

Scrutiny Commission Report

Report title: Unregistered Education Settings (Inquiry Recommendations Update)

Meeting date: 19th January 2022

Report originators: Rory McCallum, Senior Professional Advisor, CHSCP

Chris Roberts, Head of Wellbeing & Education Safeguarding, LBH

1. Purpose of the report

1.1. In January 2018 the Scrutiny Commission published its report following an inquiry into Unregistered Education Settings (UES) in Hackney. The purpose of this report is to update commission members on the progress made in response to the report's ten recommendations.

2. Recommendations

2.1. That the commission notes the progress made since the publication of its report and recognises that where progress has been limited, this is primarily due to factors outside of the control of the London Borough of Hackney (LBH) and the City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership (CHSCP).

2.2. That the commission supports safeguarding partners of the CHSCP, including LBH, in making use of the various legal powers available to them in response to UES.

2.3. The commission endorses the conclusion of LBH's internal audit that *'the Council and the CHSCP have demonstrated that considerable effort has been made under current legislative and regulatory constraints to implement the recommendations made in the investigation on UES by the CYP Scrutiny Commission'*.

3. Background

3.1. Over the course of 2017 Hackney's Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission conducted an inquiry into the issue of UES in Hackney. Its report, which was published in January 2018, made ten recommendations.

3.2. UES provide a 'full-time' education to children of compulsory school age but teaches a curriculum that is too narrow for the setting to constitute a 'school'. The consequence is that they cannot be registered (or regulated) in the same way that schools are. This was and remains a significant issue of concern for the safeguarding partners of the CHSCP.

3.3. The situation remains largely unchanged from when the commission examined this issue and published its investigation report. This is despite on-going and significant efforts to engage with community leaders and lobby the government for change.

3.4. That said, some changes have been introduced to support and improve the multi-agency response to concerns raised about UES. This has been driven via four relevant and related work strands, which are:

3.4.1. The continued engagement and efforts of the Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner on behalf of the CHSCP;

3.4.2. The work and oversight of the UES Working Group, which is chaired by the Director of Hackney Education;

3.4.3. The work of the Out of Schools Settings (OOSS) Project to better engage settings in the child safeguarding agenda; and

3.4.4. The implementation of the UES protocol, which provides a multi-agency framework for coordinating the response to settings by bringing together a range of services and partners.

4. Commission recommendations with progress update

- 4.1. The commission's recommendations along with a progress update as of September 2021 can be found in Appendix A to this report. Please see this appendix for full details.
- 4.2. The commission will want to be aware of some of the specific work that has been undertaken in respect of UES over the past 12 months.
 - 4.2.1. The UES protocol is now embedded into operational practice and in 2021 eight protocol meetings were convened to consider our response to nine settings. Protocol meetings are multi-agency and as well as representatives from relevant Hackney Council services they are attended by the police, fire brigade, health and Ofsted. This has led to Ofsted inspections of settings and other measures to safeguard children.
 - 4.2.2. Collaboration between Hackney Education and the Planning Department has led to the identification of new UES and the co-ordinated appropriate use of planning powers in response to these where planning permission is also lacking.
 - 4.2.3. There are currently 609 children and young people known to Hackney Education who are believed to attend UES. This however is a fraction of the true number, which is estimated to be in excess of 1,500. Since July, following the appointment of an officer to focus on this cohort. Since starting, the officer has undertaken visits to families to check a) on the education arrangements and b) the welfare of the child.
 - 4.2.4. Efforts have been ongoing to engage with Orthodox Jewish representative bodies regarding safeguarding practice in UES and ensure we have assurance as to those arrangements. However, these have not been successful at bringing about satisfactory engagement with UES themselves to provide the necessary assurance we seek regarding safeguarding. We are looking at offering sessions as part of the wider Out Of School Settings work to see if there is a take-up of our safeguarding offer.
 - 4.2.5. The CHSCP has continued to lobby the Department for Education for changes in legislation in the area. Proposals were consulted on in 2020 and Hackney submitted a response to this. The outcome of that consultation has still not yet been published however the responsible minister, Baroness Barran, in a letter dated 3rd December to the Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner for City & Hackney confirmed that the government remains committed to changing the law to require currently unregistered settings to register in the same way as independent schools.
 - 4.2.6. The Council is exploring how it can best utilise the legal powers currently available to us in respect of the UES and the children who attend them.
- 4.3. Between August and November 2021 LBH's internal audit reviewed the progress of the commission's ten recommendations. Audit found the following:
 - 4.3.1. Implemented - Two
 - 4.3.1.1. Recommendations 5 and 7
 - 4.3.2. In progress (within the Council's control) - Two
 - 4.3.2.1. Recommendations 4 & 10
 - 4.3.3. Partially implemented (constrained by factors outside of the Council's control) - Six
 - 4.3.3.1. Recommendations 1,2, 3, 6, 8 & 9
 - 4.3.4. Not implemented - None
- 4.4. Internal audit made one recommendation, which was that
 - 4.4.1. *'Further consideration is given to making use of the legal powers confirmed by the legal advice provided to the CHSCP on the legal position relating to UES in the*

context of the Children Act 2004 and the new safeguarding arrangements led by statutory safeguarding partners.'

4.5. The management response to this recommendation was:

4.5.1. 'The Children and Education Department recognises its legal powers to take action regarding UES. We established a system to respond to concerns about UES and this includes seeking legal (counsel) advice and taking legal action. This is an ongoing activity.'

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. Local children who attend UES in Hackney continue to be outside the line of sight of safeguarding professionals. There is no direct mechanism to ensure that the premises within which they congregate are safe; that the infrastructure is sound; environment appropriate; or that contemporary safer recruitment practises are being applied to those working frequently and routinely with children.
- 5.2. Disappointingly, despite repeated attempts to engage community leaders and seek their cooperation, the status quo continues. A comprehensive package of safeguarding support has been developed and shared with community leaders. Even with this package excluding any focus on what is being taught in UES, these leaders have been unable or unwilling to commit to or influence cooperation with any programme of work. Based on the conditions seen at some UES (via the UES protocol meetings), this remains a significant concern.
- 5.3. Equally disappointing is the ongoing legislative vacuum that facilitates the ongoing operation of UES as they are. Whilst recent contact from government (to the CHSCP's Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner) states its intent to introduce legislation, timescales in this regard remain ambiguous.
- 5.4. This overall situation regarding the above means that the position concerning UES remains largely unchanged from when the commission examined this issue in 2017.

Report originators: Chris Roberts & Rory McCallum

Other contributors:

Name	Designation	Section

Date:

Cleared by:



Appendix A - Commission recommendations and progress update

	Commission Recommendation	Progress Update
1	<p>To formalise and build on the work that has already been undertaken locally, it is recommended that the Council develop and publish a strategy that clearly sets out its approach to UES in the borough. Such a strategy will help to develop a comprehensive, consistent and transparent approach to UES, particularly within the Orthodox Jewish Community in Hackney.</p> <p>a) Local ambitions and priorities for UES and those children that attend, and which clearly describe the expected benefits of registration and compliance with the regulatory framework in respect of health and safety, safeguarding, educational outcomes and community cohesion;</p> <p>b) The legal duties of the Council (and partners) in ensuring that children attending UES in Hackney are taught in safe and hygienic conditions, that there are rigorous safeguarding protocols in place, that their well-being is promoted and that the curriculum taught conforms to agreed standards;</p> <p>c) The roles and responsibilities of the Council and its statutory partners in the regulatory and enforcement framework for UES; specifically to state how they work together to identify, support and promote compliance with regulatory standards for health and safety, safeguarding and quality of education taught;</p> <p>d) How the Council will engage the Orthodox Jewish community and its representatives to promote compliance and adherence to the regulatory framework;</p> <p>e) The legal responsibility of parents to provide an appropriate and full-time education for their child regardless of setting.</p>	<p>The impact of the strategy has been limited. The overall vision of the strategy remains frustrated on a number of levels.</p> <p>Although the Council has endeavoured to constructively manage this problem, no real progress has been made. There are considered to be two primary reasons for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first reason is highlighted by the absence of a central faith and community based body with responsibility for and authority over yeshivas. Each setting is understood to be autonomous and the local proposals to strengthen safeguarding oversight have simply gained no traction. Whilst there remains an aspiration by partners to work together to ensure that all children in Hackney receive appropriate educational opportunities in safe and suitable environments, there is all but no progress in the context of collaboration and co-production in this regard. • The second reason is because there is no existing regulatory/statutory framework within which these settings neatly fit. As a consequence, the Council has been both required and encouraged to be lawfully audacious in its approach to assuring the safety of the children who attend these settings, which the Council has done with limited success. <p>The Council has engaged (and continues to engage) the police, fire service and other partners focusing on health and safety to intervene with those running the establishments in an effort to safeguard the young people frequenting them.</p> <p>The position the Council finds itself in was previously summarised by Amanda Spielman, Ofsted's Chief Inspector</p> <p><i>"We can issue a warning notice, but ... no one has the power to close them, neither us, local authorities or the Department for Education."</i></p>

		<p><i>There is no general power to close something that is not registered as a school. We need a better definition of a school – it is too easy to fiddle at the margins and claim that something isn't a school. When people are operating illegally, there should be somebody with powers to make it close. There should be serious consideration of disqualifying people who've run an illegal school. The legal framework needs to evolve."</i></p> <p>The Council endorses Amanda Spielman's comments regarding the need for a clearer definition of a school and the importance of a legal framework within which we can act to inspect and regulate establishments to ensure the welfare of children and young people.</p>
2	<p>Whilst the Commission acknowledges the challenges in developing meaningful engagement and involvement with the Charedi Orthodox Jewish community, this remains the only way to secure consensual and lasting change and to bring UES into regulatory compliance in Hackney. The Commission therefore recommend that engagement efforts are renewed, and that a contact group be established between Community leaders, including the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, Interlink, Head Teachers of Registered Independent Schools and Chief Rabbis of all Charedi sects operating yeshivas in Hackney, and the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board (or its equivalent successor organisation) to support the development of a safeguarding reassurance process. The establishment of such a contact group would help to build trust and confidence, and demonstrate a commitment to improve understanding of those issues pertaining to UES and to develop shared solutions to improved safeguarding arrangements for children that attend such settings.</p> <p>It is recommended that the contact group:</p> <p>a) Is led by the Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Board and therefore free from involvement of any other statutory body including e.g. Hackney Council, the Metropolitan Police or Ofsted;</p> <p>b) Should develop a clear remit and terms of reference which should:</p>	<p>Whilst the Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner of the CHSCP and Hackney Council have attempted to find a resolution to this problem (and despite continuing efforts to engage community leaders), no real progress has been made.</p> <p>Since 2014, the Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner (ICSC) and the Council have been proactively advocating that the central government needs to enact legislation that provides the same level of safeguards for all children who attend full-time education settings, whatever subject is being taught. The DfE consulted on possible changes to legislation in 2020 but to date, the outcome of the consultation has not been published and no such legislation has been implemented.</p> <p>Local children who attend UES in Hackney continue to be outside the line of sight of safeguarding professionals. There is no direct mechanism to ensure that the premises within which they congregate are safe; that the infrastructure is sound; environment appropriate; or that contemporary safer recruitment practises are being applied to those working frequently and routinely with children.</p> <p>Disappointingly, despite repeated attempts to engage community leaders and seek their cooperation to develop a safeguarding reassurance framework, they have been unable, unwilling or lacked the overarching authority to commit to the changes required.</p>

<p>(i) Set out those measures that will build confidence between and among various representative including how UES will be engaged and involved;</p> <p>(ii) Agree the nature of safeguarding standards to be established in UES (for example DBS checks on staff, staff awareness and training in safeguarding, anti-bullying, complaints procedures, whistleblowing, health and safety);</p> <p>(iii) Identify those systems and processes that will provide assurance that identified safeguarding standards are being met within UES (e.g. health checks, piloting and peer assessment and assurance) and acknowledge that this will be an incremental process;</p> <p>(iv) Agree key milestones and outcomes (both process and safeguarding practice) and the timeframe for their implementation within UES in Hackney.</p> <p>c) Report back progress of its work twice yearly to the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission and annually within the City and Hackney Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report.</p>	<p>Significant communication has been sent by the Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner to a variety of stakeholders encouraging UES to engage in a range of opportunities set out within an agreed 'offer' (to be led by the CHSCP and Hackney Education).. More recently the CHSCP has been contacted by PR Pro, a PR company engaged by a Rabbi in the UOHC. Our understanding is that this company has been commissioned to help broker progress against the CHSCP's offer.</p> <p>IICSA - The ICSC of the CHSCP gave evidence on behalf of the Council to the Independent inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA). This was as part of the Inquiry's focus on religious institutions and settings. This set out the already known problems, the attempts at resolution and the action required by the government.</p> <p>IICSA published its report in September 2021. Of two recommendations, one specifically related to UES, which was:</p> <p><i>Legislation on the definition of full-time education and unregistered educational institutions providing full-time education The government should introduce legislation to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>change the definition of full-time education, and to bring any setting that is the pupil's primary place of education within the scope of the definition of a registered educational setting; and</i> • <i>provide the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) with sufficient powers to examine the quality of child protection when it undertakes inspections of suspected unregistered institutions.</i> <p>UES Protocol - In 2020, the CHSCP developed a protocol to help manage the response to the identification of UES and any concerns arising in respect of them. It is disappointing that this has been necessary, but in the absence of any appetite from either community leaders or Yeshivas themselves to cooperate, this is the best we have been able to do as a partnership.</p> <p>UES protocol meetings are chaired by the Head of Wellbeing & Education Safeguarding, Hackney Education. When convened, there is good engagement from all relevant agencies, including Ofsted. The</p>
--	---

		<p>Disclosure & Barring Service has recently been made a standing member of the group</p> <p>The protocol itself is relatively straightforward. There is an expectation that when UES are identified, they are notified to Hackney Education and when there are reported concerns, that defined procedures oversee the response to these. The protocol has not been constructed on the basis of educational registration requirements, but on core safeguarding requirements. It is already distinct in that its entire focus is upon those settings that are neither registered nor regulated.</p> <p>Legal Advice - The CHSCP has also sought counsel advice on the legal position relating to UES in the context of the Children Act 2004 and the new safeguarding arrangements led by statutory safeguarding partners.</p>
--	--	---

3	<p>It is recommended that the Mayor and Chief Officers within the Council continue to robustly press the Government, Department for Education and relevant parliamentary bodies (e.g. Education Select Committee) for a more effective legislative framework for UES. Government should review its legislative timetable and produce a 'statement of intent' about how it plans to close the evident legal loopholes that allow UES to operate with impunity. Specific improvements required of such new legislation would be to:</p> <p>a) Extend the definition of a school, or a part-time school, to include where this setting is the child's main educational experience;</p> <p>b) Expand the powers of entry, inspection and enforcement of UES to give local authorities greater powers to regulate and improve such settings, particularly in relation to health and safety and the safeguarding of children;</p> <p>c) Improve regulation around home schooling, specifically making it a legal requirement for parents to notify the local authority if their child is being electively home educated, and additional powers for the local authority to ensure the quality of education where children are home schooled;</p> <p>d) Improved statutory guidance for how local statutory agencies work in partnership to improve safeguarding of local children (sharing of inspection data, shared intelligence);</p> <p>e) Improve statutory guidance and powers to help local authorities track those children missing from education – with a duty of cooperation among partners (see recommendation 6);</p> <p>f) Provide further clarification about the introduction of a system of regulation for out-of-school settings (including for example, the maintenance of a central register and being subject to inspection and sanctions for those not meeting required standards).</p>	<p>The record on this issue already details the significant lobbying undertaken with ministers. Disappointingly, there appears to have been little appetite to progress solutions at pace and the overall response from the government has lacked any sense of urgency.</p> <p>The Department for Education launched a consultation concerning the regulation of UES and other independent settings on 14 February 2020. This consultation was withdrawn on 7 May 2020 due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak and was relaunched on 13 October 2020. It closed on 27 November 2020.</p> <p>More recently, the CHSCP's Independent Child Safeguarding Commissioner has escalated this matter to the former Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Schools System (Baroness Berridge of the Vale of Catmose). This yielded no clarity. Subsequent letters to the new Secretary of State for Education, The Rt Hon Nadhim Zahawi MP, were the same. The new Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Schools System, Baroness Barran, replied on 3 December. Her letter stated:</p> <p><i>I am happy to confirm that the government remains committed to changing the law on the registration of independent education settings, which would bring into scope a range of currently unregistered institutions. You will know that we repeated that commitment in the department's evidence to the Independent Inquiry on Child Sexual Abuse, and we welcomed the recommendation when the report was recently published. I expect that we will be publishing the response to the Regulating Independent Educational Institutions consultation shortly.</i></p> <p>Our collective position remains unchanged. Government needs to strengthen both the registration requirements and regulation of UES. Without such change, children and young people will continue to be exposed to a two-tier safeguarding system that is simply unacceptable.</p>
4	<p>It is recommended that the Council should take the lead in developing an alliance with those authorities which experience similar issues with UES.</p>	<p>The Council has previously had contact with a number of authorities who are concerned about existing legislation – although it's important to</p>

<p>Such an alliance will facilitate the sharing of good practice and help to develop a common approach to resolving those concerns with UES. In addition, such an alliance will aid the collection of evidence and strengthen the position of those authorities to lobby for legislative change with the Secretary of State for Education and other governmental departments. To support this recommendation the Council should consider hosting a UES conference for local authorities as this will help to maintain the public profile of this issue, assist in identifying the legislative reforms required and help to identify common ways forward for local authorities.</p>	<p>note that Hackney's concerns are distinct and very different to those of other councils, so learning has been limited.</p> <p>The Out of Schools Settings (OOSS) project has, however, assumed this role at a local level. The project brings together 16 Local Authorities, nine of which are East London boroughs. The OOSS Project, which is funded by the DfE, is designed to map and support settings in relation to safeguarding children. It sits alongside existing work undertaken by LBH officers including the Prevent Education Officer and Children Missing Education Team.</p> <p>The strategic direction of the OOSS project has been to build a comprehensive typology of settings and test interventions to discover what works and identify the challenges or barriers to engagement. In practical terms the interventions have included meetings with trustees, staff and volunteers, policy support and the offer of signposting to safeguarding training.</p> <p>The OOSS project team has undertaken extensive mapping of the sector and identified over 300 settings including yeshivas, tuition centres, sports clubs, housing associations, community centres, charities, church halls and other religious settings.</p> <p>The OOSS project team has also developed a RAG rating system. This has been adopted by other pilot projects and promoted, via the DfE, as a model of good practice.</p> <p>Engagement thus far has concentrated in community spaces, particularly those hiring halls to other/smaller organisations or clubs and ensuring hire agreements explicitly describe expectations to safeguard.</p> <p>To support this, an example policy has been written and organisations are signposted to relevant sources of support including the NSPCC's webpages for the sector, the voluntary code for OOSS and CHSCP training.</p> <p>A significant challenge to understanding and embedding effective safeguarding practice is staff and volunteers accessing appropriate safeguarding training. To remedy this the OOSS project team has</p>
--	--

		<p>developed a training offer that will be delivered free of charge either in settings (if there are sufficient staff) or via The Tomlinson Centre. This sits alongside the core training offered by the CHSCP. Three sessions have been held, to introduce the OOSS project to settings that have been delivered, supported by HCVS.</p> <p>Promotional materials have been produced for parents/carers and for proprietors; information is presented on the Local Offer and an OOSS App is in development. This is in addition to an OOSS online portal that contains instructive videos from the HE Safeguarding in Education Team and Re-Engagement Unit, highlighting OOSS responsibilities with links to local and national guidance. Partnership working with other pilot areas including Redbridge, Manchester and Birmingham is online to develop the portal.</p> <p>In conjunction with the CHSCP, all mapped OOSS were sent a tailored Safeguarding Self Assessment audit tool, after being named as 'relevant agencies'. In total the following responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 30 OOSS ● 6 Community Halls ● 11 orgs under Southern / Hackney Housing ● 22 religious settings ● 16 OOSS which are also captured under the commissioned provider
5	<p>The Commission noted evidence of positive collaboration among regulatory partners, though it is apparent that such partnerships between the Council (Planning, Learning Trust, Children & Families and Food Safety) and statutory partners (Health & Safety Executive, Fire Service, Ofsted) could be improved and formalised to help strengthen and improve the regulatory framework for UES. To support this process, it is recommended that a Memorandum of Understanding or similarly agreed protocol is developed across these agencies to:</p> <p>a) Identify a common approach and priorities for UES – e.g. child safeguarding;</p>	<p>Positive collaboration remains across a range of local agencies and services involved with UES. The Council also continues to engage with Ofsted and DfE, particularly through the operation of the CHSCP's UES Protocol. When called, meetings are well attended by partners and actions taken away; including partners such as LFB and Ofsted.</p> <p>Oversight on progress against strategy and operational actions with individual settings is overseen by the UES Working Group, which is chaired by the Group Director.</p>

	<p>b) Share data and intelligence about UES across statutory partners (e.g. location, number of children in attendance, health and safety concerns etc.);</p> <p>c) Undertake joint holistic inspection and assessments of UES;</p> <p>d) Develop a coordinated response and interventions where such settings are uncovered, and do not meet regulatory standards.</p>	
6	<p>Understanding that a significant number of Charedi Orthodox Jewish children are able to remain outside the registered school sector and therefore unknown to the Council and other regulatory partners, the Commission recommends that the Council must improve those systems for identifying and tracking children missing from education. Improved tracking and identification processes are central to developing an informed and proportionate response to UES, and will help to establish a clearer picture of the nature and scale of UES and the children that attend them, and to guide and support regulatory and enforcement action. To this end it is recommended that the Council:</p> <p>a) Lobby for legislative change that legally requires parents to notify their LA if their child is electively home educated (as in 3 above);</p> <p>b) In line with statutory requirements, ensure that all local Independent Schools notify the LA of those children that enter or leave the school register at standard transition points;</p> <p>c) In line with statutory requirements ensure that all local Independent Schools notify the local authority when a child leaves or is placed on the central school register outside transition points;</p> <p>d) In line with statutory guidance, raise awareness of the Council's children missing education procedures and notification processes with local agencies including schools, GPs, other health professionals (Health Visitors), clinical commissioning groups, police and other emergency services, housing agencies and voluntary sector groups;</p> <p>e) Given the possible numbers of children involved (1,000-1,500), ensure that the Children Missing Education Service is adequately resourced and</p>	<p>The EHE consultation ended in June 2019. A formal response by the government is still awaited after all this time, though revised guidance was issued by the DfE in April 2019.</p> <p>Despite the proposed duties undoubtedly strengthening oversight on the children attending such settings, the consultation failed to adequately address the issue of oversight of the settings themselves by way of regulation.</p> <p>The local authority has recruited an additional officer to manage the recent requirement for schools to inform the local authority of non-standard phase admissions. This duty applies to state funded and independent schools. The return rate is subject to ongoing monitoring. Schools with no or inconsistent returns are reminded of their responsibilities. Where a school 'off rolls' a pupil, they are required to specify or undertake joint investigations to determine the name of the receiving setting. If this cannot be determined the issue is referred to the CME team. Reminders of the process are sent to schools annually.</p> <p>Hackney Education's processes regarding elective home education were updated and revised in July 2020 and the resources undertaking EHE assessments were increased from 0.5 FTE to 1 FTE. These processes were subject to a recent internal audit and no recommendations were made. In addition Hackney Education has employed a Pupils Out of School Officer, part of whose job is to engage with Orthodox Jewish families who are believed to be attending a yeshiva. This is to check on children's wellbeing and their education arrangements. Families who attend yeshivas state that they are</p>

	<p>supported to undertake systematic identification, tracking and enforcement procedures;</p> <p>f) With improved detection of those children missing education, introduce a more robust policy of administering enforcement notices and School Attendance Orders.</p>	<p>educating otherwise than at school and therefore come under the scope of the EHE/CME procedures.</p>
7	<p>Although there are limited statutory duties and responsibilities for the Council in respect of registered schools within the independent school sector, given</p> <p>a) the interrelationship between this sector and the children that attend them and UES and</p> <p>b) the number of local independent schools which are not reaching the required standards or where explicit safeguarding concerns have been raised; it is recommended that engagement and liaison with the local independent school sector by the Council should be strengthened. Improved relationships will help build links, trust, and confidence and help to establish those systems and processes which ensure local children are taught in safe conditions, that their welfare is safeguarded and they obtain the best possible educational outcomes.</p>	<p>The activities and approaches cited in the previous update continue to be pertinent. A standing invitation remains to Special Educational Needs and Disability Coordinators (SENDCOs) from independent sector schools to attend events such as the termly SENDCO forum and annual conference that SENDCOs from the maintained sector attend.</p> <p>Following engagement with Interlink, Hackney Education has, in conjunction with independent schools, established a forum for heads of independent schools. The forum will be jointly coordinated by a senior leadership and management advisor from HE and an independent school headteacher.</p> <p>Hackney Education has also met with Interlink and school leaders to discuss SEND provisions and will be attending their next meeting of the independent schools SENCO Forum.</p>
8	<p>Parents are ultimately responsible for the safety and welfare of their child and legally obliged to ensure that they are in receipt of appropriate full-time education. It is recommended therefore that the Council should engage and involve parents within the Charedi Orthodox Jewish community, to inform them of relevant statutory health and safety regulations (e.g. fire safety) and safeguarding standards (e.g. DBS checks) required for their child's schooling, with the intention of supporting parental enquiry and challenge to local UES. It is recommended that the Council should start to engage directly with parents in the Charedi community, rather than relying on intermediary bodies</p>	<p>As part of the OOSS project, guidance for parents and carers for children attending OOSS (including UES) has been revised and is available on the Local Offer.</p> <p>Whilst the identities of some children are known, there remains an absence of intelligence on a significant majority of children attending UES and hence the parents / carers who could be 'enabled' to challenge UES.</p> <p>The changes in legislation concerning Home Educated Children might provide an avenue to identify these families at some point in the future as might the application of the legal powers open to safeguarding partners through the seeking of an injunction. The latter is yet to be tested. Hackney's new EHE procedures are clear on the threshold for</p>

		<p>determining suitability and this includes an element of a secular education (as required by the DfE).</p> <p>The DfE has published guidance for parents/carers with the intention of developing their understanding of the types of questions they should ask proprietors of, and people offer OOSS. This will be available via the OOSS App.</p>
9	<p>Whilst it was broadly recognised that child safeguarding must take a priority for the Council and other regulatory bodies, there was widespread recognition that specific issues with the curriculum at yeshivas remained which could not be ignored and not addressed given the marked differences in educational attainment and the work and training outcomes that result for the Orthodox Jewish Community (particularly among males). It is the belief of the Commission that there will be a significant benefit for the Charedi Orthodox Jewish community if English and STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and maths) were taught in parallel with religious studies, and in advance of likely changes to legislation. Specifications and standards for any school curriculum, irrespective of setting, are however determined and regulated by the Department of Education and this is an area over which the Council has no powers. In addition, the Department of Education and Ofsted are responsible for inspection, compliance and enforcement of the curriculum quality and standards within all educational settings. In this context, the Commission recommend that the DfE and Ofsted work with the Charedi Orthodox Jewish Community to identify those processes which can lead to a pathway to compliance for UES, in which the curriculum taught is balanced, of sufficient quality and provides outcomes for children which enable them to achieve better outcomes for themselves and their families. The Commission recognises that the Council has no direct role here, but recommends that the Council should facilitate this work and help to move this issue forward wherever possible.</p>	<p>Engagement with registered Orthodox Jewish schools continues from Hackney Education.</p> <p>Hackney Education also continues to work with partners on the issue of UES. Whilst dialogue continues and a clear offer of support / advice for UES has been made by Hackney Education, activity at present is primarily focused on responding to UES under the CHSCP's protocol.</p>
10	<p>The Commission noted that the Stamford Hill Area Action Plan (AAP) is still in the process of development and finalisation, and as such</p>	<p>The Stamford Hill Area Action Plan (AAP) is being developed. The need for further school places and community facilities is recognised in the</p>

<p>represents an opportunity to address those education and training issues identified for the Orthodox Jewish Community within this review. It is recommended therefore that the Council ensures that the Stamford Hill AAP makes sufficient provision in respect of:</p> <p>Capacity of educational settings to deal with future demand from the Orthodox Jewish community;</p> <p>Availability of potential sites for registered education settings;</p> <p>Youth employment, training and apprenticeship opportunities for young people in the areas, particularly from the Orthodox Jewish community</p>	<p>plan. Even though, it is not possible to distinguish between registered and unregistered provision within planning policy, the AAP does include an Informative on Safeguarding and Health & Safety in Schools which sets out the need for new schools to register with the Department for Education and meet the requirements set out in the Independent Schools Standards. It also sets out that if an existing school is looking to expand or change their site they must notify the Department for Education of a material change to their existing registration.</p> <p>The AAP's approach to educational facilities is to increase the capacity of existing educational settings in a managed manner and to identify site allocations that can accommodate flexible and adaptable space to accommodate a wide range of community needs, which could include educational facilities.</p>
---	---