

Minutes of the Safe and Strong Communities Select Committee Meeting held on 8 June 2016

Present: John Francis (Chairman)

Maureen Compton
Mike Davies

Terry Finn
David Williams (Vice-Chairman)

Also in attendance: Councillor Mark Sutton, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

PART ONE

1. Apologies

Apologies were submitted by Councillors Margaret Astle, Bob Fraser, Robert Marshall, Christine Mitchell and Mark Olszewski.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were none received.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 May 2016

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 9 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. Update on Work Addressing Child Sexual Exploitation

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People introduced the item and invited questions.

The Staffordshire Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) Manager explained that the Joint LSCB Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Child Sexual Abuse Forum met quarterly and was the strategic lead for child sexual exploitation work across the county and city. The functions in relation to this agenda were set out. There had been some difficulties in the functioning of the forum and delay in completing the finalised CSE Strategy, however an Interim Strategy and Action Plan was in place and activity was being driven forward by partner agencies. Separate task groups had led on scoping around, female genital mutilation, children who are trafficked, honour based violence, forced marriage, intra-familial abuse and youth violence. The different criteria that sat beneath these areas were being considered to identify any further work required, to be assured that information sharing was taking place and that the strategic arrangements required were in operation. Activity had progressed but the Board needed to drive the agenda forward in a timely way.

The Chairman queried the timeframe for the work.

It was confirmed by the Board Manager that the Strategy would be presented at the next Child Sexual Abuse Forum on the 19 July 2016.

The County Commissioner for Children and Community Safety referred to the different elements that sat within the Child Sexual Abuse Forum and explained that these areas had been examined to consider where they should sit and the governance arrangements. The governance arrangements for work to address youth violence and gangs for example, sat within the Responsible Bodies Group and the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) and the SSCB could therefore hold these bodies to account for delivery.

A Member of the Committee referred to the areas for development as outlined within the report. It was requested that the Committee had sight of the action plan, could monitor the implementation of the action plan and that the recommended areas would be addressed at future Committee meetings.

The County Commissioner for Children and Community Safety suggested that the Connectivity Operations Manager could provide more information about school transport issues.

The Connectivity Operations Manager referred to the complexity of the issue and explained that the areas for improvement were clearly identified at the end of 2014 and work had been undertaken with a range of partners through the Responsible Bodies Group, Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Child Sexual Abuse Forum, the Safeguarding Children Boards, the District/Borough Licensing Teams, operators delivering services and other partners. Work had been undertaken within statutory legislation and to meet local objectives. There were three areas of responsibility within the procurement of contracted providers, licensing, clearing and registration. Companies and traffic commissioners, District/Borough Licensing Teams, and the County Council were responsible for this work, for example in Disclosure and Barring Scheme (DBS) checking. Previously there had been no consistent process in how applicants were assessed and a defined criterion was now in place.

The Connectivity Operations Manager explained that the focus of work had been on bringing the system together efficiently, to avoid duplication between licensing authorities and the County Council. As this was regulated activity, the County Council had worked on the basis of bringing services in house. The County Council was now notified if an individual was involved in an inappropriate activity. There was continuous monitoring and not, as in the past, a three yearly cycle of DBS checks.

The Connectivity Operations Manager clarified that training had been delivered by individual companies for example coach operators, the County Council and a range of other services. Defined training, accredited at the appropriate level, had been introduced to ensure that anyone contracted to work for the County Council would be better able to identify changes in behaviour that may be indicative of abuse and to minimise the risk of inappropriate individuals being involved in regulated activity. The County Council could reject drivers who were licensed by the Districts on the basis that they would be providing regulated activity as opposed to solely taxi or private hire activity. Over one hundred drivers had been trained by the County Council and two hundred drivers had already been trained in Stoke-on-Trent. It was important not to duplicate training but

augment it as efficiently and effectively as possible and ensure the implementation of the enhanced DBS. The target date for the completion of training and the enhanced DBS check of at least two thousand five hundred staff, including drivers, passenger assistants and depot staff who planned and managed regulated activity, was mid October 2016. By mid December 2016 anyone not DBS cleared and/or appropriately trained would not be allowed to work for the County Council's contracted services.

The Connectivity Operations Manager emphasised the continued monitoring through the DBS alert system. Where other authorities had delivered training a comparison was made with the County Council's training and any gaps identified and additional training provided. If anyone came to the County Council already DBS cleared, subject to them providing their DBS certificate and identification number, this would be accepted.

The Connectivity Operations Manager summarised that the responsibilities of a number of responsible authorities were being pulled together and procedures were now in place. A further sixty four training sessions would take place by mid-October 2016. Training was delivered using the team's own staff, with the assistance of one other. The process had been worked through with all partners, which would minimise risk and provide greater skills for those delivering the service. This approach would improve the reputation of the industry and give confidence to the end user.

The Vice Chairman queried if alternative funding options for Chelsea's Choice had been considered and if not if there were any ideas as to how this could be progressed.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People explained that he had not looked into alternative funding but towards the end of the previous year, Members had used their Community Fund to part fund it for schools and a letter from the former Cabinet Member had been sent out suggesting this.

The Commissioner for Children and Community Safety confirmed that SSCB's own budget constraints meant that it was unable to fund the production going forward. Conversations had been held with the Community Safety Partnerships but they had not been in a position to fund this production either. The County Council was however undertaking work in relation to Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) and there was work with partners across Stoke and Staffordshire to consider how a universal approach around CSE could be delivered so that schools would have the resources to provide information to pupils themselves. This could potentially be combined with the Prevent, Gangs and Drug and Alcohol work being undertaken.

The Vice Chairman confirmed that he had written to the Leader of the Council to encourage all Members to pay for Chelsea's Choice. It was suggested that the Cabinet Member for Children and Community Safety should discuss this matter with the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Cabinet Member confirmed that he would do so.

The Cabinet Member explained that when approached regarding the matter, his local school had recognised the importance of the play and had been happy to pay for it themselves.

The SSCB Manager referred to the Section 175/157 Safeguarding in Education Audit, that had recently been disseminated to all education establishments in Staffordshire.

This Audit included a number of questions regarding an establishment's responsibility to engage children and young people in activity to learn about child sexual exploitation and help them to keep themselves safe. Chelsea's Choice had been well received but it was not financially sustainable in the long term. A strategic approach to PSHE was being developed across the county and the city; which would include learning related to healthy relationships. The Section 175/157 Audit has also been designed to capture what arrangements educational establishments had in place for example around Prevent, FGM, CSE etc. and what they were currently providing to help keep children safe. The Board could provide more insight into local activity once the Audit had been completed and analysed.

The Committee Chairman queried the availability of the Escape drama in primary schools.

The SSCB Manager confirmed that the same funding issues applied to Escape. Thousands of young people had seen the play over the years and it has been recognised as a good preventative approach.

The Committee Chairman explained that the Committee advocated providing education to stop CSE happening in the first place and save money later. The Committee had written to all schools before and whilst some schools had taken up the offer others had not. Escape could be shown to vulnerable children with learning disabilities.

The SSCB Board Manager explained that it was important to be clear about how services engaged with young people and the mechanism to do this. The economic climate could not sustain the current mechanism so responsibility had to be put back on schools, parents/carers and governors to own this important agenda and ensure that all children had access to quality information.

The Committee Chairman agreed that schools should take responsibility and fund the performances themselves if they could do so. He referred to the role of the Designated Safeguarding Lead within schools.

The Strategic Lead, Specialist Safeguarding Delivery, confirmed that twelve months worth of data from CSE Panels had not included one child under the age of twelve. There was a compelling case to target resources at the top class primary school age group as this was a critical age group in terms of understanding healthy relationships. It was important to capture children before they suffered harm and data would support attention at the primary school age range.

The SSCB Manager explained that the Government had recently published revised Keeping Children Safe in Education guidance which would place a greater requirement and responsibility on schools for promoting this agenda.

The Committee Chairman queried the role of the three police teams involved in addressing CSE.

The Commissioner for Children and Community Safety referred to previous discussions at the Committee regarding this. He explained that the Prevent CSE Team was relatively new and had received funding from the Home Office. This Team worked at a

lower level to prevent issues of CSE and raise awareness. The On-street Team would target people where there was known grooming. The Committee had previously received details of the work of the online CSE Team. A briefing on operational activity could be provided following the meeting if requested.

The Strategic Lead, Specialist Safeguarding Delivery, referred to the multi-disciplinary CSE Prevent Team and clarified that this included not only the Police but also representatives from other agencies. The Team was managed by the Police and was up and running, working with individual and groups of children. If the CSE Panels identified a school with a cluster of children involved in CSE for example, the Prevent Team would be asked to deliver group work in that area. The Team was a useful resource, putting in place early targeted intervention. All CSE Panel intelligence was shared with the Police and frontline staff so geographical areas and localities where children were gathering which may put them at further risk, for example where house parties took place, could be identified and targeted. Addresses and geographical locations were shared with the Prevent team which enabled them to undertake targeted work. Social workers worked with the On-Street CSE Team and there had been joint operations which were helpful in building relationships and understanding how teams could work with one another. There were very positive inter-professional relationships on the matter of CSE between Staffordshire Police and the County Council. Progress on the local authority Action Plan had been instrumental in achieving this. The CSE Co-ordinator spent part of the week with the Police CSE Team and was the main point of contact when children from other local authorities were placed in Staffordshire.

The Chairman queried the impact of more children and young people being referred to CSE Panels.

The Strategic Lead, Specialist Safeguarding Delivery, confirmed that this was being managed. The Panels had been a victim of their own usefulness as practitioners and partners now understood and experienced the usefulness of them and had responded to eighteen months of awareness raising and training on the subject and the introduction of the CSE Risk Factor Matrix. This new way of working had been embedded and mainstreamed successfully and as the number of cases grew, the length of time Panels took had also increased. The Panels had therefore been reviewed and work was being undertaken with practitioners to ensure that Panels were focussed on managing CSE issues rather than the child's entire Care Plan. Conversations could broaden out to wider issues but the only way for the Panels to be manageable was for them to remain focussed. The primary purpose of the Panels was not individual Care Planning as there were existing structures and social work mechanisms which accounted for this, but rather hearing stories together to develop learning about the locality. Work had been undertaken around the Charing of Panels and the standard Panel agenda had been re-written to support this.

In response to the Chairman's query, the Strategic Lead, Specialist Safeguarding Delivery, clarified that the main document for the Panel was the CSE Risk Factor Matrix. Each child/young person would have an Early Help Assessment, Social work assessment or Child Protection assessment. At the Panel the practitioner would provide very brief précis explaining the wider circumstances of the child but there were other forums for this wider discussion. The Panels were regularly scrutinised by senior managers. Localised geographical knowledge was gained through the Panels which had

previously been a gap. The Panels were not intended to re-create existing social work care planning practices.

The Commissioner for Children and Community Safety referred to the positive feedback received from partners regarding the Panels. The intelligence that had come out of Panels had been very good and comprehensive risk planning continued.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Strategic Lead, Specialist Safeguarding Delivery, clarified that a number of months ago it was recognised that Child Protection legislation stopped at the age of seventeen years and three hundred and sixty four days. There was however a population of care leavers whom the County Council continued to have a Corporate Parenting responsibility for, some of whom were still at risk and vulnerable young adults. Although not supported by statutory child protection legislation which would enable partners to act in the same way, risks could still be recognised locally and agencies could work together on plans. The right agenda and attendance for a Panel was being considered. There was not the resource or number of young people to have a Care Leaver Panel in every District so logistically these Panels were more difficult to set up. After a couple of Panels had been held however there would be a clearer understanding of how they could run. The Police could find the Panels useful in understanding the link between young people who had been victims and perpetrators. The transition from victim to offending behaviour may be identified and stopped before it happened. At least one Panel would be held before the update to the Committee and detail of the Panel could be shared then.

The Chairman referred to the work to commission a CSE/Missing Children contract as detailed within the report.

The County Commissioner for Children and Community Safety referred to the intention, as previously reported to the Committee, to commission a CSE/Missing Children contract across Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent. Unfortunately the service specification and the financial envelope meant that there was insufficient interest from providers. Feedback from those who had attended soft market testing was being considered along with learning from other areas. Over the past twelve months there had been a pilot in the north of the county and a bespoke team in the five Districts in the south of the county focussed on missing children and the evidence from this was that it had worked well. There was CSE support in the north of the county however a gap had been identified around CSE support in the south of the county and there was spot purchasing to fill this. Conversations were taking place to put something in place to fill this gap whilst the pilot ran in the north. From a commissioning perspective the number of cases for CSE support and the costs of providing this would be considered.

The Chairman sought reassurances regarding the tender and what was being asked of providers.

The Commissioner for Community Safety clarified that national companies expected to be paid higher rates than what was provided on a local basis. There continued to be CSE support provided in the north of the county by Brighter Futures and spot purchasing had taken place in the other five Districts. Over the next twelve months commissioners would try to forecast the demand and consider the costs involved of spot purchasing.

A Member queried the length of support offered.

The Commissioner for Community Safety explained that there was a programme in place but support varied depending on the needs of and the resilience of the victim.

The Chairman referred to licensing policies and congratulated the Director of Legal and Public Health Protection, South Staffordshire District Council for the work he had undertaken in relation to this. Reassurance was sought that all policies were in place and that they were being robustly monitored.

The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection explained that the policy was approved by Chief Executives in March 2016. Out of the nine authorities, including Stoke-on-Trent, four had changed their policies and five were in the process of doing so. The policy for Cannock for example was going to full Council for approval on the 6 July 2016. It was not an easy process to get policy changed as Councils had to consult with the trade and go through the formal process to seek approval, generally at a Full Council meeting. South Staffordshire District Council had approved the policy in February 2016, East Staffordshire Borough Council had approved the policy slightly before and Stoke-on-Trent had just approved the policy. Progress was being made and the policy was either out to consultation or about to be consulted on. By the end of the year all policies would be in place. One of the key aspects of the policies was driver training. Where people have received school transport training this would be acknowledged as safeguarding training to make sure that training was not double counted and drivers did not have to do it twice. Out of approximately four thousand five hundred drivers in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent, just over two thousand had been trained. Stoke had trained one thousand three hundred drivers. East Staffordshire Borough Council had trained three hundred and twenty drivers, Staffordshire Moorlands had trained sixty six of eighty one drivers, South Staffordshire had trained thirty six of one hundred and eighty drivers and training was happening in the next few weeks. Until policies changed drivers could not be forced to do the training but Councils were making sure that training was in place already. Updates on progress would be requested at the Responsible Bodies Group.

It was the responsibility of each authority to ensure the robust implementation of policy. Taking the policy to the Chief Executives group ensured sign off at the highest level. Chief Executives would no doubt be informed if it was suspected that the policy was not being implemented. Comments from the Police at the meeting in February 2016 indicated that there had been a sea change by Licensing Authorities in their response to CSE which was positive however there was no room for complacency as there could always be issues. Drivers had asked why they had been trained and it was highlighted that it was in their interest to protect their trade as cases such as that in Rotherham had undermined the entire trade in those areas. Taxi drivers could bring issues to the Council's attention. There was commitment at a senior level to make things happen and ensure that the practice was being delivered.

The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection was responsible for work at South Staffordshire District Council and had invited internal audit in to review the licensing process and identify any issues and would be suggesting this to the other Councils. However he only had responsibility for what happened at South Staffordshire Council.

A Member queried the elements of driver training.

The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection clarified that this training included, what is abuse, what the issues are, what drivers should look out for, types of abuse, how abuse happened, consideration of previous cases and types of behaviour for example having lots of alcohol or cigarettes or unexplained gifts and meeting people online. Safeguarding training had been provided to the South Staffordshire District Licensing Committee and other authorities were committed to this.

The Committee Chairman citing the Rotherham case, sought reassurance that those responsible for licensing were doing the job correctly.

The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection explained that this was a matter for each local authority and that it was suggested that checks could be instigated to make sure this was happening, such as the step taken at South Staffordshire, by inviting in the auditors. Members were encouraged to ask questions of their local District/Borough Councils. The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection would be going back to local authorities and asking if robust processes and procedures were in place. There was a reliance on intelligence and if people had concerns the Director of Legal and Public Health Protection would happily pass these on to the relevant people to follow them up. It was key for all to work together to ensure a strong process was in place. This was a top priority for the Chief Executives.

The Commissioner for Children and Community Safety emphasised that each local authority was accountable for their own procedures and practices. SSCB had a District Sub Group and there was also an opportunity to work together through the Child Sexual Abuse Forum. More work would be undertaken to provide further reassurance to the Committee and bring the safeguarding perspectives together. Within the County Council there was a CSE Action Plan which had been audited. Substantial assurance was given which provided reassurance about what was going on internally. The CSE Co-ordinator had contributed to this.

The Chairman referred to an email that had been sent to him by a Committee Member regarding the need to ensure robust policies and practices within the District and Borough Councils to safeguard vulnerable children.

The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection reiterated that out of the nine local authorities, four had the revised policies in place and one was about to change its policy, but it was important to make sure that practices and procedures were followed and delivered as a result. Those at senior level had to keep the issue on the agenda and there was a strong commitment to do this.

In response to the Chairman's comment highlighting areas for improvement referred to within the report, the Director of Legal and Public Health Protection explained that South Staffordshire District Council had a stronger policy than elsewhere which had created the inconsistency. All other District and Borough Councils were being brought up to South Staffordshire District Council's level.

The Connectivity Operations Manager explained that those drivers who did not have an employment record or who had a relatively short employment record in this country were required to provide a certificate of good conduct from their county's embassy or if it was not possible, recognising the varying levels of professionalism across the world, a sworn declaration witnessed by a solicitor. The team were working with approximately two hundred and eighteen companies on the Framework Agreement. A PQQ process had been completed and conditions of contract had been altered so that if any companies did not declare they would be off the list by December 2016.

The Director of Legal and Public Health Protection confirmed that in South Staffordshire a Certificate of Good Conduct was already required and that this was being brought in by some of the other District and Borough Councils.

It was **RESOLVED** that;

- The Committee have sight of the CSE Action Plan and an opportunity to monitor the implementation of the action plan to address the recommended areas in need of further development at future meetings.
- The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People discuss with the Police and Crime Commissioner opportunities to fund Chelsea's Choice and the Escape drama in schools.
- That more insight into local activity in schools to address CSE is to be shared with the Committee following the completion of the Section 175/157 Audit.
- Learning from the Care Leaver/ Young Person CSE Panel would be shared with the Committee at a future meeting.

5. Children, Young People and Families Transformation Programme

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People introduced the item explaining that the report to the Committee was an update following on from the presentation in October 2015. The comments and thoughts of the Committee were sought.

The Commissioner for Children and Community Safety explained that a multi-agency approach was being taken by the County Council with statutory partners and the third sector. All organisations needed to buy into the vision and not work in silos. There were difficult challenges in terms of resources and it was important to work together to maximise the use of available resources. A fundamental principle was identifying issues through early help to prevent things escalating. There were five key areas including, partnership endorsement, developing work with partners, continued work with stakeholders, learning from District and Borough Councils and taking forward a number of pilots. At the next Committee meeting more information about the individual pilots within the eight Districts would be presented. Regarding system leadership the Family Strategic Partnership had been set up to support the process. The Partnership was chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive and Director for Families and Communities and was supported by a small Executive Group to take forward actions. The Partnership was developing a Children and Families Strategy which once signed off would be followed by a Delivery Plan.

The Chairman queried the timescale for this work.

The Commissioner for Community Safety confirmed that the Partnership had been set up and fell within the governance of the Health and Wellbeing Board. The Board had agreed that the Partnership would have responsibility for the children and wellbeing work within the joint health and wellbeing strategy and that the Partnership would report back to the Board. The link between the Family Strategic Partnership Board, SSCB and the Health and Wellbeing Board had been established. The implementation of the Early Help Strategy was led by the Partnership. Work to address hidden harm caused by substance misuse, domestic abuse and parental mental health issues was also being driven by the Partnership. There were opportunities for partners to jointly commission services and integrated commissioning was being taken forward. A review on the County Councils internal commissioning arrangements was being undertaken. This would provide a clear view on commissioning, ensuring that money was being spent appropriately and to meet statutory duties. This piece of work included hundreds of county wide and locality contracts. It was anticipated that a report on commissioning would be presented to Cabinet at the end of June 2016.

The Development Manager discussed the model of implementation. There had been significant progress with infrastructure and resource attached to the programme. The four areas of work include;

- The intelligence function and ensuring that the information and insight was available to commission appropriately.
- Access points – Staffordshire County Council has over fifteen points of access for children, young people, families and partners, ranging from safeguarding First Response to the Contact Centre. This could cause confusion and waste and inefficiency in the system. Considerations were being made about how this could be rationalised and how digital technology could be used.
- The pilots - these had now moved into the delivery phase. Some would work better than others and the learning from them would be gathered.
- Community Resilience – this was about building community capacity to provide Early Help Tier 2 work which was critical to families. Early Help was an area which Families First needed to move out of so that it could focus on protecting children most at risk.

The Commissioner for Children and Community Safety referred to the detail in the papers regarding the model and the pilot projects. The model had been shared by partners and would be reflected in the Strategy. The programme had some challenges but it would make a difference and give children a better start by keeping them out of the system, safe and independent. It was about joining up services and working with partners and the community.

The Chairman praised the work of Families First.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Committee receive more details of the Pilot Projects at the July 2016 meeting.

6. Preventing the Low Level Neglect of Children in Staffordshire Working Group Final Report

The Vice Chairman of the Committee introduced the Working Group's report referring to the role of the Committee in setting up the review. He thanked all Members who attended and all those who had contributed.

The Working Group had identified seventeen recommendations and felt that there were ways of working that prevented low level neglect happening in the first place, preventing children suffering and leading to savings in the future. Recommendations incorporated schools and partners and also training needs. People were encouraged to use the Early Help Assessment.

The Chairman reiterated the Vice Chairman's thanks to those who had contributed to the review. It was evident that the Safe and Strong Communities Select Committee and the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee interfaced with one another. It was requested that the Cabinet Members took away the recommendations and responded to the Committee in three months' time.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People undertook to provide an update to the Committee when he next attended.

The Strategic Lead, Looked After Children and Disability Services, explained that within Families First there was an Edge of Care Service which involved a number of different aspects including the Intensive Prevention Team. This Team worked with families where there was domestic abuse, mental health issues and/or substance misuse, worked to support the rehabilitation of children from being looked after to going home and worked with women who had had a child removed through the Breathing Space project. A bid to the Innovation Fund had been made to undertake work specifically focussed on neglect as this was the biggest factor for those children subject to Child Protection Plans, younger children coming into the care system were often victims of physical and emotional neglect and often neglect was cyclical with siblings also experiencing neglect. It was recognised that if Families First could do something to address this, which specifically focussed on the younger age group, the Intensive Prevention Service would include the whole age range and could make a real difference to children and families.

The Interim Strategic Lead, Targeted Services, explained that a challenge for the review was to remain focussed on low level neglect. The identification of neglect at the earliest stage and the extent to which this could happen by building community capacity was one of the areas that had come out strongly from the work and was a key area for the Children and Families Transformation Programme.

A Member referred to children believing that neglect was normal.

A Member referred to recommendation four regarding Health Visitor provision and queried if antenatal support was being provided.

The Vice Chairman explained that the provision of group antenatal support varied across the County which was why the recommendation had been included. It was important for prospective parents to receive the right information at the right time so that they understood, for example, the importance of interacting with their child rather than being on their mobile phone. The Working Group had stressed that people needed to be prepared for parenthood. Antenatal groups could also provide an opportunity to identify

issues and address problems straight away. The Early Help Assessment could be used before issues emerged, reducing work for Families First later on.

The Chairman thanked the Vice Chairman for his work. The issue had now been considered in depth.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Committee endorse the recommendations within the report and submit it to the Cabinet for a response in three months time.

7. Work Programme

The Scrutiny and Support Manager discussed the next Committee meeting which would take place on Friday 8 July 2016. The Work Programme had included an item on Modern Slavery but it had been reported to the Scrutiny and Support Manager that there was no substantive further progress to report on and it was therefore suggested and agreed that the item be deferred.

A Youth and Community Service update and an update on the Children, Young People and Families Transformation Programme Pilots would be presented at the July meeting.

In September the Police and Crime Commissioner would be attending the Committee meeting and Members were invited to submit lines of inquiry for this item to the Scrutiny and Support Officer by the end of the month.

The Chairman suggested that the use of the Police and Crime Commissioners resources to support community safety issues such as Chelsea's Choice could be put forward as an item for discussion.

It was **RESOLVED** that;

- The item on Modern Slavery be deferred from July to a future meeting.
- That Members submit possible lines of inquiry for the conversation with the Police and Crime Commissioner to the Scrutiny and Support Manager in advance of the next Committee meeting.

8. Exclusion of the Public

Chairman

Documents referred to in these minutes as Schedules are not appended, but will be attached to the signed copy of the Minutes of the meeting. Copies, or specific information contained in them, may be available on request.