

Supplementary Questions CYPSC 18 July 2023

Questioner:	Ms Reid Herefordshire
Scrutiny Meeting:	July 2023 - (submitted via email)
Question:	<p>The response states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A scrutiny committee may co-opt non-voting people as and when required, for example for a particular meeting or to join a scrutiny group.”</p> <p>However two “church” co-optees and three parent-governor co-optees are statutory requirements and two co-optees are required by the Constitution (4.5.7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “One representative from the teaching sector”• “One representative from a family who are or have been supported by social workers” <p>I repeat:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“How will the Committee ensure that the seven co-optees - especially the teaching sector co-optee and “representative from a family” co-optee who are not nominated or elected (by the relevant sector) - are appointed and able to attend the next meeting of the Committee on 26 September 2023? Please give details, for example, dates, where the positions will be advertised (eg Hoople’s website and/or the council’s Facebook) and so on.”</p>
Response: Disallowed.	<p>It was explained to the committee that the monitoring officer had disallowed this supplementary question as it was a straight repeat of the original question, which had already been responded to.</p>

Questioner:	Hannah Currie
Scrutiny Meeting:	July 2023 - (submitted via email)
Question:	<p>The committee needs to be aware that the families that attended the commission did so following a press release which rejected the terms of reference as binding or effective remedies. At least two families questions put to the council are missing in the report published in June, I'm aware of at least two individuals who didn't receive a letter from the service director (one of whom ex partners received a letter).</p> <p>Given this position of the families that did attend had in advance rejected the terms of reference as binding. I will ask you which is it:</p> <p>The system used for reporting is not fit for purpose; the staff using the system are not fit for purpose or the data cleansing is not fit for purpose?</p>
Response:	<p>The independent panel overseeing the Families’ Commission met with a total of twenty families. The report which was subsequently prepared by the independent Commission was written from</p>

the perspective of the families, using their own words wherever possible, whilst balancing the need to maintain anonymity.

During the independent panel process the chair approached the council with specific questions in relation to eleven families. It is these eleven families who received a letter from the Service Director.

The independent Families' Commission process and subsequent report was necessarily independent of the council and the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee. The council had no input into the format, structure or content of the report or about the supplementary questions which were raised by the independent Commission in relation to individual families.

If any individual or family has issues to raise around specific matters following the publication of the Families' Commission report they should contact Cllr Powell and raise the matter with him. Cllr Powell has clearly stated his commitment to endeavouring to reach resolution for families alongside the improvement journey.

Questioner:	Jennie Hewitt
Scrutiny Meeting:	July 2023 - (delivered verbally in person at the meeting)
Question:	Can the committee now resolve to get some analysis as to why there was a spike in children placed for adoption between 2021 and 2022?
Response:	The committee reviews its work programme after each meeting and welcomes suggestions from members of the public for topics to include in the work programme. We will include this suggestion in the next committee work programme meeting but we cannot provide any guarantee that your suggestion will be included in the committee's programme of work.