

## **Cabinet Scrutiny Committee**

Minutes of the Meeting Held on Tuesday 25 May 2010

### **Present:**

Mr P Morse (Chair)

Mr T Adams  
Dr A Boswell  
Mr J Dobson  
Mr P Duigan  
Mr R Hanton  
Mr C Jordan  
Mr J Joyce  
Mr M Kiddle-Morris

Mr G Nobbs  
Mr R Rockcliffe  
Mr M Scutter  
Mr J Shrimplin  
Mr T White  
Mr P Wells  
Mr M Wilby

### **Also Present:**

Ms Julie Anderson	Interim Children's Trust Partnership Manager
Mrs Karen Haywood	Scrutiny Support Manager
Mrs Kristen Jones	Committee Officer
Mr Stephen Revell	Chairman of Standards Committee
Mr Chris Small	Deputy Head of Norfolk Youth Justice Service
Mr Chris Walton	Head of Democratic Services

### **1. Apologies and substitutions**

Apologies were received from Mr Byrne and Mr Wright (Mr Wells substituting). Mrs Alison Thomas (Cabinet Member for Children's Services) offered her apologies in relation to the agenda item on the Common Assessment Framework (Item 8).

### **2. Election of Chair**

Mr Morse was elected as Chair of the Committee for the ensuing year.

### **3. Election of Vice-Chair**

Dr Boswell was elected as Vice-Chair of the Committee for the ensuing year.

### **4. Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **5. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held 20 April 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the deletion of the words “should be taken up” in the ninth bullet point of 6.2.

## **6. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **7. Call-in Item(s)**

There were no items called in.

## **8. Common Assessment Framework**

8.1 Members received the annexed reports (8i and 8ii) by the Scrutiny Support Manager and the Interim Children’s Trust Partnership Manager.

8.2 The Interim Children’s Trust Partnership Manager and the Deputy Head of Norfolk Youth Justice Service were present to answer questions.

8.3 During the discussion the following points were noted:

- The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) was a tool to enable early identification of the needs of those children and young people and their families who required additional support.
- Children’s Services funded the training budget for staff involved in the CAF. It was estimated that the current financial year’s training budget was approximately £100k and this included the costs for continued support through the process. It was clarified that there were different levels of training for different types of staff.
- Schools were the primary initiators of intervention but more work could be done with health colleagues, GPs, nurseries, and children’s centres to reach children at the earliest possible stage.
- Schools did not have to pay for the CAF process but did have to cover the costs of staff time, including their involvement in any subsequent interventions. Members felt that the practice of expecting the initiator to become the lead practitioner or caseworker may be a deterrent for using the CAF. It was noted that the CAF was not always carried out by teachers; teaching assistants or other staff could take a lead role. Teachers often see the use of the CAF as a time saving tool in the long term as it was a way to get families the help they need early on, directly from the professionals.
- The Interim Children’s Trust Partnership Manager clarified that a

“completed” CAF meant when the required paperwork had been completed while a “closed” CAF meant that there was currently no further interaction with a family. Many CAFs were closed due to the situations being referred, the family disengaging from the process, or the family moving out of the area. As the CAF process was completely voluntary, staff needed to have expert engagement skills to ensure families who saw improvement did not stop the process too soon.

- It was noted that 63% of children in Norfolk did not have additional needs and therefore one of the main challenges was to identify the families which did require additional help. Two other main challenges were to get agencies to use the CAF and to reach those people with high levels of need who lived in rural areas.
- It was difficult to get direct feedback on the success, or otherwise, of the CAF. Feedback was received through professionals who would write up case studies.
- Norfolk was rare in that it held and maintained a database of the number of cases ongoing. There was no national database for CAFs but this was in development.
- It was noted that in the east of Norfolk, the CAF had been running for longer and had more dedicated staff, which was why there was a higher number in this area of the county.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 8.4 To agree the report and conclude the scrutiny of the Common Assessment Framework.

### **9. Large Scale Projects Processes**

- 9.1 Members received the annexed report (9) by the Scrutiny Support Manager.
- 9.2 The report from the Head of Procurement was delayed until the next meeting.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 9.3 To receive the report from the Head of Procurement at the next meeting of the Committee and to include within the report the following details:

“Examples of successful (or otherwise) projects of major impact or significance for Norfolk communities over the past four years.”

### **10. Ethical Governance Terms of Reference**

- 10.1 Members received the annexed report (10) by the Scrutiny Support

Manager. The committee was asked to consider the Terms of Reference and agree whether it wished to proceed with the scrutiny of Ethical Governance, either as a working group or as a full committee and when this would take place.

10.2 During the discussion the following points were noted:

- Members were divided about how to handle the scrutiny of this item. Some Members thought that it was not the Committee's place to look at the issue of ethics, and particularly those of other organisations. Other Members thought that it was an opportunity for Members to satisfy themselves that partnerships of which the Council was a member had a clear ethical framework in place.
- A vote was taken and four Members were in favour of progressing with this piece of scrutiny and eleven against.

**RESOLVED:**

10.3 Not to progress this scrutiny item.

**11. Cabinet Scrutiny Committee: Forward Work Programme**

11.1 Members received the annexed report (11) by the Scrutiny Support Manager. The report contained the issues raised for future scrutiny and the suggested approach for Members to take.

11.2 During the discussion the following points were noted:

- The Chair noted that the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive would not be available until the August 2010 meeting to answer questions on the Organisational Review and it was suggested that this report was taken at that meeting.
- Planning for the meeting with Norfolk's MPs was currently underway and three possible dates had been circulated. These dates were 2 July, 16 July, and 23 July. It was noted that MPs were asked to respond by the end of that week so the chosen date would be announced shortly. The Chair asked Members to prepare questions for the MPs and hand these over to their Scrutiny Leads.

**RESOLVED:**

11.3 To receive a report on Organisational Review in August 2010.

11.4 To update the Forward Work Programme in regards to the Objective for the Road Maintenance item to read

"To examine the standards of work and of materials used to repair Norfolk's roads in the last few months, including the system of contracting employed

for this purpose, following the additional funding made available in the budget to deal with this issue.”

The meeting concluded at 10:55am.

CHAIR



**If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Kristen Jones on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.**