

MINUTES of the meeting of the **CHILDREN & EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 19 September 2013 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 28 November 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mrs Liz Bowes
- * Mr Ben Carasco
- * Mr Robert Evans
- * Mr Denis Fuller (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Goodman
- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff (Chairman)
- * Mr Ken Gulati
- A Mr Colin Kemp
- * Mrs Stella Lallement
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- * Mrs Marsha Moseley
- * Mr Chris Townsend

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Vice Chairman of the County Council
Mr David Munro, Chairman of the County Council

Co-opted Members:

- * Cecile White, Parent Governor Representative
- A Duncan Hewson, Parent Governor Representative
- * Derek Holbird, Diocesan Representative for the Anglican Church
- A Mary Reynolds, Diocesan Representative for the Catholic Church

Substitute Members:

Mrs Margaret Hicks, Substitute for Mr Colin Kemp
Marie Ryan, Substitute for Mary Reynolds

In attendance

Mary Angell (Cabinet Member for Children and Families)
Clare Curran (Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Learning)
Linda Kemeny (Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning)

10/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Colin Kemp, Duncan Hewson and Mary Reynolds. Margaret Hicks acted as a substitute for Colin Kemp and Marie Ryan acted as a substitute for Mary Reynolds.

11/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 31 JULY 2013 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting on 31 July 2013 were agreed as a true record of the meeting with the following amendments:

- On page 1 of the minutes Marie Ryan acted as a substitute for Mary Reynolds rather than Derek Holbird, as stated.
- Item 4/13 paragraph 5 should state the under-spend being queried for 2012/2013 rather than 2013/2013.

12/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

13/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

14/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

There were no responses from the Cabinet to report. The Committee was informed that it would receive a response to its previous recommendation to Cabinet concerning Education, Health & Care Plans at its next meeting.

15/13 CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION [Item 6]

The Chairman explained to the Committee that the aim of the meeting was to look at Early Help and Prevention in Surrey, and that there were three reports to consider on this topic. The first report gave the Committee an opportunity to consider the County's overall approach to Early Help, while the second report on the Surrey Family Support Programme enabled Members to see an example of Early Help in practice. Finally, a report from Public Health explained how the department supported the early help and prevention programme.

16/13 EARLY HELP OFFER - REDUCING THE NEED FOR FAMILIES TO ACCESS HIGH SUPPORT SERVICES [Item 7]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

- Caroline Budden, Deputy Director for Children, Schools and Families, Surrey County Council

- Jon Savell, Detective Superintendent, Head of Public Protection, Surrey Police

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. It was important to identify all the partners involved in the Early Help agenda, as it would assist in making the final strategy more effective in recognising families in need of support and referring them to the right services for assistance.
2. The Deputy Director for Children, Schools and Families felt that the challenge would be to agree governance arrangements and to encourage staff to act differently. It was hoped the governance of the scheme would be agreed before the end of the year.
3. Partners, under the Early Help offer, would work towards a single assessment which would be called the “Early Help Assessment”, or similar, as agreed through engagement with partners. The processes for this assessment had been agreed by all partners, but needed to be ratified by the Safeguarding Board.
4. The Deputy Director stated that the demand for acute services had grown, but that the eventual strategy would aim to work with individuals before their problems became entrenched and they required acute support. The County Council would continue to provide statutory services but would now have a partnership strategy to recognise issues earlier. It was felt that the more joined up approach by partners would create a more effective and proactive service within the budgets currently available and would be supported by the Family Support Programme.
5. The Committee queried how the new Early Help Assessment differed from the Common Assessment Framework (CAF). They were informed that the new assessment was built upon and similar to the CAF but had been formed in conjunction with agencies rather than it being imposed on them, and this would lead to a greater sense of ownership. Additionally, the assessment would involve the views of the family, including the child.
6. Members queried where the clear offer, measurements and commitment from partners and County Council was stated, as these things had been recommended by OFSTED in their 2012 report. The Deputy Director stated that the submitted report was not the final strategy and that the action plan would state the clear measurements for the Council and partners. There was no prescriptive approach to Early Help or a complete list of agencies involved as the strategy was about tailoring services to the specific and varying needs of residents.
7. The Committee queried how the Early Help approach fitted in with the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner’s policy of Zero Tolerance and how the Police intended to approach the apparent ‘revolving door’ once young people entered the criminal justice system. It was explained by the Detective Superintendent that Zero Tolerance was more about Police Officers actively challenging bad behaviour rather than ‘locking people up and throwing away the key’. Police were

frustrated by the revolving door and would support any policy which would assist in ending it. The Police, it was stated, came into contact with families which were dysfunctional and early help was required to ensure their behaviour did not develop. The Police believed that working together would make the programme more effective.

8. Members queried who should be contacted if a member of the public had a concern about the welfare of a child or family. Working together would ensure the agencies who were best placed to act upon concerns were informed. Officers wanted the public to continue reporting concerns and with a new central hub – the Central Referral Unit, based in Guildford – decisions could be made together between the County Council and Police. It was hoped that a larger central unit would be created in the future with more partners based there.
9. It was stated that there was a commitment to have a Lead Professional for each case which would be decided upon once the assessment had been completed. However, responsibility and accountability would fall to all those involved.
10. Members felt that there needed to be clearer guidance on which organisation to call if a member of the public had a concern. Officers felt that there was a lot of publicity on who to contact nationally, but would consider whether further publicity campaigns could be of benefit.
11. Members raised concerns regarding the number of reviews which had taken place nationally which suggested a great need for pooling information from different agencies. Officers agreed that previously work completed by agencies had been very fragmented, but felt that the new strategy would be a step towards tackling this issue as there would be a greater commitment to work together. The Central Referral Unit in the future would be developed into a Safeguarding Hub and would overcome this criticism as partner organisations would be based in the same office sharing information.

Recommendations:

1. That once available, the Committee receives the formal Early Help Commissioning Strategy and Action Plan.
2. In development of the Strategy, officers give consideration as to how partner contribution and commitment can be encouraged and tracked.
3. That officers also give consideration to how the intended overarching partnership outcomes will be agreed and measured with the intention that the Select Committee will revisit the progress once the formal Strategy is in place.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

The Committee to assess the overarching partnership outcomes once the Strategy is in place.

17/13 THE SURREY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMME AND TRANSFORMING PUBLIC SERVICES [Item 8]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

- Sean Rafferty, Head of Family Services, Surrey County Council
- Caroline Budden, Deputy Director for Children, Schools and Families, Surrey County Council
- Philip Bell, Woking Family Support Team Manager
- Mary Angell, Cabinet Member for Children and Families
- Clare Curran, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Learning

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee were informed that the Family Support Programme concentrated on families in Surrey with complex problems and who had a variety of agencies involved in assisting them. The Programme aimed to create a more streamlined process by ensuring that agencies worked together, with the Boroughs and Districts coordinating the process.
2. The Programme was part the Government's Troubled Families initiative which aimed to turn around 1,050 troubled families in Surrey by 2015. This would be achieved with the provision of intensive support to the family for 4 to 5 hours per week for 12 weeks and the interagency Team Around the Family for up to 12 months.
3. Six Boroughs and Districts had implemented the Programme, with 358 families already participating. It was planned to be rolled out countywide from October 2013.
4. The Committee was informed that the Family Support Programme was a transformation programme which looked closely at the cost of supporting a family, with the national average currently costing around £75,000. It was felt that by working closely with families this could be lowered.
5. It was felt by the Head of Family Services that the Programme should be expanded in the future to families that did not fit the Government definition of a troubled family, so as to ensure the benefit of the Programme was wider reaching.
6. Members were concerned about the effect of the Programme on statutory services for children. The Committee was informed that although there was no new money for this initiative, the Programme

would make more efficient use of resources already being utilised. Furthermore, the Programme worked with families which agencies were already in contact with, assisting them to make savings and beneficial lifestyle changes.

7. Members raised concern that many of the behaviours of these families were embedded and that 12 weeks support would not be sufficient. The Woking Family Support Team Manager explained the process of the Family Support Programme to the Committee and stressed that the agencies worked with the family to create an action plan and that the multi-agency support continued after the 12 weeks intensive support was complete.
8. The Committee queried what happened to those who refused to be part of the Programme and were informed by officers that it was a voluntary system but the door was always open should they change their mind later and that families would not lose the support they already received.
9. Members queried whether there were specific geographical areas where there were a higher number of families requiring support, and if there was whether any specific work should be done in these localities. Officers agreed that it was important to work with specific local communities, as most families within the Programme lived in distinct areas, most of which were urban.
10. The Committee requested to know if and when savings from the Programme would be realised. Officers informed the Committee that a cost benefit analysis was being developed, for example in Woking a sample of families were having their costs assessed every 12 weeks.
11. The Committee was assured that the Family Support Programme would not duplicate work already being conducted by the Council, rather it was ensuring the multi-agency approach was more effective by moving away from the more universal approach which was previously followed. Furthermore, there was no diversion of social workers from Child Protection.
12. The Committee was presented with a case study of a family within the Programme and queried how the programme had made an improvement for the family and community. Officers stated that the family in question was at risk of being made homeless which would have caused further issues with re-homing. Officers expressed the view that the Programme was effective in stopping this escalation and turning the family around, therefore benefiting both the family and community.
13. The Committee thanked the officers for a clear report and presentation.

Recommendations:

1. That the Family Support Programme model be used to inform the development of the Early Help and Commissioning Strategy.

2. That officers consider how best to monitor savings achieved by the Family Support Programme and ensure that this information is received by the Select Committee once available.
3. The Committee notes that they have received assurances that resources will not be diverted from statutory services to support the Programme.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

18/13 PUBLIC HEALTH, EARLY HELP AND THE SUPPORTING FAMILIES PROGRAMME [Item 9]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

- Helen Atkinson, Acting Director of Public Health, Surrey County Council
- Kelly Morris, Public Health Principal, Surrey County Council
- Caroline Budden, Deputy Director for Children, Schools and Families, Surrey County Council
- Mary Angell, Cabinet Member for Children and Families
- Michael Gosling, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Acting Director for Public Health explained that the Public Health Team had moved from the NHS to Surrey County Council in April 2013 and were in the process of meeting colleagues from across the Council and seeing where Public Health delivery could link in and support projects such as the Early Help and Prevention programme. She explained that Public Health had three main functions: health improvement, health protection and improving health and social care services, and that their focus was on improving and protecting the health of Surrey residents through both universal schemes and targeted approaches to reduce health inequalities.
2. The Committee were informed that the Public Health Outcomes Framework was used as a performance tool to hold the Public Health function to account, and that the overarching target was to reduce the life expectancy differences across Surrey. The team were concentrating on the mandatory services which transferred with them, which included substance misuse, alcohol, and drugs, and this was a universal approach. Additionally, there was the targeted approach

through the Supporting Families Programme, and a proposal for staff to be trained to identify the best time to discuss health issues with the families.

3. It was important for Public Health to work with the Family Support Programme as they already had contact with hard to reach families. It was also important for the success of Public Health for them to achieve a targeted approach early so as to ensure long term health benefits.
4. The work of School Nurses was discussed by the Committee, and it was explained their work was both universal and targeted, in that they assessed all children in schools but offered targeted support when there was an identified need.
5. The Committee discussed the issue of behaviour change as it was felt there was enough information available which informed the public of the health risks of smoking, drinking alcohol, not exercising etc. The Acting Director of Public Health agreed there was an abundance of information on healthy living, but that targeted programmes which worked with families were important as it gave people the support they required to make behaviour changes. She went on to explain that the information available was having an effect as there had been an increase in the number of mothers breastfeeding and having their children immunised, in addition to a drop in the number of people smoking.
6. Public Health had begun collaborating with teams across the County Council, with a small team working with the Early Help programme, as it was felt there would be a long term health benefit and they were working towards the same aim – assisting people before there was a crisis. The Public Health team would ensure, when contracts were being re-procured, that the new contracts would deliver the key aims of the Early Help Programme.
7. The Acting Director explained that decreasing the number of people who smoked was multi-stranded, with both education, regulation and legislation playing a part. It was important to recognise that young people experimented with risk taking behaviour but there needed to be enough deterrents such as restraints on the sale of cigarettes to young people. Additionally, it was stated that there was the universal offer of the Stop Smoking service across Surrey which was monitored closely and payment was by results.
8. The Committee were informed that Surrey had the fourth lowest rate for teenage pregnancy in the country, with around 22.5 young people per 1,000 per year. The evidence showed that there was a higher probability of teen pregnancy if parents had themselves been teenage parents. Additionally self esteem was a contributor which linked with other youth services across Surrey. Finally access to contraception was often an issue, and so the Public Health team were working with the Children, Schools and Families directorate to ensure contraception was readily accessible.

9. The Acting Director explained that currently Public Health commissions school nursing services for 5 to 19 year olds. However, from 2015 they would also be commissioning health-visitor services for 0 to 5 year olds.
10. It was important to evaluate the health outcomes of the work with the Family Support Programme to ensure long term health benefits were being realised. The Head of Family Services stated that they were unclear of the health outcomes of the Family Support Programme at the present time, but were in the process of starting to evaluate the long-term health outcomes.

Recommendations:

1. That the Public Health team ensures all commissioned services have a universal and targeted element.
2. That the Public Health team designs a support programme for the Early Help system which mirrors the core offer being developed for the Family Support Programme.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

**19/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME
[Item 10]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman explained an updated version of the Forward Work Programme had been circulated to Members at the meeting, along with copies of outstanding recommendations from the now decommissioned Education Select Committee and the Children & Families Select Committee. Members were informed that the vast majority of outstanding recommendations from these Committees had been incorporated into the Children & Education Select Committee Forward Work Programme.
2. Members of the Committee and the Cabinet Member for Schools & Learning requested that the workshop on School Place Planning be rearranged as many could not attend a meeting on 2 October 2013. The Chairman requested officers look into finding an alternative date for this session.

3. The Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Learning suggested the Committee may wish to look at budget monitoring more in the future.
4. Officers explained that they were in discussion with the Head of Commissioning and Development on how the Committee could pursue a piece of work on improving careers information, advice and guidance, as recommended at the last meeting. Members would be updated once more information was known.
5. The Committee discussed organising a Member Reference Group to contribute in the development of Surrey's strategy for improving the outcomes for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and young people.

Recommendations:

None.

Action/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

1. The Committee set up a Member Reference Group to contribute to the development of a strategy to improve outcomes for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and young people in Surrey. The membership of this Member Reference Group would be as follows:
 - Robert Evans
 - Mike Goodman
 - Zully Grant-Duff
2. The Committee would continue to review its Forward Work Programme at each meeting.

20/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The Committee noted that the next meeting of the Children & Education Select Committee would be on 28 November 2013 at 10am. Members were reminded that there would be a private pre-meeting beginning at 9.30am.

Meeting ended at: 1pm

Chairman