

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

Monday 26 January 2015 at 1.00 pm

To be held at the Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

Membership

Councillors Gill Furniss (Chair), Nasima Akther, John Booker, Mike Drabble, Talib Hussain, Karen McGowan, Pat Midgley, Colin Ross, Ian Saunders, Diana Stimely, Stuart Wattam and Cliff Woodcraft (Deputy Chair)

Education Non-Council Members

Jules Jones, Gillian Foster, Joan Stratford and Alison Warner

Substitute Members

In accordance with the Constitution, Substitute Members may be provided for the above Committee Members as and when required.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

The Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee exercises an overview and scrutiny function in respect of the planning, policy development and monitoring of service performance and other general issues relating to learning and attainment and the care of children and young people within the Children's Services area of Council activity. It also scrutinises as appropriate the various local Health Services functions, with particular reference to those relating to the care of children.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk. You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked * on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Scrutiny Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Scrutiny Committee meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Committee may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

If you require any further information about this Scrutiny Committee, please contact Diane Owens, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email diane.owens@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:diane.owens@sheffield.gov.uk)

FACILITIES

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

**CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILY SUPPORT SCRUTINY AND POLICY
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA
26 JANUARY 2015**

Order of Business

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest** (Pages 1 - 4)
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meetings** (Pages 5 - 20)
To approve the minutes of (a) the meeting of the Committee held on 17th November, 2014 and (b) the special meeting held on 15th December, 2014, and to note the attached Actions Update
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Children and Families Act 2014** (Pages 21 - 26)
Report of the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families
- 8. Work Programme 2014/15** (Pages 27 - 28)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Building Successful Families Programme - Update** (Pages 29 - 38)
Briefing paper for information
- 10. Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, 9th March, 2015, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall

This page is intentionally left blank

ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
 - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
 - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
 - the landlord is your council or authority; and
 - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
 - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
 - (b) either -
 - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
 - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Interim Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Meeting held 17 November 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Gill Furniss (Chair), John Booker, Mike Drabble,
Talib Hussain, Karen McGowan, Pat Midgley, Colin Ross,
Diana Stimely and Cliff Woodcraft (Deputy Chair)

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Gillian Foster, Education Non Council Voting Member
Jules Jones, Education Non-Council Voting Member
Joan Stratford, Education Non-Council Voting Member
Alison Warner, Education Non-Council Member

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nasima Akther and Ian Saunders.

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 Jules Jones declared a personal interest in agenda items 7 (2014 City-Wide Attainment Outcomes in Schools and Academies) and 8 (Academies in Sheffield) as she has two children on roll at an academy in the City.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22nd September 2014, were approved as a correct record, and the Committee noted the attached Actions Update.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 There were no questions raised or petitions submitted by members of the public.

6. 2014 CITY-WIDE ATTAINMENT OUTCOMES IN SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES

6.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report providing further detail with regard to attainment and performance outcomes from Foundation Stage to A Level in Sheffield's schools and academies in 2014.

6.2 The report set out a number of headlines and contained details of the different assessments in respect of each key stage, a detailed summary of the attainment outcomes for the key stages, including comparisons nationally, with other core cities, statutory neighbours and metropolitan authorities, and details of the achievement of identified groups of vulnerable learners.

6.3 In attendance for this item were Antony Hughes, Interim Director, Inclusion and Learning Services and Children's Commissioner, Pam Smith, Head of Primary and Targeted Intervention, and Janet Doherty, Head of Learning and Achievement Service.

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

- In the case of those schools or academies which were, or were likely to be below the Government's floor standards, the Authority would take a number of measures, such as engaging with the Heads to discuss any issues of concern. With regard to Sheffield Springs Academy, the Authority had a seat on the Academy's Improvement Board, and attended all the Board meetings in order to assist in the process for improving attainment levels. It was stressed that although the attainment figures in respect of Chaucer, Fir Vale and Sheffield Springs Academies had gone down, it was not possible to make a clear comparison to last year's results due to a number of changes made in respect of the examination marking systems.
- There were many varied and complex reasons for the drop in rankings in respect of Fir Vale Academy, following conversion.
- The reasons as to why attainment levels at Key Stage 1 had not been followed through from the Foundation Stage, at which Sheffield had been ranked 70th nationally in terms of children who had made good progress, had mainly been due to the fact that the results of children who had been in the country for less than two years could be discounted at Key Stage 2, but not at Key Stage 1, and this had resulted in a significant difference, particularly due to the increase in the number of young children coming into the country.
- In terms of all Key Stages, and taking into account Sheffield's social deprivation levels, it was envisaged that the City would be ranked between 103rd and 105th nationally.
- The work required to ensure that attainment levels in respect of the traditionally high performing schools remained high, was always viewed as a significant challenge.
- In respect of the lower performing schools, the Authority planned for better engagement with the Heads and to assist the schools in forging effective partnerships with other schools in order to learn from each other in terms of adopting best practice. The City Wide Learning Body would also assist with the process. Other strategies the Authority adopted to help improve

performance included Every Sheffield Child a Learner.

- It was accepted that the attainment gaps in respect of SEN pupils at all key stages were not acceptable, with such gaps often being the widest in higher performing schools. Whilst it was agreed that attainment levels for SEN pupils were generally lower, work was being undertaken to support schools to improve such performance. The Authority was working closely with Rowan and Talbot Special Schools, and the Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs) across the City, to look at how SEN needs were identified and how performance was reported, especially for those children on the P scale (lower than Level 1). There had been a number of incidences where the attainment gaps in respect of SEN pupils had narrowed.
- The Authority was engaging with schools in connection with the difficulties being faced by pupils whose parents' first language was not English, and strategies and programmes were in place, specifically in schools having high numbers of children with similar needs, in order to assist them. Significant investment had been made in the last few years in connection with the teaching of reading, writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2, which had resulted in a 4.2% closure in the attainment gap in terms of national outcomes.
- In terms of the attainment and progress of vulnerable learners, a number of pupils at some of the City's special schools would appear in more than one column on the chart in the report due to their complex level of need. The demand for places at Heritage Park, Spring Lane and Holgate Meadows was very high, and it was a challenge for the Authority to ensure that more young people were supported better, in terms of their education, in mainstream schools.
- A considerable amount of work was undertaken to try to ensure that parents or carers were fully engaged in pupils' education, both whilst at school and in the home.

6.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, the comments now made and the responses provided to the questions raised;
- (b) acknowledges that, although improvements have been made in the progress of children and young people at all key stages, there was still a considerable amount of work required to ensure that attainment levels improved in schools and academies, at all key stages; and
- (c) requests that arrangements be made for the establishment of a small sub-group, comprising Members of the Committee, to look in more detail at gaps in performance in connection with the attainment and progress of vulnerable learners in 2014, and to report back to the January 2015 meeting on their findings.

7. ACADEMIES IN SHEFFIELD

7.1 Antony Hughes, Interim Director, Inclusion and Learning Services and Children's Commissioner, gave a presentation on all aspect of academies. This included details of the number of academies in Sheffield and across England, and the different models in terms of academy status in Sheffield. He also provided details of those Academy Trusts that provided sponsorship, issues to be considered for those schools considering conversion to academy status, the Council's role in connection with schools attaining academy status, and issues for consideration by the Council in the light of the increase in the number of schools attaining academy status.

7.2 Also in attendance for this item was Matthew Bradshaw, Lead Project Manager.

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

- Any schools expressing an interest in moving to academy status would be required to consult with parents and carers of all children at the schools. There have been examples of both good and poor consultation in this regard and, where necessary, the Authority has challenged some schools, where the standard of consultation, though adequate, had not been good. It was very important to ensure that there was robust consultation in all cases.
- With regard to the performance of those schools which had been in special measures, and had now converted to academy status, three sponsored academies had recently achieved their highest attainment figures ever. When schools first convert to academy status, they were no longer classed as having an Ofsted category until they were inspected two years after conversion. The Local Authority sits on the Governing Body of those academies which were in special measures before converting, right up until their first adequate inspection outcome.
- As with schools, there were a number of different curriculum models across the academies, with academies having the choice to choose what they wish to do in terms of the national curriculum they offered, which was compulsory in maintained schools.
- Once a school had moved to academy status, the Authority no longer had mandatory powers to take any action if there were any problems. The Authority's duty would be to inform the Department for Education and would only do this once the leadership of the school and the sponsor had been alerted to, but failed to address, Local Authority concerns.

7.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:

- (a) notes the information now reported as part of the presentation, together with the responses provided to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks Antony Hughes for the presentation now made; and

- (c) requests the Policy and Improvement Officer to circulate a copy of the presentation to all Members.

8. WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15

8.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer, Diane Owens, submitted a paper containing the Committee's draft Work Programme 2014/15.

8.2 Ms Owens made reference to a training session open to Members of the Committee, which was to be held on 24th November 2014, from 1.30 pm to 4.00 pm in the Town Hall. The training was on Questioning and Listening skills, and would provide Members with information and advice which should be useful as part of the scrutiny process.

8.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the draft Work Programme 2014/15; and

- (b) requests:-

- (i) the Policy and Improvement Officer to identify a meeting or other suitable time when the newly appointed Police and Crime Commissioner, Dr Alan Billings, could attend to report on his response to the issue of Child Sexual Exploitation and other areas of work linked to the role of this Committee; and

- (ii) Members inform the Policy and Improvement Officer if they wish to attend the training session on Questioning and Listening skills.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

9.1 It was noted that (a) a special meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday, 15th December 2014, at 2.00 pm, in the Town Hall and (b) the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday, 26th January 2015, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

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

Meeting held 15 December 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Gill Furniss (Chair), John Booker, Mike Drabble, Talib Hussain, Karen McGowan, Pat Midgley, Colin Ross, Ian Saunders, Diana Stimely, Stuart Wattam and Cliff Woodcraft (Deputy Chair)

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Jules Jones, Education Non-Council Voting Member
Gillian Foster, Education Non Council Voting Member
Alison Warner, Education Non-Council Member

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tim Rippon.

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 The Chair (Councillor Gill Furniss) declared a personal interest in agenda item 6 (Assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation Services in Sheffield), as she had been interviewed in connection with the compilation of the report.

3.2 Councillor Colin Ross declared a personal interest in agenda item 6 (Assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation Services in Sheffield), as he had been interviewed in connection with the compilation of the report.

3.3 Alison Warner declared a personal interest in agenda item 6 (Assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation Services in Sheffield), as a member of the Education Safeguarding Reference Group.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 Val Binney referred to the assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) services in Sheffield, offering her congratulations to the Council in respect of the positive report, but indicated that there was no mention of ongoing monitoring of the Council's CSE policies and procedures as routine work, which had been noted as one of the key weak links following the recent enquiry in Rotherham.

- 4.2 Dr Kathryn Houghton, Safer Outlook Consulting Ltd., and author of the report now submitted, stated that, as part of the assessment, the Local Authority had clearly recognised the need to continually update its policies and procedures in relation to its CSE services. It had also been recognised that new policies would always be introduced, which would also need to be monitored and updated. It had been identified that there was a need to be careful in terms of designing policies and procedures in this regard as child sexual exploitation was only one aspect of the Council's Safeguarding Children services. As part of the assessment, there had been evidence of new quality assurance processes, thematic audits on child sexual exploitation and practitioners having reflective practice of children's experiences.

5. ASSESSMENT OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION SERVICES IN SHEFFIELD

- 5.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, attaching an Executive Summary and Overview Report drafted by Dr Kathryn Houghton, Safer Outlook Consulting Ltd, on an Assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Services in Sheffield. The Executive Summary and Overview Report had been drafted following a motion passed at the Full Council meeting on 3rd September 2014, requesting that such an assessment be undertaken in response to the publication of the report of Professor Alexis Jay's Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham. The motion stated that the completed assessment would be shared with both the Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet. The attached reports were presented in response to this request, and summarised the activity that had been undertaken in all areas of work in connection with the Council's Child Sexual Exploitation services.
- 5.2 Present at the meeting were Sue Fiennes, Independent Chair of the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) and member of the Overview Panel, Dr Kathryn Houghton, Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, Dorne Collinson, Director, Children and Families Service, Victoria Horsefield, Manager, Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB), Kevin Clifford, Chief Nurse, Clinical Commissioning Group, Councillor Julie Dore, Leader of the Council and Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families.
- 5.3 Sue Fiennes reported on the role of the Overview Panel, indicating that the assessment, which had been commissioned by the SSCB, had looked at how Sheffield City Council and partner organisations were achieving Sheffield's strategic aims in tackling child sexual exploitation, including the operation of the multi-agency team - Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service (SSES) - established in 2001. She stated that, as well as the Board continuing to examine the various governance arrangements, there was also a robust Strategy Group, linked to the Board, which would take forward any actions arising from the assessment.
- 5.4 Dr Kathryn Houghton stated, as an introduction, that the CSE assessment had looked at many aspects of the Council's CSE services, including leadership and governance, multi-agency working, safeguarding, self-assessment, compliance with Ofsted's CSE thematic inspection Annexe A requirements, evaluation of processes, procedures and tools, evaluation of the CSE training programme, staff

surveys on training and support, evaluation of ten cases managed through the SSES and an audit of 32 cases of children and young people who had received input from the SSES, and a Young People's Panel. Dr Houghton referred specifically to the case reviews, indicating that they were a prominent part of the report.

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

- In terms of the areas for development outlined in the report, it had been recognised by all concerned that there was a continuing need to constantly review, develop and improve the services. The Service could not be complacent and could never think that it has got everything right. There was a level of awareness with regard to the fact that the education sector was very broad and that the procedures for CSE did work in practice. However, some educational establishments required assistance in developing a specific CSE policy or in amending existing safeguarding policies to fully encompass requirements. The report recommended that the SSCB assisted the educational establishments in this action.
- The Strategy Board, a sub-group of the SSCB, had been formed around five years ago. The Strategy Board had been tasked at looking at the Action Plan, and had already commenced working on this. The SSCB would then receive regular reporting in terms of progress made in connection with the Action Plan. The Chair of the Strategy Board had commenced implementing a number of actions, and the Action Plan could be submitted, on a regular basis, to the Scrutiny Committee. The Strategy Board would also be looking at a number of actions from a sub-regional point of view, and not just relating to Sheffield.
- It was accepted that it was not always possible to reach all groups, particularly those hard to reach groups in the Voluntary, Community and Faith (VCF) sector. There had been a number of publicity campaigns, which had helped to increase awareness, and training had been arranged for staff and local community representatives, including representatives from the VCF sector. Both of these initiatives were beginning to have an impact, which had been shown by the level and nature of feedback received. Councillors had been encouraged to look out for, and inform the Council of, any such hard to reach groups who would welcome training. Online training had also been made available, which involved parents talking about their experiences. Sheffield had been innovative in this, and other local authorities were using the training package.
- There was a Licensing Manager on the SSCB, who was responsible for providing help and advice on safeguarding issues in respect of licensed premises. All new applicants for taxi licenses were required to undertake a BTEC course, with Safeguarding Children being one of the modules, and there were plans to roll this out for existing taxi drivers. A considerable amount of work had been undertaken with the hotel trade, with advice being

provided for all members of staff in terms of CSE awareness, indicators and risks, with positive results of this work having already been witnessed.

- The issues relating to poor communication and information-sharing were usually highlighted as serious case review lessons on a national basis. It was important in all safeguarding children activities, not just CSE, to adhere to information-sharing protocols, as guided by Working Together 2013. This ensured that relevant information was shared with the right people and organisations. As part of the assessment, there had been evidence of good information-sharing and the case reviews highlighted an almost seamless system in this regard. One of the areas for development in the report was having a central base to hold information and this had been identified as the CareFirst system. This would mean that various workers would be able to access CareFirst at an appropriate access level. It was important that the Police shared relevant information in terms of criminal activity, which was, or could possibly, be linked to CSE. It was accepted that people were not infallible and so there could be no guarantee that all relevant information would be made available and/or shared with the relevant partner organisations. Whilst there were clear guidelines in legislation in terms of levels of information-sharing, it would never be a fool-proof system. The issue of information-sharing between partner agencies was made difficult due to the agencies having different protocols in this regard, but every effort would be made to share information, where relevant, in order to safeguard children. Efforts were presently being made to complete a sub-regional sign-off in terms of an information-sharing protocol, through agreement with the four South Yorkshire Authorities and the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.
- In terms of mechanisms for allowing Members and other relevant people and organisations access to monitor whether CSE systems were operating effectively, one of the recommendations arising from a recent Ofsted thematic assessment was a requirement for the SSCB (with SSES) to produce a suite of reports for such relevant people and organisations, including the SSCB and this Committee, in terms of monitoring. It was also recommended that the SSCB and Scrutiny Committee should be provided with a timetable in respect of the receipt of regular update reports. Reference was made to the annual Safeguarding Report produced by the SSCB, and which was submitted to this Committee for information and scrutiny. It was also suggested that it would be useful for Members to have a checklist in terms of issues/questions they could consider raising as part of their scrutiny role.
- The in-depth audit of 32 cases of children and young people who had received input from the SSES had been considered a very important aspect of the overall assessment. Additionally, the Young People's Panel was critical to understanding their views. This required a considerable level of planning and preparation in terms of the Panel attendance. A lot of the information recorded as part of the Panel was reflected in the Overview Report.
- In the light of the challenges in terms of transitions and access to the Child

and Mental Health Service (CAMHS), the Council had begun to challenge how appropriate the Service was for children and young people, both in terms of suitability and accessibility. Steps had been taken to look at how CAMHS, which offered general practice services as well as mental health services, could be provided differently. Questions had also been raised in terms of the gap in post-16 services, but this issue was now being addressed, with the Clinical Commissioning Group making a financial commitment on this issue.

- There were clear protocols in terms of how information was shared around CSE and referrals, and there was confidence, in the light of the robust processes adopted by the Council, that any referrals made to the Council would be dealt with adequately.
- It was clear that the recent media attention, particularly following the issues in Rotherham, had impacted on people's views and perceptions of child sexual exploitation which, amongst other things, had made people more aware, and therefore more confident, of reporting incidents. There was a considerable level of confidence in terms of capacity and level of expertise regarding staff in the SSES. It had, however, been recognised that the social work workforce in Sheffield was no different to anywhere else in that it was subject to turnover and change, but there was every confidence that the staff were resilient and would be able to respond to the demands placed on them. It was recognised that there was still a need for staff to maintain high standards, particularly in connection with training, the provision of support and monitoring levels of need, as the Council moved through the next phase of development.
- Despite the heavy demands placed on Social Workers, and the high levels of blame laid on them, recruitment levels were still high, and there was still a highly committed workforce in the City. The Council benefited from operating a rolling recruitment process, which resulted in there being less gaps in staffing, as at other local authorities. Dr Houghton stressed that she was confident that Sheffield had robust processes in place in terms of its CSE services and that she would not have put her name to the report if she was not happy with the findings reported. The assessment had been so detailed and wide-ranging, that there was very little chance of anything being missed. Whilst accepting that, on occasions, information could go missing, there were adequate safeguards in place to limit such occurrences. Dr Houghton trusted all the Council officers and representatives from the partner agencies who had been involved in the assessment and had been very impressed with the attitude and work ethic of the Social Workers.
- In order to ensure that Members had as much information as possible, both in terms of levels of questioning and interpretation of data, in connection with their scrutinising role, relevant training would be provided. Whilst Members would not be able to access information in terms of individual cases, they would be able to monitor and raise questions in terms of trends and other statistics. The Overview Panel established to oversee the assessment of the CSE services had also performed a scrutiny role. The Scrutiny Committee may wish to request some of the expert witnesses, who had been engaged as

part of the assessment, to attend a future meeting.

- The Police representatives on the SSCB had not been able to attend this meeting as they were party to an ongoing national Police review, and their attendance could potentially compromise their involvement in the review. The two Police representatives on the SSCB had attended the Young People's Panels, and had responded to a number of questions in terms of their roles. Also, the newly appointed Police and Crime Commissioner for South Yorkshire was scheduled to attend the Scrutiny Committee's meeting to be held in March 2015, to provide an update on his role around CSE. The Police had also taken part in the CSE self-assessment.
- In terms of recent Police prosecutions relating to child sexual exploitation, there had been three prosecutions as part of Operation Glover, two prosecutions as part of Operation Alphabet and five prosecutions as part of Operation Keg. In addition, a similar case (Operation Kreele) had been unsuccessful as the trial had collapsed. As a number of child sexual exploitation cases were considered by the Crown Court, in addition to those considered at Magistrates Court, there was also a need to educate juries on all aspects of child sexual exploitation. In such cases, the burden of proof was very important, so evidence gathering was considered a key element of such cases. Whilst comments as to whether the Police and Courts were taking tough enough action against perpetrators was a subjective issue, the Council was forced to trust and rely on both bodies in carrying out their roles to the best of their abilities. Officers had every confidence in the Police in the CSE Team, together with those Police Officers in the Community Youth Team.
- A number of sources assisted in the design of the CSE audit toolkit used in the assessment, including Working together 2013, Ofsted inspection toolkits, CSE evidence-based literature, best practice shared between local authorities, together with the experience of the report author, and the SSCB and SSES professionals. The audit toolkit had not been included in the report as it would have made it too lengthy. The audit toolkit could however be shared with the Scrutiny Committee if requested. The case reviews, which ran alongside the case audit, were very helpful. There was a need to be mindful as to how much data was included in the report.
- In terms of engagement with academies and private schools in the City, the Education Safeguarding Reference Group, linked to the SSCB, had an all-encompassing reach in terms of disseminating information with regard to CSE. In addition to this, the Safeguarding Service provided advice to all educational establishments in the City. Information could also be shared through the City-wide Learning Body. All educational establishments in the City had access to online policies, guidance, advice and online training.
- In terms of engagement with the VCF sector, there was a third sector representative on the Voluntary and Community Reference Group. The Group was open to any group who wished to join, and any volunteers or

representatives of groups could attend any of the safeguarding training sessions arranged. They would also all have access to all the safeguarding policies and procedures.

- The issue with regard to the provision of help, advice and training for those people for whom English was a second language, had been addressed in the Overview Report, in that reference had been made to the receipt of any reports in other languages. It was accepted that, in some cases, problems with literacy was an issue and, where possible, community leaders were asked to help provide any relevant information.
- It was important that both perpetrators and victims of child sexual exploitation should not be stereotyped in terms of gender or ethnicity as this had the potential to increase risk to children.
- There were a number of strands of independence that had been applied to the assessment to ensure that due process had been followed, including the appointment of Sue Fiennes as the Independent Chair of the SSCB, and whose role it was to provide scrutiny and robust challenge to partner agencies in the City on all matters regarding safeguarding, including CSE. The level of independence was also reflected in the membership of the SSCB, which was made up of partner agencies which scrutinised and held officers to account. Ofsted's review of the SSCB in February 2014, had judged the Board to be 'good', and reported that Sheffield had demonstrated appropriate challenge. The CSE Service arrangements in Sheffield had been commended by Ofsted, a view consequently confirmed by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC). The Independent Chair had not seen anything in the report's findings to suggest that Sheffield was looking for a reasonable outcome, instead, finding that there had been a robust and transparent process throughout. Dr Kathryn Houghton stressed that she would not have undertaken this piece of work, or put the reputation of her company in jeopardy, if she had not been confident in the process.

5.6 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the Overview Report and Executive Summary – An Assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation Services in Sheffield, together with the information now reported and the responses provided to the questions raised;
- (b) expresses its thanks and appreciation to Dr Kathryn Houghton for drafting the report; and
- (c) requests:-
 - (i) the Policy and Improvement Officer to draft letters, to be signed by the Chair of the Committee, and forward them to (A) the Crown Prosecution Service, with copies to the Sheffield MPs, in support of the issue highlighted in the assessment that continuing work is

required with the judiciary system to explain the complexities of child sexual exploitation, to increase the level of knowledge and understanding about the complexities of this issue, (B) the Sheffield Health and Wellbeing Board, expressing concerns around the lack of resources and appropriateness of services for young people's health pathways, (C) those members of staff in the Children, Young People and Families Portfolio involved in the assessment, expressing its thanks for their dedication and ongoing work and (D) the young people involved in the assessment, expressing its thanks in terms of their involvement;

- (ii) specific training in terms of the interpretation of figures and statistics to assist Members in their scrutiny role, to be in line with one of the identified areas for development within the assessment;
- (iii) that officers from the Children and Families Service continue to engage with parents and carers as part of the process; and
- (iv) a copy of the case audit toolkit that was used in the assessment for use as part of its ongoing scrutiny role.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 6.1 The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, 26th January 2015, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall.

Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny Committee
Actions update for meeting on 26th January 2015

Action	Minutes	Update	R A G
<p>2014 City-Wide Attainment Outcomes in Schools and Academies The committee; 6.5 (c.) requests that arrangements be made for the establishment of a small sub-group, comprising Members of the Committee, to look in more detail at gaps in performance in connection with the attainment and progress of vulnerable learners in 2014, and to report back to the January 2015 meeting on their findings.</p>	<p>17th November</p>	<p>This meeting will involve Cllr Gill Furniss, Cllr Diana Stimely and Jules Jones and will take place on 2/2/2015</p>	
<p>Academies in Sheffield The committee 7.4 (c.) requests the Policy and Improvement Officer to circulate a copy of the presentation to all Members</p>	<p>17th November</p>	<p>This has been circulated.</p>	
<p>Work Programme 2014/15 The committee requests 8.3 (b) (i) the Policy and Improvement Officer to identify a meeting or other suitable time when the newly appointed Police and Crime Commissioner, Dr Alan Billings, could attend to report on his response to the issue of Child Sexual Exploitation and other areas of work linked to the role of this Committee</p>	<p>17th November</p>	<p>The Police and Crime Commissioner, Dr Alan Billings will attend the meeting on Monday 9th March from 1pm.</p>	
<p>Assessment of Child Sexual Exploitation Services in Sheffield The scrutiny committee agreed to:</p> <p>a. Write to the Crown Prosecution Service (copying in Sheffield MP's) in support of the issue highlighted in the assessment that continuing work is required with the judiciary system to explain the complexities of CSE, to increase the level of knowledge and understanding about the complexities of this issue.</p>	<p>15th December- special</p>	<p>In progress</p>	

b. Write to the Health & Wellbeing Board regarding the committee's concerns around a lack of resources and appropriateness of services for young people's health pathways	15th December - special	In progress	
c. Request specific training in terms of interpretation of figures and statistics to assist members in their scrutiny role. This is in line with one of the identified areas for development within the assessment.	15 th December - special	The Policy & Improvement Officer is liaising with colleagues to arrange this session.	
d. Request that officers from the Children & Families Service continue to engage with parents and carers as part of the process	15 th December - special	This request has been shared with the service.	
e. Request a copy of the case audit toolkit that was used in the assessment	15 th December - special	This has been shared with members of the scrutiny committee.	
f. Write to staff in the Children, Young People & Families portfolio who were involved in the production of the assessment to thank them for their dedication and ongoing work	15 th December - special	In progress	
Write to the young people involved in producing the assessment to thank them for their involvement	15 th December - special	In progress	
Briefing paper Building Successful Families Programme – update report The committee requested an update report with regards to Sheffield's bid to be an early adopter" for phase 2 of the programme.	21 st July	This item is on the agenda for 26 th January as a briefing paper. The update report was sent out to members of the scrutiny committee on 11/12/14 and has been redistributed with the meeting papers.	

**Report to Children, Young People
and Family Support Scrutiny &
Policy Development Committee
26th January 2015**



Report of: Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People & Families

Subject: Children & Families Act 2014

Author of Report: Dorne Collinson, Director of Children and Families

Summary:

The Scrutiny Committee has requested this report in order to allow it to understand the implications of the Children & Families Act 2014 for Sheffield, how the Council and its partners are responding to the new legislation and any challenges posed by it.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	x
Other	

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

The Committee is asked to consider the new requirements under the Children & Families Act and make recommendations for any changes to the proposed implementation to comply with the legislation.

Background Papers:

n/a

Category of Report: OPEN

Report of the Executive Director, Children, Young People & Families

Children & Families Act 2014

1. Introduction/Context

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Committee has requested this report in order to allow it to understand the implications of the Children & Families Act 2014 for Sheffield, how the Council and its partners are responding to the new legislation and any challenges posed by it.
- 1.2 The new Children & Families Act received royal assent on 13th March 2014. It came into force in September 2014 (other timescales specified throughout the report).

2. Children & Families Act 2014

Part 1: Adoption and contact

Part 1 of the act contains provisions to give effect to proposals set out in 'An action plan for adoption: tackling delay' and 'Further action on adoption: finding more loving homes'.

New duties include:

- Contact: the children and grandchildren of adopted people will be able to **access information** on the adopted person's birth family under certain circumstances
- **Fostering for adoption:** to enable children to be placed earlier with prospective adopters who are already approved foster parents
- **Removing the requirement** that adoption agencies must give **due consideration to ethnicity**, religious persuasion, racial origin and cultural and linguistic background when seeking prospective adopters
- The Government is given a power to **require** a local authority to **outsource** its functions relating to the recruitment, assessment and approval of prospective adopters **and adoption functions**
- Changes to support for adoptive families including **personal budgets**, **additional information**, and access by prospective adopters to the national register of children for whom adoptive parents are sought. Further regulations will be published regarding these elements.
- A new statutory basis to giving **an adoptive child contact** with the child's birth family

Key dates are as follows:

- The option for the Secretary of State to require all Local Authorities to outsource adoption functions cannot be used until March 2015. The

Secretary of State may require LAs to outsource before then on a case by case basis.

- Personal budgets, associated regulations and the rolling out of the Adoption Support Fund are expected to commence in 2015.

Part 2: Family justice

Part 2 of the Act contains provisions relating to recommendations from the independent family justice review.

New duties include:

- A **requirement to attend a family mediation**, information and assessment meeting to find out about and consider mediation before applying for certain types of court order unless an exemption applies
- Courts to take into account that **both separated parents** should continue to be **involved** in their child's lives where that is consistent with the child's welfare, although "involvement ... shall not be taken to mean any particular division of a child's time"
- New '**child arrangements order**' to replace the existing residence and contact orders
- Expert evidence in family proceedings concerning children is permitted only when necessary to resolve the case justly, taking account of factors including the impact on the welfare of the child (with exceptions for local authority social workers and CAFCASS staff)
- Introducing a maximum **26-week time limit** for **completing care and supervision proceedings**, with the possibility of extending the time limit in a particular case for up to 8 weeks at a time, should that be necessary to resolve the proceedings justly

Part 3: Special educational needs

Part 3 of the Act has a focus on improving outcomes for children and young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities. It will extend the SEN system from birth to 25, giving children, young people and their parents greater control and choice in decisions and ensuring needs are properly met. It takes forward the reform programme set out in the green paper: 'Support and aspiration: a new approach to special educational needs and disability' published by the Department for Education on 18 March 2011 and the follow up 'Progress and next steps' published 15 May 2012.

New duties

This is one of the larger parts of the Act and so not all elements have been included but key changes include:

- **Replacing statements** with a new birth- to-25 education, health and care (EHC) plan
- Offering families **personal budgets**

- Improving cooperation between all the services that support children and their families, particularly **requiring local authorities and health authorities to work together** (and specifically Clinical Commissioning Groups requirement to comply with health service requirements in EHC plans)

Key dates are as follows:

- The final SEN code of practice was issued shortly ahead of reforms coming into force in September 2014.

Part 4: Childcare reform

Part 4 of the Act contains various provisions relating to childcare, described in More Great Childcare which the Government published on 29 January 2013 and which includes the Government's response to Professor Cathy Nutbrown's report, Foundations for Quality (published June 2012). Section 3D of the report refers to the plans to introduce childminder agencies.

Key changes include:

- New mechanisms for the registration of childminders via **childminder agencies**
- The option for early years childcare providers to **request (and pay for) inspections**
- A **repeal of the duty** to conduct a **childcare sufficiency assessment** every three years
- **Removing the requirements for governors to consult** on offering childcare and wrap-around support

Part 5: Welfare of children

Part 5 of the Act is largely comprised of amendments that were requested by the House of Lords, as such is it is perhaps more wide-ranging than other parts of the Act.

New duties include:

- Every local authority to have a **virtual school head** to champion the education of children in the authority's care, as if they all attended the same school
- Gives **children in care** the choice to **stay** with their **foster families** until they turn **21**, so long as the child, family and local authority deems it appropriate
- A new legal duty on schools (including academies) to **support children at school** with **medical conditions** better

- Making young carers' and parent carers' rights to support from councils much clearer including the duty for local authorities to **assess the needs of young carers and parent carers**
- Reforms to **children's residential care** including a provision to allow the Secretary of State to create regulations for organisations regulated by Ofsted and to use the national minimum standards to supplement this
- **Ofsted's new ability to suspend registration**, for example in relation to a children's home, where someone has been suspended from being a foster carer
- A requirement on all state-funded schools - including academies - to provide **free school lunches** on request for all pupils in reception, year 1 and year 2 (*and this provision can be extended to early years*)
- Amendments to the law to **protect children from nicotine** including in cars from the dangers of second-hand smoke, purchase of tobacco on behalf of others, the option to introduce plain packaging
- Repeals s.38 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1963 which **removes restriction** on the circumstances in which a local authority can issue a **performance license** to a child under the age of 14

Part 6: Children's Commissioner

Reinforces the role of the national Children's Commissioner, taking forward recommendations in John Dunford's 'Review of the Office of the Children's Commissioner (England)' including giving the commissioner a statutory remit to promote and protect children's rights.

Parts 7, 8 and 9: Statutory rights to leave and pay, time off work and right to request flexible working

Part 7 of the act delivers the legislative commitments made in the government response to the modern workplaces consultation (November 2012), including a new employment right to **shared parental leave** and statutory shared parental pay for eligible working parents.

Part 8 creates a new right for employees and qualifying agency workers to take unpaid **time off work** to attend up to two **ante-natal appointments** with a pregnant woman.

Part 9 provides for the **expansion of the right to request flexible working** from employees who are parents or carers to all employees, and the removal of the statutory process that employers must currently follow when considering requests for flexible working. The government's policy reforms for the right to request flexible working are set out in its paper 'Modern workplaces - government response on flexible working' (published in November 2012).

Key dates are as follows:

- from April 2015, mothers, fathers and adopters can opt to share parental leave around their child's birth or placement. This gives families more choice over taking leave in the first year - dads and mothers' partners

can take up to a year, or parents can take several months at the same time

- from 1 October 2014, prospective fathers or a mother's partner can take time off to attend up to 2 antenatal appointments
- adoption leave and pay will reflect entitlements available to birth parents from April 2015 - no qualifying period for leave; enhanced pay to 90% of salary for the first 6 weeks; and time off to attend introductory appointments. Intended parents in surrogacy and 'foster to adopt' arrangements will also qualify for adoption leave and pay
- extending the right to request flexible working to all employees from 30 June 2014

Financial pressures generated by the Act

The total financial pressures generated by implementation of the Act are significant (this includes areas where we have some existing spend, we have not yet calculated how much can be off-set against the pressures). Whilst in the long-term, changes brought in by the Act are intended to result in better outcomes for children and families and may therefore reduce crisis / high cost reactive spend in the future, this cannot yet be forecast. The total annual pressures are currently estimated to be in the region of £2,323,600 once fully implemented. This is not all new cost but it represents the total pressures from the Act – these are services which we cannot now cut. We have SEN grant income of £1m in 2014-15 and expect a further £300,000 in 2015-16. The adoption reform grant will allow us to manage some of the costs identified in Part 1, Part 2 and Part 5. This is £466,000 to be spent over 2014-16 but we do not know whether it will be available in future years.

3 What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?

- 3.1 The Act is an important piece of legislation aimed at improving outcomes for children and families. There are many positive changes included within it.
- 3.2 Implementation will be expensive and this needs to be considered in the context of broader budget reductions and consequently the impact on other services.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 The Committee is asked to consider the new requirements under the Children & Families Act and make recommendations for any changes to the proposed implementation to comply with the legislation.

Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee
Draft Work Programme 2014-15

Chair: Cllr Gill Furniss

Vice Chair: Cllr Cliff Woodcraft

Meeting papers: [click here](#)

Meeting day/ time: Monday 1-4pm

Please note: the Work Programme is a live document and so is subject to change.

Topic	Reasons for selecting topic	Contact	Date	Expected Outcomes
Monday 9th March 2015				
Looked After Children & Care Leavers Annual Report to Scrutiny	To receive an annual update on looked after children and care leavers including performance outcomes.	Jon Banwell, Assistant Director - Provider Services	Mar-15	
Adoption & Fostering Annual report to Scrutiny	To receive a six monthly update on adoption & fostering including performance outcomes.	Jon Banwell, Assistant Director - Provider Services	Mar-15	
Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB)- Annual Report	Presentation of the Annual Report from the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB)	Trevor Owen – Head of Service, Safeguarding Children	Mar-15	
Thursday 19th March 2015, 5.30-6pm Reception Room B, Town Hall				
Annual Meeting with Young People & Young Carers	Annual meeting with the scrutiny committee and young people / carers to discuss issues which are of concern to the young people.	Emma Hinchliffe, Sheffield Futures	Mar-15	

Briefing papers				
Building Successful Families Programme (Phase 2)	The committee requested an update report with regards to Sheffield bid to be an early adopter” for phase 2 of the programme.	Dawn Walton, Assistant Director, Prevention & Early Intervention	December-14	This update was circulated to the Committee on 11/12/14.



Report to Children Young People and Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee November 2014

Report of: Executive Director Children and Families

Subject: Building Successful Families

Author of Report: Hazel Dobson, Service Manager: Building Successful Families, hazel.dobson@sheffield.gov.uk, Tel: 0114 2052670

Summary:

The Building Successful Families Programme started in Sheffield in April 2012 in response to the government's national 'Troubled Families' Programme. This report is provided as an update to the report provided in July 2014.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	✓
Other	

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

The Committee is asked to consider the update and support the implementation of Phase 2 of the Building Successful Families Programme.

Background Papers:

Building Successful Families update report.
Appendix 1 – Executive Summary of the Ecorys evaluation report

Category of Report: OPEN

This page is intentionally left blank

Building Successful Families Programme: Update report for Children Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee – November 2014

1 Progress to-date

- 1.1 Delivery continues through existing services and with partnerships to turn around 100% of the cohort of 1680 families by May 2015.
- 1.2 The performance statistics are as follows:-
 - 1.2.1 We have currently identified 2168 families in Sheffield who meet the Troubled Families criteria.
 - 1.2.2 At the end of June 2014 we were required (by DCLG) to have worked with 1680 – we have exceeded this and to-date have supported 1833 families.
 - 1.2.3 The last Payment by Results claim was in October 2014. So far;
 - (i) 79% families have been ‘Turned Around’ due to either improved school attendance and reduced ASB or because an adult in the family had entered employment
 - (ii) 53 families have achieved 26 weeks employment
- 1.3 We have commissioned a local evaluation through ECORYS. They have produced an ‘early findings’ report completed in July attached as Appendix 1.
- 1.4 A further interim report will be available in January 2015 with the final report being published after the closure of Phase 1.

2 Requirements of being an ‘Early Starter’.

- 2.1 Sheffield were able to evidence that we have identified, engaged and ‘turned around’ the required number of families for the Department for communities and local government (DCLG) to feel confident that we were in a position to be one of the 50 early starter authorities across the county for Phase 2. Phase 2 will be rolled out nationally from April 2015. As a Phase 2 ‘Early Starter’ we have a number of commitments;
 - 2.1.1 Over the next 5 years, we are required to bring to the programme 5540 families (831 by 31 March 2015). The criteria has been broadened from Phase 1, families

eligibility to the programme will now be determined by whether or not they meeting 2 out of the following 6 criteria,

- (i) Parents and children involved in crime or antisocial behaviour
- (ii) Children not attending school regularly
- (iii) Children who need help
- (iv) Adults out of work or at risk of financial exclusion and young people at risk of worklessness
- (v) Families affected by domestic violence or abuse
- (vi) Parents and children with a range of health problems

2.1.2 Our first task is to establish the new cohort of families, however, in order to do so we are required to produce, a 'Troubled Families Outcome Plan' which will:

- (i) Establish how we will work in a collaborative way to meet the needs of the families in the programme.
- (ii) Identify data sources that will identify the families for each criterion.
- (iii) Determine what constitutes 'significant and sustained success' for each element of each criterion. In order to enable Payment by results reporting, monitoring and cost saving calculation.
- (iv) Establish what joint outcomes we are aiming to achieve for the families by working in a collaborative way
- (v) Determine what delivery is required to achieve the outcomes – in line with the agreed 'Way of Working' signed off by CTEB in May 2014

2.1.3 Being an 'Early Starter' brings with it some additional requirements, we are expected to support;

- (i) The development of an independent national evaluation for the expanded Troubled Families Programme,
- (ii) The completion and continued improvement of the Troubled Families online cost savings calculator,
- (iii) The design and implementation of a new system of Family Progress Data
- (iv) The refinement of the indicators suggested to identify families and the development of best practice approaches to measuring significant and sustained progress with families, and

(v) The introduction of a model of transparent local accountability for the success of the programme as a tool to drive greater service transformation.

2.1.4 Effective implement of Phase 2 requires a strong partnership commitment. The Board are asked to support and championing the success of Phase 1 and the implementation of Phase 2

2.1.5 The BSF Phase 2 programme features significantly in the broader CYPF service transformation including the development of Community Hubs, the integration of Early Years and the forming of the Integrated Front Door (Prevention and Assessment Team)

3 Celebration and Launch

3.1 We are planning an event, to take place in May 2015. The event will focus on the achievements in Phase 1, it will involve families and include a short production created to demonstrate the impact of the programme. This will be a Launchpad for Phase 2 of the programme.

This page is intentionally left blank



Evaluation of the Sheffield Building Successful Families Programme

Phase One Interim Report July 2014

Executive Summary

Introduction

Ecorys was commissioned by Sheffield City Council in April 2014 to evaluate their Building Successful Families (BSF) programme: Sheffield's local response to the national Troubled Families programme. This interim report reflects findings from phase one of the evaluation which primarily involved a review of relevant documentation and consultations with key stakeholders, including core BSF staff, partner organisations, senior strategic leads at Sheffield City Council and other stakeholders with a strategic role in planning, overseeing or implementing the programme.

Background to the BSF Programme

BSF aims to achieve positive outcomes for families facing multiple challenges and achieve a shift in expenditure from reactive service provision towards early intervention. BSF identifies families based on data and also by screening referrals from local professionals. Eligible families have a BSF Whole Family Action Plan which reflects their needs and an allocated key worker to devise an appropriate support package and coordinate services.

BSF is not a 'new', separate service. Instead, BSF invests in existing services, delivered by a range of public and voluntary and community sector (VCS) partners, to increase their capacity to embed "distinct ways of working" across services, supporting the 'whole family'. Investment has included employment of some specialist staff: BSF (whole family) Specialists, Social Workers, Employment and Skills Specialists, School Attendance Specialists and Adult Mental Health Workers. There has also been investment into contracts for localised and specialist delivery.

Stakeholder Consultations: Development of Building Successful Families, Management and Service/Partner Relationships

Stakeholders generally felt that BSF has enabled whole family working to be extended, more quickly and intensively, across services within the council and the

voluntary sector. This was seen as laying the basis to improve the quality of support offered to families. Building on existing structures was universally recognised as the correct approach; however, doing so has to some extent made it more difficult for BSF to differentiate itself from what went before it.

BSF has benefited from support from senior council staff including the Chief Executive and Cabinet, which has stimulated commitment to the programme, and some strong examples of joined-up working between partners were provided by stakeholders. These included co-location of services and closer integration between one of the VCS organisations involved and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS).

As with any new initiative, awareness and engagement by services and practitioners has improved with time, often once services are able to 'see' or benefit from BSF. Those closer to BSF (for example, the Multi Agency Support Teams (MAST) involved in delivery and children's services) understood BSF and bought into it more quickly. It was evident that communication with partners further away from the core of BSF should continue to be improved in order to further the reach of the programme, along with helping to overcome the perception that capacity and resource constraints are barriers for services to engage with the programme. Stakeholders reported some confusion caused by the replacement of the 'Original Core Group', a virtual team who originally led on the development of BSF, with the 'New Core Group' who are now responsible for its on-going management.

Stakeholder Consultations: Distinct Ways of Working and Systems Change; Working with Families; Progress and Outcomes

Stakeholders felt that awareness and implementation of the distinct ways of working have improved over time and were generally positive that this trend would continue. Those services and partners closer to BSF, or with more of a tradition of whole family working (e.g. MAST, children's services), tended to be using action plans and 'distinct ways of working' practices more consistently at the time of the research relative to others. A suggestion was for distinct ways of working to feature more prominently in policies and job descriptions to reinforce the need for their adoption across services.

Specialist staff have universally been seen by stakeholders as adding significant value to delivery, bridging gaps that existed prior to BSF, acting as 'BSF champions' and helping embed the model across services. For example, the role of Employment and Skills Specialists (seconded from Jobcentre Plus) in supporting key workers to help families move towards employment was often positively commented on. These specialists were seen as helping to instigate "a huge culture change" around sharing information and improving key workers' understanding on welfare to work issues.

BSF was also seen as increasing robustness in the way practitioners work in many instances. In particular the initiative was seen as enabling practitioners to provide more intensive support focused on outcomes, utilise the new Action Plan and monitor progress and outcomes more closely. It was also noted that those delivering BSF have come to appreciate the importance of recording data through the Action Plan, as services recognise the importance of demonstrating their impact on families.

Action planning as a process was largely seen as the norm amongst those involved in delivery and as a crucial component in bringing in other agencies to work with the family.

It was noted that a key challenge in implementing BSF has been joining-up data from different sources to establish a clear picture of a family. Employment and Skills Specialists' access to DWP data was seen as making a significant positive difference in this though it was also acknowledged that this remains a challenge. A further issue raised in some quarters concerned the potential for the processes involved in identifying families for support to involve the sharing of data prior to those families giving informed consent for their information to be treated in this way. This issue also pertains to the national Troubled Families programme.

In terms of outcomes to date, the general view of stakeholders was that families have responded well to BSF and better than BSF's predecessors. Feedback from stakeholders suggests that families have ownership of their support plan, feel empowered and do not have to duplicate discussion of their circumstances with several services. Key to this is the Action Plan, which promotes multi-agency working.

Data provided to DCLG shows that good progress has been made with BSF having met its local target of identifying 1,680 families, of which 1,520 are currently being worked with (91% of the 1,680 target), at the end of March 2014. Progress on outcomes has been slower, particularly around employment outcomes. Partly explaining this, a number of stakeholders noted that a long lead-in time had been required and that it was inevitably challenging to 'turn around' 100% of the cohort. Outcomes will be further explored in subsequent rounds of the evaluation.

Conclusion

BSF has added value to support for families in the city in the form of specialist support and robustness in approach, primarily led by the BSF Whole Family Action Plan and a more cultural shift towards monitoring outcomes. There is recognition that such work requires commitment from partners at an early stage but that the potential future savings likely to be created are particularly important in a time of public sector austerity. Multi-agency working is widely recognised as the best way to deliver an intensive support programme.

While it has taken time for BSF to start having an effect, the positive outcomes for families now being generated are proving important in engaging new and existing stakeholders in support of the approach. Awareness and engagement with the model is continuing to increase and in time it is hoped that the model will be embedded as the model for family working across the city, regardless of the service that works with the family. The distinct ways of working have been the key facilitator in positive progress towards mainstreaming this approach. There is a clear intention

This page is intentionally left blank