Safer Rotherham Partnership (SRP) Board
Monday 05 February 2018 at 3.00pm
Meeting Room 2, Wing B – 4th Floor, Riverside House

Present

Cllr Emma Hoddinott (Chair) RMBC Cabinet – Lead Member for Community Safety
Cllr Alan Atkin South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority
Carol Adamson RMBC Community Safety Officer
Sally Adegbembo Head of Probation for National Probation Service in Doncaster and Rotherham
Sam Barstow RMBC Head of Service, Community Safety, Resilience and Emergency Planning
Helena Bland (Minutes) RMBC Community Safety/Anti-Social Behaviour Unit
Supt Stephen Chapman South Yorkshire Police
Malc Chiddey RMBC Public Health Specialist
Amanda Cullen Director, South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company
Andy Fyfe Rotherham South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Samantha Housley Operations Manager, Victim Support South Yorkshire
Shafiq Hussain Director of Partnerships, Services and Programmes, Voluntary Action Rotherham
Sandie Keene Independent Chair for Rotherham’s Safeguarding Adult’s Board
David McWilliams RMBC Assistant Director, Early Help and Children’s Services
Linda Mayhew Business Manager, South Yorkshire Criminal Justice Board
Ruth Nutbrown Assistant Chief Officer, NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Garry Parvin RMBC Joint Head of Learning Disability and Autism Commissioning
Richard Smith RMBC Interim Assistant Director for Adult Services

Apologies

Steve Adams Group Manager for Rotherham South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
Chris Edwards Chief Officer, NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Leigh Garbett National Community Manager for FORTEM
Sharon Kemp RMBC Chief Executive
Commissioner Mary Ney RMBC
Ch Supt Rob O’Dell South Yorkshire Police
Steve Parry RMBC Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour and SRP Manager
Terri Roche RMBC Director, Public Health
Ian Thomas RMBC Strategic Director, Children and Young People’s Services
Damien Wilson RMBC Strategic Director, Regeneration and Environment Services
Cheryl Wynn Partnership and Project Officer, Office of Police and Crime Commissioner

1. Introductions and Apologies

1.1 Introductions were made around the table and apologies noted as detailed above

2. Members Declaration of Interest

2.1 There were no declarations of interest
3. Local Safeguarding Adult Board presentation

3.1 A copy of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Adult Board (LSAB) Annual Report 2016 -2017 had been circulated prior to the meeting on behalf of Sandie Keene, Independent Chair of the LSAB.

3.2 Sandie had been invited to today’s meeting as part of the protocol agreement made between the Boards who have the responsibilities of safeguarding in Rotherham.

3.3 A small presentation was given and covered the Safeguarding Board achievements 2016 -17, the common themes and work for the future. It was explained the report circulated refers to 2016 – 2017 and had been reviewed and refreshed after the Care Act 2014 with a view to have all partners working together. A partner self-assessment and challenge had also taken place with partners. This led to every agency completing documentation and developing an action plan of what came out of the audit. A performance management framework was put in place along with a number of sub groups. It was noted that in 2016 - 2017 there were 2456 concerns raised in relation to safeguarding matters. The training plan, strategy and membership have all been refreshed.

The following priorities are currently being worked on by the LSAB and are of relevance to the work of SRP:

- Case file audits/quality assurance
- Multiagency training approaches
- Practice issues (self-neglect, trafficking/modern day slavery, Deprivation of Liberties, - all ages, Mental Capacity Act consistency)
- Assurance (safeguarding and learning disability, Safeguarding Adults Review (SAR) action plans and dissemination, advocacy take up)
- Campaigns (safeguarding is everyone’s business, Legal Power of Attorney)
- Development (joint work with Community Safety and Children’s Boards)

3.4 Comments were invited. The following points were of note:

- Making Safeguarding Personal is about asking people their views. For those who do not have the capacity to voice their views/satisfaction there is a process put in place under the Care Act. At the end of the process there is a questionnaire.
- Referrals are made via the front door process through the Council’s safeguarding team. Some issues have been raised around the threshold. Under the Care Act a 3 point test is carried out. Working is taking place with the Vulnerable Peoples Unit to make sure people don’t slip through the net.

3.5 The Board were informed a Domestic Abuse Peer Review for Rotherham took place on 25 January 2018. Bradford Council carried out the 1 day review and consisted of 4 teams including the support of the association of the Director Children’s services. A range of staff and service users were interviewed. Overall feedback was positive including that of the Domestic Abuse strategy (which is owned by this Board) although the action plan may benefit from being stripped back to focus on key issues. Issues highlighted by the Partnership were around training, use of data, pathways of medium and standard risk victims. Bradford Council did acknowledge these gaps exist and a suggestion was made that these be the key areas of focus within the action plan. The process and linkages between the Multi Agency Domestic Abuse (MADA) meeting and Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) were additional areas which required some work. Credit was given to the strategic protocol between the 3 Boards which Bradford are looking to replicate. The full report from Bradford Council is expected back by mid-February when it will be presented to the Domestic Abuse...
Priority group for review and any amendments if required; the report will then be brought to this Board

Agreed: That the information

4. Minutes of the SRP Board meeting held on 04 December 2017

4.1 The minutes of the SRP Board meeting held on 04 December 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings

5. Matters arising from SRP Board meeting held on 04 December 2017

5.1 Please refer to action schedule

6. Appropriate Adults update

6.1 A briefing paper on the Appropriate Adult service offer in Rotherham had been circulated to Board members prior to the meeting on behalf of Garry Parvin, RMBC Joint Head of Learning Disability and Autism Commissioning and contained the following recommendation:

- The SRP Board note the report

6.2. The paper outlined the current arrangements in Rotherham and options to be considered for future funding/commissioning; RMBC Adult Care was tasked with taking this forward, with RMBC accepting lead responsibility. Historically the Appropriate Adult service offer in Rotherham has been financed by the Partnership; this is due to cease on 31 March 2018. Assurance was given to the Board that in terms of the budget of the Appropriate Adult service from 01 April 2018 this will be supported by RMBC Adult Care and Children and Young People services; Service Level Agreements are being reviewed in line with National standards

Agreed: 1) That the information is noted
2) From 01 April 2018 RMBC Adult Care and Children and Young People services are taking responsibility of the Appropriate Adult provision for Rotherham

7. Prevent Self-Assessment

7.1 A report on Prevent progress and self-assessment had been circulated to Board members prior to the meeting on behalf of Carol Adamson, RMBC Community Safety Officer and contained the following recommendations:

That the Board
- Notes the outcomes of the Prevent self-assessment
- Refers this update report to the Rotherham Safeguarding Adults Board and Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board
- Receives a progress report in August 2018

7.2 The progress/self-assessment report had been at the request of the Board following a presentation of Rotherham’s Prevent Plan at August 2017 Board meeting. The self-assessment criteria had been provided by the Home Office and is based on the legal prevent duty

7.3 Carol took Board members through the following key achievements:

- Governance structures are well established under the SRP Board. There is a well-attended partnership Prevent Silver group. Meetings have been reviewed and established with regular
meetings taking place over the last 12 months. Training and case studies have been part of the meetings
• Prevent Plans have been in place for 2 years
• Chanel Panel meetings have been established on a monthly basis

7.4 There are still some areas for development and concerns in terms of the number of referrals raised from Rotherham which the Police have reported as being lower than expected. A task and finish group has reviewed the referral pathways for adults and children to make sure they are fit for purpose. Partners are continuing to deliver Prevent training. Police have reported that the referrals for the most recent quarter have risen to expected levels. Data is being requested in order to review and analyse

7.5 There is a gap in community and voluntary sector engagement but with the recent appointment of a community engagement co-ordinator post contact has been made with fifty one community groups on the counter-extremism agenda

7.6 It was highlighted Prevent was not included as part of the recent safeguarding training for elected members

Agreed: 1) That the information is noted
2) That approval is given by the Board to the recommendations as detailed above
3) Action: Carol Adamson to ensure that future elected member safeguarding training includes Prevent
4) Action: Carol Adamson to escalate the Prevent report to Local Safeguarding Children’s Board and Local Safeguarding Adults Board

8. Multi-Agency Review

8.1 A report on the Multi-Agency meeting structure had been circulated to Board members at short notice on behalf of Sam Barstow, RMBC Head of Service, Community Safety, Resilience and Emergency Planning and contained the following recommendations:

That
• The SRP Board approve the proposed multi-agency meeting structure
• The SRP Board seeks to review the structure at an appropriate interval, either 6 or 12 months

8.2 Members were informed the paper takes in to account a review of the Case Identification Meetings (CIMs) process which sits under the structure of the SRP. There are 2 key pieces of work being carried out under the CIMs, these are cases (identified individuals who cause problems in the community) and neighbourhood issues/functions (general concerns). It was also identified that the CIMs are covering a wide range of work from a local/ward level as well as broader areas. A range of agencies officers including Elected members were invited to 2 separate workshops where the need of what is required was captured and final proposals developed; the result of this has led to the changes detailed in the report. Board members were taken through the revised multi-agency meeting structure

8.3 It was acknowledged this had been a difficult process, especially for elected members as it removes some of the access to cases to comply with new and existing data protection legislation

8.4 Comments/feedback was invited and the following points noted:

• Clarity on reporting into the system – every case reported, if it meets the new shared definition then it will fall into a risk assessment process and will be dealt with under the area based tasking and escalated
- Missing partners ie health - it has been identified that currently there is no data provided to support demanding enhanced engagement but that this would be developed as the new systems are implemented
- Referral process and thresholds for agencies to access
- Being clear on whether measures are reactive or pro-active

8.5 Reference was made to current work taking place in the Eastwood area which has been based on the new principle of co-located teams sharing information and tasking; benefits are being seen from this way of working

8.6 The Chair stated that on behalf of elected members at present approval could not be given to the proposed structure. There were still concerns that required addressing around the Elected member input not being strong enough at the community action level and a challenge around the level of Policing being too low. It was requested that further work be carried to address the points highlighted today

Agreed: 1) That the information is noted
2) Action: Sam Barstow to address the points highlighted around missing partner agencies and to re-engage with elected members on their concerns/requirement

9. Youth Offending Team Management Board report

9.1 The Youth Offending Team (YOT) report had been circulated on behalf of Paul Grimwood, RMBC YOT Manager and contained the following recommendation:

That
- The Partnership note the contents of the report

9.2 In respect of the 3 National performance indicators (first time entrants, use of custody rate and re-offending rates after 12 months) Rotherham’s performance is better than the regional and national level. Before Christmas Rotherham were shown to be the 3rd highest performing YOT in the Country. This was partly due to a change in working methods with South Yorkshire Police which had led to a significant reduction in the number of first time entrants

9.3 In relation to adult re-offending it was noted that Rotherham has a disproportionate (higher percentage) of women re-offending compared to other areas. A recent ‘deep-dive’ into youth re-offending also highlighted the trend of young women and included women of Black and Minority Ethnic. Further analysis around this is to take place and will be presented at YOT away day; an update to be given at the next Board meeting in April 2018

Agreed: 1) That the information is noted
2) Action: David McWilliams to provide an update from the YOT away day for April’s Board meeting and to include additional analysis around young women offenders

10. Priority Setting Proposals

10.1 A report to confirm the proposals for the format of the 2018/19 priority setting process for the SRP had been circulated to Board members on behalf of Sam Barstow, RMBC Head of Service, Community Safety, Resilience and Emergency Planning and contained the following recommendations:

That
- SRP agrees the proposed process to identify in the region of ten potential priorities
- Organisation within the Board agree to commit a senior officer to assist members in understanding potential priority areas (temporary theme lead role)
• SRP Board agrees the format of the priority setting workshop

10.2 The priority setting workshop is one of the actions from October 2017 Board meeting as of the Partnership re-structure and how the priorities will be set. As part of the process more data has been obtained by using a broader range partners. The aim of the full day workshop (on Monday 05 March 2018) will be to narrow down from a potential list of twelve to five/six priorities

Agreed: 1) That the information is noted
2) That approval is given by the Board to the recommendations as detailed above

11. Domestic Abuse Peer Review update

11.1 Update on the Domestic Abuse Peer Review covered under agenda item 3

Agreed: That the information is noted

12. Performance

➢ Performance update

12.1 There was no performance update for today’s meeting; this was due to a new Police connect recording system being put into place. At present there is a problem with the retrieval of data and in the way data is being recorded. The ability to not receive data reports (since December 2017) is now causing a number of problems for the Council and partners

12.2 Members were informed that it had taken 6 months to obtain any relevant data when the new system was placed within the Humberside Force. The system in Rotherham is progressing slowly

12.3 Supt Chapman provided the Board with the following performance points of note:

• For victims the overall satisfaction rate had increased Force wide. In respect of the hate crime satisfaction rate for Rotherham this had previously been reported at 73%. After an improvement plan was put in place in the last quarter this increased to 94%. This means 18 out 19 hate crime victims were fairly/completely satisfied with the service received
• In Rotherham crimes per 1000 of the population are less than the Force average. From the 10 crime types 3 are higher than the Force average (sexual offences, commercial burglary and other theft)

Agreed: 1) That the information is noted
2) Action: Supt Chapman to provide an update at April’s Board meeting re the new Police connect system

➢ SRP Budget Proposals

12.4 A paper on the SRP under-spend had been circulated to Board members prior to the meeting on behalf of Sam Barstow, Head of Service, Community Safety, Resilience and Emergency Planning. The paper contained the following recommendation:

That the SRP allocate the remainder of it’s funding in the following manner:
• Ask Angela £800
• Domestic Abuse Gold Training £750
• Post Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) support services £2,000
• The Big Rotherham Knock £2,000
12.5 There were no declarations of interest in respect of the funding proposals

12.6 The underspend amount is approximately £5,500. Clarification was given that the proposals detailed are for the use of materials and not employment

12.7 A suggestion was made to see if there is any scope for the underspend amount to be carried over into the next financial year, 2018/19. From a small discussion it was agreed that the preferred option of the Board is for any remaining funding to be deferred to 2018/19 with a proviso if this is not possible the paper is re-circulated via email for comments/agreement of the proposals listed above

**Agreed**: 1) That the information is noted  
2) **Action**: Sam Barstow to contact the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) to confirm whether the underspend can be differed into the next financial year, 2018/19 and inform Board members of the OPCC response

13. **Priority Lead update**

13.1 A copy of the Priority Lead update had been circulated to Board members. The new style of reporting document had been introduced at December 2017 Board meeting. Members were asked if the document was too complicated and whether it would be of benefit to deliver the update based on the 3 signs of safety (what is working well, what is not working well and what is be done). It was decided that the document should outline the objectives but also includes the lead officer, a narrative of the 3 signs of safety and Red, Amber, Green (RAG) rating

**Agreed**: 1) That the information is noted  
2) **Action**: Sam Barstow to amend the document as detailed above

14. **Items to escalate to other Boards**

14.1 The Prevent report is to be escalated to Local Safeguarding Children’s Boards and Safeguarding Adults Board

**Agreed**: That the information is noted

15. **Any Other Business**

15.1 The CSE sub group are looking to launch a CSE intelligence app on National CSE awareness day, Sunday 18 March 2018

15.2 In view of the recent fires in parts of the Borough, the Chair requested that for future meetings updates be given from South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue

15.3 For the minutes, the full Ofsted report for Rotherham Children’s services can be view on the official Ofsted website. A copy of Rotherham Single inspection of LA children’s services will be circulated with today’s minutes. Acknowledgment and thanks were given to partners around the table for their assistance

15.4 The Community Rehabilitation Company had been successful in obtaining the County bid for the Domestic Abuse program (Inspire to change program)

**Agreed**: That the information is noted
16. Future meeting date

16.1 SRP Board meeting – Monday 09 April 2018 at 3.00pm, Meeting Room 2, Wing B – 4th Floor, Riverside House, Rotherham S60 1AE