

**GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY (GMCA)  
CORPORATE ISSUES AND REFORM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
20 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 6.00PM AT GMCA OFFICES**

Present: Councillor Nathan Evans (Trafford) (in the Chair)  
 Bury: Councillor Tim Pickstone  
 Manchester: Councillor Annette Wright  
 Councillor Mary Watson  
 Oldham: Councillor Colin McLaren  
 Councillor Peter Davis (Substitute)  
 Salford: Councillor David Jolley  
 Stockport: Councillor Linda Holt  
 Councillor Yvonne Guariento  
 Trafford: Councillor Anne Duffield  
 Tameside: Councillor John Bell

**In attendance**

GMCA Andrew Lightfoot, Deputy Chief Executive  
 Martin Nugent, Rehabilitation Programme Manager  
 Richard Paver, GMCA Treasurer  
 Jane Forrest, Assistant Director  
 John Holden, Assistant Director  
 Claire Norman, Assistant Director  
 Alex Flahive, Digital Manager  
 Susan Ford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer  
 Jamie Fallon, Governance and Scrutiny Officer

**CI49/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hamid Khurram (Bolton), Stella Smith (Bury), Peter Malcolm (Rochdale), Gillian Peet (Tameside), Joanne Marshall (Wigan).

**CI50/18 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS**

No urgent business was raised.

**CI51/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received.

**CI52/18 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 NOVEMBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 were submitted for approval.

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2018 be approved as a correct record.

### **CI53/18 WORK PROGRAMME**

Susan Ford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer, introduced the work programme which had been revised to reflect the GMFRS items discussed at the last meeting. It was proposed that the most effective way to receive further information on sprinklers and the work with utilities was via briefing notes which would be available in January 2019.

Members were asked to contact the Statutory Scrutiny Officer with any further items for inclusion in the work programme.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the reconfigured work programme be agreed.

### **CI54/18 GM RESPONSE TO MINISTRY OF JUSTICE FEMALE OFFENDER STRATEGY**

Andrew Lightfoot, GMCA Deputy Chief Executive, introduced a report which provided the Committee with an overview of how GM is responding to the Governments' new strategy in the broader context of devolution of the criminal justice system.

The Deputy Chief Executive and Martin Nugent, Rehabilitation Programme Manager, who was also in attendance, highlighted the following key areas:

- GM is the one area nationally that has developed and delivered a 'whole system approach' that addresses the needs of women who are vulnerable, marginalised and in contact with the criminal justice system, by ensuring that criminal justice partners, community services and the voluntary sector, work together with the women to help them make positive changes in their own lives.
- The GM 'whole system approach' has been fully operational since January 2015. The approach, delivered by an alliance of 8 voluntary sector organisations, together with police triage, a problem-solving court, and support alongside community orders and on release from prison, with women's centres established in all boroughs in GM to provide women-only 'one-stop shop' support.
- The providers in the alliance are engaging with early help offers in their locality to raise the visibility of the service. They are also developing step-in/ step-out arrangements with statutory support offers to ensure they are working in line with public service reform principles.
- Of the women that engaged 51% had identified needs in five or more different areas showing that these women are some of our most vulnerable women in our communities.
- Emerging evidence from the GM Whole System Approach shows a 40% reduction in the number of adult women sentenced to immediate custody since 2014, compared with a 3% reduction for England and Wales.
- Proven re-offending is 16% for all GM women offenders compared to the national reoffending rate for England and Wales of 22.9% and other comparable metropolitan areas ranging from 23.7% (West Yorkshire) to 27.4% (South Yorkshire).
- An independently reviewed cost benefit analysis of the approach shows there is an economic fiscal benefit of £3.18 for every pound invested over a two year period, partners that include

the Ministry of Justice, local authorities, through avoided looked after children and homelessness costs, and health partners through improved mental and physical health outcomes.

- The ambition is to be fully integrated into the local community delivering support and following public service reform (PSR) principles to ensure women who are vulnerable and marginalised have access to support to help them cope and recover.
- Despite MoJ's close engagement with GM, they do not currently fund the approach. The Project has previously been funded through one off pots from the Lottery Fund and the GM Police & Crime Commissioner.
- Fortunately, the local bid by the Greater Manchester Women's Support Alliance (the Alliance) supported by local justice and partners and the GMCA had been successful, and will contribute £250,000 to the financial year 2019/20. This will be crucial to maintain the GM 'whole system approach' in the short term whilst developing a more long term funding mechanism that integrates the approach into local delivery landscapes and referral routes for vulnerable and marginalised women at various (early) points in the system, with the ambition to include the MoJ as a justice reinvestment partner.
- GM has been at the forefront of the development of a 'whole system approach' to female offenders and was considered a 'pathfinder' for the MoJ Strategy. However, the service is now at a crossroads in terms of the shifting shape of probation and prison services, sustainability of local funding and extension of provision to those women who are vulnerable and at risk. Critical decisions will need to be made within the next 12 months as to the direction of travel, dependent upon sustainability of funding and integration with local areas.
- A further update would be provided to the Committee as the negotiations progress.

Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Do the partnership arrangements in place vary between the districts? It was confirmed that there are elements of excellence but also weakness across GM districts. It was highlighted that Tameside was an area which had secured additional funding to develop their approach which included; a women's centre which looked beyond criminal justice and offers an in-house crèche. In addition, they have peripatetic workers who deliver outreach support. To measure quality, the Alliance has developed its own internal quality mechanisms which seeks to ensure that there is a consistent standard of delivery. There is a commitment from all districts to work to the best standard their budget allows, noting that funding was an issue for some areas who were unable to secure additional funding.
- On average, how long do women need support for? It was acknowledged that this was driven by the service user, noting that some people had been known to the service for a number of years. The service was there to provide additionality and to avoid duplication, therefore, the providers in the alliance are engaging with early help offers in their locality to raise the visibility of the service. They are also developing step-in / step-out arrangements with statutory support offers to ensure they are working in line with PSR principals.
- A Member explored whether a similar service was available for men? It was confirmed that there were services available to support men including a specific service supporting 18-25 year old males who have received community orders. The approach recognises that many women in the justice system have also been victims of offences themselves and that domestic abuse can be a driver for offending and reoffending.
- A Member felt that there was scepticism in the sector regarding funding a residential setting, and explored whether an analysis had been conducted? It was confirmed that the strategy announced that the MoJ was keen to explore the possibilities of developing five suitable

accommodation pilots in the community, which could be used as an alternative to prison, and reduce the number of women being sentenced to short custodial sentences. However to date, no funding had been announced. Locally, partners and service users had been consulted on the approach to see what options would be most appropriate. Nationally women were increasingly being sentenced to short and very short custodial sentences, however, in GM this was not the case, noting that snap shot data (captured in early 2018) had indicated that only seven GM women were sentenced to less than six months. GM does have a significant cohort of women that fail to resettle and are recalled or go onto commit further crimes and subsequently receive a further custodial sentence. There is also a cohort of women who are being supervised in the community or on Suspended Sentence Orders that risk being breached and receiving a custodial sentence.

- Were the 'Problem Solving Courts' still adding the value? It was confirmed that they had been impacted upon by changes to court efficiency programmes and changes to probation. Work is underway to ensure that this element as a minimum, is maintained, and the Criminal Justice Board have agreed to developing the approach across GM.
- Has an evaluation been conducted to measure the transitional outcomes of this work? A cost benefit analysis of the agencies that benefit from this approach tells us that the MoJ, local authorities and the health services appear to benefit in some way, whether through demand reduction or mitigating complexity of demand.
- How much would it cost to sustain the service? At the moment it costs £850,000 per year to deliver the service across GM which supports approximately 1600 people per year. Additional funding would be required to develop the service to a higher minimum standard and to intervene at different points. The level of funding required would depend on scale of our ambition.
- Members expressed their support for the programme. Following discussion, the Committee agreed that a recommendation be submitted to the Mayor and GMCA to consider how a more sustainable funding base could be secured, and also consider undertaking an impact assessment to help understand how future funding could be allocated.
- It was agreed that a further update be provided to the Committee as the discussions with MoJ develop.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That a further update be provided to the Committee as appropriate.
3. That the Mayor and GMCA are recommended to consider how a more sustainable funding base could be secured.
4. That the Mayor and GMCA are recommended to consider undertaking an impact assessment to help understand how future funding could be allocated.

John Holden, Assistant Director Policy and Strategy presented the Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) implementation and performance dashboard update to Members. Following the development of the GMS, attention was now focused on delivery and to support this the GMCA had agreed a two year implementation plan in April 2018, with the inclusion of ambitions to be achieved by 2020, and delivery milestones for the first six months (to October 2018). The dashboard was intended to provide clarity in relation to GM's ambitions and the chosen indicators were those it was felt could best demonstrate GM's progress.

The approach was still being refined and developed. It was noted that data and actions were not directly comparable as some of the data was lagged. The measures used did not directly respond to the actions GM is taking, but it was felt that the two together provided a rich picture of where we are.

The following priorities were highlighted as relating most closely to the Committee's remit:

Priority 1: Children starting schools ready to learn

Priority 8: Safer and Stronger Communities

Priority 10: An age-friendly Greater Manchester

Enablers and ways of working

Members posed the following questions and comments to John Holden, and Jane Forest, Assistant Director Reform, who was also in attendance:

- A Member felt that the indicators used to measure 'An age-friendly GM' (Priority 10) were not robust, and felt that the indicators could focus on the more positive achievements as opposed to problems. It was acknowledged that the measures could be improved and work was on going to develop more robust proposals.
- Would further information on the progress of the GM resident's survey be provided to the Committee in January 2019 as part of the Ageing Strategy update? It was confirmed that the GMCA had not yet decided to proceed with the resident's survey. However, work was ongoing to develop strong measures, and strong partnerships were in place with the University of Manchester to support this work. It was agreed that an update on the progress on the development of the metrics would be provided in January 2019.
- Why was the ambition to 'develop a single and consistent high quality workforce development programme and roll out to place-based teams and early years settings' (priority one) rag rated red? It was confirmed that the rag rating was a reflection of the complexity, breadth, and scope of workforce development which is required. The gap in performance relates to the most challenging and deprived neighbourhoods, supporting those with highly complex needs who require a targeted multi agency response. Work was ongoing with districts, health visitors and nurseries to develop evidence based assessment tools and proposals were being developed for an early years workforce academy. GM is also exploring how we can embed the GM way of doing things through working with colleges and universities.
- A Member of the school readiness task and finish group highlighted that Members had wanted to present an interim report to the Committee but they had not yet received a response to the officer actions agreed at their meeting. In addition, the visits to the districts had not yet taken place and a fresh impetus was required. The Chair expressed his disappointment at the lack of progress and requested that this be progressed. It was

confirmed that visits were in the progress of being arranged, noting that the Bury visit was scheduled to take place on the 29<sup>th</sup> November, and a visit to Oldham in the New Year.

- A Member explored why the dashboard indicated that there had only been 0.5% percentage point change on the previous year in relation to the 'proportion of children who are school ready at five years old (2018).' It was confirmed that the data was lagged which meant that the new approach would have not impacted on those children as they had already started school. It was acknowledged that to make an impact interventions were required from pre-conception to ensure that the children are school ready. It was highlighted that the new GM delivery model had been implemented in 2013, and had made an impact, but there was recognition that a significant part of the gap related to the proportion of children with the most complex needs, and a different approach was required to tackle this cohort.
- Are we able to deep dive into the data to identify what elements of work will enable us to bridge the gap between GM and the national average (3%)? It was confirmed that the digital and data aspects of the PSR programme were a top priority. Currently the data collected was lagged meaning that it was difficult to make a timely impact to improve outcomes. Work was underway to develop a system which would enable us to capture the data, and proactively analyse and respond to it. In addition, there was ongoing work with experts to design new interventions which will make a difference. Arrangements around information sharing were also being developed to enable seamless data sharing across a range of practitioners as this has been identified as a barrier to improving outcomes.
- How much of the challenge on school readiness is structural and how much of it is related to the fact that child poverty rates are increasing? A deep dive in localities was currently being undertaken to help understand the scale of the challenge. Anecdotally, it was both a product of budget pressures and also an increase in child poverty. Reference was made to the increasing number of women and children who were at risk of losing their homes.
- Were the rag-ratings different for the targets and the underpinning measures? It was confirmed that the rag-rating was a reflection of our trajectory towards the 2020 target, with the red recognising that we are significantly behind and at risk of not meeting the target. In terms of the supporting indicators, the rag ratings represented how far behind the national average we are and whether targets were likely to be attained.
- Concerns were raised regarding the level of red and amber indicators detailed within the dashboard in relation to high priority areas such as; crime, mortality and homelessness. It was acknowledged that these were areas which the Committee may wish to look into at future meetings.
- Further clarity was sought in relation to why there had not been an improvement in the number of rough sleepers since the last dashboard. It was confirmed that the homelessness data had not been updated since the last dashboard as the data was only collected annually. The latest data set would be available in January 2019.
- The Chair felt that it was not clear how the pots of funding fitted together to deliver the PSR agenda. It was confirmed that PSR was not a philosophy on an approach to prevention and improving outcomes, with key principles which can be applied to a broad range of services. It was agreed that further information on this be provided to the Committee.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the update on be noted.
2. That an update on the development of the age-friendly metrics be provided to the Committee when the item is considered in January 2019.

3. That a response to the actions requested by the school readiness task and finish group be provided.
4. That further information on the Public Services Reform principles be circulated to the Committee.

**CI56/18**

**NEW GMCA WEBSITE**

Claire Norman, Director of Communications and Engagement, introduced a report which provided an overview of the plan for the new GMCA website.

The following key points were highlighted:

- It was felt that the current website does not adequately reflect GM's ambitions.
- Currently the website receives 225,000 visitors per year, with 1million page views which was expected to increase.
- The new website is being developed internally which would save money and reduce the time required to update the content.
- The project was progressing well and it was envisaged that the site would go live before Christmas.
- An internal task and finish group had been set up to coordinate the activity of the project.
- Meeting papers would still appear on the website but would be published via Modern.gov, a programme used by most districts.
- Phase two of the project would include the development of a 'your area' section which would show statistics, news, and information, which promote each individual borough. This would include an interactive map.

Alex Flahive, Digital Manager, provided Members with an example of how the new GMCA website would look.

The following questions were raised:

- How would the website reflect the relationship between the GMCA and the Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service (GMFRS) and Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC)? It was confirmed that this would be reflected within the relevant portfolio section e.g. Police and Crime. It was noted that the GMFRS website was also being redeveloped, and scheduled to go live before Christmas.
- How do we avoid causing confusion to the public in relation to what are GMCA/ Mayoral responsibilities and what they must go to their district websites for? It was confirmed that site usage would be monitored to ensure that people are able to find what they are looking for. It was noted that the interactive map could provide further information on what they can access on their district's sites.
- How can we encourage Members to use the website to help educate them on what is going on at a GM level? It was confirmed that an overview of the portfolios was being developed which would include key messages on activity within that portfolio. The pack would be shared with Portfolio Leads who could then cascade it to Members. The general information pack was also being updated to support Members who are operating at locality level. Any further suggestions were also welcomed.

- A Member expressed their support of the move to Modern.gov and explored whether there would be a private area which would enable Members to access their confidential papers. It was confirmed that clarification would be sought and circulated to the Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That Members contact the communications team with any further ideas regarding the type of information that would be helpful for elected members.
3. That further information on how Members will access confidential papers on Modern.gov be circulated to the Committee.

**CI57/18                      GMCA REGISTER OF KEY DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**CI58/18                      DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> December, 6pm, GMCA Boardroom, Churchgate House, Manchester, M1 6EU

**CI59/18                      GMCA BUDGETS AND SOURCES OF INCOME**

Richard Paver, GMCA Treasurer, presented a report which provided an update on the GMCA budget, and provided information on the various sources of income funding budgets.

In addition, the Committee were asked to consider areas where they might wish to receive further information, or refer specific items for possible consideration by other Overview and Scrutiny Committee's.

The following questions and suggestions were raised:

- The Chair suggested that a deep dive into the Homelessness budget would be of interest to the Committee.
- A Member requested more information on how risk was managed within the transport budget, in particularly related to bus support, such as bus concessions. It was confirmed that the Housing, Planning and Environment were considering aspects of the TfGM Capital Programmes in December 2018.
- Further clarity was sought in relation to the Business Rates Income 2017/18 (detailed at paragraph 3.14 -3.15), and what the 'Pool receipts from Cheshire' related to. It was confirmed that the GMCA had been part of the 100% Business Rates Pilot since 2017/18 which was generating additional revenue for GM. Prior to this, you were able to pool your 'business rates' with both authorities within the area and outside of the area. This has allowed the Cheshire's authorities, who aren't in the Business Rates Pilot, to continue that arrangement



on a notional basis with GM, and they are generating receipts which they haven't passed back to Government, to which, we receive half of this money under the arrangement.

- A Member queried whether the Government's decision on the budget was expected before Christmas? It was confirmed that the area of interest for the GMCA related to the limits imposed on the precepts. Early indications were that there would be an increase in the PCC Precept to £12. In terms of the Mayoral Precept, the Government had indicated that they were not minded to implement a limit. The decision was expected on the 6<sup>th</sup> December in advance of the next meeting. It was noted that the GMCA only receives the Revenue Support Grant for the GMFRS components and is reliant upon contributions from districts for the waste budget, most of the Transport budget, and the majority of the GMCA budget.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.
2. That more detail be provided on budgets, particularly on Bus and homelessness within the work programme.

**CI60/18**

**EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED:**

That, under section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public should be excluded from the meeting for the following items on business on the grounds that this involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as set out in paragraph 3, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**CI61/18**

**UPDATE ON BUDGET OF GMCA WASTE SERVICES**

**CLERK'S NOTE:** This item was considered in support of the Part A report GMCA Budgets and Sources of Income.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

