

# minutes



Meeting SOCIAL SERVICES STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

Date Tuesday, 28<sup>th</sup> September 2004 (commencing at 10.30 am)

## Membership

Persons absent are marked with 'A'

## COUNCILLORS

Chris Baron (Chair)  
Joe Lonergan MBE (Vice Chair)

	John Bell		Peter D Prebble
A	Mrs Sue Bennett	A	Chris Preston
	Steve Carroll	A	R S Robinson
A	Rod Kempster		Rita Sharpe
	J T A Napier		K Walker
A	R Needham		

## ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor M Brandon-Bravo

## MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting of the Select Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2004 were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from:

Councillor Rob Kempster  
“ R Needham  
“ Chris Preston  
“ R S Robinson

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

None.

## **BEST VALUE REVIEW FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF OLDER PEOPLE – IMPROVEMENT PLAN PROGRESS REPORT**

Mr Joe Pidgeon from the Social Services Department introduced the report which gave details on the progress of the Best Value Improvement Plan.

Councillor Baron indicated he was pleased with the progress being made. Councillor Bell stated that the Stapleford Resource Centre Project was going well and that garden holder users of the Resource Centre were now teaching young people about how to use allotments.

In response to a question from Councillors Lonergan and Napier, Mr Pidgeon agreed that there had been a drop-off of the senior peer mentors in the Ashfield Project, but added that the co-ordinator was optimistic of carrying out additional work to recruit 15 more. He explained that the £3,000 grant was to provide support and administrative costs. He indicated that Ashfield, Bassetlaw and Broxtowe PCT's were providing funding to their own schemes for senior peer mentoring type activity but the other Primary Care Trusts were not. He would like to see Primary Care Trusts contribute towards the healthy living outcomes of this review.

With regard to the flexi-line pilot the Environment Department had provided a lot of publicity in the area in question, but it had not seemed to impact. An evaluation was to be carried out which would inform future thinking.

It was agreed that a further progress report be considered at the meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2005 and that other Departments be asked for details of progress on recommendations which affected them.

## **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIALIST RESIDENTIAL PROVISION**

Alison Shield from the Social Services Department introduced the final report of the Specialist Residential Study Group. She indicated that the Department now had a series of 3/4 bedded units instead of the 12 bedded unit at The Ridge, which had been planned. This meant that all the units should be able to offer specialist, holistic facilities. She indicated that it was proposed that all the staff would be trained and that this would be supported by a full-time CAMHS post. She reported that education had had difficulties finding staff who were able to deal with young people not in the education system. It had been negotiated with Education to appoint someone and the benefits were that opportunities can be taken at other times of the day and would therefore be more flexible. She explained that the draft protocol had been drawn up to reduce the instances of staff reporting minor assaults by young people to the police. The aim was to avoid criminalisation of children and young people. There had been consultation with staff but negotiations were still to be held with the unions.

Councillor Baron was pleased to see the cross-cutting working between Departments for the benefit of young people's welfare.

Councillor Lonergan commented that the proposed model had changed from the outset of the work and he felt that the Study Group had made a contribution to this. He felt that the Education involvement was crucial. In response to a question from

Councillor Lonergan, Alison Shield stated that the unit costs at Woodland View were higher than expected and would provide a written response.

Councillor Napier supported the proposals in the paper. He registered a concern about the language used and the perspective in the protocol. Councillor Baron explained that the principle behind this was about being a corporate parent. He indicated that the thinking behind it was if ones own child assaulted you would you report that to the police. He added that the protocol was still to be fully discussed with the trade unions.

Councillor Rita Sharpe indicated that she was pleased with the report, particularly the flexibility with education. She wondered how long the commitment from Education and Community Services was as she did not want it to be time-limited. She supported the proposed protocol and felt that a common sense approach was needed. She suggested that young people should be involved in drawing up the protocols. She felt that as a society we were not equipping young people in care to live on their own afterwards. Alison Shield stated that the Culture & Community and Education Departments were involved in a year's pilot scheme to see that it worked. A meeting was arranged with Education to discuss performance indicators. She added that young people were to be involved in the consultation on the protocol.

It was agreed:

- (1) That the developments outlined in the report be supported by the Select Standing Committee.
- (2) That the report be referred to Cabinet with a response being brought back to the Social Services Standing Select Committee.
- (3) That an interim progress report be presented to the Select Committee six months after the implementation date, with a full report after one year.

### **BEST VALUE SERVICE REVIEW ON ADOPTION – PROGRESS REPORT**

Rachel Coombs, from the Social Services Department introduced the report and indicated that all the suggestions from the Best Value Review had been progressed and achieved.

Councillor Lonergan was pleased to see the length of time it took to adopt reduced and asked whether this could be maintained. Rachel Coombs was confident that this would be sustained. She added that the Department were clearer about the reasons for delay but pointed out that some care proceedings can be very long, which affects the figures.

The Select Committee noted the progression made on the Adoption Best Value Improvement Plan and achieving the recommendations of the Review. It was agreed to delete this from the Select Committee's programme of work.

### **DAY SERVICES MODERNISATION – UPDATE**

Councillor Steve Carroll stated that he was impressed with the progress being made and the challenges identified. He commented that Beck Meadow was based on an

industrial estate and wondered whether this was relevant. Councillor Napier wondered whether Primary Care Trusts could contribute. Alan Pryke, from the Social Services Department, explained that Rushcliffe was a dispersed service and therefore the costs were higher. He added that there were always robust discussions with health over funding. He indicated that he would provide a written answer about the funding situation.

## **DIRECT PAYMENTS**

It was agreed to establish a Study Group of up to five Elected Members to examine issues and make recommendations in relation to direct payments in adults and children's services. The study was to be completed by December 2004.

## **AFTERCARE SERVICES**

Consideration was given to a report which proposed that the Aftercare Services Study be deleted from the programme of work. Councillor Rita Sharpe stated that she could not support deleting this from the programme. She felt that this work would be valuable. She was however willing to support a delay for a couple of months. It was suggested that Councillor Rita Sharpe spend some time with the Aftercare Team and that the matter be considered further at the next meeting.

It was agreed that Councillor Rita Sharpe visit the Aftercare Team and report to the next meeting when a decision would be made about a study of the Aftercare service.

## **HEMOCARE IN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE – IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE STUDY GROUP**

Carol Harper from the Social Services Department introduced the report. She explained that some of the recommendations had to be considered as part of the budget forming process. Councillor Loneran commented that there was no action plan for the implementation of the recommendations and he felt that six months before a progress report was too long.

It was agreed that a progress report be brought to the Select Committee at its meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2005.

## **URGENT ITEM**

In accordance with Section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Chair had approved that the report on Childrens' Residential Services – short term breaks provision – extension of timescales being regarded as an urgent item to ensure that the Study Group have appropriate time to complete a thorough and comprehensive study.

## **CHILDRENS' RESIDENTIAL SERVICES – SHORT TERM BREAKS PROVISION – EXTENSION OF TIMESCALES**

It was agreed:

- (1) That approval be given to the extension of the Childrens' Residential Services - Short Term Breaks Provision Study Group until April 2005.
- (2) That an interim report be brought to the Select Committee in December 2004 with a final report being completed by April 2005.

## **WORK PROGRAMME**

Consideration was given to the Work Programme and it was noted that it would be up-dated in the light of amendments made during the meeting.

## **CHAIR**

Councillor Baron thanked all Members who had contributed to the work of the Select Committee during his time as Chair.

The meeting closed at 11.40 am.

## **CHAIR**

M\_28Sept04