

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

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

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

**36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

No Declarations of Interest were made.

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

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

**38. COMMUNICATIONS.**

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

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

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

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

**40. SCHOOL PLANNING, ADMISSIONS AND APPEALS UPDATE.**

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

**Department for Education Admissions Consultation: -**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Other technical drafting changes.**

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

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

**School place planning: -**

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

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

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

**Temporary increases in school places: -**

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

**Potential new Schools: -**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Extra district import and export figures: -**

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

**Department for Education Basic Need Scorecard: -**

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

- Quantity;
- Quality;
- Cost.

**Admissions: -**

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

**Admission Appeals: -**

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

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

**School places overview by Learning Community: -**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Child Neglect: -**
  - Corrosive effect on wellbeing if not tackled from an early stage;
  - Neglect was the biggest category of those who were suffering significant harm in Rotherham;
  - Required a Child Protection Plan;
  - Multi-faceted issue requiring a multi-agency response;
  - A 2013 RLSCB review of cases of neglect – key messages were early identification, early utilisation of assessment tools and assertive interventions addressing the factors underpinning neglectful parenting;
  - The RLSCB were ensuring the review's lessons were implemented by sharing with all stakeholders at high-level strategic meetings.
  
- **Domestic Abuse: -**
  - Impacted on all aspects of wellbeing;
  - Correlation between Children on a Child Protection Plan and domestic abuse within the family, mental health and substance misuse;
  - In 2013, the Improving Lives Select Commission completed their scrutiny review of domestic abuse, with recommendations on developing more integrated services with clear protocols and pathways, and be more integrated at a strategic level;
  - Development of the Multi-Agency Support Hub (MASH);
  - Changed definition of domestic abuse to include young people aged 16-18.
  
- **Early Help: -**
  - The number of children in the Borough who were at risk of significant harm, had been taken into care or where there were concerns about them referred to more than one agency was high and rising;
  - Providing the right help at the right time for children and their families helped prevent problems from escalating;
  - The Local Authority had developed an Early Help Dashboard where caseload information from agencies was shared between Children's Centres, Targeted Family Support, Integrated Youth Support Service and the Learning Support Service;
  - The Early Help Dashboard included the ability to benchmark against regional outcomes.
  
- **Voice of the Child: -**
  - Listening to what children and young people said was key to understanding their needs, keeping them safe and providing effective services;
  - The RLSCB listened to the voice of children and young people via the results of the Lifestyle Survey, the Looked

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **42. EDUCATION LIFESTYLE REPORT, 2014.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Overall, the 2014 positive outcomes were: -**

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

**2014 impact and outcomes: -**

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

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

**2014 areas for attention: -**

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

**2014 areas for improvement: -**

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2015, to start at 2.00 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.