

<b>MEETING:</b>	Full Council
<b>DATE:</b>	Thursday, 2 February 2017
<b>TIME:</b>	10.30 am
<b>VENUE:</b>	Council Chamber, Barnsley Town Hall


## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

### Minutes of the Regulatory Boards

13. Audit Committee - 18th January, 2017 (*Pages 197 - 206*)

### Minutes of the Scrutiny Committees

19. Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 17th January, 2017 (*Pages 207 - 214*)



Diana Terris  
Chief Executive

Wednesday, 25 January 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

# Item 13



<b>MEETING:</b>	Audit Committee
<b>DATE:</b>	Wednesday, 18 January 2017
<b>TIME:</b>	4.00 pm
<b>VENUE:</b>	Reception Room, Barnsley Town Hall

**Present** Councillors Richardson (Chair), Barnard, Clements and Lofts together with Independent Members - Ms K Armitage, Ms D Brown, Mr S Gill, Mr P Johnson and Mr M Marks

## 40. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members in respect of items on the agenda.

## 41. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 7th December, 2015 were taken as read and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

## 42. ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Committee received a report detailing actions taken and arising from previous meetings of the Committee.

It was noted that one of the items relating to the submission of a report on the multi-agency approach to safeguarding and the creation by the Police of multi-agency hubs had been delayed for some time and questions were asked as to when a report was likely to be submitted.

The Director of Legal and Governance responded by stating that the delay was due to the logistics of collating the information together. The multi-agency hubs had now been established and were working well and it was now a question of determining which meeting was best to submit this report to. It was also proposed that the Executive Director (People) or her representative be invited to that meeting on the basis that they were in the operation of the hubs.

The Director also stated that information on recent Ombudsman complaints and the use by the Council of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 would be circulated to all Members of the Committee.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

## 43. APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITOR

The Director of Finance, Assets and IT submitted a report on the various options available for the appointment of external audit services from 2018/19 onwards and seeking approval to recommend to Council the preferred option.

The report provided an appraisal of the three main options available as follows:

- Option 1 – a Standalone Tender
- Option2 – Combined Tender

- Option 3 – a sector led procurement scheme whereby an Appointed Person appoints the external auditor on the Authority’s behalf

The preferred option was Option 3 on the basis that this provided the potential economies of scale and, more importantly, a high probability of securing auditors with the necessary experience and knowledge to effectively audit the Authority. It the Authority approved this option during the compulsory appointing period it would need to give notice to the Appointing Person of the decision to become an opted authority.

In the ensuing discussion, and in response to detailed questioning, the following matters were highlighted:

- The Service Director Finance outlined the process to be adopted in the appointment of External Auditor in relation to all three options and also made reference to the role of the Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd in this process
- It was noted that the Local Government Association supported the approach outlined in Option 3
- The rationale for recommending Option 3 was outlined as it was particularly felt that the more Authorities which opted for this approach would provide certainty about the volume of work included in the procurement exercise and would secure the best possible prices
- The Authority could, as it currently did, procure additional services over and above those included within the original ‘contract’
- The new regulation required the rotation of auditors every five years, although a waiver could be sought if required. In addition, the lead auditor was required to rotate every two years
- In response to detailed questioning, it was noted that the majority of Authorities appeared to be recommending Option 3
- Whilst the exact audit fees were uncertain at the moment, it was thought that any other option would be likely to be more expensive
- The External Auditor referred to and there was a discussion of the ways in which quality assurance would be maintained . Arising out of this discussion, the Director of Legal and Governance commented on the statutory processes for the appointment of External Auditor and to the ways in which quality would be ensured. He suggested that some form of client panel would be established to oversee the process but it was acknowledged that further information was required on the selection process to be adopted
- The Service Director Finance assured the Committee that under the current regulations there could be no one firm monopoly for undertaking External Audit Services for Local Authorities

**RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:**

- (i) That the options available for the procurement of external audit services from 2018/19 onwards be noted; and

- (ii) That the Council opt in to the sector led scheme for appointing auditors as outlined in Option 3 within the report now submitted.

#### **44. RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT 2016/17**

The Risk and Governance Manager presented a report of the Director of Finance, Assets and IT outlining the progress made to date towards the achievement of the goals set out in the Council's Risk Management Policy and Signposting further work to be undertaken in the year.

The following matters were highlighted:

- The report sought to provide suitable assurances that the Risk Management Framework remained fit for purpose
- The Committee was reminded that the Register had been updated in October 2016 and the outcomes reported to the meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2016 and to Cabinet on the 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2017
- The Council's Operational Risk Registers remained aligned to the Future Council operating model and the Risk Management Framework had been reviewed in April 2016
- The Risk and Governance Manager also reported that he continued to support the development of risk management arrangement for a number of organisations in the area. Arising out of this the Manager reported that the Learning and Development Awareness sessions could be delivered to Member of this Committee
- The Annual Governance Review process had been delivered during the early part of 2016/17 and this had resulted in the production of an evidence based Annual Governance Statement which had been approved by the Council in September 2016
- The outcomes of the recent Association of Local Authority Risk Managers (ALARM) and CIPFA benchmarking exercises suggested that the outputs and overall maturity of the Council's Risk Management arrangements were broadly in line with similar Councils and peer organisations
- The Risk Management Workplan for 2016/17 was being regularly monitored and reviewed to ensure the delivery of the identified actions outlined
- There was a discussion of the Benchmarking Outcomes in relation to the difficulties of providing accurate analysis against previous years. It was anticipated that benchmarking results for 2016/17 would see improvements going forward
- It was noted that there had been a reduction in the percentage of Operational Risk Register Reviews being completed on time between quarter one and quarter 2. This was thought to be a blip due to holidays. Arising out of this discussion, the Risk and Governance Manager reported that his service was in the process of being audited and this was likely to be an area of focus for the auditors. Any issues identified or any non-compliance would be reported to a future meeting

## RESOLVED

- (i) that the Risk Management Update report and the robustness of the assurances provided be noted; and
- (ii) that the Committee continue to receive periodic reports during the year in order to monitor the progress in achieving the actions identified for 2016/17.

### 45. INTERNAL AUDIT QUARTERLY REPORT 2016/17 - QUARTER ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 2016

The Head of Internal Audit and Corporate Anti-Fraud submitted a report providing a comprehensive overview of the key activities and findings of Internal Audit based on the Division's work covering the whole of the third quarter with additional details of audits completed up to the end of December 2016.

The report covered:

- The issues arising from completed Internal Audit work in the period
- Matters that had required investigation
- An opinion on the ongoing overall assurance Internal Audit was able to provide based on the work undertaken regarding the adequacy and effectiveness of the Authority's internal control environment
- Progress on the delivery of the Internal Audit Plan for the period to the end of the third quarter of 2016/17
- Details of Internal Audit's performance for the quarter utilising performance indicators

Reports issued and the Internal Audit work completed during the period had raised two fundamental recommendations relating to a Human resource Governance issue regarding absence management information and a financial management issue concerning the management of service budgets.

Internal control assurance opinion overall remained adequate based on the results of the work undertaken during the quarter.

Of the 25 recommendations followed up, 64% had been implemented by the original target date with a further 24% implemented after the original target date and 12% not implemented with revised implementation dates being agreed by management

In relation to the Audit Plan, actual dates days delivered were broadly in line with the profiled days at the end of the third quarter.

Overall, Divisional performance remained satisfactory and all Performance Indicators were either on or exceeding target levels.

In the ensuing discussion, and in response to detailed questioning, the following matters were highlighted:

- It was pleasing to see an increase in the percentage of recommendations followed up within the originally agreed timescales
- It was noted that the first three quarters of the year, audit resources had been directed and prioritised to undertake work for the Council and the reasons for this were outlined. It was also noted that there would have to be a reprioritisation to deliver more work for non-Council clients. Work was being undertaken with Executive Directors to review the final quarter activities and to determine which work would slip into the first quarter of the next financial year
- The Head of Internal Audit and Corporate Anti-Fraud commended that his Annual report would include work undertaken in April and May which, in part, was because of the number of vacant posts within the service. He stressed, however, that he was satisfied that the work undertaken would still be sufficient to justify his opinion
- There was a detailed discussion of the limited assurance given in relation to Budget Monitoring and Reporting and Service and Financial Planning and the reasons for this particularly in the light of the reducing number of staff employed within the various service areas. It was noted that the review had concluded that Budget Managers sometimes did not proactively monitor and performance manage budgets for which they were accountable in line with the Future Council arrangements. The Service Director Finance stated that he had requested this audit and commented that the issues raised were not in relation to the budget monitoring processes themselves but were about roles and responsibilities of managers and what they did with the information they had/received. It was noted that work was being undertaken to address the issues raised
- Reference was made to the feedback sheets and to the way in which suggestion for improvements were addressed. In relation to the specific issue raised, this was something which the 'client' thought audit had missed. However, the fact that this matter had been raised by the client suggested that they were aware of those issues identified
- Reference was made to the audits that had been deferred together the reasons for this which were largely in relation to the need to implement revised/new policies and procedures in particular service areas. It was noted that as the Head of Internal Audit and Corporate Anti-Fraud was jointly responsible with the Director of Legal and Governance, for the Corporate Whistleblowing Policy this audit was likely to be undertaken by the Service Director Finance. The policy was to be revised in the light of legislative changes
- It was noted that there were currently two vacancies within the service and arrangements were in hand to recruit to the posts
- In relation to HR E-Procedures and the limited assurance given, in relation to E-Enabled leave, it was noted that these arrangements had been in place less than a year.
- There was a discussion of the limited assurance in relation to cash and banking arrangements and to the action being taken to address those issues.

In response to specific questioning, however, it was reported that there had been no identified losses or fraud occurring

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) that the issues arising from the completed internal audit work for the period along with the responses received from management be noted;
- (ii) that the assurance opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the Authority's Internal Control Framework based on the work of Internal Audit in the period to the end of December 2016 be noted; and
- (iii) that the performance of the Internal Audit Division for the third quarter be noted.

## **46. CORPORATE ANTI-FRAUD AND CORRUPTION POLICIES**

The Head of Internal Audit and Corporate Anti-Fraud submitted a report presenting draft versions of the revised Corporate Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy and the Corporate Anti-Fraud and Corruption Strategy together with a draft version of the Council's new Corporate Anti-Bribery Policy and requesting the Committee to forward any observations and amendments to Cabinet which be requested to approve those policies.

The need for the revision of the policies had been identified following the creation of the Corporate Anti-Fraud Team within Internal Audit and, in addition, the Anti-Bribery Policy had been written in order to meet the legal obligations in relation to anti-bribery legislation. Copies of these documents were appended to the report.

The report also outlined how these policies and strategy fit within the overall counter fraud framework of the authority. It was also noted that a number of other policies including the Fraud Response Plan, Prosecutions Policy, Whistleblowing Policy and Anti-Money Laundering Policy were also being reviewed and would be presented to Committee in due course.

In the ensuing discussion, the following matters were raised:

- The valuable contribution of the Corporate Anti-Fraud Team in this process was noted. It had been a number of years since some of these policies had been reviewed and all submitted today had been previously submitted to the Employee Forum, SMT and to Service Directors. The recommendations of this Committee would then be submitted to Cabinet for approval
- The benefits of limiting cash payments had had a significant impact on reducing the opportunity for fraud. In those areas where cash payment was retained, the service undertook unannounced visits in order to minimise the opportunity for theft
- Referring to the Corporate Anti-Fraud and Corruption Strategy, the Head of Internal Audit and Corporate Anti-Fraud outlined the instances in which the



Police would become involved in issues and the procedures which were followed. It was noted that the burden of proof to ensure a successful prosecution was higher than that required by the authority which could take appropriate disciplinary action irrespective of whether or not a case was taken to prosecution

- There was a discussion of the language used throughout the policies. It was suggested that actions required to be taken by officers/Members should be prescriptive rather than advisory. The Director of Legal and Governance and Head of Internal Audit and Corporate Anti-Fraud stated that these policies should be read alongside the Code of Conduct policies which detailed the actions required to be taken in relation to suspected fraud. The points made by members of the Committee were, however, well made and it was agreed that the wording of the policies would be reviewed and re submitted to the next meeting. Also, given that the Committee had not had sight of the Codes of Conduct, these would also be submitted to the next meeting so that members could see the correlation and interrelationship between all policies
- Arising out of the above, there was a discussion of the requirements of the procedure for the declaration by staff and Elected Members of gifts and hospitality
- There was a discussion of the action which could be taken against both an Elected Member and officers who through their actions in their 'non work' life, brought the Authority into disrepute
- Reference was made to training. It was noted that anti-fraud awareness training had not yet been made mandatory but the Service was looking to include this as part of a wider suite of awareness training. Arising out of the discussion, it was reported that a log of all online training undertaken

**RESOLVED** that the report and draft policies be received and amended as indicated and that they be submitted to the next meeting together with copies of the Employee and Elected Member Codes of Conduct

#### **47. EXTERNAL AUDIT - ANNUAL REPORT ON GRANTS AND RETURNS 2015/16**

The Committee received a report of the External Auditor summarising the work undertaken on the Council's 2015/16 grant claims and returns including the work completed under the Public Sector Audit appointment certification arrangements, on the work undertaken on other grants/returns under separate engagement terms, detailing the certification work on the Housing Subsidy Benefit claim and outlining the fees for undertaking this work.

Mr M Moore, representing the External Auditor, commented that the only qualification had been in relation to the Housing Subsidy Benefit claim and the issues identified had been minor. No adjustments had been necessary to the other Council's grants and returns as a result of the certification work, which was the same as in previous years. In addition, it was noted that the fees were approximately half those charged in the previous year. He also asked to place on record his thanks to the Finance Team for all their help and support throughout the process.

In the ensuing discussion the following matters were highlighted:

- There was a discussion of the background to the qualification of the Housing Subsidy Benefit Claims and the reasons for it. It was noted that only 6 areas had been identified and that similar errors had not been seen in the last two years.
- It was noted that Barnsley was in no different situation to most other Authorities in relation to the qualification of Housing Subsidy Benefit Claims. Mr Moore commented that he had never issued an unqualified opinion on such claims. The Service Director Finance commented that the wording of the Statutory Instrument meant that there was little chance of getting a clean bill of health, however, the areas identified were very minor compared to the overall value of the claims

**RESOLVED** that the Annual Report on grants and returns 2015/16 be received.

#### **48. EXTERNAL AUDIT - TECHNICAL UPDATE INCORPORATING THE EXTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee received the External Audit progress report and technical update giving a high level overview of progress in the delivery of the External Auditor's responsibilities.

The planning for 2016/176 had already started and the audit plan would be submitted to the March meeting. The interim audit visit was scheduled for March and the review of the draft financial statements would commence in July.

As previously reported, the audit of the Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit Claim had been completed as had those which fell outside the PSAA regime, namely:

- The Teacher's Pension Agency Return; and
- The Pooling of Housing Capital receipts

In relation to KPMG resources details of the first edition of the @gov digital magazine were outlined which focused on Transforming government in the age of technology. In addition, a series of local government accounts workshops were to be run again for key members of the finance team and would focus on the 2016/17 closedown and the statement of accounts.

Details of the Technical Developments including the likely level of impact were outlined particularly in relation to:

- PSSA Value for Money Profiles tool
- Local Government Licensing fees – following a referral from the Supreme Court of the UK in relation to the lawfulness of licensing fees in a case involving Westminster City Council with regard to the grant or renewal of a sex establishment licence

- CIPFA publication – Understanding Local Authority Financial Statements
- National Audit Office activities
  - The publication of a report entitled – Children in need of help or protection
  - A speech made at the Institute for Government on the need for greater prioritisation in governments and the case for recognising and addressing the skills gap in the civil service particularly in digital skills

An appendix to the Report gave details of the 2016/17 deliverables together with the timing and status of those deliverables.

**RESOLVED** that the External Audit progress report, resources and technical update be noted.

#### **49. AUDIT COMMITTEE WORK PLAN 2016/17 AND 2017/18**

The Committee received a report providing the indicative work plan for the Committee for its proposed scheduled meetings for the remainder of the 2016/17 municipal year and for 2017/18.

The Director of Legal and Governance reported that at the workshop meeting held in November, 2016 there had been a discussion about the future terms of reference of this Committee. The Work Programme had anticipated that this would be a matter considered at this meeting, however, he had written to the Chair to explain why this was not currently possible. He reported that further work on this matter had been undertaken following the discussion at the workshop but it had been concluded that it would be advantageous to take account for the proposed reconfiguration of the Core Services for which he was to be the Executive Director from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2017 following his appointment by the Council.

It was the intention to bring other areas of core governance into the scope of the terms of reference of this Committee such as Information Governance, Performance Management, Workforce Development, and Health and Safety and to establish clear responsibility for reporting these into the Committee from amongst the Service Directors who would be reporting to him in the new Directorate after April. To this end, therefore, it was proposed to bring a report to the April meeting on the revised terms of reference for discussion so that a revised work plan could be developed for implementation from the new municipal year. The new terms of reference would be reported for approval at the Annual Council meeting.

In relation to the reorganisation, the Director of Legal and Governance informed the Committee that the Service Director Finance would be the Section 151 officer following the departure of the Director of Finance, Assets and IT in March and he also reported that Director of HR, Performance and Communications had left the Authority in December, 2016.

Finally, he expressed the hope that these proposed changes reflect Members aspiration for the developing role of this Committee.

**RESOLVED**

- (i) that the core work plan for 2015/16 meetings of the Audit Committee be approved and reviewed on a regular basis; and
- (ii) that the proposals of the Director of Legal and Governance for the revised Terms of Reference and the developing role of this Committee be supported.

.....  
Chair



<b>MEETING:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
<b>DATE:</b>	Tuesday, 17 January 2017
<b>TIME:</b>	2.00 pm
<b>VENUE:</b>	Council Chamber, Barnsley Town Hall

## MINUTES

### Present

Councillors Ennis (Chair), P. Birkinshaw, G. Carr, Charlesworth, Clarke, Clements, Frost, Daniel Griffin, Hampson, Hayward, W. Johnson, Lofts, Makinson, Mathers, Mitchell, Phillips, Pourali, Sheard, Tattersall, Unsworth and Wilson together with co-opted members Ms P. Gould and Mr J. Winter and

### 3 Apologies for Absence - Parent Governor Representatives

No apologies for absence were received in accordance with Regulation 7 (6) of the Parent Governor Representatives (England) Regulations 2001.

### 4 Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest.

### 5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

With reference to item (ii) relating to the Barnsley Safeguarding Children Board (BSCB) Annual Report 2015-16, the Chair advised that the case of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) occurred elsewhere and not in Barnsley. The minutes should therefore read 'The Group were advised of one case elsewhere which made the national headlines was related to a surgeon correcting a previous FGM procedure'.

The Chair also advised that the NHS consultation on proposed changes to Hyper Acute Stroke Services and Children's Surgery and Anaesthesia Services has been extended to 14 February 2017.

A Member of the committee queried how the hospitals who are proposed to deliver the Hyper Acute Stroke Services coped over the Christmas period with demand for services. The Chair confirmed once this information has been received from the hospitals, this will be forward to all Elected Members.

The minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2016 were then approved as a true and accurate record.

### 6 Support to Families in Barnsley Including the Troubled Families Programme and Changes from Children's to Family Centres

The Chair welcomed the following witnesses to the meeting, which included:

- Rachel Dickinson, Executive Director of People, BMBC

- Jayne Hellowell, Head of Commissioning, Healthier Communities, BMBC
- Margaret Libreri, Service Director, Education, Early Start and Prevention, BMBC
- Nina Sleight, Head of Early Start, Prevention and Sufficiency, BMBC
- Claire Gilmore, Early Start & Families Strategy and Service Manager, BMBC
- Councillor Jenny Platts, Cabinet Member for Communities
- Councillor Tim Cheetham, Cabinet Member, People (Achieving Potential)

Jayne Hellowell introduced the report, explaining that it is in two parts; firstly providing an update on the Troubled Families Programme (TFP), for which we need to consider its sustainability; followed by an update on our Family Centres.

Nina Sleight confirmed the change from Children's to Family Centres could be considered as largely successful and that services continue to be available on a borough wide basis. Due to the expanded age range, work has been undertaken to both engage and strengthen partnership working, in particular with schools and health practitioners. These changes support the Think Family approach. Family Centres are part of the Early Start, Prevention and Sufficiency Service within the council and this brings together other services which support children and young people and their families including the Targeted Youth Support Service including the Early Intervention and Prevention Team, Youth Offending Team and the Multi-Systemic Therapy Team. In the future the service will need to explore how the developments around early help and specialist services align with the Public Services Hub. Additionally, we have statutory local Family Centre Advisory Boards which provide Members with an opportunity to become involved in the local governance arrangements for their respective Family Centre.

Members proceeded to ask the following questions:

- i. Following the introduction in 2012 of the TFP has this led to any changes in working practices?

The committee were advised the changes have instigated better integrated working amongst different services. For example Family Centres used the funding to challenge existing systems. The TFP is a complex programme; it's not just about one caseworker working with one family, it is wrap-around support which requires a number of different organisations. The funding from the TFP has enabled the strengthening of partnerships through the work we've done.

- ii. How do you rate the relationships amongst partner organisations involved in the different services, such as the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Berneslai Homes (BH), South West Yorkshire NHS Partnership Foundation Trust (SWYPFT) etc.?

Members were advised relationships are patchy in areas. However, we have a good relationship with BH who are integrated with the Think Family approach. Our relationship with 3<sup>rd</sup> sector providers is also good; although, with the CCG there is still work to be done to align commissioning at a strategic level; however the Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) is a good forum for these discussions. Full engagement amongst all partners has not yet been achieved; there is good

engagement with the Think Family approach which we need to continue to strengthen.

- iii. After the funding ceases in 2020, how will you ensure these services continue to be delivered and a good standard of service is maintained?

The group were advised the sustainability of the programme is essential. As the funding is only for a limited period, we are currently working with services to ascertain what the implications will be when the funding ceases. To ensure sustainability, the majority of the funding has been assigned to transform services rather than set up new ones. We have currently increased capacity to make improvements so that when funding ceases the good practice will continue and be sustained.

- iv. How reliant are the Family Centres on receiving continued funding?

The committee were advised one-off funding is available through the government, for example the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has made some available in relation to domestic violence against women and girls which we have bid for. If we are successful we will use this money to transform areas for improvement such as to our systems. £15 million is available nationally; however this is not a lot across the whole country. Some bids have to be joint, for example in relation to rough sleepers funding has been awarded for 2 years across the South Yorkshire Authorities.

- v. The national evaluation of the TFP could not directly attribute whether changes made by families were as a direct result of the programme or not; in view of this, how does Barnsley compare?

Members were advised there is some merit in the criticism of the programme, as, if we are honest about the figures, it is difficult to say that we have 'turned around' a family in 6 months, even though the national TFP says this is expected. In Barnsley we need to show sustained progress and be realistic about how many families we can support, as well as monitor sustained change to ensure those families are not coming back into the system after 2 years. We want to use the funding to support the use of the Maturity Model as an audit tool to establish baselines so we can understand the progress of our families.

- vi. Are secondary schools, including academies and our colleges aware they are able to utilise the facilities provided by the Family Centres?

The group were advised one of the benefits in the transition to Family Centres is the range of early help services for families is now provided up to the age of 19 years and 25 years old if the young person has a disability. This is overseen through a borough wide multi-agency steering group which our secondary schools are a key part of, particularly as they are able to identify issues at early opportunities. Currently, a multi-agency deep dive analysis is being done to ensure delivery of services is evidence-based. The service is also going to undertake work with secondary head teachers to inform them of what support is available in relation to their work with young people and families. Stakeholders from the local community, for example from health, care, education, voluntary sector with parents/carers, come together on Family Centre Advisory Boards and look at the needs of that community, what services are being offered and what else may be needed or improved to have a

positive impact. Members can help support this work by raising awareness of early help services on offer to people in our communities and also encourage our partner agencies to engage in this work.

- vii. What happens outside in communities often affects how children behave in schools; what is done to consider this?

The committee were advised that support to families is important as behaviour in school, and engagement in education can be attributed to other issues and needs. As part of the performance framework one of the indicators that is monitored is persistent absence from school figures, as this can be an indication of engagement and a sign of whether support or intervention is working. Data and local knowledge are also utilised to consider if what is in place to support pupils is effective.

- viii. The report confirms there are four Troubled Families/Think Family Programme family support providers, are these public, private, third sector or former employee providers?

Members were advised these are all provided by the public sector and within the Council's ownership as one is from our Family Centres, another from the Youth Offending Team, another from Safer Communities and another from Berneslai Homes.

- ix. Will there be a move towards utilising both the private and third sector to administer the Think Family programme in the future?

The group were advised the Think Family Programme plan is to continue the services in place for the next few years, but also put some of the money into the Public Service Hub. Although the service funds four family support advisors there are a lot of other organisations in the community which are not mapped. In terms of Domestic Abuse services, another public sector agency delivers this, however we provide the funding, therefore we need to take the credit for this as we also obtained this funding as part of the TFP.

- x. A member of the committee advised over the potential closure of the Barnsley Churches Drop-in Project who provide help and support to troubled families in Barnsley, and whether the service was aware of this?

The committee were advised that the Churches Project is currently operated from John Street where Addaction is located. Addaction was funded to provide our needle exchange programme but this has recently been awarded to another provider. However Addaction did not bid for it, therefore will lose their funding and will no longer rent the building from the Council which they then allowed the Churches Project to use. As the building is the Council's we have a commercial interest, however we have now got confirmation that the Churches Project will lease Temperance House. This is by Sarah's Flower Shop and she does training to help people obtain employment therefore this will create additional useful links. We are not currently clear what the Churches Project are supporting as their ethos is that they don't judge, however we're currently trying to work with them so we can understand support requirements and have given some assistance to their staff.



The Chair of the committee commended the response from the service which indicates how well informed and responsive our officers are.

- x. A Member raised concerns that there had been a new manager at their local Family Centre since April 2016, however they were only scheduled to meet them in January 2017, however the manager is now leaving and therefore this creates difficulties with them engaging with the service?

The committee were advised that the service were aware of the concern when the member had raised this previously and the service promptly contacted the manager involved. Whilst the service understood the manager had contacted local members since, all concerned were sorry that this had not happened sooner. The service commented that due to the significant transitions that had taken place including streamlining previous Children's Centre Advisory Boards into Family Centre Advisory Boards there had been some delays in some areas. The service advised that it is very important to them that they support Members to be involved in their local Family Centre and would encourage their ongoing participation. The service confirmed that recruitment was underway for a new manager in the relevant centre; and apologised for the gap during the transitional period.

- xii. How many families do we expect to be a part of the TFP and what measures are in place to ensure their improvement is assured?

The group were advised that to date there have been 908 families on the programme against a target of 1196; however, the service is confident this target will be achieved. To date, 68 families have been successfully turned around, which is short of the target of 100 however we're confident this will be achieved by the end of March 2017. In relation to sustainability, we will be working with providers to review if changes have been sustained by families by reviewing them on a periodic basis so that we can re-engage with families if we need to. We have ambitious targets over the next 3 years and we are aware that for some, it will not be possible to turn them around as the problems are so complex. We plan to engage with 800 families this year, 600 the next, then 400, with outcomes being 250 turned around in the first year, then 350, then 450, with numbers accumulating to our target of 1000 TF turned around over the 5 year programme. It will take years to review the sustainability of the changes and for some families we know there will not be an end point.

In relation to Family Centres and the wider offer, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016, 5292 families have been engaged with, compared with 4,380 in quarter 4 of 2016. Some families only need a little support, whereas some families need a lot more which can be more intensive. These figures don't include the young people aged 11+ who have been engaged with as part of the offer from the Targeted Youth Support Service. Through the new model, families continue to access provision and we try to ensure this is in a timely way. For example, within three weeks of an Early Help Assessment (EHA) being started we follow up with agencies to check they have a clear plan for the family. We also have an 'outcomes star' which looks at how a family feels on a range of indicators and ensure interventions are appropriate by measuring how they feel at certain points to assess the distance they have travelled. We also audit cases to ensure the quality and timeliness of interventions which also helps us to keep an eye on long term outcomes. All this creates a rich picture in terms of service access, quality and outcomes.

- xiii. It is difficult to get volunteers to come in and engage in the Family Centre Services, as some find it boring just attending a meeting therefore how can we involve people differently?

The committee were advised that we need to focus on the involvement of volunteers as they are a key part of the service strategy and we need to encourage them to work in our communities. Some people may only want a short voice and influence on the service, whereas there are others who want to be engaged on an ongoing basis. We need to ensure that Family Centres continue to be non-stigmatised and gateway to other services including facilitation of peer-support.

The Chair reiterated this and highlighted that this is where Members can take a lead role in encouraging volunteers to participate even though this can be difficult.

- xiv. What impact have the changes (positive and negative) from Children's to Family Centres had for families in Barnsley?

Members were advised we have received anecdotal feedback from parent forums and advisory boards regarding the improvements the changes have made. By expanding the age range to cover the whole family this has strengthened the holistic support to families and avoids silos. The new model has also helped with relationship-building and has particularly strengthened our relationship with Primary Schools, helping us to make a difference across the Borough.

- xv. In relation to TF and the evaluation of Phase 1: how 'troubled' were the families; when a family is 'turned around' what does this mean; and what has been done to evaluate the impact of Phase 1?

The group were advised the service don't have the specific data to hand as it covers a number of areas but the figures can be provided to the group in relation to the outcomes and evaluation. We know that 36% of families had evidence of domestic violence; therefore we want to get meaningful data on this so we can focus on it in future and bid for government funding. The data for the first two years was in relation to payment by result; we have not yet looked at the detail of this which we will be doing, so we can identify what were the key things that made a difference.

In terms of evaluation, we plan to use the Maturity Model so we can use this for the next Phase of the programme. It has taken some time to set up the programme; however we are now in a good place to make a difference and evaluate what are the key things which have worked.

- xvi. Approximately how many troubled families are living in social and private-rented sector housing?

The committee were advised this information can be forwarded to Members.

- xvii. In relation to the TFP criteria in Appendix 1, are all family members considered as part of the plan, for example if there was an absentee parent?

Members were advised that what constitutes a family is a complex picture, therefore all would be considered. Some families may have 100 contacts therefore support can

be very complex, particularly as some people may not live in the house but play an important role in the family.

A member of the committee commented that it is important that we dispel the myth that troubled families are only seen as being endemic in social housing, as they can also be found within private sector housing.

Another committee member explained there needs to be consistency and regular attendance within the Advisory Boards; this comment was echoed by the service.

- xviii. In terms of young people at risk of entering the criminal justice system, parenting orders were being utilised; is there any evidence that the new methods are helping pre-court diversion and keeping young people out of trouble?

The committee were advised Parenting Orders are one tool available. We are exploring whether this is something we could use in the right circumstances, however we don't expect a spike in their use. We now have an early intervention team who undertake work with specific groups. Also, we provide one to one support in family centres who are able to take a holistic view of a child.

The structural transformation has enabled work to be done in a whole family way and provide age-appropriate support, such as for teenagers. Over the next few months we will review if the roles we have created are working and will amend other roles if we need to.

- xix. Historically Children's Centres have been seen as a local resource where new mums can obtain general support; are we continuing this ethos with Family Centres?

The group were advised this continues with the Family Centres and we're still subject to Ofsted regarding provision of services from pre-birth to 5 years. It is important that Family Centres are seen as a resource for all families and that it is a non-stigmatised access to services and an opportunity to build up relationships with our communities.

The Chair thanked all the witnesses for their attendance and helpful contribution and declared the public part of the meeting closed.

## **7 Exclusion of Public and Press**

RESOLVED that the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items, because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as described by the specific paragraphs of Part I, of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended as follows:-

Item Number	Type of Information Likely to be Disclosed
10	Paragraph 2

## 8 Children's Social Care Reports

Members reviewed and provided challenge to Children's Social Care performance information in relation to early help assessments, contacts, referrals, assessments, section 47 investigations, child protection, looked after children, and caseloads. Witnesses gave further information on issues raised by the report submitted in response to questions from Members.

### Action Points

1. Patient numbers for over the Christmas period for the Chesterfield Royal Hospital, Doncaster Royal Infirmary and The Royal Hallamshire Hospital, Sheffield, the proposed alternative care providers for Hyper Acute Stroke Services to be provided to all Elected Members.
2. Members to support the work of our services by raising awareness of early help services on offer to people in our communities and also encourage our partner agencies to engage in this work.
3. Members to engage with their local Family Centre by participating in the relevant Advisory Board and encouraging the engagement of volunteers.
4. Service to provide details of the Phase 1 data and work done with troubled families.
5. Service to provide data on the number of troubled families living in social and private rented sector housing.