A whole school approach was desired and having a positive attitude to mental health and strategies to support good mental health applied in all workplaces. Trailblazer will support that and although the pilot was only in a small number of schools the governance structure aimed to broaden it out. Priorities could not really be discussed in isolation as they fitted together like a jigsaw.
- Why then was prevention not included as a priority as it was really an underpinning part of the model? Punishments were seen from schools regarding behaviour which emanated from a child's needs and it was important to have whole school approaches and create those environments otherwise the other priorities could become quite

piecemeal. – This was helpful feedback and the whole school approaches and prevention would be strengthened in the document.

- What types of emotional behaviour were most common – anxiety or depression? Did distressing media stories have an impact or seeing other children have difficulties in the classroom? – It was impossible to generalise as the whole spectrum of presenting behaviour was seen, from children being very withdrawn to exhibiting traumatised or violent behaviours. How they responded to trauma or stress depended very much on the individual.
- There seemed to be a heavy reliance on the Trailblazer, so were there concerns about sustainability, such as future funding? – It did have a strong focus this year with going live and being a good opportunity but not all priorities relied on Trailblazer and they had separate funding streams to support them. The aim was to maximise the opportunities from Trailblazer to learn from it regarding future activity. For example, for the work with the workforce separate funding had been identified. Trailblazer would provide intelligence and sufficiency work would be delivered through the capital programme.
- Was there involvement from sixth form colleges and Further Education? - Yes as SEMH was a category within SEND and responsibilities around SEND go up to age 25 they were included.

Resolved:

- 1) To note the draft strategy and information provided in the presentation.

42. MENTAL HEALTH TRAILBLAZER

Following on from the SEMH Strategy, Jenny Lingrell continued with a second presentation in relation to the Mental Health Trailblazer.

Mental Health Support Team (MHST) Service Model

The mental health trailblazer pilot will see mental health support teams established in 22 schools and education settings across Rotherham. Up to 8,000 children and young people will receive face-to-face support to help address and prevent mild to moderate mental health problems

Wave 1 – Whole School Approach including the senior designated mental health lead

Wave 2 – Delivered by the Education Mental Health Professionals

Wave 3 – MHST senior practitioners linked to CAMHS Locality and Advice Teams

Wave 4 – MHST clinical lead and liaison/case management function linked to CAMHS pathways

This project was not a replacement for the CAMHS service. It provided a graduated response with a range of activities within each wave and needed to dovetail with and enhance what was in place. Under wave 2 liaison with services to access the right support would help with triage. Workers had been recruited and were at university but also working one or two days each week in schools already part of the time.

MHST Roles

- Deliver evidence-based interventions 1:1 and to groups of children and young people, building on the support already in place, not replacing it
- Support the senior mental health lead to introduce or develop a whole school approach
- Give timely advice to school staff, and liaise with external services, to help children and young people get the right support and stay in education.

Education Mental Health Professional Role

- Delivering evidence-based intervention for children and young people, with mild to moderate mental health problems, in schools.
- Helping children and young people who present with more severe problems to rapidly access more specialist service.
- Supporting and facilitating staff in education settings to identify, and where appropriate, manage issues related to mental health and wellbeing.

Role of the MHST Strategic Lead

- Strategic lead from the voluntary and community sector will integrate the social model/trusted relationship approach to complement CAMHS clinical approach
- Ensure effective dissemination of learning from the Trailblazer – viewed as key
- Produce a MHST service model and referral pathway
- Oversee the allocation of referrals across the schools
- Establish how the views of young people and families are collated - done
- Establish what schools need and how they will work together and share good practice - a lot of time had been spent on this aspect
- Following a competitive procurement process Barnardo's will lead this work
- Barnardo's have significant experience of working in Rotherham schools. They currently deliver services focused on Child Sexual Exploitation, Child Criminal Exploitation, Harmful Sexual behaviour and young carers

Other slides

- Diagram showing how MHST complement CAMHS Locality Model
- Recruitment of MHST – 2 in Rotherham, fully recruited
- Map of participating schools and colleges – some at different stages on the journey so the learning could be compared

- Implementation milestones

Detailed discussion ensued on a number of issues.

- Overall how did you see the project going and were you confident that the requirements of the Green Paper would be met? How was the training going and what was the background and expertise of the practitioners? - People came from a variety of backgrounds and details on training and expected interventions could follow from CAMHS.
- Rotherham MIND used to carry out an effective schools mental health programme. Was this still in place and was it connected in? - Yes MIND did still work in some schools and Maltby had their own delivery around counselling and mental health support. Early Help also delivered targeted interventions in some schools. It was a mixed picture but many schools already had support for children with SEMH needs. Mental Health Support Teams (MHST) were the “glue” between CAMHS and Early Help to ensure the right support at the right time.
- Cllr Bird had declared an interest in this item but asked a broad question. With the reduction in budgets for Children’s Centres, was money going from schools and elsewhere to fund this project? - This was separate money from RMBC funding and had come down through the NHS to deliver *Future in Mind*. The Assistant Director clarified that her post was a joint RMBC/RCCG role but it was RCCG who led on the Trailblazer.
- Regarding the whole school approach with a senior mental health lead, was that person in a full time role within each school? Or was it the lead from one of the two teams that were being established? - It was a separate school based role and varied between schools, which linked in but was supported through this funding for MHST. It was not a case of one size fits all and some larger schools or a Multi-Academy Trust may have a full time designated person whereas in a smaller school or primary it might fit within the role of the SENCO or pastoral lead.
- Were there any recommendations to schools of how large the role should be in terms of the school population? – In the absence of statutory guidance it was at schools’ discretion. It was hoped that the project would provide a lot of information about how needs were met and what worked well.
- With two teams across all schools, where would they be based and would they just go into schools according to demand? - Operational implementation was being worked out with schools being asked if they had space to accommodate a MHST, as it was hoped they would each have a permanent base in one school whilst working across a

number of schools. Schools were also asked about availability of space and having the necessary infrastructure and IT in place for a team when they did come in to a school.

- Looking at the map, there appeared to be clusters of participating schools in some parts of the borough yet others with only one or a few. – In part this reflected the nature and population of Rotherham as what is referred to as the central area is located quite high up on the map to the north. In addition the workers were only in the schools that submitted a bid to be in the project and there had been a process around that.
- How did it work in practice, through direct access for children and young people or via a teacher or teaching assistant? - Yes face-to-face contact was intended, probably through an appointment system to be determined by schools. The aim was to link MHST in with existing access and infrastructure. The EMHPs would work with individual children and groups of children, not just with staff. In 12 months it might be worth coming back to report on progress and outcomes. As relationships varied flexibility was needed to ensure support from someone with whom the child was comfortable.
- In 2016-17 a whole school approach mental health pilot had run in six schools. Had that been reflected back on to inform this work and had there been a continuation of the work post-pilot as at the time schools had been keen to keep it going and sustainability was important? - To follow up.
- Could you say more about the successful work of Barnardo's? - Improving Lives have considered several monitoring reports regarding Barnardo's work on CSE through the ReachOut programme. Individual contract monitoring also took place.
- What were the success measures for this pilot? How would it be funded in the future if it worked, as we have seen issues with ongoing funding for other positive initiatives such as the Pause Project? Would the money be found to sustain it and expand into other schools? - As an NHS England programme clear outcomes were needed so measure would include a reduction in inappropriate referrals and increased confidence in schools which could be brought back in 12 months. In terms of sustainability partners were mindful of funding but future funding from the NHS for mental health was yet to be confirmed
- How would greater confidence as an outcome be measured - School workforce perception surveys would be used as people reported feeling overwhelmed by the level of needs presented and meeting those needs in the way that they would wish.

- The point was reiterated about needing to consider the money and future sustainability at the outset and about expectations being met.
- There was still a lack of awareness about the Trailblazer across the wider workforce, including staff from Early Help, which a need to educate them. - This would be taken back as a local reference group included staff from Early Help so information should be cascaded.
- How will it contribute to schools as at present the support mentioned is low level, so what system is there for higher need levels and those close to exclusion? - Others had fed this in as well and it was a case of challenging and unpicking. It was still very early days and practitioners were still training but once embedded it would be clearer. Existing pastoral support was good for children feeling “upset” and it was the next level where people needed support.
- Reassurance was sought that the rumour that CAMHS support would be withdrawn from Trailblazer schools was untrue. – That rumour had been challenged very robustly.
- What method was employed in choosing participating schools and was there any danger some with the most needs were overlooked? Were there plans to roll it out more widely later? - Levels of need in each school were considered and performance data, together with deprivation. NHSE guidelines were also referred to regarding the number of students who would be involved. Schools had to bid in and want to be part of the project. Secondaries would also be expected to link in with their feeder primaries. It was reiterated that the SEMH strategy and the priorities within it applied to all schools across the Borough not just those in Trailblazer.
- A four week standard waiting time was referred to; what was it currently? - Approximately six.
- The Chair returned to two recommendations made at the previous meeting. One had been for consideration to be given to having a lead case worker for families as their dedicated single point of contact. Was this happening? - Yes but this would depend where the child sat in the system and could be a social worker, someone from Early Help, the EHCP coordinator or a single point of contact within the school.
- The second had been for consideration to be given to support for LGB&T+ young people as Members were aware of long waits for Tavistock and Porterbrook Clinics. Was there anything specific in the strategy or in Trailblazer for that cohort of young people? - It had not been highlighted in either but that could be picked up. Information about support through Early Help would be circulated again.

The officer was thanked for her attendance and presentations.

Resolved:

- 1) To note progress on the implementation of the Mental Health Trailblazer pilot.
- 2) That details of the training and types of interventions to be delivered in schools be provided for the Select Commission.
- 3) That consideration be given to including support for LGBT+ young people as a cohort within the SEMH Strategy and within the Trailblazer Project.

43. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST - ACHIEVE AN IMPROVED CQC RATING

Angela Wood, Chief Nurse, provided an update regarding the findings and the ongoing actions to improve the Care Quality Commission (CQC) rating for the Trust, in particular for the Urgent and Emergency Care Centre (UECC).

Four requirement notices were given to the Trust following CQC inspections in 2018, plus 74 actions, (a combination of 47 Must Do and 27 Should Do actions), some of which were organisation-wide such as governance, training and medicines management. A comprehensive action plan was developed and monitored in the Trust with significant progress made to address the concerns raised by the CQC. Examples of activity and improvements were outlined across all five domains – Safe, Effective, Responsive, Caring and Well-led. Two actions had slipped and the Trust was in dialogue about these with the CQC – training around mental health capacity and medical audits around care in the UECC. The remainder of the actions would be completed by 31 October 2019, followed by monitoring/audit for a period of sustained improvement.

The CQC had subsequently returned in an unannounced inspection in August 2019 to the UECC and the Trust was awaiting the draft report for comment on factual accuracy. A re-rating of the core service would ensue and the Trust hoped to achieve improved ratings in the domains previously rated as inadequate.

The CQC would probably return again in early 2020 as some core services had not been inspected for a while. A request for a Provider Information Return would flag up that the CQC were expected imminently, usually within six weeks. Regular meetings were taking place with the CQC, including inviting them to visit core services and to a quality assurance meeting. The CQC had also visited a Serious Incident Panel and complimented the Trust on the rigour with which that was conducted. Preparation for the next inspection was under way through assessments and peer reviews and after 12 months in post the Chief Nurse was able to see the progress made in terms of engagement and quality of care.

Members raised the following issues.

- Was a system in place to reward positive role models and staff behaviours? - This had been touched upon at the last meeting and discussed subsequently. Star cards are sent as thanks for staff going over and above what they should be doing or demonstrating really good values. The Proud awards on 15th November, 2019 would be voted for by staff and there was also a patients' category. One area to look at capturing would be if a person received multiple star cards.
- The positive report was welcomed as good news with the hope of it being formally confirmed in due course and clarification was sought on several acronyms within the briefing.
- With the reorganisation within the Trust to what extent did the CQC pick up on the teething problems? – Some recognition was given to this such as the vastness of the areas, bringing things together and cultural issues to work on. Team building and organisational development were worked on, including strong leadership and support for escalating issues, but it was also about delivery to the required standards as well.
- Recently on social media messages were posted asking people not to go to the UECC due to a shortage of beds. What was the current position? - Nationally, increased numbers had been attending A&E and the usual summer lull did not occur in 2019. The hospital was looking to improve patient flows through the hospital to have beds available, for example improvements in the discharge process through the work of the Integrated Discharge Team. Some of the issues related to the sheer volume of people attending and whether they should be at the UECC or seen elsewhere. Work was taking place with GPs and RCCG around the pathways and increased care at home and support to avoid hospital admissions.
- In relation to mandatory training work with certain staff was mentioned, so what more was needed to ensure compliance? - Significantly increased compliance had resulted, but further work was taking place with some of the medical colleagues but it could be difficult to release staff from the sharp end in the UECC so the Trust was looking at alternative methods of delivery.
- Staffing - had there been a reduction in use of agency staff and were measures being introduced to try and retain the Trust's own good staff? - Significant staffing issues had been present in the paediatric UECC before but no agency staff had been used since early 2019. The hospital's own staff and bank staff had been used for extra shifts. The Trust had now exceeded the CQC requirements for paediatric nursing staffing. In general UECC some agency staff were used due to unfilled vacancies, more for medical staff than nurses and a review had just been undertaken of nursing staff and vacancies would be backfilled with bank/agency staff to ensure an appropriate skill mix.

Recruitment would be taking place in November and a number of staff were also on maternity leave.

- Monthly culture checks, what were they for and what were they showing?
- They covered working together and appropriate escalation of issues. Various pieces of work were under way as outlined in the paper, including the drop-in clinics for people to share ideas or concerns. Organisational development within HR was looking to introduce monthly barometer checks to gauge how people were feeling.
- From a patient perspective, how different would things look and feel now in the UECC compared with at the beginning of this journey? - The UECC was busy but would feel like a calmer and safer environment to be in and with staff now more engaged. Information came through more quickly and better communication was happening. With a high throughput of patients delays were inevitable but triage times were monitored and staff were ensuring people were streamed appropriately from the front door. Ambulances were also bringing people in to rapid assessment areas.

Resolved:-

- 1) That the progress being made with the 2018 and 2019 inspection process be noted.
- 2) That a further monitoring report be provided for HSC once the outcome of the CQC re-inspection was known.

44. TRAINEE NURSING ASSOCIATE

Angela Wood, Chief Nurse delivered a short presentation on the recently created role of Nursing Associate and how this would help to address the national shortage of Registered Nurses, estimated to be around 40,000, by bridging the gap between staff in unregulated support roles and Registered Nurses. The need for defined principles of practice, a competency framework, and a defined career pathway had been recognised for the role.

The presentation covered the role of the Nursing Associate and the training involved, which was a two-year programme of study and clinical practice leading to a level 5 Foundation Degree. The trainees would work in clinical practice as a member of the nursing team with a number of placements each year and achieve agreed competencies. After the generic training they would then choose their preferred route.

Recruitment to the courses had been positive with over 5,000 people recruited nationally as trainee nursing associates in 2018, with the ambition to attract a further 7,500 in 2019. Sheffield University and other local affiliated universities were offering the courses and the first five

nursing associates qualified in April 2019 and were still at the Trust. During June 2019, a further 22 commenced their training and the Trust would continue to support future cohorts as part of wider workforce planning.

The June cohort was smaller than expected but the requirements regarding Maths and English could be a barrier for some people and the hospital was offering training to support people to achieve the required level so they could apply in the future. The courses and opportunities were promoted both internally within the Trust and externally and school leavers would be considered.

Members inquired whether a patient's treatment might differ between a Registered Nurse and a Nursing Associate. It was clarified that not in terms of hands on care delivery once people were confident and competent. The difference would be more in the organisation, management and accountability of planning care for groups of patients. The Nursing Associate would be responsible for the delivery of care planned by the Registered Nurse. Nursing Associates were a Band 4 role working in health and social care, Registered Nurses were Band 5 and Support Workers would be a Band 2 or 3 so there would be differences in salary.

HSC welcomed the opportunities provided by the new role and drew parallels with the former State Enrolled Nurses but wondered if there were any threats to success. There was a potential risk that people might all want to move straight to becoming Registered Nurses and hospitals needed some to stay in the Nursing Associate Role. The Chief Nurse highlighted the importance of people utilising their skills fully and for the role and contribution to care to be recognised and valued appropriately.

The Chief Nurse was thanked for her informative presentation.

Resolved:-

- 1) That the information presented be noted.

45. SOUTH YORKSHIRE, DERBYSHIRE, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND WAKEFIELD JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - UPDATE

The Governance Advisor confirmed that the committee was scheduled to meet on 7th November, 2019. Although the agenda had not yet been finalised it was likely to include:-

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION - 10/10/19

- Hospital Services Review
- Gluten Free Prescribing Proposals
- Hyper Acute Stroke Services – implementation of the new model
- Integrated Care System (ICS) Work Programme – what was coming up in the short-medium term that the JHOSC would wish to consider

There was a possibility that Yorkshire Ambulance Service would be scrutinised at some point but this would not be in November. This might depend on the response from the service to the queries that had been submitted by HSC which colleagues were working on and which should be back in time for the next meeting.

Once the papers had been published they would be shared with the Health Select Commission to enable Members to feed in any questions or issues they would like the Chair to raise at the meeting.

46. ROTHERHAM HEALTHWATCH

An update was provided by Healthwatch under Communications.

47. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to report.

48. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission take place on Thursday, 28th November, 2019, commencing at 2.00 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
17th September, 2019**

Present:- Councillor Cusworth (in the Chair); Councillors Jarvis, Clark, Fenwick-Green, Ireland, Khan, Marles, Senior and Julie Turner.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Elliot, Hague, Marriott, Pitchley and Price.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Elliot, Hague, Marriott, Pitchley and Price.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest to report.

23. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items requiring exclusion from the press or public.

24. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

25. COMMUNICATIONS

PAUSE PROJECT

Cllr Clark provided an update to the Commission on the Pause Pilot Project in her role as a member of the Pause Board. She highlighted progress since the project commenced in August 2018. 40 women were prioritised, with 20 currently on the programme many of whom had complex and inter-linking needs, including experiencing domestic abuse, mental ill-health, substance misuse, homelessness or insecure housing. A significant proportion of the cohort were previously looked after children. It was estimated there was cost avoidance of approximately £1.3m associated with the successful completion of the programme, with a potential to avoid costs of approximately £2.1m over a five year period.

Cllr Clark gave examples of the positive outcomes for Pause participants and the value of the project to enhance quality of life. It was noted that the programme had entered into a transitional stage and Cllr Clark asked that consideration be given to the future sustainability of the project when budget options were discussed.

The Chair and Deputy Leader thanked Cllr Clark for her contribution to the Pause Board and her championing of the project.

PERFORMANCE DATA – PERSISTENT ABSENCE

The Chair requested that a report be submitted to the meeting scheduled for October 29, 2019 (or as soon as was practical) on steps taken to address persistent absence in schools.

26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH JULY, 2019

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 19 July, 2019, be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

Matters arising: Cllr Cusworth advised that in relation to Item 14, that the review of Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) would be submitted to the next meeting of the Corporate Parenting Panel and circulated to the Commission in due course.

27. COUNTER EXTREMISM IN SCHOOLS

The Chair welcomed Shokat Lal, Assistant Chief Executive, Pepe Di'Lasio, Assistant Director for Education, Ian Stubbs, Community Engagement Co-ordinator, and Sam Barstow, Head of Community Safety and Regulatory Services to the meeting.

The Assistant Chief Executive introduced the briefing paper which detailed the proactive work Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council was undertaking in schools and colleges across the Borough to counter extremist narratives and build the resilience of young people to reject extremism, intolerance and hatred.

The paper outlined that the distinction between Counter Extremism (CE) and Counter terrorism (PREVENT) was difficult to make. PREVENT was a safeguarding process for individuals vulnerable to radicalisation like any other safeguarding process whereas Counter Extremism worked with communities rather than individuals, to challenge extremist narratives and build resilience within communities to reject hatred.

Extremism was defined by government as the vocal or active opposition to our fundamental values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and the mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.

The key pieces of work developed in accordance with statutory guidance and undertaken with schools and colleges to counter extremism included:

- Holding the “Harms of Hate” event for schools and developing teaching resources which have been recognised nationally as good practice.
- Delivery of assemblies on extremism in secondary schools.
- Delivery staff training on the current far right threat.
- Delivery of work with primary schools.
- Work with partners to develop CE projects including some delivered in schools.
- Development and sharing of teaching resources to challenge extremism.

It was stated that RMBC was in a strong position to lead on CE work. There was a strong correlation between the Council’s Building Stronger Communities (BSC) action plan and actions covered in the Government’s integrated communities’ strategy. The BSC and thriving neighbourhoods strategies are both recognised in recent Local Government Association (LGA) reports as good practice. The Local Authority had successfully applied for funding to support the CE initiative across the Borough.

The current national climate was such that the extremism risk, especially from the far right was unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. It was highlighted that the threat of extremism in Rotherham reflected the national picture.

It was outlined that positive relationships had been developed with schools and colleges across the Borough to deliver this initiative sensitively. Partners included South Yorkshire Police, Rotherham United Community Sports Trust and other voluntary sector organisation were engaged in this agenda and were committed to its ongoing delivery.

The Strategic Director gave details of future developments including work with adults with particular reference to neighbourhood working and engaging people in dialogues about their communities. He noted that there were challenges in relation to hate crime and stressed the importance of strengthening the relationship with police and other partner agencies.

A short video was shown from the “Harms of Hate” event which took place in 2018. Over 400 children from 10 Rotherham schools participated in the event and at the request of Secondary Heads, another event had been planned for later in the year.

The Chair welcomed the work undertaken to date and was assured by the work undertaken in schools and colleges to challenge the extremist narrative at the earliest opportunity.

Members sought information on what basis the work undertaken had been judged as good practice. It was outlined that it was difficult to evaluate this work as it was hard to measure, in the short term, how perceptions and behaviours have changed. However, the request to hold

a second “Harms of Hate” event by schools was seen to be positive and the work had generated interest from other Local Authorities. The Assistant Chief Executive and Assistant Director for Education committed to exploring how the impact in schools can be evaluated qualitatively. It was reported that there was a reduction in the number of hate incidents in schools reported to the local authority recently.

Training was offered to staff identified by schools. This included teaching staff, support staff or lunch-time supervisors as appropriate. An element of the training focused on safeguarding and ensuring that staff were alert to concerns relating to CE and these were referred appropriately. It was recognised that children and young people had other influences outside of the school environment and schools were also linking with the wider community to ensure concerns were flagged. Reference was made to a recent terrorist attack in New Zealand and work undertaken with faith communities within Rotherham to address concerns, promote cohesion and manage consequences. Assurance had been given to local communities, particularly around the reporting of hate crime and how such incidents were responded to.

Work with parents and carers was not specifically delivered as part of this project. However, it was recognised that this could be an important area for development, as part of the broader neighbourhood engagement work.

It was noted that the main focus of the counter extremism work focused on countering far-right activity, which was considered to be the greatest current threat. Assurance was sought that agencies were alert to other forms of extremism and plans were in place to address them. In response, it was outlined that Safer Rotherham Partnership examined local intelligence and risks and threats and there was an action plan in place co-ordinated by the ‘Prevent Silver Group’ to ensure that resources were targeted appropriately.

It was noted that the Community Engagement Coordinator’s post was funded until March 2020, however discussions were underway with the Home Office about the future sustainability of the initiative.

Clarification was sought on the schools which had not fully engaged in the counter extremism work and what action was taken to address this. The Community Engagement Co-ordinator outlined that engagement with schools was an improving picture. Whilst there were three schools which had had little or no engagement currently, the Assistant Director for Education was brokering meetings to begin this work with headteachers.

A request was made that a further report be provided to the Commission outlining how the local authority was meeting its Prevent duty and an update given on its counter extremism work as part of 2020/21 work programme.

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

(2) That a report be submitted to this Commission as part of 2020/21 work programme outlining how the local authority was meeting its Prevent duty.

(3) That an update on its counter extremism work be submitted to this Commission as part of 2020/21 work programme.

(4) That this update includes an evaluation of the work in schools and further details of the work with adults and neighbourhoods and any specific work with parents and carers.

28. CHILDREN MISSING FROM EDUCATION, CARE AND HOME

The Chair welcomed Cllr Gordon Watson; Ailsa Barr, Acting Assistant Director for Safeguarding; Rebecca Wall, Head of Safeguarding, Quality and Learning and Dean Fenton, Head of Service, Access to Education to the meeting.

Officers gave a short presentation to outline the different legislative frameworks which guide the response to children missing from care and home and missing from education. Reference was made to research which highlighted that missing from care and home could indicate wider contextual safeguarding concerns outside the family such as criminal exploitation, child sexual exploitation or honour based violence.

In respect of missing from education, Local Authorities were required to ensure that Children Missing from Education (CME) were identified, reported and tracked, and where appropriate, suitable educational providers found. The term CME referred to children of compulsory school age who are not on a school roll, and who are not receiving a suitable alternative education. A suitable education can be approved via alternative provision such as home tuition or appropriate Elective Home Education.

The presentation outlined areas which were working well, areas of concerns (what are we worried about) and actions to address concerns (what are we going to do about it).

In respect of areas which were working well, the following measures were highlighted. The Missing Team was now on a permanent footing with a dedicated Team Manager to support the number of Return Home Interviews offered. There was a Missing from Home and Care Scorecard is produced monthly and provided a clear understanding around the Missing Cohort and identifies patterns and trends. There were strong established links with a range of internal and external partners in relation to CME. The success in reducing the number of children missing from home and care reflected excellent multiagency partnership and improved practice.

At the end of the reporting period there were 160 active cases that remained open to CME which highlighted a 24% reduction from Quarter One. There were 166 resolved cases in Quarter Four, which showed a significant increase on Quarter One when 120 cases were resolved in the period. Cases of CME needed to remain open until the child was found or until all enquiries had been exhausted and this can mean that cases remained open for extended periods.

In relation to exclusions, the invalidated data for 2018/2019 reflected a stabilisation in permanent and fixed term exclusions in secondary settings; whilst in primary settings fixed terms exclusions had stabilised, there had however been an increase in permanent exclusions.

The presentation highlighted areas of concern – what are we worried about? Looked after children were the largest cohort of missing children, accounting for over recorded episodes. After the Looked After population, the largest Missing group was children and young people who were not currently known to services. The Return Home Interview (RHI) offered an opportunity to explore why the young person went missing and reduce future missing episodes. There had been a seasonal increase in the number of episodes which had meant a decline in RHI completed.

There had been an increase in new CME referrals which highlights an increase when compared with the previous Quarter. It was reported that a number had been known to have previous episodes of CME that were closed. Evidence suggested that this recurrence was largely due to families being transient and then returning to Rotherham intermittently rather than key concerns related to vulnerability and/or safeguarding issues.

Of the newly identified cases of CME, 39.2% of children were from the Central area of Rotherham at the time of the referral, which correlates to the transient nature of families. This had a financial impact on both schools and council services due to the additional resource required to support CME. The majority of children CME were classified by ethnicity as Roma by their parents (44%) and a further 33% were unclassified. Parents do not have to complete ethnicity as a mandatory declaration and many choose not to do so.

Areas for improvement (what are we going to do about it?) were highlighted. Actions included the development of an Inclusion Performance Scorecard to cross reference child level data with the current Missing Scorecard. Joint work with South Yorkshire Police (SYP) would be continued to strengthen the joint responses to young people missing out of the Rotherham area. There was a planned joint review of complex cases to maximise response and preventative action.

Clarification was sought on information sharing particularly in relation to children missing and if concerns had been identified about hotspots, adults of concern, businesses etc and if Child Abduction Warning Notices

had been utilised. It was noted that abduction notices had been used successfully as a deterrent in other parts of the country. Assurance was given about information sharing protocols across agencies when cases of concern were discussed. Examples were given of how information from RHIs was shared and analysed to identify trends and inform responses.

It was noted that in respect of the data sets, the scorecards gave good oversight to establish if there was commonality across the groups of children who have missing episodes or were missing from education. This could ensure prompt action was taken to address concerns. Cllr Watson gave assurance about the governance structures in place to ensure that oversight and challenge was provided on a timely and proportionate basis.

Officers clarified the difference between missing from education which meant a child was not registered on a school roll and not receiving a suitable alternative and persistent absence, which may incur parental fines. It was noted that there was collaboration with other authorities to share information about registration, particularly if there was confusion about local authority boundaries.

Questions were asked to establish how risks were assessed and escalated if a child was missing from education and had been identified as being at risk of forced marriage etc. It was confirmed that in such instances, or if a disclosure is made as part of a RHI, safeguarding procedures would be applied regardless of parental consent.

Further details were sought on the increase of numbers of children at risk of CSE who had missing episodes. It was reported that although there was often a seasonal variation, there was good oversight in relation to the Missing and CSE teams. Both individual and group work had been delivered to understand circumstances to disrupt activities. Steps to address missing episodes for children placed out of authority were explored, particularly in respect of capacity to undertake RHIs and the role of advocates to support children appropriately.

It was noted that there had been a rise in the number of permanent exclusions at primary school. The Assistant Director committed to providing data on the number of exclusions to the Committee later in the year as part of the Educational Outcomes report. It was outlined that SEND strategy was having impact in reducing exclusions and schools were committed to taking a personalised and proactive approach to keep pupils in schools.

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

(2) That a further update on progress be provided to the Commission as part of its 2020/21 work programme.

29. ELECTIVE HOME EDUCATION

The Chair welcomed Marie Boswell, Deputy Head of Access to Education to the meeting who presented the item in conjunction with the Head of Access to Education.

Cllr Watson briefly introduced the item and highlighted some of the challenges of ensuring that children who were electively home educated received a good standard of education. Elective Home Education (EHE) was the term used to describe a legal choice by parents to provide education for their children at home - or in some other way which they choose - instead of sending them to school full-time. This was different to education provided by a local authority (LA) otherwise than at a school - for example, tuition for children who are too ill to attend school.

The Head of Access to Education outlined that the Department for Education Guidance was being refreshed and the Directorate would be consulting with parents and other stakeholders on a revised policy in due course.

An overview was given on the role of EHE Officers who conducted home visits to discuss the education a child in EHE was receiving and review samples of work, progress made and future plans. Where there were concerns about the suitability of the education being provided the EHE Officer discussed alternative options with parents/carers e.g. amendments that could be made to improve the education being provided or returning to mainstream or other education setting.

The EHE team was part of a regional network which co-ordinated responses to consultation. However there was no requirement to collate and publish data in relation to EHE so there is little in the way of comparative data available. It was reported that EHE team linked into the Operational and Strategic Missing Groups.

The Officers outlined areas of concerns (what are we worried about) and actions to address these concerns (what are we going to do about it).

There had been a rise in the number of parents requesting information about EHE or considering alternatives to current schools. Without sufficient EHE Officer capacity to discuss issues rapidly, local knowledge and school admissions/other service links, many families would have elected to home educate without a full understanding of the implications of this decision or the education options and support available to them, often at a time of crisis. It was highlighted that a small, but increasing number of families had declined EHE Officer visits or refused to send actual evidence in support that their child was receiving a 'suitable education' when requested.

Parents did not have to inform the Local Authority if they chose to home educate. Current legislation appeared to conflict with other Government strategies for protecting the rights of children. Although the legislation had not changed, the new, clearer Guidance to LA's and parents was welcomed.

Concerns were raised about access to public examinations. Whilst progress to further education (FE) and training without evidence of qualifications was possible, children may be disadvantaged if they are required to evidence academic achievement for other employment or training.

Rotherham had had its first formal case of a primary school agreeing to a Flexi-Schooling arrangement with a family starting on a trial basis in late Summer 2018. Flexi-Schooling was legal and was at the discretion of the headteacher and governors. A Flexi-Schooled child remains solely on the school roll. School maintains full responsibility for outputs and achievements but an agreement with parents was in place about the times when a child was educated by the parents.

In respects of actions to support improvement it was outlined that staff capacity was monitored to ensure that EHE Officers can act as quickly as possible to give advice to parents about EHE and other options. Liaison with Local Colleges and Early Help Services in relation to Y10/11 children, was undertaken to support progress and transition to post 16 education or training. A watching brief was maintained in relation to regional and national forums and Rotherham continued to contribute to consultation, changes to legislation and research.

Members queried if there had been any identifiable trends in the rise in EHE applications. It was outlined that none had been identified but this was monitored. A further query was raised in relation to how children were prepared for transition into adult life and work and/or education. The links with colleges and the work undertaken with parents to ensure transition readiness were explained, however it was stressed that engagement was through parental choice.

In response to a query about monitoring progress, the Local Authority was not allowed to undertake formal assessment. However, through regular visits, judgements were made about progress albeit on an informal basis. If EHE students progressed to post-16 provision, outcomes were monitored through formal routes. Those not in education, employment or training were recorded under 'NEETs' data and preventative measures put in place to support them.

Assurance was sought that measures were in place to properly safeguard children and if concerns were raised (for example around radicalisation), these could be escalated appropriately. Members referred to the death of a child in Wales who had been home educated and asked if any learning had been applied from this tragic event. In response assurance was given

about the purpose and scope of the Overview and Accountability Group and its links to safeguarding, health and early help services.

The Deputy Head of Access to Education stressed the importance of building and maintaining relationships with parents within the boundaries of legislation relating to elective home education. It was outlined that parents could refuse access however, if safeguarding concerns were raised these would be escalated appropriately.

The Chair reflected on the challenge of parental rights to home educated and the local authority's responsibilities for safeguarding. There was assurance that there were good levels of information sharing between agencies. The Chair shared concerns in relation to the limitations of legislation and commented that these should be addressed at a national level. Officers were thanked for their work and for the report.

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

(2) That an update is provided at the end of the 2019/20 academic year.

30. WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20

Consideration was given to the Improving Lives Work Programme. An update was given in respect of work undertaken, progress in relation to recommendations and future work.

The Chair invited Members to submit any comments to the Governance Advisor.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and the Work Programme detail be noted.

(2) That updates be provided to each meeting of this Commission on the progress of the work programme and further prioritisation as required.

(3) That a report be submitted to the meeting scheduled for October 29, 2019 (or as soon as was practical) on steps taken to address persistent absence in schools

31. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to report.

32. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Tuesday, 29 October, 2019 at 5.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
29th October, 2019**

Present:- Councillor Cusworth (in the Chair); Councillors Jarvis, Atkin, Beaumont, Buckley, Clark, Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Ireland, Khan, Marles, Pitchley, Price, Senior and Julie Turner.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Hague and Marriott.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Hague and Hague and Marriott

34. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 SEPTEMBER, 2019

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 17 September, 2019, be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

Matters arising:

The Governance Advisor updated Members that the meeting to discuss Persistent Absence (Item 25) would take place on Tuesday November 12th, 2019 and that email notification had been sent to members of the Commission.

Cllr Clark made reference to the Harms of Hate event (referred to in Item 27) which had been held earlier in the month, and informed the Commission that she would be providing feedback to the Assistant Chief Executive.

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest

36. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items requiring exclusion from the press or public.

37. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

38. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items for communication.

39. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20 - UPDATE

Consideration was given to the Improving Lives Work Programme. An update was given in respect of work undertaken, progress in relation to recommendations and future work.

It was noted that a sub-group had been established to scrutinise measures to address persistent absence and work would commence shortly to review “Holiday Hunger”.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and the Work Programme detail be noted.

(2) That updates be provided to each meeting of this Commission on the progress of the work programme and further prioritisation as required.

40. ROTHERHAM'S EARLY HELP OFFER

The Chair welcomed Cllr Watson, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children's Services & Neighbourhood Working and the Assistant Director for Early Help and Family Engagement, along with service users and members of staff from the Early Help & Family Engagement Service.

The Chair invited service users to give an account of their experiences of early help services and youth offending services respectively. They outlined the support and advice received from staff and the positive impact the interventions had had on them. This included support for new parents, assistance with benefit and financial advice, employment support and transition into adult services. The service users also highlighted how different agencies were co-ordinated in delivering tailored provision which reflected their assessed needs.

Officers from the Early Help Service gave case studies (which were provided with the consent of service users) which illustrated how the voice of service users were captured and gave an indication of the breadth and complexity of the case work under consideration. Details were also given of the “Signs of Safety” methodology used to ensure consistency of practice, and how positive outcomes for children and young people were measured.

Members thanked the service users for their personal testimonies and the assurance that they gave about quality of service.

The following issues were raised and clarified:

- The service user highlighted that there was a lack of education and employment opportunities for young offenders. Members requested that the Deputy Leader explore if further measures could be taken to identify Council apprenticeship opportunities for young people involved in the youth justice system and engage the wider business community in similar initiatives. It was further explained that work was being undertaken with schools to minimise school exclusions and promote attendance as this was recognised as an important factor in diverting young people from offending behaviours.
- Work was undertaken with young offenders under 18, to ensure that if they were transitioning into adult services, that this was done as smoothly as possible.
- Examples were given of peer support schemes set up to engage young offenders or those at risk of offending and offer diversionary activities. The service user had participated in such schemes. An application for funding with neighbouring authorities had been successful to support such initiatives.
- Further details were provided of the early help offer to new parents; for newer parents this may involve intensive one-to-one parenting support, however as parents grew in confidence, play groups and other outreach support could be accessed on an 'as-and-when' basis.

The Deputy Leader introduced the briefing paper, outlined the key themes covered and plans moving forward. This included the statutory guidance, Working Together to Safeguard Children (2018) which set out requirements for Early Help Services to provide a continuum of support to respond to the different levels of need of individual children and families; details of the Early Help Strategy 2016-2019, which had been previously considered by Improving Lives Select Commission; and the 2018 Ofsted re-inspection of Services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers report which noted effective early help work with children and families.

The paper outlined that all phases of the Early Help Strategy had been completed on time, with all associated savings delivered. An overview of performance was given which included:

- Improvement in the number of families were contacted and engaged within three working days.
- Children Centre registration and engagement within Rotherham's most deprived areas.
- The year-to-date attendance rate was good and in-line with national averages.

- The three national YOT Youth Justice Board Performance indicators showed Rotherham YOT outperforming regional and national trends.

Following previous lines of enquiry from Members, information was provided on early help assessments (EHA) completed by partners and how the voice of children and young people were captured.

Steps taken to improve partner completions of EHA included:

- Hosting regular Multi-Agency Practice Development Group to share good practice
- Undertaking checks of EHAs as they are submitted by partners to ensure Local Authority oversight of quality
- Provision of information and advice to partners
- Supporting Lead Professionals with 'stuck' cases and support with Team Around the Family (TAF) meetings where appropriate

In relation to capturing the voice of the child or young people, details of consultation and engagement events were given. Practice learning days also highlighted how workers considered the voice of the child and young people. Exit Surveys and case closures had been adapted to ensure that specific questions had been asked.

Key risks for the Early Help Service were highlighted which included:

- Increased demand and complexity of work,
- Poverty and Deprivation,
- Education performance,
- Budget,
- Rotherham's Universal Offer.

The Assistant Director cited research commissioned by the Local Government Association (March 2019) which involved eight Local Authorities. The research identified the key enablers of an effective early help services as follows: setting the direction, developing capacity, working with families and evaluating impact and quality.

Further details were given of the strategic change programme taking place across within Children's Services which included;

- Market Management
- Demand Management
- Early Help and Social Care Pathway

Specifically, the Early Help and Social Care Pathway sought to develop better systems and processes that provided the right level of care and support at the right time, in the right setting which led to better outcomes for children, young people and families and fewer children and young people coming into care.

The objectives for the Early Help and Social Care Pathway included an increased focus on prevention and early intervention which supported children, young people and families to stay at home and in their community settings and avoided unnecessary and costly statutory intervention.

The following points were raised in respect of the briefing paper:

Had an analysis of early help services in Rotherham been undertaken using the ISOS framework of services against comparative councils (including Children's Trust)? It was indicated the service would be willing to undertake the analysis as it was felt the service would reflect positively against the framework. It was stressed that no two early help offers were the same so direct comparisons with other early help services were difficult.

Clarification was sought on the current budget and future sustainability of the service. It was highlighted that 40% of early help service was funded from external sources. Future Troubled Families funding was uncertain, as were other streams. There was limited research on cost avoidance for partners arising from early help interventions, however, higher level data showed that early help services were making a positive impact.

The Chair requested that a further piece of work be undertaken on early help offer, to include the ISOS framework and that a sub-group be established to scope the specific elements which require assurance.

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

(2) That a sub-group be established to undertake further scrutiny of the early help offer.

41. YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN

The Service Manager (Evidence Based Hub & YOT) gave a presentation which outlined the role of the Youth Offending Team. The YOT worked alongside statutory partners including Police, South Yorkshire Probation Trust and the NHS, together with a wide range of contracted Voluntary and Community Sector organisations to achieve the national youth justice strategic objectives which were to:

- Prevent Offending
- Reduce Re-Offending
- Increase Victim and Public Confidence
- Ensure the Safe and Effective use of Custody

Rotherham YOT was located in CYPS within the Early Help Service and was governed by the YOT Management Board and Safer Rotherham Partnership. The paper referred to the Rotherham Youth Justice Plan

2019-21, which was approved by the Chair of the YOT Management Board and Chair of the Safer Rotherham Partnership and signed off by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) on 3rd September 2019.

The following areas were highlighted as working well:

- The rate of First Time Entrants (FTEs) for Rotherham continued to fall significantly. It was suggested that the lower rate in Rotherham was due to the work undertaken to triage and assess young people at an early stage prior to their entry into the Criminal Justice System.
- Rotherham continued to have Custody rates below national and regional figures.
- The voice of young people was strong within the YOT and young people attended and presented at the YOT Board when available.
- The YOT Board Chair was proactive and sought innovative ways to share good practice.
- There were good relationships with the YJB Regional leads who provided essential peer support and challenge.
- There were Child Criminal Exploitation pathways in place across the sub-region with outreach, intelligence sharing and partnership working.

The paper referred to the YJB Peer review in January 2017 which noted that the Rotherham YOT was performing well in relation to reducing reoffending and the use of custody. The review team were impressed with the focus that partners in Rotherham had placed on the service and the local youth justice system.

In respect of areas for improvement, the Looked After Children status of the offending cohort continued to increase as a percentage from 20% in Q4 18/19 to 25% in Q1 2019/20. It was noted that this was a small cohort and therefore, any increase would be reflected as a large percentage change. Reoffending rates also continued to be of concerns, and it was acknowledged that this cohort of young people had entrenched behaviours and complex needs with a propensity to reoffend more often. However, programmes had been developed to address Barriers to Learning to reduce the number of NEET young people and increase access to counselling. YOT staff were encouraged to support families to attend the range of parenting programmes available through the Evidence Based Hub.

Reference was made to the detailed Action Plan that addressed key priorities of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Safer Rotherham Partnership and the YOT Board. Progress was measured and reported to the board at quarterly intervals.

Further work was also underway to better identify the needs of the cohort, particularly in relation to Special Education Need (SEN) or unmet needs.

The following points were raised and clarified:

Examples were given of how different agencies worked together to disrupt anti-social behaviour to prevent escalation and possible entry into the youth justice system. This partnership working included housing officers, the police and police community service officers and fire officers along with early help workers.

Further clarification was sought in respect of lower rate of entrants in Rotherham and the evidence which supported the assertion that Rotherham was performing better than other South Yorkshire authorities. Details were given of the assessment and triage process, which contributed to lower levels of entrants into the system.

Details were given as to how risks around child criminal exploitation and peer radicalisation were assessed for first time entrants and re-offenders? Assurance was given that there was good oversight of the Prevent and criminal exploitation agenda. Examples were given of the assessment process, restorative justice in relation to hate crime and work undertaken with young people in schools.

Reference was made to whether the findings of 2017 Peer Review were still pertinent and the timeliness of data reported. It was highlighted that work was underway to track data in a more timely way. The Youth Justice Board had not yet considered commissioning another peer review to affirm that practice and processes remained robust, however assurances were given that the service was 'inspection ready'.

Thanks were given to the officer who had attended the meeting whilst on annual leave.

In summing up, the Chair referred to the earlier input from a service user and the points raised during that discussion.

Resolved:

- 1) That the Deputy Leader explores if further measures can be taken to identify Council apprenticeship opportunities for young people involved in the youth justice system and engage the wider business community in similar initiatives such as job fayres.
- 2) That the involvement of service users in offering awareness raising in schools and/or peer support to other young offenders or those at risk of offending, be explored.

42. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to report.

43. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Tuesday, 3rd December, 2019 at 5.30 p.m.

**IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
17th September, 2019**

Present:- Councillor Cusworth (in the Chair); Councillors Jarvis, Clark, Fenwick-Green, Ireland, Khan, Marles, Senior and Julie Turner.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Elliot, Hague, Marriott, Pitchley and Price.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Elliot, Hague, Marriott, Pitchley and Price.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest to report.

23. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items requiring exclusion from the press or public.

24. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

25. COMMUNICATIONS

PAUSE PROJECT

Cllr Clark provided an update to the Commission on the Pause Pilot Project in her role as a member of the Pause Board. She highlighted progress since the project commenced in August 2018. 40 women were prioritised, with 20 currently on the programme many of whom had complex and inter-linking needs, including experiencing domestic abuse, mental ill-health, substance misuse, homelessness or insecure housing. A significant proportion of the cohort were previously looked after children. It was estimated there was cost avoidance of approximately £1.3m associated with the successful completion of the programme, with a potential to avoid costs of approximately £2.1m over a five year period.

Cllr Clark gave examples of the positive outcomes for Pause participants and the value of the project to enhance quality of life. It was noted that the programme had entered into a transitional stage and Cllr Clark asked that consideration be given to the future sustainability of the project when budget options were discussed.

The Chair and Deputy Leader thanked Cllr Clark for her contribution to the Pause Board and her championing of the project.

PERFORMANCE DATA – PERSISTENT ABSENCE

The Chair requested that a report be submitted to the meeting scheduled for October 29, 2019 (or as soon as was practical) on steps taken to address persistent absence in schools.

26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH JULY, 2019

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 19 July, 2019, be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

Matters arising: Cllr Cusworth advised that in relation to Item 14, that the review of Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) would be submitted to the next meeting of the Corporate Parenting Panel and circulated to the Commission in due course.

27. COUNTER EXTREMISM IN SCHOOLS

The Chair welcomed Shokat Lal, Assistant Chief Executive, Pepe Di'Lasio, Assistant Director for Education, Ian Stubbs, Community Engagement Co-ordinator, and Sam Barstow, Head of Community Safety and Regulatory Services to the meeting.

The Assistant Chief Executive introduced the briefing paper which detailed the proactive work Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council was undertaking in schools and colleges across the Borough to counter extremist narratives and build the resilience of young people to reject extremism, intolerance and hatred.

The paper outlined that the distinction between Counter Extremism (CE) and Counter terrorism (PREVENT) was difficult to make. PREVENT was a safeguarding process for individuals vulnerable to radicalisation like any other safeguarding process whereas Counter Extremism worked with communities rather than individuals, to challenge extremist narratives and build resilience within communities to reject hatred.

Extremism was defined by government as the vocal or active opposition to our fundamental values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and the mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.

The key pieces of work developed in accordance with statutory guidance and undertaken with schools and colleges to counter extremism included:

- Holding the “Harms of Hate” event for schools and developing teaching resources which have been recognised nationally as good practice.
- Delivery of assemblies on extremism in secondary schools.
- Delivery staff training on the current far right threat.
- Delivery of work with primary schools.
- Work with partners to develop CE projects including some delivered in schools.
- Development and sharing of teaching resources to challenge extremism.

It was stated that RMBC was in a strong position to lead on CE work. There was a strong correlation between the Council’s Building Stronger Communities (BSC) action plan and actions covered in the Government’s integrated communities’ strategy. The BSC and thriving neighbourhoods strategies are both recognised in recent Local Government Association (LGA) reports as good practice. The Local Authority had successfully applied for funding to support the CE initiative across the Borough.

The current national climate was such that the extremism risk, especially from the far right was unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. It was highlighted that the threat of extremism in Rotherham reflected the national picture.

It was outlined that positive relationships had been developed with schools and colleges across the Borough to deliver this initiative sensitively. Partners included South Yorkshire Police, Rotherham United Community Sports Trust and other voluntary sector organisation were engaged in this agenda and were committed to its ongoing delivery.

The Strategic Director gave details of future developments including work with adults with particular reference to neighbourhood working and engaging people in dialogues about their communities. He noted that there were challenges in relation to hate crime and stressed the importance of strengthening the relationship with police and other partner agencies.

A short video was shown from the “Harms of Hate” event which took place in 2018. Over 400 children from 10 Rotherham schools participated in the event and at the request of Secondary Heads, another event had been planned for later in the year.

The Chair welcomed the work undertaken to date and was assured by the work undertaken in schools and colleges to challenge the extremist narrative at the earliest opportunity.

Members sought information on what basis the work undertaken had been judged as good practice. It was outlined that it was difficult to evaluate this work as it was hard to measure, in the short term, how perceptions and behaviours have changed. However, the request to hold

a second “Harms of Hate” event by schools was seen to be positive and the work had generated interest from other Local Authorities. The Assistant Chief Executive and Assistant Director for Education committed to exploring how the impact in schools can be evaluated qualitatively. It was reported that there was a reduction in the number of hate incidents in schools reported to the local authority recently.

Training was offered to staff identified by schools. This included teaching staff, support staff or lunch-time supervisors as appropriate. An element of the training focused on safeguarding and ensuring that staff were alert to concerns relating to CE and these were referred appropriately. It was recognised that children and young people had other influences outside of the school environment and schools were also linking with the wider community to ensure concerns were flagged. Reference was made to a recent terrorist attack in New Zealand and work undertaken with faith communities within Rotherham to address concerns, promote cohesion and manage consequences. Assurance had been given to local communities, particularly around the reporting of hate crime and how such incidents were responded to.

Work with parents and carers was not specifically delivered as part of this project. However, it was recognised that this could be an important area for development, as part of the broader neighbourhood engagement work.

It was noted that the main focus of the counter extremism work focused on countering far-right activity, which was considered to be the greatest current threat. Assurance was sought that agencies were alert to other forms of extremism and plans were in place to address them. In response, it was outlined that Safer Rotherham Partnership examined local intelligence and risks and threats and there was an action plan in place co-ordinated by the ‘Prevent Silver Group’ to ensure that resources were targeted appropriately.

It was noted that the Community Engagement Coordinator’s post was funded until March 2020, however discussions were underway with the Home Office about the future sustainability of the initiative.

Clarification was sought on the schools which had not fully engaged in the counter extremism work and what action was taken to address this. The Community Engagement Co-ordinator outlined that engagement with schools was an improving picture. Whilst there were three schools which had had little or no engagement currently, the Assistant Director for Education was brokering meetings to begin this work with headteachers.

A request was made that a further report be provided to the Commission outlining how the local authority was meeting its Prevent duty and an update given on its counter extremism work as part of 2020/21 work programme.

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

(2) That a report be submitted to this Commission as part of 2020/21 work programme outlining how the local authority was meeting its Prevent duty.

(3) That an update on its counter extremism work be submitted to this Commission as part of 2020/21 work programme.

(4) That this update includes an evaluation of the work in schools and further details of the work with adults and neighbourhoods and any specific work with parents and carers.

28. CHILDREN MISSING FROM EDUCATION, CARE AND HOME

The Chair welcomed Cllr Gordon Watson; Ailsa Barr, Acting Assistant Director for Safeguarding; Rebecca Wall, Head of Safeguarding, Quality and Learning and Dean Fenton, Head of Service, Access to Education to the meeting.

Officers gave a short presentation to outline the different legislative frameworks which guide the response to children missing from care and home and missing from education. Reference was made to research which highlighted that missing from care and home could indicate wider contextual safeguarding concerns outside the family such as criminal exploitation, child sexual exploitation or honour based violence.

In respect of missing from education, Local Authorities were required to ensure that Children Missing from Education (CME) were identified, reported and tracked, and where appropriate, suitable educational providers found. The term CME referred to children of compulsory school age who are not on a school roll, and who are not receiving a suitable alternative education. A suitable education can be approved via alternative provision such as home tuition or appropriate Elective Home Education.

The presentation outlined areas which were working well, areas of concerns (what are we worried about) and actions to address concerns (what are we going to do about it).

In respect of areas which were working well, the following measures were highlighted. The Missing Team was now on a permanent footing with a dedicated Team Manager to support the number of Return Home Interviews offered. There was a Missing from Home and Care Scorecard is produced monthly and provided a clear understanding around the Missing Cohort and identifies patterns and trends. There were strong established links with a range of internal and external partners in relation to CME. The success in reducing the number of children missing from home and care reflected excellent multiagency partnership and improved practice.

At the end of the reporting period there were 160 active cases that remained open to CME which highlighted a 24% reduction from Quarter One. There were 166 resolved cases in Quarter Four, which showed a significant increase on Quarter One when 120 cases were resolved in the period. Cases of CME needed to remain open until the child was found or until all enquiries had been exhausted and this can mean that cases remained open for extended periods.

In relation to exclusions, the invalidated data for 2018/2019 reflected a stabilisation in permanent and fixed term exclusions in secondary settings; whilst in primary settings fixed terms exclusions had stabilised, there had however been an increase in permanent exclusions.

The presentation highlighted areas of concern – what are we worried about? Looked after children were the largest cohort of missing children, accounting for over recorded episodes. After the Looked After population, the largest Missing group was children and young people who were not currently known to services. The Return Home Interview (RHI) offered an opportunity to explore why the young person went missing and reduce future missing episodes. There had been a seasonal increase in the number of episodes which had meant a decline in RHI completed.

There had been an increase in new CME referrals which highlights an increase when compared with the previous Quarter. It was reported that a number had been known to have previous episodes of CME that were closed. Evidence suggested that this recurrence was largely due to families being transient and then returning to Rotherham intermittently rather than key concerns related to vulnerability and/or safeguarding issues.

Of the newly identified cases of CME, 39.2% of children were from the Central area of Rotherham at the time of the referral, which correlates to the transient nature of families. This had a financial impact on both schools and council services due to the additional resource required to support CME. The majority of children CME were classified by ethnicity as Roma by their parents (44%) and a further 33% were unclassified. Parents do not have to complete ethnicity as a mandatory declaration and many choose not to do so.

Areas for improvement (what are we going to do about it?) were highlighted. Actions included the development of an Inclusion Performance Scorecard to cross reference child level data with the current Missing Scorecard. Joint work with South Yorkshire Police (SYP) would be continued to strengthen the joint responses to young people missing out of the Rotherham area. There was a planned joint review of complex cases to maximise response and preventative action.

Clarification was sought on information sharing particularly in relation to children missing and if concerns had been identified about hotspots, adults of concern, businesses etc and if Child Abduction Warning Notices

had been utilised. It was noted that abduction notices had been used successfully as a deterrent in other parts of the country. Assurance was given about information sharing protocols across agencies when cases of concern were discussed. Examples were given of how information from RHIs was shared and analysed to identify trends and inform responses.

It was noted that in respect of the data sets, the scorecards gave good oversight to establish if there was commonality across the groups of children who have missing episodes or were missing from education. This could ensure prompt action was taken to address concerns. Cllr Watson gave assurance about the governance structures in place to ensure that oversight and challenge was provided on a timely and proportionate basis.

Officers clarified the difference between missing from education which meant a child was not registered on a school roll and not receiving a suitable alternative and persistent absence, which may incur parental fines. It was noted that there was collaboration with other authorities to share information about registration, particularly if there was confusion about local authority boundaries.

Questions were asked to establish how risks were assessed and escalated if a child was missing from education and had been identified as being at risk of forced marriage etc. It was confirmed that in such instances, or if a disclosure is made as part of a RHI, safeguarding procedures would be applied regardless of parental consent.

Further details were sought on the increase of numbers of children at risk of CSE who had missing episodes. It was reported that although there was often a seasonal variation, there was good oversight in relation to the Missing and CSE teams. Both individual and group work had been delivered to understand circumstances to disrupt activities. Steps to address missing episodes for children placed out of authority were explored, particularly in respect of capacity to undertake RHIs and the role of advocates to support children appropriately.

It was noted that there had been a rise in the number of permanent exclusions at primary school. The Assistant Director committed to providing data on the number of exclusions to the Committee later in the year as part of the Educational Outcomes report. It was outlined that SEND strategy was having impact in reducing exclusions and schools were committed to taking a personalised and proactive approach to keep pupils in schools.

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

(2) That a further update on progress be provided to the Commission as part of its 2020/21 work programme.

29. ELECTIVE HOME EDUCATION

The Chair welcomed Marie Boswell, Deputy Head of Access to Education to the meeting who presented the item in conjunction with the Head of Access to Education.

Cllr Watson briefly introduced the item and highlighted some of the challenges of ensuring that children who were electively home educated received a good standard of education. Elective Home Education (EHE) was the term used to describe a legal choice by parents to provide education for their children at home - or in some other way which they choose - instead of sending them to school full-time. This was different to education provided by a local authority (LA) otherwise than at a school - for example, tuition for children who are too ill to attend school.

The Head of Access to Education outlined that the Department for Education Guidance was being refreshed and the Directorate would be consulting with parents and other stakeholders on a revised policy in due course.

An overview was given on the role of EHE Officers who conducted home visits to discuss the education a child in EHE was receiving and review samples of work, progress made and future plans. Where there were concerns about the suitability of the education being provided the EHE Officer discussed alternative options with parents/carers e.g. amendments that could be made to improve the education being provided or returning to mainstream or other education setting.

The EHE team was part of a regional network which co-ordinated responses to consultation. However there was no requirement to collate and publish data in relation to EHE so there is little in the way of comparative data available. It was reported that EHE team linked into the Operational and Strategic Missing Groups.

The Officers outlined areas of concerns (what are we worried about) and actions to address these concerns (what are we going to do about it).

There had been a rise in the number of parents requesting information about EHE or considering alternatives to current schools. Without sufficient EHE Officer capacity to discuss issues rapidly, local knowledge and school admissions/other service links, many families would have elected to home educate without a full understanding of the implications of this decision or the education options and support available to them, often at a time of crisis. It was highlighted that a small, but increasing number of families had declined EHE Officer visits or refused to send actual evidence in support that their child was receiving a 'suitable education' when requested.

Parents did not have to inform the Local Authority if they chose to home educate. Current legislation appeared to conflict with other Government strategies for protecting the rights of children. Although the legislation had not changed, the new, clearer Guidance to LA's and parents was welcomed.

Concerns were raised about access to public examinations. Whilst progress to further education (FE) and training without evidence of qualifications was possible, children may be disadvantaged if they are required to evidence academic achievement for other employment or training.

Rotherham had had its first formal case of a primary school agreeing to a Flexi-Schooling arrangement with a family starting on a trial basis in late Summer 2018. Flexi-Schooling was legal and was at the discretion of the headteacher and governors. A Flexi-Schooled child remains solely on the school roll. School maintains full responsibility for outputs and achievements but an agreement with parents was in place about the times when a child was educated by the parents.

In respects of actions to support improvement it was outlined that staff capacity was monitored to ensure that EHE Officers can act as quickly as possible to give advice to parents about EHE and other options. Liaison with Local Colleges and Early Help Services in relation to Y10/11 children, was undertaken to support progress and transition to post 16 education or training. A watching brief was maintained in relation to regional and national forums and Rotherham continued to contribute to consultation, changes to legislation and research.

Members queried if there had been any identifiable trends in the rise in EHE applications. It was outlined that none had been identified but this was monitored. A further query was raised in relation to how children were prepared for transition into adult life and work and/or education. The links with colleges and the work undertaken with parents to ensure transition readiness were explained, however it was stressed that engagement was through parental choice.

In response to a query about monitoring progress, the Local Authority was not allowed to undertake formal assessment. However, through regular visits, judgements were made about progress albeit on an informal basis. If EHE students progressed to post-16 provision, outcomes were monitored through formal routes. Those not in education, employment or training were recorded under 'NEETs' data and preventative measures put in place to support them.

Assurance was sought that measures were in place to properly safeguard children and if concerns were raised (for example around radicalisation), these could be escalated appropriately. Members referred to the death of a child in Wales who had been home educated and asked if any learning had been applied from this tragic event. In response assurance was given

about the purpose and scope of the Overview and Accountability Group and its links to safeguarding, health and early help services.

The Deputy Head of Access to Education stressed the importance of building and maintaining relationships with parents within the boundaries of legislation relating to elective home education. It was outlined that parents could refuse access however, if safeguarding concerns were raised these would be escalated appropriately.

The Chair reflected on the challenge of parental rights to home educated and the local authority's responsibilities for safeguarding. There was assurance that there were good levels of information sharing between agencies. The Chair shared concerns in relation to the limitations of legislation and commented that these should be addressed at a national level. Officers were thanked for their work and for the report.

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

(2) That an update is provided at the end of the 2019/20 academic year.

30. WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20

Consideration was given to the Improving Lives Work Programme. An update was given in respect of work undertaken, progress in relation to recommendations and future work.

The Chair invited Members to submit any comments to the Governance Advisor.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and the Work Programme detail be noted.

(2) That updates be provided to each meeting of this Commission on the progress of the work programme and further prioritisation as required.

(3) That a report be submitted to the meeting scheduled for October 29, 2019 (or as soon as was practical) on steps taken to address persistent absence in schools

31. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to report.

32. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Tuesday, 29 October, 2019 at 5.30 p.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
29th October, 2019

Present:- Councillor Cusworth (in the Chair); Councillors Jarvis, Atkin, Beaumont, Buckley, Clark, Elliot, Fenwick-Green, Ireland, Khan, Marles, Pitchley, Price, Senior and Julie Turner.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Hague and Marriott.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Hague and Hague and Marriott

34. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 SEPTEMBER, 2019

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission, held on 17 September, 2019, be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

Matters arising:

The Governance Advisor updated Members that the meeting to discuss Persistent Absence (Item 25) would take place on Tuesday November 12th, 2019 and that email notification had been sent to members of the Commission.

Cllr Clark made reference to the Harms of Hate event (referred to in Item 27) which had been held earlier in the month, and informed the Commission that she would be providing feedback to the Assistant Chief Executive.

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest

36. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items requiring exclusion from the press or public.

37. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

38. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items for communication.

39. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20 - UPDATE

Consideration was given to the Improving Lives Work Programme. An update was given in respect of work undertaken, progress in relation to recommendations and future work.

It was noted that a sub-group had been established to scrutinise measures to address persistent absence and work would commence shortly to review “Holiday Hunger”.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and the Work Programme detail be noted.

(2) That updates be provided to each meeting of this Commission on the progress of the work programme and further prioritisation as required.

40. ROTHERHAM'S EARLY HELP OFFER

The Chair welcomed Cllr Watson, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children's Services & Neighbourhood Working and the Assistant Director for Early Help and Family Engagement, along with service users and members of staff from the Early Help & Family Engagement Service.

The Chair invited service users to give an account of their experiences of early help services and youth offending services respectively. They outlined the support and advice received from staff and the positive impact the interventions had had on them. This included support for new parents, assistance with benefit and financial advice, employment support and transition into adult services. The service users also highlighted how different agencies were co-ordinated in delivering tailored provision which reflected their assessed needs.

Officers from the Early Help Service gave case studies (which were provided with the consent of service users) which illustrated how the voice of service users were captured and gave an indication of the breadth and complexity of the case work under consideration. Details were also given of the “Signs of Safety” methodology used to ensure consistency of practice, and how positive outcomes for children and young people were measured.

Members thanked the service users for their personal testimonies and the assurance that they gave about quality of service.

The following issues were raised and clarified:

- The service user highlighted that there was a lack of education and employment opportunities for young offenders. Members requested that the Deputy Leader explore if further measures could be taken to identify Council apprenticeship opportunities for young people involved in the youth justice system and engage the wider business community in similar initiatives. It was further explained that work was being undertaken with schools to minimise school exclusions and promote attendance as this was recognised as an important factor in diverting young people from offending behaviours.
- Work was undertaken with young offenders under 18, to ensure that if they were transitioning into adult services, that this was done as smoothly as possible.
- Examples were given of peer support schemes set up to engage young offenders or those at risk of offending and offer diversionary activities. The service user had participated in such schemes. An application for funding with neighbouring authorities had been successful to support such initiatives.
- Further details were provided of the early help offer to new parents; for newer parents this may involve intensive one-to-one parenting support, however as parents grew in confidence, play groups and other outreach support could be accessed on an 'as-and-when' basis.

The Deputy Leader introduced the briefing paper, outlined the key themes covered and plans moving forward. This included the statutory guidance, Working Together to Safeguard Children (2018) which set out requirements for Early Help Services to provide a continuum of support to respond to the different levels of need of individual children and families; details of the Early Help Strategy 2016-2019, which had been previously considered by Improving Lives Select Commission; and the 2018 Ofsted re-inspection of Services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers report which noted effective early help work with children and families.

The paper outlined that all phases of the Early Help Strategy had been completed on time, with all associated savings delivered. An overview of performance was given which included:

- Improvement in the number of families were contacted and engaged within three working days.
- Children Centre registration and engagement within Rotherham's most deprived areas.
- The year-to-date attendance rate was good and in-line with national averages.

- The three national YOT Youth Justice Board Performance indicators showed Rotherham YOT outperforming regional and national trends.

Following previous lines of enquiry from Members, information was provided on early help assessments (EHA) completed by partners and how the voice of children and young people were captured.

Steps taken to improve partner completions of EHA included:

- Hosting regular Multi-Agency Practice Development Group to share good practice
- Undertaking checks of EHAs as they are submitted by partners to ensure Local Authority oversight of quality
- Provision of information and advice to partners
- Supporting Lead Professionals with 'stuck' cases and support with Team Around the Family (TAF) meetings where appropriate

In relation to capturing the voice of the child or young people, details of consultation and engagement events were given. Practice learning days also highlighted how workers considered the voice of the child and young people. Exit Surveys and case closures had been adapted to ensure that specific questions had been asked.

Key risks for the Early Help Service were highlighted which included:

- Increased demand and complexity of work,
- Poverty and Deprivation,
- Education performance,
- Budget,
- Rotherham's Universal Offer.

The Assistant Director cited research commissioned by the Local Government Association (March 2019) which involved eight Local Authorities. The research identified the key enablers of an effective early help services as follows: setting the direction, developing capacity, working with families and evaluating impact and quality.

Further details were given of the strategic change programme taking place across within Children's Services which included;

- Market Management
- Demand Management
- Early Help and Social Care Pathway

Specifically, the Early Help and Social Care Pathway sought to develop better systems and processes that provided the right level of care and support at the right time, in the right setting which led to better outcomes for children, young people and families and fewer children and young people coming into care.

The objectives for the Early Help and Social Care Pathway included an increased focus on prevention and early intervention which supported children, young people and families to stay at home and in their community settings and avoided unnecessary and costly statutory intervention.

The following points were raised in respect of the briefing paper:

Had an analysis of early help services in Rotherham been undertaken using the ISOS framework of services against comparative councils (including Children's Trust)? It was indicated the service would be willing to undertake the analysis as it was felt the service would reflect positively against the framework. It was stressed that no two early help offers were the same so direct comparisons with other early help services were difficult.

Clarification was sought on the current budget and future sustainability of the service. It was highlighted that 40% of early help service was funded from external sources. Future Troubled Families funding was uncertain, as were other streams. There was limited research on cost avoidance for partners arising from early help interventions, however, higher level data showed that early help services were making a positive impact.

The Chair requested that a further piece of work be undertaken on early help offer, to include the ISOS framework and that a sub-group be established to scope the specific elements which require assurance.

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

(2) That a sub-group be established to undertake further scrutiny of the early help offer.

41. YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN

The Service Manager (Evidence Based Hub & YOT) gave a presentation which outlined the role of the Youth Offending Team. The YOT worked alongside statutory partners including Police, South Yorkshire Probation Trust and the NHS, together with a wide range of contracted Voluntary and Community Sector organisations to achieve the national youth justice strategic objectives which were to:

- Prevent Offending
- Reduce Re-Offending
- Increase Victim and Public Confidence
- Ensure the Safe and Effective use of Custody

Rotherham YOT was located in CYPS within the Early Help Service and was governed by the YOT Management Board and Safer Rotherham Partnership. The paper referred to the Rotherham Youth Justice Plan

2019-21, which was approved by the Chair of the YOT Management Board and Chair of the Safer Rotherham Partnership and signed off by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) on 3rd September 2019.

The following areas were highlighted as working well:

- The rate of First Time Entrants (FTEs) for Rotherham continued to fall significantly. It was suggested that the lower rate in Rotherham was due to the work undertaken to triage and assess young people at an early stage prior to their entry into the Criminal Justice System.
- Rotherham continued to have Custody rates below national and regional figures.
- The voice of young people was strong within the YOT and young people attended and presented at the YOT Board when available.
- The YOT Board Chair was proactive and sought innovative ways to share good practice.
- There were good relationships with the YJB Regional leads who provided essential peer support and challenge.
- There were Child Criminal Exploitation pathways in place across the sub-region with outreach, intelligence sharing and partnership working.

The paper referred to the YJB Peer review in January 2017 which noted that the Rotherham YOT was performing well in relation to reducing reoffending and the use of custody. The review team were impressed with the focus that partners in Rotherham had placed on the service and the local youth justice system.

In respect of areas for improvement, the Looked After Children status of the offending cohort continued to increase as a percentage from 20% in Q4 18/19 to 25% in Q1 2019/20. It was noted that this was a small cohort and therefore, any increase would be reflected as a large percentage change. Reoffending rates also continued to be of concerns, and it was acknowledged that this cohort of young people had entrenched behaviours and complex needs with a propensity to reoffend more often. However, programmes had been developed to address Barriers to Learning to reduce the number of NEET young people and increase access to counselling. YOT staff were encouraged to support families to attend the range of parenting programmes available through the Evidence Based Hub.

Reference was made to the detailed Action Plan that addressed key priorities of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Safer Rotherham Partnership and the YOT Board. Progress was measured and reported to the board at quarterly intervals.

Further work was also underway to better identify the needs of the cohort, particularly in relation to Special Education Need (SEN) or unmet needs.

The following points were raised and clarified:

Examples were given of how different agencies worked together to disrupt anti-social behaviour to prevent escalation and possible entry into the youth justice system. This partnership working included housing officers, the police and police community service officers and fire officers along with early help workers.

Further clarification was sought in respect of lower rate of entrants in Rotherham and the evidence which supported the assertion that Rotherham was performing better than other South Yorkshire authorities. Details were given of the assessment and triage process, which contributed to lower levels of entrants into the system.

Details were given as to how risks around child criminal exploitation and peer radicalisation were assessed for first time entrants and re-offenders? Assurance was given that there was good oversight of the Prevent and criminal exploitation agenda. Examples were given of the assessment process, restorative justice in relation to hate crime and work undertaken with young people in schools.

Reference was made to whether the findings of 2017 Peer Review were still pertinent and the timeliness of data reported. It was highlighted that work was underway to track data in a more timely way. The Youth Justice Board had not yet considered commissioning another peer review to affirm that practice and processes remained robust, however assurances were given that the service was 'inspection ready'.

Thanks were given to the officer who had attended the meeting whilst on annual leave.

In summing up, the Chair referred to the earlier input from a service user and the points raised during that discussion.

Resolved:

- 1) That the Deputy Leader explores if further measures can be taken to identify Council apprenticeship opportunities for young people involved in the youth justice system and engage the wider business community in similar initiatives such as job fayres.
- 2) That the involvement of service users in offering awareness raising in schools and/or peer support to other young offenders or those at risk of offending, be explored.

42. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to report.

43. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Tuesday, 3rd December, 2019 at 5.30 p.m.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
2nd October, 2019

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, Cusworth, R. Elliott, Jarvis, Mallinder, Taylor, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies were received from Councillor Tweed.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

58. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 SEPTEMBER 2019

It was noted that the minutes of the previous meeting would be presented for approval at the next meeting on 16 October 2019.

59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members in respect of items listed on the agenda.

60. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

61. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair reported that there were no items of business on the agenda which would require the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting.

62. UPDATE - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20

Consideration was given to an update report in respect of the 2019-20 work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The work programme had been developed following a Scrutiny Chairs' work planning session held on 19 June 2019 with Cabinet Members and the Strategic Leadership Team. Since that point, Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) had held ongoing discussions to refine its draft work programme.

Members noted the content of the work programme and the work undertaken to date in the current municipal year. Furthermore, it was agreed that update reports on the progress against the work programme would be submitted to ordinary meetings of the Board.

Resolved:-

1. That the work programme of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be noted.
2. That updates be provided to each 'ordinary' meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on the progress of the work programme and for further prioritisation as required.

63. STATUTORY GUIDANCE ON OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Head of Democratic Services and Statutory Scrutiny Officer which summarised the key points outlined in the guidance and was to submitted to provide an opportunity for members of Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB) to comment and determine any learning or improvements that can be made to overview and scrutiny in Rotherham.

It was reported that the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) had published new statutory guidance on overview and scrutiny in local government in May 2019. This new guidance for local (and combined) authorities stressed the role of scrutiny committees in holding decision makers to account and its importance in supporting the successful functioning of local democracy.

Reflecting on the content of the statutory guidance, Members were of the view that scrutiny was in a healthy position in Rotherham. Suggestions were made that the way in which Members volunteered to be members of the Select Commissions did not take account of the skills sets of the individual members. It was also suggested the use of external, expert technical advisers may be helpful in some areas of scrutiny.

In summary, the Chair proposed that a working group be convened later in the municipal year to review the authority's position against the statutory guidance with a view to making recommendations for improvements to be implemented at the commencement of the 2020-21 municipal year.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.
2. That a working group be established by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board later in the municipal year to review the statutory guidance and inform proposals for improvement.

64. CHILDREN'S SERVICES FINANCIAL MONITORING AND REVIEW 2019/20

Consideration was given to a report detailing financial monitoring and review activity for 2019/20 in Children & Young People Services. The directorate was implementing a two-year budget recovery plan to reduce the budget pressures from previous years (£15.7m in 2018/19) and deliver budget savings. The budget pressure at the end of July was £4.9m and adverse movement of £600k in the period, and whilst the Looked After Children number of 634 was just below the budget profile (638) for this period, the placement mix of having too many placements in residential care was leading to budget pressures.

Members recognised that the main indicator for future spend in Children and Young People's Services was a positive and safe reduction in the numbers of looked after children. It was recognised that as a demand led service, it was impossible to predict exactly what would happen, but there was assurance that the service was aware of the challenges and doing a lot of work to address them. Members asked the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Neighbourhood Working as to how confident he was that savings could be achieved in the timescales agreed. In response, the Cabinet Member indicated that he was very confident that the savings target would be met, however he was only quite confident on when the savings would be met.

Following on, assurance was sought on the recruitment of new foster carers. In response, officers confirmed that they were fairly confident. The offer was competitive and the authority was doing much better in terms of the package for foster carers than previously. It was noted that there had been a significant increase in visits to the fostering website and indications were positive. There was more visibility and transparency in relation to the recruitment and there was evidence of recruitment from the independent foster agency sector.

Members expressed concern at the figures in respect of the Dedicated Schools Grant and sought assurances in respect of arrangements for monitoring. In response, officers confirmed that it was monitored at internal budget monitoring meetings, at Improving Lives Select Commission and the Rotherham Schools' Forum also had oversight of the budget too. A recovery plan had also been submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) and it was anticipated the DfE would introduce a monitoring programme.

Assurances were sought in respect of actions being taken to address the £500,000 overspend in respect of transport. In response, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the directorate would continue to do what it had been doing, but it would be a slow process to save money. A significant amount of work had been undertaken to look at individual journeys and it was felt that the savings would be realised and a number of short term actions were expected to realise impact.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be accepted.
2. That a further report be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 29 January 2020 in respect of fostering and the High Needs Block.

65. COUNCIL PLAN QUARTER 1 (APRIL TO JUNE 2019) AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Consideration was given to the Council Plan Quarter 1 Performance Report for the period from April to June 2019. It was reported that at the end of Quarter 1, 31 measures had either met or had exceeded the target set in the Council Plan. This represented 55% of the total number of measures where data was available or where targets had been set. This was a significant improvement in performance compared to Quarter 1 2018-2019 where only 47% of measures hit their targets. The priority area with the highest proportion of targets met was Priority 4 (Extending opportunity, prosperity and planning for the future) where 75% of measures (where data is available or where targets have been set) were marked as on target. The direction of travel was positive for 29 (53%) of the measures calculated in this quarter. This was noted as an improvement compared to the 51% figure for last quarter and 45% in Quarter 1 2018-2019.

Referring to the measure in respect of repeat child protection plans, Members sought clarification as to whether any work had been done to establish how effective interventions have been. In response, officers indicated that a substantial amount of work had taken place, with reviews occurring through practice learning days and developing a culture of learning in the service. In response to a supplementary question, officers were not wholly confident that plans were not revisiting issues that were considered to have been previously resolved.

Members sought to understand the rationale behind the projected increase in missed bins. In response, officers indicated that performance was not where they wanted it to be, but context was important given the significant change in the service that had occurred. It was noted that officers were aware of the areas where collections were being missed. On this basis, they were confident that performance would be under the target figure before the end of the calendar year.

The Board sought assurances around the system in place to ensure that teachers understood the needs and issues of looked after children. In response, officers indicated that every school had identified leads for looked after children and each child had a personal education plan. It was recognised that transitions from one class to another or one school to another could be very complex for children, and teachers needed support in challenging difficult behaviours.

Members queried the level of compliance in respect of safeguarding requirements for hackney carriage/private hire licence holders. In response, officers confirmed that there was 100% compliance and that the policy provided for a licence not to be issued without a check from the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Surprise was expressed that only 8 homes had been delivered against the target of 175 and sought to understand what the timeframes and plans were for delivery. In response, officers confirmed that it was not a linear process and it was not expected to be a problem in delivering against the target. Construction programmes at Braithwell Road in, Maltby and the Bellows site at Rawmarsh would contribute significantly towards the delivery of the target. It was noted that pre-fabricated home were not included in the delivery plan.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.

66. ANNUAL COMPLIMENTS AND COMPLAINTS REPORT 2018-19

Consideration was given to the annual report on compliments and complaints received by the Council during 2018-19 in line with statutory requirements and identify key trends within complaints and compliments over a five year period.

Members welcomed the report and were particularly pleased to see the learning and trends identified, specifically referencing the opportunities for improvement. It was noted that Members often received compliments arising from their casework which was not being recorded and felt that this was an area for improvement. It was also suggested that the recommendations from the Local Government Ombudsman annual report could be incorporated into the report in future. In response, officers confirmed that this could be done in future.

Reference was made to avoidable contact and the work that the authority was undertaking to reduce calls to the Council. In response, it was confirmed that work was underway, but it was difficult to quantify volumes as data was manually recorded presently. The new system to improve customer experience had recently been procured and when operational would provide greater insight on this.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 02/10/19

In summarising the Board's views, the Chair congratulated officers on an excellent report which was easy to read and the improvements in complaints handling were welcomed. Customer Access would continue to be a focus for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board throughout the municipal year.

Resolved:-

1. That the report be noted.

67. CALL-IN ISSUES

The Chair reported that there were no call-in issues arising from the recent Cabinet meeting held on 16 September 2019.

68. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair reported that there were no matters requiring urgent consideration by the Board.

69. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:-

That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held on Wednesday 16 October 2019 commencing at 11.00 a.m. at Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
16th October, 2019

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, R. Elliott, Keenan, Mallinder, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies were received from Councillors Cusworth, Jarvis, Taylor and Tweed.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

72. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 11 September 2019 be approved as a true and correct record of the proceedings.

73. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest by Members at the meeting.

74. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

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

75. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items of business on the agenda that would require the exclusion of the press or public.

76. SOCIAL VALUE POLICY

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Chief Executive which introduced the proposed Social Value Policy that was to be determined by the Cabinet at its meeting on 21 October 2019.

It was reported that the policy set out the ways in which the Council aimed to maximise the local impact of its spend through its commissioning and procurement processes and work with partners and suppliers. The key elements of the policy were to:

- Raise the living standards of Rotherham residents and commit to working towards the Joseph Rowntree Living Wage
- Increase the proportion of the council's expenditure which goes to local businesses and providers rather than those elsewhere in the country.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/10/19

- Build social value into all council contracts (in excess of £100,000) and maximise the impact gained from every pound spent and introduce a rigorous system for assessing and measuring social value.
- Commit to the principle of co-designing services wherever possible.

It was further reported that the Council planned to take steps to increase the amount of additional Social Value from its contracts and commissioned services by securing Social Value in every contract above a £100,000 threshold. It would ensure that when the Council invited written quotations – where possible - at least one of the quotes would be from a Rotherham organisation and, where that was not possible, from Sheffield City Region. The Council also aimed to increase over time the proportion of its spend with local businesses and organisations and to open up opportunities for more co-designed services through its commissioning and procurement processes. The Social Value Framework set out the methodology for measuring Social Value through the procurement process. It was framed around six high level outcomes. These were:-

- Raising living standards for residents
- A strong local economy with employment and skills opportunities and a growing business base
- Young people have the opportunity to develop skills and find worthwhile employment
- Equality of opportunity for disadvantaged people and communities including disabled people
- Strengthened and sustainable community and voluntary organisations
- Greater environmental sustainability including accessible green public spaces.

Members noted that Social Value returns would be monitored and reported on an annual basis. The first year of the policy would be a baseline year with targets set subsequently to increase the amount of Social Value secured.

In reviewing the proposed policy, Members sought assurances as to how the Council would ensure that the policy would be adhered to where sub-contractors were involved. In response, it was explained that the CLES would analyse and review the supply chain and identify through the framework how much money would go through the local supply chain

The Board welcomed the opportunity for young to develop skills and employment through the policy and framework. Following on, the Chief Executive confirmed that suppliers would need to demonstrate commitments to young people and the Council would need to see evidence against social value outcomes. To this end, suppliers would need to think creatively and provide assurance as to how they would bring forward proposals to deliver.

In response to a concern in respect of the likelihood of the framework being subject to abuse, it was confirmed that there was a self-declaration process against target outcomes, but there would be independent verification.

Members sought assurances that the costs for suppliers would not apply to smaller organisations and wanted more information on who would manage the portal. In response, the Chief Executive confirmed that the portal would detail all social value outcomes identified by suppliers and those would need to be updated on a quarterly basis. It was explained that the Council would learn from other organisations, but funds were available with existing budgets in the Assistant Chief Executive's Office if required to assist with development.

Having considered the report and responses to questions, the Board was broadly supportive of the proposal to be considered by the Cabinet. Furthermore, it was felt that the wider body of Members would benefit from learning about the Social Value Policy and Framework and that a Member Seminar should be arranged by the Cabinet Member. Given the significance of the policy, Members felt it would be useful to get a report back on the progress made in implementing the policy after twelve months.

Resolved:-

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That a Member Seminar be arranged in respect of the Social Value Policy.
3. That a report be brought back to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board after 12 months of the implementation of the policy to review its impact to date.

77. CRISIS SUPPORT (LOCAL WELFARE PROVISION)

Consideration was given to a report submitted by the Assistant Chief Executive in respect of contracts for crisis support services which was due to be determined by the Cabinet at its meeting on 21 October 2019. The proposed recommendations for commissioning future crisis support services over the medium term three years from 2020/21 to 2022/23 with voluntary sector providers through the terms of the Rotherham Compact. The process would include an invitation to bid to be the lead organisation in the voluntary sector to engage partner organisations in a co-design with the Council, leading to award of grant(s) and service level agreements.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 16/10/19

Members queried the where the funds expected for the £100,000 needed in the third year of the contract would be provided from given that budgets had not been agreed for that period. In response, it was explained that if there was a contractual commitment to provide this funding then it would be built into the budget setting process for the third year of the contract.

Resolved:-

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That consideration be given to further pre-decision scrutiny of the future delivery arrangements by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board prior to a future decision by Cabinet.

78. HOUSE TO HOUSE COLLECTION POLICY

Consideration was given to a report which was submitted by the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment and was due to be determined by the Cabinet at its meeting on 21 October 2019. The report detailed the findings of a public consultation carried out to seek views on key elements of a proposed House to House Collections Policy. Members noted that the Council had been keen to understand what levels of returns to charities the public expected when making donations, and in addition, the times at which collections might be considered to be reasonable. The proposed House to House Collections Policy reflected the findings of the consultation and was recommended for adoption.

Members welcomed the policy but expressed concerns about the cut off time being 1900 hours, which they felt was too late. Members also felt it was important to encourage licence holders to use recyclable plastic bags under the policy. In response, it was explained that the concern around the cut off time of 1900 was a valid point. It was further explained that the law did not allow the authority to enforce provisions regarding the use of recyclable plastic bags, but the policy could potentially be amended to expect collections to be done in a reasonable way.

Resolved:-

1. That Cabinet be advised that the recommendations be supported.
2. That consideration be given to amending the policy to restrict collection times during Greenwich Mean Time to 1600 hours, whilst retaining the limit of 1900 hours during British Summer Time.
3. That consideration be given to encouraging the use of recyclable collections bags, where practicable, through the House to House Collections Policy.

79. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair reported that there were no urgent items of business requiring the consideration of the Board at the meeting.

80. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:-

That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held on Wednesday 13 November 2019 at 11.00 a.m. at Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
27th November, 2019

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, R. Elliott, Jarvis, Mallinder, Taylor, Tweed, Walsh and Wyatt.

Apologies were received from Councillors Cusworth, Jepson and Keenan.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in any items on the agenda for the meeting.

82. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or press in respect of matters on the agenda for the meeting.

83. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair advised that there were no items of business that would require the exclusion of the press or public from the meeting.

84. UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF AGENCY, CONSULTANCY AND INTERIM STAFF

Consideration was given to a report providing an update on the implementation of recommendations arising from the scrutiny review of agency, consultancy and interim staff.

It was reported that the Workforce Management Board (WMB) continued to monitor and control agency costs by challenging usage across the Council. In approving agency resource, WMB took into account several factors:

- What risks are associated with not filling the role – including safeguarding?
- Is there budget available to fund the agency resource?
- Is the agency resource required to deliver a statutory function?
- Can the work be delivered in any other way?
- Any other factors that are deemed critical for securing additional agency resource

Members queried what work had taken place within the Regeneration and Environment directorate to reduce agency spend and introduce multi-tasking amongst the existing workforce to build capacity and reduce the need for additional cover. In response, officers confirmed that there had been a heavy reliance on agency workers and a large in-year reduction in agency spend was anticipated in the Regeneration and Environment directorate. It was explained that agency costs were largely incurred due to seasonal work between March and October, but work was being undertaken to analyse the potential for the work to be done outside of peak hours.

Members sought to understand how the authority had engaged with the trade unions to prioritise the protection of jobs and saving of money. It was explained that this had been recognised as a priority and options were being explored with the trade unions, who were keen to see staff employed directly by the authority.

Referring to the major transformational changes within Adult Social Care, Members sought reassurances that posts could be filled without recourse to using agency or interim staff. Officers explained that they would need report back outside of the meeting on the detailed numbers, but there was an awareness that recent recruitment activity had been successful and the position would be kept under review.

Members sought further assurance on the way in which the Workforce Management Board monitored spend. It was explained that spend was reviewed on a monthly basis, which had fed into the projections detailed within the report. It was felt that the numbers would have to increase significantly to distort the projected year-end figure.

Having been assured of processes and the ongoing oversight provided by the Workforce Management Board, Members agreed to review the position in respect of implementing recommendations from the scrutiny review of agency, consultancy and interim staff in November 2020.

Resolved:-

1. That the update be noted.
2. That a further update on the implementation of recommendations from the scrutiny review of agency, consultancy and interim staff be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in November 2020.

85. OUTCOMES FROM ADULT SOCIAL CARE WORKSHOP

Consideration was given a briefing paper which detailed the main findings from a scrutiny workshop undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 9 October 2019. The session provided Members with an overview of the new operating model for Adult Social Care that would be implemented from October 2019 onward.

Since 2018, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board has regularly scrutinised the budget position and service performance for Adult Social Care together as the two are closely interlinked. The purpose of this approach was to seek assurance that the budget overspend would be reduced and proposed savings achieved without a negative impact on service users and performance, whilst making the requisite changes to practice and service transformation.

Members felt that the workshop had provided a very useful insight into the new operating model and had welcomed the opportunity to discuss a number of issues in detail with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health and the Strategic Director of Adult Care, Housing and Public Health. There was broad consensus that future discussions on these matters should be conducted in open session, as the workshop approach had served its purpose during the development period for the new operating model.

Resolved:-

1. That the update be noted.
2. That the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health and the Strategic Director of Adult Care, Housing and Public Health be invited to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board meeting on 4 March 2020 to provide a further update on the progress made in adult social care.

86. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

It was reported that the Rotherham Youth Cabinet manifesto launch had taken place on 21 November, with young people identifying the following four key aims:

- Environment and Climate Change
- Mental Health
- Hate Crime
- Public Transport

Members noted that the next topic for the Children's Commissioner Takeover Challenge (CCTOC) had yet to be confirmed.

Referring to recommendations from previous CCTOCs, the following updates were noted:-

- Public Transport - the South Yorkshire young people's public transport charter will finally be launched in January
- Work experience – a progress update will be presented to Rotherham Youth Cabinet on the evening of 27 November 2019
- Young Carers – a positive meeting had taken place between the Deputy Leader and the Young Carers service at Barnardo's to discuss ideas. People for Places leisure were organising a free activity day for young carers in February half term which would be advertised to encourage other young carers to come forward in addition to those with whom the young carers service is already working.

Resolved:-

That the update be noted.

87. WORK IN PROGRESS - SELECT COMMISSIONS

The Chairs of the Select Commissions provided an update on their recent work:-

Health Select Commission

In the absence of Councillor Keenan, Chair of the Health Select Commission, Councillor Rob Elliott provided an update on the activities of the Health Select Commission:-

- **Workshop on the Refresh of Suicide Prevention and Self-Harm Action Plan**
This was an opportunity for HSC to have an input into the refreshed plan and to discuss some of the wider partnership work taking place. HSC made suggestions for improvements to how the "local picture" information was presented in the plan. They also made some wider recommendations including involving foster carers in training initiatives around mental health.
- **Mental Health Trailblazer project in schools**
This will see mental health support teams established in 22 schools and education settings across Rotherham for face-to-face support to help address and prevent mild to moderate mental health problems. The project will be fully operational next month and will complement the RDaSH CAMHS locality model.
- **Social Emotional and Mental Health Strategy**
Members considered and commented on the draft multi-agency strategy and action plan. Initial work focused on the development of robust data on Special Educational Needs and Disability Sufficiency and will culminate in new provision being introduced in a phased approach by September 2021.

- **Update from Rotherham Hospital following their CQC inspection**

Members were updated on the positive work undertaken to address concerns identified by the CQC inspection of the Urgent and Emergency Care Centre. The CQC returned to the hospital in an unannounced inspection in August and the Trust is awaiting the outcome.

- **Trainee Nursing Associate**

A short presentation outlined this recently introduced role which will help to address the shortage of Registered Nurses and also provide potential career progression opportunities for health care assistants. The Trust is actively supporting this initiative as part of its wider workforce planning.

Improving Places Select Commission

Councillor Mallinder, Chair of Improving Places Select Commission, provided an update on the activities of that committee:-

- **Allotments Self-Management**

A new Community Benefits Society known as Rotherham Allotments Alliance Ltd. will assume allotment management responsibility from the Council in January 2020. The original timescale was extended to ensure sufficient time for surveys and to develop heads of terms for the transfer lease.

- **Impact of traffic from Waleswood Caravan Park**

A review of correspondence, observations of the local road network and an assessment of the traffic signal timings at Wales Bar Crossroads have not identified any negative impact on the local highway network. A follow up traffic speed survey will be undertaken during 2020 to determine existing vehicle speeds as there had been requests for a reduction in the speed limit on Delves Lane. IPSC will have a further report next year and the briefing has been shared with Wales Parish Council.

- **Workshop on Area Housing Panels Review**

In effect this was earlier stage pre-decision scrutiny with IPSC having an opportunity to discuss emerging proposals which reflect the move to ward based working and the Thriving Neighbourhoods Strategy. Emerging proposals discussed were:

- 25 ward housing hubs to replace the existing Area Housing Panels from 2020-21
- base budgets for each hub
- the remainder of the annual budget to be allocated on the basis of the percentage of council homes in each ward

Members were assured by the developing proposals after considering the review process, engagement and tests of the approach that had taken place. They also noted the emergent recommendations around budgets and governance. The equality analysis was also circulated at the workshop.

Resolved:-

That the update be noted.

88. FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS - NOVEMBER 2019 TO JANUARY 2020

Consideration was given to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period from November 2019 to January 2020 detailing the decisions to be taken by the Cabinet over that three-month period.

Members identified the following reports for pre-decision scrutiny at the meeting on 20 December 2019:-

- HRA Rents and Service Charges for 2020-21
- HRA Business Plan 2020-21
- Outcome and recommendations from Non-Residential Charging Consultation
- New organisational and budget arrangements for Area Housing Panels
- South Yorkshire Regional Adoption Agency
- Rotherham Town Centre Parking Strategy

Resolved:-

1. That the Forward Plan of Key Decisions from November 2019 to January 2020 be noted.
2. That the following reports be presented for pre-decision scrutiny on 20 December 2019:-
 - HRA Rents and Service Charges for 2020-21
 - HRA Business Plan 2020-21
 - Outcome and recommendations from Non-Residential Charging Consultation
 - New organisational and budget arrangements for Area Housing Panels
 - South Yorkshire Regional Adoption Agency
 - Rotherham Town Centre Parking Strategy

89. CALL-IN ISSUES

The Chair reported that there were no call-in issues requiring the Board's consideration.

90. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there were no urgent items of business to be considered by the Board.

91. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:-

That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Friday 20 December 2019 at 11.00 in Rotherham Town Hall.

BARNSELEY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
2nd December, 2019

Present:- Councillor Lamb (Barnsley MBC) (in the Chair), Councillor Hoddinott (Rotherham MBC), Councillor C. McGuiness (Doncaster MBC); together with Mrs. L Baxter, Mr. P. Hutchinson, Mr. T. Smith (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Castle (Barnsley MBC), Mr. L. Garratt (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. J. Busby (DEFRA).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sansome (Rotherham MBC), Mr. P. Dale (Doncaster MBC) and Mr. M. Gladstone (Barnsley MBC).

44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest reported at this meeting.

**45 MINUTES FROM THE JOINT WASTE BOARD MEMBERS MEETING
HELD ON 30TH SEPTEMBER, 2019 AND MATTERS ARISING**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board held on 30th September, 2019.

With regards to Minute No. 36(3) it was reported that once the report template was received following approval this would be forwarded on.

In terms of Minute No. 36(4) and the potential to webcast the Joint Waste Board, it was noted that this was subject to further discussion regarding potential cost and dates/times of future meetings to fit in with the Council Chamber access.

Reference was also made to Minute No. 38 and the need for clarity on the arrangements for the disposal of clinical waste across South Yorkshire. This would be included as an agenda item for discussion at the next meeting.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved as a correct record.

**46 JOINT WASTE BOARD - INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT
DELEGATIONS REPORT**

Consideration of this item was deferred pending approval. The document would be circulated to the Joint Waste Board Members as soon as it was received.

47 BDR MANAGER'S REPORT AUGUST TO OCTOBER 2019

Consideration was given to the update report of the BDR Manager covering the period from August to October, 2019.

A number of issues were highlighted including:-

- Governance.
- Contract Delivery.
- Legal.
- Financial.
- Communications.
- Resources.
- Other.
- Liaison Committee Minutes.
- Glossary of Terms.

The Joint Waste Board were advised the BDR CELO secondment had been extended and she was working on a calendar of events.

Reference was also made to the Fire Protection Works which were almost complete, but had been delayed slightly due to the recent flooding. It was anticipated the works would be completed by the 16th December, 2019 pending any revision requests.

The discussion referred to fly complaints and the proactive plans being taken with the contractor and the Environment Agency that may be associated with the plant. The contractor had since changed the fly management chemical that suffocated flies with a much less chance of resistance and was ensuring waste was securely wrapped.

A complaint by a local resident had also been made to all three Leaders of the Council regarding flies and on identification of the species they were found to be corn flies and unrelated to the plant.

In terms of odour emanating from the plant work was ongoing with the Environment Agency on the bio filters following the formation of a crust. Once it was established the mitigation works to bio filter number one were working, action would then be taken to bio filter number two.

The Environment Agency were notifying local residents accordingly on action being taken.

The Joint Waste Board welcomed the action being taken on both fly control and odour in collaboration with the Environment Agency and thought it quite bizarre that odour complaints were more prevalent in the winter months.

It was also noted that a noise complaint from a resident in Swinton was being investigated.

The Joint Waste Board were also advised that during the recent floods one of the access/egress routes into the plant was inaccessible. However, the contractor was able to continue processing all waste having utilised a waste transfer station in Barnsley.

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

48

CURRENT ISSUES

Consideration was given to the current issue that remained ongoing in terms of insurance and the brokering of a deal, which may have a market difference following fire improvement works.

It was noted that insurance would be provided this year.

Resolved:- That the update be noted.

49

RISK REGISTER

Consideration was given to the report which set out in detail the risks associated with the delivery of the BDR PFI Waste Facility contractual obligations now the facility was operational. The risks identified in the register were considered by the BDR Steering Committee every eight weeks.

Whilst there were a number of risks on the risk register nothing had changed since the previous meeting.

Discussion ensued on the current score for Risk Number 16 should the contractor exit the UK market due to financial pressures and it was noted that a good relationship currently existed with no indication this was at risk.

However, Councils would be able to identify areas where they could work with the contractor should this be necessary with mitigating measures and negotiations being put in place for the plant to continue to operate. The position would continue to be monitored.

The Joint Waste Board were also mindful of any potential changes in Government Law/Regulations which the Government had pledged to fund

Resolved:- (1) That the updated Risk Register be received and the contents noted.

(2) That any further risks be identified that require deletion or addition to risk register.

50

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other matters of business to discuss.

51 DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board take place on Monday, 16th March, 2020 at Rotherham Town Hall (time to be confirmed).