



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 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on **22 November 2018 at 7.00 pm.**

Lesley Seary
Chief Executive

Enquiries to : Jonathan Moore
Tel : 0207 527 3308
E-mail : democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched : 14 November 2018

Membership

Councillors:

Councillor Theresa Debono (Chair)
Councillor Vivien Cutler (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Santiago Bell-Bradford
Councillor Rakhia Ismail
Councillor Michelline Safi Ngongo
Councillor Marian Spall
Councillor John Woolf
Councillor Kadeema Woodbyrne

Co-opted Member:

Mary Clement, Roman Catholic Diocese

Quorum is 3 Councillors

Substitute Members

Substitutes:

Councillor Satnam Gill OBE
Councillor Mouna Hamitouche MBE
Councillor Angela Picknell
Councillor Nick Wayne

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

1 - 8

5. Chair's Report

6. Items for Call In (if any)

7. Public Questions

For members of the public to ask questions relating to any subject on the meeting agenda under Procedure Rule 70.5. Alternatively, the Chair may opt to accept questions from the public during the discussion on each agenda item.

B.	Items for Decision/Discussion	Page
1.	Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school - Witness Evidence	9 - 26
	a) Evidence from Head Teachers	
	b) Briefing note – Government review of Exclusion and Alternative Provision	
2.	Executive Member Update and Questions	27 - 28
3.	Work Programme	29 - 30
C.	Urgent non-exempt items (if any)	

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 items 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. Confidential/exempt items

G. 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 10 January 2019

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 - Thursday, 18 October 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on Thursday, 18 October 2018 at 7.00 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Debono (Chair), Cutler (Vice-Chair), Bell-Bradford, Ismail, Ngongo and Woolf

Co-opted Member: Mary Clement, Roman Catholic Diocese

Councillor Theresa Debono in the Chair

34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM NO. A1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Woodbyrne.

Councillor Ismail submitted apologies for lateness.

35 DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (ITEM NO. A2)

None.

36 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM NO. A3)

None.

37 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (ITEM NO. A4)

It was agreed to delete the words 'if they did not receive appropriate support' at Minute 31(a).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2018 be agreed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them, subject to an amendment to delete the words '*if they did not receive appropriate support*' at Minute 31(a).

38 CHAIR'S REPORT (ITEM NO. A5)

The Chair commented that the focus group with parents of excluded pupils had been very informative and the points raised by parents would inform the review of permanent and fixed period exclusion from school.

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

None.

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

None.

41 **PERMANENT AND FIXED-PERIOD EXCLUSION FROM SCHOOL - WITNESS EVIDENCE (ITEM NO. B1)**

(a) Peter Gray, Independent Expert and Government Adviser

The Committee received a presentation from Peter Gray, Independent Expert and Government Adviser, on the national context of the exclusions review.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- Nationwide, a total of 7,700 pupils were permanently excluded in 2016/17. This was an increase of 1,000 over the previous year.
- Nationwide, 382,000 pupils had received a fixed term exclusion in 2016/17, an increase of 40,000 on the previous year.
- The number of exclusions had reduced since 2006/07, however had steadily increased since 2010/11. The government had commissioned the Timpson Review to review school exclusion practices. This was expected to conclude in late 2018.
- The Committee considered the reasons for the initial decrease in exclusions over the previous decade. It was advised that between 2006 and 2010 schools had greater capacity and resources to support children inside of school. There was also a broader range of subject choices at Key Stage 4 which appealed to children with non-academic interests. There was an increase in the supply of alternative provision which could be accessed without exclusion. The government also encouraged the creation of 'behaviour and attendance partnerships' in which schools took collective responsibility for coordinating and commissioning services for young people at risk of exclusion. These had since been disbanded or had been incorporated into other forums.
- Although the needs of young people had increased in recent years, the rise in exclusions could not be attributed solely to an increase in need. Cuts to school budgets had resulted in reduced staffing levels and increased workloads.
- It was advised that some schools and academies, and in particular some large multi-academy trusts, had introduced 'zero tolerance' behaviour policies and these schools and academies tended to have higher rates of exclusion than other schools.
- Although Islington had retained a School Improvement function, other local authorities had not, and it was thought that this, coupled with an increase in the number of academies, had reduced partnership working between schools in some areas. Officers advised that they had

developed close relationships with academies in Islington and, in general, it was thought that they were supportive of the council's priorities for young people.

- Local authorities received 'High Needs Funding' which could be spent on support services for vulnerable and challenging pupils, however this was allocated based on population as opposed to need. This meant that any increase in need had to be met from within existing resources.
- It was suggested that the limited funding available to schools may provide a perverse incentive for schools to exclude pupils. Supporting a disengaged child to remain in mainstream education was resource intensive, whereas there was no cost to exclude a pupil.
- It was commented that, due to the limited funding available to schools, support services must be effective and have a measurable high impact.
- Many schools did not prioritise Personal and Social Education. It was thought that PSE provided an opportunity for young people to focus on their behaviour and develop their personal skills.
- It was thought that providing schools with comparative data on exclusions helped to raise standards. It was also useful to share with schools how much funding was allocated to supporting the pupils they had excluded, compared to other schools. Schools did not want to be seen to be out of line with their peers.
- Schools with strong partnership arrangements and that took collective responsibility for pupil engagement tended to have lower rates of exclusion. Some schools opted to share support services, which made them more affordable.
- It was commented that many schools would benefit from greater support for children with special educational needs. Nationwide, services needed to be more effective, more targeted, have an increased capacity, and pupils with special educational needs needed to be identified earlier.
- It was thought that greater monitoring of which pupils were receiving multiple fixed period exclusions could help in targeting resources more effectively.
- A survey had identified that many teachers did not consider 'managing behaviour' as a core part of their role. However, teachers did consider that they were responsible for supporting all children to engage in learning. It was essential to work positively with teachers and the Committee noted the importance of using language that teachers could relate to.
- Some pupils struggled when transitioning from primary to secondary school. Greater support for pupils at this time may be beneficial.
- It was important to listen to the voices of young people and respond to their needs.
- A member asked how alternative provision could be more inclusive. In response, it was advised that exclusion and alternative provision disconnected young people from mainstream education and young people wanted a second chance to engage. It was thought that using alternative provision flexibly as part of a package to meet a young person's needs would be a positive development.

- A member asked how the council could challenge schools on their use of 'zero tolerance' behaviour policies. In response, it was advised that this needed a national solution which sought to address the perverse incentives to exclude. League tables did not reward schools for being inclusive. It was thought that local authorities should share data and the cost consequences of exclusion with schools.
- Although the majority of excluded pupils were boys, the proportion of excluded girls had increased in recent years.
- A member suggested that there should be a financial deterrence to exclude and school exclusions data should be published in a league table. Although this may help to reduce the number of exclusions, it was noted that this would require national policy changes.
- It was noted that some parents supported 'zero tolerance' behaviour policies.
- The Committee asked in what circumstances exclusion was necessary. In response, it was commented that drug and weapon offences were serious and it was generally accepted that exclusion was an appropriate response to such instances; however, the majority of exclusions nationally were for persistent disruptive behaviour.
- The majority of exclusions were not unpredictable. Excluded pupils tended to have unmet needs and schools and support services needed to meet those needs more effectively and at an earlier stage.
- It was suggested that devolving funding for alternative provision to schools would make schools accountable for the quality of provision and may result in the development of more flexible provision. However, this would reduce local authority influence over provision.

The Committee thanked Peter Gray for his attendance.

(b) Gabriella Di-Sciullo, Head of Admissions and Children Out of School

The Committee received a presentation from Gabriella Di-Sciullo, Head of Admissions and Children Out of School, on the exclusion appeals process.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- The Committee noted the exclusion and appeals process and how it had developed over time. The government was responsible for providing regulations and guidance on exclusions.
- New regulations introduced in 2012 gave school governors greater responsibility for exclusions. Under the previous arrangements the Independent Appeals Panel was able to overturn a school's decision to exclude. Since 2012, the Independent Review Panel can only quash a decision when public law principles are contravened. The Panel can request that governors reconsider the decision to exclude, but have no power to compel them to do so. Since the change in regulation, the number of successful appeals had reduced from 57% to 21%.
- If a decision was quashed, the school was fined £4,000.
- At appeal stage the Head Teacher had to provide a report explaining why the pupil had been excluded. It was advised that the quality of

these reports varied. The Committee suggested that the council could share best practice on what is expected to be included in exclusion reports.

- It was suggested that an above average number of exclusions may suggest that a school's behaviour policy is not effective.
- Although the council ensured that local schools had behaviour policies which complied with statutory requirements, the council did not review policies for their effectiveness. It was queried if the council could adopt a process in which a set number of exclusions triggered a review of a school's behaviour policy. In response, officers suggested that it would be better for schools to take collective responsibility for behaviour management and develop best practice in partnership with each other.
- It was reported that the Fair Access Protocol had some success in reintegrating pupils into mainstream education.
- In response to a question, it was advised that no school was expected to take sole responsibility for reintegrating pupils into mainstream education. Transparency was key to the effectiveness of the Fair Access Protocol. Data on reintegration was shared with Head Teachers and every school was expected to take their fair share of pupils over time.
- In response to a question, it was advised that governor decisions were not reported back to the Independent Review Panel.
- Schools would convene a committee of governors to consider exclusion matters. Parent governors should not sit on these panels.
- It was suggested that not all governors were confident in dealing with exclusion issues and many would always choose to support a Head Teacher's decision. It was suggested that more could be done to develop the skills of governors.
- It was suggested that governors and parents should have a greater role in developing school behaviour policies.

The Committee thanked Gabriella Di-Sciullo for her attendance.

(c) Update on national exclusions data

Candy Holder, Head of Pupil Services, provided a data update. The following main points were noted in the discussion.

- Although Islington had higher rates of both fixed term and permanent exclusion than its statistical neighbours and the Inner London and England averages, it was noted that one primary school/academy was excluding far more pupils than others and this had a considerable negative effect on the borough's ranking. Officers advised that they had met with the Head and Chair of Governors to seek to address this, and reiterated that it would not be an effective use of resources to develop a new a 'whole-borough' approach.
- It was advised that the council was not able to sanction schools for excluding pupils. A member suggested that it may be possible to incentivise schools to reduce their exclusion rate.

The Committee thanked Candy Holder for her attendance.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES PERFORMANCE (Q1 2018/19) (ITEM NO. B3)

The report was presented by Carmel Littleton, Corporate Director of Children, Employment and Skills; Finola Culbert, Director of Safeguarding and Family Support; Mark Taylor, Director of Learning and Schools; Anthony Doudle, Head of School Improvement (Primary); and Penny Kenway, Head of Early Years and Childcare.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- The number of repeat young offenders had increased. This was attributed to a small but persistent cohort of young offenders. However, it was reported that the number of first time entrants to the youth justice system had decreased.
- The number of children missing from care and missing from home had increased, however the previous figures were unusually low.
- The percentage of children who had become the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time had increased by 5%, however this figure had been affected by families who had multiple children that were subject to a Child Protection Plan.
- The Committee was pleased that re-referrals to Children's Social Care had decreased. Officers commented that the council's model of motivational social work was having a positive impact.
- The percentage of children who were seen in accordance with a Children in Need Plan had decreased. There was no statutory requirement for how often children were seen. Although the council set a target of every four weeks, Ofsted recommended every six weeks. Officers commented that there was pressure on the Children in Need team due to an increase in the number of children with disabilities.
- The Committee welcomed the progress made in Early Years provision.
- Work on educational equalities was progressing. Officers had met with Head Teachers and had raised issues around the attainment and progress of Black Caribbean pupils at governor briefings. Officers were working to raise the profile of equalities issues and were encouraging schools to address this disparity.
- There was a concern that families from some demographic groups were not regularly accessing Children's Centre provision. The service was working on improving their data to allow promotional messages to be better targeted.
- A member highlighted that she had visited the Packington Hub and was advised that they were fully subscribed for two year olds but were losing pupils aged three and four. Officers advised that they were not aware of this particular issue, however commented three and four year olds were previously eligible for full-time funded places but this could no longer be offered due to reductions in the Dedicated Schools Grant.

- Following a question, it was advised that schools were responsible for how pupil premium funding was spent, however the council did challenge schools when necessary.
- A member noted that pupils eligible for pupil premium were not always the lowest achieving group and commented that it was important to closely monitor the progress of all pupils.

RESOLVED:

That the Children's Services performance indicators for Quarter 1 2018/19 be noted.

43

SACRE ANNUAL REPORT (ITEM NO. B2)

Anthony Doudle, Head of School Improvement (Primary), introduced the report which summarised the annual report of the Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- The Committee noted SACRE's work in supporting religious education in the borough.
- SACRE had worked to develop a new RE syllabus which focused on the six major faiths and humanism. Additional information could be added if a particular school had pupils of another faith which was not represented in the syllabus. The syllabus reflected the latest government guidance and officers considered that it provided a rich and diverse religious education.
- All Islington schools had a scheme of work that provided lesson plans for every aspect of the syllabus. This would help teachers in delivering the new syllabus in a safe, respectful and dignified way.
- Faith schools were not required to follow the syllabus, but all schools had access to the syllabus and the associated resources and were encouraged to make use of them.
- Collective Worship could be challenging for non-faith schools. The new syllabus allowed for schools to take part in 'collective reflection' on a Christian value instead.

The Committee noted the Annual Report and thanked Anthony Doudle for his attendance.

44

WORK PROGRAMME (ITEM NO. B4)

It was agreed that representatives of low-excluding schools would be invited to the next meeting to provide evidence on best practice.

MEETING CLOSED AT 9.05 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY REVIEW INITIATION DOCUMENT (SID)	
Review: Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school	
Scrutiny Committee: Children's Services Scrutiny Committee	
Director leading the review: Mark Taylor, Director of Schools and Learning	
Lead Officer: Candy Holder, Head of Pupil Services	
Overall aim: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To examine the use and impact of fixed period and permanent exclusion from both primary and secondary school, and make recommendations that will enable more children and young people to remain in mainstream education. 	
Objectives of the review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To understand how the school exclusion process operates and the work undertaken at school and local authority level to prevent exclusions. To review the support available to excluded pupils, and to scrutinise if this is effective. To explore the reasons for exclusions, and the reasons why Islington schools have higher rates of exclusion than the Inner London average. To evaluate the impact of permanent and fixed period exclusion from school for all stakeholders – the young person, their parents and family, the school, the Pupil Referral Unit and the Local Authority. To assess the effectiveness of school based provision and work being done by schools to improve behaviour and reduce exclusion, including access to effective support services. To examine the variability in readiness to exclude across Islington schools, and the perception by some parents whose children have been excluded that some schools are giving up on their children too soon and at too young an age. To review alternative interventions and approaches to fixed period and permanent exclusion and evaluate their effectiveness, informed by national and local good practice in successfully reducing exclusion. To evaluate provision for children and young people for whom mainstream education may not be appropriate. To review how all Councils services and functions can be utilised to reduce exclusions. To understand if and how the council can work with academies and Trust Boards on their exclusion practices. 	
Scope of the review: <p>The review will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exclusion trends/characteristic in Islington, including the different rates of exclusion between boys and girls, and the disproportionate representation of some minority ethnic groups; the interaction between these characteristics; why do certain groups appear more likely to be excluded? If pupils eligible for free school meals or with special educational needs are more likely to be excluded than the remainder of the cohort The effectiveness of exclusion in addressing disruptive behaviour, both for the excluded young person and across the school. 	

- The factors which influence schools' decisions to exclude, and their interaction with other services whose interventions, in partnership with the school and the family, might otherwise have helped to avoid exclusion.
- The impact of support, monitoring, challenge and intervention mechanisms from the Local Authority / Academy sponsors on schools' exclusions practices.
- The role of governors and Trust boards/Chief Executives in endorsing school policies, providing scrutiny and challenge of exclusion decisions by schools.
- The extent to which permanently excluded children and young people are able to return to mainstream education, and the challenges this presents for all stakeholders.
- Examples of good practice in managing children identified as being at risk of exclusion (e.g. Islington Schools with zero exclusion), and in reducing exclusion rates (including between different groups of pupils).
- If there are any common factors among pupils who are excluded and those who are persistently absent.

Type of evidence:

The Committee will:

- Hear the views of individuals affected by the exclusion of a child from school and their real-life experiences and observations of the exclusion process
- Be fully briefed on the current exclusion process including arrangements for appeal
- Visit New River College (Pupil Referral Unit) - the main destination for permanently excluded children and young people - to meet staff and young people
- Observe a Head Teachers briefing (all Islington Head Teachers) and discuss their views
- Receive witness evidence from national advisers

It is proposed that witness evidence is taken from:

- Children and young people excluded from school and their families
- Representative Headteachers
- Peter Gray, Independent Expert (Government Adviser)
- Gabriella Di-Sciullo, Head of Admissions and Children Missing Education
- Nigel Smith, Executive Head of New River College
- Gill Sassienie, Principal Educational Psychologist
- Head of Early Help Service
- Representative from Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services

Written evidence will include:

- Annual report on Schools and Learning (June 2017)
- Department for Education (DfE) statistical release: permanent and fixed period exclusions from schools and exclusion appeals in England 2016/17 (July 2018)
- Exclusion from maintained schools, academies and pupil referral units in England; Statutory guidance for those with legal responsibilities in relation to exclusion (DfE) (Sept 2017)
- Behaviour and discipline in schools; Advice for headteachers and school staff (DfE) (January 2016)
- 'They never give up on you' – Office of the Children's Commissioner School Exclusions Inquiry (2012)
- A Review of School Exclusion: terms of reference (May 2018) Edward Timpson for DfE (due to report to the Prime Minister by the end of 2018)

Additional information:

In carrying out the review the committee will consider equalities implications and resident impacts identified by witnesses. The Executive is required to have due regard to these, and any other relevant implications, when responding to the review recommendations.

Witness Evidence Plan

Committee Meeting – Monday 16 July 2018	
Who / What	Area of focus – Introductory Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny Initiation Document 	For the Committee to agree the aim, objectives and scope of the review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candy Holder, Head of Pupil Services 	Introductory presentation to include exclusions data; processes; the legislative framework; the roles and responsibilities of schools, the local authority, young people and their parents; and an overview of the impact that exclusions can have on young people, their families, schools, the Pupil Referral Unit, and the Local Authority.

August Recess	
Who / What	Area of focus – Background Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Evidence 	Written evidence will be circulated to members over the August recess. This will include background information that may be of interest to members; i.e. previous reviews carried out at national level, statutory guidance produced by the Department for Education, national statistics, and so on.

Committee Meeting – Thursday 13 September 2018	
Who / What	Area of focus – The Council's Role in Prevention and Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gill Sassienie, Principal Educational Psychologist 	The role of the educational psychology service in preventing exclusions and supporting pupils.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ruth Beecher, Head of Early Help Services 	The role of early help services in supporting pupils staying in school and preventing exclusion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representative of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services 	The mental health support available to young people at risk of exclusion, and to those who have been excluded.

Scrutiny Visit – Tuesday 2 October 2018	
Who / What	Area of focus – The views of parents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus Group with parents of excluded pupils 	To discuss exclusion issues with parents, their experiences and views on how schools and support services operate, the impact of exclusion on the family, how they think services and processes could be improved to better support young people and prevent exclusions.

Committee Meeting – Thursday 18 October 2018	
Who / What	Area of focus – The National Context
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peter Gray, Independent Expert and Government Adviser 	The national context and work underway across the country to prevent exclusion and support excluded pupils. To include best practice from other areas, and details of the government's Review of School Exclusion, due to conclude in late 2018.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gabriella Di-Sciullio, Head of Admissions and Children Missing from Education 	The exclusion appeals process.

Scrutiny Visit – Wednesday 21 November 2018	
Who / What	Area of focus – The experiences of young people
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to the New River College Pupil Referral Unit to meet excluded pupils and Nigel Smith, the Executive Head of New River College 	To talk to excluded young people about their experiences, to assess provision for excluded pupils, and to discuss the review with the Executive Head.

Committee Meeting – Thursday 22 November 2018	
Who / What	Area of focus – The views of Head Teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three Head Teachers to attend (ideally two secondary and one primary) 	To discuss their approach to exclusions and their views on processes and support.

Committee Meeting – Thursday 10 January 2019	
Who / What	Area of focus – Any outstanding matters
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings of the National Review of School Exclusion 	The national review should have concluded by January and the Committee will be able to assess its findings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other information as requested by the Committee 	To consider any outstanding information requested by the Committee during the course of the review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concluding Discussion 	For the committee to discuss their thoughts and conclusions on the evidence received, prior to developing recommendations.

Committee Meeting – Monday 4 March 2019	
Who / What	Area of focus – Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Recommendations 	To agree a set of draft recommendations that will form the basis of the committee's report.

Committee Meeting – Thursday 30 April 2019	
Who / What	Area of focus – Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Report 	To agree the final report, summarising all of the evidence received, and explaining the reasons for the recommendations. The report will then be submitted to the Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank

Government review of Exclusion and Alternative Provision – Briefing note for Children’s Services Scrutiny Committee

The Education Select Committee published the report of its inquiry into alternative provision (AP)¹ on 25 July 2018 (see briefing to Children’s Services Scrutiny Committee of 13 September 2018). The report

This briefing paper summarises the Government’s response² to the Select Committee report, published in October 2018. Some proposals within this response also reflect plans already set out ‘Creating Opportunity for All: our vision for reform’³, and the current review of exclusions being led by Edward Timpson (due to report in December 2018).

Responses to individual recommendations from the select committee:

What’s going wrong in mainstream schools?

Select committee recommendations:

- 1. The Timpson Exclusions Review should ensure that it looks at the trends in exclusion by school type, location and pupil demographics. (Paragraph 18)*
- 2. The Timpson Exclusions Review should examine whether financial pressures and accountability measures in schools are preventing schools from providing early intervention support and contributing to the exclusion crisis. (Paragraph 20)*

Government response:

- Throughout the review, Edward Timpson is engaging with key stakeholders, including a range of schools of different types and phases, alongside exploring the data on exclusions.
- We have also received over 900 responses from parents, children, schools, local authorities and other organisations, and these have been analysed to inform the review (the vast majority from parents).

Select committee recommendations:

- 3. The evidence we have seen suggests that the rise in so called ‘zero-tolerance’ behaviour policies is creating school environments where pupils are punished and ultimately excluded for incidents that could and should be managed within the mainstream school environment. (Paragraph 25)*
- 4. The Government should issue guidance to all schools reminding them of their responsibilities to children under treaty obligations and ensure that their behaviour policies are in line with these responsibilities. (Paragraph 26)*

Government response:

- We recognise that effective behaviour strategies across all schools, where children feel safe and stimulated in their education, are key to ensuring that all children are able to achieve their full potential. We believe that head teachers and teachers know best how to improve behaviour in their own schools.

¹ Forgotten children: alternative provision and the scandal of ever-increasing exclusions - <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmeduc/342/34213.htm>

² https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/748723/ESC_Government_response_FINAL.pdf

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/creating-opportunity-for-all-our-vision-for-alternative-provision>

Select committee recommendation:

5. The Government and Ofsted should introduce an inclusion measure or criteria that sits within schools to incentivise schools to be more inclusive. (Paragraph 27)

Government response:

- We agree with the Committee's recognition of the importance of schools being inclusive of all children, to create an environment in which every pupil has the opportunity to do well.
- The introduction of progress 8 provides greater accountability on schools to ensure they are supporting all pupils to make as much progress as they can, as it enables schools with lower attaining intakes to be recognised for the progress they make with those pupils.
- In his speech to the Association of Directors of Children's Services on 5 July 2018, the Secretary of State outlined the Government's commitment to both equip and incentivise schools to do better for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

Select committee recommendation:

6. We do not think that Ofsted should take sole responsibility for tackling off-rolling. Off-rolling is in part driven by school policies created by the Department for Education. The Department cannot wash its hands of the issue, just as schools cannot wash their hands of their pupils. (Paragraph 34)

Government response:

- Unlawfully removing a child from the school admission register is not acceptable practice, and we take any allegation of schools unlawfully "off-rolling" pupils very seriously. Once a pupil has been admitted to a school, they can be removed from the admissions register only in limited circumstances prescribed under regulation 8 of the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006, as amended.
- In April 2018, the Department published a call for evidence on elective home education (EHE). We are analysing the responses received and we will publish a response to the call for evidence in due course, setting out our conclusions on elective home education and related issues.

Select committee recommendations:

7. An unfortunate and unintended consequence of the Government's strong focus on school standards has led to school environments and practices that have resulted in disadvantaged children being disproportionately excluded, which includes a curriculum with a lack of focus on developing pupils' social and economic capital. There appears to be a lack of moral accountability on the part of many schools and no incentive to, or deterrent to not, retain pupils who could be classed as difficult or challenging. (Paragraph 36)

8. We recommend that the Government should change the weighting of Progress 8 and other accountability measures to take account of every pupil who had spent time at a school, in proportion to the amount of time they spent there. This should be done alongside reform of Progress 8 measures to take account of outliers and to incentivise inclusivity. (Paragraph 37)

Government response:

- The Government agrees with the Committee's comments which recognise that Progress 8 is a more nuanced and improved measure of school performance accountability than existed previously.

- We recognise, however, that no measure is perfect, and it can drive perverse incentives in the system in the absence of a counterbalance incentivising schools not to exclude pupils. This can be particularly true for schools with challenging intakes. This is why we are continuing to take action to improve school performance measures.
- Following feedback received about the disproportionate effect that a small number of extremely negative scores can have on a school's average progress score, from 2018, we are introducing a limit on how negative a pupil's progress score can be when calculating the school average for Progress 8 and for primary progress measures. This change will ensure that a school's overall progress score is not disproportionately affected by extremely negative progress scores of pupils whose attainment was affected by reasons beyond the schools control (e.g. health issues).
- Furthermore, we are considering issues around 'pupil-mobility' and exploring options to incentivise inclusivity in school performance measures.
- In a speech on 4 May 2018, the Secretary of State announced that there will be a public consultation on proposals to introduce a transparent 'trigger' to identify schools that would benefit from an offer of support.

The process of exclusion and referral

Select committee recommendations:

9. The exclusions process is weighted in favour of schools and often leaves parents and pupils navigating an adversarial system that should be supporting them. (Paragraph 44)

10. When a pupil is excluded from school for more than five non-consecutive days in a school year, the pupil and their parents or carers should be given access to an independent advocate. This should happen both where pupils are internally or externally excluded from school, or where the LA is arranging education due to illness. (Paragraph 47)

Government response:

- The Government recognises the importance of engaging parents and carers with every aspect of a child's education, and has taken steps to ensure that they have access to information about the exclusions process.
- In September 2017, we published new, non-statutory guides for parents to support their understanding of the exclusions process.
- All head teachers are legally required to notify parents when their child has received an exclusion and the reasons for it, without delay.
- The head teacher should also draw attention to relevant sources of free and impartial information and advice on exclusions that parents can access.
- The Government welcomes the Committee's proposal for stronger parental engagement. The [Timpson] review of exclusions is exploring how the parent and pupil experience of exclusion varies and is looking for best practice in engaging parents and pupils effectively in the exclusions process. We have sought the views of parents through the Call for Evidence, which received over 900 responses of which the majority were from parents. The Department will consider any necessary action following the publication of Edward Timpson's report.

Select committee recommendation:

11. Legislation should be amended at the next opportunity so that where Independent Review Panels find in favour of the pupils, IRPs can direct a school to reinstate a pupil. (Paragraph 45)

Government response:

- The Government does not intend to implement the Committee's proposal, but our intention is to support schools to manage poor behaviour and intervene early to address any underlying causes. In addition, the Government is committed to improving the quality of the provision so that excluded pupils receive an excellent education.

Select committee recommendations:

12. Where responsibility sits for excluded children in a local area has become very ambiguous. The Timpson Exclusions Review needs to clarify whose responsibility it is to ensure that excluded or off-rolled pupils are being properly educated. This could be the local authority or it could be local school partnerships, but at the moment too many pupils are falling through the net. (Paragraph 46)

13. Local authorities have statutory responsibilities to provide suitable education for pupils and yet can have little oversight or scrutiny over decisions about exclusions and placement decisions. This may be due to inadequate resourcing, which needs to be addressed. We are also concerned by the lack of transparency about exclusion rates that are available to parents about schools. (Paragraph 62)

14. We recommend that LAs are given appropriate powers to ensure that any child receive the education they need, regardless of school type. (Paragraph 63)

Government response:

- The Committee rightly recognises that our guidance on exclusions suggests that there is a role for local authorities to play in the oversight and monitoring of exclusions.
- When a child is excluded, all schools including academies are required to notify the local authority.
- All local authorities are also required to have a Fair Access Protocol in place to ensure that outside the normal admissions round unplaced children, especially the most vulnerable, are offered a place as quickly as possible. These Protocols are often used to monitor vulnerable children in the area and ensure that they are effectively placed in other schools.
- The [Timpson] exclusions review is looking at the factors driving differences in exclusion rates between schools, areas of the country and pupils with different characteristics, and it is focused on how exclusion is used in practice. The review is not looking at the legislative framework for exclusions.
- The review is also being conducted alongside the AP reforms announced in March 2018, and we are also committed to clarifying the expectations for the roles and responsibilities of schools, alternative providers and local authorities in commissioning and delivering high quality AP.
- We plan to build on AP research and the conclusions of the [Timpson] exclusions review by updating statutory guidance, commissioning, funding, inspection arrangements and legislation as required.

Select committee recommendation:

15. The Government should encourage the creation of more specialist alternative providers that are able to meet the diverse needs of pupils with medical needs, including mental health needs. (Paragraph 53)

Government response:

- The duty to arrange AP and responsibility for commissioning is devolved to a local level. It is right that local areas decide what provision is needed in their area as they know their population best. Schools, local authorities, medical professionals and other agencies should work in partnership to deliver provision to meet the needs of each individual child.
- Alternative providers also often have close links to wider mental health services. In December 2017, the Government published a Green Paper, 'Transforming children and young people's mental health provision', which sets out an ambitious set of proposals to fill the gap in support for children and young people's mental health. This outlined how Government will test, through the Mental Health Support Team trailblazers, how mainstream, special and AP settings, including PRUs, can enhance provision for the most vulnerable children.

Select committee recommendations:

14. There is an inexplicable lack of central accountability and direction. No one appears to be aware of all the provision that is available, which impacts on both schools, local authorities and parents. Unless all providers are required to notify the local authority of their presence, not all schools or LAs will be able to make informed decisions about placements. Without someone to take responsibility for co-ordinating and publishing information about the local provision that is available, parents and pupils will remain unable to fully participate in discussions about alternative provisions referrals. (Paragraph 56)

15. All organisations offering alternative provision should be required to inform the local authority in which they are based of their provision. The local authority should then make the list of alternative providers operating in their local authority available to schools and parents on their website. (Paragraph 57)

Government response:

- We agree that schools, alternative providers and local authorities should work in partnership to commission AP effectively, and that commissioners of AP should be aware of all AP available in their area. We will consider the Committee's recommendation alongside the recently published findings from the AP research programme we have commissioned, as part of our programme of reforming AP.

Select committee recommendation:

16. Pupil Referral Units, and other forms of alternative provision, should be renamed to remove the stigma and stop parents being reluctant to send their pupils there. We suggest that the Government seeks the advice of pupils who currently attend alternative provision when developing this new terminology. Many have described AP as specialist provision, offering children a more tailored, more personal education that is more suited to their needs. (Paragraph 58)

Government response:

- No child should be stigmatised by where they attend school. We recognise that for some children and parents, a referral to AP does not initially represent a positive choice. However, many children who attend AP recognise that it has given them more tailored support, a second chance and a fresh start to engage in their education.

- We want AP to provide an ambitious education that meets children’s needs and prepares them for success in the next phase of their education, and we recognise that many providers already do this, regardless of their name.
- Schools are able to choose their names, both when they are established and at any point afterwards, and we know that many alternative providers adopt this approach. [Locally, New River College chose their name in collaboration with their students, choosing to refer to it as a college rather than a Pupil Referral Unit]. We support local authorities and governing bodies in taking this approach.

Select committee recommendation:

17. Schools should publish their permanent and fixed term exclusion rates by year group every term, including providing information about pupils with SEND and looked after children. Schools should also publish data on the number of pupils who have left the school. (Paragraph 64)

Government response:

- The Department publishes a National Statistic release annually, which reports on permanent and fixed-period exclusions from state-funded primary, state-funded secondary and special schools, based on exclusion data collected via the School Census. As well as school level exclusions, this publication includes information on the following:
 - Reasons schools report for excluding pupils;
 - Exclusions for different pupil groups, including SEND, ethnicity, free school meal eligibility and English as an Additional Language;
 - Independent exclusion review panels; and
 - Exclusions from PRUs.
- Edward Timpson’s review of exclusions is exploring the differences in exclusion rates between schools, areas of the country, and pupils with different characteristics, to examine the factors that drive these differences.

Select committee recommendations:

18. Schools do not always have the capacity and specialist knowledge to have full responsibility for the commissioning of long-term placements for pupils who will often have complex needs. If, as we discussed in paragraph 52, local authorities are unaware of provision in their area, they too do not always have enough knowledge to make appropriate commissioning decisions. A fragmented approach to commissioning responsibilities and a lack of oversight and scrutiny around decisions means that pupils are being left vulnerable to inappropriate placement decisions. (Paragraph 66)

19. The best Fair Access Protocols work well because they are local and understand the needs of their communities. However, this is not always the case, and it is not right that some schools can opt out of receiving pupils back to mainstream schools or following the Fair Access Protocol. (Paragraph 71)

20. Government should issue clearer guidance on Fair Access Protocols to ensure that schools understand and adhere to their responsibilities and encourage reintegration where appropriate. No school should be able to opt-out and if necessary either the local authority or the DfE should have the power to direct a school to adhere to their local Fair Access Protocol. (Paragraph 72)

Government response:

- The Government implemented Fair Access Protocols through the School Admission Code, to ensure that, throughout the school year, unplaced children, especially the most vulnerable, are found and offered a place as quickly as possible, so that the amount of time any child is out of school is kept to the minimum.

- All local authorities are required to have a Fair Access Protocol in place, developed in partnership with local schools, including academies, who are also required to comply with the Fair Access Protocol for their area. That means if a child is referred to a school via the protocol, they must be admitted. Where it appears a school is in breach of a statutory duty, the Secretary of State has the power to intervene and direct the school to comply with that duty.
- It is important that local authorities and schools have the freedom to develop and agree Protocols, which best serve the needs of children in their area. In practice, many local authorities establish Fair Access Panels to facilitate the Fair Access Protocol, and we encourage the use of these where all schools and local authorities are working in partnership to make sure every child referred to the protocol is found a suitable school place as quickly as possible.
- We are considering revising the guidance around Fair Access Protocols, to ensure roles and responsibilities are better understood.

Select committee recommendations:

21. There should be greater oversight of exclusions and the commissioning of alternative provision for all pupils by the local authority. These children need a champion, and schools need both challenge and support. (Paragraph 76)

22. There should be a senior person in each local authority who is responsible for protecting the interests and promoting the educational achievement of pupils in alternative provision, which is adequately resourced. This role and post-holder should be different from that of the Virtual School Head for Looked-After Children. (Paragraph 77)

Government response:

- In practice, many local authorities will already have this staffing structure to ensure there is sufficient oversight of the commissioning process, including where a school is commissioning AP, and a champion to represent this group of children.
- We are concerned that implementing this requirement at this time would impose additional burdens on local authorities, and we believe that local authorities should be able to allocate their resourcing and funding to meet their needs best.

What does good alternative provision look like?

Select committee recommendations:

23. Government should collect best practice and provide dedicated resources and guidance to schools to improve behaviour and reduce exclusion and develop appropriately resourced Learning Support Units. This guidance should include that all LSUs are staffed by at least one qualified teacher. The Government should also investigate the practice of placing students in isolation units. (Paragraph 87)

Government response:

- We support the use of in-school alternatives where they are used to provide support to pupils, to keep a child engaged in their education and to prevent exclusion.
- The Department is aware that many mainstream schools establish and maintain internal behaviour support units (referred to as Learning Support Units by the Committee) as a tool to effectively managing behaviour within school.
- With regard to isolation rooms, the Department's behaviour and discipline advice makes clear that schools can adopt a policy which allows disruptive pupils to be placed in isolation away from other pupils for a limited period. As with other disciplinary penalties, schools must act lawfully, reasonably and proportionately in all cases.

- Through the review of exclusions, Edward Timpson is looking at practice in schools in relation to behaviour management and exclusions, including identifying effective approaches that improve outcomes. He aims to report on his findings by the end of the year.

Select committee recommendations:

24. Ofsted should carry out thematic inspections of in-school alternative provision. (Paragraph 88)

We welcome the Committee's recommendation and we support Ofsted in looking at the use of in-house alternatives, as part of their ongoing wider work investigating behaviour management in schools.

25. All trainee teachers, in order to achieve Qualified Teacher Status, should be required to undertake a placement outside of mainstream education, for example in a special school or in alternative provision. (Paragraph 96)

Government response:

- We agree with the Committee that teaching in AP should be held in high regard, and attract the highest quality leaders and teachers, which in turn ensures there is sufficient high quality and specialist provision to meet the needs of these children.
- The Government does not prescribe the content of Initial Teaching Training (ITT) courses. It is for ITT providers to use their professional judgement to determine the content and structure of courses, but they must prepare trainee teachers to demonstrate that they have met all of the Teachers' Standards at the appropriate level.

Select committee recommendations:

28. We do not consider that there are sufficient checks on unregistered providers. If pupils are placed in unregistered provision, without sufficient oversight, their education and safety is put at risk. We are not convinced that the quality and consistency of oversight is enough not to require there to be registration and regulation across the sector. (Paragraph 109)

29. No pupil should be educated in unregistered provision for more than two days a week. The Government, Ofsted and independent school inspectorates should consider how this may affect different forms of alternative provision so that where providers want to accept pupils for more than two days a week, they are able to register and be subject to a suitable inspection and regulation regime. Schools that commission any alternative provision should be responsible for the quality of that provision. (Paragraph 110)

Government response:

- We are clear that all schools, regardless of their type, are responsible for providing a safe environment to educate young people.
- A setting must be registered as an independent school if it meets the criteria for registration.
- It is a criminal offence to operate an unregistered independent school. Where settings are illegal and unsafe, the Government has a duty to act and protect the children within those settings. That is why we have established a joint team with Ofsted.
- We have also signalled our intention to change legislation, when parliamentary time allows, to strengthen the registration requirement in relation to independent education settings.

Select committee recommendations:

30. Mainstream schools should be more proactive in their engagement with alternative provision. All mainstream schools should be 'buddied' with an alternative provision school to share expertise and offer alternative provision teachers and pupils opportunities to access teaching and learning opportunities. (Paragraph 113)

Government response:

- We know that many mainstream schools and alternative providers have developed strong working partnerships to collaborate and share expertise and practice.
- It is the Government's vision that effective practice in AP is shared across the school system and with other services, because the sector has extensive expertise in working with vulnerable children that would benefit mainstream schools.

Successful outcomes and destinations**Select committee recommendations:**

31. This framework should take into account the fragmented educational journey that these pupils will have had, and enable schools to demonstrate all the achievements of their pupils. We urge the Government to ensure that it uses the very broadest of measures, including softer skills that pupils have developed as well as harder outcomes like apprenticeship take up. (Paragraph 119)

Government response:

- We recognise that, beyond Ofsted judgements, there is no systematic way of identifying and celebrating effective practice in AP.
- As set out in our vision for AP, we intend to develop a bespoke performance framework for the AP sector, to ensure that there is a suitable mechanism for measuring the activity in AP that enables pupils to make rapid personal, social and educational progress.
- The development of the performance framework will consider a number of metrics such as improved attendance, destinations and educational outcomes.

Select committee recommendations:

32. It is extraordinary that the increase in the participation age was not accompanied by statutory duties to provide post-16 alternative provision. Pupils neither stop being ill at 16, nor do they stop being in need of additional support that would enable them to access education. These pupils are being denied access to post-16 education because the system is not designed or funded to accommodate their additional needs. There is a clear will in the sector to provide post-16 education to pupils in alternative provision, and a clear need on the part of pupils. (Paragraph 123)

33. Given the increase in participation age to 18, the Government must allocate resources to ensure that local authorities and providers can provide post-16 support to pupils, either in the form of outreach and support to colleges or by providing their own post-16 alternative provision. (Paragraph 124)

Government response:

- The Government agrees it is important that children and young people in AP are able to access post-16 education and training provision that meets their needs, and we remain committed to ensuring that they are able to achieve successful and sustained outcomes in adult life.

- The duty on local authorities to arrange AP applies only to children of compulsory school age (5 to 16). When the Government raised the participation age to 18, it did not raise the compulsory school age, but expected 16 and 17 year olds to engage in the wide range of education and training possibilities available to them.
- We recognise that children in AP may need additional support when entering post-16 provision.
- It is our expectation that the majority of children in AP would benefit from one of the many types of post-16 provision on offer, and we do not believe at this time that there is a need for Government to impose a new duty on local authorities to establish new types of post-16 provision when the landscape is already so varied.
- We welcome the Committee's views on post-16 provision for children in AP. We will continue to consider how we can further improve outcomes for these young people.

Government review of Exclusions and Alternative Provision – Overview

House of Commons Education Committee:
(Sept 17 – July 18)

‘Forgotten children: alternative provision and the scandal of every increasing exclusion’ (July 2018)

Report suggests its conclusions and recommendations be read as a Bill of Rights for pupils and parents, as follows:

- Schools should not rush to exclude pupils: (i.e. schools should be inclusive).
- Parents and pupils have a right to know how often schools resort to exclusion: (i.e. schools should publish their exclusion rates termly)
- Parents deserve more information when their children are excluded: (i.e. the process currently parents and pupils fighting a system that should be supporting them).
- Pupils and their parents should have someone in their corner: (i.e. access to independent advocacy).
- Parents and pupils should be given accurate information about the range and type alternative provision that is available locally: (i.e. all AP providers should be required to inform the local authority in which they are based - the local authority should then make the list available to schools and parents).
- Independent Review Panels should be able to direct a school to reinstate pupils: legislation should be amended at the next opportunity so that this can happen.

Secretary of State for Education
‘Creating Opportunities for All – our vision for Alternative Provision’
(March 2018)

Sets out the Government vision for AP:

- The right children are placed in alternative provision;
- Every child in alternative provision receives a good education;
- Every child can make a successful transition out of alternative provision;
- Alternative provision becomes, and is recognised as, an integral part of the education system; and
- The system is designed to achieve high quality outcomes for children and value for money for the taxpayer.

Sets out the Government’s plan to:

- Lay strong foundations for reform by: building the evidence base; reviewing exclusions practice; and supporting schools to establish systems to manage poor behaviour
- Develop and share effective practice within alternative provision by: ensuring alternative AP settings can access school improvement resources and improving young people’s transition out of alternative provision
- Strengthen partnership arrangements for commissioning and delivering alternative provision

Government response to the Education Committee’s report on alternative provision (October 2018)

Summary:

- Commitment to equip and incentivise schools to be more inclusive
- Consider evidence on elective home education
- Consider pupil mobility and impact on school performance
- Consider a ‘trigger’ for support to schools who disproportionately exclude
- Consider further measures for stronger parental engagement following Timpson report
- Consider revision to Fair Access guidance on roles and responsibilities
- Consider practice in schools in relation to behaviour management / exclusion
- Develop a bespoke performance framework for the AP sector
- Consider how to further develop post-16 provision for young people in AP
- Changes to primary legislation and the introduction of Independent Review Panels rejected

Edward Timpson Review of School Exclusion (Due to report in December 2018)

Terms of Reference: to explore

- Practice in schools in relation to behaviour management and exclusions.
- The exclusions process in schools e.g. how head teachers decide when to exclude, the role of governors
- practice in schools in relation to directing pupils to alternative provision
- the drivers behind the variation in exclusion rates of:
 - pupils of groups
 - geographic variation
 - rates between schools
- Best practice in managing exclusions e.g. Fair Access protocols
- How effective joint working impacts on exclusion
- How the parent and pupil experience of exclusion varies
- Steps taken by schools to ensure that their behaviour and exclusion practices are compliant with duties under the Equality Act 2010
- The statutory guidance in place to ensure effective use of exclusion

This page is intentionally left blank

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

22 November 2018

Executive Member Questions

The Executive Member for Children, Young People and Families will provide an update on his work. The Committee is invited to ask questions on any matter in relation to the executive portfolio or the work of the Committee. The procedure for Executive Member questions is set out below.

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 Friday 16th November 2018. The Chair may also permit questions to be asked at the meeting without notice.

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, Young People 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 2018/19

Tuesday 26 June 2018

1. Membership, Terms of Reference, Dates of Meetings
2. Executive Member Annual Presentation
3. Child Protection Annual Report
4. Education Annual Report
5. Scrutiny Topics and Work Programme 2018/19

Monday 16 July 2018

1. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school
– Scrutiny Initiation Document and Introductory Briefing
2. Post-16 Education Employment and Training Review 2016/17 – 12 Month Report Back
3. Quarterly Review of Children's Services Performance (Q4 2017/18)
4. Review of Work Programme

Thursday 13 September 2018

1. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school – Witness Evidence
2. Support for children with special educational needs and disabilities
3. Review of Work Programme

Thursday 18 October 2018

1. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school – Witness Evidence
2. SACRE Annual Report
3. Quarterly Review of Children's Services Performance (Q1 2018/19)
4. Review of Work Programme

Thursday 22 November 2018

1. Executive Member Update and Questions
2. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school – Witness Evidence
3. Review of Work Programme

Thursday 10 January 2019

1. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school – Witness Evidence and Conclusions
2. The effectiveness of Islington Council's Free School Meals Policy
3. Quarterly Review of Children's Services Performance (Q2 2018/19)
4. Review of Work Programme

Monday 4 March 2019

1. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school – Draft Recommendations
2. Islington Safeguarding Children Board: Annual Report
3. The Children's Services Response to Prevent – Update
4. Implementation of the Fair Futures Commission recommendations

Thursday 30 April 2019

1. Executive Member Update and Questions
2. Education Annual Report
3. The role of Islington's supplementary schools
4. Quarterly Review of Children's Services Performance (Q3 2018/19)
5. Permanent and fixed period exclusion from school – Final Report

WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20**Thursday 13 June 2019**

1. Membership, Terms of Reference, Dates of Meetings
2. Child Protection Annual Report
3. Scrutiny Topics and Work Programme 2019/20