

AT A MEETING of the SAFE AND HEALTHY PEOPLE SELECT COMMITTEE of the COUNTY COUNCIL held at The Castle, Winchester on Friday, 14 March 2014.

PRESENT

Chairman:
p Councillor Patricia Stallard

Vice-Chairman
p Councillor Chris Carter

Councillors:

p Alan Dowden
p Keith Evans
a David Harrison
p Marge Harvey
p Roger Huxstep
p Chris Lagdon

p Fiona Mather
p Andy Moore
a George Ringrow
p Steve Rippon-Swaine
p Frank Rust
p Martin Tod

Also in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman:
Councillor Jonathan Glen, Chairman of Policy & Resources Select Committee
Councillor Andrew Joy, Executive Member for Communities and Partnerships;

39. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Harrison and George Ringrow. Councillor Mark Kemp-Gee, as the appointed conservative substitute member, and Councillor David Simpson, as the appointed liberal democrat substitute member, attended in their place. Apologies were also received from Councillor Liz Fairhurst, Executive Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health.

40. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3, Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter

being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

41. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Select Committee held on the 24 January 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

There was a single matter arising from the minutes:

That the briefing raised at the last meeting on the 'Westholme' Care Quality Commission inspection would be heard as part of the Adult Safeguarding update to the 30 April meeting.

Adult Safeguarding update to come forward in April.

42. **DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations to the Select Committee.

43. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman invited the Vice Chairman to provide an update on the Care Bill working group.

The Care Bill had returned to the House of Commons for its report stage, which had now concluded. There were no major changes to social care elements of the Bill. The Bill would now enter its ping-pong stage between the two Houses until both agree a final version of the text. It was expected that the Bill would receive Royal Assent around April 2014, becoming law a year before some measures in the Bill start to be implemented. Some elements, such as the cap on care costs and other funding changes, would not be scheduled to start until April 2016.

It was noted that a large volume of draft regulations and guidance on the Care Bill was expected to be released around May (based on the latest Department of Health timetable information), which would give the Council the detailed information required to plan effectively for implementation. The Care Bill working group would meet around this time in order to feed into work ongoing by the Department.

Care Bill working group to meeting in May 2014.

The Chairman explained to Members that the Committee, as part of its statutory duty under the Police and Justice Act 2006, scrutinises the responsible authorities under the County

Strategy Group on work undertaken during the year. The Committee would on this day be receiving detail of progress on Domestic Abuse services, the Supporting Troubled Families programme and Integrated Offender Management.

Councillor Andrew Joy, Executive Member for Communities and Partnerships, was invited to say a few words as Chairman of the County Strategy Group. He explained that the County Council had a responsibility to support partnership working through the County Strategy Group, which involved a large number of organisations and partners who were keen to ensure that activities undertaken on shared work-streams were efficient and effective. Members were reminded that Police and Crime Commissioners were elected in November 2012 and had responsibility for setting policing and crime priorities locally, which the County Strategy Group took account of. Councillor Joy thanked those officers present to speak to Members on the topics under discussion, and explained that he would be happy to receive any recommendations the Committee may have in response to the presentations received.

44. **DOMESTIC ABUSE**

The Committee welcomed a representative of the Director of Adult Services, Martha Fowler-Dixon, Head of Prevention and Early Intervention, to present on the delivery of Domestic Abuse services in Hampshire, and the draft strategy for the commissioning of future services. Also present was Melani Morgan, a Senior Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) Development Officer for Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse (CAADA), a national charity supporting a multi-agency response to domestic abuse who had been working closely with Hampshire County Council, and Karen Dawes, Commissioning Manager for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

(Take in presentation)

Members heard:

- That a review had recently been conducted in partnership with CAADA to refresh and develop existing Domestic Abuse practices to ensure they are sustainable, innovative and remove barriers towards improved outcomes for individuals and families.
- Specifically the review had aimed to establish a joint strategy between partners in order to enable a more efficient, simple and modernised service which meets demand and provides community solutions where appropriate.
- In addition to this review, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire had held a domestic abuse conference, which was attended by over 60 organisations involved in Domestic Abuse services in

Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. Shared outcomes had emerged from this work and these would feed into joint strategies.

- That current provision in Hampshire included a mix of 11 refuges, eight floating support services, children and family interventions, perpetrator interventions and a sanctuary scheme. The service has 4.5 Independent Domestic Violence Advocates (IDVAs) supporting 440 clients annually.
- The review found that some refuges were not being used as crisis accommodation, and that women and their families were staying for a long period of time in such homes – sometimes for up to eight months, with known cases of staying over one year. It was accepted that crisis accommodation was required as part of the Domestic Abuse service, as sometimes individuals need to be removed from their situation. However this should only be for a short period of time until alternative housing provision can be found, or the individual is able to return home (because the perpetrator has been removed or the risk managed).
- The review therefore recommended streamlining the number of refuges and ensuring that these are used as crisis accommodation only. Some individuals could not currently use refuges – e.g. males and those with male children over a certain age – so solutions needed to be found that met all victims' needs. Funding released from this work would be reinvested into community solutions and increasing the number of IDVAs available to work with victims and their families in Hampshire.
- The review also suggested increasing support to those at medium and high risk of domestic abuse, using existing resource more effectively to meet their needs.

In response to questions, Members heard:

- That most individuals who are concerned about potential Domestic Abuse incidents call 999 or CrimeStoppers. All organisations are able to deal with such calls confidentially and sensitively. Employers are encouraged to have a Domestic Abuse policy, and the County Council has webpages devoted to signposting individuals to Domestic Abuse services.
- That the definition of 'Domestic Abuse' had recently been updated by the government, with this now including controlling or coercive behaviour. Checklists held locally were being updated to reflect this.
- That perpetrator programmes were just as important as services for victims, given that crime prevention was key to tackling offending. The Police and Crime Commissioner had made Domestic Abuse one of his key areas for working, and perpetrator programmes were a part of this. If a perpetrator volunteers for a community programme, they might not be considered

suitable if they have a serious substance misuse problem. This could be considered a gap in provision, but it would be highly unlikely that someone would be accepted onto the programme until they have addressed that issue.

- That Domestic Abuse service interface with the Supporting Hampshire's Troubled Families Programme.
- That Hampshire Fire service employees received domestic abuse training and attend MARACs.

Members held a discussion on the information heard as part of the item, and agreed that all County Councillors could benefit from a briefing on the future commissioning and provision of Domestic Abuse services in Hampshire.

RESOLVED:

That the Member Briefing programme include an item on changes to Domestic Abuse commissioning in Hampshire.

Councillor Alan Dowden left the meeting at this point.

46. **SUPPORTING HAMPSHIRE'S TROUBLED FAMILIES PROGRAMME**

The Committee welcomed a representative of the Director of Policy and Governance, Ian Langley, Strategic Programme Lead for the Supporting (Troubled) Families Programme, who provided an update on progress since the last Crime and Disorder scrutiny meeting, together with the current challenges and future development of the programme. He was joined by Mark Stukings, an Employment Advisor at Job Centre Plus and secondee to the Programme, who provided Members with his experience of assisting families on the Programme.

(Take in presentation)

Members heard:

- That the Supporting Hampshire's (Troubled) Families Programme (hereafter referred to as 'the Programme') was being led by Hampshire County Council and supported by new money from Central Government. It was expected that this spend would result in greater efficiency between partners and ultimately lead to a reduced cost to the public purse.
- Hampshire County Council had taken the approach of 'troubled' families being everyone's business – expecting joined up working from all partners involved. The engagement of District and Borough Councils had been especially crucial to the Programme, given their ability to work locally.
- According to the nationally-set definition, 'troubled' families are households who:

Suggestion be made to member briefing programme to include item on domestic abuse commissioning.

- Are involved in youth crime and/or anti-social behaviour;
- Have children not in school (<85% attendance, 3 fixed term exclusions, permanently excluded, or head teacher discretion);
- Have an adult on out of work benefits.

In addition to these, the Programme is able to use locally-set criteria – for example those at risk of domestic abuse.

- Once a family has been nominated for either intensive family support (the 'Transform' part of the Programme) or the less intensive locally-determined solutions, a plan is pulled together for them. The Programme does not assess families – it shares data to learn from assessments that may already have taken place.
- That as of this meeting, 1,350 families had been identified to take part in the Programme, with 1,008 now engaged. Of these, 214 had been put forward to the high-intensity 'Transform' part of the Programme.
- The lead agency in the Programme isn't necessarily that which has had the most interaction with the family, but whichever has the best working relationship with them.
- HMP Winchester had been involved in the Programme, helping to introduce a father parenting group ('Invisible Walls'), and 'Inside Out', a project designed to provide offenders with an experience of the prison system and the opportunity to speak with prisoners, in order to dissuade them from future criminal activity.
- That the Programme had partly funded three Domestic Abuse Projects, including one with a male officer, recognising that not all abuse is experienced by females.
- That the voluntary sector were actively involved in the Programme.
- A case study example which put into perspective the partnership working undertaken on the Programme. It was noted that confidence building in parents was a critical part of the work undertaken.

In response to questions, Members heard:

- That each of the nine Local Co-ordination Groups in Hampshire had discretion on which organisations they wished to work with or provide funding to in order to assist nominated families. Some had worked closely with the charity HomeStart, for example.
- It was expected that the number of families in contact with the Programme would be over 1,600 by the summer of 2014.
- That commitment had been given for the Troubled Families Programme to continue on into the 2015/16 financial year, but beyond this point it was not yet known whether the project would continue to be funded in its current form.

- That the use of food banks was not explicitly a local indicator of a 'troubled' family, but it had been noted that use of these had increased dramatically. Hampshire County Council received a grant to assist those who are in immediate financial crisis. The future of this funding was currently under review, with a decision likely to go to the Executive Member for Adult Services and Public Health later in the year.
- That further local discretion had been provided to take into account issues that families may be experiencing that were not part of the original criteria. For example, work would be ongoing with South Central Ambulance NHS Foundation Trust, as the major provider of ambulance services in Hampshire, in order to see if regular callers to the ambulance service were part of the 'troubled' family cohort and could benefit from targeted intervention via the 'family plan' to reduce these demands.
- That Portsmouth University were involved as a 'critical friend' to the Programme, and would enable partners to see where data indicated long-term change.

Discussion was held on the need to ensure early intervention and prevention in order to reduce the number of families becoming 'troubled' in the County. As part of this, the topic of teaching parenting skills was highlighted as an area for exploration. The Chairman agreed to raise this as an issue that the Children and Young People Select Committee may wish to look at in future, and agreed to discuss this at the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Select Committee, at which all Chairmen of Select Committees were present.

Councillor Jonathan Glen, Chairman of the Policy and Resources Select Committee, invited all Members to the upcoming meeting of the Policy and Resources Select Committee, which was due to take place on 10 April at the Havant Public Service Plaza. This meeting would focus primarily on partnership working.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee receive a future item on services provided by Hampshire County Council to those residents in immediate financial crisis.

Councillor Mark Kemp-Gee left the meeting at this point.

46. INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

The Committee welcomed representatives of the Director of Adult Services, Martha Fowler-Dixon, Head of Prevention and Early Intervention, and John Winter, Communities Manager, to present on the delivery of the Hampshire Integrated Offender

Chairman to raise issue at Policy and Resources Select Committee.

Item on financial crisis services added to the work programme.

Management Service. They were joined by Chris Mitchell, Offender Management Director for Hampshire Probation Trust, who provided an overview of the background to the national offender management reforms.

(Take in presentation)

Members heard:

- That Hampshire County Council is the lead commissioner and co-ordinator of Integrated Offender Management service, with the Probation Trust as the main provider. The service also received input from Hampshire Constabulary and HMP Winchester.
- That the aims of the Integrated Offender Management service were:
 - to reduce crime and reduce re-offending
 - to provide the right interventions, to the right individuals, at the right time
 - to improve information exchange around risks and needs
- That the service involved intense case management, with all individuals who have received a sentence under 12 months, are at high risk of reoffending, are prolific offenders or are known substance misusers considered for the programme.
- Evidence had shown that since the introduction of the Integrated Offender Management service, reoffending in Hampshire had reduced significantly, with data showing considerable reductions in the number of individuals reoffending and number of crimes committed by reoffenders. It was also known that the service has reduced the amount of money that would have been spent by the criminal justice system in relation to these individuals, although it was more difficult to estimate this cost to the public purse.
- It was thought that the Integrated Offender Management service had been successful due to the partnership working and co-location of the key agencies involved in this work. Intelligence sharing was as important as resourcing the service, and Hampshire had been successful at enabling this to happen.
- That the Government had introduced new policy on transforming rehabilitation and reducing reoffending, changing the way these services are delivered locally. Hampshire Probation Trust would no longer exist from the end of May 2014, with approximately 60% of low and medium risk offenders instead due to be managed through a local private contract, and the remaining high risk offenders managed by a National Probation Service, organised divisionally.
- That it had been noted that the Government wished to see successful Integrated Offender Management services sustained and improved locally. It was, however, difficult to predict how these significant

reforms to probation services would affect good work locally.

- Integrated Offender Management would continue to be a top priority for both Hampshire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner, given how successful work had been locally.

In response to questions, Members heard:

- Confirmation that approximately 60% of the Probation Trust's services will be privatised under the Government's new reducing reoffending and improving rehabilitation policies.
- That it was currently unclear how the payment by results element would work in practice, but it would be likely that contracts agreed with providers would include specifications that must be met in order for payment to be received. As any agreement would be commercially sensitive it would likely be confidential.
- That any private provider of these services would be subject to inspection by the Probation Inspectorate.
- Bespoke services for women offenders are provided within Hampshire, although there aren't any prisons for women in the County. It was noted that it can be difficult to engage with female inmates from Hampshire given that they will be incarcerated out of the County boundary.
- That although HMP Winchester were not a 'responsible authority' under the Police and Justice Act, they had been actively involved in County Strategy Group work on Integrated Offender Management, amongst other projects. Improvements had been made at the prison following feedback from HM Inspectorate of Prisons, particularly around structured activity.

It was noted that the Care Bill, when it receives Royal Assent, would place responsibility for the social care needs of prisoners with the County Council. Members were interested in work between the County Council and HMP Winchester, and requested that a visit be organised for the Committee to understand progress being made locally.

Visit to HMP Winchester organised.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee receive a further item on Integrated Offender Management once national reforms to offender management have taken place.

Item added to the work programme for future monitoring.

Councillor David Simpson left the meeting at this point.

47. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chief Executive presented the work programme (Item 9 in the minute book).

The Chairman highlighted the topic of Supporting People to the Committee, and proposed that this item move from April to July following a request from the Department. This would align the Committee's consideration of this item with the Executive Member decision report, which was due to be presented to the July Executive Member decision day, and would allow the Committee to scrutinise and feed into the Executive Decision. Members agreed this move subject to the Department organising an opportunity for the Committee to be briefed and feed into the likely outcomes of the Supporting People review prior to the July meeting.

Supporting People briefing organised.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee's work programme be approved subject to the issues raised at the meeting.

Chairman, 30 April 2014