

Outcomes of Overview and Scrutiny Work January – June 2019

Report of the Chairman of Corporate Review

Background

This report provides a summary of the overview and scrutiny work that has been undertaken since the beginning of January to the end of June 2019, highlighting how the Select Committees have added value to the democratic process and addressed the priorities of the County Council and its partners.

Corporate Review Committee



Councillor David Brookes
Until Annual Council May 2019)
Chairman of Corporate Review Committee



Michael Greatorex (from Annual
Council May 2019)

The Corporate Review Committee met on the 8 January 2019 as a joint Committee with Stoke on Trent City Council Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee to discuss the **Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)**.

A report summarising the work and ambitions of the LEP over the previous year was presented along with a list highlighting some of the successes during the year. Members asked questions and made the following observations:

- The best achievements of the LEP since 2011 were Gestamp; the Ceramic Valley Enterprise Zone; District Heat Network and Stafford Western Access Route.
- The Chairman asked what dialogue there was with East Staffordshire Borough Council who were not currently a part of the Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire LEP, and where one of the major manufacturers, JCB, was sited. It was reported that it was essential that the LEP was not inward looking and should not be restricted to boundaries. The LEP had a very strong working relationships with Greater Birmingham & Solihull, Black Country, Cheshire and Warrington.
- The LEP was likely to see a greater allocation from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund to reflect that there are significant areas of deprivation in the area.
- The LEP was going to address the local media report that Stoke on Trent was “the insolvency capital in the country”. It was explained that if businesses thrived, insolvency from existing businesses would be curtailed.
- The steps taken to alleviate flood risk in Stoke on Trent area and the LEPs bidding for funding was discussed.
- Public sector procurement money should be spent locally to boost the local economy.

- Reviewing the membership of the LEP was discussed and local authorities having more representation on the LEP Board.
- The need for infrastructure to be in place e.g. transport and ducting for Superfast broadband.
- The need to ensure that money is best directed to where it generates the best return for our local community.
- Representation of HS2 was attending the LEP Annual Conference to answer questions regarding procurement.
- The advantage of the economy in Staffordshire is that it was well-balanced with the two major global anchors of JLR and JCB, as well as a broad range of Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs). There was no one dominant sector and the LEP must build on this to meet the challenges of the future.

The Committee agreed to an annual review of the LEP and Stoke City Council agreed to host the next meeting.

At its meeting on the 24 January 2019, **the Committee considered the Report of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Working Group.** The Scrutiny and Support Manager introduced the report which was the result of the MTFS work, scrutinising the proposed budget pressures. The Committee were requested to ratify the report before it could be presented to the Cabinet. Reference was made to the valuable contribution made, particularly in relation to the School Crossing Patrols.

The Committee asked a number of questions on the content of the report and some of the budget cuts listed. The report contained reference to monitoring and the constant assessment needed to achieve the savings proposed and asked how this would be done to keep the budget on track. In response, it was explained that in previous years the MTFS working group had operated from September to January, however, it was now felt that its work should be extended and should include the monitoring of the plan. The report was approved and submitted to Cabinet for their consideration.

On the **8 March 2019** the Committee received **Equality and Diversity Training** provided by the Equality and Diversity Manager from Staffordshire Fire and Rescue.

The Committee suggested that Members receive unconscious bias training and that the Leader of the Opposition's report on Gender Issues be added to the Work Programme and be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee also considered a report on the **Staffordshire County Council People Strategy.** Members asked what the Council was doing to recruit and retain social workers. They were informed that a targeted recruitment campaign had been very successful and had reduced demand for agency staff. Going forward the Authority was trying to understand the reasons why staff were leaving in certain areas and creating skills gaps e.g. children's social work.

Members asked how the Council was going to improve its absence and particularly stress related absence levels by 8%. The Thinkwell Service and Mindkind had been introduced as part of the Council's Mental Health Strategy.

Members stated that they would like to see more performance management targets so that progress could be seen over time. They also stated that it was difficult to identify from the Strategy what the Council was trying to achieve and what difference the Council was trying to make.

The Committee resolved that the Staff Engagement Survey 'Connecting Us' and additional background information that supported the People Strategy be forwarded to Members; that the Learning and Development Commissioning Plan be added to the Work Programme; and that that the comments regarding the content of the Strategy be considered by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources.

The **Integrated Performance Report**, Quarter 3 2018-19 reported that the first patients had moved into Amber Wood, a purpose-built specialist dementia Centre of Excellence in Burton and recommended that Members visit to see the facilities. The following areas were considered during the debate:

- **Health and Care** - the funding risk associated with the NHS reducing the amount of money to fund community care; and that Nexus Care should be added to the Work Programme.
- **Families and Communities** - Members asked why schools' pensions costs showed a saving of £0.5m and were informed this was because of academisation; there was also concern regarding the high level of vacancies for social work staff.
- **Finance and Resources & ICT** - Members raised concerns regarding the potential financial risks associated with the actions of external partners e.g. care home providers.

The Committee resolved that the Leader should obtain a written response to the Members' question regarding the possible financial impact of the closure of community hospital rehabilitation beds in North Staffordshire; that further information be obtained and forwarded to Members on the purchase of Treka buses; and that scrutiny of Nexus Care and the outcomes of the joint scrutiny of the joint local area SEND inspection in Staffordshire be added to the Work Programme.

At its meeting held on **2 April 2019**, the Committee received information on **Assets and Property**. There are two main designations of property; schools and corporate. Corporate assets and property are sub divided into operational and non-operational. Operational properties include libraries and highways depots.

Details of the properties owned were explained. The Authority held an asset database which contained all information held. The Committee asked questions on the income and expenditure on property generally; schools property and the usage of leased out property.

In regard to Corporate Projects, Castle House in Newcastle is saving a number of organisations money by rationalising the estate and leading to 'softer' advantages in terms of organisations working together. The Council's printing costs are reduced by £1m per year by staff in SP1 SMART working differently. Lichfield Library had led to add-on benefits such as an increase in access to archived information that was now digitised. Shugborough Walled Garden was being addressed as part of the Authorities plan to exit from the Shugborough estate.

With regard to the MTFS targets for 2017/18-2018/2019, £30m of capital receipts had been received from the disposal of redundant property. At the beginning of 2017/2018 there were 60-64 properties that were empty or about to become empty. Around 40 had been disposed of which had generate £30m and there were a further 20 to be sold at a value of approximately £20m. This number was being refreshed currently. The disposal process was described:

- The service declares an asset surplus to their requirements;
- the property is inspected, and decommissioning is considered, and details drawn up of what is required e.g. removal of asbestos; this is then reported on.
- If a decision is made to sell the property, consideration was given as to whether it would be beneficial to have planning consent which may generate the maximum value.
- A decision was then taken on how to dispose of the property – e.g. sell, lease or rent. The team then we go through a marketing and disposals process.
- The decision then goes through the relevant decision-making process and upon completion, the asset inventory is updated and the land registry informed.

The status of the Penda Property Partnership was requested. The Cabinet Member stated this would be a future agenda item.

There was also a report on the **Proposals for Scrutiny of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Annual Budget and Council Tax**. The plan was to establish an MTFS Working Group along the same lines as in the previous year. Members preferred the focus on key strands where there was a history of overspend or where spending was more volatile.

The Committee considered an exempt **Report on Gender Issues**. It was agreed **that the** Leader meet with the Leader of the Opposition to discuss her report and then make a statement to May Council on gender issues; and that a Working Group on Gender Issues be set up after May Council.

At the meeting held on 13 June 2019, the Committee considered the **Integrated Performance Report - Quarter 4, 2018/19**. The overall assessment of the council's performance was described as amber with particular areas of risk being highlighted as Adult Social Care and Children's and Families.

NEXXUS were now trading in domiciliary care and had started to purchase packages for Staffordshire residents. Social Worker recruitment and retention issues were discussed as was the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) High Need Block and the anticipated £5.6m overspend. With regard to the level of outstanding debtors, the committee were informed that discussions were always taking place with partners to ensure that as much debt was recovered as quickly as possible, this was generally reducing.

The Committee asked that in future Select Committee reports, information on obesity should be split down into geographical areas as this would be useful in identifying areas to concentrate on: the Health Lifestyles and the work of the Public Health

team be considered by the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee at an appropriate time; the results of the commissioned Tourism study by Destination Staffordshire should be taken to a Select Committee for further scrutiny; and Information on the reason for the number of older people receiving packages from the Council reduced be supplied to the Committee.

At the same meeting the Committee received a report on the **Property Strategy Review**. The Committee considered the draft Strategy for 2019-2024. The strategy was aimed at providing a high level framework to base decisions and actions. The strategy was closely aligned to the MTFs. The Strategy was to be considered by Cabinet later this year and the committee's comments would be considered prior to this.

A number of members raised concerns about the point at which they were informed about the disposal of land in their areas. Members were encouraged to see that there was a clear and transparent process for dealing with property issues, including bidding and non commercially viable sites. Access to the capital receipts information would be useful in order to see that money is tracked and what it is being used for. The Committee's comments were noted and would be fed into the development of the strategy, prior to consideration at Cabinet. The Head of Commercial and Property was asked to: ensure that the Capital Receipts Programme be available to Members; keep Members informed of informal items under consideration; and, inform local members of projects in their areas.

Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee



Councillor Ian Parry
Chairman Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee

At its meeting held on 18 January 2019, the Committee considered a report on the **Countryside Estate Review – Final Proposals for Management and Delivery**. The County Council had undertaken a review of its countryside estate in order to address increasing challenges facing the service and to find a more financially sustainable delivery model. Early in the process it had been agreed by Cabinet that there would be no sale of countryside estate sites, and that the review would focus on the future management. Through the County Council's MTFs, Rural County was currently committed to delivering further savings of £318,000 from its net operating budget for 2019/20 through to 2020/21. Members considered a detailed report on the steps which had been taken in the review and the wide range of options which had been explored. Based on the outcomes of the options appraisal and considering how options might work in combination across the estate, three potential management proposals were identified:

- **Management Proposal 1 – Default Option** This would be to retain management of the entire estate in-house under a revised operating model.
- **Management Proposal 2 – Transfer to Environment Body/Trust/In-house**, this proposal would explore the transfer (a long-term lease) of the country parks and major local sites to environmental bodies.

- **Management Proposal 3 – Transfer Management to a Trust/In-house.**
Under this proposal, a charitable trust/not-for-profit body would be established to manage all the country parks and major local sites via a transfer (long-term lease).

Based on the options appraisal, Management Proposal 2 was the preferred option and the Committee's views were sought on this. The Committee raised concerns/questions on the timescales proposed; achievability of the savings; the number of organisations that had expressed interest in the countryside estate; introducing car park charges and holiday accommodation was also missing an opportunity.

Concern was expressed that any proposal other than Management Proposal 1 would mean that the County Council would lose the ability to control what happens to the estate, and that flexibility was needed to deliver across a large number of sites. Officers responded that Management Proposal 2 offered significant opportunities to develop the visitor offer, whilst under Management Proposal 1 the County Council had limited ability to invest in the estate. Several members spoke in support of Management Proposal 2, although a concern was raised that transfers to environmental organisations could potentially lead to restrictions on access and consequently could reduce visitor numbers.

The Committee's recommendation that the Management Proposal 2 should be pursued – Transfer to Environment Body/Trust/In-house, whilst acknowledging that there was still a detailed piece of work needed to identify a sustainable way of managing sites for the future, as in the long term the County Council was unable to do this.

A report on the **On-Street Parking Strategy and Forward Programme of Pay & Display Parking** was also considered by the Committee, prior to it being issued for consultation and formally adopted.

The Strategy was underpinned by the following core principles:

- A consistent approach to on and off-street parking;
- A well-structured regime for the management (and charging) of on-street parking;
- Parking facilities, arrangements and charging structures that reflected the needs of the individual towns (including free parking); and
- A charging structure that reflected the varying demands of all the users of the service.

Members questioned how businesses would be involved in the strategy. They were informed that initially the consultation process would involve District and Borough Councils, the Staffordshire Parish Councils Association and businesses at a strategic level but would then be aimed at a local level at the implementation stage. Members suggested that Chambers of Trade and Railway stations should be added to the list of proposed consultees. They stressed the importance of the consultation being all-encompassing and involving local communities, local residents and local businesses and welcomed the reference to supporting town centres. It was also suggested that there should be liaison with other operators of car parks in order to provide a co-ordinated approach to manage the resource overall. The Cabinet Member confirmed

that this consultation would take place and that it was crucial to adopt the right approach.

Members expressed concerns over parking on footpaths and verges and were assured that these issues would be included within the strategy. In relation to enforcement, a member commented that it would be helpful to give the Police and Police Community Support Officers the power to move vehicles which were causing an obstruction. They queried whether additional staff would need to be employed to manage additional car parking spaces. Officers responded that Pay and Display parking was easier to enforce and would use the same enforcement resource but in a different way.

It was queried how a balance was struck between encouraging more vehicles into town centres and the impact that this would have on air quality and it was suggested that it would be helpful to include an environmental group in the consultation exercise.

The comments and suggestions of the Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee contribute to the consultation on the On-Street Car Parking Strategy and forward programme on on-street pay and display spaces.

At the same meeting, the Committee considered details of the new governance structure and operating model of the **Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership (SSRP)**. They also received details of a wide range of initiatives used to promote road safety across Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent.

As part of the new governance arrangements implemented in 2016 two boards were established. Firstly, the Strategic Board, which sets the strategic direction of the Partnership and secondly the Operational Board which reviews current local issues.

Concern was expressed over the Board's visibility and lack of public scrutiny. In examining the governance model, accounts and budget it was evident that it was a self-funding organisation. It was queried where the funding came from and commented that if this was predominantly from educational course referrals it was potentially a concern that it was a business model dependent on people being caught speeding. Officers responded that enforcement activity was not driven by a desire to create income, and that enforcement was managed carefully and proportionately. Officers confirmed that the location of cameras was based upon collision data and in response to concerns raised by the community. The Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee agreed to continue to scrutinise the Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership.

The Committee considered an exempt report updating them on **Section 53 Applications**. The Committee agreed to support the approach being adopted by Legal Services and Rural County to jointly address the Section 53 backlog and directions from the Secretary of State.

At its meeting held on the 1 March 2019, the Committee considered a report on **Delivering Housing in Staffordshire**. There were three main ways in which Housing Associations engaged in the housing market. Firstly, through the acquisition of land or the use of their own land; secondly through Section 106

planning obligations; and the thirdly by setting up market sale companies and entering into development partnerships with private sector developers.

A future collaborative relationship between the County Council and Housing Associations could offer the potential for some form of joint delivery vehicle. Another opportunity could be Homes England which was the national funding agency for affordable housing. Homes England were able to bring very significant funding and capacity into housing delivery.

Following the report presentation, Members asked questions on the following:

- whether there was a shortage of land allocated for housing in the County. In response, there was a significant amount of land allocated for housing, but it was questionable whether this was all deliverable as there was a mis-match between who was capable of delivering housing on strategic sites and who was ready, able and willing to work on smaller sites.
- issues around peoples' ability to move up and down the property ladder and affordability at the entry level point preventing accessibility to home ownership.
- concern was expressed that the County Council had a strategic responsibility in relation to housing and that delivery was the role of District and Borough Councils and it was important to recognise this and work in conjunction with them.
- growing conflict within the Section 106 negotiations about affordable housing provision.
- the impact of housing developments on the existing infrastructure and the importance of enhanced two-tier working.

The Committee requested that their comments be used in the development of the strategy and that is brought back to the Committee in Autumn 2019.

At the same meeting, the Committee considered a report on the **Economic Growth Programme**. Claimant unemployment rates continued to be persistently below the averages for the West Midlands and Great Britain, due to the partnership with the Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership and other key local stakeholders.

Members queried the ideal conditions for economic growth; the help being given to town centres and the support offered to high streets; the number of jobs guaranteed at the end of apprenticeships; and the concern over congestion on roads and a negative impact on air quality. The Committee resolved that the Economic Growth Programme be noted; and that the Committee continue to scrutinise this on a six-monthly basis.

A report on **Petitions received on School Crossing Patrols** was considered. Three petitions had been received however, the County Council had announced that they would not be withdrawing school crossing patrols and consequently the Select Committee agreed that they need take no further action. Petitioners were notified of this decision.

At its meeting on **25 April 2019**, the Committee considered a report on the **Community Learning Annual Self-Assessment & 2019-2023 Strategy and Priorities**. The focus of the new Strategy was on the County Council's Strategic Priorities, in particular assisting care leavers, adults with low skills particularly in English and Maths. A further focus was on families and family learning.

Members commented that they were pleased to see the Strategy aligned to the Council's Strategic Priorities, specifically in relation to employment and better paid jobs and the focus on digital skills development.

The Committee asked for their comments on the Strategy and priorities for the Service for 2019-2023 be taken into consideration by the Cabinet Member for Learning and Employability to help to shape the Strategy.

A presentation was also received on the **Career Learning Pilot**. Staffordshire had been one of six areas selected by the DfE to participate in the pilot, which was aimed at supporting the Government's ambition for an adult education system that helps people upskill and reskill throughout their working lives. The pilot qualifications (level 3 and above) could only be delivered by partners who already had Advanced Learner Loan facilities and premises in Staffordshire.

Initial feedback had suggested that the pilot in the Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire LEP area had been one of the most successful. Members were informed that the results would be available in September to indicate how many learners had actually completed courses. The Cabinet Member confirmed that there would be a number of changes which would be made should the programme be given back to the local authority to deliver on a rolling basis, or that when the DfE bring the national training programme forward the learning from the pilot will enable the Authority to deliver it very well and will be able to have some influence and credit with them in terms of being a strong partner. Feedback on the results, due in September, would be provided to the Select Committee.

The Committee met on the **20 June 2019** to consider **Staffordshire Air Quality Projects** (on Clean Air Day) and **Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Policy** (HIAMP) and Strategy and Infrastructure+ and Lighting for Staffordshire Performance Review. Richard Harris and David Ogden were in attendance as representatives of Amey. There has been increased focus by government in recent years by potential harm caused by airborne pollution, particularly from motorised traffic. The Committee were asked to review current activities in this regard. Local authorities have been asked to review air quality in their areas and to determine whether or not air quality objectives are likely to be achieved and to prepare an action plan. The Climate Change Strategy is being reviewed and expanded to include Clean Air. Members were also informed that the Council had been successful in putting in a joint bid with Stoke City Council and borough and district councils in Staffordshire for monies from the government's Clean Air Fund. Members asked questions around evidence that current activities had been a success and stated that robust measurements must be put in place. Members called for a consideration to be made of impact on economic development on the environment. Members moved on to scrutinise the HIAMP and asked to feed in their comments to the Cabinet Member prior to consideration by this Cabinet in August. There was a wide ranging discussion. Members requested additional detail

on personal injury claims, updated information on average response time Enquiry to Inspected. Moving on to discussion regarding the Infrastructure+ and Lighting for Staffordshire Performance Review. Members asked if the reporting system could be modified to allow Members to report more than one pothole when they are near to one another and urged officers to ensure that the contract with Amey was managed effectively and that we got the service and response times that were agreed in the contract. Members also received an update on the LED roll out programme. The 4 year programme for roll out would commence in November 2019. Members suggested a Working Group to consider some of the environmental issues raised earlier and it was suggested that a discussion be taken up with the Leader, Cabinet Member and Cabinet Support Member prior to scoping this. It was also proposed that the item on community transport be broadened to include some of the issues regarding public transport and the supported bus network. The Safe and Strong Communities Select Committee had asked that the Committee consider educational outcomes for children not in full-time education at their next meeting.

Safe and Strong Communities Select Committee



Councillor John Francis
Chairman Safe and Strong Communities Select Committee

At its meeting, held on 22 January, the Committee considered a report on **Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in Staffordshire**. The report updated Members on:

- a) the Child Sexual Abuse Forum (CSAF);
- b) outcomes from the Staffordshire County Council Children's Services focused visit from Ofsted in June 2018 and the subsequent action plan;
- c) CSE Action Plan, including the Harmful Sexual Behaviour (HSB) audit and HSB Steering group, the work of the Joint Strategic Coordinator and changes implemented following the publication of revised Working Together guidance in July 2018;
- d) the CSE Outcomes framework;
- e) communications;
- f) workforce and development;
- g) Personal, Social, Health and Economic education (PSHE);
- h) youth produced sexual imagery (sexting);
- i) learning and improvement;
- j) work progressed by Staffordshire Police, including Operation Safenet, the Child Protection and Exploitation Team and abduction notices;
- k) work progressed by Families First and Commissioned Services; and,
- l) CSE and licensing.

Members were informed that the Care Act set out the criteria for those who should receive services post 18. Many vulnerable young people who had received services up to their 18th birthday did not fit the Care Act criteria and therefore, whilst being no less vulnerable, they would not qualify to receive services after their 18th birthday. There was a need to consider preparation for adulthood at an earlier stage and also

a discussion around wider transition issues. Members were informed that Newcastle had experience of working with complex children interventions and that hearing their experiences may be useful.

The Select Committee were informed that CSE Outcome Framework was currently too big to be manageable. There was a need to rationalise the data required to ensure added value and give consideration to the frequency of reporting.

The use of social media was suggested to help key messages reach young people. An example of this work was the “Like a cup of Tea” video clip that looked at issues around consent.

The Committee resolved that consideration of preparation for adulthood and “transition” from children’s to adult services be included on the work programme; and that the video clip “Like a cup of tea” be shared with Members.

Also, at the January meeting, the Committee considered a report on **Staffordshire Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) Annual Report 2017 – 2018**. As part of the new arrangements from April 2019 it was anticipated that a funding formula would be produced with only statutory partners i.e. the County Council, Police and the NHS contributing. Members noted that although the six CCGs still existed, they were now working as one combined group for commissioning arrangements. Whilst understanding that the new arrangements were being developed, Members asked for details of what the anticipated changes would be and how this Select Committee could continue in its scrutiny of the Board’s work. The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People offered to forward a paper to Members that had recently been shared with the SSCB.

Private Hire Licensing was discussed, as was the continued lack of regulation within Elective Home Education (EHE); the high level of fixed term exclusions; and the 19.83% increase in the number of children placed on a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time.

14,306 incidents on the Domestic Abuse Incident Log (DIALs) had been recorded last year. Members were informed that the level of training from a Police perspective was very thorough, with children central to that training.

Members were aware that post March 2019 John Wood, Independent Chair of the Board, would be standing down. They congratulated him on the work he had done during his time chairing the SSCB and thanked him for his commitment and expertise.

The Committee resolved that; the Independent Chairman and Members of the SSCB be congratulated on their Annual Report; the paper on the new arrangements for the SSCB be forwarded to Select Committee Members; future scrutiny arrangements for the SSCB be discussed at the next Triangulation meeting; and, current child protection figures with respect to the number of children placed on a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time for forwarded to Select Committee Members.

Also, at the January meeting, the Committee considered the **Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Adult Safeguarding Partnership Board Annual Report 2017/18**.

During the course of the reported year (2017-2018) in Staffordshire there had been 4,908 occasions when concerns had been reported that adults with care and support needs may be at risk of, or were experiencing, abuse or neglect. The total figure had decreased by 621 occasions from the previous year.

Neglect continued to be the most prevalent factor leading to concerns being made, followed by physical abuse. Financial abuse referrals were increasing and concerns were shared with Members that this was an under reported abuse category. Financial abuse was a new strategic priority for the Board during 2018-2021.

The issue of recognising abuse and understanding how to report concerns was raised. Whilst the Board wasn't funded to provide such training they had developed a free Level 1 safeguarding package which was available on their web site.

Members queried why transition from children to adult services was not to be a priority for the Board going forward. This had been a strategic priority for three years, with a review commissioned and LAs responding to this. Project and delivery plans were now in place and the infrastructure around transition had been recognised. It was felt that, over the three year period when transition had been one of the Board's priorities, enough work had been undertaken and assurances receive to now close the work and move to a new priority area.

The Committee congratulated the Board on their annual report. At its meeting held on the 4 March 2019, the Committee considered a report on **Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR) and Emerging Themes**. In 2018 an analysis of DHRs in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent was commissioned and considered outcomes from all completed DHRs to identify any trends or themes. Of the fourteen statutory DHRs considered, six were Staffordshire based. In addition to DHRs, four Domestic Abuse Multi-Agency Learning Reviews (MALRs) were considered totalling 18 reviews (DHRs and MALRs). The key findings were considered.

An action plan was produced as part of each DHR which looked at how any recommendations made would be implemented. The Community Safety Partnership in the area where the victim lived was responsible for monitoring the implementation of any recommendations made in a timely manner.

A further report was considered on **Prevent**, the implementation of which was overseen by a multi-agency Board. Members received details of school responses to the specific Prevent related questions which had been included in the mandatory audit of schools undertaken by the Staffordshire Safeguarding Children's Board. Around 85% had actioned all of the requirements with regard to their Prevent Duty. 2% had been unable to confirm that they had all the expected elements in place and Officers were working with these schools to address this. Members raised the issue of online safety and shared their concerns over how radicalisation could be prevented on-line. They were informed that this was part of a broader safeguarding agenda looking at Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), gangs and radicalisation. The Committee noted the report and asked for a 12 monthly update.

Also, at the March meeting, a report on **Youth Offending Service (YOS) Review** was considered. In 2018 a revised staffing structure was agreed which would enabled the Staffordshire YOS to achieve its agreed contribution to the Medium

Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) of £300,000 savings in 2018/18 and a further £100,000 in 2018/19. This was in addition to the £100,000 reduction in 2016/17.

The new structure was due to be implemented on 15 March 2019 and reviewed in September 2019 to ensure that the new structure was effective.

Members asked for a brief description of the role of each individual job title within the YOS structure. A brief overview was given but Member's asked that a note be forwarded to them after the meeting for future reference. They also asked for the outcome of the review be reported to the Committee in December 2019.

The Committee had undertaken a number of visits to **Children's Centres** during September and October 2018 to consider the changes and developments made since the Committees 2014 review. In general Members were pleased to see that there was now a clear Strategy for Early Years and that Children's Centres were being well used. Two key findings resulting from these visits were firstly the provision of Wi-Fi in the Centres, and secondly a request for an update on the operation of the 0-19 Health Visiting contract.

Following on from the previous report, the Committee received an update on the **0-19 Health Visiting Contract**. The presentation outlined the new approach to commissioning these services, eventually the work of the Children's Centres would also be brought together with health visiting and school nurse services for the benefit of local families. The new approach ensured the most appropriate skilled member of staff was supporting families appropriately. Members also received details of the universal services and the graded response and specialist services for those at greatest risk.

On the 28 May 2019, the Select Committee considered a report on **Children and Young People who go Missing from Home and Care in Staffordshire**.

In 2017, Catch 22 were commissioned to deliver Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and Missing Services across Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent. Catch 22 conducted all independent return interviews for missing and absent children and young people aged up to 18 years residing in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent, including those placed by other Local Authorities (LAs). Members received details of the interview process and use of information gathered. A performance and quality assurance framework was in place, with monthly and annual reporting to ensure appropriate intervention meetings were undertaken based on vulnerability and to build intelligence and insight to enable appropriate safeguarding initiatives were in place.

The Committee heard that over the last six months between 70-80% of missing person interviews had been carried out in comparison to a national average of 38%. There was a good record of building rapport and relationships with those at risk of episodes to help reduce risk; use of a co-designed interview form created a consistent approach to return interviews; and there were strong links between the CSE and Missing Co-ordinator, Catch 22 and Children's Services in sharing information.

Members received details of developments in place in response to the Ofsted Focused Inspection and also details of priorities for the next 12 months.

The Select Committee were aware that Stoke-on-Trent's Children's Services had been judged as "inadequate" by Ofsted and were reassured that the details of the work Catch 22 did would be fed back to the host authority.

Member's queried the information sharing between the Police and Children's Services. Catch 22 reported details of information gathered through the interview process to both partner organisations. Unfortunately, as the IT systems for the differing organisations were not compatible, details had to be put into the differing systems manually.

The Select Committee was aware that Ofsted had recognised the work of Staffordshire's Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Panels as good but had felt they needed to have broader consideration of exploitation than just CSE. To ameliorate this, a pilot had been developed in Burton for a Panel with a broader more contextualised approach to safeguarding.

Members received details of how the work of Catch 22 was quality assured. They raised some concerns at the Ofsted comment that there was a lack of tenacity when undertaking some missing interviews. Whilst there were always opportunities to improve Members were informed that Catch 22 had evidenced tenacity and had, in fact, delivered well beyond their contract which stipulated two interview attempts should be made. A Multi-agency Board oversaw this work, with a lot of pro-active preventative work undertaken. Members wished to see first hand the work that Catch 22 undertook and the internal audit systems they employed.

At the same meeting the Select Committee considered a report on the **Children and Families Improvement Plan**. The Committee received details of the Improvement Plan post the outcome of Ofsted's focused visit in June 2018 and the Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services in February 2019, which rated services as "Good". The June focused visit had evaluated the Local Authorities arrangements for the protection of vulnerable adolescents. Inspectors identified the following areas for improvement:

- a) Changes to the auditing process to include greater focus on the quality of practice taking place;
- b) High workloads in specific parts of the service impacting on case planning for children and young people;
- c) Plans for children and young people not being outcome focused and SMART enough linked to timescales;
- d) Management oversight and supervision to progress plans for all children and young people.

In response, an improvement plan had been developed and was regularly reviewed by both the Children's Social Care Management Team and the Children's Improvement Board. At the February 2019 Ofsted inspection, it was noted that leaders and managers had made impressive progress since the focussed visit in 2018.

The Select Committee noted concerns around caseloads and received information on the appropriate casework levels dependant on work area and complexity of cases. Members queried whether it was difficult for children in the looked after care system to be returned home. Until recently the rise in the number of children in the

looked after system was not so much resulting from a rise in the number of children coming into care but in the lack of children leaving. Each child in care had an Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) who reviewed their care plan, contact, return home etc. and it was acknowledged that at times young people could perhaps be returned home a little sooner than was currently the case.

At the same meeting, Members considered a report on the **Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire Safeguarding Children's Board**. The Governance arrangements have been revised and the new arrangements came into place in 1 April 2019. The Board would meet monthly during the initial implementation period and quarterly thereafter. The role of the Chairman would be different from the role of the previous Board, in that they chaired the individual meetings rather than being responsible for the whole work of the Board. The Select Committee received details of the new structure, key functions and activities of the board. There had been suggestions that schools should be included as the fourth statutory partner. Work was currently underway to find the most appropriate mechanism for schools to feed into the Board.

Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee



Cllr Johnny McMahon
Chairman Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee

The Committee held a meeting on the 4 February 2019 which considered a report on **Discharge to Assess** which was one of the models of care used to get people out of hospital and cared for in their own homes or in their local communities.

The Discharge to Assess model had been working in the North of the County for approximately 12 months and had seen reductions of delayed discharges of 50 %. This model of care now needed to be rolled out to the rest of the County.

A Member of the Committee asked what the targets were for the South of the County; were they SMART and how would they be monitored, also how Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) were being coordinated and the funds spent wisely. In response, it was explained that there were targets set through the commissioning process and it was then for the providers to supply and have the support services such as staff to run them. Assurance was given that targets and contracts were closely monitored. DFGs was a priority for the partnerships.

Several questions were asked on the recruitment and retention of care workers and ways partners used to incentivise staff.

The Committee asked for the following information: the outcomes and savings from Discharge to Assess; and the numbers of admissions to each of the out of county hospitals from the South of the County for both planned and urgent care, and the numbers of delayed discharges for each of the out of county hospitals.

At the same meeting the Committee considered an update from the **University Hospitals of Derby and Burton (UHDB)**. The presentation covered:

- The story so far – the ‘Big Conversation’; investing in maternity services; Joint Advisory Group (JAG) accreditation; and increased capacity over winter.
- The Merger principles – Sustaining clinical services at Queens Hospital Burton; Developing tertiary (specialist) services at Royal Derby; and Making the best use of community hospitals in Lichfield, Tamworth and Derby.
- Six clinical deep dives – Cardiology, Trauma and Outpatients, Stroke, Renal, Urology (Cancer) and Radiology.
- Next stages – A further six deep dives into Ophthalmology, Dermatology, Gynaecology, Vascular Surgery, Critical Care and Head and neck.
- The development on the Outwood’s site (Queens Hospital) and the capital funding of £21.88m received from the Department of Health and Social Care.
- Cancer performance – the 62 day cancer referral standard remained a challenging target.

Members asked questions on patient choice; transport between Burton and Derby Hospitals; parking spaces on the Derby and Burton site; cancer service and screening. It was noted that the development strategies employed by UHDB were very different to that of the Staffordshire Hospitals.

The Committee was informed that one of the main areas of concern for UHDB in relation to the 4 hour emergency target was the 12 hour breaches for mental health patients as one patient that could not be transferred from UHDB to a more appropriate service provider could result in a whole ward being closed and used by that one patient, dependant on safety/care issues. The Committee requested more information on how this was being managed with the Midlands Partnership Foundation Trust.

A Member asked if information could be shared to demonstrate real patient benefit that had been delivered because of the merger. The Director of Governance & Communications gave an example of the significant positive outcomes for patients with Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) and agreed to share the data that had been shared with UHDB’s Council of Governors

The Committee asked for the following information/action:

- a) It was acknowledged that integrated communication between the community and acute hospitals was a particular issue and was a valid concern which officers would take back to the Trust.
- b) The Committee asked if they could have sight of the Trusts financial plan, for information.
- c) The rationale behind the move to repatriate specialism services.
- d) More information on how patients with mental health issues were being managed in order to transfer them to the most appropriate service provider.
- e) Data relating to the AKI outcomes to be shared with the Committee.

During the report which summarised the **District and Borough Health Scrutiny Activity** a discussion took place on legal requirement of Health Partners to respond as there was no statutory requirement to consult with Health on planning applications under 500 houses, but it was felt that in order to plan effectively for the populations wellbeing, Health partners should have an input and therefore legislation should be

changed to require a response. There was also a discussion on whether raising the item at a meeting of the Chief Executives and Leaders Forum could help to highlight the issue.

The Committee requested that:

- a) the Chairman write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government explaining that Scrutiny Committees are powerless to scrutinise the wider determinants of health if Health Partners are not a statutory consultee when dealing with planning applications;
- b) the Chairman write to District and Borough Councils to ensure that they are considering Health implications with the same level of importance as for example, highway observations.
- c) That the Chief Executive and Leaders Forum be approached to ensure that they are considering Health implications with the same level of importance as for example, highway observations.

At the Committee meeting held on the 19 March 2019, the **Proposal for the Provision of an Integrated stroke service at University Hospitals of Derby and Burton** was discussed. The proposal was for the hyper acute stroke medicine (first 72 hours) to be delivered via a centralised service in Derby, and a single referral point for Transient Ischemic Attack (TIA). Patients would be transferred back to Burton for acute care, rehabilitation and discharge closer to home.

The Committee asked questions and received responses on the following items:

- how patients would move between the two sites. In response, patients would only be transferred if they were fit to be moved and if it was safe and appropriate to do so. A robust co-ordination process had to be involved.
- How the ambulance service decides on which hospital to take a patient to was under discussion to ensure efficiency and better care for the patient.
- drugs prescribed whilst under a consultant at Derby Hospital should be available when transferred back to Staffordshire.
- It was explained that the number of beds required had been estimated following detailed modelling and research into the type of Strokes and the level of provision needed. There had been a capital programme planned for the additional beds and this could be expanded in the future if needed. Currently only 11 extra beds were required.
- the number of patients currently seen at both Derby and Burton Hospitals was requested. It was noted that Burton saw approximately 500 patients, and Derby 1,000. The recommended patient level was between 1,000 and 1,600.

The Committee supported the integration of stroke services at University Hospitals of Derby and Burton (UHBD) and suggested an 8-week public consultation period for this service change and that they concentrate on travel times and distance travelled by some patients and relatives.

Also, at the meeting, Members considered report outlining the key priorities and summarised current performance and ways to improve. During the presentation it was explained that there were three key areas to the Cancer Transformation Plan and these were: 1) detection, 2) referral to treatment and 3) diagnosis. It was reported that the targets were being achieved generally with the exception of the 62-

day intervention target. The cancer target fluctuated across Staffordshire from 68 days to 72 days. The Committee was informed that a more in-depth analysis was available if required.

The location of screening facilities was discussed. It was explained that there were different methods of testing being developed such as home testing kits which could increase take up rates.

The Committee requested information on the performance on cancer targets for all regions in Staffordshire including the in-depth analysis; the National target figures for diagnosis for stage 1 and 2 cancers; and, National and local target figures for different types of cancers, both diagnosis and treatment.

A progress update on **Palliative and End of Life Care** was also considered at the meeting. The Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent End of Life procurement of services ceased in June 2017. Following this a Programme Board was established to take forward the palliative and End of Life priorities. The main areas of work undertaken were:

- Palliative Care registers
- Electronic Palliative Care Co-ordination systems
- Admission avoidance
- Care homes
- Children and young people
- Voluntary sector engagement

A Care Quality Commission (CQC) review recently stated that partnerships needed to improve and highlighted a number of actions to be developed.

Officers explained that the main issues surrounded; a higher than average admissions into the service; and gaps in some services e.g. district nurses and the need to support palliative care.

Questions were asked on the supply of equipment to people in their homes and the integration of patient records and how the systems linked together. It was explained that procurement was in process and systems will be able to talk to each other.

Healthwatch informed the Committee that from the information they had, patients were most concerned about; Equipment - lack of it, not in time, inappropriate etc; and, the quality of care and training of care staff to deliver services at the end of a patient's life.

A report was considered on services that were classed as **Excluded and Restricted Procedures (including Hearing Aids)**. The report explained that the CCGs need to priorities resources and align commissioned services across the six Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent CCGs. These services included:

- Assisted conception
- Hearing aids for non-complex hearing loss
- Male and Female sterilisation
- Breast Augmentation and reconstruction
- Removal of excess skin following significant weight loss.

The CCG proposed a formal consultation for these areas and this would start in August/September 2019 for a 12-week period. It was established that nothing would happen to any of the services until the consultation had taken place.

The Committee resolved that the public consultation on the excluded and restricted procedures should be for a 12-week period; and that the CCG Accountable Officer be informed that the Select Committee do not believe that Hearing Aids should be on this list of consultation items as they were not an 'excluded or restricted procedure' but are as essential part of keeping people healthy.

At the Select Committee meeting held on the **10 June 2019**, the Committee considered a report on **Adult Learning Disability (ALD) Community Offer 2022**. The report was due to go to Cabinet on 19 June for consideration and the Select Committee was being asked for comments prior to decision. Engagement had taken place with key stakeholders, including carers.

A Member expressed concern that some of the more rural areas of the County had a limited number of providers and little transport links between communities. It was acknowledged that there were always more challenges in the rural locations. Transport availability and its costs would be looked at as would standard specifications and measuring performance.

It was explained the respite service were 'weekend heavy' which affected staffing and capacity. It was explained that Cabinet in September would be considering an options appraisal which should give some clarity to staff and service users of residential care services. Future demand predictions and the types of service currently being accessed would also be included.

The Committee commented on the need for day opportunities purchased from the independent marketplace needing to have clear service specifications, standards, ensuring the delivery of safe, quality services; and further consideration should be given to the availability and provision of services in rural communities (and supporting transport arrangements); Comments were also made on the need for clarify over what direct payments can purchase in respect of meeting eligible needs (including activities within day opportunities and respite / short breaks). In respect of all services in the scope of the programme, consideration of the needs of carers should be of the utmost importance and regard; and in respect of services directly provided by the council, the Council needs to understand both the current and future needs; there needs to be clarity about ambition and outcomes; and, the Council needs to be clear about its position in the marketplace.

At the same meeting, **University Hospital North Midlands** attended the meeting to answer questions on staffing levels and retention of staff. The County Hospital Birthing Unit and Paediatric provision: the treatment of cancer and appointment/treatment targets and reasons for delays; death rates; and the financial position of the Trust were all discussed. Regarding the financial position of the Trust, UHNM plan to break even at the end of the 2019/20 financial year. Possible service changes were highlighted and the reviews of all services in order to ensure efficiencies are made in all service areas were explained.

The Committee asked for the following information to be sent to them: The number of people who could have used The County's Birthing Unit but chose to use an alternative provision; In relation to cancer targets, the range of time for those patients who miss the 62-day target before they are treated; this to include specialisms and whether these cases were referred to other hospitals which specialised in this area; and, the impact of any delay had had on the patient; National Cancer statistics for a full 12 months period; Details of patients sent to other geographical areas for specialist cancer services such as Brampton in London; Delayed discharges on death figures; and, A list of services which are currently provided at The County Hospital.

A **Joint Health Scrutiny** Committee was established with Stoke on Trent City Council to consider the CCGs consultation on the **Future of Local Health Services in Northern Staffordshire**. The Joint Committee met on two occasions, firstly on 13 February 2019 at Stoke on Trent City Council Offices and again on the 11 March 2019 at County Buildings.

The Joint Committee asked questions and made the following comments:

- Home First service should meet patient needs when they are needed.
- Recruitment and retention of staff, particularly in the home care services was a concern.
- If demand for support were to fall onto GPs there were a number of vacancies and long term projections, that this would become a critical situation.
- The figures for Community beds in the document was incorrect.
- The scoring had been worked out using set criteria. Without the financial element, the care homes option had scored the lowest. When finance had been added this had made the option the highest scoring (preferred option).
- An explanation of the term 'preferred option' was provided as *"it was NHS terminology for the highest scoring option of those that were being considered but did not mean that the governing body preferred the option"*. The Joint Committee felt that the term "preferred option" gave the public the impression that it was the CCG's preferred model. This was misleading and could stop the public responding to the consultation.
- Concern over the quality of care provided in care homes, particularly the geographical location of good or outstanding care and standards in homes can change very quickly when the management or staff change. The perception was that this happens more frequently in private care homes than in Community Hospitals. How would quality and standards be monitored?
- The procurement process and cross border discharge arrangements were discussed.
- Tier 4 services at Leek were discussed and the reasons for them being included in the consultation.

The Joint Committee considered their responses to the areas listed in the consultation document. This included the **Integrated Care Hubs** which it was felt that there was general support and agreement with the proposal to develop Integrated Care Hubs sited in the four areas. Stoke on Trent City Council Members expressed a preference of option 1A which was for a new build at Greendock Street in Longton. **Community hospital rehabilitation and NHS care home beds** - there

was concern from many quarters of the Committee around the option to use care home beds, particularly around:

- The current quality of some private care homes and the CCGs ability to monitor standards on a regular basis
- insufficient resources in the community to adequately support the proposals. For example, the number of GP and home care worker vacancies.
- Care home management and staff turnover and its effect on standards.
- The perception by some that Community hospitals\beds tend to have more stable management and higher standards of care and facilities to treat and assess patients.

Some Members felt that the use of care homes was inappropriate and that it couldn't be accepted at any price, however others felt that with some assurances, particularly in relation to quality of care, they may be able to accept their use. The Members from Stoke on Trent City Council expressed the view that of the options consulted on, option One was not acceptable as having all community beds in one location reduced accessibility for patients and family in the majority of North Staffordshire. They also strongly objected to option Six as there were concerns over the safety, quality and the associated quality monitoring processes, location and sustainability issues of some care homes. Issues around staff recruitment and retention were also a concern. They were happy to support any of the other options.

In terms of Staffordshire Moorlands there was a view that if the Leek hospital was due to be rebuilt or refurbished as an integrated care hub then community beds could be part of the new facility.

The geography of the North of the County and accessibility from some parts, particularly Staffordshire Moorlands was a consideration when looking at the location of community beds.

Tier 4 services in Leek - It was felt that there was insufficient information as to why the clinics needed to be relocated and that there may be better ways to use the services rather than moving them to Royal Stoke.

The Joint Committee made a formal response to the CCG summarising its comments and thoughts on the consultation and the options proposed. The letter to be signed by both Chairman.

Looking Ahead

1. It is clear that each of the Select Committees have continued a full work programme of activity with positive, effective outcomes, aided by the ongoing engagement with the Cabinet Members on service reviews and developments.

To be effective Select Committees need to continue to be:

- Rigorous in identifying issues in a timely way for which it has a genuine opportunity to feed in new insight into the development of services for the communities of Staffordshire and for which it has the time and capacity to have

an impact. Members are reminded of the existence of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions as a useful tool in identifying forthcoming decisions for which the Select Committees may have an interest in investigating further.

- Consider wide ranging evidence, where appropriate, not solely relying on information presented by Directors but also evidence from the wider engagement of frontline staff, service users and the public to help inform the evidence base of scrutiny investigations.

Link to Strategic Plan

2. The Select Committee work programmes have produced recommendations that have directly contributed to the Council's strategic priorities.

Link to Other Overview and Scrutiny Activity

3. This is a summary of the work programmes of all of the Select Committees from January – June 2019. Full details of the work of the Select Committees' work including their work programmes and previous Outcomes of Overview and Scrutiny Work are published on the County Council's website.

Contact Officer

Tina Gould - Scrutiny and Support Manager
tina.gould@staffordshire.gov.uk

Nicholas Pountney, Scrutiny and Support Manager –
nicholas.pountney@staffordshire.gov.uk