



Telford & Wrekin  
C O U N C I L

Addenbrooke House Ironmasters Way Telford TF3 4NT

# CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2015**

**6.00pm**

**Meeting Room G2, Ground Floor,  
Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way  
Telford, TF3 4NT**

**Lead Officer:**

Fiona Bottrill  
Scrutiny Group Specialist

**(01952) 383113**

**Democratic Services  
Support Officer:**

Jayne Clarke

**(01952) 383205**

# CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

Meeting to be held on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2015 in  
Meeting Room G2, Ground Floor, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters  
Way, Telford TF3 4NT at 6.00pm

1. **Minutes** Appendix A  
To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2014
2. **Apologies for Absence**
3. **Declarations of Interest**
4. **Scrutiny Review of Multi Agency Working against Child Sexual Exploitation** Appendix B
  - (a) To consider the public consultation process and feedback received on the Terms of Reference
  - (b) To finalise the Terms of Reference
  - (c) To agree information to be requested from participants prior to the Inquiry Day
5. **Chair's Update**

### Membership of Committee

Cllr K R Guy (Chair)  
Cllr J Loveridge

Cllr S P Burrell  
Cllr A A Mackenzie

Cllr G M Green  
Cllr J Pinter

Cllr R G Scammell  
Cllr C R Turley

### Co-optees:

Mr S Ali  
Ms E Ofori

Mr A Atkinson  
Mr S Rayner

Ms S Harris  
Ms M Ward

## **CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday, 3 March 2015 at 6.00pm in Meeting Rooms G3/G4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford.**

**PRESENT:** Councillors K R Guy (Chair), G M Green, J Loveridge, J Pinter, R G Scammell, C R Turley and Co-optees S Ali, S Rayner and Mel Ward.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Jo Banks, Associate Director Patient Safety at Shrewsbury and Telford Hospitals NHS Trust and Cllr P R Watling, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families.

**IN ATTENDANCE :** F Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist and D Moseley, Scrutiny Officer

#### **CYPSC-17 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 14 November 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **CYPSC-18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Mr A Atkinson (Co-optee) and Mr A Mason (Independent Chair of Telford and Wrekin Local Safeguarding Children's Board).

#### **CYPSC-19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

#### **CYPSC-20 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF MULTI AGENCY WORKING AGAINST CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION (CSE)**

**Consideration of public consultation process and feedback received on the Terms of Reference**

The Chair invited the Scrutiny Group Specialist to give an overview of the feedback received. She advised that 21 responses had been received in total and a number of issues raised had already been responded to following consultation with the Chair:-

- The Probation Service had been invited to attend the inquiry day on 13 March 2015 and representatives had been nominated to attend.
- Representatives from the Borough's further education colleges (Telford College of Arts and Technology and New College) had accepted an invitation to take part in the Inquiry Day and representatives from Madeley Academy and Ercall Wood Technology College had also agreed to attend. Representatives from Primary Schools, Independent Schools and Special Schools were still being sought.

- Contact had been made with Shropshire Council to inform the Head of Public Protection that the review was taking place and that the issue of taxi licensing would be included in the work undertaken by the Working Group
- The Chair would attend a meeting on 6 March 2015 with a voluntary organisation supporting victims of CSE. The Chair expressed the opinion that this could result in an opportunity to co-opt an expert in the field onto the Working Group, depending upon the individual's ability to commit their time, or at least receive some expert knowledge in evidence.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist highlighted that one of the main themes that came from the public feedback was that the survivors of CSE and their families wanted to help develop services that better met the needs of victims, survivors and their families.

Members were disappointed at the low number of responses received and queried who had been invited to respond. The Scrutiny Group Specialist outlined the consultation process and the local media coverage which had taken place, which included a number of radio interviews with the Chair and newspaper reports. The deadline to respond had also been extended in an effort to give more time for responses to be made. Despite the low response rate, this did not detract from the value of the responses received. The Chair hoped that the lack of response was a positive indicator that the public thought the terms of reference were thorough enough and required no further comment, rather than demonstrating a lack of engagement or confidence.

### Finalising the Terms of Reference

The Chair asked Members to consider whether the scope of the review and Terms of Reference had been drawn broad enough to reflect the feedback or whether the Committee wished to further respond to issues regarding:

- Ongoing support for victims and their families
- How to engage with young people in a safe and unpressured environment (both young people in general and victims or young people at risk)
- How to engage with parents during the review (both in general and parents of children affected by CSE)
- Engagement with Primary Schools
- Role of councillors in tackling CSE. The Chair of the Scrutiny Management Board had offered to give evidence on his experiences of Operation Chalice.
- Engagement with Landlords
- Engagement with voluntary organisations working with young people to seek the views of staff and volunteers and young members regarding awareness and the referral process.
- Engagement with other services for vulnerable people (eg Drug and Alcohol Recovery Service (DARS), NACRO, TACT, Axis counselling)
- Whether to invite the chair of the appropriate Scrutiny Committee and LSCB Chair in Shropshire to the meeting which discusses Taxi Licensing in Shropshire

The Chair encouraged Members to read the recently published report of Louise Casey's Inspection of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council. For the avoidance of doubt, he felt that Ms Casey clearly identified the significant role of Local Authorities in addressing CSE: "Tackling CSE effectively requires a council and its partners to mobilise their services and powers together. The Council has a duty to safeguard the victims. It also governs the landscape in which CSE is played out including many schools, care homes, parks, taxis and take away food shops. Councils have powers of licensing and regulation which can be used to disrupt illegal activity in these places and keep the community safe. *This is in addition to the duties and powers of the police*". [Chair's emphasis].

The Chair had noted a theme in some recently published reports which demonstrated a breakdown in communications between agencies, which was also a concern in the recent HMIC National Child Protection Inspection of West Mercia Police. The Chair asked Members to endeavour to read the HMIC National Child Protection Inspection report prior to the Inquiry Day on 13 March 2015.

Members considered each paragraph of the Terms of Reference alongside the feedback received and were satisfied that the feedback fitted into the broadly drawn Terms. Members also requested that the Oxford Serious Case Review and HMIC National Child Protection Inspection be added to the background documents.

Members were conscious of the borough election in May 2015 and, due to the importance of the Review, requested that reassurance be sought from all Group Leaders that the Review would be continued by the Committee (or any successor Committee) following the election.

#### Information to be requested from participants prior to the Inquiry Day

Members had previously informally raised a number of initial lines of inquiry which had been circulated to the participants. Members identified some further issues to explore during the course of the review as follows:-

- How the Police engage and share sufficient information with the Cabinet Member and Senior Officers with regard to current cases whilst maintaining an appropriate level of confidentiality.
- Whether young people are successfully made aware of where to seek support and guidance, and, after disclosure, whether processes are adequately explained to them and their families.
- How the National Probation Service and local Community Rehabilitation Companies work together and with others to share information regarding Child Sexual Exploitation.
- Availability of training for Councillors and the role of Councillors in supporting affected community members.

Members were concerned to ensure that all participants at the Inquiry Day understood the role of Local Government Scrutiny. Some information had been provided to participants when the Chair initially wrote to organisational leads but it was agreed that explanatory information would be distributed to the participants in the Inquiry Day.

Members considered the draft agenda for the Inquiry Day on 13 March 2015 and were satisfied that, within the time available, sufficient organisations had been included. In later stages of the review, the Committee would seek to meet with Shropshire Council's Head of Public Protection, the voluntary sector, Councillors, front line staff in various agencies, and a cross-section of young people. It was agreed that it was important that the scope of the Review remained manageable.

Jo Banks, Associate Director Patient Safety at Shrewsbury and Telford Hospitals NHS Trust was in attendance at the meeting and made a commitment that the Hospital would take part and engage in the review. She reflected on the Trust's experience of CQC Inspection, noting the outstanding rating received for safeguarding, and drawing on this experience, she supported the Committee's commitment to challenge information received by Managers by also seeking to engage with frontline staff.

**CYPSC-21 CHAIR'S UPDATE**

There were no other relevant issues upon which to update the Committee.

The meeting ended at 6.40pm.

**Chairman:.....**

**Date:.....**

## **CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday, 4<sup>th</sup> November 2014 at 6.30pm in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford, TF3 4JA.**

**PRESENT:** Cllrs. K. Guy (Chair), C. Turley, A. Mackenzie, J. Loveridge, J. Pinter, R. Scammell, and Co-optees Mel Ward, S. Rayner.

**ATTENDING:** Cllr. P. Watling, Cabinet Member Children, Young People and Families, A. Mason, Independent Chair of Telford and Wrekin Local Safeguarding Children's Board, J. Collins, Assistant Director, Education and Corporate Parenting, K Perry, Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services, F. Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist.

#### **CYPSC-8 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chair subject to the amendment that Cllr. J. Loveridge and co-optee M. Ward had sent apologies.

#### **CYPSC-9 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr. G. Green and Co-optee A. Atkinson

#### **CYPSC-10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

#### **CYPSC-11 RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF SOCIAL WORKERS AND THE USE OF AGENCY STAFF**

The Chair welcomed the officers to the meeting and asked K. Perry, Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services to present the report.

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services explained that the Children in Care Dashboard has been a standing item on the Committees agenda and a copy of this was circulated to Members. In addition to this members had asked for information on the recruitment and retention of social workers and the use of agency social workers and the implications for Children in Care. It was explained that over the last 18 months the vacancy rate for Social work posts has fluctuated between 7% and 18%. The most recent rate as at the end of September 2014 was 18%. It was explained that there are a number of complex reasons for this:

During this period the number of social work posts in Children and Family Services has risen from 75 to 84. Half these are new posts – the remainder is due to the movement of the leaving care function to Adult Social Care.

During this period approximately 20 social workers have resigned and left the council, in addition 8 have been promoted within the council, 6 have moved sideways to another children's social care post in the council. Of those who have resigned and left the council, about half moved to more suitable posts (location or role) outside the Council.

Whilst the council has a good pool of applicants for basic grade social work posts it is difficult to attract applicants of suitable calibre for more experienced practitioner and Team manager posts.

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services said that to respond to these issues the Council is currently refreshing the elements of the workforce strategy for the recruitment and retention of social workers. The council will continue to advertise for more senior posts but in addition to this will seek to recruit the best newly qualified social workers and "Grow our Own" through developing a social work career pathway through to senior. This will also ensure that social workers develop with the culture the council wants. In order to achieve this the Council has:

- Participated in 2 cohorts of "Step up to Social Work" a regionally supported national programme which selects the most highly qualified graduates to be trained as social workers. Each local authority offers placements to 5 students per co-hort.
- Taken additional year students on placement and make sure this is a good experience. Students are very keen to apply for jobs in the local authority where they have their final placement. Three excellent appointments were made through this route last year.
- Provide work experience / and or career advice to potential applicants e.g. social workers moving into the areas or wanting to return to or enter for the first time. There have been 4 successful appointments via this route.
- Develop a role of Advanced Social Work Practitioner whose express purpose is to provide additional support to newly qualified social workers.
- Introduced a Marker Factor payment of £1500 per year for Team Managers and for social workers with 2 years plus experience.
- Pilot "fast track to SSW". Of the 5 selected last year 3 have since SSW posts in Telford. This was a learning experience and the Council is now able to provide better support.
- Develop a robust recruitment day which consistently receives good feedback from candidates, which involved role play, written test and children and young

people's panel alongside traditional interviews.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that the Regional Children's Board identified leadership as an issue and he saw that this is an issue for middle tier managers. This is part of our strategy to "Grow our Own". He said it is really good to see students who have trained here now as staff. The stability of staff here is better than in other areas.

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services added that the Council has kept and developed some very good staff.

The Chair asked if the vacancy rate was 18% in September – when will this reduce?

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services replied that this is partly dependent on whether more staff leave – either through resigning or through maternity leave. She explained that there will be 19 staff starting between October to the end of January. This recruitment process started in July. There should not be any vacancies in January but some social work posts are held against SSW posts.

A.Mason asked the demand for the service is being managed?

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services responded that Children's Services was working with partners so that they understand the work of Family Connect. Some referrals did not need the specialist skills of social workers. The case loads of social workers can be reduced by stepping down support e.g. to a health visitor, school nurse or family intervention worker.

R. Aveley said that he thought this was excellent work that the service is getting the social workers it needs. However, he added that it will be difficult for the service to reduce costs and remove the need for contingency funds.

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services replied that the spend on agency social workers is reducing. It was reported that the number of agency social workers over the last 18 months has ranged from 1 – 10. At the end of September there were 10. Agency social workers are used to cover vacancies, maternity leave and long term sickness as necessary to maintain caseloads at a safe level. The overall position is predicted that the service will not be in balance by the end of the year. Some of the costs of agency social workers is paid for from the vacant posts. Part of the approach is to over recruit. Many of the workforce are women aged 25-40 and it is prudent to plan for maternity leave.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that the team met with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Enterprise on a monthly basis to see how the service is performing. This is a robust discussion. The costs do fluctuate and it is not possible to give a timescale on when the budget will be in balance.

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services added that the need for agency staff is because the service does not have unallocated cases.

This is why it is so important to manage referrals in and referrals out. Community social workers have a remit to support other lead professionals and give advice so that referrals are not made to Family Connect and automatically expecting a social worker assessment. Reviews were carried out for 'Children in Need' cases who are not on Child Protection Plans or in care to check if they are receiving the support at the right level. It was reported that there was a very useful team meeting recently looking at performance and work flow. The model was very powerful and showed where the problems are. Children need the right care at the right time. It was recognised that it is important to check with the Lead Professionals after 3-6 months that the support is still in place without the Social Worker and that families have not disengaged.

S. Rainer asked if people who have left the profession are being encouraged to return e.g. through offering part time work?

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services responded that the feedback has been that the most important factor in encouraging people back to work is the support and supervision that is offered. Some people find the job more demanding and there is a risk of 'burn out.' It was reported that the Council is very flexible and Children's services does have quite a few part time workers.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that a big pressure for social workers is the coverage in the press which blames social workers.

S. Rayner asked if there is access to pastoral support?

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services said that staff have access to the Council's counselling service. It is important for staff to remain dispassionate but it is upsetting work and people need to be able to talk about it.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that peer support from colleagues is very important.

The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services added that it is important for staff to be able to ask for help. If something is not working they must be able to say and that no one will blame them.

The Chair thanked the Cabinet Member and officer for attending the meeting. The Assistant Director: Children's Safeguarding and Specialist Services left the meeting.

## **CYPSC 12 – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND EDUCATION RESULTS**

The Chair welcomes the Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting to the meeting and asked him to present the reports.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting explained that he would combine the reports in School Improvement and the Education Results. He explained

that the Educational performance for Children in Care has been difficult to draw together as the Key Stage 4 results were released at the end of the previous week and the results were provisional. The results are available through the Educational Performance Analysis System 3 or 4 days before the statistical release but these were withdrawn 3 times. He provided an overview of the results which showed that Key Stage 1 was doing well particularly Years 1 and 2 in primary school. Reading is showing an improvement, and writing is 1% point above the national average. Maths was the same as the national average for the second year running.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting said that there is a big debate about the teaching of reading with a push on phonics. Year 1 pupils showed a 10% point improvement on last year. This is a really significant improvement and will improve the results in Year 2 next year. It was highlighted that Year 2 results were also a success and that this should be celebrated.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that it is inspiring to see how hard teachers and pupils are working.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting gave the example of Millbrook school which had been rated as 'Requiring Improvement' by Ofsted but following training and investment the school has turned around and is now 'Good' HMI Inspectors are now using this school as an example of good practice. He went on to report on performance in Key Stage 2 which showed that the percentage of pupils gaining a Level 4 or above in reading, writing and Maths is 78% - this is the first time this has been at the same level as the national average. Level 4B in reading, writing and maths is only one percentage point below the national average. Level 5 has dipped to one percent below the national average but is still higher than last year.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting explained the Ofsted measure on progress. While a child might not get a Level 4 it is important to recognise progress.

The Chair said these were quite positive results.

Cllr. C. Turley asked if there was any effect on result for schools where there were high numbers of children who spoke little English?

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting responded that children who have English as an additional language can make remarkable progress and gave Millbrook School as an example.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting set out the Key Stage 4 results which he said does not look nearly as positive. He commented that this is an early statistical release and some schools submit remarks when they have checked the data. He explained that the methodology for measuring the headline figure of 5 A-C including English and Maths has changed in three ways:

- Only the 'first' entry for any GCSE exams counted as opposed to the previous methodology where the 'best' entry was counted.

- Only two vocational subjects from an approved list counted; previously there was a much wider range of vocational subjects which were considered to be equivalent to a GCSE.
- The threshold for a grade A-C in English and maths were increased. In English the threshold for a Grade C is roughly equivalent to the threshold for a grade B three years ago.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting gave the example of one school which still entered all children in Year 11 for GCSEs and 47% got grade C or better. Last June the same children sat the exam and 61% got Grade C or better but the league table shows the 47% as this was the first entry result. He gave another example of a school that continued to offer a wide range of vocational qualifications. Last year 90% of students got grades A-C including vocational qualifications. This year the result for the school was 34% as many of the courses were not included. There has been a debate in the press as nationally results have gone up for the last 21 years – some questioned if this is the results going up or standards slipping. There has been a 5 percentage point drop nationally from 2012/13 to 2013/14. Telford and Wrekin's results have gone down to 51.2% grade A\*- C passes including English and maths. This is below the national average of 56.1%. It was highlighted that other in other areas the results have gone down even more and it was noted that the changes in methodology have a disproportionate effect in challenged areas.

A. Mason asked if schools are withdrawing vocational courses as a result of the changes?

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting replied that it has had this effect. Schools can still provide these courses but it will not count towards the schools results. All 14 West Midlands authorities apart from Herefordshire saw results go down.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that it is disappointing for students as the results show they are under achieving but they are not.

S. Rayner asked about the poor results in English

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting replied that the results showed under performance in Telford and Wrekin in English and maths but English was worse. He explained that although the minimum grade children aim for is Grade C – schools need to teach to B standard. Schools are pairing up with Teaching Schools to help improve. Phoenix School paired with a teaching school in Shrewsbury which shows that intervention can work.

When looking at the Ofsted ratings for schools it was highlighted that Telford and Wrekin are currently 5% points above the national average for Good or Outstanding Schools. The Local Authority provide support for schools so they do not go down a category and also if they require support to move up a category.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that the School Improvement service is trusted by head teachers and staff and also work extremely well with Governors. He said he had seen this as a Governor is an extremely challenging area in Telford and Wrekin.

M. Ward supported this and said that the School Improvement Team has always been very supportive and constructive.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting highlighted the Ofsted comments on the schools that 'Required Improvement'. This illustrated the positive work of the School Improvement service.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting then explained the results for Children in Care. He brought to the attention of the Committee there had been an error in the previous reporting of the Key Stage 2 reading, writing and maths combined at level 4 which had showed that 13% of children in care achieved this – this should have shown 31%. It was recognised that the correct attainment was not good but it was noted that in 2014 this had risen to 38%. The Key Stage 4 measure for 5 A\*-C including English and maths was 26% for Children in Care which was better than the national average of 20%. It was noted that because of the change in methodology outlined earlier this will have also affected the results for Children in Care.

When looking at the results for Children in care by type of school it was noted that it was important to look at the numbers of children and the percentages could be misleading due to low numbers. The results showed that Children in Care are closing the gap and performance had exceeded predictions.

The Chair asked if there is data for progress for Children in Care.

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting said that a data analyst post has been appointed and the post of Virtual Head Teacher for Children in Care will focus on this level of detail.

### **CYP SC 13 – MONITORING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCRUTINY REPORT ON THE PROVISION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES**

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting reported on the implementation of the recommendations:

Consultation on School Catchment numbers: The consultation exercise on primary school attendance areas in north central Telford was conducted during the last academic year and has now been completed. The solution which was agreed satisfied all parties and addressed the problem of having too many primary aged pupils in the Hadley area. This is likely to be re-visited at a later date in the light of planned housing growth in the area. The School Organisation Team always consults widely on proposed attendance area changes and tries to find solutions that are

acceptable to the vast majority of those affected.

Admission Appeals Meetings: Following the Scrutiny Committee Inquiry about the attendance of head teachers as admissions appeal meetings there have been a number of discussions with officers and Head teachers to ascertain whether this would be feasible for us to adopt. In order to gain a full sense of the practice across the West Midlands the Admissions Team has conducted some research through the regional admission forum. Whilst there is no preferred pattern it seems that there is a wide degree of variance across local authorities with some inviting Heads to attend and some not doing so.

There is a further meeting to discuss admission appeal hearings with the legal section of the council next week. Colleagues from the legal section act as clerk to the appeals and oversee the procedure used.

Academies Protocol: The discussions to develop a protocol for Academies is ongoing and as an initial step the School Improvement Service have revisited the Securing School Improvement Protocol to take account of the Local Authority's statutory responsibility for standards across all schools in the Borough. The draft suggestions will be subject to further consultation with Head teachers and the relevant professional associations. There was a discussion about the role of Scrutiny if an Academy's performance is poor.

#### **CYP SC 14 POLICY ON FINING PARENTS FOR TAKING CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL DURING TERM TIME**

The Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting circulated the Council's policy on Penalty Notices. This states that taking children out of school without authorisation from the Head teacher the local authority must issue a penalty notice and the level of the fine is nationally prescribed. It was explained that the Council has accrued income but the regulation state this must be used to improve school attendance for example money can be given to schools to give attendance awards. The court proceedings only begin if the fine is not paid. It was discussed that the issue behind many parents taking their children out of school is the huge increase in the price of holidays outside the school term. Holiday companies should be challenged on this.

#### **CYP SC 15 SCRUTINY REPORT ON YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT**

The Chair confirmed that the report had been circulated to all members of the Committee who had supported the report and recommendations. The Chair also reported that he had had two very productive discussions with the FE college principals and that they were both very supportive of the report. The report was being brought to this meeting for formal approval.

**RESOLVED: The Committee approved the Scrutiny Report on Youth Unemployment.**

**CYP SC 16 CHAIR'S UPDATE**

The Chair said he wanted to discuss with the Committee the implications of the recent report on Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham. The Jay report highlighted the lack of scrutiny of this issues and the failure of the Scrutiny Committee. The Chair said he had spoken to the Cabinet Member who would encourage the Scrutiny Committee to undertake some work in this area. However, the Chair noted that if this work did go ahead, it would be necessary to put aside the work the Committee had planned and that there would have to be clear aims and objectives.

R. Aveley said that there had been cases in Telford and asked why the Committee should focus on it now?

The Chair responded that this was a valid question but there is a role for Scrutiny to look at mistakes that have been made and what has improved.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that CSE has been a priority for the Local Safeguarding Children's Board. A huge amount has been done in Telford and Wrekin. What is missing is a public outlook – identifying good practice and the reaction of partner organisations. It is important to get an outward facing public view that Scrutiny can provide. The LSCB has multi-agency scrutiny as a core part of the business.

A.Mason said the LSCB would welcome the work of Scrutiny. It would re-assure the Board that there is public scrutiny. There has been a lot of publicity on this issue and there needs to be assurance that multi-agency working is effective.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said if he was asked can he guarantee that it is not happening in Telford and Wrekin he could not say that but he can say that there are pathways for young people who are at risk and how we respond to them.

R. Aveley commented that Scrutiny should not look at current cases and does not have legal powers to do so.

Cllr. C. Turley said that he was aware it is still an issue.

Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said that Scrutiny could bring everyone together.

A.Mason said that the LSCB is challenging partner organisations and that the police are happy for this work to take place.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist reminded Members of the statutory power of the Committee which related to the Local Authority. Other organisations could be asked

to participate in the review on a voluntary basis, unless the Council's constitution was changes to give the Committee power to scrutinise external organisations. This would still not cover all the organisations. E.g. police.

Cllr. A. Mackenzie said he agreed that the Committee should scrutinise this issue.

S. Rayner suggested that the Committee should look at previous reports and the lessons learnt?

Cllr. A. Mackenzie agreed that the Committee should focus on lessons learned from Operation Chalice and the Rotherham report.

R. Aveley suggested that a sub-committee should look at this issue. He expressed his reservations about the Scrutiny Committee getting involved in an issue that the police may be investigating and the safeguarding board is already looking at.

The Chair said that the Scrutiny Committee has a statutory duty to vulnerable young people and it was highlighted in the Jay report that Scrutiny in Rotherham was unwilling to challenge.

Cllr. A. Mackenzie said that there have been successful prosecutions in Telford but we can still learn from other areas.

The Chair said that it will be important that all organisations agree to take part on a voluntary basis and that the Committee should talk to senior officers but also front line staff.

Cllr. A. Mackenzie said that it is important to go to the staff that are dealing with these issues and working with the children.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families asked that the Committee did not approach victims to take part in the review. They have experience abuse and been through the criminal justice system.

Cllr. J. Pinter said it is important that the Committee understand why this is happening and to understand more about grooming.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families said it is also important to find out how best to work with parents and inform them.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist asked the Committee when the review should start and how long it would take. It would take time to set up the meetings with partner organisations and it would be likely to be the new year before any formal meetings could be held. If the Members wanted to undertake further work it was unlikely this would be concluded before the elections in May 2015.

**It was agreed that the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee will undertake a review of child sexual exploitation. This will start in the 2014/15**

**municipal year and continue into 2015/16.**

Members requested hard copies of the reports discussed at the meeting.

The meeting ended at 8.08pm.

**Chairman:.....**

**Date:.....**

**TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**3<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2015**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR SCRUTINY REVIEW ON MULTI-AGENCY  
WORKING AGAINST CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION**

**REPORT OF SCRUTINY GROUP SPECIALIST**

**1.0 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to inform members of the comments received on during the period of public comment and having considered these to agree the terms of reference for the review.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee:

- Consider the responses received on the terms of reference during the period of public comment
- Following consideration of these comments consider and agree the terms of reference for the review of multi-agency working against CSE ( Appendix1)

**3.0 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee agreed at the meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> November 2014 to undertake a review on the issue of Child Sexual Exploitation. It was agreed that the focus of the review would be to look at how organisations are working together to prevent CSE, support and protect victims and their families and prosecute perpetrators.

- 3.2 Following discussions it was agreed it was important to ensure that local people and organisations had confidence in the work of the Committee and to assist with this the Terms of Reference for the review would be published for a period of public comment. The Terms of reference were published on 16th January 2015 and was promoted through the media. The Committee Chair was interviewed by 2 radio stations, an article was published in the Shropshire Star and the opportunity to comment was posted on the Council's Facebook page and twitter account. The initial deadline for responses was set as the

6<sup>th</sup> February 2015. The number of responses was low and so the deadline for comments was extended until the 15<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

#### 4.0 SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES RECEIVED

4.1 The response form asked 3 specific questions about the terms of reference for the review:

- What issues do you think should be included?
- Who do you think should be involved?
- Any other comments you want to make on the terms of reference?

4.2 In total 21 responses were received. The tables below sets out information which summarises the responses received.

| Responses Received from:                  | Number of responses |
|---|---------------------|
| Members of the Public                     | 4                   |
| Elected Member / co-opted Scrutiny Member | 12**                |
| Organisation / partnership / forum        | 6*                  |

\* This does not include the organisations that have agreed to take part in the review without making further comment on the terms of reference.

\*\* Includes comments from Members of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee at briefing meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> February.

4.4 All the responses received were supportive of the review. Some responses referred to specific cases of CSE. The details of these individual cases are not set out in this report and individual staff and officers have not been identified. The full responses have been shared with Members of the Committee prior to the meeting and will be available as a confidential document at the meeting. The analysis of the responses to the 3 questions is set out below.

4.5 Question 1: "What issues should be included in the review?"  
Due to the low numbers of responses it is difficult to provide a qualitative description of the responses. However a number of themes have been identified and a summary of the issues raised is provided.

| <b>Involvement in Developing Services</b>   |
|---|
| <p>Enabling survivors of CSE to reform the services that have failed them<br/>           Working with survivors to help educate young people about CSE<br/>           Consulting survivors in their views of services and the help they received and what they think of proposed plans for the future<br/>           Professionals cannot view their services externally – what they think is an appropriate response may not actually work for victims and</p> |

|  |
|--|
| survivors.   |
| <b>Support for Victims and Survivors</b>   |
| Survivors are victims and should not be treated as criminals<br>Funding for charities that support victims and survivors of CSE<br>Survivors have to wait for counselling unless they have funds to pay privately  |
| <b>Views on previous cases</b>   |
| Dissatisfaction with the response from police and social services prior to police intervention<br>Parents have not had their say about how their issues have been handled prior to police intervention   |
| <b>Prevention</b>  |
| Not placing vulnerable girls in accommodation in areas where CSE has been identified as an issue.  |
| Working with landlords who have concerns about their properties being used in CSE.   |
| <b>Licencing</b>   |
| It is estimated that there are approximately 600 licenced drivers and 500 licenced vehicles working in the Borough of Telford & Wrekin . Of those 142 drivers (though not all may be active) and 89 vehicles are licenced by Telford and Wrekin Council. |

4.6 It should be noted that there were some very positive comments about individuals providing statutory services and particularly the support provided by voluntary sector organisations.

4.7 Question 2: Who do you think should be involved?  
There were a range of organisations and individuals that were identified that could contribute to the review. These are set out below:

|  |
|--|
| <b>Voluntary Sector Organisations</b>  |
| Representatives from young people’s organisation: Scouts,. Guides, Cadet Forces, Boys / Girls Brigades,<br>Representatives from local sports organisations with significant youth membership<br>Representatives from local faith based organisations working with young people<br>Voluntary organisations that support vulnerable young people: KIP, STAY and YMCA |

|   |
|---|
| Axis – a counselling organisation that provided support to survivors of CSE<br>Drug and alcohol organisations NACRO and TACT<br>Public Sector                                   |
| <b>Public Sector</b>  |
| Probation Service<br>Local Authority Children’s Safeguarding Lead<br>Shropshire Council Safeguarding and Licencing  |
| <b>Victims / survivors and their families</b>   |
| Three responses stated that it is important to seek the views of survivors and their families. One individual who responded expressed an interest in contributing to the review |
| <b>Education</b>  |
| Further Education Colleges<br>Independent schools   |
| <b>Other</b>  |
| Landlords   |

4.8 Question 3: Any other Comments you want to make on the terms of reference?

|  |
|--|
| <b>In addition to the comments set out above the following responses were also received:</b>   |
| The Local Safeguarding Children’s Board supported the review and the terms of reference. The Board and individual members also agreed to respond to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review and that the responses will be co-ordinated by the Board.   |
| The Primary Heads Forum responded that it is difficult for Head teachers to attend meetings.<br>The Secondary Heads Forum responded that it is difficult for one Head to represent the group. It was suggested that a meeting with a schools safeguarding lead may be a way for schools to contribute to the review. *** |
| West Mercia Police sent a letter to the Chair of the CYP Scrutiny Committee which was very positive about the review.  |

\*\*\* Alternative ways of engaging with schools and further education colleges are being explored.

## **5.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The comments on the draft terms of reference have highlighted the need to engage with victims, survivors and their families, voluntary organisations that support vulnerable young people.

## **6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations contained within this report. Any costs associated with the review process will need to be met from within existing resources.
- 6.2. Any financial implications arising from the recommendations of the review will be identified within a future report.

## **7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 There are no additional legal comments to make in addition to the matters already covered within the body of the report and the draft terms of reference.

## **8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There are no environmental implications resulting from this report

## **9.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no direct ward implications resulting from this report

**Report prepared by Fiona Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist, 01952 383113**

**DRAFT Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Review Working Group of Multi-Agency Working  
Against Child Sexual Exploitation**

**January 2015**

**1.0 Background**

It was agreed at the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee on 4 November 2014 that a working-group would carry out a review on Child Sexual Exploitation.

**2.0 Membership of Sub Group**

Cllr Kevin Guy (Chair)

Cllr Gill Green

Cllr Chris Turley

Cllr Roy Scammell

Mel Ward

If the Scrutiny Committee identifies any particular knowledge or skills gaps in the membership of the Review Group which could be filled by a co-opted member, parties with relevant skills or experience may be invited to participate in the Review as time limited co-optees for the duration of the review. Time-limited co-opted members will not have voting rights.

**3.0 Chairing**

Chair of CSE Review Working Group is the Chair of the CYP Scrutiny Committee.

The Chair of a Scrutiny Committee would usually have a casting vote if there is a difference of views within the Committee. As the Members of the working group aim to work through a process of consensus, the Chair's casting vote will be waived.

**4.0 Quorum**

Under most circumstances it is expected that there will be a minimum of two members at any working group meeting. However, there may be occasions where it is appropriate for one member of the working group to receive evidence accompanied by a Scrutiny Officer.

## 5.0 Political Balance

The Working Group is not required to be politically balanced, as the Group's findings and report will be considered and approved at a formal meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee which is politically balanced.

## 6.0 Scope

### The focus of this Scrutiny Review is:

"How are organisations in Telford and Wrekin working together to prevent CSE, protect and support the victims and their families and prosecute perpetrators?"

Lines of inquiry

- How well have organisations implemented lessons learned from Operation Chalice and contributed to the development and implementation of the CSE support and protection pathway?
- How well are organisations responding to the findings and recommendations of national reviews and inquiries including the Jay Report (July 2014), Coffey Report (October 2014), DCLG Select Committee report (November 2014) and Ofsted Report (November 2014).

The Terms of Reference for this review will be published for public comment during January 2015. The Committee will consider the comments received and may amend the Terms of Reference for the Review or refer issues to the relevant organisation to respond.

## 7.0 Powers

The Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee is the main mechanism by which Scrutiny members scrutinise and monitor the planning and performance of the Council's services to children and young people, and the Council's Corporate Parenting role. The Committee may also scrutinise the services of partner organisations in accordance with national legislation. All partner organisations included in this Review have agreed to participate on the same voluntary basis. However, the Council's Scrutiny Committees do have some legislative powers to scrutinise partners as follows:-

- The Police and Justice Act 2006 provides powers for scrutiny committees to investigate work being undertaken by Community Safety Partnerships (known locally as the Safer, Stronger Communities Partnership) as a whole rather than a power to scrutinise individual partners (eg the Police). Scrutiny of the Safer Stronger Communities Partnership is exercised by Scrutiny Management Board.
- Under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, the Health and Adult Social Care Committee scrutinises and monitors the planning and performance of the Council's adult social care services and NHS services

The Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and the Working Group established to carry out the review will invite partner organisations to participate in the review on a voluntary basis.

The Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) endorse these terms of reference and all the partners commit to supporting this review. The LSCB agrees to co-ordinate the joint or individual organisational responses to the Scrutiny Committees recommendations. (Subject to approval of the LSCB.)

### **8.0 Timescales and Ways of Working**

The Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee will agree the terms of reference for this review having considered the comments from partner organisations and the public. The Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee will receive evidence from partner organisations at Inquiry Day(s) to be held in February / March 2015. It is anticipated that the review will conclude in February 2016. The Committee may decide to publish an interim report if there are recommendations the Committee will want to make before the review has concluded.

The Working Group and the full Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee will work through consensus for the purposes of this Review. Where there are differing views within the Working Group these will be reflected in the public report.

The Working Group will follow the Centre for Public Scrutiny principles of good scrutiny when undertaking this review:

- Providing a "critical friend" challenge;
- Reflecting the voice and concerns of the public;
- Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process; and
- Making an impact on the delivery of public service

The Inquiry Day(s) in February / March 2015 will be held as public Committee Meetings. The following organisational representatives will be invited:

- Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Telford & Wrekin Council
- Director of Children and Family Services, Telford & Wrekin Council
- Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding & Specialist Services, Telford and Wrekin Council
- Director of Public Health, Telford & Wrekin Council
- Chairman, Local Safeguarding Children's Board
- Chief Constable, West Mercia Police
- West Mercia Police and Crime Commissioner
- Primary Heads Forum
- Secondary Heads Forum
- Chair / Chief Operating Officer, CCG
- Chief Executive, Shrewsbury and Telford Hospitals NHS Trust
- Chief Executive, Shropshire Community Health Trust
- Chief Executive, South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust
- Chief Executive, West Midlands Ambulance Service

- Chair/Chief Executive, Shrop Doc / GP Federation
- Chief Crown Prosecutor, Crown Prosecution Service

The Committee wants to ensure that children, young people, family and carers are appropriately involved in the review. Prior to the Inquiry Day(s) the Committee will request that the statutory organisations provide information about how they have engaged with children, young people and their families / carers to help shape the services in response to Child Sexual Exploitation.

Following this meeting the Working Group will determine the issues that will be scrutinised in more detail. The evidence for this stage of the review may be sought through meetings, focus groups, questionnaires etc. Members may seek the views of front line staff from partner organisations and local groups. It is at this stage that the views of children and young people may be sought in line with the Council's policies on consultation.

Minutes will be taken as a record of public meetings and a summary of the evidence received at working group meetings will be included in the Scrutiny Report.

### **9.0 Training**

All Members of the working group will undertake the Council's on-line training module on CSE. There will be a follow up training / workshop session for the Members prior to the Committee Meeting.

### **10.0 Confidentiality and Safeguarding**

The Scrutiny Review is not a Serious Case Review or full scale investigation along the lines of the Jay Report. It will not investigate previous or current cases of Child Sexual Exploitation. Any information received in the course of the Review regarding individuals will be managed in confidence in line with the Council's policies. However, if any information is provided about cases or allegations are raised in the course of the Review then those issues will be reported to the appropriate organisation in line with the Council's safeguarding policies.

The Committee recognise that CSE is an issue that directly affects some individuals, families and communities in Telford and Wrekin. The direct voice of victims and their families will not be actively sought again as it is acknowledged that providing evidence is a difficult process and some of their feedback has been included in published reports. However, if victims or their families express a wish to voluntarily engage in the review (either through commenting on the terms of reference or otherwise) that will be welcomed. In such an event, the Committee's final report will be anonymised in order to protect identities.

## **11.0 Resources for review**

In order to devote sufficient time and focus to this Review, Members have agreed to postpone all other items on the Work Programme for Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee. In order to focus limited resources efficiently, the Review Working Group will only select witnesses and activities that are necessary to address the concerns identified in the scope.

The Scrutiny Management Board will oversee the allocation of scrutiny officer resources to the Scrutiny Committees, and will make decisions where there are competing demands for resources.

## **12.0 Background Publications**

New Start - Child Abuse through Sexual Exploitation (CATSE) Learning 2008 – 2013 (October 2013)

LSCB Child Sexual Exploitation Learning Overview Report (April 2014)

LSCB Annual Reports

Jay Report (August 2014) (Rotherham)

Coffey Report (October 2014) (Greater Manchester)

National Working Group Network: Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation – Summary of Recommendations (as referred to by the Jay Report) <http://www.nwgnetwork.org/>

Office of the Children’s Commissioner: If Only Someone Had Listened (November 2013) (includes the See Me, Hear Me Framework)

DCLG: Child sexual exploitation in Rotherham: some issues for local government (November 2014)

Ofsted, The sexual exploitation of children: it couldn’t happen here, could it? (November 2014)

DCSF: Supplementary Guidance to Working Together to Safeguard Children

HMI Crime Inspection (November 2014)

IRO Report (May 2013) (Rochdale)

Birmingham City Council: We Need to Get it Right: A Health Check into the Council’s Role in Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation (December 2014)

West Mercia Consortium Inter Agency Child Protection Procedures (October 2014)  
[http://westmerciaconsortium.proceduresonline.com/chapters/quick\\_guide.html](http://westmerciaconsortium.proceduresonline.com/chapters/quick_guide.html)