



London Borough of Hackney  
Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission  
Municipal Year 2018/19  
Date of Meeting Thursday, 20th September, 2018

Minutes of the proceedings of the  
Children and Young People  
Scrutiny Commission held at  
Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street,  
London E8 1EA

---

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Chair</b>                      | <b>Councillor Sophie Conway</b>  |
| <b>Councillors in Attendance</b>  | <b>Cllr Margaret Gordon (Vice-Chair), Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Clare Joseph and Cllr Caroline Woodley</b>  |
| <b>Apologies:</b>                 | <b>Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr James Peters and Cllr Clare Potter</b>  |
| <b>Co-optees</b>                  | <b>Graham Hunter, Michael Lobenstein, Liz Bosanquet, Jo Macleod and Sevdie Sali Ali</b>  |
| <b>Officers In Attendance</b>     | <b>Anne Canning (Group Director, Children, Adults and Community Health), Annie Gammon (Director of Education), Paul Kelly (Head of Wellbeing and Education Safeguarding, Hackney Learning Trust), Andrew Lee (Assistant Director of Education Services, Hackney Learning Trust), Sarah Wright (Director, Children and Young People's Service) and Deborah Ennis (Safeguarding and Learning Consultant)</b> |
| <b>Other People in Attendance</b> |  |
| <b>Members of the Public</b>      |  |
| <b>Officer Contact:</b>           | <b>Sanna Melling</b><br> 020 8356 3315<br> sanna.melling@hackney.gov.uk  |

---

## Councillor Sophie Conway in the Chair

### 1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from the following Members of the Commission:

- James Peters (Councillor)
- Katie Hanson (Councillor)
- Clare Potter (Councillor)

- Jane Heffernan (Co-optee)
- Ernell Watson (Co-optee)

## **1 Urgent Items / Order of Business**

2.1 There were no new or urgent items and the agenda was as published.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

3.1 Cllr Ajay Chauhan declared that he worked as a teacher and was a member of the National Union of Teachers but this was not a prejudicial interest.

3.2 Co-optee Michael Lobenstein declared that he is a representative of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregation. This was not a prejudicial interest.

## **4 Executive Response - Unregistered Educational Settings in Hackney**

4.1 The Chair thanked the officers for Hackney Learning Trust for the comprehensive response to the investigation into Unregistered Settings in Hackney.

4.2 The Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Children's Social Care, Education and Young People told the Commission that she, the Mayor and officers welcomed the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commissions investigation. It was noted that the investigation had brought to light all the work of officers and political leaders that had gone on in the background to address the issues identified by the Scrutiny Commission. Further, the investigation had provided a time to pause and reflect, and for the Council to set out a clear strategy for engaging with unregistered settings around safeguarding and educational expectations.

4.3 The Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Children's Social Care, Education and Young People thanked the Charedi Orthodox Jewish community for their input and pointed out that unless there are legislative changes councils will continue to find it very difficult to intervene in unregistered settings to ensure children are safe. Therefore it remains essential that she, as the Deputy Mayor, continues to lobby the Government for a change in legislation.

### **Questions and answers**

4.4 The Chair wanted the officers in attendance to expand on which Local Authorities they had meet with, what the learning had been so far and what the commonalities/differences were in their approaches compared to Hackney's. In response the Group Director of Children, Adults & Community Health made the following substantive points:

- The Local Government Association (LGA) and Hackney co-hosted a conference on unregistered educational settings in June which was attended by local authorities from across the country. Most of them, without characterisation, when talking about unregistered educational settings refer to other and disparate religious faiths in comparison to Hackney where we are dealing with one particular faith. Further, it was noted that it was hard to draw out commonalities and differences due to the vast range of faiths and the disparity of settings,

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

across the different local authorities that attended the conference. However, it was noted that there was good local authority interface across the board.

- As a part of some explorative work with Department of Education (DfE), 5-6 local authorities in London, including Hackney, are discussing how in partnership they can best support unregistered educational settings in moving into the regulative framework as well as exploring how and in what way this task can best be carried out. It was noted that although all the local authorities have the same end in sight they all have their own complexities to work with locally.
- Salford and Gateshead are the two local authorities that work with unregistered settings that most resemble those in Hackney.

4.5 The Commission wanted to know whether it is only in Hackney where it appears to be mainly an issue within the Orthodox Jewish Community or whether this is reflected elsewhere. In response, the Group Director of Children, Adults & Community Health, the Deputy Mayor and the Assistant Director Education Services made the following substantive points:

- Salford and Gateshead have been identified as having similar unregistered settings to those in Hackney however, that was far from the only type of unregistered settings nationally.
- Nationally, unregistered settings are linked to a wide range of different faiths as well as non-faith groups.
- The LGA conference highlighted that the issues vary locally and are different across the country for example in Luton they found the same issue was linked to unregistered tutorial colleges and tuition.
- It was noted that unregistered setting was not a faith issue, often there was a political persuasion or an ideological reason to why some groups do not want their children to attend a mainstream setting where the national curriculum was taught.

4.6 At this point one of the Members of the Commission wanted it recorded that he disagreed with the term 'unregistered' being used to describe a form of home schooling. This would imply that a setting or an entity was in the first place required by law to be registered in order for it to have been unregistered or otherwise it was an incorrect use of the word.

4.7 The Group Director of Children, Adults & Community Health informed the meeting that the Council has agreed to adopt this terminology, which was used across the country, when discussing a setting where children and young people are organised in a way similar to a school.

4.8 The Members wanted to know how this issue was dealt with in the past and sought to understand how many of these settings have moved from being unregistered to being registered and if so what interventions took place to ensure this happened. They also wanted to know in more detail the outcomes of the strategic safeguarding project and how HLT in practice will identify the parents of children who are not being educated in registered settings. In response, the Group Director of Children, Adults & Community Health, the Assistant Director Education Services, the Director - Children and Families and the Head of Wellbeing and Safeguarding Education Services made the following substantive points:

- To date no unregistered settings have gone through the process to become a registered settings.
- The responsibility to register a setting sits with the proprietor and the process with the DfE and Ofsted. Local authorities do not form part of this stage of the process.
- The strategic safeguarding project was a joint project with Public Health and Interlink, an Orthodox Jewish umbrella organisation working with the community in Stamford Hill, to develop a programme in schools with young children to build up an understanding of and talking about safeguarding issues, developing

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

- curriculum materials, upskilling teachers to ensure there was a greater knowledge of, as well as, good safeguarding procedures and policies in place.
- It was noted that the small project was about to enter its third phase and the feedback received at this point highlighted that teachers were feeling more confident in dealing with safeguarding issues.
  - In order to make contact and to discuss the matter HLT have written to the proprietors of the 22 settings which they have identified as unregistered, on several occasions in the last few years. It was noted that the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board (CHSCB) also had approached these proprietors. The only response so far had been in the way of challenging HLT, accusing them of asking for data on the children that had the settings obliged, would have breached data protection. This was noted to be untrue.
  - On the other hand, the CHSCB has had some response from the community in regards to setting up an advisory group working in the community around safeguarding procedures. The advisory group has agreed to meet with the DfE as a starting point.
  - Further, the Council are grateful for the involvement of Interlink and the other agencies working in the community, and will continue to work in partnership and to engage with the community through these agencies.
  - HLT has set up a SENCO forum for the independent schools with the aim to move away way from solely dealing with SEN to also incorporate safeguarding issues. Discussing safeguarding issues in the registered schools continues to be of importance as it was noted to be a community issue rather than an unregistered settings issue.
- 4.9 To sum up the Members wanted to understand more about the officers understanding to why the Government appears to be reluctant to discuss a change in legislation, seemingly this had been going on since 2014, and if the Council has the resources to cope with a possible change in legislation. In response, the Group Director of Children, Adults & Community Health and the Deputy Mayor made the following substantive points:
- The details of this complex issue which relates to all areas of the country in different guises will need to be carefully considered. The Council's lobbying has meant that the Independent Chair of CHSCB has received confirmation from Lord Agnew at the DfE that there is a draft legislation that will be brought forward, but due to the number of issues the Government is currently dealing with in regards to Brexit, the DfE will not put forward a date for when this will go on the Government's agenda and therefore officers do not have a sense of when this will be.
- 4.10 The Commission thanked the officers for the response and it was noted that the 6-month recommendation update will be presented to the Commission in April (2019).

## **5 Executive Response - Recruitment and Support to Foster Carers review**

- 5.1 The Chair explained to the members that last year the Commission carried out a review of recruitment and support to foster carers. This was in light of the difficulties around recruiting in-house foster carers culminating in having to rely on independent fostering agencies to provide foster carers with a greater cost to the service. The objective for the review was to identify and assess the challenges which impede the recruitment and retention of foster carers in Hackney and to identify those policies and practices which can help to overcome them.
- 5.2 It was noted that the Commission had asked for an officer to attend the meeting in order to provide more information on the progress of recommendation 2 and 3 in the

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

Executive response in regards to the foster carer recruitment strategy and the pilot of offering larger properties to experienced foster carers.

5.3 The Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

- It was a useful and thorough review and the Fostering service welcomed the recommendations.
- The Commission's recommendations had informed the review of the current foster carer recruitment strategy.
- Last year 17 new foster carers were recruited which was noted to be considerably more than Hackney's neighbouring boroughs, indicating how challenging this target was to achieve. The service feel confident that they will get reasonably close to the target set by the Commission of 23 new recruits per year.
- A lot of activity has taken place around recruitment including a piece of work focusing on the LGBTQi community, participating in a number of events and a social media campaign with the focus on myth busting and raising the profile of fostering through an increased number of in-house ambassadors. It was noted that recent statistics show that foster carers or staff recruiting foster carers were the most effective ways of getting people into fostering.
- The service has implemented a system which responds to in-house foster carers enquiries within 2 days as well as a new online system which helps to filter the enquiries received so that the service only deal with those that are likely to be eligible to become foster carers. The service has found that people are often not eligible due to the fact that they have not got a spare room, however the service will still engage with people that have indicated that they are thinking about moving to a bigger property and similarly where there is a lack of child care experience the service engage and encourage people to volunteer in schools and other children settings.
- Hackney Fostering Service has been working with the Council's Benefits and Housing Needs Service around exploring the possibility for more experienced foster carers to move into a larger property to allow them to provide additional foster placements. Two foster carers have been referred to this scheme and one foster carer has already moved into a larger property. It was noted that the Benefits and Housing Needs Service is committed to this initiative and foster carers are equally committed and interested in this possibility.
- Further, Hackney Fostering Service has formally signed up to the Mockingbird model and there is a plan in place to work with the Fostering Network to implement this model in Hackney. The model encourages using experienced foster carers to help build resilience amongst foster carers in their area through operating as a network. The Commission heard that this model has worked very well in the US and has begun to be used in some local authorities in England.

5.4 At this point the Deputy Mayor added that she welcomed the review and informed the Commission that foster carer recruitment and retention continues to be a standing item at Hackney's Corporate Parenting Board. Further, Staying Put arrangements allow looked after children stay with foster carers as they enter young adulthood and go off to university. Officers have been asked to continue to consider and celebrate different and diverse groups of foster carers and to continue to encourage foster carers to look after young people with more specific needs.

### **Questions and answers**

5.5 Members sought to understand what the impact of a shortage of in-house foster carers has been on children services that are already stretched as well as how quickly the service anticipate that the Mockingbird model will be up and running and whether the service foresee any barriers in the implementation of this model, particularly around training and resourcing. In response the Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

- The shortage of in-house foster carers was a national issue and in Hackney, the Fostering Service are, along with the recommendations in the review, addressing this by reviewing their offer to in-house foster carers and looking at how to best ensure foster carers choose to become and remain in-house foster carers, rather than opting to go through independent fostering agencies. It would also be more cost efficient for the Council to be able to use more in-house foster carers.
- The Mockingbird model was at the early stages of development and the idea was to not push it through too fast but to ensure there was a phased roll out beginning with one cluster of foster cares and in that way develop and implement the model over time to all foster carers.

5.6 The Commission sought clarification around whether in regards to recommendation 3, the 4 larger properties allocated to foster carers would be allocated to this specific pool on a permanent basis as well as around the allocation process. In response the Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

- The allocation would be based on the Fostering service's experience of working with the foster carer and their commitment to fostering over a long period of time. An assessment would be made to ensure the foster carer would be best placed to take on an additional foster placement.
- A number of foster carers had shown an interest in this scheme which requires them to move house and be able to be in a position where they can absolutely commit to continue to foster and increase the number of placements they provide.
- It was noted that the details in regards to the allocation arrangement was not available at the meeting.

5.7 The Commission wanted to know a bit more about recruitment through schools and how this was incorporated in promoting fostering as well as whether third sector charities, such as Home for Good, had been considered as a part of the recruitment strategy. In response the Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

- As a part of the [North London Fostering Consortium](#), Hackney had previously entered into an agreement with Home for Good, however it did not provide the expected number of referrals, at least not at that point in time, since then the Fostering Service has developed links with local churches that have proven to be a fertile recruitment ground for potential new foster carers.
- The Fostering Service has gone into schools and children centres as part of the recruitment strategy (both in relation to staff in schools, and within the parent networks).

5.8 Members wanted to know whether the Fostering Service had a sense of why foster cares choose independent fostering agencies over the in-house fostering service and wanted to better understand how Islington had managed to turn their situation around (as referred to in the agenda) by the use of satellite specialists. In response the Deputy Mayor and the Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

- Research completed by the Fostering Service over the last few years has highlighted that independent fostering agencies tend to pay a bit more and sometimes provide other benefits. It was noted that the flipside to this was that these organisations also take a lot of money out of the system.
- Some foster carers have also fed back that they prefer to work with one agency rather than liaise with a number of local authorities (and therefore prefer to become an in-house foster carer) and others do not want to foster a child from the same borough in which they reside.
- It was noted that the research and feedback received has been carefully considered and has helped inform the recruitment strategy.

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

- Further, no Hackney in-house foster carers have left to join an independent fostering agency in recent years.
- Islington is part of the North London Fostering Consortium, alongside Hackney, and as a part of the consortium the individual local authorities benchmark their fees across the consortium. Even though all partners have slightly different schemes Hackney is pretty much on par with the others. Further, all the partners have a slightly different history, a few years ago the number of looked after children in Hackney came down to a very low level and therefore so did the focus on recruiting new foster carers, when the trend changed and the numbers came back up again it proved difficult to respond as quickly in terms of foster carer recruitment. In Islington they did not experience the same drop in numbers and had maintained their level of recruitment and in-house foster carers throughout this period of time. It was noted that in general Islington's current recruitment levels were lower than Hackney's.

5.9 The Commission thanked the officers for the response and it was noted that the 6-month recommendation update will be presented to the Commission in March (2019).

## **6 Controlling Migration Project: Building foundations: Meeting the needs of unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC)**

6.1 The Chair asked the officers from Children and Families Service to briefly summarise how the 'Building foundations: Meeting the needs of unaccompanied asylum seeking children' bid will be used and to update the Commission on the progress so far. In response the Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

- Hackney has been awarded just over a quarter of a million pounds for a two-year project to support unaccompanied asylum seeking children.
- We recognise that unaccompanied asylum seeking children have very particular and specific needs and the bid will be used to take the two strands of the project forward:
  - recruiting foster carer and supported lodgings
  - developing independence and integration
- The latter includes helping them settle, provide support around their asylum application and preparing them for the possible rejection and repatriation back to their country of origin.
- Further, the bid will be used to reduce isolation and setting up support groups reflective of their background as well as ensuring they receive the support required from the Virtual School.
- It was noted that a lot of this support was already in place but the bid allows the service to set up the supported lodgings which requires more investment to start with and allows them to invest in additional specialist support. This aids the other professionals in the means of providing advice and an opportunity to up-skill while ensuring that the expertise is maintained in the service beyond the two years. These two specialist posts have been successfully recruited to.

### **Questions and answers**

6.2 The Chair wanted to know a bit more about the role of the Home Office worker and how their services might be used to assist unaccompanied minors. In addition, the Commission also sought to understand how the current climate of immigration has impacted on the existing service and if this bid alleviates some of the pressures in the system. In response the Director - Children and Families made the following substantive points:

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

- A Home Office representative already works with the service one day a week providing support to families with no recourse to public funds around the immigration process and help to expedite their right to remain. It was noted that the Home Office representative will provide support and advice when challenging decisions around deportation.
- The national allocation quota was set to 0.07% of the child population and in Hackney this equates to 42. Hackney currently supports 42 unaccompanied minors and this number was expected to remain close to 42 despite two of them turning 18 shortly. It was noted that this in conjunction with more care leavers still going through the asylum process does put a strain on the local authority and therefore the additional funding is welcomed.
- Further, finding legal representation to deal with these complex issues also presents a challenge due to a decrease in capacity as well as being due to the relatively short window of time to help those that come to Hackney when they are around 17 years old. It was noted that the local authority work with some very good solicitors and always aim to seek to work with them on these cases.

6.3 At this point the Deputy Mayor added when young people that are new to the country come to Hackney with complex issues such as trauma, staff provide great support and work really hard to ensure that these issues are addressed and ensure that health and wellbeing wrap-around care is set up.

## **7 SEND funding Co-design Group - update**

7.1 The Chair handed over to the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play and Cllr Gordon to present this item and asked them to begin by outlining the context, why the group was set up, progress so far and the next steps. In response, Cllr Gordon made the following substantive points:

- The group meets in private, for accountability the terms of references have been put to the Commission to comment on in public.
- Last year, the Council launched a consultation in regards to the changes to the funding structures for SEND (Special Educational needs and Disability) in schools. The consultation received a very large response from parents and campaigners, these responses helpfully highlighted a broad range of issues in regards to the SEND provision particularly in regards to the significant reduction in resources available. It was noted that the funding had been frozen since 2012 and meanwhile the responsibility for the local authority had been extended from not only school aged children, to 0-25s. The change in the landscape had led to an increasing number of children with identified needs in relation to SEND education.
- The co-design group, which consists of Council officers, Councillors, school governors, parent representatives and SEND teacher representatives, has met three times since the beginning of August. The group has agreed on a terms of reference (as in agenda) and there was an understanding that while they might not cover everything the group wish to discuss this had been aired at the meetings. It was noted that the group still need to recruit a head teacher representative.
- At their last meeting the group received a helpful presentation from Haringey describing their funding model and at the forthcoming meeting they will hear from Newham around their funding model. The Commission was told that it would also be beneficial to hear from Camden, Islington, Lewisham and Lambeth.

7.2 The Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play added that the purpose of the group was to recommend options and state its preferences for the cabinet to consider and consult on. The group was looking at comparable local authority



models and the group was looking at the existing 5 levels of funding and how these might be used better or changed.

- 7.3 The Commission were informed that there was an ongoing legal challenge and the outcome was expected to be announced in mid-November and it can be assumed that any recommendations to come out the judicial review will need to be taken into account in the scoping of a new model.

#### **Questions and answers**

- 7.4 The Commission wanted to know whether the group had looked at models used outside of London and wanted to gain a better sense of the timeline for this exercise. In response, the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play made the following substantive points:

- The SEND support group had also been looking at models used in Leeds and Nottinghamshire where there are similarities in the innovative approach but quite often not the same level of need and therefore the group ought to look at other major metropolitan areas in terms of comparable local authority models.
- The recommendations made by this group are expected to go to Cabinet at the mid to end of November with the caveat that they should take into account those of the judicial review.

- 7.5 Members also sought clarity on why the group had not managed to engage a head teacher to sit on the group. In response the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play and the representative from HiP (Hackney Independent Forum for Parents/Carers of Children with Disabilities) made the following substantive points:

- The Group has continued to try to promote this opportunity for a head teacher to join the group and the message has recently been re-circulated again. It might be reflective of the pressures they are under in regards to their workload.
- It was noted that while there was one school staff representative the SENCOs in the group had not been in attendance as of yet.

- 7.6 The Chair wanted to understand whether the co-design group will reflect on the areas of overspend in the SEND budget as a part of its set up or whether the focus will be just on a way forward. In response the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play made the following substantive point:

- It was noted that the greatest spend was in the mainstream block, much greater than that of the three other blocks independent schools, special schools and out of borough provision. The terms of reference are therefore right to concentrate on the area of the greater spend.

- 7.7 At this point the representative from HiP (Hackney Independent Forum for Parents/Carers of Children with Disabilities) added that arguably, cuts in the mainstream would most likely also result in a greater number of children going out of borough.

- 7.8 The Assistant Director of Education Services added that the focus of the group as clearly outlined in the terms of reference was to consider and advise on a funding model, the system of allocations and the processes, not on the values attached.

## **8 Outcomes of Exclusions in Hackney - DRAFT Terms of Reference**

- 8.1 The Chair explained that since the Commission agreed at their meeting in June to look at outcomes of exclusions in Hackney as their review for this year, she had worked together with the Scrutiny officer on the draft terms of reference. This included meeting with a number of officers, reading and reviewing reports and

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

recent research on the topic whilst being mindful to not duplicate the work done in the earlier exclusion review.

- 8.2 The draft terms of reference had been circulated to the Members of the Commission and to the lead officers in August for their comments.
- 8.3 It was noted that Cllr Peter's had sent through a number of suggested amendments still to be incorporated into the draft terms of reference and subsequently the Chair asked the Members of the Commission for any other comments in regards to the aims and objectives, on page 88 in the agenda, before agreeing the draft terms in principle.
- 8.4 At this point a member of the public asked why the Commission had chosen to look at what happens after a child has been excluded, and wanted to know what the Commission learnt at the last review and highlighted that she felt it was a model that seemed to blame the children for being excluded. In response the Chair made the following substantive points:
- The Commission felt that while the reasons for exclusions and the rates of exclusions should still be monitored and reviewed, this particular review would limit its focus to looking at how the national issue around the outcomes of excluded children, which are known to be very poor, apply here in Hackney. They would also be better placed to make recommendations with an impact, unlike in the previous review where it was felt that the Commission and the local authority had limited powers to implement change across academies and independent schools. Further, while in the last five years the alternative provisions have not been reviewed by Scrutiny, this would be an opportunity to get a better understanding of what the alternative pathways can offer and how to best ensure that these children have the same opportunities as their peers in mainstream school. As well as looking at, when bearing in mind that a lot of the excluded children have identified and unidentified SEND needs, whether the alternative provision is appropriately equipped to meet the needs of these individual children.
  - It was noted that the alternative provision also work with children at risk of exclusions and the Commission were therefore keen to, by reviewing this cohort, tease out if there was more that can be done or whether resources can be used differently to ensure these children remain in mainstream schools.
- 8.5 At this point the Director of Education added that while it was not one of the objectives of this review to review exclusions in mainstream schools it was on Hackney Learning Trust agenda as a priority attached to an action plan.
- 8.6 The Members of the Commission wanted clarification on how the review will look at children with SEND in relation to exclusions and felt that perhaps the review should also take into account the planning of school places and the built environment (new schools) and the withdrawal of a school and what that does to enhance or further diminish exclusions. They questioned whether point 2.2 could further draw out the safeguarding issues related to exclusions as well as enhance what further support could be put in place in mainstream schools to prevent exclusions and the voice the child including their experiences, wishes and trying to get a better understand the impact exclusions have on their mental health and wellbeing.
- 8.7 The Chair thanked the members for their contributions and comments and made the following substantive points:
- Building on the findings from the previous review and following the meetings with officers, it was felt that the review should ask questions around how and when in the exclusion process children's needs are identified and whether we are satisfied that alternative settings are best placed to meet the needs of this large percentage of the excluded cohort.

**Thursday, 20th September, 2018**

- The review aims to explore the extent to which special schools are working with other mainstream schools and alternative provision to see if there is scope for any further collaboration between the different settings.
- The intention is for the Commission to meet with a group of young people as a part of this review in order for them to share their experiences, whilst the review will use a backwards logic in finding out what support and advice received during this process.

8.8 Cllr Joseph put forward the following suggestion – it would be beneficial to create a ‘at risk’ control group based on the different sets of characteristics held by excluded children which could be used to prevent exclusions going forward. In response the Chair responded that within the limits of the review the best indication of being ‘at risk’ would be those that have received a number of fixed term exclusions and those that are in an alternative setting due to concerns in regards to their behaviour.

8.9 Cllr Adejare suggested the Commission also consider looking at how we can access the data on managed moves and looking retrospectively at those without Education Health Care plans and unidentified needs as a part of this review.

8.10 The Commission agreed the terms of reference in principle.

## **9 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

9.1 The Commission noted the actions and agreed the minutes of the last meeting.

## **10 Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission - 2018/19 Work Programme**

10.1 The Members of the Commission noted the last version of the work programme for the municipal year 2018/19 including the additional joint meeting with Health in Hackney in November when the Commission will receive an update from the Integrated Commissioning Children, Young People and Maternity Work stream.

10.2 It was noted that there was flexibility in the work programme to include another 3-4 substantial discussion items and the Chair encouraged the Commission to put forward areas/topics for scrutiny including context, objectives and desired outcomes outside of the meeting.

## **11 Any Other Business**

11.1 None received.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 8.50 pm