



Brighton & Hove
City Council

Overview & Scrutiny

| | |
|----------|---|
| Title: | Children & Young People's Overview & Scrutiny Committee |
| Date: | 4 July 2011 |
| Time: | 5.00pm |
| Venue | Committee Room 1, Hove Town Hall |
| Contact: | Sharmini Williams Overview & Scrutiny Support Officer 29-0451 sharmini.williams@brighton-hove.gov.uk |

| | |
|---|--|
|  | The Town Hall has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets |
|  | An Induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter and infra red hearing aids are available for use during the meeting. If you require any further information or assistance, please contact the receptionist on arrival. |
| | FIRE / EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts;• Do not stop to collect personal belongings;• Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions; and• Do not re-enter the building until told that it is safe to do so. |

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The following are requested to attend the meeting:

Councillors:

Powell (Chair), Lepper (Deputy Chair), Bennett, Brown, Buckley, A Kitcat, Pissaridou and Wealls

Statutory Co-optee with Voting Rights

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Mike Wilson | Diocese of Chichester |
| David Sanders | Diocese of Arundel & Brighton |
| Amanda Mortensen | Parent Governor Representative |
| Vacancy | Parent Governor Representative |

Non-Statutory Co-optees without Voting Rights

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Rachel Travers | Community Voluntary Sector Forum |
| Mark Price | Youth Services |
| Rohan Lowe | Youth Council |
| Azdean Boulaich | Youth Council |
| Vacancy | Children's Social Care Representative |

AGENDA

Part One

Page

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

(Copy attached).

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1 - 6

Minutes of the previous meeting held on the 23 March 2011. (Copy attached).

3. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

7 - 10

Letter from Ms. Paula Donovan was been received.

5. QUESTIONS & LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

No questions and letters have been received.

6. INTRODUCTION TO CHILDREN SERVICES

Presentations from the:

- Strategic Director, People – Terry Parkin;
- Lead Commissioner, Children's Youth & Families – Steve Barton
- Lead Commissioner, Schools, Skills & Learning – Gil Sweetenham
- Head of Service, Children & Families – James Dougan

On their priorities and challenges

7. CYPOSC WORK PROGRAMME REPORT

11 - 18

PART TWO

8. OFSTED INSPECTION OF SAFEGUARDING AND LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN SERVICES

19 - 80

Report of the Strategic Director, People – Exempt Category 3 (circulated to members only).

Contact Officer: James Dougan

Tel: 295511

Ward Affected: All Wards

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The City Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public. Provision is also made on the agendas for public questions to committees and details of how questions can be raised can be found on the website and/or on agendas for the meetings.

The closing date for receipt of public questions and deputations for the next meeting is 12 noon on the fifth working day before the meeting.

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, on audio tape or on disc, or translated into any other language as requested.

For further details and general enquiries about this meeting contact Sharmini Williams, (29-0451, email sharmini.williams@brighton-hove.gov.uk) or email scrutiny@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Date of Publication - Friday, 24 June 2011

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

5.00PM 23 MARCH 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Older (Chair); McCaffery (Deputy Chair), Davis, Deane, Hyde, A Norman and Phillips

Statutory Co-optees: with voting rights::

Non-Statutory Co-optees: Rachel Travers (Community Voluntary Sector Forum) (Non-Voting Co-Optee) and Azdean Boulaich (Youth Council) (Non-Voting Co-Optee)

Apologies: Mike Wilson, David Sanders, Amanda Mortensen, Carrie Britton and Mark Price

PART ONE

44. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

44a. Declarations of Substitutes

44.1 There were no substitutions and apologies were received from David Sander (Diocesan representative for Arundel & Brighton), Mike Wilson (Diocesan representative for Chichester), Amanda Mortensen (Parent Governor Representative), mark price (Youth Services representative) and Carrie Britton (Children's Health representative).

44b. Declarations of Interest

44.2 There were none.

44c. Declaration of Party Whip

44.3 There were none.

44d. Exclusion from the Press and Public

44.4 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I (1) of the said Act.

44.5 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

45. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

45.1 A member requested an update on the number of SEN tribunals this year as it was indicated at the last meeting that parents were satisfied with the statementing process.

45.2 RESOLVED –

(1) That the minutes of the meeting of 26 January 2011 were approved.

(2) It was agreed to receive an update on the number of SEN tribunals this year.

46. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

46.1 The Chair informed the Committee that this was her last meeting, and thanked all the members, especially the Youth Council for their commitment, officers from Children's Services, Steve Barton and Scrutiny Officers.

46.2 This was also the last meeting for Carrie Britton (Co-optee for Children's Health) and her input has been valuable in raising the profile of children with complex needs and their parents.

46.3 Information was circulated out on the update of the Youth Council's 3:1 campaign and the restructuring of the Education Welfare Service. If there were any questions, then to direct these to the relevant officers.

46.4 The Chair informed the Committee that due to an Ofsted inspection the order of the agenda would change to the following:

52, 49, 51, and 50.

47. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

47.1 There were none.

48. QUESTIONS & LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

48.1 There were none.

49. CHILD POVERTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

49.1 This Agenda Item was heard after Item 52.

49.2 Steve Barton, Lead Commissioner for Children, Youth & Families introduced the report and answered questions with Matt Wragg, Acting Central Policy Development Team Manager.

49.3 In answer to a question on what the next practical steps now that needs assessment has been completed, the committee were informed that for example the Turner Children's Centre was already addressing the impact of child poverty and had just received an outstanding inspection from Ofsted. The next stages were to see how the recommendations from the needs assessment; partnership commitment and capacity,

coordination of services, monitoring improvement plus the further evidence gathering would be put into operation.

- 49.4 In response to a question on how substantial the child poverty issues were and that the problems seem bigger than the service, members were told that child poverty would need be embedded into other services and strategies i.e. Total Place and commissioning across the council, as the issues were not the council's concern alone however the consequences would have to be dealt with by children's services.
- 49.5 A member agreed that this was a significant piece of work for the council to deal with, that the problems had been entrenched for many years however it was important to undertake this work and start somewhere and if the needs assessment and strategy helped to change some children's lives then it shows what value the process gave.
- 49.6 In answer to a question on whether the new strategy would have any additional funding attached to it the committee were informed that the Graham Allen review into early intervention was looking at national policy on new and innovative initiatives for family support , but these were not expected to bring in new government funding.
- 49.7 Members noted that the Brighton & Hove Local Information System (BHLIS) will provide further information to the needs assessment. The Community budget pilot would contribute into the child poverty strategy.
- 49.8 Azdean Boulaich, Youth Council representative asked how it was identified that children and the neighbourhood were deprived, it was confirmed that specific family income data was used to clarify this.
- 49.9 Officers Matt Wragg & Sarah Colombo were thanked for putting together such a complex needs assessment which encompassed the Task Groups discussions and decisions.
- 49.10 **RESOLVED** – The Committee noted and commented on the findings of the Brighton & Hove Child Poverty Needs Assessment.

50. CORPORATE PARENTING STRATEGY

- 50.1 This Agenda Item was heard after Item 51.
- 50.2 Dermot Anketell, Service Manager for Children, Schools & Families introduced the report and answered questions.
- 50.3 Alex Qiu, Youth Council representative questioned why the monitoring performance of educational attainment wasn't obtained for key stage 3 children, this information would be circulated to the Committee at a later date. Members were told that a virtual school was created for all looked after children across the area to monitor these children.
- 50.4 A member commented that all Councillors and the council should have the responsibility of corporate parenting and that training was difficult to access. The Committee were informed that training could be provided at anytime to members and had been provided in the past.

50.5 In reference to the Scrutiny Panel report on School Exclusion which stipulated that the Local education authority should look into improving their monitoring processes to ensure that looked after children were not excluded; further information was requested for 2009-2010 on exclusions from school of children who had been looked after continuously for at least 12 months.

50.6 **RESOLVED –**

(1) The Committee noted and commented on the report.

(2) The Committee agreed to recommend that all councillors should attend the Corporate Parenting training.

(3) CYPOSC requested to know why key stage 3 information for the monitoring performance of educational attainment was not recorded.

(4) Further information was requested on school exclusion of children who had been looked after, including the number instances for 2009-2010.

51. LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN'S BOARD (LSCB) ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2009-2010

51.1 This Agenda Item was heard after Item 49.

51.2 Alan Bedford, Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) Independent Chair introduced the report and answered questions with Terry Parkin, Strategic Director, People.

51.3 Members were informed that the number of child protection plans for the city was double to that of comparable cities and that work was being carried out to investigate the reasons why.

51.4 In answer to a question on how the LSCB worked with the Children's Trust Board (CTB) members were informed that there were representatives that were members of the LSCB & the CTB, the statutory Annual report was heard at the CTB and safeguarding items were also taken to the CTB to be discussed and noted. The LSCB can take action and question Chief Executives about their decisions and promoted partnership working and informal networking. A formal protocol setting out the respective roles and duties of the CTB and LSCB, the mutual scrutiny and sharing of information was agreed at the CTB on 21st March 2100.

51.5 **RESOLVED –** The Committee considered the report and agreed to have the LSCB Annual 2010-2011 report on their work programme.

52. CHILDREN & FAMILIES SOCIAL WORK IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

52.1 This Agenda Item was heard after Item 48.

- 52.2 James Dougan, Head of Service for Children, Schools and Families presented the report and answered questions with Terry Parkin, Strategic Director, People and informed members that the service was in the middle of an Ofsted inspection.
- 52.3 In answer to a question on the reduction of activity of social workers from 86% to 32% and whether there was a timescale to reduce this further, the Committee was advised that the service aimed for a high quality work and that the service was recruiting to social worker posts. The service was moving from three front doors (offices) to a one front door approach on the 1 September, so that the specialist teams were all under one roof. Unqualified social workers did give a high quality of service and it was apparent that young people in care responded well to unqualified social workers.
- 52.4 It was noted that the national perspective was to have a one front door approach so that specialist teams worked from one area. A member agreed with this approach. The children in need team would be delivering their services through the Children's Centres.
- 52.5 In response to a question on whether the restructuring of the service from 3 front doors to 1 front door would affect the back office teams and would this mean streamlining the quantity of administration staff currently working in the 3 offices, members were informed that £500k had been invested into the service for social workers which would take the service above the establishment. The service was also trialling a paperless office approach which meant that all documents were scanned in. This trial would give the service a chance to make a proper evaluation of all their administration processes.
- 52.6 Members noted that the service preferred to use unqualified social workers than agency staff as it was felt that they were committed. Recruitment was sourced from the university of Sussex and Brighton University. The council ran a bursary scheme to support newly qualified staff as they were aware that housing costs were a significant issue when recruiting to social workers posts.
- 52.7 Members were told how newly qualified social workers have a protected caseload and individual support compared to a qualified social worker. Brighton and Hove had 4 agency staff on their team which was low in comparison to other local authorities e.g. Islington which had 65% in the past. Other challenges were recruiting social workers to hospital teams.
- 52.8 In answer to a question on how long it took unqualified social workers to become qualified, the Committee were informed that through the bursary scheme social workers would be interviewed for the post this summer and then start employment with the council the following May. These social workers would be unqualified until they received their certificates in September.
- 52.9 **RESOLVED** – the Committee noted the report.

53. WORK PROGRAMME FOR JUNE 2010 - MARCH 2011

- 53.1 Members were informed that the work programme was completed up until the end of March 2011 and a new programme would be put together after the local elections in case there were any changes to the membership of the committee.

The meeting concluded at 6.45pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

Hove
East Sussex

22nd June 2011

Stephanie Powell
Chair Children & Young People's Overview & Scrutiny Committee
King's House
Grand Avenue
Hove
BN3 2LS

Dear Ms Powell

I am writing to draw your attention to a new publication, *Difference in Mind*, a '10 questions' guide for Overview and Scrutiny Committees looking at child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) for children with autism.

Autism is not a mental health problem, but as many as 71% of children with autism do also develop mental health problems, such as depression and obsessive compulsive disorder. This is in no way inevitable, and with the right support children with autism can enjoy good mental health, just as anyone else can. But where mental health problems do develop, too often children and young people with autism are often unable to get the support they need.

The guide is a joint publication from the Centre for Public Scrutiny and The National Autistic Society, and can be downloaded at www.cfps.org.uk/what-we-do/publications/cfps-health/?id=164

In Brighton & Hove children with diagnosed Autistic Spectrum Conditions are eligible for support via the Seaside View Development Centre, CAMHs or, if in mainstream or special schools, the Autistic Spectrum Condition Support Service. There are currently 226 children with a recognised diagnosis on the ASCSS register and the service is 'very stretched'. The charity Amaze has 363 children with ASC on their Compass database, of which 113 are over 16 years old. They considered that they had details of 'approximately half of the young people with ASC in the city'. 'Children & Young Peoples' Plan Brighton & Hove City Council 2009 - 2012

'Every child matters' yet it is widely accepted that there are children in Brighton & Hove (as there are nationally) who struggle not because they have ASC but because their ASC is undiagnosed and those with a diagnosis are getting insufficient support. Children deserve the right to be supported to live freely with whatever their unique condition and presentation might be.

'You're one of the worst areas. I think of all those poor schools in Brighton and all those children not getting their needs recognised'. This comment was made to me by Laura Sanderson DLA assessor in Blackpool, 2010. The Benefits Agency has its own medical assessors and families are free to apply for DLA for their disabled children even if their children's needs have not been officially diagnosed in their locale.

If staff are insufficiently trained, the children with less obvious or more masked ASC traits and behaviours often fail to receive a formal diagnosis yet the impact on their lives is no less severe than for the 'obvious' ASC children. If the undiagnosed children are lucky they may have an understanding school that implement an 'Action Plan' but often they will be labelled ill disciplined or badly behaved. 'BESD' (behavioural, emotional, social difficulties) is often a cheap and convenient option for services who fail to put a child forward for a full Stage II ASC psychiatric assessment. If the child has to seek a private assessment or is in Independent Education there is no co-ordinated support and the level of help received is purely 'pot luck'. Undiagnosed children are all too often 'invisible' and often not recorded in any statistical information. Too often families are left with little or no guidance nor support at home and the impact is often devastating on family life.

Current strategic reviews in Brighton & Hove comment on the rising awareness of ASC in children and rise in School Action, School Action Plus and Statements, with the highest number of new SEN statements issued over the last five years for children on the AS Continuum. However,

“Children with harder to diagnose, mild or moderate disabilities or more complex needs may not be receiving the services they need”.

“1.4 Recommendations for Further Needs Assessment Work: More information is needed on the particular needs of children with Autism Spectrum Condition so services can effectively address their specific needs”.

The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Brighton & Hove, September 2010

Anecdotal evidence suggests a significant number of referrals are still not being picked up by CAMHs.

Our personal experience

Our child struggled with their physical and mental health from an early age. Aged five his crippling pain was diagnosed as Irritable Bowel Syndrome induced by anxiety and he was regularly treated at the Whittington and the Royal London hospitals, Great Ormond Street CAMHs and the Tavistock Clinic prior to a referral in 2006 to the Royal Alexander Hospital and CAMHs in Brighton. Our son had endured years of medical interventions and CAMHs Brighton decided he had ‘behavioural/emotional difficulties’ (BEDS) due to his medical history. The lack of training and awareness of staff at the White House CAMHs meant they failed to recognise, or even consider, our son’s anxiety, traits and behaviours actually stemmed from Asperger Syndrome which was finally diagnosed at the Priory Hospital in 2010.

For ten years before we knew he had an ASC, life for our family was horrendous. I consider our story typical of the experience of many families with children with undiagnosed AS conditions. After more than two years of what CAMHs described to me as ‘management of his behaviour’ our son received a short series of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy ‘for pain management’ and was discharged from CAMHs with no further follow up or support. In desperation we employed a private therapist. When our son was forced to change schools in the recurring crisis of poor mental health, our GP re-referred him back to CAMHs but they failed to re-engage explaining that as we had private help they would prefer to ‘stay in the background’ as being ‘more helpful’. Our son’s condition had not improved in any way and had remained chronic (erratic and unstable) throughout the time he was known to CAMHs and we had continued to struggle, failing to understand why he experienced depressive episodes, anxiety attacks and crippling abdominal pain.

Being properly assessed and diagnosed with ASC, which we sought and paid for privately, has liberated our family. Now we have a much better understanding of how to support our child and the affect on his mental and physical health has been immediate and far reaching, resulting in a huge improvement in our family life. We have been able to do so by paying for assessments that diagnosed his condition and educational needs; small environments in private schools; a chiropractor for IBS pain management and family support from a psychotherapist who specialises in ASC. The NHS is lucky we have the resources to do this for our son. Not every child is as fortunate.

The prolonged catalogue of ineffective interactions with CAMHs not only did not help our son in any way but was a very unpleasant, difficult and stressful experience for all our family. As a result of this we made a formal complaint to Sussex Partnership Trust for the lack of meaningful support we received. Our concerns centred on:

- Failing to identify, assess and diagnose our son nor to treat his mental health appropriately.

- Being 'pushed away' from the service and having inferences made about our parenting.
- Being told our son was not eligible for CAMHS support as he is in private school and 'in this case' we would need to pay for advice for school ourselves.

The Trust acknowledged our complaint, described their service as 'clumsy' 'thoughtless' and 'tardy' and refunded our losses of £2,190 which we incurred having to seek private support. We took complaint action as a last resort and then we found other families receiving the same ineffective service. We wish to highlight how CAMHS has not responded to families appropriately and to campaign for a better service for the children coming after us.

Due to our experience we would like to request

- For the Children's and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review and monitor CAMHS' implementation of the new 'Autistic Spectrum Condition Pathways' policy for children in Brighton & Hove; To ensure that an evaluation of ASC need in the city is undertaken and that appropriate targets for diagnostic assessments are set. This, in view of the fact that services for adults are currently being scrutinised under the Adult Autism Strategy.
- That *all families* who are referred/ request an ASC assessment are supported with prompt and proactive responses; That families are kept fully informed at all stages and for CAMHS to offer advice and support with positive regard for service users, working 'with' rather than 'managing' clients.
- That privately educated children must receive the same level of advice and support as state educated children. Parents who pay taxes to support local services must have access to the same level of service that state school children receive via the ASC Support Service.

Given the high proportion of children with autism who experience mental health problems and access support from CAMHS, this is an area where your committee could help to ensure that local services are delivering good outcomes for this group, and that funding is being used effectively to avoid more costly interventions in the longer term, in some cases into adulthood, as recently illustrated by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 'Review of Services for Adults with Autistic Spectrum Conditions' in Brighton.

Therefore I hope that your committee will consider using the 'Difference in Mind' guide to carry out a scrutiny of CAMHS for children with autism in Brighton & Hove.

Yours sincerely

Paula Donovan (parent of child aged eleven with Asperger Syndrome)

cc
 Mike Wetherley, MP
 Vanessa Brown, Ward Councillor for Hove Park;
 Tom Madders, Head of Campaigns National Autistic Society
 Ros Cook, Operational Director, AMAZE
 Family x (in similar circumstances/same concerns)

Snapshot - Comments about Brighton & Hove CAMHs

- 'Oh it's always the mother at fault with them.' Play group manager
- 'My husband was annoyed his absence was always commented on, 'tell them I go to work to support my family.' Comment from two separate fathers
- 'We suspected our child has autism, I'm a teacher, I'm trained to spot the signs. When workers made a home visit my husband was late, I was embarrassed and got upset, the CAMHs workers levered open my worries, they said they were going to record they suspected domestic abuse. We didn't go to them for help again'. Parent
- 'We fled when we thought CAMHs were threatening social service involvement.' Different parent
- 'CAMHs are restructuring themselves into a more '*sensible*' (ironic) approach.' A GP
- 'This CAMHs has a style of working that is toxic for families.' Health care professional
- 'CAMHs are a law unto themselves; they don't pick up their referrals.' Different health care professional
- 'You're one of the worst areas. I think of all those poor schools in Brighton and those children not getting their needs recognised.' DLA assessor in Blackpool
- 'CAMHs is in chaos.' Ex CAMHs worker
- 'We hear the same concerns about CAMHs all the time.' Local voluntary sector worker
- 'There would be families who would feel they had benefitted from CAMHs but there are many who have problems with them.' Different voluntary sector worker
- 'Referrals to us from CAMHs are working well, the assessment procedure is well developed at SVDC and is developing at CAMHs, yours could just be a minority experience although couldn't comment on how many children get missed. Funding is extremely stretched and services can only deal with the most obvious cases'. Support service manager
- 'I often hear parents with children in private schools say 'we didn't realise when we opted out of state education that we were opting out of the health care service as well". Different Support service manager

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Agenda Item 7

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: **Work Programme Report**

Date of Meeting: **June 2011**

Report of: **Strategic Director, Resources**

Contact Officer: Name: Tom Hook Tel: 29-1110

E-mail: Tom.hook@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 This report provides Members with information on the Children and Young People's Overview & Scrutiny Committee (CYPOSC) June 2011 – April 2012 work programme. It is presented to Members for information and to help with the future work-planning for this committee.
- 1.2 Appended to this report are the current Forward Plan and the Committee's draft work programme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That members:
- (1) Note the general information on CYPOSC work programme;
 - (2) Agree the work programme for the next committee.

3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 CYPOSC is required to have its own work programme, setting out the committee's schedule (Constitution Part 6.1, para 3.2). Setting a work programme in advance in this way facilitates effective planning by council officers, and should ensure that all reports to CYPOSC are delivered on time and are of a high quality.

O&S committees are essentially autonomous bodies, responsible for determining their own work schedules (Constitution Part 6.1, para 12.2), providing these accord with the Committee Terms of Reference; and subject to co-ordination and monitoring by the OSC (as detailed in point 3.2 above).

- 3.2 However, it is incumbent upon CYPOSC members to ensure that CYPOSC is as effective as possible. To this end, members should seek to ensure that items placed on committee work programmes are:
- significant issues;
 - issues where there is a genuine opportunity for O&S to make a positive contribution. Try not to have reports purely to note;
 - dealt with at the appropriate time (i.e. when there is the greatest opportunity for CYPOSC to 'add value');
 - aligned with the council's corporate priorities;
 - coordinated with work being undertaken with the Council's partners.
- 3.3 Each quarter 'tripartite' meetings are held with the Committee Chair, relevant Cabinet Members and senior officers to discuss the Committee's work programme.

Sources that should be considered for the work programmes include:

- 3.4(a) **Plans or strategies which comprise part of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.** The council's constitution requires the Executive to consult with O&S before formulating its final proposals for these plans and strategies. The Executive must take account of any O&S response in drawing up firm proposals to be submitted to Full Council (Constitution Part 4.4, para 2(b)).
- 3.4(b) **Other plans and strategies.** Members of the Council's Cabinet and senior officers in the council's directorates may choose to consult with CYPOSC concerning the development of plans and strategies which do not form part of the Budget and Policy framework, but are nonetheless considered to be of particular importance (including, but not limited to, items which feature on the Council's Forward Plan).
- 3.4(c) **Items put forward by other members.** Any member of the Council may place a written question to the Leader of the Council, Cabinet members or Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee (including O&S committees). Such questions should be included on the agenda of the next suitable committee meeting, where members will determine how best to deal with them (Constitution Part 3.2, rule 9.2).

- 3.4(d) **Public Questions.** Members of the public may submit questions to CYPOSC no fewer than 5 working days before a scheduled committee meeting. Providing a question is relevant to the work of the committee, is not vexatious, and is not substantially similar to a question which the committee has recently debated to its satisfaction, it will be added to the agenda for the appropriate meeting (Constitution Part 9.9).
- 3.4(e) **Referrals from other Council bodies/committees.** Any Council body or committee may choose to refer items CYPOSC for consideration.
- 3.4(f) **Referrals from Outside Bodies.** Other organisations (e.g. The Older People's Council, the Youth Council, LAA partners, neighbouring Local Authorities etc) may refer items to CYPOSC for consideration.
- 3.4(g) **Referrals from Outside Bodies with statutory powers of referral.** In some instances, external bodies may have a statutory power/obligation to refer items to CYPOSC for consideration. These include:
- (i) **Local Involvement Networks (LINKs).** LINKs were granted powers of referral by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. LINKs can refer items to any local O&S committee responsible for aspects of adult health and social care and/or children's health issues. In the context of Brighton & Hove, this means that the Brighton & Hove LINK has a statutory power of referral to the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (HOSC), the Adult Social Care and Housing Overview & Scrutiny Committee (ASCHOSC), and the Children and Young People Overview & Scrutiny Committee (CYPOSC).
- 3.4(h) **Councillor Call for Action.** This is a power which was introduced in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. It enables ward Councillors to bring items of local concern, which could not be resolved via other avenues, to the appropriate O&S committee for investigation.
- 3.4(j) **Scrutiny of Petitions.** The Council has agreed procedures for dealing with petitions received by members of the public.
- 3.5 The above list is not intended to be prescriptive; CYPOSC has an important role to play in encouraging closer working between various parts of the council; between the council and its key city partners; and in fostering better relationships between the council and local residents. Any suggestion for the work programme which may help achieve these goals should therefore be given serious consideration, whether or not it accords with the formal means of referral listed above.

4. THE FORMAT OF WORK PROGRAMMES

4.1 CYPOSC work programmes should:

- (a) List all items for scrutiny in the current council year;
- (b) Indicate the date when an item is to be considered;
- (c) In instances where an item has not been requested by committee members, indicate where the item originated (e.g. referral from Cabinet, public question etc);
- (d) Indicate a mode of enquiry (e.g. ad hoc panel, workshop, report for information etc);
- (e) Indicate why the O&S committee is looking at a particular item – e.g. pre-decision policy development, performance monitoring, scrutiny of area of concern.

4.2 An updated copy of the work programme should be included in each committee agenda for information. (There should generally be no need for members to agree the work programme at each meeting.) Items which have already been dealt with should remain on the work programme, with an indication of the date they were addressed and any action agreed. Therefore, anyone consulting an CYPOSC work programme should be able to tell at a glance what work the committee has already undertaken in the current year and what work it is planning to undertake.

4.3 There is an obvious utility in committees agreeing and keeping to an annual work programme. However, it may well be necessary to add items to the work programme throughout the year (e.g. in response to unanticipated events etc). In general it should be possible to add individual items at the Chair's discretion. However, if very significant changes to the work schedule are required, it may be necessary to ask committee members to agree a revised work programme.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 No formal consultation has been undertaken in compiling this report.

6. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

6.1 There are no financial implications to this report. Issues relating to the CYPOSC work programmes may impact upon the allocation of resources within the Scrutiny team, but this will relate to the existing Scrutiny budget and will not involve additional funding.

Legal Implications:

- 6.2 Relevant parts of the council's constitution and any relevant legislation or government bills are referred to at appropriate points in the report.

Equalities Implications:

- 6.3 CYPOSC work programmes should be formulated with equalities issues in mind.

Sustainability Implications:

- 6.4 Members should consider whether the draft committee work programme adequately reflects the importance of sustainability issues to the committee's Terms of Reference.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 6.5 Members should consider whether the draft committee work programme adequately reflects the importance of crime and disorder issues to the committee's Terms of Reference.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 6.6 Members should consider whether risk and opportunity management issues have adequately been addressed in formulating the draft committee work programme.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 6.7 CYPOSC work programmes should reflect corporate and citywide priorities.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

- 1) Committee draft work programme

Documents in Members' Rooms:

None

Background Documents:

None

**AGENDA ITEM 7 APPENDIX 1 – DRAFT Children and Young People’s Overview and Scrutiny
(CYPOSC) Work Programme June 2011- March 2012**

| Issue /Topic | Date | Reason for the agenda item | Outcome and Monitoring |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | 4 July 2011 | | |
| | 4 July 2011 | | |
| | 4 July 2011 | | |
| | | | |
| Review Children & Alcohol Scrutiny Panel | 14 September 2011 | | |
| | 14 September 2011 | | |
| | 14 September 2011 | | |
| | | | |
| Review School Exclusions Scrutiny Panel | 9 November 2011 | | |
| | 9 November 2011 | | |
| | 9 November 2011 | | |
| | | | |
| Children’s Services Budget Strategy | 25 January 2012 | | |
| | | | |
| | 18 April 2011 | | |
| | 18 April 2011 | | |
| | 18 April 2011 | | |

**AGENDA ITEM 7 APPENDIX 1 – DRAFT Children and Young People’s Overview and Scrutiny
(CYPOSC) Work Programme June 2011- March 2012**

Other reports to consider:

- Children & Young People’s Plan Annual Report (which is one of the council’s policy framework documents)
- Annual Performance report
- School Examinations report
- Local Safeguarding Children’s Board report
- Intelligent Commissioning
- PCT priorities are teenage pregnancy and childhood obesity

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

