

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

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

Meeting held 3 April 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Ian Saunders (Chair), Andy Bainbridge, Olivia Blake, John Booker, Terry Fox, Kieran Harpham, Karen McGowan, Mohammad Maroof, Abtisam Mohamed, Josie Paszek, Colin Ross, Alison Teal, Cliff Woodcraft and Adam Hanrahan (Substitute Member)

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Waheeda Din, (Parent Governor Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)
Peter Naldrett, (Parent Governor Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Steve Ayris and Craig Gamble Pugh, and from Gillian Foster (Diocese Representative – Non-Council Voting Member), Joanna Heery (Parent Governor Representative – Non-Council Voting Member), Alice Riddell (Healthwatch Sheffield – Observer) and Alison Warner (School Governor Representative – Non-Council Non-Voting Member).

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 In relation to Agenda Item 7 (Sheffield Children’s Safeguarding Board – Annual Report 2015/16), Councillor Colin Ross declared a personal interest in his capacity as Deputy Chair of Aldine House Governing Body.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

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

5. SHEFFIELD CHILDREN'S SAFEGUARDING BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16

5.1 The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, attaching the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board – Annual Report 2015/16.

- 5.2 In attendance for this item were Jane Haywood (Independent Chair, Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB)) and Victoria Horsefield (Assistant Director and Quality Assurance Professional Adviser to the SSCB).
- 5.3 Jane Haywood referred to the introductory report, which outlined the progress that had been made during the year, together with the key challenges ahead for the City to ensure that its children were safe from harm, abuse and neglect. Ms Haywood, who had taken the role of Independent Chair in April 2016, referred to multi-agency partnership working in Sheffield in terms of safeguarding children and young people, with all partner agencies being very supportive of each other, and each other's agendas. She stated that there had been excellent work undertaken in a number of key areas. In terms of challenges for the coming year, she referred to proposed changes in legislation, specifically the removal of the legal requirement for Safeguarding Boards, and a move to more localised, and possibly regional, working.
- 5.4 Victoria Horsefield referred to some of the specific initiatives during 2016/17, including the emphasis on preventative work in order to stop incidences of abuse, harm or neglect in families escalating. She also made reference to the work undertaken in connection with Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), the Youth Suicide Prevention Pathway and the Hidden Harm (Substance Misuse) Strategy. Ms Horsefield reported on the proposed Business Plan for 2017/18. Two of the key priorities included looking at the issues regarding the transition of children and young people as they approached adulthood into adult services, and a project looking specifically at Teenage Partner Abuse. On 22nd May 2017, the Board, in conjunction with the NSPCC, would be launching the 'It's Not OK' campaign in connection with sexual abuse and exploitation.
- 5.5 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-
- One of the roles of the Independent Chair of the SSCB was to hold all partners to account and, as part of this role, the Chair would meet with the Chief Executives of the Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group and the City Council, and the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, to discuss progress, or any issues of concern. The Board has the power to ask questions of all the partner agencies.
 - The Board was happy with the current policies, which were constantly being reviewed and updated, if required. If there were any issues with the policies, the Board would raise these with the Chief Executives of the relevant agencies, although there had been no cause for this action to date.
 - The partner agencies held their own budgets in terms of their safeguarding responsibilities, and although all the agencies had, and continued to face, reductions in their budgets over the last few years, they remained fully committed in terms of their individual responsibilities. The Board and the partner agencies were constantly reviewing their budgets in the light of such reductions. The Board had built up some reserves, which were held as a

contingency for Serious Case Reviews, but was not using such reserves as part of its core service. A further review of its funding formula would have to be reviewed in the light of the expected changes in the next few years.

- Children and Families Services and the partner agencies would work with all families where it was identified there could be potential safeguarding issues, with a strong emphasis on prevention. Whilst no specific targeted work was aimed at single parents, the agencies would adopt a similar approach as with any other family.
- It was accepted that there could be specific concerns regarding the vulnerability of care leavers and, although relevant help and support should be included as part of their care plans, a full assessment would be undertaken in those cases where concerns had been raised. Resources were concentrated on the early intervention and prevention stage, and there was considerable work undertaken in universal services, including schools and GP practices.
- Although there was no reference within the SSCB Annual Report to work regarding the radicalisation of children and young people, there was a specific officer dealing with this area of work, who worked closely with the partner agencies. Training was also provided on this issue.
- In terms of issues regarding alcohol and substance misuse, there was a Substance Misuse Worker, who worked very closely with Children and Families Services and drug and alcohol services. There had been recent changes in the City, where there had been an increase in the number of parents using legal highs, cannabis and steroids. The partner agencies continued their work in looking at the effects of this on children and young people within households. Issues with regard to alcohol misuse were historically more difficult to identify, with alcohol being prevalent in many households. It was easier to identify issues in those households where parents were receiving treatment for alcohol or substance misuse, as questions would be raised in terms of whether they had any children, or were in contact with children, who could be affected. Such cases would then be referred to a Health Visitor or Family Liaison Officer.
- Whilst there was no clear evidence at this time, to show that there was an increase in cases of teenage abuse in households where alcohol and substance misuse was prevalent, there was a likelihood that there would be a better understanding of any such links next year.
- It was accepted that there were difficulties in terms of what questions to ask when trying to identify cases of abuse, harm or neglect, and to aid this process, the Independent Chair of the Board had begun a programme of meetings with those officers of the partner agencies on the front-line, including social workers and representatives of the MASTs, as well as meeting children and young people deemed at risk. The Board acknowledged that there was a clear protocol in terms of the safeguarding of

children and young people, and that the Board and partner agencies all worked within such a protocol. If Members had any concerns about children and young people, they should alert officers to these.

- It was accepted that, due to the nature of the work involved, such partnership working arrangements would never be perfect, but Sheffield worked hard to keep children safe. Efforts were continuously made to improve, including learning from other areas in the country, and there was a considerable level of information-sharing between different Safeguarding Children Boards.
- Officers were not aware of any increased concerns about street child sexual exploitation, or any link between an increase in such action and the reduction in the budgets of the partner agencies. Whilst the budget reductions had forced the agencies to review their working practices, it was not believed that such budget cuts had affected activity in this area. If there were reports of a possible increase in such activity, this issue would be raised with the police.
- Although the change in terms of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) now treating children and young people up to the age of 18 had helped in terms of their transition to the Adult Mental Health Service, it was accepted that there were still a number of issues in terms of such transition. The Transition Sub-Group would continue to monitor this issue, and such work would include thinking about the transition at an earlier stage. One of the issues identified as being a contributing factor to this problem may be that the threshold in terms of children and young people accessing the CAMHS was much lower in comparison to accessing the Adult Mental Health Service.
- Cases regarding young carers were referred to the Hidden Harm Group to be put in the Hidden Hard Strategy Action Plan.
- It was difficult to comment on the implications of any proposed new arrangements for the Board at this point. The Committee would be kept informed as the new arrangements developed.

5.6 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, and the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2015/16, together with the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) highlights the importance of a Sheffield focus to any new arrangements;
- (c) expresses its thanks to Jane Haywood and Victoria Horsefield for attending the meeting and responding to the questions raised; and
- (d) requests that Members be (i) informed of the changes to local Safeguarding Children Boards and (ii) sent information on (A) the "It's Not OK" campaign and (B) the launch of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub.

6. SHEFFIELD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION SERVICE - ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16

6.1 The Committee received a report of the Chief Executive Officer of Sheffield Futures, attaching the Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service Annual Report 2015/16.

6.2 In attendance for this item were Janine Dalley (Senior Programme Manager for Targeted Service, Sheffield Futures) and Jane Fidler (Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service Manager, Sheffield Futures).

6.3 Janine Dalley referred to the introductory report, which contained information on the service user profile for 2015/16, key achievements in 2015/16, developments in 2016/17 and priorities for the Service for 2017/18.

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

- There was no threshold as such in terms of accessing the Service. Any level of need and risk would be assessed and receive an intervention. The Service had worked in schools, with staff and parents, to help them recognise the signs of grooming, and to help parents protect their own children. The Service placed an emphasis on prevention and intervention work.
- Whilst lessons had been learnt, and policies and procedures changed or amended, where required, following recent high profile child sexual exploitation cases, there were concerns regarding changes in the manner children and young people were being targeted, as well as changes to the cohort, mainly relating to online exploitation. The Service team would be trained in Asset Plus, the assessment tool used by Community Youth Teams and the Youth Justice Service, which ensured that young people's needs and vulnerabilities were assessed holistically, thereby identifying strengths and risks.
- The City Council had commissioned a review from the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) in 2014, reflecting the findings of the Jay Report, which had included scrutiny of Sheffield's systems with regard to sexual exploitation, with such a review identifying key strengths with regard to governance arrangements and service configuration. In addition to this, the CSE Operational Board and the CSE Strategic Board continued to monitor progress with regard to the City's sexual exploitation procedures, through a CSE Delivery Plan.
- The national evidence base suggested that there was under-reporting of CSE by a specific ethnic group. There was no local evidence base to support this.
- There was a dedicated officer in the Local Authority who worked closely with schools across the City to deliver training on e-safety. By working with Community Youth Teams, more targeted e-safety training was able to be

delivered, covering all aspects of the dangers of on-line exploitation for vulnerable groups. Discussions centred around school exclusions, but there were no statistics on hand to further explore any correlations. There was a reliance on schools to inform Community Youth Teams of cases where pupils had been excluded, as they worked with young people with two or more fixed-term exclusions to prevent them becoming permanently excluded. There was centre-based youth provision and open access youth provision, which was available for all children and young people. In addition to this, and with regard to those more vulnerable children and young people, there was targeted detached youth provision in particular hotspot areas. Due to the numbers involved, and reducing budgets, it was very difficult for the Community Youth Teams and partner agencies to meet demand all the time, but there were a number of examples of effective intervention work, which had resulted in a reduction in levels of anti-social behaviour.

- In line with best practice, training had been targeted at taxi drivers, with the aim of empowering them to report concerns of a safeguarding nature.
- The role of the Specialist Nurse attached to the Service was to ensure that all young people identified as being vulnerable were given a health assessment, and could be referred quickly to other services, such as sexual health or the Child Assessment Unit. The Nurses were responsible for identifying those young people whose health needs had not been identified. There was a link between vulnerable young people and unmet health needs, for example, more risk of criminal, financial and sexual exploitation.
- Of the 136 referrals to the Service in 2015/16, 63.2% of the 19 children in care, who were in foster care, were already in foster care at the point of referral.
- The Service was very satisfied with the support it received from South Yorkshire Police. There was a dedicated team of police officers, comprising a Detective Sergeant and seven Detectives working solely in connection with child sexual exploitation, Sheffield Futures had assisted in investigations and provided a direct link with the police. The police had representatives on both the Child Sexual Exploitation Strategic and Operational Boards.

6.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service Annual Report 2015/16, and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) expresses its thanks and appreciation in terms of the excellent work undertaken by all staff in the Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service, and all partner agencies involved in tackling sexual exploitation in Sheffield.

7. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

7.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20th February 2017, were approved as a correct record.

8. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17 DRAFT CONTENT AND WORK PROGRAMME 2017/18

8.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer (Diane Owens) submitted a report providing a summary of the Committee's activities during the Municipal Year 2016/17, together with a list of topics which it is recommended be put forward for consideration as part of its 2017/18 Work Programme.

8.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) notes the contents of the report now submitted; and

(b) in the light of the information now reported, and further to the Work Programme for 2017/18, requests that (i) SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disability) and approaches to co-production be added to the list of topics to be considered in 2017/18, and (ii) arrangements be made for Sam Martin, Assistant Director, Lifelong Learning and Skills, to run a separate Task Group session for interested Members to look at the draft proposals for Youth Services.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

9.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on a date to be arranged in the next Municipal Year.