

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SOCIAL CARE SERVICES BOARD** held at 10.00 am on 25 January 2016 at Ashcombe, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Board at its meeting on Friday, 4 March 2016.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Ramon Gray
- * Mr Ken Gulati
- * Miss Marisa Heath
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * Mr Daniel Jenkins
- Mrs Yvonna Lay
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mr Adrian Page
- * Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
- * Mrs Pauline Searle
- Ms Barbara Thomson
- Mr Chris Townsend
- * Mrs Fiona White

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Chairman of the County Council
Mr Nick Skellett CBE, Vice-Chairman of the County Council

60 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies received from Barbara Thomson. Bill Chapman substituting for Yvonna Lay. Nick Harrison substituting for Chris Townsend.

61 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: [Item 2]

The minutes of both 30/10/2015 and 25/11/2015 were agreed.

62 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

63 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

None received.

64 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]

No issues were referred.

65 SOCIAL CARE IN PRISONS [Item 6]

Witnesses:

Jo Poynter, Area Director
Caroline Hewlett, Senior Manager for Prison Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Board were advised that the in the first months of operation the new service had completed the number of assessments expected but developments in the prison sector – closure of HMP Holloway, changes to HMP Downview – could have an impact on future demand.
2. The witnesses were congratulated on the success of the service and asked about the prisoners who were under the threshold for social care. Officers explained that the issues faced by prisoners were broad – learning disabilities, physical disabilities, mental health problems, substance abuse – and they were aware of these. The Senior Manager gave the example of a man with Korsakoff's psychosis who had fallen between services as his needs had been met by the structure of prison and on release these returned, however, now social care was involved due to the existence of this new service.
3. The Board inquired about the recruitment of Support, Time and Recovery Workers (STRs). Members were advised that recruitment of staff had been a challenge nationwide. In Surrey, five had been recruited and organised into two bases: east and west.

4. The Board asked about the role of the Family, Friends and Community Support programme in helping prisoners and whether mental health needs were being met. The Senior Manager replied there was some scope for FFC as this was provided from inmate to inmate. In terms, of mental health there had been support offered for women with perinatal difficulties. There is a medical in-reach service provided by the NHS and there was a very clear boundary. On release the council has strong links with the NHS to meet the people's needs.
5. Members asked whether the council was adequately funded given the number of prisons in the county and the likelihood of people being detained here from other parts of the country. The Board were informed that the funding was allocated on the basis of prison population not residency. Although Care Act funding met the need for the current prison population, there will not be sufficient funding in 2016 to meet the needs of the increased population in Surrey resulting from the closure of HMP Holloway. Officers were working with the National Care Act Funding Team to ensure that a reallocation of money takes place.
6. The Board asked how the Officers could be sure the service was a success – what measurements have they been using? Officers reminded Members that this is a new service so their understanding is developing but they do know Surrey is in the top five nationally for the number of referrals and they have been given positive verbal feedback as part of an inspection of HMP Bronzefield. They have commissioned an evaluation of the service which is not yet due for reporting.

Recommendations:

1. The Board expressed its appreciation of the service's work in the first year of its operation.
2. The Board supports the continuation of the current model of service, for a further two years.

66 ADULT SOCIAL CARE QUALITY ASSURANCE TASK & FINISH OUTCOMES [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Helen Atkinson, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health
 Vernon Nosal, Interim Head of Quality Assurance and Strategic Safeguarding
 Rebecca Pettitt, Project Manager, Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Before this item began the Strategic Director gave a verbal update to the Board on developments within the Directorate and focused on two

areas: the staff structure and the health & social care integration agenda.

2. The Public Health directorate has been lifted and shifted into a new combined Adult Social Care and Public Health directorate. The Strategic Director has some new direct reports including the new Deputy Director of Adult Social Care who had a operational lead, the Deputy Director for Public Health, Head of Safeguarding and the Principal Social Worker. The Strategic Director would work closely with both the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Independence and Wellbeing and the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing.
3. The Strategic Director advised the Board that there was an action plan to align back office functions and work for example on contract management and intelligence. Increasingly, Adult Social Care and the Clinical Commissioning Groups were working together but the Strategic Director did not envisage savings from co-location instead this would come from demand management which relied on the continued integration agenda.
4. The Interim Head of Quality Assurance and Adults Strategic Safeguarding advised the Board that this project was requested as a result of enforcement action taken in December 2014 that closed a home in Reigate at short notice. The Task and Finish group's brief was to review current arrangements with regard to Quality Assurance in Surrey Providers already had standards to meet to keep people safe. A multi-agency task group was convened to discuss a new model. There was no national precedent for this and other Local Authorities were interested in the outcome.
5. The Care Act 2014 placed a duty on the council to understand the market. In Surrey, there are more than 650 providers, however, the quality assurance team consists of five officers and a manager so for the future a robust relationship agreement was required. It was stated that commissioners needed to develop a communications strategy to outline was good looks like for staff and families.
6. A challenge existed at a time when the council was trying to reduce costs at the same time as trying to develop a pro-active approach with providers and to develop better relationships. The Care Quality Commission inspects against a statutory framework and in the case of Merok Park it was the CQC's judgement that the home was failing.
7. In order to prevent future failings the Interim Head explained that more resource would be provided by joining up with those in contact with care providers by implementing a shared framework across the health and social care system. This would be aided by an e-brokerage

system and the location of the customer relations team under the Interim Head to make optimum use of complaints and soft intelligence.

8. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social, Independence and Wellbeing emphasised to the Board that there was a robust safeguarding already in place but that there were a lot of social care cases across the county so it was essential that all the practitioners that work with Surrey residents work together.

Recommendations:

The Board:

1. Supports the proposals as outlined in the report, concluding the task and finish group work
2. Supports the first phase of implementation and areas of further work, as outlined in the report, to be set up and managed as a new multi-agency project
3. Recommends that Officers return to the Board when they have an implementation plan for the Board to review

Actions/further information to be provided:

Strategic Director to provide the new staff structure of Adult Social Care and Public Health to the Board.

67 THE SURREY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMME [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Yvonne Rees, Strategic Director for Customers and Communities
Sean Rafferty, Head of Family Services
Kim Rippet, Head of Housing Advice Services, Guildford Borough Council
Helen Dowlatshahi, Family Support Team Manager, Guildford Borough Council

Clare Curran, Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing
Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families Wellbeing

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Head of Family Services advised the Board that the Family Support Programme (FSP) in Surrey was now four years old, the approach was originally piloted in south west Surrey and then superseded by the national Troubled Families Programme. The FSP in Surrey meets the aims of the national programme. At its core the

programme worked with families that had multiple needs across a number of agencies. The delivery of help was very local, delivered by District and Borough Councils alongside other local public partners. The Surrey programme was one of the highest performing programmes in the country.

2. The Head of Housing Advice at Guildford Borough Council explained to the Board that the programme was not initially thought as being a natural fit with the structure of Surrey's District and Borough Councils but it was aligned with their roles in the community. The different borough and districts councils have placed the project in varied places in their organisations. In Guildford Borough Council the Programme is delivered from within the Housing Advice Service. Over the period they had been involved in the delivery of the FSP the councils had gone from having reservations at the very beginning to being advocates of the programme. They had built new relationships with Guildford schools and that this was the fundamental basis of the work: multi-agency partnership work.
3. The Board noted that the Government estimated the cost of a 'troubled family' to statutory services as being around £75,000. To this end, the Board questioned what savings had been made in Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing advised that the Head of Family Services was working with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on the evaluation of the programme and the actual saving realised by agencies. The Head of Family Services stated that the first phase of the programme made savings for central government through reduced welfare payments and that for local Surrey agencies whilst there will have been financial efficiencies the savings were smaller; spread across numerous public sector bodies and not always readily costed.
4. Board Members stated that the programme needed to have long-term aims and highlighted the reduction of payments from central government in the coming years. Officers were asked what the shortfall meant for Surrey. The Head of Family Services responded that the £1.3m per annum the County Council was due to receive, subject to performance, was adequate to provide continued funding to the existing six intensive support teams. Representatives from Guildford Borough Council did remark though, that they had seen an impact on the prevention of homelessness in their area but they reiterated that all the District and Borough Councils had made a financial commitment to the programme.
5. The issue of people with mental health and, in particular, women with perinatal difficulties was raised and the Board inquired how many people the Family Support Programme worked with that had these conditions. The Head of Family Support advised that 60% of the

families reported individuals with mental health problems and would provide data on perinatal cases. The service monitored the long-term outcomes of the families they work with and the benefits to the communities they lived in with the ultimate aim being to empower families to improve their lives themselves so that they do not need future interventions from the Council or its partners.

6. The Board acknowledged the work done by the FSP but expressed concern over its future especially with reduced government funding. The Head of Family Services reassured the Board that Government funding was committed to deliver the programme until 2020 and that the team would continue to work with Districts and Boroughs for as long as necessary, however, the ambition was for the programme to become business as usual. Additionally, the Cabinet Member felt that the positivity of the model would underpin the improvement plan in place for the Children, Schools and Families Directorate and the ongoing transformation of how local government provides services for its residents.

Recommendations:

1. The Board notes:
 - the success of this multi-agency and preventative approach in achieving the first phase of the Family Support Programme; and
 - the significant contribution the Family Support Programme can play as part of the emerging Preventative and Early Help Strategy and other preventative initiatives across the Council and with Surrey partners.
2. The Board requests further information, following the DCLG's national evaluation of the Troubled Families Programme, regarding the various savings made by the agencies involved in the Surrey Family Support Programme
3. The Board expresses concern regarding the proposed per capita Government funding of the programme and asks that the Cabinet take up this point to ensure the continuance of the programme beyond 2020.

68 SURREY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD (SSCB) ANNUAL REPORT [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Elaine Coleridge - Smith, Surrey Safeguarding Children Board Independent Chair

Julian Gordon-Walker, Head of Safeguarding

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Independent Chair outlined the structure of the Safeguarding Board, reflected that the size of the Board was appropriate and that in 2015 the Board had sub-groups with specific responsibilities. The Safeguarding Board were looking at introducing similar groups to cover neglect and section sexual exploitation.
2. The Independent Chair highlighted the context that the Safeguarding Board must address in 2016 including child exploitation and neglect as well as checking safeguarding legislation and guidance for child protection was in place. The Independent Chair also noted that they must increase consistency of outcomes in social care in the wake of Ofsted's judgements.
3. The Independent Chair noted four priorities from the report; reduction of domestic violence, early help for children and families below social care's threshold, looking at current processes around child protection and to implement a strategy on child sexual exploitation. The Independent Chair also noted that the Board would step in to provide training and quality assurance to ensure children's safety.
4. The Independent Chair informed Members that the Safeguarding Board's ambition was to gain an Ofsted 'outstanding' grade and to look to develop and to be highly influential in strategic arrangements and make sure improvements were sustained and to provide effective challenge of partners at board meetings. The Independent Chair noted that they were intent on improving training and communicating good practice from the board level to the front line.
5. Members noted that the home educated children annual assessment was not comprehensive and asked what the annual visit covered. The Head of Safeguarding commented that the legislation that covered home education did limit the powers of officers and they would raise this issue to central government. The Head of Safeguarding also noted the difficulty of safeguarding children who were being educated by their parents in their own home.
6. A Board member asked what would happen to children who had come to live in Surrey from outside the United Kingdom. The Independent Chair informed Members that work was underway to revise the Board's website to improve accessibility for schools.

They also want to provide more training for school governors but had found some schools were more difficult to reach than others.

7. A Board member commented that the annual report was out-of-date by the time it reached Members, however, thanked the witnesses for additional verbal information. The Independent Chair informed the Board that the annual report was a requirement but suggested that a further update in six months to report progress on priorities would be useful.
8. A Board member asked what the Safeguarding Board were doing in relation to radicalisation in which the Independent Chair responded that they were doing all they can to communicate with schools and parents regarding the risk of radicalisation and that they provide training to spot the signs and to combat radicalisation. The Independent Chair noted that they were monitoring the situation but reiterated that they can provide guidance and training to boost awareness but cannot force schools to take certain actions in regard to radicalisation. Further to that, the Head of Safeguarding informed the Board that they would look into the issue with a view to delivering effective training.

Recommendations:

1. The Board thanks the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board for presenting its annual report but expresses concern about the lack of local oversight of children who are home educated.
2. The Board recommends that a verbal update is provided by the Independent Chair on the Safeguarding Board's activity in six months time.

69 CHILDREN'S QUALITY ASSURANCE [Item 10]

Witnesses:

Julian Gordon-Walker, Head of Safeguarding

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Head of Safeguarding advised the Board that the work undertaken on quality assurance stemmed from the Improvement Plan produced in response to inspection of children's services. Since then the ambition has been to broaden the work on quality assurance across the Children, Schools and Families directorate to make activity more integrated.

2. The Board were advised that the next steps for the review of quality assurance were to meet the actions of the Improvement Plan and produce a revised quality assurance framework. Members agreed that it would be beneficial to consider this framework alongside an update from the Safeguarding Board.

Recommendations:

1. Schedule for scrutiny in six months alongside the update from the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board

70 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 11]

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Vice-Chairman reported to Members of the Board that following the 9 December 2015 call-in meeting she had visited Sight for Surrey to check on plans for the implementation of the Combined Sensory Service.
2. The Vice-Chairman confirmed that twelve members of staff from First Point had TUPE transferred to Sight for Surrey and that the speculation about the future delivery of services had quietened down following the discussion at the call-in meeting. Staff would all be working from one building which was due for refurbishment.
3. It was agreed that the Vice-Chairman would return for a further meeting in a few months time and would report back to the Board with her findings.
4. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing suggested that the Board bring forward its next review of the Ofsted Improvement Plan. It was agreed to consider this at the 4 March meeting of the Board.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. Improvement Plan update item to be added to Forward Work Plan.
2. Vice Chairman to update the Board on Sight for Surrey's delivery of the combined sensory services contract as appropriate.

71 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The next meeting of the Board will be held at 10am on 4 March 2015

Meeting ended at: 13:36

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank