

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

PRESENT: Councillor Raistrick (Chair)

Councillors Baines MBE, Blagbrough Collins, Courtney, Dacre, Hutchinson, Parsons-Hulse and Rivron.

CO-OPTED MEMBERS:

David Gott (Roman Catholic Representative), Shelagh Hirst (Church of England Representative) and Dr Helen Vickers (Parent Governor).

54 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Krish Nair and Madeleine Partland (Youth Council Representatives).

(Councillor Rivron arrived at 18:11 hours)

(Councillor Dacre arrived at 18:18 hours)

(The meeting closed at 20:16 hours).

55 MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD HELD ON 27TH NOVEMBER AND 16TH DECEMBER 2019

IT WAS AGREED that the Minutes of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Board held on 27th November and 16th December 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

(a) Minute Number 48 bullet point 6 – the word 'inducing' should be replaced with the word 'including'.

(b) Members were encouraged by the Chair to attend training for Regulation 44 visits.

56 CHILD HEALTH AND WELLBEING SURVEY 2019 (e-HNA)

The Director of Public Health submitted a written report to update the Scrutiny Board following the annual survey of the health and wellbeing of children and young people. As part of Scrutiny's ongoing commitment to the eHNA previously, it had consistently identified child public health as something which was important to Members.

The survey had taken place in secondary schools since 2010 and in primary schools since 2012. The surveys were anonymous online questionnaires where students answered questions relating to a wide range of health and wellbeing issues. This enabled schools and services to hear what children and young people were saying about their health and wellbeing, and act on it. Since 2018 the eHNA function had been brought in-house by the Local Authority which facilitated an opportunity to review the questions and control the analysis of data. The aim of the results was to inform Public Health, the wider Council and external parties (particularly in the Education sector).

Members commented on the following issues:

- It was noted that the report was easy to read but did the data represent a genuinely honest and true reflection? If not, was there a way to get any more

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

information. In response, Officers advised that the data was a genuine reflection of what children were prepared to say.

- What areas should be worked on as a result of the findings? In response, Officers advised that the outcomes were not very different from last year and Emotional Health and Wellbeing continued to be the biggest challenge.
- Were eating disorders a concern? In response, Officers advised that there were issues around self-esteem, weight and children's perceptions of themselves. Schools were carrying out work around body image and self esteem.
- What physical activity were we encouraging children to get involved in? In response, Officers responded that there had been some change in Primary phase, lots of activities during the school day and out of school clubs were offered. Schools were always exploring the possibility of innovative provision.
- Could we do more to get young people into out of school sports clubs? In response, Officers advised that transport and accompanying children was an issue as parents were sometimes not willing to do this. There was also an issue around cost.
- Concerns were raised around self harm, especially in Primary phase and was there a link between Primary and Secondary, was self harm linked to the exam system? Did Officers think that exams caused more pressure and what was being done about it? Was there anything that could be done to address stress? In response, Officers advised that there was a spectrum for self harm which recognised that some were doing it and some were experimenting with it. Exams did create more pressure and work was being done in schools via the Schools' Nurses and exam preparation was something that had been done by schools for some time. Officers would bring more details for the next Scrutiny meeting if Members were agreeable.
- Did the questionnaire capture or identify the source of drugs as it was anonymous, was there an opportunity being missed? In response Officers advised that it would be difficult as further specialist questions would decrease the responses received and this information was available elsewhere in the system.
- How useful was the data to schools? How was it used? Was funding obtained as a result of it? In response, Officers advised that there were school level reports available and Chairs of Governors were informed when the results became available. The Headteacher from Bolton Brow stated that the school had been taking part in eHNA since 2013 and were keen to engage with Pupil Voice and it identified issues which they addressed as a result of understanding the picture from the results. The school had also referred back to it when changes were made. Staff training around anxiety and emotional health was already underway in his school in conjunction with CAMHS. Access to different services such as Northpoint and NSPCC were available and these could feasibly be shared in a cluster of schools.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

- Headteachers received the report first and Governors would be notified when the results were made available to the school. The Headteacher from Bolton Brow was happy that Governors saw the information and it had formed a Health and Wellbeing Action Plan for the school in previous years around healthy eating etc. Officers advised that they were engaging with schools who were not participating in eHNA survey.
- How long were self harm records kept? Data on sexting seemed to indicate that children did not realise that this was an offence. A large number of responses were marked as 'other' and could this be looked at to obtain a different response and could work be carried out to check understanding of what the response meant. In response, Officers advised that children were perhaps reluctant to say and balance was needed in relation to sexting to ensure honest responses. Work was underway with the Police to get additional resources into schools for PSHCE.
- How were Governors receiving information previously as it did not appear that some Governors had received data previously? In response, The Headteacher from Bolton Brow advised that, from a personal perspective, he would prefer the information was sent to Headteachers and Governors were advised to obtain reports from Headteachers.
- With regards to the Ofsted framework, were Mental Health First Aid courses available? In response, Officers advised that they were providing subsidized and at cost courses and advised that costs with private providers should be checked against those from Calderdale.
- Had the use of contraception changed as some young people were not using protection? In response, Officers advised that support was provided on a school-by-school basis, which targeted where need was highest and that they would report back at a later Scrutiny Board.

IT WAS AGREED that:

- (a) Officers be thanked for the report and;
- (b) the report be noted.

57 YOUTH JUSTICE SERVICE: INCLUDING ITS FUNCTION, NEW INITIATIVES, PARTNERSHIP INVOLVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

The Service Manager, Youth Justice Service submitted a written report which updated Members on the outcomes for young people involved with the Youth Justice Service and the performance of the service. The Youth Justice Service (YJS) consisted of a multi-agency team whose task was be involved with young people before and after they offended having been identified as 'at risk'. The work of the YJS was governed by the YJS Management Board, The Board was made up of statutory and voluntary partners and chaired by the Director of Children & Young People's Services. The YJS Management Board ensured an integrated approach to youth crime, offending and victims of crime. The YJS Management Board also acted

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

as the lead governance body for the local Youth Justice System, and had oversight of performance against the following key outcome indicators:

- reduced reoffending
- reduced first-time entrants to the youth justice system
- reduced use of custody
- locally agreed targets e.g. reduced offending of looked after children

The report concluded that young people were supported by the Youth Justice Service to reduce offending and appropriate action was taken when there was a breach in compliance. The data contained in the report showed a reduction in the number of young people in custody and reoffending rates.

The report also concluded that the partnership working was appropriate and governance arrangements were in place to support the management of Youth Justice Services in Calderdale. Peer challenge activity, in partnership with East Riding Council would facilitate learning for the service. This would, in turn improve case file audit activity and would inform practice development in the service.

Members commented on the following issues:

- Page 23 of the report, what steps had been taken to address the verification of education data? In response, Officers advised that the increase in exclusions was a concern and that a strategy was needed to ensure that data was robust with a clear escalation route if hours in education were less than 16 per week.
- Was there a link between exclusions and youth crime? In response, Officers advised that there was a link if young people were not in education or employment and unless they were engaged, it often led to problems such as anti-social behaviour and this was something the YJS supported Education Welfare and the Police with.
- Officers were asked to expand on the information on page 15, section 6.2 in relation to overall alternative provision. In response, Officers advised that there had been a reduction in the Youth Offending grant available and some voluntary sector resources.
- Page 17, section 6.11 relating to Transforming Rehabilitation, Officers were asked how they saw it playing out? In response, Officers advised that it had an impact on the relationship with Probation and was under review.
- What happened to the re-offending rate for April-June 2016 (shown on Page 19 of the report)? In response, Officers advised that they were dealing with individuals and it depended on who they were dealing with and that they were looking for the offence type coming down and tariff de-escalation.
- As all numbers were coming down, how much was due to National policy rather than local practice? And how is it measured if that was the case? In response, Officers advised that there were more pre-court disposals and some of the drop was due to a different type of reporting. There were 4 voluntary pre-court

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

disposal options and 1 which was statutory as it had conditions. These were referred back to the Police if there was no engagement. An additional offer was added between Youth Community Resolution and Youth Caution which required no admission of guilt and offered intervention. If the young person agreed to Youth Offending Team (YOT) and there were no breaches then they were deemed 'Outcome 22' with outcomes not shown on subsequent DBS checks. This was piloted in Leeds and was funded by the Police.

- What was the detail of Point 8.8 which related to Children Looked After (CLA)? In response, Officers advised it was a 10 point plan which de-escalated the offence and engaged the young person and victim – it was a very clear process for CLA which has been adopted across West Yorkshire.
- This was the first report from YJS and stated that expertise from East Riding was used for a peer review. It would have been helpful to understand how it worked and the difference it made. The provision of a 6 monthly report on improvement action was suggested. In response, Officers advised that they were preparing for a full inspection and had taken advice from East Riding who were judged in theirs to be outstanding. Officers advised that audit processes needed to be smarter but preparation for inspection was going well.
- Custodial sentences were not broken down by age and were young people held in secure youth accommodation? In response, Officers advised that all children were in child estate and never adult facilities.
- There was some cynicism in the national press around non-court disposals as a soft option to save money and Officers were asked if they were satisfied that it was being used properly and not just a money saving exercise. In response, Officers advised that the issue had been raised and there were concerns that incidents were not fully investigated. There was daily monitoring by the Police Early Intervention Team and intervention took place on first offence. These took the form of home visits and conversations with parents. Earlier intervention helped young people not to re-offend.
- There was a significant decrease in education and employment statistics and access to training was not as good as Members had hoped for. A Co-opted Member commented that access to facilities for young people aged 8-15 years not good either. Were these results associated with this? In response, Officers advised that there was a reduction in E2E but Project Challenge in Calderdale was in place to help those at risk of exclusion or not getting a placement. There had been an increase in home education but needed more attention which they were actively doing.
- Why had YJS only just gone down the road of systemic practice and what information was available in terms of case load (similar to information the Board had received on Social Worker caseloads etc)? In response, Officers advised that there had been a change in the use of language and the practice focus had changed in the last few years. Child First, Offender Second, they were using systemic approach to use the same terminology and language.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

- The targets quoted on page 32 – who set these? Were they national targets? In response, Officers advised that they were local and national and had been reviewed and reduced from 15 down to 3 targets. These were locally defined and refreshed annually.
- Focusing on the 3 key issues how are authorities measured against each other? In response, Officers advised that the Government pulled down and tabulated data to compare with similar YOT's. The figures provided were local KPI's (key performance indicators).
- Where were emotional health and wellbeing referrals coming from? In response, Officers advised that referrals came from the Courts, Early Intervention Panels, Vulnerable Young People's Panel, Children's Social Care, Schools and ASB Panels. Those referred had to be considered at risk of offending or re-offending.
- How was 'at risk' identified? Why were we not getting information? Was it measured? And was case load information available? In response, Officers advised that the turnaround was defined by the Courts and that case load information could be supplied.
- The provision of appropriate adults, in section 6.2 of the report and 10.4, relating to voluntary organisations was inconsistent. Were there loads or were there none? In response, Officers advised that appropriate adults were taken away from YOT, were commissioned by the Police on contract and were a mixture of voluntary and paid staff.
- How stable was staffing in the service? In response, Officers advised that turnover was very low and they employed no agency staff.

IT WAS AGREED that:

- (a) the report be noted: and
- (b) YJS to submit a 6 monthly report to include Improvement Actions to the Scrutiny Board

58 GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET 2020/21 TO 2022/23 – PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTATION

The Director of Children and Young People's Service submitted a written report which provided an opportunity for the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Board to inform the discussion by Strategy and Performance Scrutiny Board. Following on from Cabinet's consideration of the 2020/21 to 2022/23 budget when it met on 13th January 2020 and adopted some budget proposals for consultation, as well as consulting the general public, Cabinet were required to consult Scrutiny Boards on changes to the policy and budget framework. The Strategy and Performance Board prepared a response to Cabinet when it met on 6th February 2020. Any comments or recommendations by the Strategy and Performance Scrutiny Board were considered by Cabinet on 10th February 2020.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

The Directorate was facing a budget pressure of £2 million which was the result of childrens social care, specifically external placement for young people and increased demand. The pressure had been relieved somewhat by Local Authority reserves in previous years, however this was not an option moving forward. In 2021, £1 million would be allocated from National Social Care Funding and £2.7 million had been made available for SEND provision as Education Health and Care Plans were increasing. There would be £500,000 reduction in spend from the Children's Centre contract as well as the restructure of the Youth Service.

Members commented on the following points:

- Was the £2.7 million one off payment and what would be done with additional funding? In response, Officers advised that there would be ongoing funding but the exact sum was not known and that additional funding would be used for targeted support to prevent children coming into care.
- Do more children come into the Authority or are we sending more out of area for placements? In response, Officers advised that we were a 'net importer' currently, but had 27 children from Calderdale in external placements, with an additional 220 from other Councils placed in private provision in Calderdale.
- High level support was very expensive so would the new residential facility which had been agreed in Calderdale save money and could we have secured additional income from other authorities to fund places with similar models? In response, Officers advised that spending was reduced by bringing children into the new facility from private provision. The new facility had 5 beds and further opportunities were being explored to provide further provision. The difficulty with placements was that often the young people in these types of accommodation had to be placed based on their needs. There were lots of economic opportunities in expanding accommodation options within an area, however this brought about other issues, such as staffing accommodation, regulating provision for Inspection purposes, ensuring children were appropriately placed together etc.
- With less funding and increased need, how long would the SEND additional provision be sustainable for? Was the funding ring fenced? In response, Officers advised that £2.7 million was ring fenced and would ensure the service was fully funded to where it needed to be currently.
- A Member commented that, in Calderdale, 800 people went through Stage 1 of the Adoption process but only 100 became adoptive parents, what were we missing? In response, Officers advised that the emphasis was on permanency and all attempts were made to keep children with their families or in safe placements. One Adoption would be invited to a future Scrutiny Board meeting to provide progress on their last report.

IT WAS AGREED that:

- (a) The report be noted, and

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY BOARD, 5TH FEBRUARY 2020

(b) The Assistant Scrutiny Officer be requested to invite One Adoption West Yorkshire to a future Children and Young People's Scrutiny Board to discuss the progress and performance data since the last report to this Board.

59 WORK PLAN 2019/20 AND POTENTIAL DETAILED REVIEWS

The Assistant Scrutiny Officer submitted a Work Plan for consideration.

IT WAS AGREED that

(a) The report be noted and;

(b) The Detailed Review on the Virtual School be approved and Councillors Blagbough and Rivron be appointed, with an anticipated completion date of April 2020;

(c) The Detailed Review on the Pastoral/Safeguarding Services in Calderdale Secondary Schools be approved, and Councillors Baines (MBE), Courtney, Dacre and Dr Helen Vickers (as Co-opted Member) be appointed to this group, with the Terms of Reference to be brought to the next Scrutiny Board Meeting.

60 CYPS AGENCY WORKLOADS AND VACANCIES

The Service Manager, Safeguarding and Quality Assurance and Principal Social Worker submitted a written report for information purposes only.

IT WAS AGREED that the report be noted.