



AGENDA FOR THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee are summoned to a meeting, which will be held in Committee Room 5, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on, **9 November 2015 at 7.30 pm.**

John Lynch
Head of Democratic Services

Enquiries to : Jonathan Moore
Tel : 0207 527 3308
E-mail : democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched : 29 October 2015

Membership

Councillors:

Councillor Kaya Comer-Schwartz (Chair)
Councillor Nick Ward (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Alice Donovan
Councillor Rakhia Ismail
Councillor Michelline Safi Ngongo
Councillor Angela Picknell
Councillor Diarmaid Ward
Councillor Nick Wayne

Substitute Members

Substitutes:

Councillor James Court
Councillor Alex Diner
Councillor Jenny Kay
Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor Dave Poyser

Co-opted Member:

James Stephenson, Secondary Parent Governor
Erol Baduna, Primary Parent Governor
Mary Clement, Roman Catholic Diocese
Vacancy, Church of England Diocese

Quorum: is 4 Councillors

A. Formal Matters

Page

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interest

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest*** in an item of business:

- if it is not yet on the council's register, you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent;
- you may **choose** to declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest that is already in the register in the interests of openness and transparency.

In both the above cases, you **must** leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If you have a **personal** interest in an item of business **and** you intend to speak or vote on the item you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent but you **may** participate in the discussion and vote on the item.

***(a) Employment, etc** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.

(b) Sponsorship - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of your expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of your election; including from a trade union.

(c) Contracts - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between you or your partner (or a body in which one of you has a beneficial interest) and the council.

(d) Land - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.

(e) Licences- Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.

(f) Corporate tenancies - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which you or your partner have a beneficial interest.

(g) Securities - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

This applies to all members present at the meeting.

3. Declaration of Substitute Members
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
5. Chair's Report
6. Items for Call In (if any)
7. Public Questions

1 - 8

B. Scrutiny Items	Page
1. Alternative Provision: Witness Evidence	
2. Child Protection Annual Report	9 - 18
3. Executive Member Questions	19 - 20
<i>Any questions should be submitted in advance to jonathan.moore@islington.gov.uk no later than Wednesday 4 November 2015. Further information is set out on pages 19 – 20.</i>	
4. Review of Work Programme	21 - 22

C. Urgent Non-exempt Items

Any non-exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgently by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

D. Exclusion of Press and Public

To consider whether, in view of the nature of the remaining item on the agenda, it is likely to involve the disclosure of exempt or confidential information within the terms of the Access to Information Procedure Rules in the Constitution and, if so, whether to exclude the press and public during discussion thereof.

E. Exempt Items for Call In (if any)

F. Urgent Exempt Items (if any)

Any exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgently by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

The next meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee will be on 11 January 2016.

Please note that committee agendas, reports and minutes are available from the council's website: www.democracy.islington.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

London Borough of Islington

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - Tuesday, 15 September 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on Tuesday, 15 September 2015 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Comer-Schwartz (Chair), Donovan, Ismail, Picknell, Ward and Wayne

Co-opted Member: Mary Clement, Roman Catholic Diocese

Also Present: **Councillors:** Caluori and Convery (in part)

Councillor Kaya Comer-Schwartz in the Chair

67 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM NO. A1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nick Ward.

68 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM NO. A2)**

None.

69 **DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (ITEM NO. A3)**

None.

70 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (ITEM NO. A4)**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

71 **CHAIR'S REPORT (ITEM NO. A5)**

The Chair advised that the Executive had noted the Committee's recommendations made through the Early Help review and would be making a full response later in the year.

72 **ITEMS FOR CALL IN (IF ANY) (ITEM NO. A6)**

None.

73 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS (ITEM NO. A7)**

The Chair outlined the procedure for public questions and the filming and recording of meetings.

74 **UPDATE ON THE YOUTH CRIME STRATEGY (ITEM NO. B1)**

The Committee received an update from Councillors Paul Convery, Executive Member for Community Safety, and Joe Caluori, Executive Member for Children and Families, on the Youth Crime Strategy, agreed by the Executive in July 2015.

A discussion was had during which the following main points were made:

- The Strategy was prepared in the context of increased youth offending in the borough; it was commented that there had been growing concerns about violent offences, snatch thefts and drug-related crime. In particular, the Committee noted the shock and concern of local people at the two murders that occurred in Islington over the summer of 2015.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 15 September 2015

- It was explained that there were three strands to the Strategy: enforcement, deterrence, and community response. The Executive was keen to implement the strategy as soon as possible. The Strategy was to be supplemented by an implementation plan, which the Leader was overseeing the preparation of. It was advised that the implementation plan would be circulated to members in due course.
- It was too early to say if the Strategy was effective, however following firm police enforcement the number of knife offences in the borough had decreased, from three in July, to none in August and none in September to date. It was commented that this was partially due to prolific offenders being in police custody; however these individuals were expected to be released in the near future. The need to work with young people to reduce offending was emphasised.
- The Committee was advised of positive work being carried out with St Giles Trust, a charity which worked with ex-offenders and disadvantaged people to break the cycle of offending. 180 young people in the borough had been identified as associated with gang violence, 50 of those had been targeted to work with the charity, and half of those had responded positively.
- The Executive Members were hopeful that the Council had command of the immediate problem, however advised that further work was needed from the Council, its partners, schools, the Police and the community to significantly reduce levels of youth crime in the borough.
- It was commented that the generation currently committing youth crime were born between 1996-99, typically did not have a strong family support network, were from families where adults were not working, and grew up at a time when the Council did not prioritise early help initiatives and there was a general reluctance to take children into care. It was commented that this demonstrated the importance of investing in early help services, to intervene early in life to stop problems becoming entrenched.
- Councillor Caluori advised of his recent visit to Leeds to learn more about best practice in restorative justice programmes. The importance of listening to young people was emphasised, especially those who had experience of the criminal justice system. It was suggested that the Youth Council could also contribute to this work.
- It was queried how success against the strategy would be measured. It was advised that key performance indicators had been identified, however many of these were related to process changes, such as further integration with the Police, as opposed to statistical outcomes. There was a target to halve the number of children in Alternative Provision by the end of 2016, and it was hoped that the strategy would lead to a sustained reduction in young people being the victims of violent crime. Reducing youth crime to levels experienced in 2011 before the recent increase in gang violence would be considered a success. It was noted that all performance measures were set out in the strategy implementation plan.
- A member queried why the number of young people in Alternative Provision entering the youth justice system had decreased while the overall number of youth crimes had increased. It was explained that some young offenders had become more prolific. The Committee also expressed concern with the number of instances where young people had been arrested by the Police but then released with 'no further action' for reasons of insufficient evidence or a low possibility of successful prosecution. The Council was working with the Police to ensure that the small number of young people who had been repeatedly arrested and then released with no further action did not necessarily have a 'clean slate' and that intelligence on these suspected offenders was not lost.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 15 September 2015

- It was advised that although there was no direct link between the two recent murders in the borough, there was a great deal in common between the two incidents, including the age of the offenders and that the offenders were on the periphery of established gangs.
- The Committee noted the three primary gang rivalries in the borough, which were between gangs operating in the Caledonian area and the Clerkenwell and Bunhill areas; the Mayville Estate and the Essex Road area; and the Elthorne Estate and the Andover Estate. The Council was keen to not label these gangs in terms of estates, as gang members were often from a much wider geographic area and were not associated with the people living on those estates.
- It was advised that the 180 young people in the borough associated with gang violence were typically aged 14 to 18, from all parts of the borough and of all ethnicities and faiths. The majority had traumatic lives and had been in Alternative Provision. The importance of understanding these children was emphasised.
- It was advised that a number of young offenders had been witnesses or victims of domestic violence. Some offenders had been groomed to commit crimes by older criminals, including trafficking drugs to rural and coastal areas. Some of the gangs operating in the borough were organised by older established criminals and had an influence beyond the borough.
- In response to a query about possible 'quick wins' to increase prevention; it was advised that the targeted youth service had been working on offending prevention over the summer and it was thought that the work in partnership with the St Giles Trust had led to positive outcomes, although further evaluation of this work was needed.
- It was queried if the Council was working with local health services to gather intelligence. It was advised that the Council was working with youth workers in local hospitals however could work further with primary care providers.
- The Committee expressed concern at the proposal for the Metropolitan Police to decommission all PCSOs. The Committee valued neighbourhood policing; it was noted that local officers had knowledge of how Islington gangs operated, and how the structure of these gangs was more fluid than in other areas.
- It was queried if the youth crime rate would be lower if a strategy was implemented earlier. Although it was not possible to say if particular offences would not have been committed, it was suggested that resources were stretched and agencies had not prioritised youth crime as high as it should have been.
- The Police had a good knowledge of older gang members, as these were often members of established crime families and had been imprisoned. Policing of these professional gangs was dealt with at a London-wide level due to its seriousness and intricacies.
- A member of the public queried linkages between Alternative Provision and youth offending. It was advised that a new team had been established to support children in Alternative Provision. It was queried how many pupils had left Alternative Provision and become NEET; it was advised that this figure would be circulated with the minutes.
- A member of the public queried how the Council would ensure that young people did not feel victimised by enhancing the focus on youth crime, especially as 'stop and search' exercises only had a 20% success rate. It was commented that stop and search was a legitimate policing tactic when it was intelligence-led and had led to the recovery of drugs and weaponry, although the concerns of its overuse and association to ethnic profiling were recognised. The Executive Members emphasised that the vast majority of young people had no connection to youth crime and that the public should not be worried about groups of young people congregating.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 15 September 2015

- The Committee requested a further update on the Youth Crime Strategy in April 2016.

The Committee thanked Councillors Convery and Caluori for their attendance.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee receive a further update on the Youth Crime Strategy in April 2016.

75

ALTERNATIVE PROVISION: SCRUTINY INITIATION DOCUMENT AND INTRODUCTORY REPORT (ITEM NO. B2)

Gabby Grodentz, Head of Alternative Provision, and Mark Taylor, Director of Learning and Schools, made a presentation to the Committee, copy interleaved, about Alternative Provision in Islington. The Committee also considered an introductory report and a draft Scrutiny Initiation Document.

A discussion was had during which the following main points were made:

- The Committee noted the context of Alternative Provision in the borough. Alternative Provision was for pupils in Years 10 and 11 who were unable to receive a suitable education in a traditional school setting due to exclusion, illness, behavioural issues, or other reasons.
- Islington currently had 105 pupils in Alternative Provision who attended various settings across North London. Of these, at least 90 had previously received some form of targeted intervention from local agencies. Wraparound support was provided alongside Alternative Provision to support pupils. It was noted that those in Alternative Provision were often vulnerable, had been excluded from school, or were young offenders.
- Officers explained that the Council had improved the quality of its data in recent years. Since 2010 the Council had recorded the outcomes of those leaving Alternative Provision, which helped to evaluate the effectiveness of services.
- Due to an increased focus on finding further education or training for those leaving Alternative Provision at the end of Year 11, the number of young people leaving Alternative Provision classified as NEET by November had reduced year on year. However, it was noted that the number classified as NEET increased during Year 12 each year as pupils dropped off their courses. It was speculated that this was due to the pupils no longer receiving wraparound support alongside their studies.
- There were no more than 12 pupils to each Alternative Provision class and each pupil was required to opt for 25 hours of education each week. Pupils were only able to opt for fewer than 25 hours of education in exceptional circumstances, such as medical reasons.
- Although pupils were required to receive 25 hours of education each week, it was noted that poor attendance was commonplace and as a result the majority did not receive the full 25 hours. The national expectation for attendance was 95%, however only 12.9% of pupils in Alternative Provision achieved this level in Islington. Officers commented that for some pupils, attendance of between 50-80% was considered an achievement given their historic level of absence. It was explained that these pupils did not necessarily truant and their absence may be caused by other factors, such as domestic violence or bereavement.
- A member commented on the benefits of counselling for vulnerable young people.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 15 September 2015

- Officers advised of recent improvements to quality assurance processes. It was explained that many local authorities in North London used the same providers and as a result providers previously received three or four inspections each year. This was considered to be onerous and disruptive, and as a result North London boroughs had agreed to a single quality assurance framework which required one inspection each year, the results of which were shared electronically.
- All providers used by the Council were rated either 'Good' or 'Requires Improvement'. The Council did not continue to use providers rated as inadequate.
- It was noted that Islington appeared to have a greater number of Alternative Provision referrals compared to other North London boroughs, however there were differences in how data was collected which meant that the data from other authorities was not considered accurate. Neighbouring boroughs had a large number of academies which referred to providers directly and as a result the local authorities had no exact data on the number of young people in Alternative Provision. It was confirmed that the two academies in Islington did provide information on how many pupils were referred to Alternative Provision and therefore the figure of 105 pupils was accurate.
- The borough had 105 pupils in Alternative Provision for 2015/16, which was the lowest number on record, with the highest number being 215. Islington no longer placed pupils in Year 9 in Alternative Provision and instead sought other support for the small number of pupils who would otherwise have been referred.
- The Committee noted the demographics of those on Alternative Provision. There was a gender gap, with the number of boys being more than double the number of girls for each of the past four years. There was a disproportionate number of White British and Black Caribbean pupils in Alternative Provision, with 60% of the cohort being White British, compared to 21.7% of the mainstream cohort, and 20% being Black Caribbean, compared to 6.7% of the mainstream cohort.
- Officers spoke of their concerns regarding the attainment of pupils in Alternative Provision. In particular, performance in English and Maths was historically poor, however was slowly improving. It was explained that the majority of pupils worked towards Functional Skills qualifications as opposed to GCSEs. A 'Level 1' qualification was equivalent to D-G at GCSE, and a 'Level 2' was equivalent to A*-C at GCSE. Although officers were hopeful of an increase in attainment following a decrease in the previous year, it was only expected for 35.7% of pupils to achieve a Level 1 or higher in both English and Maths.
- The Committee noted that the Council could receive up to £7,703 of external funding per pupil, subject to certain eligibility criteria. The cost of providing Alternative Provision varied between £4,000 and £14,000 per pupil, and therefore achieving value for money was very important.
- The Council had recently appointed an Education Welfare Officer who was tasked with improving attendance. The Council was also in the process of appointing an IFIT worker to work in the three highest-referring schools with the families of Year 9s at risk of being referred to Alternative Provision.
- Officers provided two case studies to highlight the differing experiences and outcomes of young people in Alternative Provision. One young male was referred to Alternative Provision, after initially engaging he suddenly stopped and his attendance dropped to 30%. It was discovered that a gang had taken him to a house outside of London where he was left by himself and forced to sell drugs. Once he was re-integrated into Alternative Provision his attendance improved to 82%, he received 3 A*s at GCSE and won a scholarship to a high-ranking boarding school, where he was studying for four AS levels. This

positive outcome was in contrast to another young male who was achieving above average results at Key Stage 3, however insisted that he did not want to sit GCSEs and preferred vocational education outside of school. He entered Alternative Provision; however had behavioural difficulties and his attendance rate decreased. His parents had difficulties setting boundaries at home, however refused support from the local authority. He developed a cannabis habit and left Alternative Provision classified as NEET. Officers considered that further work with the pupil in Year 9 could have significantly improved his outcomes.

- Officers suggested that the Committee could focus on how to reduce referrals to Alternative Provision, how to reduce the number of pupils in Alternative Provision, how to raise the number of pupils sitting Level 2 qualifications, and how to best support the most vulnerable pupils.
- Following a query, it was advised that aside from Functional Skills, pupils also studied for BTEC qualifications and other vocational courses. Many girls were studying hair and beauty or childcare. It was advised that a detailed analysis of courses would be presented to a future meeting.
- The Committee raised some concern with the lack of providers offering Science and ICT; only one provider offered science and only two offered ICT. It was commented that these subjects required specialist equipment and experienced teachers who may not be available to providers.
- It was confirmed that many of the children in Alternative Provision were from single parent families.
- It was queried how the Council monitored attendance when pupils were attending courses across North London. It was advised that electronic registers were used and only the Council was able to authorise absence.
- The Executive Member for Children and Families commented on the disproportionate number of White British pupils in Alternative Provision and advised of Camden Council's 'White British Achievement Project'.
- It was queried why the IFIT worker would be working with pupils in Year 9, as greater benefit may be gained from taking an 'early intervention' approach of targeting pupils at a younger age. It was advised that the impact of the IFIT work would be evaluated and, if successful, could be carried out from Year 7 onwards.
- It was suggested that some schools in the borough had very low referral rates and best practice could be learned from these schools. Although Islington schools had varying demographic profiles, this was not considered to be a significant factor in the numbers of young people being referred to Alternative Provision.
- A member of the public queried if the Council had analysed the risk of local authority schools becoming academies. It was advised that the Council was not aware of any schools in the borough currently contemplating becoming academies. However, it was noted that the Government permitted providers of Alternative Provision to register as academies and free schools and it was expected that providers would face pressure to convert in future.
- It was agreed that the SID be amended to include an objective to consider the attendance of those in Alternative Provision.
- It was agreed that the SID be amended to include an objective to evaluate the range of Alternative Provision available.
- It was agreed that the SID be amended to make reference to the demand for therapeutic interventions among pupils in Alternative Provision.
- It was agreed to consider witness evidence relating to Camden's White British Achievement Project.
- The Committee considered that a visit to a local provider of Alternative Provision would be more useful than a visit to a 'good practice' local authority.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 15 September 2015

- The Committee agreed that it was important to consider evidence from a range of secondary schools and academies.

The Committee thanked the officers for their attendance.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the report be noted;
- 2) That the Scrutiny Initiation Document be agreed, subject to the following amendments:
 - a) Objective 3 be amended to include reference to the attendance of those in Alternative Provision;
 - b) Objective 5 be amended to make reference to the range of Alternative Provision available;
 - c) 'Scope' be amended to make reference to the demand for therapeutic interventions;
 - d) 'Witness evidence' be amended to specify that the Committee is to consider evidence from a range of secondary schools;
 - e) 'Witness Evidence' be amended to make reference to Camden's White British Achievement Project;
 - f) 'Visits' be amended to read 'A local provider of alternative provision, such as New River College'.

76

WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16 (ITEM NO. B3)

The Committee considered its work programme for 2015/16. It was noted that the Executive Member for Children and Families would be available at each meeting to answer questions submitted in advance. In addition, the Committee requested that the Executive Member submit a short briefing note to each meeting updating the Committee on his work and related issues.

It was advised that Councillor Nick Ward was seeking a date for an informal member workshop on child sexual exploitation in the near future.

It was advised that a press release would be issued on the work programmes of all of the Council's scrutiny committees to raise awareness of their work and how the public can attend meetings.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be agreed, subject to the addition of an update on the Youth Crime Strategy in April 2016.

MEETING CLOSED AT 9.20 pm

Chair

APPENDIX – Further to minute 74

Query – “How many pupils had left Alternative Provision and become NEET?”

Response – There were 109 Year 11 leavers at the end of the 2013/14 academic year. Of these, 74 attended off-side Alternative Provision and 35 attended the New River College Pupil Referral Unit.

Of this cohort, 18 (16.5%) were classified as NEET at November 2014. This figure is comprised of 13 young people who had attended off-side Alternative Provision, and 5 who had attended New River College.



Report of: Interim Corporate Director of Children's Services

Meeting of:	Date	Agenda item	Ward(s)
Children's Services Scrutiny Committee	9 November 2015	B2	All
Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt	

SUBJECT: Safeguarding Islington's Children: Child Protection Annual Report

1. Synopsis

This report provides an update to the Committee on the progress being made in safeguarding and promoting the welfare of Islington's most vulnerable children.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That the Committee scrutinise the headline performance outcomes;
- 2.2. That the Committee scrutinise the governance arrangements for safeguarding children;
- 2.3. That the Committee scrutinise the findings of quality assurance activities.

3. Background

- 3.1. The welfare of Islington's vulnerable children is rightly one of the Council's highest priorities. Islington Children's Social Care (CSC) is currently working with 895 children in need, 381 children who are looked after of which 8 are disabled children and 64 are Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC). We have 513 care leavers and 151 children with child protection plans. The majority of child protection plans are because of emotional abuse or neglect. Characteristics of parents whose children have child protection plans include domestic violence (33%), substance misuse (15%) and mental health problems (24%).

4. Governance Arrangements

- 4.1. The governance and scrutiny of the arrangements for safeguarding children take place through this Committee and the following inter-agency fora:
- 4.2. **Safeguarding Accountability Meetings** chaired by the Chief Executive and attended by the Leader of the Council, Executive Member for Children and Families, Corporate Director of Children's Services,

Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Children Board and Director of Targeted and Specialist Children and Families. The meeting is held eight weekly and allows senior members to hold senior officers and the chair of the Board to account, to scrutinise performance related to vulnerable children, to be appraised of any concerns about the safety and welfare of children and to drive improvement.

- 4.3. **Corporate Parenting Board**, chaired by the Executive Member for Children and Families and attended by four elected members, senior officers and representatives of the In Care Council. The Board meets eight weekly and scrutinises performance and strategic planning related to children in care and care leavers, sets direction and drives improvement.
- 4.4 During the year there has been a great deal of media attention about missing children, and those at risk of sexual exploitation (CSE). The Corporate Parenting Board has particularly looked at this issue, and received detailed reports about the reasons that children run away from care. During 2014/15, 35 children went missing from care on 128 occasions. Fifteen of those children had become looked after within the year, and all were aged 14-17.
- 4.5 As of 31 March 2015, of the 35 children and young people missing from care, 21 have achieved some stability, 4 have returned home and 4 have left care, 1 was in secure accommodation. Twelve of the 17 at risk of CSE are no longer at risk. The other predominant reason for going missing is related to offending and gang association, all were young men. Many of these young people came into care later with very complex needs and despite intensive support some have not achieved good outcomes.
- 4.6 All children who run away have a safe and well check from the police and a return home interview (RHI) from a youth worker in our Targeted Youth Support Service (TYS). The RHI explores the reasons that the young person went missing and seeks to ensure that the problems are resolved to prevent further episodes. This service was introduced during 2014 and YYS was able to conduct 19 return home interviews for children looked after (CLA). Some children refused to be seen and our success in securing their compliance needs to improve so that all children can benefit from this service. The main reason given for going missing was to be with family and friends or partners. Other reasons were being unhappy with placements due to money restrictions or boundaries. Two girls were adamant that they were not missing but with boyfriends, family or friends and their carers were aware of this.
- 4.7 The Children Looked After (CLA) service response to missing children is robust. Over the last year they have applied successfully for 9 recovery orders, 2 collection orders and 4 secure orders in order to remove children from risky situations or people. Abduction notices are served by the police on adults that knowingly harbour our missing children.
- 4.8 During 2014/15, 35 children were reported as missing from home on 77 occasions. It is thought this is an under representation of the true number. All those reported missing have a safe and well check from the police and a return home interview (RHI) offered by the Targeted Youth Support Service.
- 4.9 Boys aged 16-18 were at highest risk of going missing from home and girls aged 13-15 were second highest. YYS completed 72 RHI for those missing from home and found that 70% of children were already actively involved with a range of existing services. Concerns were identified about CSE in 20 cases, in 18 of these the CSE risks were already being addressed by workers. In seven cases there were concerns about gangs noted from the RHI.
- 4.10 **Islington Safeguarding Children Board (ISCB)** is chaired by an independent chair, the Board meets eight weekly. This is a statutory body responsible for ensuring the effectiveness of inter-agency safeguarding and the co-operation of partners. The Board has sub-committees which drive and co-ordinate quality assurance, policy and practice, training, Serious Case Reviews and the Child Death Overview Committee which reviews all the cases of children who die through natural causes or accidents to evaluate whether improvements to practice would reduce future tragedies.
- 4.11 ISCB agrees local priorities and monitors actions taken to implement them. The Board completed two serious case reviews during the year.
- 4.12 The Independent Chair of the ISCB reported in his annual report that 'the work of the Board has become mature in recent years and has taken the steps of formulating objectives which challenge partners to

focus on the advanced work that is required by professionals to help children undo the harms caused by abuse and neglect.....the Board has made in roads to identify children at risk of CSE but is now pushing partners to identify and prosecute those offenders who exploit and abuse.’ The annual report evaluates the effectiveness of child protection in Islington and has set the following priorities for the next three years: To improve the collective effectiveness of agencies in:

- 1) Addressing the impact of neglect on children, including by helping them to become more resilient.
- 2) Addressing the consequences / harm suffered as a result of domestic violence, parental mental health and substance abuse.
- 3) Identification of children who are vulnerable to sexual exploitation and holding perpetrators to account.

The Annual Report of the ISCB will be presented to the Committee in January 2016.

5. Performance Management and Quality Assurance

- 5.1. In order to ensure that Islington’s most vulnerable children are safe and that our services continuously improve, Children’s Services employ a range of quality assurance measures to test the ‘health’ of our services and to learn lessons about how to improve.
- 5.2. Through performance management we are able to use key performance indicators as a ‘proxy’ measure for quality of service and to support service improvement. Caution needs to be exercised in relying on performance indicators in isolation however, as it is possible to have good performance but poor quality of service; although conversely it is unlikely that there could be good quality of service and poor performance. Therefore to ensure that there is a comprehensive understanding of the quality of service both quantitative and qualitative information must be reviewed. From monitoring key performance indicators we are able to identify that:
 - 5.3.
 - All children who have child protection plans are visited every two weeks (where this is part of the plan);
 - All children who have child protection plans have a core group of professionals who have prescribed tasks in respect of their involvement with the child;
 - All children who have child protection plans have their plan reviewed after three months and six monthly thereafter;
 - All children who have an allocated social worker have a plan that sets out the actions required to improve their outcomes;
 - All children newly allocated to a social worker are seen within 10 days (sooner if needed);
 - All looked after children are seen at four weekly intervals unless the Independent Reviewing Officer agrees alternative arrangements;
 - All children in care cases are independently reviewed every six months;
 - Social Work case loads are reasonable with the average being 9 - 22 children per worker for Children in Need and 10 children per worker for Children Looked After.

6. Headline Performance 2014/15 (see Appendix A)

- 6.1.
 - We receive 1,000 contacts regarding concern about children per month, most come from the police, closely followed by schools;
 - Most contacts are about domestic violence, parenting capacity and child criminal behaviour;
 - We have the 11th highest rate of assessed Children in Need in the country;
 - 84% of our children in need assessments are carried out within 45 days;
 - We have a similar number of children per 10,000 with child protection plans as statistical neighbours (SN) currently 151;
 - We carry out more child protection enquiries than SN;
 - Repeat child protection plans comparable with SN;
 - Children do not have child protection plans for too long and their child protection issues were

resolved within short timescales;

- We apply to court for orders to protect children more often than most other boroughs;
- The number of children subject to court orders is stable;
- Islington has more children looked after per 10,000 than SN (381);
- The number of Looked After children who had to move more than three times during a year is comparable with SN;
- The long term placement stability of Looked After children is stable;
- More children 16+ are becoming looked after, and more 11 -15 year olds are becoming looked after;
- There are more Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers (64);
- More young people are remaining with their foster carers after their 18th birthday;
- Placements for children looked after are becoming much more difficult to find, there is a national shortage of foster homes and significant challenges of supply within the children's homes sector;
- For the first time in six years we have started using secure orders to protect children from absconding and harm.

- 6.2. To assure the quality of our safeguarding services we routinely review qualitative information alongside performance data through our Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). This provides a consistent set of minimum practice standards, to measure practice and identify patterns across the service, within a team and/or in relation to an individual's performance.
- 6.3. Each quarter managers undertake observations of practice and audits of case files, the findings of the audits are judged against the Ofsted inspection framework and practitioners are given feedback about how their practice can improve.
- 6.4. **The following gives examples of findings that have been used to improve practice:**
- 6.5. **Early intervention and assessment** – In 86% of cases auditors found that at the point of contact the thresholds were appropriately applied and that the response was proportionate to the concerns raised. The majority (93%) of referrals were responded to within the required seven working days. In over half of the cases (58%) the auditors found no record that the referrer had been notified about the course of action agreed. In almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of cases the child was talked to alone whilst the assessment was carried out and there is evidence that they were listened to and their experiences taken into account in 90% of cases. Relevant parties such as extended family members or agencies were readily consulted in 90%. The changes necessary for the child not to be in need or at risk of harm were clearly recorded and the actions and decisions were clear and up to date in 90% of cases.
- 6.6. **Strategy discussion/meeting (a meeting called to discuss whether the child is at risk of significant harm)** – In $\frac{3}{4}$ of the cases reviewed a strategy discussion to consider significant harm appeared to have been necessary. Sixteen of the seventeen were held at the appropriate level of seniority, there was evidence of management oversight and a child protection conference was convened when required (94%). For cases that progressed to conference, there was evidence of a clear picture of the risks to the child (94%). In 85% of cases the outline plan was considered to clearly state the actions agreed to reduce the risk of harm. However, in 3 out of the 17 cases looked at, auditors found that the outline plan was not sufficiently clear.
- 6.7. **Child In Need Intervention** – The audit found that the children are being visited regularly (89%) and that in 4/5 cases the visits are frequent enough to allow the worker to build a meaningful relationship with them. Although the auditors found evidence that in 67% of cases the recording was dynamic and captured change, they found that in over half of the cases (56%) changes in the child's circumstances is not captured in the chronology and thus the tool was not used to analyse the child's experience over time.
- 6.8. **Child Protection plans** – Most of the child protection plans were deemed to capture the concerns for the child (94%). Over three-quarters (78%) evidenced how the child will be safe and have their needs met. In all but one of the 16 cases reviewed, the concerns were clearly stated and the actions were linked to the risks and needs identified. Furthermore, most plans evidenced what the family and the case worker were going to do to help achieve change.

- 6.9. **Multi-agency working arrangements** – Three quarters (74%) of the cases showed evidence that the team around the child meetings are attended by key people and in almost all (90%) the sharing of information was used effectively for planning and risk-based decision making.
- 6.10. **Overall service provision** – In most cases there is evidence that the children (75%) and parents (88%) were heard and that their wishes and feelings influenced the help provided and that their concerns/issues were responded to. There was strong evidence that the parents and the child (94%) were involved in the planning of the help they were provided and that the children are currently safe and actions have been taken to protect them (90%). In most cases there was recorded evidence of the difference Children's Social Care is making in helping to improve the child's life.

7. **Observation of supervision**

- 7.1. The findings show that overall the supervision sessions observed met service standards. Quality of supervision delivery – 87% of the sessions observed were well organised and there was evidence that both participants worked well together to achieve their objectives (86%). Auditors found that supervisors used skills to promote reflection and analysis (82%) and that they also used their experience and expertise to inform case discussion (87%). Furthermore, in three-quarters (73%) of the sessions observed, the supervisor took time to acknowledge the personal impact of cases on the supervisee and support the worker in containing anxiety and discuss professional development. Review of the auditors' comments showed that social workers raised anxiety with regards to managing risks to the child as well as their workloads, in particular in being able to meet timescales. One commented on the challenges of partnership working, including communication and tensions that arise from differences of opinions. There is evidence that supervisors were able to reassure their staff and help them prioritise tasks. A number of auditors commented that the records did not adequately capture the discussions they observed during the supervision session.
- 7.2. **Quality of case discussion** – The quality of analysis of the child's risks and needs was rated very highly (94%) and the plan for managing those risks was considered to be proportionate (88%). Ten of the auditors commented on the direct work discussed during the session. Whilst (82%) sessions observed found that actions from previous sessions and the child's or family's plan were reviewed, the auditors found that actions from child protection conferences, children looked after reviews, team around the child or team around the family meetings were reviewed in only 33% of cases. This figure has remained constant for the past two quarters. Moreover, most case records reviewed contained an outline of the presenting issues (88%); a review of outcomes from previous decisions and actions (78%) and a course of action agreed on key decisions (87%). The rationale for why key decisions were made was recorded in almost two-thirds of the cases reviewed as was any dissent about the course of action taken (63%). Auditors found evidence of the use of chronologies as a tool to help inform case discussions in less than (60%) of the observations carried out.
- 7.3. **Direct observations of practice in Children's Social Care and Families First**
- 7.4. Auditors reported that overall the home visits observed were carried out to a good standard. The question that scored the lowest was the exploration of the home environment where only about half (54%) of the practitioners were observed to carry this out. In five cases the observation was carried out not at a home visit but at a meeting either in the office or another venue. Where the home was explored, there was evidence that social workers did so purposefully to address safety issues and assess living arrangements by seeing the bedrooms. In one case the auditor thought the looking around could have been handled more tactfully and the worker should have explained to the family why it was necessary. Auditors observed direct work take place in over 2/3 of the visits and a few commented on seeing practitioners apply solution-focused or 'Motivational Interviewing' skills in their interaction with either the child or the parent. In one case there was preparation work prior to the visit.
- 7.5. In summary a total of 109 case files were reviewed across the division in this period. The findings of the broad review of practice highlight widespread examples of good and outstanding practice. However, the findings also show that there areas for improvement in both the interface with service users and partner agencies and in the internal operational management of practice. These findings are fed back to staff to

support the journey of continual improvement and an action plan is created to ensure that the areas for development are addressed.

- 7.6. Although the parent feedback represented only a small sample, they voiced strong views on maintaining one social worker throughout their journey through services and served as a reminder that the importance of continuity in human relationships should not be overlooked.

8. Innovation

- 8.1. Islington has been awarded two grants for Innovation by the DfE; one for the Pause Programme and one to transform social work practice which we have called Doing What Counts and Measuring What Matters.

8.2. Pause

- 8.3. The Pause Programme provides intensive, integrated support to women who have more than one child in care. Women in this situation have almost always had very hard lives themselves, often starting with abuse in childhood, and including many issues in adulthood such as domestic violence, mental health issues, and substance misuse. Pause aims to break this cycle by intervening at a point when the women have no children in their care, using reversible long acting hormonal contraception to create a space in which women are supported to reflect and develop new skills and responses.

- 8.4. 50 women were identified in Islington who had 2+ children (207 in total) removed during the research period November 2009 – November 2014. Of our Islington cohort, 84% experience domestic violence; substance misuse is prevalent (52% cannabis, 44% class A drugs); 66% have mental health issues; 46% abuse alcohol; 20% have learning difficulties; 24% are known to the criminal justice system; 24% are sex workers; 18% are care leavers; 18% have a personality disorder.

- 8.5. The project will run with DfE funding for one year and then become self funding from savings made through reducing the number of children in care.

8.6. Doing What Counts and Measuring What Matters

- 8.7. The DfE has granted £3m to children's social care to transform services to improve outcomes for children including ensuring more of them can safely remain with their families rather than enter the care system.
- 8.8. Islington and the University of Bedfordshire have created a new model of social work practice called Motivational Social Work, building on a randomised control trial using Motivational Interviewing carried out by Bedfordshire in Islington in 2013.
- 8.9. The model of practice aims to ensure that social workers practice is not skewed by counting their inputs e.g. how long it takes to do an assessment, but rather they can be measured on their outcomes e.g. the quality of their observed practice and the goals achieved by the family.
- 8.10. This transformational work is one of nine projects nationally that aim to create systemic change in children's social care.
- 8.11. It has enabled Islington to attract more social workers and to reduce caseloads so that they can undertake more direct work with children and their families. Para-professionals have been recruited to support social workers to reduce bureaucracy associated with their role, IT systems have been adapted to reduce duplicate recording and tablets have been provided to support remote working.
- 8.12. The University of Bedfordshire has provided embedded 'practice evaluators' who observe the practice and score the practitioners fidelity to the model, which enables improved relationships with families and hence greater likelihood of keeping children safe. The practice evaluators collect information from the children and families about their experience of the social work and this feedback is provided to the social worker in feedback sessions.

- 8.13. The next phase of the programme introduces co located mental health professionals (both adult and child) who will work alongside the social worker to jointly provide assessments and treatment in more complex cases with the aim of keeping more children within their families, avoiding court proceedings and the need for children to be in the care of the local authority.
- 8.14. The model aims to become self sustaining through reinvesting the savings achieved through reducing the number of children in care to continue the model of reduced social work caseloads which provides greater capacity for relational work with children.

9. Implications

9.1. Financial Implications:

- 9.2. All of the measures described in this report can be implemented within existing budgets.

9.3. Legal Implications:

- 9.4. The Council has a duty to investigate where it has reasonable cause to suspect that a child in the area is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm, and to take appropriate action (section 47 Children Act 1989). This includes a new Local Children Safeguarding Board (LCSB) power to request any person or body to supply such information as is specified in the request (Children, Schools and Families Act 2010 (Commencement No. 3) Order 2013).

- 9.5. The Children Act 2004 introduced the requirement for the Council to set up a LSCB to co-ordinate, and ensure the effectiveness of, partner agency services for the purposes of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in Islington (Sections 13 and 14).

- 9.6. The Council must have regard to the revised statutory guidance, Working Together to Safeguard Children, which came into force in April 2015.

9.7. Environmental Implications:

None.

9.8. Resident Impact Assessment:

- 9.9. The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations, between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it (section 149 Equality Act 2010). The Council has a duty to have due regard to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages, take steps to meet needs, in particular steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, and encourage people to participate in public life. The Council must have due regard to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

- 9.10. A very high proportion of vulnerable children known to children's social care live in workless households. All social care interventions aim to address the needs of the whole family which include maximising benefits and supporting routes into employment, education and training.

10. Conclusion and Reasons for Recommendations

- 10.1. The Council rightly places a high priority on safeguarding and promoting the welfare of vulnerable children in Islington. This report provides assurance about the quality and effectiveness of safeguarding and looked after children's services provided through a range of performance and quality assurance measures that are in place to ensure that services to Islington's most vulnerable children are as safe as they can be.

Final report clearance:

Signed by:

Cathy Blair
Interim Corporate Director Children's Services

Date 25.10.2015

Received by:

Head of Democratic Services

Date 27.10.2015

Appendices:

Appendix A: Headline performance data

Background papers:

None.

Report Author: Cathy Blair, Interim Corporate Director of Children's Services
Tel: 0207 527 8912
Email: Cathy.Blair@islington.gov.uk

APPENDIX A

KEY DATA 2007-2015

	2007 (31/03/07)		2008 (31/03/08)		2009 (31/03/09)		2010 (31/03/10)		2011 (31/03/11)		2012 (31/03/12)		2013 (31/03/13)		2014 (31/03/14)		2015 (31/03/15)		YTD	Based on LBI data
	LBI Return	DCSF	LBI Return	DCSF	LBI Return	DCSF	LBI Return	DfE	LBI Return	DfE	LBI Return	DfE	LBI Return	DfE	LBI Return	DfE	LBI Return	DfE	LBI	
No. CIN (those with open ref at 31 March) inc CP & CLA							1834		1778		1772		2011		2038		1530		1425	
Number subject to a CPP	112	110	111	110	138	140	132	132	112	112	141	141	117	117	137		171		155	
Number CLA	364	365	332	330	307	305	316	315	324	325	329	330	310	310	307	305	352		368	
CLA (not UASC)	307	310	290	290	272	270	284	285	295	295	296	295	283	285	280		308		311	
CLA (UASC)	57	55	42	40	35	35	32	30	29	30	33	35	27	25	27		44		57	
Contacts	14933		12667		9940		11183		12700		12505		11688		11730		11766		5498	
Referrals (inc. re-ref)	2100	2100	2545	2545	2263	2265	2571	2571	2404	2404	2430	2430	2576	2576	2776		2450		890	
Re-referrals	293	295	408	410	373	375	452	452	500	496	475	418	465	466	575		445		133	
Private Fostering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	
Missing From Care (Incidents)																	188	-	140	
Missing From Care (Children)																	46	-	46	
Initial Assessments (numbers)	1497	1495	2082	2080	2013	2015	2319	2319	2146	2146	1874	NA*	753							
Core Assessments (numbers)	909	910	1502	1500	1349	1350	1149	1149	1079	1080	1171	NA*	714							
Single Assessments (numbers)												NA	1462	NA	2834		2822		1284	
Number of Section 47's	295	295	543	545	482	480	413	413	369	369	457	457	383	383	489		639		218	
Initial Conferences	149	150	186	185	168	170	151	151	167	176	163	163	164	164	210		197		79	
Number becoming subject to a CPP in the year	132	130	141	140	154	155	131	131	148	148	149	149	134	134	179		186		62	
No. subject to a CPP for a second / subsequent time	18	20	16	15	24	25	19	19	23	23	19	19	14	14	36		27		3	
No. of CPP ceasing after 2 or more years	11	10	2	-	3	x	4	x	5	x	3	x	9	9	9		5		1	
Contacts - % progressing to referral							23%		19%		19%		22%		24%		20%		19%	
% of children who had more than one ref in financial yr							9.1%	9.1%	11.1%	NA	11%	NA	8.7%	NA	10.5%		7.3%		7.4%	
Initial Assessments (within 7/10 days %)	65%	65%	81%	81%	86%	86%	85.3%	85.3%	82.8%	82.8%	96.5%	NA*								
Core Assessments (within 35 days %)	67%	67.6%	75.4%	75.0%	88.3%	88%	86.8%	86.8%	83.4%	83.4%	86.8%	NA*								
Single Assessments (within 45 working days)													67.0%		68.2%		84.2%		83.4%	
% subject to a CPP for a second / subsequent time							14.5%	14.5%	15.5%	15.5%	12.8%	12.8%	10.4%	10.4%	20.1%		14.4%		18.3%	
% of CPP ceasing after 2 or more years							2.9%		3.0%	x	2.5%	x	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%		3.3%		0.4%	
CPP per 10,000											41	38.8	32	31.9	37		45			
CLA per 10,000			99		92		94		94		96	91	84	84	84	81				
Single Assessments per 10,000												NA	NA	772						
Population													36,700	36,700	38,000	36,700	36,701			

x = Any number between 1 and 5 inclusive has been suppressed and replaced by x (DfE, formerly DCSF)

Please note, statistics published by the DfE (previously DCSF) are included in this table as they sometimes differ to the figures submitted by the council in the annual SDA 903 and CIN returns and their precedents.

The population number used in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 rate per 10,000 figures is 36,700. This is the mid-year 2012 (Projection) based on the 2011 census used by the DfE and released in October 2013.

This page is intentionally left blank

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

9 November 2015

Executive Member Questions

The Committee is invited to note the below update and question the Executive Member on his work and the work of the Committee.

It is also recommended that the procedure for Executive Member questions set out overleaf be agreed.

Any questions that the Committee or members of the public may have should be submitted in advance to jonathan.moore@islington.gov.uk no later than Wednesday 4th November 2015.

Executive Member Update

- The 'Pause' programme has now launched in Islington. Pause is a programme that started in Hackney and is currently being piloted around the country with DfE funding. The project involved working with a cohort of women who have repeatedly become pregnant and had babies taken into care. In Islington we have seen 50 women have 207 children taken into care between them at a huge financial cost to the Council, and an unimaginable emotional cost to the women. The Pause programme has enabled us to hire a team of support workers who will work with 21 of these women. The women agree to a long acting reversible contraceptive (LARC) whilst providing the women with the support practitioner who provides advice, support and assistance to the women in addressing all of the factors that have contributed to the situation in which they find themselves. You can find out more about this exciting project at www.pause.org.uk.
- Following the conclusion of the consultation period, we have decided to delay a decision on the future of Lough Road. It was clear that parents felt there are not yet a full enough range of alternative options for them, so we have pledged that will spend the next three months co-producing some alternative options before making a final decision in February.
- We are currently recruiting a new Director of Children's Services following the secondment of our previous Director, Eleanor Schooling, to be interim Head of Social Care at Ofsted. This is the most important appointment we will have made since appointing Lesley Seary as Chief Executive and the interview panel will include the Chief Executive, Council Leader Cllr Richard Watts and myself alongside Cllr Gill and Cllr Gallagher.
- It's election time for the Youth Council - we have an incredible 37 candidates this time, all of whom are raring to get onto the campaign trail. Electoral Services will be running the election on polling day and we are hoping for a record turnout, so yet again the young people of Islington can show the adults how it should be done...

Procedure for Executive Member Questions at Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

- (a) Elected members and members of the public may ask the Executive Member for Children and Families questions on any matter in relation to the executive portfolio or the work of the committee.
- (b) The intention of the session is to complement and enhance the work of the committee. The Executive Member may submit written information in advance of the meeting to advise of his recent work and other topical and timely matters of relevance. The session is not intended to replace or replicate the questions sessions held at each ordinary meeting of the Council.
- (c) Questions should be submitted in writing to the committee clerk no later than three clear working days in advance of the meeting. Such questions will be notified to the Executive Member which may facilitate a more detailed answer at the meeting. Details of how questions should be submitted will be detailed on the agenda for the meeting.
- (d) Questioners should provide their name to enable this to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The minutes of the meeting will include a summary of the question and the response.
- (e) The Chair may permit questions to be asked at the meeting without notice.
- (f) The time set aside for questions shall be no longer than 15 minutes.
- (g) No individual may ask more than two questions at each meeting.
- (h) Where there is more than one question on any particular subject or closely related subjects, the Executive Member may give a joint reply to the questions.
- (i) The committee clerk shall have power to edit or amend written questions to make them concise but without affecting the substance, following consultation with the questioner.
- (j) An answer may take the form of:
 - A direct oral answer;
 - Where the desired information is in a publication of the Council or other published work, a reference to that publication; or
 - Where the reply cannot conveniently be given orally, a written answer circulated later to the questioner within 5 working days provided the questioner has given contact details.
- (k) Priority shall normally be given to questions notified in advance.
- (l) The Chair may permit supplementary questions to be asked. Supplementary questions must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.
- (m) A question may be rejected by the committee clerk, or the Chair at the meeting, if it:
 - does not relate to the executive portfolio or the work of the committee;
 - is defamatory, frivolous or offensive;
 - is substantially the same as a question asked to the Executive Member at any meeting within the last six months;
 - requests the disclosure of information which is confidential or exempt; or
 - names, or clearly identifies, a member of staff or any other individual.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

Work Programme 2015/16

15 SEPTEMBER 2015

1. Work Programme 2015/16
2. Alternative Provision: Scrutiny Initiation Document and Presentation
3. Update on the Youth Crime Strategy
(to cover the engagement of adolescents)

9 NOVEMBER 2015

1. Alternative Provision: Witness Evidence
2. Child Protection Annual Report
3. Executive Member Questions
4. Review of Work Programme

11 JANUARY 2016

1. Alternative Provision: Witness Evidence
2. Islington Safeguarding Children Board: Annual Report
3. The Impact of SEN Changes on Children and Families
4. Executive Member Questions
5. Review of Work Programme

2 FEBRUARY 2016

1. Alternative Provision: Witness Evidence
2. Review of Work Programme

3 MARCH 2016

1. Alternative Provision: Witness Evidence
2. Education in Islington: Annual Report 2015
3. The Educational Attainment of BME Children
4. Executive Member Questions
5. Review of Work Programme

12 APRIL 2016

1. Alternative Provision: Draft Recommendations
2. Engagement with and the Consistency of Early Years Provision
3. Update on Youth Crime
4. Executive Member Questions

9 MAY 2016

1. Alternative Provision: Final Report
2. Executive Member Annual Presentation
3. Scrutiny Topics 2016/17