



London Borough of Hackney
Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2018/19
Date of Meeting Monday, 24th June, 2019

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

Chair	Councillor Sophie Conway
Councillors in Attendance	Cllr Margaret Gordon (Vice-Chair), Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Katie Hanson and Cllr Clare Potter
Apologies:	Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters and Cllr Caroline Woodley
Co-optees	Graham Hunter and Shuja Shaikh
In Attendance	Cllr Anntoinette Bramble, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People; Anne Canning, Group Director, Children Families and Community Health; Sarah Wright, Director of Children and Families Service; Annie Gammon, Director of Education and Head of Hackney Learning Trust; Marian Lavelle, Head of Section (Admissions and School Place Planning), Hackney Learning Trust; Donna Thomas, Head of Early Years, Hackney Learning Trust.
Members of the Public	One member of the public was in attendance.
Officer Contact:	Martin Bradford  020 8356 3315  martin.bradford@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sophie Conway in the Chair

1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair (19.00)

1.1 Councillor Sophie Conway was nominated for the position of Chair by Cllr Ajay Chauhan and was seconded by Cllr Katie Hanson. There being no other nominations, Cllr Conway was duly elected to the position of Chair of the Commission.

1.2 Cllr Margaret Gordon was nominated for the position of Vice Chair by Cllr Sophie Conway and was seconded by Cllr Ajay Chauhan. There being no other nominations, Cllr Gordon was duly elected to the position of the Vice Chair of the Commission.

2 Apologies for Absence (19.05)

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from:

- Cllr Clare Joseph
- Cllr Sharon Patrick
- Cllr Caroline Woodley
- Cllr James Peters

2.2 Apologies for lateness were received from:

- Cllr Clare Potter
- Cllr Sade Etti
- Shuja Shaikh

3 Urgent Items / Order of Business (19.05)

3.1 There were no late or urgent items of business.

4 Declarations of Interest (19.05)

4.1 The following declarations were received by members of the Commission:

- Cllr Conway was a Development Manager for Just for Kids Law;
- Cllr Chauhan was a teacher at secondary school in another London borough and a member of the NEU;
- Graham Hunter declared that he was a Governor of the Primary Advantage Federation.

5 Children and Families Action Plan from Ofsted Focused Visit (19.10)

5.1 In February 2019, Ofsted conducted a focused visit to the Children and Families Service (CFS) in Hackney. At this visit Ofsted assessed the support provided to children on a Child Protection plan and to children in need. Ofsted identified a number of priority actions from this visit for which CFS were required to develop an action plan. At its meeting in March 2019, the Commission agreed that the action plan would be presented for scrutiny once completed.

5.2 Officers presented the action plan and updated the Commission on work that had taken place in CFS in response to the Ofsted focused visit. A summary of the key discussion points discussed are presented below.

- The action plan was submitted for review at the end of March 2019, and Ofsted agreed that the plan would meet the priority actions identified from the focused visit;
- Since the Ofsted visit, CFS had undertaken wide ranging engagement with front-line staff and managers to ensure that there was an awareness of the outcomes of the visit, to keep staff sighted to the developmental actions needed, but also to provide reassurance and support in what was acknowledged to be challenging situation;
- Task and finish groups had been established to deliver improvements in three key areas: performance, systems and data; practice development; management oversight;
- It was noted that a new IT performance monitoring system had been launched since the Ofsted visit and would be fully functional once a few minor operational glitches had been resolved;

Monday, 24th June, 2019

- In terms of practice development, plans developed for children in need or on a Child Protection plan were more outcome-focused, so that family progress could be measured more accurately;
- In terms of management oversight, a number of new defined check-points had been agreed to enable managers to review progress against the agreed outcomes for children and their families;
- The Family Information Support Service (FISS) had reviewed 175 cases which had been open for 9 months or longer, in 26 of these cases, actions needed to be accelerated, whilst in 55 cases, the case could have been closed;
- CFS had also engaged CHSCB to understand how the wider safeguarding partnership could contribute to meeting the priority actions set out by Ofsted (e.g. timely actions and reporting) and a series of workshops were planned across the partnership to support this;
- CFS had also developed a number of critical questions to embed within internal and external partners' practice to ensure appropriate support (p7 of agenda report pack);
- CFS continued to track its progress against the targets set out in the action plan and held monthly meetings with the lead Cabinet member to support this review;
- CFS planned to visit a number of other local authorities to inform comparative assessment of services and further inform the development of best practice in Hackney.

Questions

5.3 Have any external specialist consultants been deployed to help CFS respond to priority actions identified by Ofsted?

- It was noted that no external consultants had been appointed as yet as CFS wanted to develop internal capacity and expertise. The DfE had however appointed a link-worker to liaise and work with CFS in response to the Ofsted focused visit and future inspections.

5.4 What have been the financial implications of the CFS response to the focused visit? Have additional resources been needed and where have these come from?

- Additional management and project management capacity had been needed and this had been financed by a drawing down on a fund used for social work improvement. Additional ICT capacity of a value of £150k had also been secured to support the action plan objectives;
- CFS was also working closely with Finance colleagues and the Chief Executive to document and record the additional spend required, but it should be noted that there was no explicit cap to any additional funds that might be needed. At this stage it was difficult to quantify the level of resources that would be required, but officers sought to reassure the Commission that any funds used would not be diverted from other front-line services;
- It was suggested that at some point in the future, when the CFS response is further embedded, a more detailed look at resourcing for the Service (particularly management support) might be needed.

Agreed: The Commission would like further information on the costs of meeting the requirements of the Ofsted focused visit when available.

5.5 In respect of the 26 cases which were identified to need speedier resolution from the internal audit, were there any discernible patterns or other consistencies within them? Has there been any analysis of the nature of the children and families in this cohort against the wider cohort of children in need or on a Child Protection plan?

- No discernible patterns had emerged as yet, though more analysis was needed;
- In terms of the children and young people involved, a broad spectrum of ages were involved. Adolescents were over represented in this group, which perhaps reflected the difficulty of achieving measurable change with this client group. Supporting this particular cohort was a particular challenge to every local authority given the complexity and multiplicity of adolescent needs.
- It was reiterated that further analysis would be undertaken of the cases which were flagged for further action and this would be reported back to the Commission.

Agreed: CFS would undertake further analysis of the cases flagged for further action and would write back to the Commission.

5.6 What impact had the Ofsted focused visit had on staff turnover, staff morale or staff caseloads?

- Whilst no discernible impact on staff retention had been recorded as yet, it was clear that the service response to the Ofsted visit had increased pressures on staff. The CFS was aware of the potential adverse impact that this process may have on staff and had attempted to implement new requirements in a measured way which did not over-burden staff. It was acknowledged however, that there would be ongoing tension in the system as the service readied and prepared itself for further Ofsted inspections.
- Whilst there had not been any noticeable differences in caseloads, it was evident that front line practitioners were very busy in adapting to new systems and requirements in response to the Ofsted focused visit. This had promoted wider discussions on the appropriateness of the size of social worker caseloads.
- Social worker caseloads were higher in Hackney, though there was additional administrative support provided within the Hackney 'unit' approach. It was reported that in some sections however, additional administrative capacity did not appear to mitigate the impact of higher caseloads. It was however important to look at caseloads in a sustainable way, rather than in the context of the response to the Ofsted visit.

5.7 Could the interrogation of systems and processes that support children and need and children on a Child Protection plan be applied across the whole of CFS to pre-empt the possible future Ofsted inspection.

- Although the report detailed actions for Children in Need or on a Child Protection plan, there had been a CFS-wide response to the focused visit by Ofsted. A wider self-assessment process had been undertaken to help CFS prepare for the Ofsted inspection anticipated in the autumn.

5.8 As a result of the internal review of cases following the Ofsted visit, had any stepping-up of support been required? For example, had children moved from 'Child in-Need plans' to a 'Child Protection plan' or from a 'Child Protection plan

to becoming looked after child by the council? Had there been a rise in the number of looked after children?

- At this stage, there had been a very small increase in number of children subject to care proceedings. The longer-term impact was however difficult to determine. The objective of this review process had been to speed up assessments, so it is likely that in most cases the outcomes for the child would have been the same but in a shorter time-frame;
- There had been concern at the beginning of this process that the priority actions identified by Ofsted may inhibit CFS from working with families in a very determined way for as long as was needed. The service was wary of creating a system where judgements were being made too early, without giving families time to change. In the context of the Ofsted requirements, this was a very difficult balance for the service to achieve.

5.9 To what extent was the outcome of the focused visit attributable to recent service reductions in the CFS, in particular the de-layering of management?

- Whilst it could not be denied that cuts had been made to the service, it was nonetheless difficult to attribute the priority actions identified by Ofsted to any one singular cause. The wider financial context could not be ignored however, and whilst the Council and the lead member had, where possible, sought to protect children's services from cuts, some savings had been required of CFS. It was nonetheless difficult to determine how the restructuring of CFS management had impacted on this area of service. It should also be noted that there had been a significant increase in demand for services during this time.

5.10 Against a backdrop of ever increasing expectations of staff in respect of service development and improvement, had the requirements of the Ofsted inspection brought the service to a key 'tipping-point'? Was this now a time to fully reflect on resourcing levels going forward?

- The Cabinet member noted that collectively children's services across the country would experience a £3.1 billion funding gap by 2025 and Hackney would not be immune from this. The council had strived to maintain and protect children services where it could, even non-statutory preventative services, but the scale of the future financial challenge was significant and it was difficult to say how this would impact on local services.

Next steps

5.11 Officers presented to the Commission the next steps that CFS were taking in response to the action plan and in preparation for the expected Ofsted inspection in the autumn (from 1st week in September onwards). It was important that the service developed and prepared the service self-assessment in readiness for the inspection.

5.12 The CFS was clear of the values that underpinned its service, in that keeping a child safe in their family environment was of paramount importance. The Ofsted visit had provided significant challenge which would further help the service to build on this approach.

5.13 The Chair thanked officers for attending and presenting for this item.

6 School Admissions (19.40)

6.1 School Admissions is a fixed item and taken annually on the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission agenda. Officers had prepared a report on admissions to Reception and transfer to Secondary School, together with a commentary on school place planning and how the Council meets its duty to provide sufficient school capacity for children resident in Hackney. A summary of the key points from the presentation are highlighted below:

Primary Transfer

- For admission to reception, there had been 153 fewer applications than in the previous year and this continued a downward trend established in 2016. Future projections however, would suggest that this trend may be reversed next year where a slight increase was anticipated;
- 98.3% of parents applied on-line which was very encouraging;
- In terms of meeting parental preferences, a slight decrease was recorded for all preferences 1-4, though the borough continues to outperform the pan-London average;
- Of the 492 children that did not have any of their preferences met, these were allocated a school, most of which was to their nearest school to their home address which had a vacancy.

Secondary Transfer

- There were 2,493 children in this cohort, which was 103 fewer than in 2018;
- 85.2% of children who expressed a first choice, nominated a Hackney school;
- 304 local children were offered a school place outside the borough and 326 children outside the borough were offered a place at a Hackney school, both of these figures are similar to that recorded for previous years;
- 2,164 (86.8%) children obtained a place in their 1st, 2nd or 3rd preference school which was slightly higher than in 2018, however, slightly fewer children in Hackney had their 1st or 2nd preference school met compared to pan London average;
- 166 children did not get a place at any of their preferred choice of schools and were allocated a school nearest to them with a vacancy – further analysis of these figures by postcode and band group demonstrated that lower band children (in bands C and D) were less likely to get a place in school of their choice.

Place Planning

- As a result of falling reception rolls a number of primary schools were operating at below capacity. In response, the admissions numbers in some schools had been temporarily capped. The reductions were temporary given the uncertainty of population predictions.

Questions

6.2 Can you explain why two schools (Skinners and Mossbourne Riverside) recorded a high number of out of borough students given places?

- This was because both of these schools were on the boundary with other local authorities (Haringey and Tower Hamlets respectively).

6.3 What was known about the school preferences for children with SEND?

Many children with additional needs may be on a SEND register but not qualify for an EHC plan, how are these children supported in obtaining the school of their choice?

- Generally, SEND children with EHCP's should get their preferred school so long as the school can meet their assessed needs. A more detailed conversation between the school and parents takes place before a place is given to ensure that the school can meet the additional needs of the child;
- It was confirmed that children with SEND but without an EHC plan were considered for places in accordance with the published oversubscription criteria.

Agreed: that further information would be provided on school place provision for children with SEND, in particular (i) how local provision compares with other boroughs and (ii) what proportion of children end up in a school setting out of borough compared with other boroughs (statistical neighbours).

6.4 A larger proportion of lower performing children (bands C and D) were among those not obtaining a place at any of their preferred schools at secondary transfer. Does the system disadvantage poor performing or disadvantaged children?

- Whilst the banding-system did provide some support in providing a more level playing field for applications, more affluent or well-resourced parents may overcome this by choosing to move closer to the desired school for their child;
- The key point however, was to ensure that there was sufficient dialogue with parents ahead of the secondary transfer process to ensure that they expressed a preference for schools that they were likely to obtain a place.

6.5 It was suggested that the banding-system was complex and parents did not always fully understand how it related to the school admissions systems; what support does the authority provide to ensure that parents were aware of the admissions process and able to make appropriate choices for their child? It was noted that some of the transfer application documents were quite dense and difficult to read especially if parents had English as an additional language.

- The HLT was very aware of this issue and it was of paramount importance to ensure that as many children as possible were in a school of their choice. Critical to this achievement was the need to facilitate interaction between parents and primary school head teachers who may be able to guide and inform appropriate choices for their child.

6.6 Given the likely overlap between those children not getting a school place of their choice with those children with SEND, what action can be taken to support the parents of such children?

- The only information that the admission authority require and receive is that which related to the application of the oversubscription criteria, no data was passed in respect of a child's SEND status, therefore much depended on the advice and support provided at primary level prior to transition and lead up to choices being made;
- It was suggested that a key development would be for primary schools to monitor applications as they were received and to contact parents before the closing date if an application has been submitted. They could then

discuss with the parent appropriate school choices and the need to apply on-time. Whether primary schools had the capacity to do this however, was debateable.

6.7 What action could be taken to help schools develop less complex admission arrangements which would be more understandable to parents?

- Schools draw up their own admission systems which must be compliant with the law and the School Admissions Code. The test is set out in the school admissions code which has stated that schools admissions procedures must be clear, fair and objective. It was noted that a local school with a particularly complex admission system had recently had this cleared by the DfE.

6.8 The Commission noted that some of the tables in the report were quite detailed and involved very small numbers of children from which it might be possible to identify individual children.

- The HLT is required to publish this information, but would look at other ways to publish this to help protect the identity of individual cases.

6.9 Do children of staff at a school get priority for applications?

- This was allowable in the admissions code and it was the decision of individual school admission authorities whether to adopt this priority.

6.10 In respect of school place appeals, what proportion were successful?

- School appeals were currently being held across the borough for those parents wanting to appeal the decision of a school not to admit their child. There were approximately 300-400 appeals each year but a very small percentage of these were successful. The grounds for successful appeal were limited.

6.11 The report did not provide any analysis of secondary school place planning?

- This was an oversight and would be provided to the Commission.

Agreed: Officers to provide an analysis of secondary school place planning for the Commission.

7 Childcare Sufficiency (20. 20)

7.1 An assessment of the sufficiency of local childcare is a fixed item and taken annually on the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission agenda. The purpose of the item is for officers to provide assurance that there is sufficient childcare capacity to meet local needs.

7.2 Officers provided a verbal update to the Commission, the key points from this presentation are highlighted below.

- The local authority has a duty under the 2006 Childcare Act to 'secure sufficient childcare, so far as is reasonably practicable, for working parents, or parents who are studying or training for employment, for children aged 0-14 (or up to 18 for disabled children)';
- This duty was extended under the Childcare Act 2016 to ensure that parents had access to free entitlement childcare (30 hours and 15 hours);
- The most recent Childcare Sufficiency Assessment was completed in 2018 and the next full report will be due in 2020;

Monday, 24th June, 2019

- Officers reported that the overall the picture for childcare in Hackney was healthy as there were sufficient places to meet current demand and that there was sufficient capacity in the system should take-up increase;

7.3 Two, three and four year olds can obtain childcare in a number of settings including private, voluntary or independent nurseries; maintained nursery schools or nursery classes in primary schools or with childminders. Table 1 below was presented to the Commission. This highlighted that:

- A small increase in the number of Childminders and PVI settings was recorded between 2017 and 2019;
- There were 129 private, voluntary and independent (PVI) childcare settings;
- The number of maintained nurseries and state funded primary schools with nursery classes had remained the broadly the same.

Table 1: Number of schools, settings and childminders 2017-2019

	2017	2018	2019
Number of Childminders	172	182	178
Number of PVI settings	121	124	129
Maintained nursery school	2	2	2
State Funded primary schools with nursery classes	53	53	52

7.4 Take up of the 3 and 4 year 15 hours free childcare entitlement was 87%, whilst take up of the 2 year old 15 hour free childcare entitlement (for most vulnerable children) was at 60%. The Commission noted that the number of two year olds accessing the free childcare entitlement had increased from 1,040 in 2016 to 1,360 in 2018.

7.5 Updates from the DWP were regularly issued on those local families which were eligible for the 2 year old free childcare. This enabled local services (Early Years) to target these families to ensure that they were aware of this entitlement and to support them to access childcare services.

7.6 From September 2017, working parents of 3 and four year olds were entitled to up to 30 hours of free childcare. The number of parents taking up this free entitlement has continued to grow; in January 2018 (3 months after introduction) 1,476 children were accessing their free 30 hour childcare entitlement but this had grown to 1,918 by January 2019.

7.7 In terms of the quality of childcare provision, 90% of all settings were rated as good or outstanding by Ofsted, this included children's centres, childminders and PVI settings. The authority had a duty to work with those childcare providers that do not meet this standard to help them improve the quality of provision.

7.8 To determine if there was sufficient childcare locally, the EY service audits all local settings to ascertain the take up of childcare places and the number of vacancies. As of January 2019, occupancy of local childcare places was running at 64% (Table 2). This figure varied by age group; occupancy for under 2's childcare places was at 49%, occupancy for 2 year olds was 57% and occupancy for 3 and 4 year olds was at 69% (this was across all settings).

Table 2: Average Occupancy rate (Jan 2019)

Under 2 years	Two year olds	Three and four	Total Occupancy
----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

olds			
49%	57%	69%	64%

7.9 Analysis of occupancy data revealed a varied picture however, for whilst some nurseries and Children Centres did not have any available spaces, and indeed in some case maintained a waiting list, others had spare capacity. Overall, officers reported that there remained ample childcare sufficiency across Hackney.

7.10 Audits had revealed wide ranging differences in the cost of childcare locally. In some childcare settings this was approximately £150 per week, but this rose to in excess of £500 in others. On average, parents could expect to pay around £250 per week for childcare.

Questions

7.11 How does the council ensure that there was sufficient childcare in the areas where it is most needed, in particular, disadvantaged areas?

- The data suggested that whilst there was a surplus of places across the borough as a whole, more childcare was needed in the north of the borough where there was a large population of under 5's. The Council was therefore working to increase childminding provision in the North of the borough with some success (e.g. the number of childminders had increased in this area of the borough as a result). The council employs an Early Years business support officer to work with local childcare businesses which want to set up in the area, and this officer provides information on the areas of greatest need and demand.

7.12 What is involved in the childcare audit?

- The last childcare sufficiency was undertaken in 2018 and the next one will be in 2020. All PVI childcare providers are assessed for the number of places that they have, the number of places which are filled and the cost of childcare. The audit also consults local parents to ascertain their childcare needs (what they want, where they want it and how much they are able to pay). It was acknowledged that there was a disconnection however, for whilst there was evidently local childcare capacity, parents indicated that they could not find the type of childcare that they wanted, in the area they wanted at a price they could afford.

7.13 Had there been any analysis of why some settings had different occupancy rates? Was occupancy higher among childminders?

- Childminders provided important wraparound childcare to other more formal settings and parents can chose to take their free childcare entitlement with them for this purpose. The council operated a local childminder network to support the quality assurance of provision.
- Data analysis had also showed that there had not been a move from PVI nursery settings to school based nursery settings, this was perhaps a reflection of the more flexible childcare offer available in these settings which were better able to provide wraparound care for their child. Schools may find this more difficult to provide financially, as staffing costs could be significantly higher.

7.14 Recent research had indicated that some nurseries required parents to pay for additional hours when taking up their free 30 hour childcare entitlement with them. Is this happening locally?

- It is up to individual childcare settings to structure their offer to parents. National funding rate for childcare is approximately £5 hour, but the real terms cost of provision can be upwards of £6 hour, so settings have to find other ways to off-set these costs, charging for higher hourly rates outside the free childcare entitlement offer is one such method. Some more expensive nurseries may not take funded children and charge the full rate for their provision.

7.15 The Chair thanked officers for attending and answering questions from the Commission.

8 2019-20 CYP Commission Work Programme (20.40)

8.1 The Officer updated the Commission on the development of the work programme for 2019/20.

8.2 There were a number of standing items which required regular oversight by the Commission and would be taken through the year. These items were:

- Children Social Care – Bi-Annual Report (twice)
- Annual Update on Pupil Achievement
- School Admissions & Childcare Sufficiency
- City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Board – Annual Report
- Annual Cabinet Member Question Time - Cllr Bramble and Cllr Kennedy

8.3 In addition, a number of items had been agreed from the 2018/19 work programme into the 2019/20 work programme. These were:

- Ofsted Focused Visit – Action Plan
- Off-rolling
- Support to LGBT+ schoolchildren
- Wellbeing and Mental Health Service (WAMHS)
- New structure for local safeguarding boards

8.4 The Commission would also need to develop capacity within its work programme to continue to undertake its agreed in-depth review for the forthcoming year as well monitoring the implementation of previous reviews. In this context space within the work programme should be allocated to the following:

- Outcomes from School Exclusions (current review) – final report
- Unregistered Educational Settings (previous review) – follow up
- Recruitment and retention of foster carers (previous review) – follow up
- New review for 2019/20 (topic to be confirmed).

8.5 With 8 formal meeting per year, there was capacity for 24 (45min items). With 14-16 slots taken through standing items, reviews and agreed one-off items, there was additional capacity for a further 6-8 items. Local stakeholders had been consulted for possible topics that could be considered within the work programme which would generate a long list of possible items. A key stakeholder group (Hackney Learning Trust, Children & Families Service and Hackney Community and Voluntary Sector Service) would appraise and prioritise these topic suggestions into a short list of potential topics. The Chair would then

meet with senior officers to assess the potential of these topics and to develop clear lines of enquiry for scrutiny.

8.6 Topics suggested from members of the Commission and from initial meetings with Directors had identified a wide range of potential topics for scrutiny. These included:

Directors suggestions	Commission suggestions
New Ofsted inspection framework	Childhood obesity – impact
Timson Report (Exclusions)	Poor housing impact on children
Children in Need	LAC - impact out of borough placement
Support to SEND children post 16	Contextual safeguarding
High achievers on pupil premium	Young People’s views of class
Support to care leavers	Behaviour policies in schools
Children in need - support for families	Arts and mental health for young people
LAC – prevention	Undiagnosed additional needs
Housing impact on children's social care	FGM – expiration of strategy in 2019
What is a Child Friendly borough?	Focus on serious youth crime across
	Early intervention – early help
	Contextual Safeguarding - progress
	Career Guidance for young people
	Adequacy of safeguarding
	Bridging the attainment gap
	Waiting list for mental health services

8.7 Members of the Commission discussed possible content for the work programme. The key points from this discussion are highlighted below:

- SC - noted that the Commission review would be undertaken through a scrutiny in a day exercise;
- SC - most of the recent in-depth reviews had focused on education matters, so it might be appropriate to move toward another policy areas covered by the Commission, such as mental health or children’s social care;
- Director of Adults, Children and Community Health suggested that a review which encompassed Children in Need would be hugely beneficial to the service;
- GH – Food poverty and the impact that this had on children and families;
- GH – Environmental poverty – air pollution, school road safety and privatisation of green spaces;
- SS – Childhood poverty (it was noted that CPAG were based in Hackney);
- MG – Young Futures Project;
- There was agreement that there would be a slot for the Youth Parliament for them to report on its work;
- CP – agreed that Children in Need would be a good focus if this can focused appropriately;
- ACan - also suggested that poverty might be a useful issue to tackle in scrutiny as the ability of parents to appropriately clothe and feed their children was coming under increasing pressure;

Monday, 24th June, 2019

- ACha – also agreed that childhood poverty could be useful for the Commission to explore, in particular the scale of the issue locally and what is being done to address this;
- ACan - ensure that voice of young people and suggestions from Young Futures were reflected in work programme;
- GH – Hackney Citizens – borough organiser – 2020 mayoral assembly – the voice of young people will be the focus of this work;
- Consistent theme would be youth violence and how this impacts on young people.

8.8 The Stakeholder group would meet on 4th July to discuss work programme suggestions. The resultant long list would be discussed with Cabinet members and senior officers and forwarded on to Commission. The full work programme would be developed for presentation in September 2019.

9 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (21.20)

9.1 Two actions were confirmed:

- Inclusion of unregistered settings on the 2019/20 work programme
- Inclusion of new safeguarding arrangements on the 2019/20 work programme

9.2 The minutes of the 30th April were agreed.

10 Support for LGBT+ children in school (21.25)

10.1 At its meeting in February 2019, the Commission reviewed the support for LGBT+ children in school in Hackney. The Commission heard evidence from a range of stakeholders, and agreed to write to the Cabinet member to summarise its conclusions and recommendations. The letter had been approved by the Commission and had been sent to the Cabinet member and was now awaiting a response.

10.2 The Commission noted the letter to the Cabinet member.

11 Any Other Business (21.25)

11.1 The Chair noted that Sevdie Sal Ali had tendered her resignation as a Parent Governor co-optee on the Commission. The Chair and other members present formerly thanked Sevdie for her support for the work of the Commission over the past three years. The process would begin to recruit a new parent governor representative.

11.2 There was no other business.

11.3 The date of the next meeting was noted as Monday 9th September 2019.

The meeting closed at 9.40pm.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.40 pm

Monday, 24th June, 2019