

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 30 November 2015 at 7.15 p.m., Room C1, 1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London, E14 2BG

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

This meeting is open to the public to attend.

Contact for further enquiries:

David Knight, Democratic Services
1st Floor, Town Hall, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent,
London, E14 2BG
Tel: 020 7364 4878
E-mail: david.knight@towerhamlets.gov.uk
Web: <http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee>

Scan this code for
the electronic
agenda:



For further information including the Membership of this body and public information, see the main agenda.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

1 - 22

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 2nd November, 2015.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.15 P.M. ON MONDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 2015

**C1, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,
LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor John Pierce (Chair)	
Councillor Danny Hassell (Vice-Chair)	
Councillor Peter Golds	– Scrutiny Lead for Law Probity and Governance
Councillor Denise Jones	– Scrutiny Lead for Communities, Localities & Culture
Councillor Md. Maium Miah	– Scrutiny Lead for Resources
Councillor Oliur Rahman	–
Councillor Helal Uddin	– Scrutiny Lead for Development and Renewal
Councillor Shahed Ali	–

Co-opted Members Present:

Nozrul Mustafa	– (Parent Governor Representative)
Victoria Ekubia	– (Roman Catholic Church Representative)
Dr Phillip Rice	– (Church of England Representative)
Rev James Olanipekun	– (Parent Governor Representative)

Other Councillors Present:

Mayor
Cabinet Member for Culture
Cabinet Member for Environment
Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services
Cabinet Member for Resources
Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Community Safety
Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education and Children's Services
Mayor

Apologies:

Councillor Mahbub Alam	–
Councillor Amina Ali	– Scrutiny Lead for Adult Health and Wellbeing

Officers Present:

Stephen Adams	– (Finance and Resources Manager, Communities Localities & Culture)
Luke Addams	– (Interim Director of Adult's Services)
Simon Baxter	– (Acting Service Head, Public Realm, Communities Localities & Culture)
Kate Bingham	– (Service Head, Children's and Adults Resources)
Mark Cairns	– (Senior Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer)
Melanie Clay	– (Director, Law Probity and Governance)
Zena Cooke	– (Corporate Director, Resources)
Stephen Halsey	– (Corporate Director Communities, Localities & Culture)
Ekbal Hussain	– (Financial Planning Manager, Chief Executive's and Resources)
Judith St John	– (Head of Ideas Stores, Communities Localities & Culture)
Debbie Jones	– (Interim Corporate Director, Children's Services)
Ali Khan	– (Political Adviser to the Independent Group Office)
Paul Leeson	– (Finance Manager, Development & Renewal)
Jackie Odunoye	– (Service Head, Strategy, Regeneration & Sustainability, Development and Renewal)
Terry Parkin	– Interim Service Head, Learning & Achievement
Nasima Patel	– (Service Head Children's Social Care, Children's Services)
Matthew Vaughan	– (Political Adviser to the Conservative Group)
Anthony Walters	– (Transformation Manager, Children's and Adults Resources)
Graham White	– (Interim Head of Legal Operations)
Corporate Director, Children's Services	– (Political Adviser, Conservative Group)
Corporate Director, Communities, Localities & Culture and Head of Paid Service	– (Deputy Service Head, Planning and Building Control, Development & Renewal)
Corporate Director, Resources	–
Director, Adults' Services	–
Director, Law, Probity and Governance	– (Technical Project Officer, Adult Services)
David Knight	– (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Chair **Moved** and it was:-

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 5th October, 2015 were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

Nil items

5. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

Nil items

6. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

Nil items

7. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

7.1 Annual Procurement Report

This report provided the annual procurement expenditure analysis for financial year 2014-15 and an update on the Authority's performance against key objectives set out within the Councils Procurement Policy Imperatives.

The Committee noted the:

1. Annual procurement expenditure analysis;
2. Achievements against the Procurement Policy Imperatives;
3. Authority's position on central records of all supplies, services and works contracts and progress made in improving third party expenditure under management; and
4. Current issues, future challenges and planned improvements to further transform Council's procurement activities.

7.2 Petition Review

It was noted that the terms of reference of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee provided that in respect of the Council's petition scheme, power is delegated to the Committee to undertake a review if a petition organiser feels the authority's response to his/her position was inadequate. In her request for a review (appendix 2 referred), the petition organiser states that despite submitting a petition to Council in January 2014, no formal response has been received and an explanation and a response is sought.

The Committee heard that:

In the autumn of 2008 following a lengthy campaign from leaseholders and Tower Hamlets Leaseholders' Association, the Council agreed a Motion to commission an independent audit of leasehold service charges to ensure these were accurately calculated in accordance with best practice, and to ensure that the charges levied were fair, accurate and transparent.

A Project Steering Group (PSG) including leaseholders and cross-party Members was set up to oversee the audit. The PSG were responsible for drawing up the brief for the audit, and oversaw the procurement process, with leaseholder representatives and Councillors on the selection panel which appointed Beaver & Struthers.

The audit by Beaver & Struthers was conducted in early 2010, and an Action Plan containing 54 service recommendations was developed. A Leasehold Action Plan Working Group (LAPWG) was established, comprising leaseholders and THH/LBTH staff, which met regularly to monitor detailed progress against the action plan and recommend completions to PSG for sign-off.

THH carried out work to implement all of the recommendations, with a projected delivery date of March 2013. The PSG signed off 9 of the recommendations as completed, 15 recommendations were considered by PSG but not signed off, and 32 were completed but not yet considered by PSG.

PSG did not discuss or consider any of the outstanding recommendations after October 2012, as leaseholder members on the LAPWG disagreed with THH over changes to service charge calculations which were introduced in September 2012. The changes introduced were to:

- allocate all overheads to front line services (in line with best practice and with Beaver & Struthers' recommendations.); and
- charges in relation to caretaking to blocks and estates based on time spent, again in line with Beaver & Struthers' recommendations.

The Council proposed to resolve this impasse by commissioning a further independent review to assess the progress made in implementing the 54

points of the action plan. This review was undertaken by Housing Quality Network and completed in February 2015. Again, leaseholder representatives from PSG were fully involved in the selection process to appoint Housing Quality Network. The review by HQN found:

- Good progress made on the B&S recommendations;
- Not all the recommendations ready for sign off;
- Evidence of improvements in the engagement structure;
- A wider range of opportunities offered to leaseholders;
- Increased leaseholder satisfaction; and
- Relationships of THH and Tower Hamlets Council and PSG needed to improve.

An audit by Mazars Audit was also commissioned by Mayor Rahman to look at:

- the on-going costs reduction process being undertaken by THH; and
- ensure that the costs charged to leaseholders are statute and lease compliant, transparent, and good value.

This audit was completed in June 2014. The audit, based on sample testing, found that:

- The calculation methodology used in 2011/12 and 2012/13 was lease compliant and accords with sound accounting practice.
- No breaches of statute were noted; and
- The apportionment of costs based upon the GV method was sound and consistently applied across the various direct cost headings.

The findings of the HQN Review, the Mazars Audit supported the actions of THH and the Council in the implementation of the action plan and the way in which service charges are apportioned and calculated.

A Council Motion was passed on 22nd January 2014 calling on the Mayor to:

- Explain why only 5 out of 54 of the recommendations arising from the B&S audit have so far been implemented;
- Explain why an 17 per cent “Overhead” has been introduced across most Heads of Charge;
- Justify the Service Level Agreements between LBTH and THH and explain what action is being taken to ensure best value;
- Instruct THH to publish a report detailing how the actions it has taken since October 2010 to achieve “savings” have resulted in reduced costs to council leaseholders and tenants.

These matters were all covered in detail within the content of the HQN Review and the Mazars audit referred to above, however PSG has not met since April 2014 to conclude this matter.

A PDQM at Council on 26th November 2014 asking for an update on the action taken received a response from the then Lead Member for Housing indicating that both the review and audit are due to be reported to PSG and the recommendations will then be finalised and form the basis of service improvements. Again, the findings of the independent review and the audit report have yet to be reported to PSG, which has not met since April 2014 pending direction from the former Lead Member. The main points of the discussion maybe summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- I. Heard that the auditors had, had access to the reports and paperwork that they required;
- II. Heard that Leaseholders felt that it was not possible to identify what is a completed exercise and they had not seem all the paperwork to conclude if the audit was as thorough as indicated;
- III. Agreed to ask the Corporate Director of Law Probity and Governance to review the action taken so far;
- IV. Agreed that officers produce a report for consideration by this Committee which would provide recommendations on how the Committee should deal with this issue, and include those reports produced by HQM and Mazars.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee reviewed the petition and the Council's response to that petition and following consideration of the evidence presented.

Agreed:

1. To ask the Corporate Director of Law Probity and Governance to review the action taken so far; and
2. That officers produce a report for consideration by this Committee which provides recommendations on how the Committee should deal with this issue, and includes the reports by HQM and Mazars.

7.3 Strategic Resources and Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) noted that good financial practice requires that regular reports be submitted to Council/Committee setting out the financial position of the Council against budget, and its service performance against targets. The regular reporting of the Strategic Performance and Corporate Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring should assist in ensuring that Members are able to scrutinise officer decisions. The main points of the discussion may be outlined as follows:

Review of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals, including the risks; and

Realignment and funding of efficiencies in early years provision

OSC agreed:

- To request more details.

Charging for community Social Care services

OSC agreed:

To request a more detailed business case and calculations/assumptions for charging;

Review of Day Services for Older People

OSC agreed:

- To request further information on how spending on Mayfield House is split between in-house and commissioned services;

Improving focus on reablement for social care users

OSC agreed:

- To request a briefing on the assumptions underpinning this proposal.

Review of high cost Learning Disability care packages

OSC agreed:

- To request details of any risks of a reduced/poorer service resulting from these proposals.

Saving Money by Reducing or Stopping Sunday Idea Store Opening

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals.

Renegotiation of Current Leisure Services Contract

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals.

Discontinue the Incontinence Laundry Service

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals, including the risks.

Alternative funding arrangement for Toilets

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals.

Alternative Waste Disposal Solution

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals.

Review of Streetcare and Streetworks Team

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals.

Reduction in Blackwall Tunnel Approach Cleansing

OSC agreed:

- To request a more detailed business case on these proposals.

Increased productivity and commercialisation of planning and building control services

OSC agreed:

- To request information on the limits of what could be funded from potential increased income generated by these proposals.

Other requests

OSC agreed:

- To request the total budget and breakdown of spend on the council's Public Health service;
- To request information on the impact of loss of the Independent Living Fund.

8. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

Agreed to defer consideration of this item until the next meeting.

9. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS

Agenda Item 5.6 – Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2014-15

Committee asked for details

1. of attendance at the Board to see who is being engaged;
2. on what the Board is doing to scrutinise themselves and their partners;
3. on what is being done to ensure learning is filtering down to staff and that they are aware of how the Board is improving their practice/learning; and
4. of the costs to LBTH of the Board Chair and how is this bench marked.

Agenda Item 5.7 - Safeguarding Adults Board Annual report 2014-15

Committee asked for details

1. of attendance at the Board to see who is being engaged;
2. on what the Board is doing to scrutinise themselves and their partners;
3. on what is being done to ensure learning is filtering down to staff and that they are aware of how the Board is improving their practice/learning; and
4. of the costs to LBTH of the Board Chair and how is this bench marked.

Agenda Item 5.13 – Transparency Protocol: A Transparent Mayor, an Open Council

Committee asked for details regarding the publication of data under the Transparency Code. He wanted to know if Tower Hamlets had reached the standard of three stars in relation to the openness of the formats that we use to publish data, as per the LG Transparency Code.

Reponses to the above are set out in the attached **Appendices A; A1 and A2**

10. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

Nil items

11. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The agenda circulated contained no exempt/ confidential business and there was therefore no requirement to exclude the press and public to allow for its consideration.

12. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Nil items

13. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

Nil items

14. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL) CABINET PAPERS

Nil items

15. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

Nil items

The meeting ended at 10.15 p.m.

**Chair, Councillor John Pierce
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

1. APPENDIX A - PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY QUESTIONS

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS
Pre-Decision Questions - Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 2nd November, 2015

Cabinet Report	Question / Comments
<p>Agenda Item 5.6 – Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2014-15</p> <p>Agenda Item 5.7 - Safeguarding Adults Board Annual report 2014-15</p>	<p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee:</p> <p>Committee asked for details</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. of attendance at the Boards to see who is being engaged; 2. on what both Boards are doing to scrutinise themselves and their partners; 3. on what is being done to ensure learning is filtering down to staff and that they are aware of how LSCB is improving their practice/learning; and 4. Of the costs to LBTH of the Board Chairs and how is this bench marked. <p>Response:</p> <p>See appendices 1 and 2</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5.13 – Transparency Protocol: A Transparent Mayor, an Open Council</p>	<p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee:</p> <p>Committee asked for details regarding the publication of data under the Transparency Code. They wanted to know if Tower Hamlets had reached the standard of three stars in relation to the openness of the formats that we use to publish data, as per the LG Transparency Code</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The Council currently publishes in full 81% of the data required under the transparency code via a central web page in a combination of 1, 2, and 3 star format, the majority achieving 2 star. A limited amount of this data is published at 3 stars; however items such as the constitution are not conducive to other formats for publication.</p> <p>We are working closely with the services producing the data to increase the amount of data currently published at level two of the transparency code to meet level not just three</p>

Cabinet Report	Question / Comments
	<p>star but four star formatting and also to include the recommended data alongside the publication of statutory data.</p> <p>The web publishing at four stars requires some work from the web editors and the data production requires input from a number of services.</p> <p>A position statement and development plan will be considered at the FOI Board on Friday 13 November seeking agreement for an action plan. It is anticipated that full compliance will be achieved no later than the end of this financial year.</p>

Date	Reference Number
16 th November 2016	CS_MB8065
CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIRECTORATE	
Briefing Note for:	Cllr Pierce – Chair Overview & Scrutiny
Subject:	LSCB
Author:	Layla Richards

LSCB Briefing

This briefing has been prepared in response to questions raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 2nd November 2015, in relation to the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).

1. Details of Attendance at the Boards

Working Together to Safeguard Children Guidance (2015) sets the expectations that an LSCB must include representatives as follows to form the core board membership:

- Local Authority
- Lead Member for Children
- Chief Officer of Police
- National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies
- Youth Offending Team
- NHS England and Clinical Commissioning Groups
- NHS Trust
- NHS Foundation Trust
- CAFCASS (Children and Family Court Advisory Service)
- Governor or Director of any secure training centre or prison in the area of the authority

Additional requirements are referenced in section 13 and 14 of the Children Act 2004 that the Local Authority must take reasonable steps to ensure two lay members and school or further education college bodies are represented.

The guidance also states that members of an LSCB should be officers with a strategic role in relation to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children within their organisation and that they should be able to:

- Speak for their organisation with authority
- Commit their organisation on policy and practice matters
- Hold their own organisation and others to account

Tower Hamlets' LSCB has 36 board members and meets the membership requirements in all areas listed above, with additional representation from youth service, community safety, housing, legal and the voluntary sector. The LSCB governance arrangement states where a member is unable to attend they must send a deputy in their place who can provide consistency to their input and oversight.

The LSCB monitors attendance of all partners at the Board and subgroups. When issues of attendance or consistency of attendance arise these are challenged by the LSCB chair and action taken. Overall, the main Board is generally always well attended.

2. What are the Boards doing to scrutinise themselves and their partners?

The LSCB has a two-year overarching business plan which sets out a number of priorities for the coming year and maintains a risk register. The core LSCB functions are delivered through six work streams. The LSCB Chair is independent and accountable to the Chief Executive of the Council. The Chair performs her scrutiny and challenge role in a number of ways:

- Annual one-to-one review meetings are held between the chair and partner agency representative(s). This year we have planned to link these meetings to the agency section 11 (Children Act 2004) returns so any short fall can be challenged directly.
- The LSCB carries out a biennial assessment of all member agencies and organisations in relation to their duties under Section 11 Children Act 2004. This is a self-assessment audit which aims to assess the effectiveness of the arrangements for safeguarding children at a strategic level. The audit may lead to an improvement action plan which is then monitored by the LSCB Chair through one-to-one meetings with Board members.
- The LSCB Chair monitors the LSCB business plan, subgroup work plans, implementation of serious case review recommendations and the safeguarding risks across the partnership. Meetings with subgroup chairs are held six times per year to review work stream progress.
- The LSCB Chair is accountable to the CEO and has regular one-to-one meetings and an annual appraisal which is informed by a 360° feedback by Board members

- Self-assessment review has been completed against the single agency inspection framework which has had Board member oversight.
- When partner agencies undergo sector-led inspections and where performance issues come to light, the LSCB seeks assurance through standing agenda reporting on the progress being made against their improvement plan e.g. CQC Inspection of Barts Health Trust.
- The LSCB Chair undertakes visits to front line services across the LSCB partnership to observe practice directly to enable an informed debate around inter-agency safeguarding arrangements and commissioning. This also bridges the distance between policy and practice and allows practitioners to raise issues and concerns directly.
- The LSCB has a performance and quality assessment framework and reports to the Board on a quarterly basis. Concerns around performance lead to further interrogation through multi-agency deep dive case audits.
- The LSCB carries out Serious Case Reviews which provides a spotlight on the safeguarding system and quality of practice usually when things go wrong. However, the LSCB also undertake/learning lesson reviews to understand how well the partnership works well to safeguard vulnerable children i.e. those at risk of sexual exploitation.
- We are planning to re-instate an executive business group which will oversee the business planning cycle and provide an additional scrutiny layer.

3. What is being done to ensure learning is filtering down to staff and that they are aware of how the LSCB is improving their practice/learning?

The LSCB has a Learning and Improvement Framework (Working Together 2015 requirement) which underpins the core function of the LSCB e.g. learning, performance and quality assurance.

The Learning and Workforce Development Subgroup supports the delivery of multiagency training and learning event including an annual safeguarding conference.

Following SCR / Thematic reviews the LSCB delivers a series of learning dissemination events to cascade the learning and engage practitioners in action planning to improve practice e.g. the recent serious case review reached over 350 practitioners across the LSCB partnership

The LSCB Chair is a member of the London LSCB chairs and National Association of LSCB chairs creating opportunities to explore different ways of working and challenging the agendas and work of the LSCB.

As a result of the Ofsted thematic inspection of Neglect, the LSCB produced a multi-agency neglect strategy to ensure the level of knowledge, quality of practice and intervention response is consistent across the boroughs workforce.

The LSCB has a website which ensures new developments, publications and resources are available to the professional and local community. Minutes of the LSCB board and other key documents are published. However, further work is planned to improve our website.

4. The costs to LBTH of the Board Chairs and how is this bench marked?

The Local Authority is not responsible for the cost of the independent LSCB chair as it is funded through partner agency contribution. However as the funding is not currently equitable across the agencies the Council consequently pays a greater proportion of the LSCB Chair's cost.

The LSCB chair is employed for 30 days per year and additional days are negotiated when there is increased demand placed on the Board's work as a result of serious case/thematic reviews.

The London Safeguarding Children Board (London Council) has undertaken a benchmarking exercise of the cost of LSCBs across the city, including the cost of LSCB Chairs which ranges between £500-£750 per day.

Tower Hamlets LSCB Chair is paid £500 per day which is at the lower end of the range.

Debbie Jones
Interim Corporate Director Children's Services

Date: 16/11/2015

Date	Reference Number
16 th November 2015	AS_3005
ADULT SERVICES DIRECTORATE	
Briefing Note for:	Cllr Pierce – Chair Overview & Scrutiny
Subject:	Local Safeguarding Adults Board
Author:	Layla Richards

This briefing has been prepared in response to questions raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 2 November 2015, in relation to the Safeguarding Adults Board (SAB).

1. Details of Attendance at the Boards

To comply with the Care Act the SAB includes as members:

1. Independent chair
2. The Local Authority
3. The Local CCG
4. The Police

In addition there is representation on the SAB from:

London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Lead Member

Corporate Director, Adult Social Care and Wellbeing

Service Manager Policy, Programmes and Community Insight

Safeguarding Adults Board Manager

Service Head, Disability & Health

Adult Safeguarding Team

Commissioning

Joint Team Manager, CLDT

Community Safety

Children's Social Care

NHS

Bart's Health NHS Trust

East London NHS Foundation Trust

Tower Hamlets CCG

Metropolitan Police

Probation Service
London Fire Service
London Ambulance Service

Care Providers/Service Users

Excelcare Holdings
Toynbee Hall
Mencap
Age UK
Tower Hamlets Council for Voluntary Services
PohWER
Toynbee Hall
Real
Healthwatch Tower Hamlets
Housing
Tower Hamlets Homes
Providence Row Housing Association
Tower Hamlets Housing Forum

Care Quality Commission

Throughout 2015 attendance has included the key members required to be compliant with the Care Act, and meetings are attended by representatives of between 12 and 15 of the member organisations.

2. What are the Boards doing to scrutinise themselves and their partners?

The SAB has developed a Joint 4 year strategy for 2015-2019. The Strategy was agreed at the September 2015 SAB and has an associated Joint Business Plan. Progress against the Business Plan will be monitored at successive SAB meetings. A new Framework for Performance and Quality Assurance for all member organisations has been drafted and will be presented at the next SAB in December 2015.

In 2014/15 member organisations undertook audits using the Safeguarding Adults at Risk Audit Tool. The tool was developed by the London Chairs of Safeguarding Adults Boards (SABs) network and NHS England London. It reflects statutory guidance and best practice. The tool provides all organisations in the borough with a consistent framework to assess, monitor and/or improve their Safeguarding Adults arrangements. In turn this will support the SAB in ensuring effective safeguarding practice across the borough. A follow-up audit will take place before April 2016 to measure progress in the member organisations.

The SAB Business Plan identifies a priority need to develop LBTH Performance Reports in relation to Adult Safeguarding, and to establish a joint performance report across key partner agencies.

3. What is being done to ensure learning is filtering down to staff and that they are aware of how SAB is improving their practice/learning

Minutes from SAB meetings are circulated to staff and information cascaded via team meetings for the Service Managers of Social Care Teams and Team Meetings. The SAB strategy will be presented to frontline staff throughout the months of November and December by the SAB Manager, who will also seek feedback to promote the development of the SAB Business plan.

Learning and Development will be conducting a further review of the learning needs of staff in partnership with the Good Practice and Training sub-group as part of the Business Plan for the year.

4. The costs to LBTH of the Board Chairs and how is this benchmarked?

The independent chair is paid £600 per day for up to 20 days of work per year. Although no formal benchmarking has been undertaken, a review of pay rates across London reveals that £600 per day is the same as many other London Boroughs.

Luke Addams
Interim Corporate Director Children's Services

Date: 16/11/2015

This page is intentionally left blank