

**Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development
Committee**

Meeting held 30 November 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs (Chair), Nasima Akther, John Booker, Katie Condliffe, Sheila Constance, Aodan Marken, Mohammad Maroof, Karen McGowan, Pat Midgley, Chris Peace, Colin Ross, Ian Saunders, Jack Scott and Cliff Woodcraft (Deputy Chair)

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Gillian Foster, (Diocese Representative - Education Non-Council Voting Member)
Jules Jones, (Parent Governor Representative - Education Non-Council Voting Member)
Alison Warner, (School Governor Representative - Education Non-Council Non-Voting Member)
Alice Riddell, (Healthwatch Sheffield, Observer)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lynn Rooney and Joan Stratford (Education Non-Council Voting Member).

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 28th September 2015, were approved as a correct record, and the Committee noted the attached Actions Update.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 The three following questions were received anonymously:-

- (a) Can Sheffield City Council explain and justify the choice of Headteacher for the proposed merged Holt House Infants/Carterknowle Junior School, as

many feel a conflict of interest is at play here. The Headteacher at Holt House has been appointed to advise the Junior School since the School got 'requires improvement' in its Ofsted report in January 2015. Since then, the Infants were proposing to take over the Juniors to the point where they physically merged, and were consumed by the Infants. Does the Council feel there is a conflict of interest here? The Juniors has been left vulnerable by the absence of its Headteacher (through ill-health) and an ineffectual governing body (deemed weak by Ofsted).

- (b) How do Sheffield City Council explain away the fact that they failed to engage all parents in the consultation process? Over 40% of parents of children at Holt House and Carterknowle are of Pakistani descent. No interpreters have been provided. No literature relating to the consultation, online or otherwise, has been translated.
- (c) What criteria will Sheffield City Council use to judge the success and effectiveness of this particular consultation process? All information relating to the consultation provided was online – discriminating against anyone without access to the internet. Information was drip fed through the Council website. There was no facility to sign up for e-mail updates when changes were being made. It relied on people checking every day. A new plan was added to the website on the last day of the consultation.

5.1.1 The Chair stated that the questions would be referred to the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, and to Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) for a response.

5.2 The following three questions were raised by representatives of the GMB:-

- (a) Can the Council give its assurances today that the vital work of the specialist Early Years Safeguarding Children Advisers and their posts will continue to be funded?
- (b) The Safeguarding Children Advisory Service is already running at only 60% of its original capacity. This is a service that schools and early years rely heavily on. Can the Council give its assurances that this service will be protected from further cuts?
- (c) Does the Council agree that further fragmentation of our Safeguarding Children's Service is in no-ones interests?

5.2.1 The Chair stated that the questions would be referred to the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, and to Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) for a response.

6. STATE OF SHEFFIELD 2014 SURVEY - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

6.1 The Committee received the Executive Summary of the Sheffield Parent Carer Forum in terms of its report "The State of Sheffield 2014". The report summarised

a study of the views and experiences of parents of children and young people (aged 0-25 years) with disabilities and/or additional needs. The study aimed to gather data on issues raised by parent carers, to find out whether, and if so how, caring for a disabled child affects the whole family, and establish a baseline of parental satisfaction with local services prior to the implementation of the Children and Families Act 2014 and the Care Act 2014. As well as being presented to this Committee, the findings and recommendations of the study have also been reported to the NHS Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group and relevant providers of education, health and social care services.

6.2 The Executive Summary was supported by a presentation from Eva Juusola, Development Worker, Sheffield Parent Carer Forum, who was accompanied by Forum Trustees, Kate Quail and Michelle Cook.

6.3 Ms Juusola reported on the aims of the survey, details of respondees, where the findings had been presented and reported to, and details of some positive results, together with further work required. Ms Juusola made specific reference to the findings in respect of challenging behaviour, and highlighted problems with regard to the capacity of support services, such as Speech and Language Therapy, Educational Psychology or the Autism Team. She also referred to the findings in respect of work and child care, which highlighted the fact that a high number of parents had been forced to reduce their working hours, or had given up work altogether, to cope with their caring responsibilities. In terms of conclusions, Ms Juusola referred to the impact of funding reductions on all areas within the public sector, the importance of limited resources being used strategically to achieve maximum impact, and to the importance of two key principles, namely early intervention and co-production.

6.4 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- Children and young people with disabilities and/or additional needs were six times more likely to be excluded from school. The findings of the survey had indicated that schools generally did not make allowances in terms of the behaviour of children and young people having special educational needs, resulting in the high number of exclusions, as well as a number of such children being taken out of education and being home educated. There was a need to secure specialist expertise and early intervention in order to reduce the level of exclusions.
- It was very clear from the findings of the survey that the wellbeing of a high number of parent carers had been affected, and that they welcomed, and relied heavily upon, the respite care available.
- Whilst there had been an element of engagement with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), such engagement had been minimal, and had only included discussions with staff on the front-line. The view of the Forum was that this issue was not considered as a priority for the CCG, although the Forum was mindful of the current budget restraints being placed on the

Group.

- Parents of children with additional needs often don't see themselves as "carers". The Forum has a large and diverse membership of over 1,100 families, which had been achieved through outreach, sensitive marketing, such as referring to "children with additional needs", rather than "parent carers", and offering activities in response to parents' priorities, such as inclusive family events and information sessions.
- In terms of links with senior officers of the Council, the Forum has started meeting with the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, with such meetings being very positive to date. There were also plans to work closely with Tim Bowman, Head of Inclusion and Targeted Services.
- In terms of monitoring the progress of the recommendations set out in the Executive Summary, the Forum planned to meet with Tim Bowman and other Council officers, to co-produce an action plan.
- There had been a considerable amount of negative feedback regarding social care services, with a number of comments being very scathing. It was hoped that if the Scrutiny Committee could establish a working group to investigate the feedback, this would provide the Forum with a wider view of parents' thoughts.
- Many children with disabilities have a Social Worker assessment in order to access social care services. Unlike a Family Common Assessment Framework (CAF), these assessments don't normally take into account the needs of the whole family, and don't include signposting to other services or help with accessing benefits. The Family CAF should be used for this.
- The survey findings had highlighted the difficulties in terms of direct payments and personal budgets, including difficulties in managing them. It was considered that a managed account should be offered from the outset.

6.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of what was considered an excellent report, together with the information reported as part of the presentation and the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks the representatives of the Forum for attending the meeting;
- (c) in the light of the concerns raised with regard to the interface between the Family Common Assessment Framework and the Children's Social Care Single Assessment, requests Dawn Walton, Assistant Director, Prevention and Early Intervention, to attend the next meeting to provide an explanation on this issue; and
- (d) requests a short briefing note from Tim Bowman, Head of Inclusion and

Targeted Support, to update the Committee on the work being undertaken with the Parent Carer Forum.

7. SHEFFIELD SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

7.1 The Committee received the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board – Annual Report 2014-15.

7.2 Sue Fiennes, Independent Chair, Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board, introduced the report, which outlined the progress that had been made during the year, together with the key challenges ahead for the City to ensure that its children were safe from harm, abuse and neglect. Ms Fiennes stated that 2014-15 had been a challenging and busy year for the Board, which had included the commissioning of an assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation Services in Sheffield following the publication of the Jay Report in Rotherham, which had highlighted that Sheffield had shown both best practice and resilience in this area, and had engaged directly with young people to enable their voices to influence this important area of work. She stated that the Annual Report would also be submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board at its meeting to be held in March 2016.

7.3 Victoria Horsefield, Safeguarding Children Board Manager, also commented that it had been a busy and challenging year as the Board had implemented the Ofsted inspection findings and responded to new and emerging safeguarding issues. She stated, however, that Sheffield was fortunate to have a strong and experienced Board, that included valuable contributions from partner agencies, which had enabled it to undertake its duties effectively. The involvement of young people in the work of the Board had, again, been a focus, and this had included the production of an e-safety drama on the dangers of online gaming and “selfies”, and the development of z-cards and leaflets on the dangers of “scratching”. In terms of future priorities, the Board was focussing on young people’s access to appropriate services to meet their emotional wellbeing and mental health needs, the transition for young people from children’s to adult-based services, and building on the Sheffield Neglect Strategy.

7.4 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- The early intervention work by the Youth Justice Service and other partner organisations was crucial in order to reduce the number of young people entering, or re-entering, the criminal justice system in the City. There were a number of programmes for families, including the Stronger, Safer Families Programme, which had been developed in collaboration with Multi-Agency Support Teams and Community Youth Teams, with a focus on families experiencing aggression and/or violence from their children.
- The Council had a strategy of implementing services and taking action at the earliest possible opportunity when issues had been identified. The Youth

Justice Service worked with those children and young people who had shown signs of entering the justice system, as well as those already in the system. The Youth Justice Board regularly received and considered reports regarding these children and young people.

- The Safeguarding Board advice line was under review to ensure that practitioners in the City received consistent, timely and appropriate safeguarding advice. The Board would seek assurance that any changes did not lead to a reduction in the quality of advice provided. Initiatives during the year and going forward included the establishment of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub, a locality based service, where specific safeguarding issues would be identified.
- During 2014/15, there was a reduction seen in the number of children subject to Child Protection Plans, but emotional abuse remained the highest category in Sheffield. This was due to the recognition of the impact of domestic abuse on the emotional health and wellbeing of children.
- There was a need for additional support in terms of the provision of advisers to work with children and young people who displayed, or were likely to develop, sexually harmful behaviour, providing them with help and intervention at the earliest possible opportunity. The figures in terms of Child Protection Plans in the City were lower than the national average, but the Board would continue to monitor the position very carefully.
- Due to effective partnership working, the Board does become aware of any emerging safeguarding risks and issues in the City, which were then dealt with in the most appropriate manner. One example of this was the partnership working between the Board's Licensing Manager, Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Health Protection agencies. Examples of this include the tackling of Novel Psychoactive Substances in the City and the identification of risks of young people visiting shisha bars.
- It was accepted that further information could have been included in the section of the report on Looked After Children and Adoption, and there were plans to build on the detail in the report year on year. A link would be included into this Annual Report to the Corporate Parenting Annual Report.
- One of the identified priorities involved the transition with regard to young people aged 16/17, who had previously been under the care of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). This had now been addressed to the extent that CAMHS now looked after young people up to the age of 18. Work was also being undertaken to build up Tier 2 services in schools, and there were a number of different projects regarding safeguarding issues in schools at the present time. CAMHS had also secured 'Future in Mind' funding, which would be used to provide additional resource to help reduce waiting times.
- The investigations into illegal tattooing ('scratching') involved mainly soft

intelligence gathering, such as from schools. The process, which mainly involved adults tattooing young people, using equipment that was readily available on the internet, but led to increased exposure to further safeguarding risks to vulnerable young people, had led to action being taken.

- Whilst the Board was reasonably confident that the number of major safeguarding issues was kept to a minimum in the City, which, it considered was as a result of good data-gathering and information-sharing between partner organisations, it accepted that there was no room for complacency. The key was how information was received, what weight was given to it and how it was acted on. It was accepted that, in some instances, there was a need for improvement in terms of how information was acted on. A recent audit had found that the Board was doing most things right.
- A Task and Finish Group had been established to look at the issues of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), comprising representatives of a number of agencies and community groups. Training events had been held, particularly aimed at offering safeguarding training to harder to reach community groups to raise awareness of FGM, along with other safeguarding issues.
- Work had been undertaken by the Safeguarding Children Board's Licensing Manager to develop guidelines in connection with licensed premises, such as saunas and massage parlours. As part of its enforcement work, officers in the Licensing Service do undertake spot checks of such premises in order to monitor the age of people working there. It was very difficult to monitor the ages of people attending such premises, although action would obviously be taken if children or young people were seen visiting, as part of the enforcement visits.
- Whilst there was not a specific secure room at Aldine House, staff were required to follow strict guidelines when restraining young people at the establishment. Restraint was considered only as a last resort, and the minimisation of restraint began with a thorough recruitment and vetting process for staff, followed up with training and development. In the event of a young person being restrained, they would be taken to a suitable room, and supervised accordingly.
- It was accepted that the number of referrals in terms of transfers to the social care system had risen by 13%, but this figure was still lower than the national average.
- The number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEETS) in the City was historically at its lowest figure. However, there were some areas of the City where the figures were higher than the national average, and such areas were targeted by the provision of additional youth services.
- The MsUnderstood Programme was a partnership between the University of Bedfordshire, Imkaan and the Girls Against Gangs Project, and involved a

three-year programme of work addressing peer-on-peer abuse, including teenage relationship violence, peer-on-peer exploitation and serious youth violence. Sheffield had been one of the three chosen sites across the country, and was now in the second year of the programme delivery.

- The Board could consider looking at the possibility of webcasting their lunchtime seminars to enable a larger group of people to access them.
- The Corner, Sheffield's young people's substance misuse service, had a website which provided information and assistance, for use by parents and young children, in connection with all aspects of substance misuse.

7.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2014-15 now submitted, together with the information now reported and the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks the Chair of the Board and officers for attending the meeting and responding to the questions raised; and
- (c) requests a brief update from Dorne Collinson, Director of Children and Families, in terms of the restraint methods used at Aldine House; and
- (d) agrees that a letter be sent, to be signed by the Chair of this Committee, to the young people involved in the illegal tattooing campaign ("scratching"), expressing its thanks and appreciation for their work.

8. SHEFFIELD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION SERVICE - ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

8.1 The Committee received the Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service – Annual Report 2014-15, which contained details of the work of the Service and its partner agencies, to address child sexual exploitation in the City. The report contained data and analysis, together with details with regard to achievements and development around the five priority areas - prevention, protection, pursuit, prosecution and partnership working. The report also contained a number of case studies and attached, as appendices, details regarding the Service's structure, meetings map and the City's CSE model.

8.2 In attendance for this item were Phil Ashford, Service Manager, and Gail Gibbons, Chief Executive Officer, Sheffield Futures.

8.3 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) and the Executive Director of Children, Young People and Families, following discussions at the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB)

had written to the Ministry of Justice, expressing concerns following the receipt, by a number of the victims involved in the Operation Alphabet case, of rejection letters regarding their criminal injuries compensation claims. A letter of response had been received from the Ministry. A number of the victims had met with national decision-makers to talk about their experiences. It was suggested that a Notice of Motion should be passed at a future Council meeting, requesting the Minister to look into this issue as a matter of urgency.

- The majority of research in terms of CSE was undertaken when young people reached adolescence on the basis that the practice largely took place outside the family home and often involved children in their early teenage years. The process of grooming started in the early teenage years and a number of young people at this age were already at risk of becoming, or already being, abused. The Service was in the process of piloting work in primary schools, with special consideration being given to how this very sensitive issue was dealt with. The Service was also looking to move to a more preventative approach, rather than reactive.
- Schools were a very key source of information, and it had been found that there had been a drop in the number of referrals during school holiday periods. The Service worked closely with charities, such as Barnardo's and the NSPCC, in connection with holding activity sessions for young children during holiday periods.
- There was evidence that incidences of sexual grooming by men on young men was under-reported. There was specific training available on this issue, including the lunch-time seminars.
- The Service was currently youth-proofing the training it delivered. It was considered that the focus should be on how the information was presented, rather than the content. It was also considered that the training would be considerably more effective if it was delivered by those younger people who had been a victim of CSE.
- The Service was well aware of the increasing problems of online abuse, and was working closely with Julia Cadman and Julie Hague, Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board, to look at the best ways of tackling this form of abuse. Whilst advances in technology obviously had benefits, it could also create problems, both in terms of making it considerably easier for perpetrators to share images and information, and in those circumstances where a young person accidentally sends information or an image they had not intended to. A number of young people had been trained up as co-advisors to work in schools on this issue, which had proved very effective.
- There were no statistics available in terms of the percentage of children and young people targeted by family members, although it was known that the majority of perpetrators were not related to their victims in any way.
- The majority of cases were referred to the Service, which was part of a multi-

agency service based at Star House. Other agencies included the police and social care.

- The Service used social media to raise awareness of child sexual exploitation in Sheffield, having a Twitter account. One of the actions following the independent review into current practice in regard of tackling child sexual exploitation, undertaken by Dr Kathryn Houghton, was to agree a communications strategy.
- Young people's understanding of consent and the law is a significant piece of work for the Service and partner agencies. Practitioners also need reminding of the law surrounding consent.

8.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service's Annual Report 2014-15 now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) thanks the officers for attending the meeting and responding to the questions raised.

9. 2015 CITY-WIDE ATTAINMENT - INTERIM UPDATE

9.1 The Committee received a presentation from Antony Hughes, Children's Commissioner, and Director of Inclusion and Learning, on an interim update in terms of City-wide educational attainment in 2015. He provided a general overview in terms of education in the City and referred to the Ofsted outcomes, as at 28th October 2015, of all schools in the City. Mr Hughes referred to statistics in terms of attainment at Foundation Stage and Key Stages 1, 2 and 4. It was stated that the full, detailed attainment report would be submitted to the Committee's meeting to be held in January 2016.

9.2 Also in attendance for this item were Pam Smith, Head of Primary and Targeted Intervention, and Kate Wilkinson, Service Manager, Performance and Analysis Service.

9.3 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- The Authority's performance, relative to all other local authorities, was considered when assessing performance, including Sheffield's quartile position for every key stage; the ambition was to perform in the top quartiles, not just exceed national averages. It was noted that, on key measures, Sheffield was improving at a rate equal or above the national average.
- The triggers for the type of local authority interventions described in the presentation applied to all sectors, not just primary, and there was positive

evidence of similar interventions in secondary performance. The Council analysed all school performance, regardless of school status.

- The recent letter from Ofsted had been sent to most authorities in the Yorkshire and Humber region, in connection with concerns regarding school performance at Key Stage 2 being below the national average. Discussions had been held with Ofsted and the Department for Education, and the Authority had a clear strategy in terms of future action to address the concerns raised, including the creation of Learn Sheffield.

9.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the information reported as part of the presentation, together with the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) thanks officers for attending the meeting, and notes that a full, detailed report on City-Wide Attainment in 2015 would be submitted to its meeting to be held in January 2016.

10. CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILY SUPPORT SCRUTINY AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PREVENT TASK GROUP - UPDATE

10.1 Councillor Cliff Woodcraft, Chair of the Task Group, provided a brief update on the progress of the work of the Group, indicating that the Group had been gathering evidence and had met with partner organisations. He stated that, in the coming weeks, the Group would be drafting its report, which would be shared with the Committee, at its meeting to be held in January 2016.

10.2 The Committee noted the information reported.

11. WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

11.1 The Committee received and noted its draft Work Programme for 2015/16.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

12.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday, 25th January 2016, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank