

Overview & Scrutiny

Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission

All Members of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission are requested to attend the meeting of the Commission to be held as follows

Monday, 24th June, 2019

7.00 pm

Room 102, Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London E8 1EA

Contact:

Martin Bradford

☎ 020 8356 3315

✉ martin.bradford@hackney.gov.uk

Tim Shields

Chief Executive, London Borough of Hackney

Members: Cllr Sophie Conway (Chair), Cllr Margaret Gordon (Vice-Chair), Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Caroline Woodley

Co-optees: Graham Hunter, Jo Macleod, Ernell Watson, Shuja Shaikh, Michael Lobenstein, Maariyah Patel, Jodine Clarke and Aleigha Reeves

Agenda

ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

- 1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair (19.00)**
- 2 Apologies for Absence (19.05)**
- 3 Urgent Items / Order of Business (19.05)**
- 4 Declarations of Interest (19.05)**
- 5 Children and Families Action Plan from Ofsted Focused Visit (19.10)** (Pages 1 - 14)
- 6 School Admissions (19.40)** (Pages 15 - 30)
- 7 Childcare Sufficiency (20. 20)** (Pages 31 - 32)
- 8 2019-20 CYP Commission Work Programme (20.40)** (Pages 33 - 34)

- 9 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (21.20)** (Pages 35 - 52)
- 10 Support for LGBT+ children in school (21.25)** (Pages 53 - 58)
- 11 Any Other Business (21.25)**

Access and Information

Getting to the Town Hall

For a map of how to find the Town Hall, please visit the council's website <http://www.hackney.gov.uk/contact-us.htm> or contact the Overview and Scrutiny Officer using the details provided on the front cover of this agenda.

Accessibility

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall.

Induction loop facilities are available in the Assembly Halls and the Council Chamber. Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

Further Information about the Commission

If you would like any more information about the Scrutiny Commission, including the membership details, meeting dates and previous reviews, please visit the website or use this QR Code (accessible via phone or tablet 'app')

<http://www.hackney.gov.uk/individual-scrutiny-commissions-children-and-young-people.htm>



Public Involvement and Recording

Scrutiny meetings are held in public, rather than being public meetings. This means that whilst residents and press are welcome to attend, they can only ask questions at the discretion of the Chair. For further information relating to public access to information, please see Part 4 of the council's constitution, available at <http://www.hackney.gov.uk/l-gm-constitution.htm> or by contacting Governance Services (020 8356 3503)

Rights of Press and Public to Report on Meetings

Where a meeting of the Council and its committees are open to the public, the press and public are welcome to report on meetings of the Council and its committees, through any audio, visual or written methods and may use digital and social media providing they do not disturb the conduct of the meeting and providing that the person reporting or providing the commentary is present at the meeting.

Those wishing to film, photograph or audio record a meeting are asked to notify the Council's Monitoring Officer by noon on the day of the meeting, if possible, or any time prior to the start of the meeting or notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

The Monitoring Officer, or the Chair of the meeting, may designate a set area from which all recording must take place at a meeting.

The Council will endeavour to provide reasonable space and seating to view, hear and record the meeting. If those intending to record a meeting require any other reasonable facilities, notice should be given to the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting and will only be provided if practicable to do so.

The Chair shall have discretion to regulate the behaviour of all those present recording a meeting in the interests of the efficient conduct of the meeting. Anyone acting in a disruptive manner may be required by the Chair to cease recording or may be excluded from the meeting. Disruptive behaviour may include: moving from any designated recording area; causing excessive noise; intrusive lighting; interrupting the meeting; or filming members of the public who have asked not to be filmed.

All those visually recording a meeting are requested to only focus on recording councillors, officers and the public who are directly involved in the conduct of the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will ask any members of the public present if they have objections to being visually recorded. Those visually recording a meeting are asked to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed or photographed. Failure by someone recording a meeting to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed and photographed may result in the Chair instructing them to cease recording or in their exclusion from the meeting.

If a meeting passes a motion to exclude the press and public then in order to consider confidential or exempt information, all recording must cease and all recording equipment must be removed from the meeting room. The press and public are not permitted to use any means which might enable them to see or hear the proceedings whilst they are excluded from a meeting and confidential or exempt information is under consideration.

Providing oral commentary during a meeting is not permitted.



<p>Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission</p> <p>24th June 2019</p> <p>Item 5 – Children and Families Action Plan from Ofsted Focused Visit</p>	<p>Item No</p> <p>5</p>
--	--------------------------------

Outline

In February 2019, Ofsted conducted a focused visit the Children and Families Service (CFS) in Hackney. At this visit Ofsted assessed the support provided to children on a protection plan and other children in need.

A number of priority actions were identified in this visit by Ofsted for which CFS was required to submit an action plan. This report provides further details of the focused visit, its outcomes and the action plan required by Ofsted.

Action

Members are requested to review the action plan in response to the priority actions identified by Ofsted.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to Children & Young People's Scrutiny Commission

From: Sarah Wright, Director of Children & Families Service (CFS)
Subject: Ofsted Focused Visit Update
Date: 24th June 2019

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an update to the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Commission on the outcome of the Ofsted Focused Visit, the development of the Action Plan in response to the findings, and an overview of the activity that has taken place to date.
- 1.2 The Report also includes the next steps planned for the continued development of the service, our ongoing self-evaluation process and preparations for the upcoming full inspection.

2. Focused Visit Outcome

- 2.1 Ofsted carried out their focused visit in Hackney on the theme of *children in need and those subject to a child protection plan* on 5th and 6th February 2019. This consisted of 2 inspectors on site for these days. CFS child-level data, management information and a list of all cases audited in the last 6 months was provided to inspectors in advance of their arrival. Inspectors chose 6 recently audited cases for a 'deep-dive' and case file documentation was shared with them on these selected cases.
- 2.2 During the 2-day focused visit inspectors primarily spent time with front-line practitioners discussing and reviewing cases. A total of 41 cases were discussed with front-line staff and inspectors viewed an additional 17 case files on Mosaic (the case recording system).
- 2.3 Inspectors provided initial verbal feedback at the end of the visit and an outcomes letter was published on Monday 4th March 2019.

Inspectors identified the following areas as being in need of swift and decisive priority action:

- The timeliness and effectiveness of social work practice and interventions to safeguard children from harm
- The quality and effectiveness of managerial oversight and supervision to ensure that children's circumstances improve within their timeframe.

- 2.4 Inspectors also identified the following areas of practice as being in need of improvement:

- Children's daily lived experiences to be central to all work
- The application of thresholds to protect children on child in need plans when risks escalate or children's circumstances do not improve within children's timeframes
- Performance data regarding the timeliness and impact of social work practice to improve children's circumstances
- Plans to be more specific and detailed about what needs to change and by when

- The greater consideration of men, including abusive partners in risk assessments

2.5 The Service was required to submit a draft action plan to Ofsted addressing the two areas identified for priority action and the other areas for development included in the outcomes letter. The Plan (Appendix A) was submitted to Ofsted on Friday 29th March 2019, the inspectorate have since confirmed that they feel the content is appropriate to meet the recommendations that they made.

3. Post Visit Action Plan (Appendix A)

- 3.1 All CFS staff have been invited to contribute to the shaping of the action plan with sessions arranged for staff to share thoughts and ideas about what our priorities are and how we should seek to deliver them in a timely fashion. These discussions were shared at the Children and Families Management Group meetings and developed into clear actions and outcomes.
- 3.2 The detailed Action Plan is underpinned by a Project Management approach to implementation, monitoring and assurance, to ensure robust arrangements that give us the capacity to confidently report back to key stakeholders against Ofsted's findings.

4. Delivery & Progress To Date

Engagement

4.1 Following publication of the feedback letter Senior Leaders within the service immediately conducted a number of staff engagement sessions. This was to ensure key messages were delivered face to face, and staff were given the opportunity to hear the feedback in context. The sessions also supported staff to reflect on what the findings meant for them and the whole service and to develop a positive practitioner response as key stakeholders in the collaborative design of our response and next steps. These engagement sessions have included:

- Senior Leadership facilitated service and team meetings with those areas directly engaged with the focussed visit.
- Whole service briefing session facilitated by the Chief Executive, Group Director and Director Children and Families Services.
- Head of Service drop in 1:1 sessions with staff.
- Head of Service briefings to individual Management Teams - outside of those areas directly engaged with the visit.
- Facilitated Leadership Discussions at whole service management forum.
- Lead Member engagement session with practitioners.

Delivery Arrangements

4.2 The delivery structure for the action plan project includes a number of Task & Finish Groups, all chaired by a Head of Service. Each group comprises of at least one representative from each service area, and where relevant additional support colleagues, i.e. Business Support, Data Analysis, ICT. These are:

- **Performance, Systems & Data Task and Finish Group** - responsible for delivering the data and reporting aspects of the Action Plan, and the improved data and reporting functionality required to support successful delivery for full inspection.
- **Practice Development Task and Finish Group** - responsible for developing and delivering the frontline practice development aspects of the Action Plan. Additionally, the group will support any new areas for development identified as part of self-evaluation and preparation for full inspection
- **Management Oversight Task & Finish Group** - responsible for developing and delivering the quality assurance and supervisory framework aspects of the Action Plan. Additionally, the group will support any new areas for development identified as part of self-evaluation and preparation for full inspection

Progress

- 4.3 Activity to deliver the necessary developments in response to the Focused Visit commenced prior to the publication and submission of the Action Plan. Additional management and development capacity was agreed and put in place across the service. This included refocusing Systemic Leads, Service Manager and Project Management who had been leading on the Partners in Practice activity to focus on internal development, and additional Service Management capacity in the Family Intervention and Support Service (FISS) and Corporate Parenting Service.
- 4.4 One of the primary issues raised by the Inspection team was that in some instances children were remaining subject to Child in Need Plans for a disproportionate length of time, and that in some cases they would expect to have seen more timely decision making to escalate or de-escalate matters. Immediately following the visit FISS Service Management undertook a review of all children's cases which had been open to the service for over 18 months, with a subsequent review of those open over 9 months being completed more recently (175 cases). We are assured that the majority are being managed at the right level, or have appropriate plans in place to escalate or de-escalate, and managers are continuing to robustly monitor these cases to ensure planned activity takes place promptly.
- 4.5 In addition to the auditing activity the Head of Service for the FISS has established a monthly Progress and Tracking Meeting which is embedding routine oversight of children's cases to ensure effective and appropriate progression. This activity entails Senior Managers (Service Manager and Head of Service) reviewing all cases after 9, 12 and 15 months with social work units.
- 4.6 The ability of the service to robustly performance manage children's cases has been improved by the accelerated implementation of the new Data Performance System - 'Qlikview.' The Service had recognised the availability of performance data as a significant area for development and the new system was already in development at the time of the focused visit. Additional ICT capacity has been agreed to bring forward full implementation and the system is already being used to provide live data to all managers across the service on timescales for case review, and critical statutory indicators such as visits to young people, and the recording of management oversight. The availability of this data has been greatly welcomed by managers at all levels.

Some recent technical issues have arisen in this system which colleagues in ICT are supporting the service to correct.

- 4.7 In addition to the above the service has delivered a wide range of development activities as part of the Plan, including:
- A series of development sessions for Consultant Social Workers and Service Managers focused on - goal oriented, outcome focused practice that places the child and the child's developmental timeframes at the centre of our plans.
 - Planning documents have been updated for Child Protection Plans, and Child In Need Plans to support the focus on outcome oriented planning.
 - New practice guidance on understanding and assessing 'parental capacity to change has been developed and distributed
 - The Case Work Audit Tool has been revised to place greater emphasis on evidence of the child's lived experience.
 - Development Session have been held with the Independent Chairs within the Safeguarding and Reviewing Team on their role in driving and challenging goal oriented practice.
 - Measures have been put in place to ensure that all case discussions begin with a review and reflection on the child's lived experience, how this is explicitly informing risk analysis and actions within the continuing intervention, and that this discussion is clearly recorded and evident on all case files.
 - A number of training sessions have been delivered across all service areas on the use of the new performance and data management system.
 - 'Best Practice' resources have been developed across all areas of our work to ensure staff have access to good practice examples and to promote ongoing peer learning.
 - A new safeguarding agreement template and safety plan templates for work with perpetrators and victims of Domestic Violence and Abuse have been developed with associated practice guidance.
 - A pilot is underway with the co-location of Domestic Abuse and Intervention Service (DAIS) Intervention Officer within CIN Teams and at the Front Door to provide early intervention and engagement with families where domestic abuse is an identified issue.
 - 'Practice Standards' for each area of service are being developed to clarify basic expectations around timescales and quality of work. These will be used both to support practitioners to understand what is expected of them and to measure performance against within the quality assurance framework.
 - A revised Hackney Wellbeing Framework (equivalent to a threshold document) has been distributed to support understanding across the service and partner agencies of the appropriate level of support relevant to children's needs in the context of their family life. This document also references the relevance of contextual safeguarding risks emanating from peer group relationships, schools and local neighbourhoods.

Self Evaluation

- 4.8 Alongside our development activity, work is also underway to complete a thorough self-evaluation and continuous development plan across all areas of the Children and Families Service in preparation for a full inspection. The detailed self-evaluation will be completed according to the ILACS Ofsted Inspection Framework Evaluation Criteria and will incorporate learning from

recent inspections and focused visits elsewhere in the country. The self-evaluation is aligned to the three critical questions within the ILACs Framework:

- What do we know about the quality of practice?
- How do we know it?
- What will we be doing to improve over the next 12 months?

Next Steps

4.9 In addition to the work being undertaken to embed the changes and developments already delivered there are a number of specific pieces of work currently in progress, which include:

- Working with colleagues from neighbouring authorities on the development of our Case Audit Moderation processes.
- Visiting partner authorities to explore good practice examples and identify learning opportunities.
- Progressing a joint working protocol between the FISS Service and Legal Service colleagues to clarify shared expectations and develop an increasingly effective working relationship. The protocol will ensure timely and proportionate responses to safeguard children where legal intervention may be necessary, and enhance the relationship between the local authority, the Courts and CAFCASS. Measures have also been put in place for the co-location of the Duty Solicitor with Social Work Units and for more routine meetings with our linked Judge.
- Delivering a refreshed vision and values statement for the service.
- Embedding a series of 'critical questions' within practice that all internal and partner agency staff should focus on and be able to answer in relation to families engaged with social care from referral through to permanence planning. These are:
 - How does the child feel, what do they want, and what is day-to-day life like for them?
 - Is the immediate safety of the child assured?
 - What needs to change for us to be less worried, and are changes happening quickly enough?
 - What would life be like for the child in the long-term if things do not change?
 - Are we putting the right interventions in place to support the change we need to see?
 - What needs to happen if things do not change?
- Following discussion with the Professional Adviser to the City & Hackney Safeguarding Children's Board, a series of events are being planned to bring together leaders, managers and practitioners from across the partnership which will focus on delivering and embedding the critical questions above, through:
 - Re-launching the Hackney Child Wellbeing Framework, understanding our thresholds and how to use the critical questions approach.
 - Launching the new partnership safeguarding arrangements.
 - Developing multi-agency practice in the key areas of goal oriented practice and the focus on the child's lived experience.
 - Consideration of how we promote respectful, confident and professional challenge across the partnership. Ensuring children's situations improve and change occurs in line with appropriate timescales or matters are escalated promptly, through the appropriate application of thresholds.

Inspection Readiness

- 4.10 Alongside the delivery of the post-visit action plan the service is also putting arrangements in place to prepare for the pending full inspection of the service. Service managers have mapped out the timetable and logistical activity required to deliver the inspection once notification is received.
- 4.11 A detailed review of the 'Annex A' evidence file is being undertaken to ensure that all appropriate policies and procedures are up to date and consistent with the changes being made across the service.
- 4.12 Service area management teams have established local arrangements to ensure they are tracking the timely completion of key activities and ensuring accuracy of data and performance recording within their areas. This is being overseen by the newly instituted fortnightly Practice and Performance Oversight Group (PPOG) chaired by the Director. The PPOG meeting reviews all key CFS performance indicators and provides both collective accountability and challenge for improvement.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 In conclusion the service has responded proactively to the focused visit outcome, embracing this as an opportunity to ensure we are achieving continuous development both in our delivery and in outcomes for children, young people and families. Over the coming months we will be continuing to deliver improvements and to gather evidence on the impact of changes made. We will also be actively preparing for a full inspection so that we are to confidently demonstrate the high quality work our practitioners deliver to children and families.

No.	Priority Action/ Recommendation	Impact - What will success look like?	Action	Timescale	Lead	Performance Management Framework	Measure	Link Plans	Governance
PA1	The timeliness and effectiveness of social work practice and interventions to safeguard children from harm	<p>All children in need of help and support will receive the right intervention at the right time, and delivered to the right quality. There will be no drift and delay in ensuring all children are kept safe, and none are left at risk of suffering further harm.</p> <p>Children will experience timely progression through the social care system. There will be reductions in the average length of time at CIN and CP, and reductions in re-referrals, repeat assessments, CIN, CP and LAC interventions. Where necessary step down and step up will be prompt and responsive to both initial concerns, and critical incidents and changed circumstances in open cases. This response will be evidently aligned to the child's developmental time frame.</p>	<p>Establish monthly CIN Plan Progress and Tracking Meeting to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Monitor quality of practice and data accuracy ■ Track timeliness of assessment planning and reviews, and frequency of visits ■ Review workloads across the service ■ Ensure appropriate application of thresholds through robust Head of Service review of all CIN Plan cases at key checkpoints (9 months, 15 months and 18 months) 	Complete	Director - Children and Families	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group Reports</p> <p>Performance Data Reports</p> <p>Audit Reports</p> <p>CIN Plan Review/CP Chair Escalations</p>	Reduction in average length of assessment	<p>Workforce Development Strategy</p> <p>Quality Assurance Framework</p>	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group</p> <p>Children & Families Management Group</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop checkpoints guidance to focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The immediate safety of the child ● Are changes happening quickly enough? ● What is the impact on the long term wellbeing of the child? ● Who is championing the voice of the child? 	Complete			Re-referral rates at or below SN average		
			Review all CIN Plan cases over 18 months to ensure any drift and delay is robustly challenged and where necessary appropriate action is taken immediately	Complete			Reduction in average length of Time on CIN Plans		
			Review all CIN Plan cases over 9 Months to ensure any drift and delay is robustly challenged and where necessary appropriate action is taken immediately	Complete			Repeat CP Plans at or below SN average		
			Staff engagement & identification of priority practice development areas	Complete			CP Plans over 2 years at or below SN average		
			Distribute briefing to all staff on assessing parental capacity to change	Complete			CP Plans under 3 months at or below SN average		
			Refresh, disseminate and implement Practice Guidance - case review, assessment, transfer, and allocation policies - to include critical review timescales and proportional assessment target setting inc. 15 day proportional assessment checkpoint.	End June 2019			Reduction in length of time between assessment, (inc. assessment following significant change in circumstances) and escalation or entry into care, or de- escalation.		

			<p>Develop and deliver mandatory practitioner and manager training on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome focussed, goal oriented practice • Assessment of parental capacity to change • Use of chronologies • Child's developmental timescales 	<p>Develop - End Apr 2019 - Complete</p> <p>Deliver - End July 2019</p>					
			<p>Identify baseline and embed in routine audit analysis thematic reviews of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome focussed, goal oriented practice • Assessment of parental capacity to change • Use of chronologies • Awareness of child's developmental timescales 	<p>End June 2019</p> <p>Quarterly</p>					
			<p>Develop good practice exemplars to share with practitioners</p>	<p>Complete</p>					
			<p>Establish and embed routine peer challenge and review process to provide peer level constructive challenge and shared learning</p>	<p>TBC</p>					
PA2 Page 10	<p>The quality and effectiveness of managerial oversight and supervision to ensure that children's circumstances improve within their timeframe.</p>	<p>Management oversight and decision making for children is timely and decisive, informed by accurate, comprehensive management information and current knowledge of the progress of the child.</p> <p>Effective action focussed case planning leads to efficient progress and improvement, or prompt review with a clear rationale for changes where progress is not in line with the child's timeframe.</p>	<p>Revise the Quality Assurance Framework including management oversight and audit mechanisms, to include new review process and strengthen emphasis on long term child and family history; child's developmental timescales; and goal oriented practice.</p>	<p>End June 2019</p>	<p>Heads of Service</p>	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group Reports</p> <p>Audit Reports</p>	<p>Audit reports report 100% evidence of management oversight</p> <p>Reduction in length of time between assessment, (inc. assessment following significant change in circumstances), and escalation or entry into care, or de-escalation</p>	<p>Quality Assurance Framework</p>	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group</p> <p>Children & Families Management Group</p>
			<p>Revise casework audit tool in line with changes to the quality assurance framework</p>	<p>Complete</p>					
			<p>Establish and embed Service Manager Case Review Programme, and meeting structures, to ensure cases at key points have senior manager oversight to ensure cases are progressed in a timely manner.</p>	<p>End June 2019</p>					
			<p>Develop and introduce performance management information system to monitor and track the regularity of management oversight of cases</p>	<p>Complete</p>					
			<p>Commission external review of management oversight</p>	<p>End Jun 2019</p>					

			Complete review of Service Manager role, function and capacity	End Jun 2019					
R1	Children's daily lived experiences to be central to all work	<p>The voice, views and lived experience of the child will be clear and apparent in all decision making.</p> <p>Children, where able, will have a clear understanding of why they have a social worker, and are shaping their own plans and associated actions.</p>	<p>Revise unit meeting agenda template to include child's lived experience as first item for each case discussion</p> <p>Develop and deliver Unit Coordinator training programme, inc. recording of child's lived experience</p> <p>Revise case recording, assessment and plan templates to more clearly and consistently articulate the child's lived experience</p> <p>Develop age appropriate 'writing to/for children' development package, inc. support from Speech and Language Therapy and Designated Safeguarding Leads to develop this</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Develop - End May 2019 - Complete</p> <p>Deliver - End Jun 2019</p> <p>End Jun 2019</p> <p>End Jun 2019</p>	Heads of Service	<p>Monthly Audit Report</p> <p>CP Chair/IRO Monitoring Reports</p>	<p>Children & young people self-report positive engagement with practice</p> <p>Audit reports show 100% evidence of the child's voice, views and lived experience as central to the development of assessments, plans and recording overall.</p> <p>Increasing quality of engagement and participation of children and young people in CIN Plan Review, Case Conferences and LAC Reviews</p>	Quality Assurance Framework	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group</p> <p>Children & Families Management Group</p>
Page 11	The application of thresholds to protect children on child in need plans when risks escalate or children's circumstances do not improve within children's timeframes	<p>Children and young people will experience a timely response to their changing needs.</p> <p>Plans and assessments are clear so that practitioners are able to quickly identify when risks increase or children's circumstances don't change, and action is taken to ensure a more robust level of intervention is in place.</p>	<p>Establish Monthly CIN Plan Progress and Tracking Meeting</p> <p>Share assessment of parental capacity to change guidance with partner agencies</p> <p>Jointly develop and deliver multi-agency engagement programme on understanding goal setting, progress, thresholds and the child's timescales., inc. focus on multi-agency challenge and escalation. To include police, health, education, voluntary & community groups, and other key stakeholders</p> <p>Share clear guidance with Independent Chairs to ensure there is a consistent approach to monitoring the progress of plans between conferences</p> <p>Adapt the structure of Child Protection conferences to ensure conferences start with a summary of the impact for the child, and the child's lived experience is at the centre of the process</p> <p>Ensure a manager chairs the third CIN Plan Review meeting, and any subsequent reviews if the case remains open</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>End June 2019</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p>	<p>Head of Service - Safeguarding and Learning & Head of Service - Family Intervention and Support Service</p>	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group Reports</p> <p>Performance Data Reports</p> <p>Audit Reports</p> <p>CIN Review/CP Chair Escalations</p>	<p>Reduction in average length of CIN Plans</p> <p>Reduction in length of time between assessment, (inc. assessment following significant change in circumstances), and escalation or entry into care, or de- escalation.</p> <p>Repeat CIN & CP Plans at or below SN Average</p>	Quality Assurance Framework	<p>Performance & Practice Oversight Group</p> <p>Children & Families Management Group</p>

			Deliver refresher training to social work practitioners on application of thresholds and the child's developmental timeframe	Complete					
R3	Performance data regarding the timeliness and impact of social work practice to improve children's circumstances	Improved performance management information will increase effective frontline management of casework, and senior management oversight and ability to effectively self-evaluate and identify areas for targeted improvement activity, leading to timely progression of plans and better outcomes for children.	Roll-out of new live performance reporting system	Complete	Business Development and Support Manager	Performance & Practice Oversight Group Reports	Increased assurance that visits are taking place within expected timescales		Performance & Practice Oversight Group
			Evaluate system impact and effectiveness	End June 2019					
			Secure continuing ICT and provider support and investment to further develop data quality and accuracy tools for routine scrutiny	End June 2019					
			Review performance information framework and structure	End Jun 2019					
			Implement recommendations from review	End Jul 2019					
						Performance Data Reports	Staff and manager feedback increased management oversight and scrutiny through use of performance data	Children & Families Management Group	
							Reduction in average length of assessment		
							Reduction in length of time between assessment, (inc. assessment following significant change in circumstances), and escalation or entry into care, or de- escalation.		
							100% compliance with review timescales		
							All levels of management report consistent use of effective performance management systems		
R4	Plans to be more specific and detailed about what needs to change and by when	Children and young people will be safer and will see effective change in their family and lives. Families are clear about what needs to change and by when. Goal oriented practice, plans and recording will lead to timely intervention, effective decision making and case progression. Multi-agency development of plans will increase shared ownership of delivery, including with children and families. Stronger and better tracked action focussed case planning will improve the evidence base for court proceedings where necessary.	Development sessions with Unit & Service Managers on supporting staff to improve outcome focussed, goal oriented practice	End Jun 2019	Heads of Service	Performance Data Reports	Audit reports report 100% evidence of action focussed planning	Workforce Development Strategy	Performance & Practice Oversight Group
			Joint development programme with key partners on evidencing change and understanding child's developmental timelines, including consultation with CAF/CASS and Courts as part of the development of this programme	End Jun 2019					
						Audit Reports	Children, young people and families self-report better understanding the reasons for intervention and of what needs to change and why.	Quality Assurance Framework	LSCB
							Reduction in number of Supervision Orders		Children & Families Management Group
R5	The greater consideration of men, including abusive partners, in risk assessments.	Children and young people will suffer less emotional and physical harm due to being victims of, or witness to DV&A. Children and young people will benefit from the active involvement of fathers in their lives,	Develop and implement new safeguarding agreement template and safety plan templates for work with perpetrators and victims of DV&A - and associated guidance	Complete	Heads of Service	Performance Data Reports	Children and young people and victims self-report positive improvement in wellbeing and perceptions of safety	Workforce Development Strategy	Performance & Practice Oversight Group
								Quality Assurance	Children &

		but will be protected from any risks from male figures in the family and these risks will be well understood. Any risks will be addressed and minimised.	Develop and implement new risk assessment guidance for working with perpetrators	End June 2019			post-intervention	Framework	Families Management Group
			Develop 'child contact' risk assessment tool for use in court proceedings	Complete			Reduction in DV&A related re-referrals		
			Pilot co-location of Domestic Abuse and Intervention Service (DAIS) Intervention Officer within CIN Teams, including pilot consultation DAIS officer for Unit Meetings	Complete			Reduction in DV&A as primary CP concern Increased perpetrator participation in behaviour change interventions		

This page is intentionally left blank



Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission 24th June 2019 Item 6 – School Admissions	Item No 6
---	--------------------------------

Outline

School Admissions is a fixed item and taken annually on the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission agenda.

The attached report provides a summary of admissions to Reception and transfer to Secondary School. The report also provides a commentary on school place planning, and how the Council meets its duty to provide sufficient school capacity for children resident in Hackney.

Marian Lavelle, Head of Section (Admissions and School Place Planning), Hackney Learning Trust

Annie Gammon, Director of Education and Head of Hackney Learning Trust

Action

The Commission is requested to:

- (i) Note the attached report;
- (ii) Identify lines of questioning to seek reassurance that there is sufficient school capacity to meet local needs;
- (iii) Determine if further information /action is needed.

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO SCRUTINY – UPDATE ON SCHOOL ADMISSIONS

24 June 2019

1. Introduction

1.1 The Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission has been provided with a summary of school admission outcomes annually since 2012. This report provides an update since the report of July 2018.

2. Reception Admissions 2019

2.1 2361 Hackney resident parents were notified on 16 April 2019 of the outcome of their applications for admission to reception class in September 2019. 98.3% or 2,321 parents applied on-line. There were 153 fewer children in this year's cohort compared to last year. A drop in applications is reflected across most of London. The above numbers do not include Hackney resident children with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) as there is a separate process for these children.

2.2 This year 92.5 % or 2183 of the cohort expressed a first preference for a Hackney school. This is similar to previous years.

2.3 Of those offered places in Hackney schools, 2209 were Hackney residents and 152 were out borough residents. In addition to the above numbers, 25 children with EHCPs were offered places in Hackney schools.

2.4 152 Hackney resident children were offered a place in out-borough schools. This compares to 186 children last year.

2.5 The number and percentage of preferences met for Hackney resident children compared with the previous year is set out in the table below. The percentage of first preferences met and top three preference met for 2019 is slightly lower than the previous year but is higher than the London totals of 85.54% for first preferences and 95.56% for the top three preferences.

Table 2. Reception preferences 2019 and 2018

Preference	Number for Transfer in 2019	% transfer in 2019	% Pan London 2019	Number for Transfer in 2018	% transfer in 2018	% Pan London 2018
1	2049	86.79	85.54	2203	87.63	86.55
1 & 2	2222	94.12	92.95	2378	94.59	93.76
1, 2 & 3	2277	96.45	95.56	2434	96.82	96.02
1, 2, 3 & 4	2296	97.25	96.64	2449	97.42	96.98
1, 2, 3, 4 & 5	2307	97.72	97.14	2455	97.66	97.39

All 6 preferences	2312	97.93	97.43	2455	97.66	97.61
No preferences met	49	02.07	02.57	59	2.35	2.39

2.6 The 49 children (shown in the 2nd column above) not offered a place at one of their preference schools were allocated a school with a vacancy. In most cases, this was the nearest school to their home address with a vacancy. In addition to the above numbers, 129 late applications were received. They have all been offered places.

3. Secondary Transfer 2019

3.1 2,493 Hackney resident parents were notified on 1 March 2019 of the outcome of their applications for secondary transfer in 2019. 98.9% or 2,466 parents applied on-line. There were 103 fewer children in this year's transfer cohort compared to last year. The drop in numbers is partly caused by the omission of the preferences for Yesodey Hatorah Senior Schools for Girls following a decision of the governing body to change the age range of the school to include year 5s and 6s, making year 5 the year of entry. One application was received and offered a place in year 5 at the school. No applications were received for year 6.

3.2 The above numbers do not include children with EHCPs as there is a separate process for these children.

3.3 85.2% or 2124 of the applicants that applied on time expressed a first preference for a Hackney school. This compares to 85.5% or 2,219 in 2018

3.4 Of those offered places in Hackney schools, 2,167 were Hackney residents and 304 were out-borough residents. In addition to the above numbers, 65 children with EHCPs were offered places in Hackney schools. Four of these lived out-borough.

3.6 326 Hackney resident children were offered a place in out-borough schools. This compares to 332 children last year. 2 children with EHCPs were offered places in out-borough schools.

3.7 The number and percentage of preferences met for Hackney resident children is set out below in Table 2. The percentage of first preferences met is lower than the pan-London average but higher than the pan-London average for the percentage of top three preference met.

Table 2 - Secondary Preferences 2019 and 2018

Preference	Number for transfer in 2019	% transfer in 2019	%Pan London total 2019	Number for transfer in 2018	% transfer in 2018	%Pan London total 2018
1	1589	63.74	65.89	1624	63.25	66.01
1 & 2	1953	78.34	79.83	2069	79.7	80.83
1, 2 & 3	2164	86.8	86.35	2295	88.41	87.31
1, 2, 3 & 4	2270	91.05	89.67	2406	92.69	90.56
1, 2, 3, 4 & 5	1310	92.7	91.39	2439	93.96	92.13
All 6 preferences	2327	93.38	92.39	2445	94.19	93.02
No	166	6.66	7.61	151	5.81	6.98

preferences met						
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

3.7 The 166 children (shown in the 2nd column above) not offered a place at one of their preference schools were allocated a school with a vacancy. In most cases, this was the nearest school to their home address with a vacancy. The table below shows the band group and the number of pupils in each post code not offered a place.

Table 3

Band Group	A	B	C	D	E	Untested
Number in each post code	1 in E5 4 in E8 4 in N14	7 in E5 2 in E8 3 in E9 5 in N16 1 in N9	1 in E1 3 in E2 17 in E5 14 in E8 7 in E9 1 in N1 5 in N16	1 in E2 15 in E5 12 in E8 11 in E9 1 in EC1V 2 in N1 8 in N16 1 in N4	3 in E8 1 in E9	8 in E5 11 in E8 3 in E9 2 in N1 6 in N16 6 in N4
Total	9	18	48	51	4	36

*Note: The above data is based on 1st preferences. This means that some of the untested will have made a first preference for an out of borough school or Our Lady's High or Lubavitch Senior Girls that does not use banding;
Some pupils are in different band groups for different schools as banding is either based on the ability of the applicants that apply to the school or on the national ability range;
Most schools that use banding have four and not five bands*

3.8 Since offer day we have received a small number of late applications. Places have been offered to all of these applicants.

3.9 There are currently no pupils that have not been offered a place.

4. Demographic characteristics of children without a confirmed place on National Offer Day

4.1 Free school meal eligibility, ethnicity, house type and other factors such as whether a child has additional needs are not monitored as part of the application process. This is because admission authorities are prevented from requesting information that is not relevant to the application of the published oversubscription criteria.

4.2 Of the primary and secondary children who did not get offered a place at one of their schools on National Offer days for reception admission and secondary transfer, the majority did **not** make use of their 6 preferences as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4.

No of preferences	1 st only	1 st and 2 nd	1 st 2 nd & 3 rd	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd & 4 th	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th & 5 th	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , 5 th and 6 th
Number - Reception	14	8	7	7	3	10
Number – Secondary Transfer	20	38	56	20	13	19

4.3 Many of the above parents expressed preferences for schools that they were unlikely to be offered a place at, based on the criteria under which parents were offered places in the previous year.

4.4 The school admission team run briefing sessions at a number of school across the borough for parents of year 5 children each summer term. These briefing sessions continue to emphasise the importance of making realistic preferences and to stress the benefits of parents using all 6 preferences. Briefing sessions are also run for school based admissions staff reiterating the above.

5 How places were allocated at oversubscribed schools on national offer day

5.1 Admission to Reception class - Twenty five of the fifty eight primary schools were oversubscribed on 16 April 2019, National Offer day. How places were offered at the oversubscribed schools is shown in Appendix A attached to this report. The remaining schools were able to offer places to all applicants.

5.2 Transfer from primary to secondary school – Nine of the sixteen secondary schools were oversubscribed on 1 March 2019, National Offer day. How places were offered at the oversubscribed schools is shown in Appendix B attached to this report. The remaining schools were able to offer all applicants a place.

5.3 Two of the oversubscribed primary schools prioritise applicants on the basis of faith and two of the oversubscribed secondary schools use random allocation. This results in some children not meeting the oversubscription criteria for their nearest school.

5 Cross borough movement of pupils

5.1 Hackney secondary schools with the highest number of out borough pupils:

- Skinners' Academy - 83
- Our Lady's Convent – 42
- Haggerston – 41
- Stoke Newington – 39
- Mossbourne Victoria Park 16
- Cardinal Pole - 15

5.2 Hackney secondary schools with the lowest number of out borough pupils were:

- The City Academy-1
- Clapton – 4
- The Petchey Academy -4
- The City Academy, Shoreditch Park - 5
- Hackney New School – 6
- The Urswick School – 11

5.3 Out borough secondary schools that admitted the highest number of Hackney children were:

- Central Foundation Boys – 47
- Gladesmore – 28
- City of London Academy (Islington) -28
- The City of London Academy (Highbury Grove) – 28
- Bobby Moore Academy - 18
- Elizabeth Garratt Anderson - 14

5.4 Hackney primary schools with the highest number of out borough pupils were:

- Mossbourne Riverside Academy - 39
- The Olive School – 18
- Shoreditch Park Primary School – 14
- Woodberry Down - 12
- Simon Marks – 10
- Sebright - 7
- Our Lady and St Joseph – 7
- De Beauvoir - 7

5.5 Out borough primary schools that admitted the highest numbers of Hackney children were:

- Ambler - 15
- St Ignatius -14
- St Joan of Arc -14
- Rotherfield -13
- Newington Green -11
- Hanover - 9

6. In-Year Admissions

6.1 Any parent can apply for a school place at any time to any school outside the normal admission round. If a school has a vacancy, a place must normally be offered. Since 1 September 2018 to the end of May 19, there have been 2216 primary in-year preferences resulting in 810 offers and 1253 secondary school preferences resulting in 219 offers. Some of these preferences were as a result of parents indicating via a new in-year application form that they wished to remain on the waiting lists of their preference schools. Parents are able to express up to four preferences via the in-year application process. These figures do not include pupils allocated schools places via The Fair Access Protocol, Managed Moves or the admission of pupils with Education, Health and Care Plans.

7. Composite prospectus

7.1 Local Authorities must publish online – with hard copies available for those who do not have access to the internet – a composite prospectus each year which explains the admission process in a way that is clear and accessible to all parents.

7.2 All parents of 3 and 4 year olds in Hackney early years' settings receive a hard copy of an eight page leaflet outlining key information relating to the reception class admission process. Similarly, parents of children in year 6 at Hackney primary school receive an equivalent leaflet relating to the secondary transfer process. The leaflets can be accessed at <https://www.learningtrust.co.uk/sites/default/files/document/%20primary-admission-leaflet.pdf> and at <https://www.learningtrust.co.uk/sites/default/files/document/secondary-admission-leaflet.pdf> Hard copies of the leaflets will be circulated at the meeting.

- 7.3 Fewer than five requests for hard copies of the composite prospectus were received from parents. Requests were resolved through direct interaction and provision of relevant information for each family.
- 7.4 The number of visits to the admission sections of Hackney Learning Trust's website can be broken down as follows: -

Primary

Brief guide to reception admissions	1704
Eadmissions website	2760
List of primary vacancies (in year)	3505
Primary composite prospectus	3123
Primary in-year application form	2167
Total	13,259

Secondary

Brief guide to reception admissions	3505
Eadmissions website	2402
List of primary vacancies (in year)	2379
Secondary composite prospectus	3901
Secondary in-year application form	1762
Total	13,949

8. The Admission of Children with Education, Health and Care Plans

- 8.1 There is a separate process for children with Education, Health and Care Plans.
- 8.2 For admission for reception class in September 2019:
- 19 children were offered places in Hackney maintained mainstream schools
 - 11 children were offered places in Hackney maintained special schools
 - 1 child was offered a place in an independent faith school
 - 4 children were offered places in out borough maintained special schools.
 - 3 children were offered places in Hackney independent special schools.
 - 2 children were offered places in Hackney Autism Resource Provisions
 - 1 child was offered a place in an out of borough Hearing Impairment Resource Provision
 - 3 children have deferred primary transfer until 2020
- 8.3 There were 127 children with an EHC plan transferring to secondary school in September 2019. Of these;
- 61 children were offered places in Hackney maintained mainstream schools
 - 36 children were offered places in Hackney maintained special schools
 - 13 children were offered places in independent faith schools
 - 2 children were offered places in out borough maintained mainstream schools.
 - 2 children were offered places in Hackney independent special schools.
 - 7 children were offered places in out borough independent special schools
 - 1 child was offered a place in an out borough maintained mainstream school
 - 2 Looked After Children children were placed in out borough independent schools

- 3 children are awaiting placement (3 June 2019)
- 1 child has deferred secondary transfer until 2020
- 4 out borough children were offered places in Hackney maintained mainstream schools
- 2 out borough children were offered places in Hackney maintained special schools

8.4 Regarding in-year admissions for children with an Education, Health and Care Plan, a request for a change of placement/in year transfer can be made at any point of the year via the Annual Review process. If a child's parent or a young person makes a request for a particular nursery, school or post-16 institution HLT must comply with that preference and name the school or college in the EHC plan unless:

- it would be unsuitable for the age, ability, aptitude or SEN of the child or young person, or
- the attendance of the child or young person there would be incompatible with the efficient education of others, or the efficient use of resources

9 School Place Planning

9.1 Hackney Learning Trust has a duty to secure a sufficient number of places for Hackney resident pupils. Primary projections are provided by the Greater London Council (GLA) annually and are based upon a number of factors such as birth, death and migration data, population projections, fertility and migration rates, housing data and school roll data.

9.2 Since 2008, Hackney has seen a steady increase in the demand for reception places with very high rolls between 2014 and January 2016. However, in October 2016, demand for reception places started to fall and has in the main continued to do so.

Table 4. Reception roll 2014-19

Census date	Reception roll
January 2014	2744
January 2015	2845
January 2016	2807
October 2016	2742
January 2017	2759
January 2018	2633
January 2019	2562

9.3 School roll projections (Table 5 below), also show a significant reduction in the number of projected pupils over the years – a projected difference of 387 pupils (equivalent to 13 forms of entry), between 2014 and 2018.

Table 5. The number of children projected for September 2019, since 2014.

Year of projection	Projected number of reception children for September 2019
2014 (based on January rolls)	2926
2015 (based on January rolls)	2801
2016 (based on January rolls)	2782
2016 (based on October rolls)	2682
2017 (based on January rolls)	2705
2018 (based on January rolls)	2539
2019 (based on January rolls)	2635

- 9.4 Falling reception rolls are not unique to Hackney but has been seen across LAs in London. Why rolls are falling is unclear, but it is thought to be a combination of changes to welfare benefits, rising rents and the possible effects of Brexit.
- 9.5 As a result of the falling rolls, there is now a significant number of surplus reception places in the borough which can impact on the efficient running of schools. In response to this, Hackney Learning Trust's School Place Planning Group monitors school rolls, school roll projections and related school organisation issues. The Group has agreed the following caps (a temporary measure which limits the number of reception places on the understanding that should there be a sudden influx of pupils that can not be placed, schools are expected to admit up to the PAN if needed), and permanent PAN reductions, in the following primary schools.

Table 6. Capped PANs for 2019/20 and 2020/21

School	Capped PAN 2018/19	Capped PAN 2019/20	Capped PAN 2020/21
Thomas Fairchild	30	30	30
Benthal	-	30	-
Harrington Hill	-	30	-
Gainsborough	-	30	-
Mandeville	-	45	45
Princess May	-	30	-

Table 7. Permanent PAN reductions from 2019/20

School	Current PAN	New PAN from 2019	Places permanently removed
De Beauvoir	60	30	30
Harrington Hill	90	60	30
Gainsborough	90	60	30
Halley House	60	30	30
Total number of places removed			120

2019 Offers at Reception Classes in oversubscribed Hackney community schools

Primary School	Total places available	Total Applications	Offers						
			Education, Health and Care Plan which names the school	Looked after & previously looked after children	Children with a Child Protection plan	Medical/ Social Reasons	Children with siblings at the school	Children of teachers at the school	Distance (distance of the last child offered in miles)
Betty Layward Primary School	61*	277	0	0	0	0	28	0	31 (0.305)
Colvestone Primary School	30	107	0	0	0	0	14	0	16 (0.526)
Gayhurst Primary School	75	246	0	1	0	0	25	0	49 (0.392)
Grasmere Primary School	30	183	1	0	0	0	12	0	17 (0.197)
Grazebrook Primary School	60	314	0	0	0	0	24	0	36 (0.280)
Holmleigh Primary School	30	122	0	0	0	1	12	0	17 (0.969)
Jubilee Primary School	60	216	0	1	0	0	23	1	35 (0.452)
Kingshead Primary School	30	106	0	1	0	0	13	0	16 (0.394)
Lauriston School	60	189	0	2	0	0	24	0	34 (0.451)
London Fields Primary School	60	332	1	0	0	0	17	0	42 (0.516)
Millfields Community School	90	280	3	0	1	0	40	0	46 (0.353)
Nightingale Primary School	30	118	0	0	0	0	8	0	22 (2.512)
Orchard Primary School	90	261	0	1	0	0	32	0	57 (1.271)
Parkwood Primary School	30	115	0	0	0	0	6	0	24 (0.255)
Queensbridge Primary School	60	274	1	0	0	0	17	0	42 (0.596)
Rushmore Primary School	60	249	1	0	0	0	30	1	28 (0.206)
Shacklewell Primary School	60	215	1	0	0	0	18	0	41 (0.377)
Springfield Primary School	30	82	0	0	0	0	14	0	16 (0.253)
William Patten Primary School	60	343	0	2	0	1	24	0	33 (0.277)
Woodberry Down Primary School	90	178	0	0	0	0	33	0	57 (0.436)

Notes

Data is valid as at 16 April 2019

Schools that do not appear in this list were able to offer all applicants a place

* Betty Layward allocated over their PAN to offer twins a place

How Reception places were allocated at oversubscribed Hackney Voluntary Aided, Academies and Free Schools
Data as at 16 April 2019

Offers at St John & St James CE Primary School

Admission Criteria	
Education, Health and Care Plan	1
Looked After Child	
Foundation Places	
Regularly attend and live in Parish area	8
Open Places	
Sibling	9
Children of Staff	
Children who live within Parish area	
Medical/Social	
Children who live outside Parish area	
Distance	12
<i>Maximum Distance (miles)</i>	0.22
Total	30

Offers at Halley House

Admission Criteria	
Education, Health and Care Plan	
Looked After Child	
Child Protection Plan	
Sibling	14
Children of Staff	
Distance	16
<i>Maximum Distance (miles)</i>	0.37
Total	30

Offers at Hackney New Primary School

Admission Criteria	
Education, Health and Care Plan	
Looked After Child	
Child Protection Plan	
Siblings of children at Hackney New Primary School	16
Siblings of children at Hackney New School	
Medical/Social	
Distance	34
<i>Maximum Distance (miles)</i>	0.3
Total	50

Offers at The Olive School

Admission Criteria	
Education, Health and Care Plan	3
Looked After Child	
Children of Staff	
Sibling	51
Medical/Social	
Distance	36
Late Application	
Alternative Offer	
<i>Maximum Distance (miles)</i>	1.22
Total	90

How Reception places were allocated at oversubscribed Hackney Voluntary Aided, Academies and Free Schools
Data as at 16 April 2019

Offers at Our Lady's & St Joseph RC Primary School

Admission Criteria	
Education, Health and Care Plan	
Catholic Looked After Child	
Baptised Catholic Children with Sibling	8
Baptised Child of Staff	1
Baptised Child Living Within Parish	11
Parents/Legal guardians are resident in the Hackney Catholic Deanery	
Other Baptised Child with a Certificate of Catholic Practice	9
Other Baptised Catholic Children.	
Other Looked After Children	
Children who are Catechumens/Eastern Church Members	
Children of other Christian Denominations	1
Any other Children	
Total	30

This page is intentionally left blank

How places were allocated at oversubscribed Hackney Secondary Schools - 2019

Data as at National Offer Day - 1 March 2019

Offers at City of London Academy, Shoreditch Park

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan	1				1
Looked After Child					
Child Protection Plan					
Sibling	4	10	6	4	24
Medical/Social	1			2	3
Children of Staff					
Distance	19	15	19	19	72
Maximum Distance (miles)	0.808	0.758	0.457	0.405	
Total	25	25	25	25	100

Offers at Mossbourne Victoria Park Academy

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan	1			3	4
Looked After Child				2	2
Child Protection Plan					
Sibling	13	14	14	19	60
Medical/Social	1	1	3	1	6
Children of Staff					
Twin/Multiple Birth				1	1*
Distance	27	27	25	17	96
Maximum Distance (miles)	0.528	0.597	0.532	0.359	
Total	42	42	42	43	169*

* Offered an additional place to a twin over PAN in accordance with admission arrangements

Offers at Stoke Newington School and Sixth Form

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan			2	5	7
Looked After Child		2			2
Child Protection Plan					
Medical/Social					
Sibling	26	27	22	26	101
Distance	38	35	39	33	145
Maximum Distance (miles)	0.655	0.65	0.672	0.733	
Total	64	64	63	64	255

Offers at Skinners' Academy

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan					1	1
Looked After Child						
Sibling	10	11	13	13	8	55
Medical/Social						
Children of Staff						
Distance	26	25	23	23	27	124
Maximum Distance (miles)	1.718	1.183	1.156	1.447	2.001	
Total	36	36	36	36	36	180

Offers at The Bridge Academy

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan			1		4	5
Looked After Child						
Child Protection Plan					1	1
Sibling	9	10	19	16	20	74
Children of Staff						
Distance	27	29	18	22	13	109
Maximum Distance (miles)	N/A*	N/A*	0.66	0.579	0.317	
Total	36	39	38	38	38	189

* all children in the band were offered

Offers at Clapton Girls' Academy

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan					1	1
Looked After Child						
Sibling	9	13	12	14	11	59
Distance	28	24	25	23	26	126
Maximum Distance (miles)	1.009	0.834	0.747	0.707	0.671	
Total	37	37	37	37	38	186

How places were allocated at oversubscribed Hackney Secondary Schools - 2019

Data as at National Offer Day - 1 March 2019

Offers at The Petchey Academy

Admission Criteria	Band A Inner	Band A Outer	Band B Inner	Band B Outer	Band C Inner	Band C Outer	Band D Inner	Band D Outer	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan	1		1			1	4	4	11
Looked After Child		1		1					2
Sibling	6	3	9	5	5	5	7	9	49
Twins						1			1
Random	20	13	24	15	19	17	14	12	134
Total	27	17	34	21	24	24	25	25	197

Offers at Mossbourne Community Academy

Admission Criteria	Band A			Band B			Band C			Band D			Total
	Inner	Middle	Outer	Inner	Middle	Outer	Inner	Middle	Outer	Inner	Middle	Outer	
Education, Health and Care Plan										6	4	1	11
Looked After Child									2	1			3
Child Protection Plan							1						1
Sibling	13	10	4	12	4	3	13	8	8	7	5	5	92
Medical and Social		2		1	1	1							5
Children of Staff			1		1								2
Attends Mossbourne Parkside	2		1	5			8			9	2		27
Twin/Multiple Birth								1		1			2*
Random	12	4	5	9	10	7	5	6	3	4	5	5	75
Total	27	16	11	27	16	11	27	17	11	28	16	11	218*

* Offered two additional places to twins over PAN in accordance with admission arrangements

Offers at The City Academy Hackney

Admission Criteria	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Total
Education, Health and Care Plan	1			9	10
Looked After Child	1			1	2
Child Protection Plan					
Sibling	12	23	27	19	81
City of London Residents					
Children of Staff					
Distance	31	22	18	16	87
<i>Maximum Distance (miles)</i>	<i>0.581</i>	<i>0.339</i>	<i>0.32</i>	<i>0.317</i>	
Total	45	45	45	45	180



Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission 24th June 2019 Item 7 – Childcare Sufficiency	Item No 7
---	----------------------------

Outline

An assessment of the sufficiency of local childcare is a fixed item and taken annually on the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission agenda.

A verbal update will be provided to the Commission on sufficiency of childcare in Hackney in relation to:

- Demand for local childcare services;
- Supply of local childcare services;
- Funded early education;
- Cost of local childcare;
- Quality of local childcare.

Donna Thomas, Interim Head of Early Years

Annie Gammon, Director of Education and Head of Hackney Learning Trust

Action

The Commission is requested to:

- (i) Identify lines of questioning to seek reassurance that there is sufficient childcare to meet local needs;
- (ii) Determine if further information / action is needed.

This page is intentionally left blank



Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission 24th June 2019 Item 8 – CYP Scrutiny Commission Work Programme 2019/20	Item No 8
--	--------------------------------

Outline

A new work programme for the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission is developed in consultation with local stakeholders each municipal year.

A presentation will be provided to the Commission on:

- The consultation and work programme development process to date;
- Items suggested for inclusion on the work programme by members of the Commission and other stakeholders to date;
- Process and criteria for prioritising items for inclusion;
- Finalisation and agreement of the work programme;
- Training, development and member involvement for 2019/20 work programme.

Action

Members are requested to:

- (i) Identify further items for possible inclusion within the scrutiny work programme;
- (ii) Review those items already suggested for inclusion within the programme;
- (iii) Agree the process for finalisation and agreement of the work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank



Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission 24th June 2019 Item 9 – Minutes of the previous meeting.	Item No 9
--	----------------------------

Outline

The minutes of the last meeting (30th April 2019) are attached for the Commission to review and approve.

Action



Members are requested to:

- (i) Note any actions or matters arising from the minutes.
- (ii) Agree the minutes as an accurate record of that meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough of Hackney
Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2018/19
Date of Meeting Tuesday, 30th April, 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 Katie Hanson, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Caroline Woodley
Apologies:	Cllr Soraya Adejare
Co-optees in attendance:	Graham Hunter, Michael Lobenstein, Jo Macleod, Ernell Watson, Shuja Shaikh, Sevdie Sali Ali, Jodine Clarke and Maariyah Patel
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Cllr Anntoinette Bramble, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People- Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cabinet Member for Early Years and Play- Cllr Aron Klein- Anne Canning, Group Director, Children Families and Community Health- Annie Gammon, Director of Education and Head of Hackney Learning Trust- Andrew Lee, Assistant Director, Hackney Learning Trust- Jim Gamble, Independent Chair, CHSCB- Rory McCallum, Senior Professional Adviser, CHSCB
Members of the Public	3 members of the public were in attendance.
Officer Contact:	Martin Bradford  020 8356 3315  martin.bradford@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sophie Conway in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from:
- Cllr Soraya Adejare
 - Jane Heffernan

- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from:
- Cllr Clare Potter

1 Declarations of Interest

2.1 The following declarations were received by members:

- Cllr Chauhan was a teacher at secondary school in another London borough and a member of the NEU.
- Cllr Peters was a governor at the Garden School.
- Jo Macleod was a governor of a local primary school.

3 Urgent Items / Order of Business

3.1 There were no late or urgent items of business.

4 Review Update - Unregistered Educational Settings

4.1 The Commission completed a review of unregistered educational settings in January 2018 which made a number of recommendations to help bring such schools into regulatory compliance. This item was a progress report on the recommendations of that review which were agreed by Cabinet in July 2018. The Chair welcomed presenters for this item Anne Canning, Andrew Lee, Jim Gamble and Rory McCallum.

4.2 It was noted that this remained an important piece of work for the Council. The Council and other regulatory and enforcement partners continued to work in partnership to ensure that the places where children congregated were safe, structures were sound and that safe recruitment practices were being followed.

4.3 Whilst it was acknowledged that whilst there had been some local progress, the paucity of regulatory legislation in this area remained a significant barrier to addressing the concerns presented by unregistered educational settings. Since the Commission's report had been published however, there had been a significant amount of media interest which kept unregistered educational settings in the national spotlight, which was positive.

4.4 The government had recently published the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper which had set out a range of developments for unregistered settings, out of school settings and home education. Whilst problems around the legal definition of a school and curriculum remained, there had been some positive advancement in 3 areas:

- Proposed tighter controls on the requirements for school registration;
- Launch of a consultation on voluntary safeguarding code of practice;
- Planned introduction of compulsory register for home educated children.

4.5 The introduction of a register for home education represented a significant development in the regulatory framework. Given the number of local children that were home educated however, this would be a major piece of work and which would require additional resources. It was still unclear however, how local education officers and regulatory partners could use the planned home education register.

4.6 It was noted that officers from Hackney Learning Trust and the Children and Families Service had met with representatives from the orthodox Jewish community (OJC), from which it was reported that the community were keen to develop local safeguarding arrangements across out of school settings. Whilst it was acknowledged that there had been improved engagement, a forum to discuss the establishment of basic safeguarding protocols in unregistered educational settings, had not yet been established. Discussions were however continuing.

4.7 CHSCB also confirmed that progress had been made in developing safeguarding arrangements in local out of school settings within the OJC. There had been increased communication and engagement with the representatives of the OJC which was encouraging. CHSCB also noted however, that whilst there had been commitments toward establishing safeguarding arrangements in out of school settings, to date there had been no tangible developments within the OJC. The CHSCB remained optimistic however, that safeguarding improvements would be introduced.

4.8 It was understood that there was a safeguarding committee in operation within the OJC which had agreed in principle to new safeguarding procedures for recruitment and to work with the CHSCB to advise, help and support the community to develop other safeguarding measures in out of school settings. It was hoped that this would lead to the development of local safeguarding policies, which would be developed, trialled and audited procedures within out of school settings in the OJC.

4.9 At a recent meeting with representatives from the OJC, the Chair of CHSCB had visited an out of school setting and was given the opportunity to speak to young men that attended. The ability for CHSCB to engage and freely talk with young people in an out of school settings within the OJC was positive, and represented significant progress.

4.10 A member of the Commission and also representative from the OJC, confirmed that progress had been made in the development of local safeguarding arrangements at out of school settings and reaffirmed the commitment of the community to work with the CHSCB to improve safeguarding arrangements.

4.11 Council officers reported that they had continued to meet with Department of Education (DfE) and Ofsted to discuss technicalities within the regulations as well as broader policy issues pertaining to unregistered schools. It was noted that these meetings were ongoing.

Questions

4.12 Whilst it was encouraging to note that progress had been made in respect of safeguarding arrangements, the Commission sought to clarify what an agreement would look like between CHSCB and the OJC, what accountability measures would be put in place and how it would operate in practice?

- CHSCB reported that officers would support the safeguarding committee within the OJC to draft an appropriate safeguarding policy for yeshivas and other out of school settings. It would also help to structure safeguarding arrangements (including safeguarding audits) in the same

way as for any other children's setting in the borough. When the audit process had been established, the CHSCB would assess a sample of out of school settings in the OJC to determine if safeguarding procedures were being followed. This would be the same process used by CHSCB to assess safeguarding arrangements elsewhere.

- CHSCB also confirmed that any conclusions reached from these assessments would be included as part of the normal safeguarding report to the local authority. This objective was confirmed by LBH officers.

4.13 The Commission questioned officers present as to whether the safeguarding policy would be legally binding or enforceable in any way and what would happen if not all out of school settings in the OJC signed up to this policy?

- CHSCB reported that the safeguarding policies that would be set up would not be legally enforceable, which was the same for other institutions. As such, the safeguarding policies and processes that were developed would only be as strong as the commitment by the community to these processes. Once the policy was signed off, CHSCB would expect it to be implemented across all institutions and would test the application of this policy through local audit. This would allow CHSCB to make an assessment of how effective local safeguarding processes were within the OJC.
- CHSCB noted that there was a level of mistrust in national and local agencies by those who operate yeshivas, as they feared the 'state' would interfere in their religious customs and practices. It was acknowledged therefore, that confidence building measures were needed to help build trust, and to help stakeholders focus on those issues which keep children safe in out of school settings. It was hoped that as trust and confidence in developing local safeguarding arrangements grew, more yeshivas would sign up to this process.
- A representative of the OJC reported that the community would be content to go along with safeguarding proposals outlined by the CHSCB but would have serious concerns with any encroachment onto the curriculum taught in yeshivas or other out of school settings. It was therefore hoped that progress could be made in safeguarding if matters relating to the curriculum were kept aside. It was acknowledged that the curriculum was a stumbling block to being within regulatory compliance with Ofsted, but yeshivas would not allow their curriculum to be policed as this had been taught to generations of people in the OJC in Hackney and beyond. This commitment to yeshivas would not change. Therefore whilst the OJC was happy to go along with safeguarding improvements, it was however wary that this could be linked to required changes in the curriculum, particularly in relation to registration and regulation requirements of Ofsted.
- CHSCB reported that safeguarding and the curriculum were two different issues. In respect of the curriculum, this was the responsibility of the DfE and additional legislation would be required for there to be any further developments. The immediate local issue was to make sure children were safe and there was appropriate safeguarding policies and practice, irrespective of educational setting or beliefs.
- LBH officers reported that new safeguarding regulations would come into force in September 2019. Within these new regulations, safeguarding partners would need to develop a local list of all 'relevant agencies' which had a safeguarding responsibility. This was an acknowledgement by the DfE to extend safeguarding practice across all out of school settings. In

this context, all those 'relevant agencies' listed would be expected to comply with local safeguarding arrangements.

Agreed: New safeguarding requirements, including the identification of relevant agencies, to be included within the 2019/20 CYP Scrutiny Commission work programme.

4.14 The Commission observed from the report that there had not been any progress against recommendation 9 (improvements in the curriculum), which would suggest that the authority was continuing to fail significant numbers of children by not equipping them with adequate education and skills, particularly in STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and maths).

- Officers from LBH reiterated that there had been no progress in matters relating to the curriculum. Further guidance and legislation was needed from DfE as to how a curriculum was defined and the components of an 'acceptable education'.

4.15 The Commission enquired if any staff at unregistered settings were currently DBS checked and whether this would be instigated with the development of new safeguarding arrangements?

- A representative from the OJC responded that at the moment staff were not DBS checked at yeshivas or unregistered settings, but that under the new arrangements all staff would be DBS checked. All staff working at local registered independent schools were however DBS checked.
- LBH officers noted the distinction between yeshivas and other unregistered educational settings in that children attending the former could be classified as having 'education otherwise' which was considered to be a form of elective home education. If children were being 'educated otherwise', the local authority had a duty to satisfy itself that the children were in receipt of an appropriate education.
- A representative of the OJC noted that many unregistered settings were afraid to identify themselves to the local authority and other bodies, as they feared that this would lead to controls as to what was taught within these settings.
- LBH officers were required to notify the DfE of those settings where children congregated. Ofsted would inspect these settings to make a determination as to whether this was a school or not. Ultimately, any unregistered setting would need to make a choice to identify as a school and therefore comply with Ofsted regulatory framework or it can be a yeshiva and overseen within elective home education framework.

4.16 Officers present were asked to update the Commission on the number of unregistered settings and yeshivas in operation in Hackney and the number of children that attended. Had any progress been made identifying these settings?

- Officers reported that the number of children attending an unregistered setting or yeshiva was difficult to calculate. However, using demographic estimates where an equal number of males and female births in the OJC would be expected, it was calculated that approximately 1,500 boys aged 14-18 years currently attended a yeshiva or unregistered setting.
- Cllr Klein suggested that the reason why these children were unidentified was that they lived a crime free society, did not do drugs or get into trouble with the police.

4.17 As there were numerous services within the regulatory framework for the unregistered settings, the Commission wanted to know how well these agencies communicated and worked together to identify and regulate unregistered settings? The Commission also requested an update on the Cabinet agreement to establish a working party of local stakeholders to work collaboratively to respond to unregistered settings.

- Officers from LBH noted that if one agency goes into a setting and identified an issue of concern, then other relevant agencies would be notified. The threshold for involvement was however very high. For example, whilst the Fire Service may be notified of fire risks identified by Ofsted, its powers to intervene and close any establishment were limited.
- Officers from LBH reported that a defined working party had not yet been established, but key stakeholders continued to meet when necessary. As the regulatory framework had not been subject to any legislative change, the partnership could not further progress collaborative working at this stage.
- There was however good cooperation at the local level between statutory services, though it was acknowledged that further improvement would be welcomed in reporting mechanisms between Ofsted and local authorities, particularly the outcomes of any assessment of unregistered educational settings (e.g. is this to be determined as a school or otherwise).

4.18 What work had been undertaken to communicate and involve parents of children that might be attending unregistered settings?

- LBH officers reported that the recent deregistration of an independent school by Ofsted required the local authority to contact all parents to ascertain the schooling plans for their child after closure. Of those that responded, most reported that their child would be home educated. CHSCB produced a leaflet that highlighted key safeguarding and safety assurances that they should seek in selecting the next school for their child (e.g. DBS checked staff).
- CHSCB noted that the leaflet developed above, was now available on line and was used to inform parental assessments for other out of school settings.
- LBH officers also noted that whilst there had not been any engagement with parents from the OJC other to what was listed above, communication would generally be conducted through Interlink rather than directly through the local authority.

4.19 The Commission was keen to understand if there was a role for local councillors to help build lines of communication and engagement with the OJC?

- LBH officers indicated that there had been some recent examples where there had been good communication and engagement with the OJC, particularly in relation to immunisation. This had presented new ways of working with the OJC which might be replicated in other service areas.
- The most important concern however was the need to raise awareness of safeguarding issues within the community, and to empower parents to make informed choices that ensure that their child is educated in a safe and protective environment.

4.20 The Commission requested further information about the Out of School Settings Project as noted in the submitted report.

- This was a DfE funded project to work with out of school settings and include a range of settings such as Saturday schools, scouts, guides and yeshivas. The aim of the project was to promote the safeguarding in a wide range of settings. It was suggested that some of the funding received would be used to commission Interlink to promote safeguarding in the OJC, such as in yeshivas. This project would work with Young Hackney and CHSCB to promote safeguarding in out of school settings. Officers would be able to report back on progress in about 18 months-time.

4.21 In data submitted by CHSCB, the Commission noted that there had been a 20% rise in the number of children that were electively home educated in Hackney in the last year. What oversight did local services have of children who are home educated in relation to safeguarding and the appropriateness of the education they received?

- Given the inadequacy of respective legislation, it was noted that oversight of such children in elective home education was minimal. Parents had the right to home educate their children and the local authority had few powers of oversight in respect of the appropriateness of their education except to offer advice and support. There was no power of entry or inspection. Parents were not required to provide any information to the local authority on the whereabouts of the child or what the child was being taught.
- In respect of safeguarding, the local authority could only act on the basis of evidence presented on a case by case basis, and could not undertake and broader 'fishing exercise' to identify broader safeguarding issues.
- A consultation on elective home education had recently been launched which was broadly welcomed. There was concern however any new duties placed on local authorities would be resourced, particularly as this involved significant numbers of local children (about 350).
- It was noted that the consultation did not make any contribution as to what might be considered an 'appropriate home-schooled education'.
- It was suggested that the number of local children that were home educated would rise as the current figure above, did not reflect the recent closure of an independent school, after which it was suspected that many parents chose to home educate rather than send their child to another independent or maintained school.

4.22 In respect of elective home education, the Commission sought to ascertain what proportion might be SEND children, and what support was available for such children if they were home educated?

- LBH officers reported that unless the child had an EHC plan there was little understanding of SEND children who were home educated. For those children that do have an EHC plan, the local authority had to be sure that the parent could deliver the requirements of that plan or make arrangements for this.

4.23 The Commission enquired what the priorities would be for the next 6 months for working with unregistered settings in the OJC?

- LBH officers reported that it would be a priority to get a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the OJC and the CHSCB to establish safeguarding processes in unregistered settings.

- Both LBH and CHSCB would continue to work with Interlink to help engage and involve the OJC in respect of yeshivas and other unregistered settings.
- Similarly, LBH would continue to engage and involve headteachers in local independent schools to support the development of the curriculum in these schools and ensure that there was appropriate SEND support.

4.24 What work had been undertaken engage children who had attended local yeshivas or other unregistered setting to ascertain their views about their education?

- Whilst the local authority did have data on the experiences of past students, it was acknowledged that it would be more helpful, particularly in relation to safeguarding, to have further data in the experiences of students currently studying at yeshivas or other unregistered settings. Access was however limited and generally through an intermediary.

4.25 The Chair thanked officers for attending and responding to questions from the Commission.

Agreed: In line with the recommendations from the review, the Commission agreed that a further update would be taken in the next municipal year.

5 City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Board

5.1 The annual report of CHSCB is presented each year to scrutiny. The independent Chair of CHSCB presented the annual report from 2017/18 to the Commission. A summary of the key points from this presentation are highlighted below.

- A key objective for CHSCB for 2017/18 was the health and wellbeing of the workforce as this was an important part of safeguarding children. Feedback from this aspect of the work has been very positive, where the local safeguarding workforce indicated that they were well led and managed.
- Hackney continued to lead in the way that local authorities provide support to vulnerable adolescents, this was exemplified through the contextual safeguarding project.
- In 2017/18, two serious case reviews were published. The first resulted in the parents being sentenced for child cruelty. The second resulted in new systems for checking the unexplained absence of children from school. The latter had also resulted in new guidelines from the DfE.
- The local training offer available had been reviewed and attendances monitored. CHSCB would continue to appraise the training offer to ensure that it met the needs of local safeguarding practitioners.
- CHSCB acknowledged the importance of the local designated safeguarding Doctor and Nurse as the work of both had been exemplary.
- An audit was being undertaken by CHSCB to ensure that the safeguarding data being collected through Children Families Service (CFS) was correct and was producing correct evaluative data. Further discussions were being held with CFS in Hackney in this respect.
- CHSCB also continued to look at the safeguarding partnership and how effectively partners communicated and worked together to address local safeguarding concerns.

- CHSCB also paid tribute to the local leadership particularly at a time of immense transition.

Questions

5.2 What work had been undertaken in relation to rough sleeping among the 15-24 year-old age group?

- It was reported that there had been no focus to date on safeguarding and rough sleepers. It was suggested however that this may be a line of work being pursued by the Safeguarding Adults Board or through another service within the council. Both the Child and Adult Safeguarding Boards had recently met to discuss transitional issues and this would be the type of issue that both boards would like to assess. It would be useful to identify early indicators and those measures that can be put in place to prevent young people ending up on the street.

5.3 In respect of domestic violence and abuse it was noted that whilst good work had been undertaken with local women, the Commission wanted to know what work had undertaken with young girls who may be in equally abusive relationships. What was behind the 43% increase in referrals to the service?

- CHSCB noted that lots of work had been undertaken on this issue through many projects, for example the Coercion and Control and Contextual Safeguarding Project. It was suggested that the increase in referrals may in part be due to the increased activity and awareness of practitioners.
- The Board also noted that there were also issues around gangs and serious youth violence and how this had impacted on relationships within such affiliations.
- It was also suggested that many practitioners were now very alert to issues presented in the local Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy which may also have contributed to increased referrals.
- LBH officers noted that the Domestic Abuse and Intervention Service moved in to the Children and Families Service two years ago and that there had been a significant programme of work with their expertise being shared among local social work practitioners on issues of domestic violence.

5.4 Could the CHSCB outline how the Contextual Safeguarding project had contributed to improved safeguarding of local children and adolescents?

- Officers from LBH responded that to date very few assessments had been undertaken using the contextual safeguarding process. Therefore to date most of the development of this project had been in the academic theory which would underpin this new approach and in developing associated policies and procedures to support this model in practice. These policies and practices were now being live tested. Contextual safeguarding was therefore at a very early stage.
- It was suggested that those assessments that have used a contextual approach may provide better outcomes for keeping children safe as a far wider range of risks were assessed within this process, beyond traditional assessments of the child in its family setting. It was suggested that it would be worth assessing in the next 6-12 months to determine the effectiveness of this approach. This would be an interesting area for scrutiny to include within its work programme.
- The CFS would also be willing to provide training and an update on this project to members of the Commission.

5.5 It was noted that new arrangements for local safeguarding children boards need to be implemented by September 2019. The Commission requested officers to outline what these new arrangements would look like in Hackney?

- This was the responsibility of the local authority, and LBH officers responded. Safeguarding was the responsibility of 3 statutory partners, the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), the Metropolitan Police and the local authority. Officers were working with colleagues in the City to develop new arrangements that maintained those safeguarding processes which worked well within the new system.
- Having an independent Chair and CHSCB was felt to be very beneficial within the current safeguarding process and it was expected that this would be retained within the new system. Therefore the new structure would be subject to independent review and it would retain a strategic group to maintain oversight. Political and lay membership would also be retained on respective boards. It was also noted that there was a new duty to list 'relevant agencies' that would need to comply with safeguarding partnership. This would bring many new organisations and settings into safeguarding systems.
- Local authorities were the most significant financial contributor to local safeguarding partnerships, in Hackney the local authority contribution made up 68% of the CHSCB budget of approximately £340k. The Police contributed £5k and the CCG contributed a further £12k, with additional financial support given by providers (e.g. ELFT and Homerton).

Agreed: Proposed new arrangements for local safeguarding partnerships to be included within the 2019/20 CYP Scrutiny Commission work programme.

5.6 The Commission raised the serious case review concerning a local child which had died from starvation after being left alone at home after his mother had died from an epileptic fit. The Commission sought to understand what was learnt from the case review to prevent this happening again.

- CHSCB reported that the case review was published in 2017/18 and had contributed to nationwide improvements in the way pupil absence was monitored within schools. Schools were now minded to obtain two numbers from parents to help verify child absence.

5.7 The Commission noted that two recent case reviews had been published in the past year both of which concerned the suicide of young people in Hackney. The Commission also sought to understand the learning from these case reviews and if there were any implications for local services?

- CHSCB noted that these were two of three serious case reviews in the past year. It was noted that a further serious case review would soon be published and that a further serious case review would be commissioned, and that both involve cases where a young person had taken their own life. In terms of the general themes, self-harm and suicide was a major issue in Hackney and in other boroughs, and indeed nationally. Similarly, it was known that locally and nationally there was high demand for CAMHS. There was also greater expectations on schools to help to identify and manage mental health issues in young people.
- None of the published serious case reviews had highlighted that these were predictive or preventable events. It was suggested that it might be of

more benefit to look at the findings of the serious case reviews when there was more time and the issues could be explored in greater detail.

5.8 What work had been undertaken in respect of school exclusions and safeguarding, particularly in the context of rising fixed and permanent exclusions?

- This was an area in which the CHSCB was taking a strong interest. It was noted that there was a vulnerable adolescent steering group which had considered school exclusions given the clear safeguarding concerns for children not in school or alternative settings.
- The CHSCB would like to develop earlier safeguarding interventions that identify those features and characteristics of children at risk of exclusion and would help to minimise the incidence of school exclusions later on in the child's life. CHSCB wanted to develop processes that identified risk factors at the beginning of a child's pathway to possible exclusion, rather than at the actual point of exclusion. CHSCB would report more on this issue in the next annual reporting year.
- HLT reported that the majority of exclusions were fixed term and in most cases children were excluded only once. Whilst schools were required to put support in place for the first day of exclusion, parents were ultimately responsible for children after exclusion.
- LBH officers noted that school governors were being encouraged to recognise the protective influence of school in keeping children safe when validating and confirming school exclusions.

5.9 Given the growing and evolving risks to children associated with social media, the Commission wanted to know what assurance CHSCB had that local services had appropriate systems and controls in place to keep children safe? Was there sufficient training and development opportunities on social media for staff?

- Social media continued to play a significant role in safeguarding and the CHSCB was alert to the risks posed to young people. CHSCB had developed a handbook for professionals and there was guidance that had been cascaded out to help professionals identify and mitigate the risks from social media.
- An APP had been developed by CHSCB for use across schools which would provide advice about the risks of certain social media sites and other APPs.
- A digital footprint survey was also planned to establish the online habits of children and young people. This would inform the work of schools as well as CHSCB's training offer.
- It was acknowledged that this was a fast moving medium which would require ongoing monitoring and assessment to identify new and evolving risks.

5.10 The Commission sought to understand how CHSCB would work together with the Children and Families Service (CFS) to respond to priority actions identified in the focused visit undertaken by Ofsted?

- CHSCB had reassessed the datasets for children on child protection plans and for children and need to assess whether these were giving an accurate picture of the interventions and support required. A key line of work would be to identify how the broader safeguarding partnership

could escalate concerns and provide challenge. CHSCB had a very positive and open relationship with CFS and had the the right to roam and had an 'open book' relationship with CFS.

- There were 4 key components to effective safeguarding; context, early help and prevention, health and well-being of staff and leadership. CHSCB was confident that there was strong leadership in place to provide effective challenge and to respond to priority actions identified.

5.11 The Commission enquired what safeguarding work CHSCB had undertaken in relation to childhood obesity?

- CHSCB responded that it worked very closely with the Health and Well Being Board, which had childhood obesity as a target area. It was noted Health partners were very active in this area.
- LBH officers noted that childhood obesity was a priority for the council and that a partnership board chaired by the Chief Executive was overseeing this work.

5.12 The Chair thanked the independent Chair and officer from CHSCB for their attendance and their responses to questions from the Commission.

6 Outcome of School Exclusions

6.1 Since the last meeting on 25h March 2019, a focus group has been held with children who have been excluded. This was conducted by Young Hackney for children in attendance at New Regents College.

6.2 The Commission will continue to collect evidence to support the review throughout May. Three more site visits of Alternative Providers were planned these included:

- Complete Works (Tower Hamlets);
- Footsteps (Haringey);
- BSix (Hackney).

6.3 The Commission would also look at the evidence from the 'deep dive' the HLT had undertaken and would use this to inform its conclusions and recommendation into school exclusions.

6.4 Once the above has been completed, the Commission will then review the evidence it has collected, assess if further work is needed, and to formulate conclusions and recommendations. These conclusions and recommendations will be tested out with senior officers and relevant cabinet member(s) to ensure that these were practical, achievable and affordable

6.5 The Chair will produce a draft report which will be circulated to the Commission for comment. This will then be finalised at a future meeting of the Commission.

7 Work Programme (Current and Future)

7.1 Given that this was the final meeting of the municipal year the Commission was invited to reflect on the current work programme (what worked, what didn't work) and what items it may want to include in the future work programme.

7.2 The 2018/19 work programme saw a wide breadth of issues covered. There were 4 types of items which were considered by the Commission:

- **Standing Items**; items which require annual oversight and surveillance such as the school places, childcare sufficiency, and children's social care.
- **Holding Executive to Account**; Cabinet Members were both invited to be questioned on their portfolio covered by the CYP Scrutiny Commission;
- **Review** – items were taken to support the current review (school exclusions) as well as to follow up the recommendations from previous reviews (free childcare, foster care, unregistered schools);
- **One-off items** – items of interest that required an update or lighter touch scrutiny (Support to LGBT young people, mental health in schools, SEND update).

7.3 It was important to remember the role of Overview & Scrutiny in developing the work programme for the Commission as these would shape the types of items that are selected for scrutiny. The key functions of scrutiny were highlighted to the Commissions:

- **Overview** – Holds decision makers (e.g. Cabinet Members and Senior Officers) to account;
- **Policy development and review** – help to improve or develop new services and policies;
- **Performance management** – e.g. reviews performance, budget monitoring, value for money, quality;
- **Scrutinise external agencies** e.g. Police, Health Services, Fire Service, Housing Associations;
- **Public engagement and involvement** - represents views of the public and helps maintain public confidence in decision making.

7.4 The Commission also discussed how valued is added to those items which are scrutinised by the Council.

- Provides assurance to decision making;
- Provides open challenge in public which promote democratic accountability;
- Bring stakeholders together to look at difficult or complex issues – bringing statutory agencies, voluntary sector and community to develop collaborative approach and solutions;
- Public engagement and involvement - seek to involve service users, residents and the local community and meetings are held in public;
- Enhances democratic accountability and involvement - open, public and transparent assessment gives confidence to community

7.5 The Commission also discussed those skills and approaches to scrutiny that contribute to effective scrutiny practice. These included:

Approaches	Skills
Cross party approach – non-party political, consensus approach	Prioritising – picking the right topics/issues

Evidence based – research	Questioning – obtaining the right information
Practical and constructive	Consensus building - working across party
Inclusive – working with partners and the local community	Partnership working - building relationships
Relevant and timely	Influencing – “selling” scrutiny
Flexible format – opportunity to innovate	
New information	

7.6 Given that there were 8 meeting per year of the CYP Scrutiny Commission there was limited capacity and it could not scrutinise all the issues that might be suggested through the consultation. In this context, it would be important to prioritise items for inclusion within the work programme against a number of assessment criteria:

- Is this issue aligned to corporate priorities of the Council and/ or its partners?
- Does this issue resonate with the Commission, other non-executive Councillors and the wider local community?
- How does scrutiny add value to this item?
- Is this issue being looked at elsewhere - will scrutiny compliment/ duplicate this work?
- Is it timely - is this right to do now (could new legislation be coming into force)?

7.7 Key stages of the consultation process to develop the new work programme were highlighted to the Commission. These included:

- Writing to key stakeholders for suggestions;
- Holding a stakeholder meeting to discuss suggestions;
- Meeting with Cabinet Members and senior officers to discuss the work programme;
- Commission discusses and agrees work programme;
- Work programme is confirmed by Scrutiny Panel.

7.8 The Commission discussed the work programme for 2018/19 and the types of items that it would like to receive at future meetings. The following summarises the key points from this discussion:

- There was a preference for discursive items, where different stakeholders to brought together to discuss issues under consideration – the LGBT item worked well in 2018/19;
- Members were keen to hear the voice of local communities and local people who may be directly affected by the policy area under consideration (people’s first hand experiences);
- Site visits should be full day, encompassing a range of stakeholder views and site visits;
- Site visits were important to help bring context and front line issues to the attention of the Commission;
- It would be useful to survey the availability of members.

7.9 Members also made a number of suggestions for possible items to include within the work programme for 2019/20:

- Mental health of young people - particularly at exam time and the support available for them;

Children's social care.

8 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

8.1 Two actions were confirmed.

8.2 These were agreed.

9 Any Other Business

9.1 There was no other business.

9.2 The date of the next meeting was the Monday 24th June 2019.

The meeting closed at 9.35pm.

Duration of the meeting: Times Not Specified

This page is intentionally left blank



<p>Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission</p> <p>24th June 2019</p> <p>Item 10 – Support for LGBT+ children in school</p>	<p>Item No</p> <p>10</p>
--	---------------------------------

Outline

At its meeting in February 2019, the Commission reviewed support for LGBT+ children in school in Hackney. The Commission heard evidence from a number of local stakeholders and agreed to write to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to summarise the evidence it had received together with a number of key recommendations.

Action

Members are requested to note the attached letter.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cllr Anntoinette Bramble
Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member
for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care
London Borough of Hackney

Room 118, 2nd Floor
Hackney Town Hall
Mare Street
London, E8 1EA

11th April 2019

martin.bradford@hackney.gov.uk

0208 356 3315

Dear Anntoinette,

Support for LGBT+ pupils in school in Hackney.

At its meeting of the 25th February 2019, the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission assessed the nature and level of support available for LGBT+ pupils in Hackney. The purpose of this item was four-fold:

- To identify the councils statutory and equality duties in respect of LGBT+ schoolchildren;
- To assess the needs of LGBT+ schoolchildren and how well these were being addressed locally;
- To highlight areas of good local practice and suggest ways in which this can be disseminated more widely;
- To determine key priorities and recommendations to inform a strategic approach to support LGBT+ children and young people in the school settings.

To support these objectives, the Commission took evidence from both internal (Hackney Learning Trust, Young Hackney and Integrated Commissioning) and external (Educate & Celebrate and Project Indigo) stakeholders, as well as a number of LGBT+ young people themselves. The Commission felt that the evidence presented and the ensuing discussion was both informative and positive (a full record of the meeting can be viewed [on-line](#)).

The Commission agreed that it would write to you to highlight key findings from the evidence it had received and to suggest a number of priorities which could support the work with LGBT+ young people in Hackney going forward.

The evidence highlighted that there were a number of examples of good practice locally for which there was positive work to support LGBT+ young people in Hackney, these included:

- A comprehensive and inclusive programme of relationship and sex education for young people aged 5-19 available to all schools free of charge (as commissioned by Public Health and delivered by Young Hackney);
- A range of forums supported by Hackney Learning Trust which helped to identify and extend good practice of supporting LGBT+ children in school;

- The attainment of a national equalities award by New Regent's College after the successful introduction of comprehensive programme of training and development to tackle homophobia and promote inclusivity.
- Project Indigo, a youth group and counselling service for young LGBT+ people or for people who are questioning their sexual or gender identity.

Whilst it was clear that there was good local practice to support young LGBT+ young people, this was often dependent on the positive and proactive approaches of individual LGBT+ teachers or students themselves. The Commission noted that more robust LGBT+ policies and procedures (which were backed up by strong school leadership) were needed for more effective and widespread support for LGBT+ young people in schools in Hackney. In this context, Hackney Learning Trust could play a pivotal role in improving support for LGBT+ young people by developing a local repository for LGBT+ school policies and protocols which could help to extend good practice across Hackney.

The Department of Education has recently published [new guidance](#) for sex and relationship education which has reminded schools of their duties under the Equalities Act 2010 and to ensure that sex and relationship education is relevant to all its pupils, including those from protected characteristics. In light of recent events elsewhere across the country however, it is apparent that schools may require additional support and encouragement to enable them to deliver positive and inclusive sex and relationship education which meets the needs of all their pupils, irrespective of their identified gender or sexuality.

Through analysis of the evidence received by the Commission, a number of priorities for supporting LGBT+ young people in Hackney have emerged and are made within the recommendations made below.

1. There is a need to further develop the voice of LGBT+ young people so that their needs are better articulated and reflected in commissioning priorities and service planning across Hackney;
2. Ensure that there is appropriate training for teachers so that LGBT+ issues can be taught confidently and positively, equips teachers to respond to the needs of LGBT+ young people and supports them to deliver a cross-curricula approach to teaching LGBT+ issues (alongside other equality strands) in their school;
3. Continue to work with Headteachers, school governors and other school leaders to ensure that there is effective leadership and robust policies in place that enable schools to meet statutory equality duties, support LGBTQ+ inclusivity and have appropriate safeguards to monitor and tackle homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying or discrimination;
4. For schools to provide a safe and positive space for teachers to meet with children and young people who may be questioning their gender identity or raise concerns about homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying;
5. The need for integrated advice, guidance and support for LGBT+ children and young people across Hackney.

The Commission would welcome your response to the conclusions and recommendations as well as your thoughts on how this work should be taken forward locally, in particular those services which should lead and coordinate this work.

It is hoped that an update on this work can be scheduled within the work programme of the Commission for 2019/20.

Yours faithfully

Cllr Sophie Conway
Chair, Children and Young People
Scrutiny Commission

Cllr Margaret Gordon
Vice Chair, Children and Young People
Scrutiny Commission

Cc Mayor Philip Glanville
Annie Gammon, Director of Education
Anne, Canning, Group Director Children & Families
Matt Clack, Head of Public Health
Amy Wilkinson, Integrated Workstream Director, Children & Young People & Maternity

This page is intentionally left blank