



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 1, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on **18 October 2018 at 7.00 pm.**

Lesley Seary
Chief Executive

Enquiries to : Jonathan Moore
Tel : 0207 527 3308
E-mail : democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched : 10 October 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. Declaration of Substitute Members
3. 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.

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

1 - 10

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	11 - 16
(a) Peter Gray, Independent Expert and Government Adviser	
(b) Gabriella Di-Sciullio, Head of Admissions and Children Out of School	
(c) Update on national exclusions data (for information) <i>[to follow]</i>	
2. Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) Annual Report	17 - 30
3. Quarterly Review of Children's Services Performance (Q1 2018/19)	31 - 46
4. Work Programme	47 - 48

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 22 November 2018

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, 13 September 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on Thursday 13 September 2018 at 7.00 pm.

Present: Councillors: Debono (Chair), Cutler (Vice-Chair), Ismail, Ngongo, Spall, Woolf and Woodbyrne
Co-opted Member: Mary Clement, Roman Catholic Diocese

Councillor Theresa Debono in the Chair

24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM NO. A1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bell-Bradford and Spall.

25 DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (ITEM NO. A2)

None.

26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM NO. A3)

None.

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

It was agreed to delete the words 'who considered exclusion to be a 'badge of honour'' at minute 20(b).

It was requested that the local labour market analysis referenced at minute 21 be circulated to members of the Committee.

It was agreed to insert an additional point at minute 21, as follows:

- A member noted that the scope of the Committee's review of Post-16 Education, Employment and Training did not include evidence from school sixth forms and colleges - the main providers of post-16 education – in respect of their role in developing pathways for young people and supporting them into employment. It was suggested that this may be an area suitable for further scrutiny in future. Following the meeting, it was advised that officers were due to commission a Local Skills Strategy that would assess the role of sixth forms and colleges and may be a useful reference for future work, should the Committee decide to revisit the topic.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2018 be agreed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) To delete the words '*who considered exclusion to be a 'badge of honour''*' at minute 20(b); and

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

- (ii) To insert the words '*A member noted that the scope of the Committee's review of Post-16 Education, Employment and Training did not include evidence from school sixth forms and colleges - the main providers of post-16 education – in respect of their role in developing pathways for young people and supporting them into employment. It was suggested that this may be an area suitable for further scrutiny in future. Following the meeting, it was advised that officers were due to commission a Local Skills Strategy that would assess the role of sixth forms and colleges and may be a useful reference for future work, should the Committee decide to revisit the topic.*' at minute 21.

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

The Chair advised that Osama Al-Jayousi, the Primary Parent Governor Representative, had stepped down from the Committee.

The Chair noted that members of the Committee had been invited to attend a workshop on scrutinising school performance data.

It was noted that a glossary of key terms had been circulated to members of the Committee. It was agreed that this would be a live document and updated as required.

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

None.

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

None.

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

- a) Gill Sassienie – Principal Educational Psychologist

The Committee received a presentation from Gill Sassienie, Principal Educational Psychologist.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- The educational psychology service took a 'whole school approach; working with school leadership, teachers, families, children, and on school systems and processes.
- The service was comprised of 11.7 FTE staff. This was occasionally supplemented by trainees from local universities.
- The service provided a core service funded by the local authority and an additional traded service which schools could choose to purchase. Statutory work included assessments of children at risk of exclusion, those with complex needs, and children who were vulnerable (i.e. looked after children, or young people engaging with the Youth Offending Service). Traded services included consultations and assessments for students with SEND, workforce development, policy development, and direct interventions with pupils.
- One of the service's biggest challenges was funding; as the demand for statutory services was increasing, the service was not able to offer as much early intervention and discretionary work as officers would like.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

- Only 5 of the 32 permanently excluded pupils in 2017-18 had been in contact with the educational psychology service; two of those had not been involved recently and a further two had only accessed the service after their exclusion. Although this limited involvement could suggest that the service was effective at preventing pupils from being excluded, officers thought that they should be involved in more cases, and considered that some schools did not refer pupils at risk of exclusion for educational psychology often enough, or at an early enough stage.
- Officers commented that some schools bought a lot of discretionary services from the Educational Psychology Service, whereas others either did not have the available funding, or did not consider educational psychology to be a priority for its pupils.
- Referrals to the service had increased recently, and officers hoped that this would help to prevent exclusions.
- Officers emphasised the importance of early intervention. The Educational Psychology Service considered that pupils engaging with its services were less likely to be excluded, and if they had to move placement it would be managed more carefully.
- The service offered both support and challenge to schools. Sometimes it was necessary to challenge schools on their processes and decisions, however as a traded service purchased by schools, the service had to be constructive in its criticism.
- The service met with school leaders on a termly basis. This meeting would consider a range of matters, including the latest exclusions data.
- Educational psychology assessed young people holistically, evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, to determine why young people exhibited certain behaviours. Psychologists then created a hypothesis and made recommendations for schools and young people to implement strategies to help them cope in school. For pupils, this sometimes resulted in practical changes, for example not sitting in assembly for so long, or working in a different way.
- Officers acknowledged that implementing different strategies for pupils could be difficult for teachers, and explained that the educational psychology service worked with teachers to support them in implementing embedding different approaches.
- Officers commented that it was helpful for teaching staff to have a basic understanding of adolescent psychology as this helped them to recognise and understand their pupils' behaviours.
- The Educational Psychology Service helped to support staff wellbeing; the service offered staff supervision and this service was valued by schools. The service sought to give teachers the capacity to de-escalate situations in their classroom.
- The service worked with head teachers on school ethos; it was explained that schools which had a nurturing ethos and involved parents in their work tended to exclude fewer pupils than schools that had a stronger focus on enforcing school rules.
- Some permanently excluded pupils were later diagnosed as having special educational needs and issued with an EHCP. It was suggested that earlier diagnosis would result in these pupils receiving the support they needed to stay in mainstream education.
- Research suggested that schools with lower rates of exclusion reported higher rates of staff wellbeing.
- Officers reported that, in their experience, pupils at New River College felt a sense of belonging and that they had positive relationships with staff.
- The Education Psychology Service suggested that the number of exclusions could be reduced by schools adopting a more nurturing approach. It was also

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

suggested that parenting classes could help parents to support children with behavioural issues more effectively. However, it was recognised that some schools and parents did not want to change, and the challenge would be convincing schools and parents that change can be beneficial.

- A member of the Committee commented that, due to the limited funding available to schools for procuring additional pupil support services, some schools prioritised resources on support for children with significant special educational needs and learning difficulties over those with emotional and social needs. The Committee understood that schools faced difficult decisions on how to allocate their very limited funding, however it was also noted that pupils with emotional and social needs tended to have behavioural difficulties which could put them at risk of exclusion if they did not receive appropriate support.
- The Committee queried how many young carers had been excluded or were at risk of exclusion. Although figures were not available, it was noted that young carers may be vulnerable and struggle to fully engage in education.
- A member queried if the schools which did not buy discretionary Educational Psychology services tended to have higher rates of exclusion. In response, it was advised that the highest excluding secondary schools did not buy many discretionary educational psychology services, however the position with primary schools was more mixed. The highest excluding primary school did buy discretionary educational psychology services.
- The Educational Psychology Service was concerned that some exclusions appeared to be avoidable and suggested that a lack of support and training on managing behavioural issues was contributing to the borough's exclusion rate. Officers suggested that developing the skills of school staff was a sustainable way of managing behaviour, however also noted that schools with high rates of staff turnover would have difficulties in embedding strategies to support pupils at risk of exclusion.
- A member noted that many parents supported schools in adopting zero tolerance approaches to behaviour, as they did not want their child's learning to be disrupted by other pupils. It was queried how schools could be inclusive whilst also having a strong focus on behaviour. In response, the Educational Psychology Service appreciated the importance of consistency, however also thought that schools should allow a level of flexibility in their behaviour policies for vulnerable pupils at risk of exclusion.
- The Committee noted the pressures on schools from parents, government targets and Ofsted. It was understandable why schools would want to adopt strong a behaviour management policy in that context.
- In response to a question on why so few excluded pupils had accessed the Educational Psychology Service, it was commented that schools tended to separate support services from behaviour management pathways; they were often managed by different staff with different priorities. Officers thought that greater join-up between support services and behaviour management practices would result in more holistic support for pupils at risk of exclusion.
- Islington Council did not provide a behaviour support service to schools. New River College had an outreach team which was available to schools, however this was a small team with limited resources. Officers considered that, on the whole, schools managed behaviour effectively.
- Officers emphasised that Islington offered a range of comprehensive support services to schools which were not available in other areas.
- Following a question from a member of the public, officers commented on the importance of supporting excluded pupils and ensuring that they are placed in a welcoming environment in which they have opportunities to progress.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

b) Ruth Beecher – Head of Early Help Services

The Chair noted that Abi Onaboye, Head of Strategy, Policy and Commissioning, was unavailable and that the evidence would be presented by Ruth Beecher, Head of Early Help Services.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- Early Help services worked with schools, council services and partners to help children and families needing additional support.
- Some families had problems which had been entrenched for generations; these families had complex needs and needed significant levels of support. Early Help was an approach to supporting families which sought to address problems at an early stage before they become entrenched.
- Early Help approaches were beneficial as they resulted in better outcomes for families and less expenditure on specialist services by local authorities.
- Early Help services worked with schools to support young people at risk of exclusion and their families. Early Help services also supported parents of young people with challenging behaviours, including those who were persistently absent.
- Families First was an open-access service which families could approach for support on any matter without stigma. Families sometimes needed help engaging with schools on issues related to their child's education.
- Islington Families Intensive Team (IFIT) provided more concentrated support to families with more entrenched issues, but who did not necessarily meet the threshold for statutory services.
- Early Help services provided a range of support to families; it was explained that some families needed a referral to a specialist service (e.g. CAMHS) whereas others simply needed a trusted person to talk through their problems with and to provide advice. The services sought to take a positive approach and focus on a family's strengths, rather than their weaknesses.
- Some parents had a poor relationship with their child's school; this could sometimes be a historic issue if parents did not have a positive relationship with their own school.
- An Early Help worker was linked to every school; the service was present at parent evenings to engage with families and occasionally held coffee mornings for parents.
- A recent survey found that 92% of safeguarding leads in the borough knew about the council's Early Help services.
- The Committee considered case studies of families engaging with Early Help services, and noted how the work of the service could help a family achieve positive outcomes.
- Officers working in the council's Early Help services did not believe that fixed term exclusion helped young people to change their behaviour. Officers considered that engagement with support services and implementing interventions was far more effective.
- Officers commented that some pupils at risk of exclusion had undiagnosed special educational needs.
- Officers explained that it was challenging for Early Help services to work across schools which had very different behaviour policies. Different rules at different schools made it difficult to give parents consistent and helpful advice, and some parents queried why some behaviours were punished more severely in some schools than others.
- Whereas social workers focused on immediate risks to the family; Early Help services could take a wider focus on behaviour, school attendance, and other issues which did not meet the threshold for statutory intervention.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

- Officers highlighted that many excluded pupils had been victims of or witnessed domestic violence. The council had recently received funding to trial a new approach to supporting families experiencing domestic violence; this involved greater partnership work with the Police, schools, and social workers.
- c) Dr Helen Aspland & Jane Stephenson-Glynn – Child and Adolescents Mental Health Services (CAMHS)

The Committee received a presentation from Dr Helen Aspland, Clinical Psychologist Lead for CAMHS in Schools and Pupil Referral Units, and Jane Stephenson-Glynn, Children's Health Commissioning Manager.

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- CAMHS was a multidisciplinary service with representation from a range of psychologists and psychotherapists. All primary schools had access to a CAMHS worker for half a day a fortnight for 5/6 half terms, and all secondary schools had access to a CAMHS worker for a day a week for 5/6 half terms. This core provision was funded by the Islington Schools Forum.
- In addition to the core provision, schools could buy in additional CAMHS services. 6 secondary schools and 12 primary schools in the borough had an SLA with CAMHS. Provision was also available to the New River College PRU.
- CAMHS offered a wide range of support to both young people and school staff. The service provided direct assessment and intervention with young people, as well as support to staff, workshops with parents, and training.
- Some schools were making use of consultation and using CAMHS to help train staff and develop their practices. It was thought that this was an increasingly attractive offer to schools given the lack of funding available for direct intervention.
- CAMHS staff were passionate about taking a 'whole school approach' which involved working with schools, public health and school improvement officers to develop trauma informed practices in schools. Officers commented that this had a real impact on how schools work with young people and helped to promote wellbeing and resilience.
- Officers commented that families were often referred to CAMHS when a child was on the cusp of exclusion; this was sometimes too late, and it was thought that earlier referral would result in more positive outcomes for young people.
- Officers thought that pupils could be referred to CAMHS earlier. Whilst some young people exhibited very challenging behaviour, their behaviour was also predictable, and it was suggested that further work was required to encourage schools to make referrals at an earlier stage.
- CAMHS officers wanted schools to keep an open mind about what was driving behavioural issues in young people, and make referrals as required.
- CAMHS officers commented that the way in which some schools and teachers manage behaviour can be triggering to young people with mental health issues. It was explained that dealing with poor behaviour in a way that lacks empathy can escalate situations in the classroom. CAMHS wanted to help teachers to manage behaviour in a way that would diffuse tensions.
- Following a question on the training available to school staff, it was advised that a range of training was offered to schools, however CAMHS officers had noticed that the same staff routinely attended their sessions. It was suggested that it would be beneficial for a wider range of school staff to attend the training on offer.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

- The Committee welcomed that the CAMHS service also supported the wellbeing of teaching staff, commenting that it was important for teachers to be supported in dealing with disruptive and challenging pupils.
 - It was suggested that the reduction in school resources, particularly through the loss of teaching assistants, had a significant impact on support available to pupils.
 - The Committee considered the impact of exclusion on pupils and their families. Excluded pupils were vulnerable to exploitation. Exclusion could also put significant pressure on parent-child relationships and staying at home with excluded pupils could put a parent's employment at risk. It was emphasised that mainstream school was the best setting for the vast majority of pupils.
 - CAMHS officers suggested how support for pupils at risk of exclusion could be improved. It was suggested that more sophisticated data sharing arrangements, developed with due regard to Data Protection requirements, would help school staff to understand the needs of young people. CAMHS officers advised that some areas had adopted 'pyramid of need' approaches, where a young person's needs were categorised without explicit reference to their individual circumstances. This allowed a wide range of school staff to be aware of a young person's needs and how best to support them, without having details of their personal circumstances.
 - Following a question, it was advised that some young people had benefitted from art therapy, as well as cultural, leisure and sporting activities focused on promoting wellbeing.
 - A member noted that excluded young people attending pupil referral units tended to achieve poor outcomes, and asked if anything could be done to improve outcomes for those already excluded. In response, it was advised that comprehensive support was available to pupils at the New River College PRU, however excluded pupils faced considerable challenges.
 - A member advised that she was impressed with the provision available at New River College, commenting that the level of support available to young people was commendable. Following a query on exposure to Adverse Childhood Experiences, it was commented that a good explanation of how such experiences affected young people mentally and physically was available in a TED Talk from Nadine Burke Harris; and it was agreed that this would be circulated to the Committee.
- d) Briefing note: Government review of pupil exclusion, and a statement on alternative provision

Candy Holder, Head of Pupil Services, introduced the briefing note, which summarised the latest progress on the Government review of pupil exclusion, and related matters.

A member queried how the council could challenge schools on exclusion matters. In response, it was advised that officers regularly met with headteachers and governors on a range of matters and exclusion could be discussed in those meetings. Although the council did not have a formal role in supporting academies, issues around exclusion could be taken up with the relevant academy trust or the Regional Schools Coordinator. However, it was emphasised that there was no mechanism for the council to formally challenge the performance of academies.

Officers expressed caution on developing borough-wide strategies on exclusion when the majority of exclusions were attributed to only a small number of schools. It was suggested that it would be better to develop the support on offer to those schools and work intensively with them on introducing an ethos and culture in which both pupils and teachers were supported and focused on managing behaviour.

The Committee thanked officers for their attendance.

SUPPORT FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES (ITEM NO. B2)

Candy Holder, Head of Pupil Services, presented to the Committee on the support available for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

The following main points were noted in the discussion:

- Officers emphasised the importance distinguishing between low levels of achievement and SEND. Similarly, children with English as a second language could not be considered to have a learning difficulty solely because of their language skills.
- Children with SEND could be broadly categorised as having four distinct areas of need: communication and interaction; cognition and learning; social, emotional and mental health; and physical and sensory needs. Islington's local offer was focused around meeting those needs.
- Officers explained that the borough's special schools were focused on supporting children with different areas of need; and officers considered that Islington provided a good local offer for a small borough.
- The Children and Families Act 2014 introduced reforms which changed the way in which children with SEND are supported. Young people with SEND were assessed to allow an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) to be developed. This was an outcome focused, personalised plan which detailed how a young person should be supported.
- Around 3.9% of Islington's young people were eligible for an EHCP. This was above the London and England average of 2.1%. More boys than girls were eligible for an EHCP, compared to the national profile.
- A new Ofsted and Care Quality Commission inspection regime had been introduced in recent years. Islington had not yet been inspected, however an inspection was anticipated in the near future.
- The Committee considered the profile of Islington's young people with SEND, and the outcomes of local young people with SEND in comparison to other local authorities. Although pupils with an EHCP and accessing SEND support achieved a good level of development in Early Years provision and tended to achieve a good level of attainment at Key Stage 2, further work was needed to improve the attainment of pupils with an EHCP at Key Stage 4.
- Islington pupils with an EHCP had achieved good levels of attainment at Key Stage 4 in recent years and officers expressed their disappointment at the most recent statistics which placed Islington 139th out of 152 local authorities against this indicator. It was noted that the previous year Islington was ranked 17th.
- Officers commented on the importance of co-producing SEND services with parents and young people. Six parents had worked with officers to co-produce the SEND Charter. The council had also established a 'Parent Parliament' of 70 parents to consult with.
- The council's priority was preparing young people with SEND for adulthood.
- Officers acknowledged that further work was needed to improve the support available to young people and their families. Officers commented on the need to embed multi-agency work, to ensure that young people with SEND received consistent support across services. However, it was considered that Islington offered high-quality provision which was developed in partnership with parents and young people.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 13 September 2018

- The Committee queried if the fact that fewer girls than boys in Islington were eligible for SEND support suggested that there was under-identification of girls with SEND. A member commented that girls with autism and other learning difficulties tended to behave differently to boys with the same needs. In response, officers indicated that they were not aware of a significant under-identification issue, however this may be an area for review in future.
- The Committee queried why White British and Black Caribbean pupils in Islington were more likely to have SEND compared to the national average. In response, officers advised that this was a complex area and was being reviewed as part of the wider equalities work around White British and Black Caribbean attainment.

The Committee thanked officers for their attendance.

33 WORK PROGRAMME (ITEM NO. B3)

Noted.

MEETING CLOSED AT 9:55PM

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
<p>Overall aim:</p> <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.
<p>Objectives of the review:</p> <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.
<p>Scope of the review:</p> <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"> Abi Onaboye, Head of Strategy, Policy and Commissioning (Early Help) 	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 – Late September / Early October	
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 – Late October / Early November	
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

ISLINGTON SACRE

ANNUAL REPORT

2017-2018



1. CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION

Religious Education encompasses not only religious literacy and the knowledge of the values and insights of religious and non-religious world views, but also the endorsement of diversity and the encouragement of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding within our neighbourhood, our nation and the wider world. Since it is the only strand of the National Curriculum which can be moulded by local circumstances and perspectives a SACRE is in a unique position to take account of local needs and circumstances. In so doing Islington SACRE seeks to provide the encouragement, support and steer local schools as they seek to provide teaching of the highest quality.

After the successful launch in September 2017 of a new RE Curriculum for Community Schools in the Borough, Islington SACRE's task has been, with the support of RE Today consultant Kate Christopher, to roll-out the new syllabus for the teaching of RE in all Key stages and to provide support and training to RE teaching. In this, we have sought to provide a framework for the teaching of Religious Education based on current thinking on religious education, but attentive to local circumstances and the needs of Islington schools. Continuing the implementation of the syllabus and scheme of works, along with developing the syllabus to take account of local knowledge and circumstances will be SACRE's first and most important on-going task. Work with local schools and faith communities will be the key to this, so that the continuing renewal and broadening of the membership of Islington SACRE remains an important task for the committee. It's to be hoped that other groups not currently represented can be encouraged to provide representatives to ensure that all voices are heard and every perspective included.

Summary of strategic plan arising from this report is given on page 5- section 8.

2. ADVICE TO STATUTORY BODIES

a) Local Authority

The major advice offered to the LA by SACRE in the year 2017-18 has been that the Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education initialled in September 2017. This is a statutory requirement of SACRE. The requirement has been discussed in SACRE meetings, and SACRE have made efforts to alert the Local Authority to the need to be involved in SACRE's decision regarding the Syllabus.

SACRE are pleased to state that councillor Michelline Ngongo has pledged their attendance at SACRE's AGM, thus providing the quoracy required to approve updates to the Agreed Syllabus. We are grateful for her support.

b) Schools

Through the Syllabus Launch on September 2017, SACRE has advised schools of the need to consider updating the Agreed Syllabus and has sought to engage Secondary and Primary school leaders and teachers in further developing the Scheme of work to provide a range of relevant useful alternatives, relevant to the local context. Teachers are strongly in favour of adopting RE Today's Model Agreed Syllabus as Islington's Agreed Syllabus, as many SACREs across the country are doing. This is seen as the most supportive option for teachers across Islington. Objections were raised and explored, but did not override desire for a practical, assessment-driven syllabus.

3. STANDARDS AND QUALITY OF PROVISION OF RE

a) Public examinations

It seems that SACRE should not publish public examination results, as was noted in the 2013-14 Annual Report. Examination results were last published in 2012-13's Annual Report.

Table 1: Islington's 2016 and 2017 RS GCSE data:

2016 RS GCSE	Islington Yr 11 inc special schools	2017 RS GCSE	Islington Yr 11 inc special schools
A*	53	A*	60
A	148	A	119
B	272	B	186
C	201	C	187
D	137	D	109
E	55	E	62
F	29	F	50
G	12	G	22
U	12	U	12
X	0	X	3
No of entries	919	No of entries	810
No of C and above	674	No of C and above	552
% on roll entered for GCSE RS	53.6	% on roll entered for GCSE RS	58.7
% of entries achieved C and above	73.3	% of entries achieved C and above	68.1

The 2016 data above shows that only 53.6% of all pupils on roll are entered for GCSE RS. In 2017 this figure was 58.7. The 2012 Agreed Syllabus does not contain specific work for KS4. This could suggest that a significant proportion of KS4 pupils are not receiving any RE at all, in breach of the law, or there could be other reasons. This is the sort of analysis SACRE could pursue with data relating to specific schools.

Public examination data at KS5 (A' Level) can also provide useful trends in individual colleges and schools.

b) Attainment in RE not covered by public examinations

SACRE does not have straightforward access to monitoring and reporting of RE at KS1, 2 or 3 apart from through teachers. All schools are currently engaged in developing monitoring and assessment systems to replace levels. Government guidance has been for schools to develop their own schemes and there is a great deal of uncertainty and replication of work. SACRE could support schools in formulating an assessment scheme for Religious Education at all age groups. The Model Agreed Syllabus offers a reliable method of assessing RE which could be tweaked by individual schools, with SACRE's support. Such an initiative could also provide a useful mechanism for SACRE to gain insight into quality of provision in schools.

c) Quality of RE provision in schools

In previous years Islington SACRE has supported initiatives to strengthen local RE; a youth SACRE ('RE Champions'), a joint conference with Camden to address RE's contribution to community cohesion, a Primary and Secondary RE network and a day conference for teachers and pupils. Links with Islington Faith Forum have also been forged. Sustaining these initiatives and connections is currently taking a back seat to decisions regarding a new syllabus, but their continuance should be part of SACRE's strategic plan.

In the process of deliberating on a new syllabus, SACRE members have articulated further ideas and suggestions to strengthen the proposed curriculum. These developments would be a valuable addition in the form of appendices to the Syllabus. The appendices could be introduced to teachers through RE sessions at

the teachers' networks. This would offer a local flavour to the Syllabus, ensure SACRE members' expertise is of direct benefit to teachers and offer an opportunity for teachers and SACRE to connect. Again, this could become part of SACRE's strategic plan to support and strengthen the local RE curriculum.

In addition SACRE could consider putting on another joint conference with Camden and Westminster SACREs. This would be a way for SACRE members to offer their skills and knowledge outside of SACRE business meetings. SACRE members could contribute to a discussion of what constitutes collective worship in a plural city in the 21st Century. This could then be produced as a guidance document for schools and made available on the Islington SACRE website.

4. Agreed Syllabus

a) Review

The Agreed Syllabus, launched in September 2017, with the involvement of Islington RE teachers.

5. Collective Worship

a) Compliance with Statutory Requirements

Collective worship is a statutory requirement of all maintained schools, and of Free Schools and Academies according to their funding agreements. It is the responsibility of the Headteacher (maintained schools and Academies) or the governors (voluntary aided schools). It should happen once a day, outside curriculum time, and be 'broadly Christian' unless the school has an alternative religious designation. It is not the same as assemblies, and could take place in one class or year group only. Parents have the right of withdrawal. 'Collective worship' should be educational and inclusive, as opposed to 'corporate worship', which is active religious worship by members of the same faith. For this reason all children should attend collective worship unless withdrawn.

This reflects the most recent legislation regarding collective worship; DfE circular 1/94. However in 2012 the DfE gave schools the choice as to follow circular 1/94 or not. There is much confusion regarding this subject.

b) Quality of Collective Worship and Reflection

SACRE has a responsibility to monitor and support collective worship. SACRE could examine any inspection reports for mention of collective worship (as well as Religious Education) and offer guidance to Heads and school leaders. No school has yet approached SACRE for support in this area. However, materials now available on the Islington SACRE website have been made available to support discussions by school teachers and leaders in providing relevant, bespoke Collective Worship and Reflection for their context.

c) Determinations

SACRE also carries the responsibility of granting determinations, where a school requests that collective worship of a broadly Christian character is inappropriate for their students and teachers. There have been no requests for a change of determination.

d) Complaints about Collective Worship

There have been no complaints regarding collective worship.

6. Management of SACRE

a) Attendance at SACRE by Committee

Committee A: Christian other than the Church of England/other Faiths and Beliefs

Committee B: Church of England

Committee C: Teacher and Headteacher association, others representing education interests

Committee D: Local Authority councillors

SACRE was inquorate for every meeting in 2013-14, according to that year's Annual Report. No member from Committee D attended any meeting, and attendance by members of Committee C was also of concern. In the year 2015-16, one meeting was inquorate, but members of Committee D attended all three meetings. In the years 2016-17 and 2017-18 two meetings were inquorate due to non-attendance of Committee D members. The issue of inquoracy seems to centre around the attendance of Committee members C and D. After conversations the clerk and adviser have come to understand that Councillors need more advance notice, which SACRE will undertake to provide. SACRE are grateful for the Borough's support of their work. Further recruitment of Committee A and C would helpfully broaden the representative base of SACRE. Although the Annual Report of 2015-16 noted that Committees B also seemed to be a problem, this is not at the moment the case.

b) Membership and Training

SACRE have not received any formal training this year, although faith members have made valuable contributions to discussions surrounding the new syllabus. It is to be hoped this interest could lead to SACRE members directly contributing to teaching and learning, supported by the adviser to SACRE, through appendices to the Agreed Syllabus.

As noted, a SACRE conference could be a forum to both utilise SACRE members' expertise and offer further development in their understanding of the role of SACRE.

7. Contribution of SACRE to the wider Local Authority Agenda

a) Contribution of SACRE to LA agenda

One of Islington's major priorities is tackling inequality through housing, opportunities and employment. For young people with a tough start in life educational qualifications are one mechanism by which they can improve their prospects. In this sense every subject of the curriculum can contribute to tackling inequality. RE is unique in that it is outside government control and thus could provide a forward-thinking curriculum aimed at equipping young people with the knowledge and skills needed for the 21st Century. There is interest of a curriculum along these lines in SACRE. This could be developed in conjunction with further additions to the Agreed Syllabus.

It has long been shown by antiracist studies in education that schools themselves tend to reproduce societal inequalities, such as along class, ethnicity and gender lines. This is a wider issue than one subject of the curriculum and concerns teacher education. However, bringing teachers together to consider how schools can be fairer and more equal in their outcomes could be part of SACRE's work in supporting the Borough's attempts to fight inequality.

b) Contribution of SACRE to equality duty

Attached is the Islington census data by religion from 2011, showing a striking diversity. Although learning about other groups does not automatically ameliorate social alienation or tensions, a chance to find out about others is a key part of improved social relations. Therefore, a contribution SACRE could make to exploring diversity in Islington could be through an RE curriculum reflecting this diversity. As mentioned, a scheme of work on the Alevi community of Islington already exists. A Jain member has offered to contribute to the Syllabus. Examples such as these show how the RE curriculum could give pupils the opportunity to find out about other groups in the borough and offer a safe space to talk, ask questions and listen. Initiatives such as a youth SACRE and interfaith work could also contribute to a wider equality agenda by offering opportunities for dialogue and friendship, in conjunction with learning about the structural and political causes of social exclusion.

c) Support of schools

SACRE’s major contribution to schools will be through the provision of an Agreed Syllabus every 5 years. SACRE can ensure this is as up to date and supportive as possible, allowing teachers to deliver high quality RE and contribute to students’ critical faculties and general education. SACRE can also support teachers through the network or conferences and pupil days in delivering high quality RE.

8. Summary and Suggestions for Strategic Plan

NB: the existence of a strategic plan is noted in 2014-15 and 2015-16’s Annual Reports. These would form a helpful basis for future planning and can be appended to this Report.

- To continue to expand and develop the Agreed Syllabus, in concert with schools, faith communities and others some of the diversity of Islington.
- Improve the dialogue between and among SACRE and Islington RE teachers through the networks
- Use examination and other school data to monitor trends and identify areas of need or concern
- To disseminate information on collective worship and reflection which will be of value to teachers and school leaders, and to support schools in seeking best practice for collective worship and reflection
- To evaluate the performance of SACRE and continue to seek to renew the membership of each section of the committee.
- To encourage schools to gain RE Quality Mark status
- To develop a youth SACRE across the borough
- To consider how far RE in Islington can support a wider equality and diversity agenda.

9. Membership of SACRE, including LA officers, clerk, chair and adviser

Category A

Name	Judith Fox
Faith/Organisation	Board of Deputies of British Jews

Name	Mohamed Mahmoud
Faith/Organisation	Muslim Welfare House Trust

Name	Merium Bhuiyam
Faith/Organisation	Muslim Educational Trust

Name	Teddy Prout
Faith/Organisation	British Humanist Association

Name	Rosalind Miller
Faith/Organisation	Sikh

Name	Vinay K Shah
Faith/Organisation	Jain

Name	Frank Tettsu Woods
Faith/Organisation	Harrow Zazenkai-White Wind Zen Community

Name	Conor McGinn
Faith/Organisation	Roman Catholic Church

Name	Tim Bradshaw
Faith/Organisation	Free Church Federal Council

Category B

Name	Fr David Allen, Chair
Faith/Organisation	Church of England

Name	April Keech
Faith/Organisation	St. Mary Magdalene Academy – Church of England
Address	Lough Road, London N7 5RR
E mail	april.keech@smmacademy.org

Name	Mary Thorne
Faith/Organisation	London Diocesan Board for Schools
Address	LDBS,36 Causton Street, London, SW1P 4AU
E mail	Mary.thorne@london.anglican.org

Name	Revd Dave Tomlinson
Faith/Organisation	Church of England

Category C

Name	Sophie Morgan
Faith/Organisation	Secondary RE Lead
Address	St. Mary Magdalene Academy, Lough Road, London N7 5RR
E mail	Sophie.Morgan@SMMAcademy.Org

Name	Semra Gökçe
Faith/Organisation	RE Primary Schools Coordinator
Address	Winton Primary School, Killick Street, London N1 9AZ
E mail	sgokce@winton.islington.sch.uk

Name	Ian Benson
Faith/Organisation	Head of RE Special Schools
Address	New River College, Lough Road, London, N7 8RH
E mail	Ian.Benson@nrc.islington.sch.uk

Name	Damien Parrott
Faith/Organisation	Primary Head's
Address	Drayton Park Primary School, Arvon Road, London, N5 1PJ
E mail	damien.parrott@draytonpark.islington.sch.uk

Name	Ann Dwulit
Faith/Organisation	Primary Head's
Address	Federation of St Luke's CoE and Moreland Primary Schools
E mail	headteacher@st-lukes.islington.sch.uk

Category D

Name	Cllr Joe Caluori
Faith/Organisation	Islington Council Majority Party (Labour)
Address	Islington Town Hall, Upper Street, London N1 2UD
E mail	joe.caluori@islington.gov.uk

Name	Cllr Michelline Ngongo
Faith/Organisation	Islington Council Majority Party (Labour)
Address	Islington Town Hall, Upper Street, London N1 2UD
E mail	michelline.ngongo@islington.gov.uk

Category D Reserves

Name	Cllr Asima Shaikh
Faith/Organisation	Islington Council Majority Party (Labour)
Address	Islington Town Hall, Upper Street, London N1 2UD
E mail	asima.shaikh@islington.gov.uk

Type	No. filled	No. of Vacancies
Committee A		
Roman Catholic Diocese of Westminster	1	0
Methodist	1	0
Salvation Army	0	1
United Reform Church	1	0
Baptist Union	0	1
Society of Friends	0	1
Greek Orthodox Church	0	1
Elim Pentecostal Church	0	1
Jewish	1	0
Muslim Community	2	1

Name	Cllr Raphael Andrews (retired May 2018)
Faith/Organisation	Islington Council Majority Party (Labour)
Address	Islington Town Hall, Upper Street, London N1 2UD

Supporting officers:

Name	Anthony Doudle
Faith/Organisation	London Borough of Islington – School Improvement Team
Address	Municipal Building 222 Upper Street, London, N1 1XR
E mail	Anthony.doudle@islington.gov.uk

Name	Kate Christopher
Faith/Organisation	National RE Today Adviser
Address	RE Today Services 5-6 Imperial Court, 12 Sovereign Road, Birmingham, B30 3FH
E mail	kate@retoday.org.uk

Name	Victoria Osbourne
Faith/Organisation	London Borough of Islington – Clerk to SACRE
Address	Municipal Building 222 Upper Street, London, N1 1XR
E mail	vosbourne@yerbury.islington.sch.uk

Jain	1	0
Buddhist	1	0
Islington Baha'i Community	0	1
Hindu	0	1
Sikh	1	0
Daoist	0	1
Humanist	1	0
Committee B		
Church of England	4	0
Committee C		
NUT	0	1
Association of School and College Leaders	1	0
NAHT	0	1
NASUWT	0	1
Head of RE Secondary Schools	1	0
Head of RE Special Schools	1	0
Head of RE Primary Schools	1	0
Committee D		
Islington Council	2	0
Representatives of Governor Organisations	0	1
Total	20	14

This page is intentionally left blank

Islington SACRE Strategic Development Plan 2017 – 2018

1. Ensure SACRE performs its statutory functions

- 1.1 Advise LA on religious education and collective worship
- 1.2 Monitor the agreed syllabus and schedule annual review of its impact**
- 1.3 Publish annual report**
- 1.4 Recruitment and recurrent training of SACRE members**
- 1.5 Networking with other SACREs and appropriate organisations
- 1.6 Secure appropriate financial and human resources to undertake its statutory functions

2. Religious Education

- 2.1 monitor standards and provision of RE in schools
 - review public exam data
 - explore ways of monitoring provision and achievement in KS1-4
 - **support schools with assessment data for religious education**
- 2.2 provide/ensure provision of
 - induction and training – RE Learning HUB – launch in September 2018
 - **supporting schools to achieve RE Quality Mark (REQM)**
 - advice for teaching the Agreed Syllabus
 - resources [linked to Agreed Syllabus]
 - relevant [statutory/non-statutory/other] guidance – collective worship, PE and Ramadan
- 2.3 promote importance of RE
 - **to schools/academies – engage governors and head teachers at termly LA briefing meetings**
 - **to LA [members & officers] - Annual Report presented to LA Scrutiny Panel**
 - **to community of Islington – representatives on the Islington Community of Schools Board**
- 2.4 facilitate/encourage people of faith/belief visiting schools in appropriate way – updated Places of Interest to be sent to all schools

3. Collective Worship

- 3.1. monitor provision of daily collective worship
- 3.2 consider any action to improve the provision of collective worship – provide updated guidance for all schools**
- 3.3 make determinations regarding collective worship
- 3.4 review process for applying and considering requests for determinations
- 3.5 review determinations of collective worship every 5 years

4. Islington specific policy

- 4.1 encourage attendance at SACRE so that its is quorate and so able to discharge its functions**
- 4.2 ensure elected members are fully informed about matters related to religious education and collective worship**
- 4.3 organise bi-annual conference with Camden SACRE 2019**
- 4.4 collaborate with Islington Faith Forum in the interests of good religious education
- 4.5 engage with the Islington Youth Council to encourage young people's contribution to the work of Islington SACRE**

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of: Corporate Director of Children, Employment & Skills

Meeting of:	Date	Ward(s)
Children's Services Scrutiny Committee	18 October 2018	All
Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt

SUBJECT: Quarterly Review of Children's Services Performance (Q1 2018/19)

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This Quarter 1 performance report provides an update on progress against Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) across Children Employment & Skills.
- 1.2 A Data Dashboard, showing performance against the KPIs, is included in a separate attachment. This report should be read alongside the dashboard for a full, rounded understanding of performance in each area.
- 1.3 This report has been substantially restructured compared to previous reports, to reflect the agreed outcomes for the local authority under the Outcomes Based Budgeting (OBB) approach, as well as the new Corporate Indicators for 2018/19.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To consider Children's Services performance in Quarter 1 2018/19;
- 2.2 To agree that the set of measures contained in these reports should be refreshed, to ensure the indicators reported are relevant and aligned with current service priorities.

3. Background

- 3.1 The main body of this report is set out using selected KPIs under each of the outcomes within the Corporate Plan for 2018-22. Corporate Indicators, including Equalities Indicators, are highlighted. Only those KPIs where new data is available at the time of writing are discussed in this report, to avoid repetition from previous performance updates.
- 3.2 Other than the revised Corporate Indicators, most of the KPIs in this report have remained as part of the set being reported for the last two years. At the time, some of these were set as they were areas of work which were a focus for improvement. Many of these areas of work are now not in need of the same level of scrutiny as they once did. Therefore, it is suggested that the set of indicators reported to Children's Services Scrutiny are reviewed during the next quarter, and amended where appropriate.

CES OBB Outcome: Creating a safe and cohesive borough for all

1.1 – Corporate Indicator - Percentage of young people (aged 10-17) triaged that are diverted away from the criminal justice system

80% of young people triaged in Q1 2018/19 were diverted away from the criminal justice system. This is in line with performance during 2017/18, although it was an improvement on performance in the first quarter of last year alone.

The offer from the Targeted Youth Support (TYS) team continues to be robust in ensuring that young people who are in need of effective early intervention and prevention work are supported at the earliest possible opportunity. This is particularly applicable to the cohorts of young people who are displaying behavioural difficulties and low-level offending and anti-social behaviour. TYS continue to offer eligible young people a robust, multi-agency package which aims to deter any further progression or escalation of their needs. The duty system, in conjunction with CSCT, enables professionals, agencies (such as schools) and self referrals to be made to assist in this regard. Work has also taken place to strengthen the TYS detached youth work programme, where workers focus on working with young people in areas in the borough which have been identified as being 'hotspots'. This has included repromoting the use of the truck and helps workers to signpost young people to the appropriate services and/or interventions.

1.2 - Corporate Indicator - Number of first time entrants into Youth Justice System

There were 16 first time entrants in the first quarter of the year, which is one below the number reported during the same period in 2017/18.

This level of performance shows significant improvements when compared to the Q1 performance of the previous two years. Some of the reasons for this improvement were covered in the commentary for 1.1 and are also applicable to this indicator. In addition, the Triage service which is offered through Targeted Youth Support being part of the duty service via CSCT, has helped ensure that young people are effectively screened and supported early on. This is leading to a more robust package of support for young people who are being diverted from offending via the Triage process and also to those young people who need more comprehensive support via Youth Cautions, Youth Conditional Cautions and Referral Orders. We are also being proactive in ensuring that young people who have had cases dropped by the Police via a 'No Further Action' are contacted and offered support. This process started via the Pre-Court Panel earlier in the year and we may be seeing the impact of this work now.

1.3 - Corporate Indicator - Percentage of repeat young offenders (under 18s)

Provisional data suggests out of the 44 young people in the cohort for 2018/19, 15 had reoffended as at the end of Q1 2018/19 (34%). This is a higher percentage than what was reported at the same time of 2017/18.

There has been a lot of effort at a casework, operational and strategic level to deal with the issue of a small, but significant group of young people who are responsible for a number of offences. We recognise that there is more to do despite these efforts. We are continuing to use the Youth Justice Board's 'live tracker' tool to identify, track and monitor the cohort (and any newcomers). In addition, this cohort of young people are being offered intensive support and resource to reduce the likelihood of them offending. Due to the multiple needs that these young people have, we have made efforts to enhance the health offer via CAMHS and the speech and language worker and we have secured funding to support 10 of our highest risk offenders into employment or training. The offer of the Integrated Gangs Team (IGT), is also being used for the cohort and these young people are also offered a mentor from St Giles Trust or Safer London.

Note – the comparison shown above is a snapshot at the end of the year. This measure actually gets refreshed during the year and is not totally reliable until some time after the data is reported (as the outcomes of offences are confirmed throughout the year).

1.4 - Corporate Indicator - Number of custodial sentences for young offenders

After a large drop in the number of custodial sentences in 2017/18, there was an increase in Q1 of 2018/19, compared to the same period of 2017/18, with 12 young people sentenced to custody in the quarter.

It is recognised that this is a large number of young people to be sentenced to custodial sentences within one quarter and this is the highest number within a quarter for a considerable period of time. In order to contextualise this, however, Q1 always seems to be the period in Islington where we see larger numbers of young people sentenced to custody.. Despite the gravity of some of the offences involved, the custodial sentences at the time of writing, so far in Q1 have been minimal. This means that the significant achievements in relation to the imposition of custodial sentences for our young people remain and we are no longer the poorest performing Youth Offending Service in London for this indicator. Magistrates and the courts are more confident in the Youth Offending Service (YOS) and are now more likely to agree with our proposals. For serious offences, however, the only option much of the time is custody. In Q1, we held another open evening for magistrates and District Judges that was very well attended and we were given a 10/10 rating by most attendees.

Work is also underway to look at the disproportionality issues that exist when it comes to the sentencing of young BME people who are more likely to receive custodial sentences and we have now created a tracking tool to help us monitor this.

1.5 - Number of children missing from care for 24+ hours

1.6 - Number of children missing from home

There has been an increase in the number of children missing from care for more than 24 hours each month during the first quarter of 2018/19, rising from 8 in March to 14 in June 2018. However, the June total is in line with the same month in 2017.

The number of children who went missing from home in June was 22, an increase from the 12 in March 2018. However, the number in March was the lowest total in any single month in 2017/18. The June 2018 figure of 22 children missing from home is in line with most other recent months, and lower than the same period in 2017 (31 children).

Protection from harm whilst children are missing from care or from home, starts with a multi-agency response using Strategy meetings to ensure there is a robust safety plan in place. During quarter 1, 14 missing strategy meetings were chaired independently by the Exploitation and Missing Team. The process regarding safeguarding missing children has continued to be embedded within Social Work teams, meaning strategy meetings do not always require an independent chair. We have developed our missing person notifications and alerts system to support the child being found as quickly as possible.

All missing children are cross referenced to see if there are links to CSE, gang affiliation, serious youth crime or exploitation. This ensures that risks are assessed at the earliest opportunity and safety plans are developed which are multi-agency. The Exploitation and Missing Team continue to provide training across the council and through the ISCB which explores the link between children that go missing and risk of exploitation.

The data evidences that there has been an increase in the number of children missing from care for more than 24 hours during the first quarter of 2018/2019. However when compared with June 2017, the figures are similar. This demonstrates that there has been limited change in terms of the number of children remaining missing for over 24 hours when comparing year on year. The Exploitation and Missing Team continue to provide new starter briefings in which the missing process is outlined to ensure new members of staff are clear about the steps they should take to safeguard a missing child. In addition there is continuous scrutiny and senior management oversight of children who do go missing, in order to support the child being found without delay.

Islington's demographic profile remains similar – in terms of the boys more likely to go missing than girls, and children aged 16 and 17yrs going missing more frequently.

CES OBB Outcome: Delivering an inclusive economy, supporting people into work and financial independence and helping them with the cost of living

No new data is available for any of the KPIs relating to children and young people under this outcome area

CES OBB Outcome: Making Islington the best place for all young people to grow up – where children and families can thrive and reach their potential

Performance in relation to Learning & Schools should be considered within the context of the current strategic priorities for Learning & Schools, as set out in the refreshed service plan:

- Narrowing the gap in attainment between Black-Caribbean pupils and the LBI average at KS2 and KS4 (KS2 gap in percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths. KS4 gap in Progress 8)
- Narrowing the gap in attainment between White British pupils eligible for FSM and the LBI average at KS2 and KS4. (KS2 gap in percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths. KS4 gap in Progress 8)
- Improving attainment and progress measures at every stage so that they are closer to, at, or above the inner London average (particularly for SEND pupils at KS4)
- Ensuring that all schools are good or outstanding
- Reducing the number of primary school children who are persistently absent and increasing attendance to be at or above the inner London average
- Reducing exclusions so that they are at or below statistical neighbours
- Continuing to secure high quality provision for children and young people with SEND – evidenced in the pending SEND inspection
- Increasing the percentage of 2year old places taken up by low income families, children with SEND or who are looked after
- Effectively supporting the Islington Community of Schools, so that it continues to develop as a school led self-improving system

3.1 – Percentage of families with under-5s registered at a Children's Centre

Data for 2017/18 shows that 82% of Islington families with children under 5 were registered with a Bright Start Children's Centre. This is lower than the 90% reported in 2016/17. Looking at the proportion of individual children shows a slightly higher percentage registered at 85%. There was no significant different in 'reach' between the different Bright Start Areas, with the highest level of registrations in Bright Start West (the smallest area) at 85%.

The proportions of each of the key target groups registered in 2017/18 were:

- 81% of social housing families
- 84% of Black & Minority Ethnic families
- 81% of lone parent families; and
- 85% of families living in overcrowded households

The co-ordination and responsibility for Bright Start Islington early childhood services transferred from individual children's centres to three area teams in September 2017. The transformation process has continued throughout 2017/18, and a more consistent offer with less duplication of services to make best use of the available resource is now in place across the borough. Data solutions included installing a new management information system and a move from paper-based to electronic registration and attendance. There has been some slippage but the new system became active in June 18, resulting already in better management information available for Bright Start integrated teams, although some aspects of the new system (online registration) have yet to be implemented. The new system will provide reports which give a clear indication of which families in terms of location do not access Bright Start services.

A drop in reach throughout the transition was expected, but there is now a clear focus to address the fall and particularly to improve the engagement of target groups and families with most to gain from early childhood services. Outreach plans have been developed for each Bright Start area, further supported through the deployment of the new parent champion volunteer programme and strengthened by improved collaboration and integrated working across partners and services. An increasing number of Bright Start services are located in the community aligned to the priority to take services to where families are. Planned changes to the child health development record (the red book) through the inclusion of Bright Start registration and co-location with health visitors across a range of children's centres and health centres will help to ensure high reach overall and enable better and earlier identification of families in greater need of services.

3.2 - Corporate Indicator: Percentage of 2 year old places taken up by low income families, children with Special Educational Needs or Disabilities (SEND) or who are looked after

This measure is based on the number of children in funded early education places compared to the number of eligible parents received from the DWP. There were 641 2 year olds in funded places in the Summer Term 2017/18. This is lower than the 675 in funded places during the previous term. However, the number of eligible parents is falling at a similar rate, so the overall proportion of places taken up is fairly similar to the previous term at 63%.

Comparator data is published in June each year, based on the take-up in the previous January. In January 2018, the published data shows that 64% of funded places in Islington were taken up, which was higher than the London (61%) and Inner London (60%) averages, but lower than the national average (72%). Islington was ranked 112th in the country, just above the bottom quartile. However, there are clearly regional differences in the level of take-up, as most authorities in the bottom quartile are from London and the South East.

While Islington's uptake of funded 2YO places continues to be high for inner London, uptake regionally is significantly lower than the national picture. While some focus has been diverted to ensure strong take up of the 30 hour entitlement for some children, this does not completely account for the small decline experienced in Islington. With eligible numbers in the borough declining, more work needs to be done to look at whether the demographic profile of those who remain eligible is also changing. A recently commissioned DFE report on the relatively low take up of entitlements across the country, identifies lower take up as being an overlapping mix of parental choice and perceived constraints. The national report found ongoing misunderstanding of who is entitled to what, a cultural reluctance from particular groups of parents to hand over the care of such young children to others, perceived parental concern about quality, flexibility and sufficiency.

Reversing the drop in take-up is a key priority for the service, given the benefits to children of early learning opportunities. Communications, outreach and accessibility are under review. Two year old provision in Islington is almost exclusively rated as good or outstanding by Ofsted and there is sufficiency at the moment with plans in place to expand further when there is demand.

3.4 – Corporate Indicator: Percentage of pupils achieving a Good Level of Development in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile

Provisional local data suggests that 71.1% of pupils achieved a Good Level of Development (GLD) in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP). Comparator data has not yet been published. However, a provisional estimate of the England average for 2017/18 suggests that it should be around 71.6%. This would mean Islington has continued to narrow the gap to the national average. Full comparator data will be published later in the Autumn term.

The areas of learning where the highest proportions of Islington pupils achieved the expected levels in 2018 were Physical Development (86.4%) and Expressive Arts and Design (84.2%). The same was true in 2017, and this matches national trends.

The GLD is the proxy indicator used to measure children's development and learning at age 5. Children are assessed in their personal, social and emotional development, physical development, communication and language (known as the three "prime areas") and in their attainment in literacy and mathematics (two of the "specific areas"). Islington's GLD continues to edge yet closer to the national and inner London averages, rising by over 27% in seven years. While nationally the rate has also improved, the rate in Islington has improved faster although it is now slowing.

79% of children achieved the expected level or above in all the three prime areas, in line with the national figure. 73.3% of children achieved the expected level in literacy (reading and writing) and 78.5% in mathematics, above the corresponding 2017 national figures of 72.8% and 77.9% respectively. A combination of factors are likely to have brought about this difference over time, including improved quality of provision with a growing number of schools and early years providers judged as good or better by Ofsted (see 4.7 and 4.8 below), as well as increased uptake of integrated early childhood services.

EYFSP scores are analysed to show the relative performance of different groups of children (eg. 77.8% of girls achieved the GLD compared with 64.4% of boys). Analysis at borough and school level is used to identify priorities which are then communicated across all early childhood services including in primary schools.

3.5 – Corporate Equalities Indicator: Percentage of Free School Meals / non-Free School Meals pupils achieving a Good Level of Development in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile

Provisional local data for 2017/18 suggests that 60.6% of FSM-eligible pupils achieved a Good Level of Development (GLD) in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP). However, 75.5% of other pupils achieved a GLD, meaning the gap was 14 percentage points.

In 2016/17, 61% of Islington pupils who were eligible for Free School Meals achieved a GLD in the EYFSP, compared to 73% of all other pupils, making a 12 percentage point gap. Therefore, the gap is wider in 2017/18 than it was in 2016/17, due to improvements in the results of non-FSM eligible pupils.

In 2016/17, the attainment gap in Islington was much narrower than across the country as a whole, where only 56% of FSM pupils achieved a GLD, whilst 73% of other pupils achieved the GLD, matching Islington. Overall the national attainment gap was 17 percentage points. In London, however, the gap was narrower, at 11 percentage points (64% FSM pupils, 75% of other pupils). Islington was in the top quartile for the proportion of FSM pupils achieving a GLD in 2017, and the gap was also in the top quartile in terms of local authorities with the smallest gaps in attainment between FSM and other pupils.

Comparator data for 2017/18 has not yet been published.

Analysis and action will be undertaken to ascertain if there are particular schools where the gap between FSM and NFSM attainment is significantly wider than in the LA or if there are particular FSM groups for whom attainment is lower.

The latest Study of Early Education and Development (SEED) research report (DFE, September 2018) confirms the link between cognitive and socio-emotional outcomes at age four, with the number of hours per week children spend in early education settings, between the age of 2 and 4. Therefore, to improve outcomes for FSM children faster, it is essential to address the decline in take up rates of funded early education for disadvantaged 2 year olds (see 3.2) and for 3 and 4 year olds with regards the universal entitlement. This will be particularly important as children from the lowest income families in Islington have had their access to early education reduced from 30 to 15 hours following the introduction of the government's national policy in September 2017 to give 30 hours only to children from working families.

In Islington, 200 of the most disadvantaged children do receive 30 hours of early education at age 3 and 4 through the borough's Early Years Priority Referral scheme. Most of these children will be in the FSM cohort but with a cohort of just under 600, there will remain a significant number of children who attend for 15 hours only, if at all.

3.6 – Corporate Indicator - Percentage of primary school children who are persistently absent

Provisional data for the Autumn and Spring terms of 2017/18 shows that the persistent absence rate for Islington primary schools was 11.4%. This compares to a rate of 9.6% in the same period during 2016/17.

Absence data is collected during the School Census following the end of each term, so there is always a time lag in the reporting of absence.

Published data shows that persistent absence levels amongst Islington primary schools were 9.4% for the 2016/17 academic year, a marginal rise on the 9.2% reported in 2015/16. However, persistent absence has significantly reduced in the longer term. The target for this measure is to reduce persistent absence levels to be in line or below the Inner London average, which has been confirmed as 8.6% for 2016/17, so Islington remained above the Inner London average.

The latest published data is for the Autumn term of 2017/18 only. This indicated that the Islington primary persistent absence rate had increased, as had the national rate. Local data suggests that absence levels were higher in the Spring term than the Autumn term, so we will need to see if this pattern is repeated across other areas. This data should be published by the DfE in time for the Q2 Performance Report.

3.7 – Corporate Indicator - Percentage of secondary school children who are persistently absent

Provisional data for the Autumn and Spring terms of 2017/18 shows that the persistent absence rate for Islington secondary schools was 13.6%. This is the same rate as in the same period during 2016/17.

Published data shows that persistent absence levels amongst Islington secondary schools were 14.6% for the 2016/17 academic year, a rise on the 12.2% reported in 2015/16. The Islington rate had been steady over the previous few years, but the rise in 2016/17 took the rate to its highest level since 2012/13, when it stood at 14.7%. The target for this measure is to reduce persistent absence levels to be in line or below the Inner London average, which has been confirmed as 11.7% for 2016/17, so Islington remained above the Inner London average.

Local data suggests that the secondary school persistent absence level increased over the Spring term, as it had done amongst Islington's primary schools. Published data for the Autumn term 2017/18 had indicated an improvement in the absence level compared to the same term the previous year.

PA still remains high compared with other LAs, particularly at primary level. Illness remains the highest reason for absence in our primary schools. We are working closely with Islington Clinical Commissioning Group, Public Health, and School Nurse Team to develop strategies to help support schools tackle illness related absence.

The Minor illness and School Attendance, Guide for Parents/Carers booklet will be reviewed and updated with Health colleagues. Updated Attendance Matters Guidance was distributed to all schools in May which includes practical advice and guidance in tackling health related absence.

We are also working with targeted schools (i.e. those with highest persistent absence) to develop action plans, and encouraging all schools via the Attendance Network (for School Attendance Leads that meet termly) to consider legal action where other interventions have failed to secure improved attendance.

Recognising that some of the factors associated with chronic absence are beyond the school's direct control, we are also supporting improved links between schools and the Early Help Service, and with colleagues in health, to target children with PAs and their families.

Note – for the 3 exclusions Corporate Indicators below, there is a time lag in the collection of exclusions data, to allow for appeals. Locally, more timely data is available for schools linked in the local authority's pupil database, but the figures would not be comparable with the published data for other years. All rates are based on the number of exclusions compared to the size of the school roll at the time of the January Census in each year.

3.8 – Corporate Indicator - Percentage rate of fixed term exclusions - primary

The published rate of fixed term exclusions for Islington primary schools was 1.95% in 2016/17. This was an increase on the previous year (1.41%), but lower than in 2014/15 (2.04%). The target for this measure is to be in line or below the Inner London average, which has been confirmed as 0.92% for 2016/17, so Islington remained above the Inner London average.

Provisional data for most Islington primary schools suggests there were slightly more fixed term exclusions in 2017/18 than there were in 2016/17, so we are anticipating a slight increase in the published Islington rate for 2017/18.

3.9 – Corporate Indicator - Percentage rate of fixed term exclusions - secondary

The published rate of fixed term exclusions for Islington secondary schools was 10.73% in 2016/17. This was a decrease compared to the rate of 11.38% in 2015/16. The target for this measure is to be in line or below the Inner London average, which has been confirmed as 8.27% for 2016/17, so Islington remained above the Inner London average.

Provisional data for most Islington secondary schools suggests there was another significant increase in the number of fixed term exclusions in 2017/18.

3.10 – Corporate Indicator - Percentage rate of permanent exclusions - secondary

The published rate of permanent exclusions for Islington secondary schools was 0.28% in 2016/17. This was a decrease compared to 2015/16 (0.30%). The target for this measure is to be in line or below the Inner London average, which has been confirmed as 0.20% for 2016/17, so Islington remained above the Inner London average.

Provisional data for Islington secondary schools suggests a reduction in the number of permanent exclusions in 2017/18.

It is well established that school exclusion remains closely linked to deprivation factors and social vulnerability; and that once exclusion occurs, outcomes - both academic and social – are poor.

Department for Education (DfE) guidance on exclusions states:

“Good discipline in schools is essential to ensure that all pupils can benefit from the opportunities provided by education. The Government supports head teachers in using exclusion as a sanction where it is warranted. However, permanent exclusion should only be used as a last resort, in response to a serious breach, or persistent breaches, of the school's behaviour policy; and where allowing the pupil to remain in school would seriously harm the education or welfare of the pupil or others in the school”.

We know that nationally:

- Exclusion (fixed period and permanent) escalates with age, and affects boys three times more than girls.
- There is over-representation of pupils with certain ethnic groups and those from lower socio-economic groups.
- Persistent disruptive behaviour is the most commonly recorded reason for exclusion.

Analysis of local exclusion vulnerability factors largely reflects these national trends, although with some interesting differences.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee have identified exclusion from school as their main area of focus for 2018-19. They have already considered a detailed analysis of permanent and fixed period exclusion from Islington primary and secondary schools, and to support a more in depth examination, will hear expert witness evidence over the next few months and make recommendations by March 2019.

Children's, Employment and Skills' Services Equalities Reference Group will also consider factors relation to the over-representation of ethnic groups in exclusions from Islington schools. Further analysis on the link between exclusion, exploitation and offending is also being undertaken.

3.11 – Percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths (combined) at the end of Key Stage 2

Provisional local data suggests the proportion of Islington pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths at Key Stage 2 rose from 66% in 2016/17 to 68% in 2017/18. Provisional national data shows that across England the proportion of pupils achieving the expected level in all three subjects rose from 61% to 64%, so Islington has stayed above the national average.

The underlying data shows that most of the increase, locally, was due to an increase in the proportion of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, with 77.2% of pupils achieving the expected level, according to the provisional data, compared to 74.4% the previous year. The proportion of pupils achieving the expected level in Writing was in line with the performance last year, which itself was the same as the year before. The proportion of Islington pupils achieving the expected level in Maths fell slightly, from 79.5% in 2016/17 to 76.8% in 2017/18, although this is still above the provisional England average of 75% for state-funded schools.

Another encouraging outcome from the provisional local data for 2017/18 is that 15.3% of pupils achieved a higher standard in Reading, Writing and Maths at Key Stage 2 (a higher standard is a scaled score of 110 or more). This is an increase on 2016/17 results, when Islington was already ranked joint 6th in the country on this measure. Provisional data from the DfE suggests we have maintained our ranking in 2017/18

Reading outcomes at KS2 have demonstrated the greatest improvement over the past 3 years as a result of the demanding expectations of the tests that pupils now undertake. Reading has improved by 10% over the past three years compared to national where the rise has been 9%. Reading remains a focus across the borough and support for schools, particularly those below the national figure (75%) have been identified and targeted support will be provided for them. Writing has remained consistent over the past three years and this in part is due to the nature of teacher assessment but also reflects the consistent training and support schools have received from School Improvement. Maths has remained relatively consistent however there has been a slight dip on last year. Despite this schools have focussed on developing mathematical fluency, particularly in arithmetic to support pupils to be successful. More emphasis needs to be given to securing pupils' reasoning skills. More able pupils across all three subjects do particularly well and are consistently above national outcomes. Schools are meeting the needs of more able pupils and using data effectively to ensure progress is maximised for all pupils so that they are ready for the next stage of their learning.

Combined outcomes for reading, writing and maths have increased by 11% over the past three years. This is in line with national. Analysis of this trend over time has identified a number of schools who are consistently underperforming despite incremental improvements each year. Through the annual categorisation process, these schools will be challenged to provide an effective strategy of improvement that will secure outcomes in line with national figures.

Compared to Inner London, Islington ranks 10/13, which is the same position as last year, however the gap between Islington and inner London has slightly widened. In 2018 Islington combined was 68% and Inner London 70%. In 2017 these figures were 65%/66%.

3.12 – Corporate Equalities Indicator: Narrowing the gap in attainment between the Black Caribbean pupils and the LBI average at KS2 (gap in percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths)

Provisional results for 2018 show that the proportion of Black Caribbean pupils achieving the expected standard across Reading, Writing and Maths fell slightly, from 50% in 2017 to 48% in 2018. However, as the results for all Islington pupils improved from 66% in 2017 to 68% in 2018, the gap between Black Caribbean pupils and the Islington average widened, from 16 percentage points in 2017 to 20 percentage points in 2018. In previous years, we have tended to see a slightly narrowing of the gap between the initial provisional results and the revised results later each year.

Since the introduction of new assessments at KS2, schools now have access to data spanning 3 years. Black Caribbean pupils compared to Islington pupils over that time consistently underperform. Over 3 years, reading outcomes have been 8% below, writing 10% below and maths 15% below LBI figures. At the combined outcome for RWM, Black Caribbean pupils perform 17% below LBI peers over 3 years. The biggest gap in underperformance is in maths and this has a direct effect on the combined outcome. Progress for these pupils remains a challenge.

School Improvement will focus on this group through their work in schools. Practice in all schools is being reviewed and a working group has been established to support schools who consistently struggle with this issue. Achievement for these pupils will be the focus of the annual Deputy Headteacher conference and a strategic partnership of schools is being developed to support other schools. Work with Subject Leaders for maths and reading will also highlight this issue in schools and Y6 teachers will receive additional support.

3.13 – Corporate Equalities Indicator: Narrowing the gap in attainment between White British pupils eligible for Free School Meals and the LBI average at KS2 (gap in percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths)

The proportion of White-British pupils who were eligible for Free School Meals who achieved the expected standard across Reading, Writing and Maths improved, from 46% in 2017 to 49% in the provisional results for 2018. As the results for all Islington pupils improved by two percentage points, the gap between White-British pupils who were eligible for Free School Meals and the Islington average narrowed slightly, from 20 percentage points in 2017 to 19 points in 2018.

White British pupils consistently achieve better than the LBI average over the past three years. In reading these pupils outperform LBI pupils by 3%, are in line in writing and 1% better in maths. At the combined outcome White British perform 4% better than LBI peers. This is a consistent picture in 2018. At the combined outcome for RWM White British pupils performed 11% better than their LBI peers. Progress for this group of pupils is consistently good, particularly in reading.

3.14 - Number of children in Alternative Provision

This KPI has been amended to now look at all pupils in Alternative Provision. Previously, the figure was based on those pupils in Alternative Provision that was managed and commissioned through the Alternative Provision Team based at New River College (NRC).

The number of pupils in Alternative Provision (AP) at the end of Q1 2018/19 was 83 pupils. At the end of Q1 2017/18, the number of pupils in just the Alternative Provision managed and commissioned via New River College was 122 pupils, so despite the change in the measurement of this KPI, we still know that numbers are falling.

From September 2018, schools are responsible for monitoring the attendance, progress and outcomes for any student placed on AP. Schools still have the option to purchase the services of NRC to broker placements, including the undertaking of a risk assessment, but can choose to do this themselves.

Local and national data confirms that mainstream schooling offers the best life chances for the vast majority of students. Islington schools are therefore committed to only placing students on AP in exceptional circumstances. To this end, the Secondary Securing Education Board will continue to monitor the number of students on AP, while NRC will continue to offer advice to schools on the quality of AP provision. Headteachers have been asked to identify a contact person to facilitate the sharing of data in relation to students attending AP. This information will be collected on a monthly basis prior to the Securing Education Board meetings and the LA pupil database will be updated accordingly in line with GDPR requirements.

3.15 – Corporate Indicator: Average Attainment 8 Score

The provisional Attainment 8 figure for Islington schools for 2018 is 46.0. No comparator data is yet available.

Attainment 8 measures achievement across 8 qualifications.

Attainment 8 scores are not directly comparable between 2018 and 2017, following the continued introduction of 9-1 reformed GCSEs.

3.17 – English Baccalaureate Average Point Score

The Average Point Score for the English Baccalaureate in the provisional 2017/18 results is 4.04. No comparator data is yet available.

Previously, the relevant measure in this area was the percentage of pupils achieving the English Baccalaureate. However, as we are now looking at the Average Point Score (due to the following the continued introduction of reformed GCSEs with marks 1-9), the measure used in 2018 is not comparable with previous years.

Turbulence continues in GCSE assessments, with significant changes in curriculum and in assessment and accountability measures. Challenges for schools will continue over the next year or so. GCSE is gradually moving from the familiar A*-G to a scale that measures from 9-1 with associated new grade boundaries. Most subjects changed this year and we are now seeing schools coming to terms with the new GCSE specifications. This makes year on year comparison impossible this year and for the next two years. In spite of this, Islington secondary pupils have continued to performed very well in relation to the Attainment 8 measure and have performed strongly in other measures.

3.20 – Percentage of schools that meet or exceed the floor standard - Key Stage 2

If there is no change in the definition of the floor standard in 2017/18, 100% of Islington primary schools met or exceeded the floor standard in 2017/18, based on the provisional results. This is the same as last year.

The Department for Education sets a floor standard for schools, to achieve a minimum level of attainment and expected progress. At primary for the 2017 results year this was:

- at least 65% of pupils meet the expected standard in English reading, English writing and mathematics; or
- the school achieves sufficient progress scores in all three subjects. At least -5 in English reading, -5 in mathematics and -7 in English writing.

To be above the floor, a primary school needs to meet either the attainment or all of the progress elements.

The 2017/18 floor standards will be confirmed later in the Autumn term, but we are not expecting there to be any change in the definition.

3.22 - Corporate Indicator: Participant rate for Islington Youth and Play settings - 5 to 12 year olds

Data for 2017/18 shows that 65.3% of 5 to 12 year olds who attended an Islington Youth and Play setting went on to have at least 5 attendances throughout the year.

3.23 - Corporate Indicator: Participant rate for Islington Youth and Play settings - 13 and older

Data for 2017/18 shows that 44.7% of 13 to 25 year olds who attended an Islington Youth and Play setting went on to have at least 5 attendances throughout the year.

The 2 participant rates for Islington Youth & Play settings are new measures, based on the proportion of young who have attended Youth & Play settings who go on to become 'participants', i.e. have at least 5 attendances at settings throughout the year. We can calculate historical figures for the 5-12 age range using data previously available to Youth and Play. However, the age range for indicator 3.23 has been expanded from 13-19 year olds to include young people up to the age of 25, so no directly comparable data is reported here.

The participant rate provides some information about the quality of the offers as it can be assumed that in most cases, children and young people are taking part voluntarily and that if they continue to attend, they are happy with what is on offer and, particularly in the case of youth work, are getting the support and opportunities that they feel are of benefit to them.

In a similar way, the participant rate also tells us something about the quality of relationships between CYP and play and youth work staff. Quality relationships lead to children and young people achieving the desired outcomes from their participation and are the basis for effective prevention and 'early' early intervention.

The participant rate for 5 to 12 year olds is likely to be consistently higher than that for those aged 13 and up as, amongst other factors, the play offer is often used on a daily basis by working families as informal childcare. Older young people have far more agency over their free time and are likely to be juggling a range of priorities in their lives which may mitigate against consistent attendance at one particular youth provision.

3.24 – Corporate Indicator: Percentage of re-referrals to Children's Social Care within the previous 12 months

The proportion of re-referrals within 12 months has reduced from 16.7% at the end of 2017/18 to 15.4% at the end of Q1 2018/19. Comparator data has now been published for 2016/17 and this shows that Islington had a lower proportion of re-referrals in 2016/17 than the national average. The reduction in the re-referral rate may be an early indication that the Motivational Social Worker approach is having some sustainable and longer term effects for families.

3.25 – Corporate Indicator: Percentage of children who become the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time

The proportion of children who became the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time increased from 15.6% in 2017/18 to 20.9% in Q1 2018/19. This was due to a particularly high proportion of new plans in April involving children who had previously been the subject of a plan (25%). The cumulative total for the year has fallen since April.

A study has been undertaken of all repeat plans in 2017/18 which was presented to the September Safeguarding Children Board. The study found that in the vast majority of cases there was sufficient reason to make a subsequent child protection plan. This is supported by the fact over half of children subject to repeat plans were also escalated to legal proceedings or alternative care or living situations sought. Domestic violence and abuse is the main reason repeat plans are made. Previous plans often show evidence of safety planning, advocacy and educational work with women and their children. The most common vulnerability in such interventions is the inability to engage with male perpetrators as well as engaging women and children in services to help them recover from the abuse. This tallies up with data we were already aware of in terms of repeat DVA referrals to Children's Social Care which in turn has led to the development of an innovative new service to help families affected by domestic violence and abuse: The Keel Project. It will be important that the child protection conference process links in with this new initiative.

3.26 - Percentage of children who were seen in accordance with a Children in Need Plan

There is no statutory obligation to report on this measure and therefore no comparator data is available for this indicator. There is no statutory timescale setting out how frequently children subject to Child in Need plans are seen though the DFE/Ofsted expectation is generally that children on Child in Need plans are seen approximately every 6 weeks. In Islington, we set high expectations regarding the frequency of visits to children and this report measures against a 4 weekly visiting timescale.

The proportion of Children in Need seen in accordance with their plans fell from 66% the end of Q4 2017/18 to 57% at the end of Q1 2018/19.

This quarter has seen a decline but has included the summer holidays – many families this year have been out or on holiday so a greater number of visits have been unsuccessful. We feel confident that this figure will improve.

3.27 - Placement stability - short term - Proportion of looked after children with 3 or more placements over the course of the year

Provisional data shows that very few of Islington's looked after children had had 3 or more placements during the year 2018/19, as at the end of the first quarter. The proportion of all looked after children who have had 3 or more placements is only 0.6%, which is lower than at the same point in 2017/18.

3.28 - Placement stability - long term - Percentage of children who have been looked after for more than 2.5 years who have been looked after in the same placement for at least 2 years or placed for adoption

Provisional data shows that at the end of Q1 2018/19, 69.4% of Islington's looked after children who had been looked after long term were in stable placements. This is better than performance as at the end of 2017/18, and in line with performance at the same point during the last year.

A robust programme of work is being developed to train and support carers to better manage the challenges and complexities of adolescents in their care. There are also a number of measures now in place to pick up concerns about placement stability at an earlier stage, with the aim of avoiding break down.

CES OBB Outcome: Ensuring our residents can lead healthy and independent lives

No new data is available for any of the KPIs relating to children and young people under this outcome area

CES OBB Outcome: Making Islington a welcoming and attractive borough and creating a healthy environment for all

No measures under this outcome are reported to Children's Services Scrutiny, to avoid duplication with reporting for other Scrutiny Committees

CES OBB Outcome: Continuing to be a well-run council, making a difference despite reduced resources

6.2 - Percentage of good and outstanding early years settings

The latest published data (as at the end of March 2018) shows the proportion of Islington's settings on the Early Years register judged good or better has increased again to 92.7%. This is above the London average, but below the England average. With this increase, Islington has moved out of the bottom quartile, nationally.

There continues to be an overall increase in the percentage of providers judged as good or outstanding in their early years Ofsted inspection. There are no inadequate settings and only four settings with a requires improvement judgement. Of these, there is one after-school provision, one private nursery, one sessional playgroup and one adventure playground. All settings have an action plan to address the weaknesses. Islington's rate of outstanding provision is well above both England and London averages at 25.5% compared with 15.9% and 13.7% respectively. Provision classed as non-domestic (ie. not childminders or group childcare in people's homes) is particularly good with 41.1% judged as outstanding compared with 21% across London and 22.2% in England. 50% of council-run nurseries are judged outstanding.

6.3 - Percentage of good and outstanding Islington schools

Ofsted have made a change to the way they report inspection outcomes at a local authority level. They are now including, for schools that have converted to academies or free schools, the last inspection outcome under the school's previous registration. For Islington, this has meant the 'inadequate' inspection outcomes for three schools have re-entered the dataset used by Ofsted.

The proportion of schools judged good or better stood at 92.5% at the end of June 2018. Islington is now ranked 23rd in the country in terms of school inspection results, above the London and England averages. Islington's ranking is slightly down on the position under Ofsted's previous way of reporting, but the difference is small and Islington remains in the top quartile, nationally.

The breakdowns by school phase are:

- 100% of nursery schools (3/3)
- 95.6% of primary schools (43/45)
- 80% of secondary schools (8/10)
- 100% of special schools (6/6)
- 75% of Pupil Referral Units (3/4)

6.4 - Percentage of new EHC plans issued within 20 weeks

Excluding exceptional cases, Islington issued 51.6% of new EHC Plans within the target timescale of 20 weeks in 2017 (calendar year). This was an improvement on the previous year, but remains below the London and England averages.

Including all cases, Islington issued 41.5% of new EHC Plans within the target timescale of 20 weeks in 2017. Again, although this was an improvement, Islington remained below the London and England averages.

Islington is in the third quartile, nationally, for the timescales excluding exceptional cases, ranked 109th out of 150. However, if we include the exceptional cases, Islington would be just inside the bottom quartile.

Performance towards meeting timescales is improving as a result of an Improvement Plan. Turn-around time for health advice to EHC assessments has reduced on average from 20 weeks to 6 weeks. We have progressed from 50% of EHC plans issued within 20 weeks in 2016/17 to 60% issued within 20 weeks in 2017/18, and our current performance is running at 80%, demonstrating that effective steps are being taken to meet the timescales required. Although current performance is better than inner London (48.9%), it is still not where we would like it to be, and remains an area for further development.

6.5 - Number of new mainstream foster carers recruited in Islington

One new foster carer has been approved, however there are 8 assessments ongoing and 5 new prospective foster families have started pre approval training. A new foster carer recruitment strategy is being presented to Corporate Parenting Board on 19th September. There are a number of foster carer vacancies and the service is focussed on only recruiting foster carers who can accept Islington children who need care.

4. Implications

4.1 Financial implications:

No implications

4.2 Legal Implications:

No implications

4.3 Environmental Implications

No implications

4.4 Resident Impact Assessment:

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.

A Resident Impact Assessment has not been completed because this report is reporting on performance only - no recommendations for actions or decisions are made.

5. Reason for recommendations

5.1 Not applicable

Appendices

Appendix A – Data Dashboard

Final report clearance:

Signed by:

Carmel Littleton
Corporate Director of Children's Services

9th October 2018

Date:

Report Co-ordinator: Adam White
Tel: 020 7527 2657
Email: adam.white@islington.gov.uk

With contributions from various managers within Children, Employment and Skills

Appendix A - Data Dashboard

CS PI No.	Corporate Indicator?	Indicator	Frequency reported	Current Figure (Period covered)	Previous Figure (Period covered)	Figure at end of previous year	Direction of travel	London	England	National quartile
CES OBB Outcome: Creating a safe and cohesive borough for all										
1.1	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of young people (aged 10-17) triaged that are diverted away from the criminal justice system	Quarterly	80% (Q1 2018/19 provisional)	73% (Q1 2017/18)	80% (2017/18 FY)	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.2	✓	Corporate Indicator: Number of first time entrants into Youth Justice System	Quarterly	16 (Q1 2018/19 provisional)	17 (Q1 2017/18)	60 (2017/18 FY)	↔	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.3	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of repeat young offenders (under 18s)	Quarterly	34% (Q1 2018/19 provisional)	25% (Q1 2017/18)	54% (2017/18 FY)	↑	YJB measure on reoffending uses a different cohort so is not comparable		
1.4	✓	Corporate Indicator: Number of custodial sentences for young offenders	Quarterly	12 (Q1 2018/19 provisional)	5 (Q1 2017/18)	17 (2017/18 FY)	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.5	x	Number of children missing from care for 24+ hours	Quarterly	14 (June 2018)	14 (June 2017)	8 (March 2018)	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.6	x	Number of children missing from home	Quarterly	22 (June 2018)	31 (June 2017)	12 (March 2018)	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a
CES OBB Outcome: Making Islington the best place for all young people to grow up – where children and families can thrive and reach their potential										
3.1	x	Percentage of families with under-5s registered at a Children's Centre	Termly	82% (2017/18 FY)	85% (Summer term 2017/18)	90% (2016/17 FY)	↓	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.2	x	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of 2 year old places taken up by low income families, children with Special Educational Needs or Disabilities (SEND) or who are looked after	Termly	63% (Summer term 2017/18 AY)	64% (Spring term 2017/18 AY)	64% (Spring term 2017/18 AY)	↔	61% (January 2018)	72% (January 2018)	2nd from bottom
3.4	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of pupils achieving a Good Level of Development in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Annual	71.1% (2017/18 AY - provisional)	69.9% (2016/17 AY)	69.9% (2016/17 AY)	↑	73.0% (2016/17 AY)	70.7% (2016/17 AY)	2nd from bottom
3.5	✓	Corporate Equalities Indicator: Percentage of Free School Meals / non-Free School Meals pupils achieving a Good Level of Development in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile	Annual	FSM - 61% Non-FSM - 75% 14 pt gap (2017/18 AY - provisional)	FSM - 61% Non-FSM - 73% 12 pt gap (2016/17 AY)	FSM - 61% Non-FSM - 73% 12 pt gap (2016/17 AY)	↑	FSM - 64% Non-FSM - 75% 11 pt gap (2016/17 AY)	FSM - 56% Non-FSM - 73% 17 pt gap (2016/17 AY)	Top (for both FSM GLD and gap)
3.6	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of primary school children who are persistently absent (below 90% attendance)	Termly	11.4% (Autumn & Spring terms 2017/18)	9.6% (Autumn & Spring terms 2016/17)	9.4% (2016/17 AY)	↑	8.3% (2016/17 AY)	8.3% (2016/17 AY)	Bottom
3.7	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of secondary school children who are persistently absent (below 90% attendance)	Termly	13.6% (Autumn & Spring terms 2017/18)	13.6% (Autumn & Spring terms 2016/17)	14.6% (2016/17 AY)	↔	11.9% (2016/17 AY)	13.5% (2016/17 AY)	2nd from bottom
3.8	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage rate of fixed term exclusions - primary	Termly	1.95% (2016/17 AY)	1.41% (2015/16 AY)	1.41% (2015/16 AY)	↑	0.83% (2016/17 AY)	1.37% (2016/17 AY)	Bottom
3.9	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage rate of fixed term exclusions - secondary	Termly	10.73% (2016/17 AY)	11.38% (2015/16 AY)	11.38% (2015/16 AY)	↓	7.50% (2016/17 AY)	9.40% (2016/17 AY)	2nd from bottom
3.10	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage rate of permanent exclusions - secondary	Termly	0.28% (2016/17 AY)	0.30% (2016/17 AY)	0.30% (2016/17 AY)	↓	0.19% (2016/17 AY)	0.20% (2016/17 AY)	2nd from bottom
3.11	x	Percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths (combined) at the end of Key Stage 2	Annual	68% (2017/18 AY - provisional)	66% (2016/17 AY)	66% (2016/17 AY)	↑	67% (2016/17 AY)	64% (2017/18 AY - interim)	Top

CS PI No.	Corporate Indicator?	Indicator	Frequency reported	Current Figure (Period covered)	Previous Figure (Period covered)	Figure at end of previous year	Direction of travel	London	England	National quartile
3.12	✓	Corporate Equalities Indicator: Narrowing the gap in attainment between the BCRB pupils and the LBI average at KS2 (gap in percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths)	Annual	20 ppts (2017/18 AY - provisional)	16 ppts (2016/17 AY)	16 ppts (2016/17 AY)	↑	Not available below National level	7 ppts (2016/17 AY)	n/a
3.13	✓	Corporate Equalities Indicator: Narrowing the gap in attainment between White British pupils eligible for Free School Meals and the LBI average at KS2 (gap in percentage of pupils achieving the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths)	Annual	19 ppts (2017/18 AY - provisional)	20 ppts (2015/16 AY)	20 ppts (2015/16 AY)	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.14	x	Number of children in Alternative Provision	Quarterly	83 (Q1 2018/19 FY)	Not comparable	Not comparable	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.15	✓	Corporate Indicator: Average Attainment 8 score	Annual	46.0 (2017/18 AY provisional)	45.6 (2016/17 AY)	45.6 (2016/17 AY)	n/a	48.9 (2016/17 AY - revised)	44.6 (2016/17 AY - revised)	2nd from bottom
3.17	x	English Bacalaureate Average Point Score	Annual	4.04	Not comparable	Not comparable	n/a	2016/17 not comparable	2016/17 not comparable	Top
3.20	x	Percentage of schools that meet or exceed the floor standard - Key Stage 2	Annual	100% (2017/18 AY - provisional)	100% (2016/17 AY - revised)	100% (2016/17 AY - revised)	↔	99% (2016/17 AY revised)	96% (2016/17 AY revised)	Top
3.22	✓	Corporate Indicator: Participant rate for Islington Youth and Play settings - 5 to 12 year olds	Annual	65.3% (2017/18 FY)	64.9% (2016/17 FY)	64.9% (2016/17 FY)	↔	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.23	✓	Corporate Indicator: Participant rate for Islington Youth and Play settings - 13 and older	Annual	44.7% (2017/18 FY)	not available - new age range	not available - new age range	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.24	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of re-referrals to Children's Social Care within the previous 12 months	Quarterly	15.4% (2018/19 Q1 provisional)	16.7% (2017/18 FY provisional)	16.7% (2017/18 FY provisional)	↓	16.2% (2016/17 FY)	21.9% (2016/17 FY)	2nd from top
3.25	✓	Corporate Indicator: Percentage of children who become the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time	Quarterly	20.9% (2018/19 Q1 provisional)	15.6% (2017/18 FY provisional)	15.6% (2017/18 FY provisional)	↑	14.8% (2016/17 FY)	18.7% (2016/17 FY)	Top
3.26	x	Percentage of children who were seen in accordance with a Children in Need Plan	Quarterly	57% (2018/19 Q1 provisional)	66% (2017/18 FY provisional)	66% (2017/18 FY provisional)	↓	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.27	x	Placement stability - short term - Proportion of looked after children with 3 or more placements over the course of the year	Quarterly	0.6% (2018/19 Q1 provisional)	2.9% (2017/18 Q1)	12.2% (2017/18 FY provisional)	↓	10% (2015/16 FY)	10% (2015/16 FY)	2nd from bottom
3.28	x	Placement stability - long term - Percentage of children who have been looked after for more than 2.5 years who have been looked after in the same placement for at least 2 years or placed for adoption	Quarterly	69.4% (2018/19 Q1 provisional)	69.9% (2017/18 Q1)	62.8% (2017/18 FY provisional)	↑	68% (2015/16 FY)	68% (2015/16 FY)	Bottom
CES OBB Outcome: Continuing to be a well-run council, making a difference despite reduced resources										
6.2	x	Percentage of good and outstanding early years settings	Quarterly	92.7% (2017/18 FY)	92.2% (Q3 2017/18)	89.8% (2016/17 FY)	↑	91.0% (2017/18 FY)	94.2% (2017/18 FY)	2nd from bottom
6.3	x	Percentage of good and outstanding Islington schools (all phases)	Quarterly	92.5% (Q1 2018/19 FY provisional)	95.3% (Q4 2017/18 FY - not directly comparable)	95.3% (Q4 2017/18 FY - not directly comparable)	Not directly comparable	91.9% (Q1 2018/19 FY)	85.8% (Q1 2018/19 FY)	Top
6.4	x	Percentage of new EHC plans issued within 20 weeks	Annual	51.6% (exc. exceptions) 41.5% (inc. exceptions) (2017)	49.5% (exc. exceptions) 40.0% (inc. exceptions) (2016)	49.5% (exc. exceptions) 40.0% (inc. exceptions) (2016)	↑	58.4% (exc. exceptions) 52.4% (inc. exceptions) (2017)	64.9% (exc. exceptions) 61.3% (inc. exceptions) (2017)	2nd from bottom (excluding exceptions)
6.5	x	Number of new mainstream foster carers recruited in Islington	Quarterly	1 (Q1 2018/19)	2 (Q1 2017/18)	12 (2017/18 FY)	↔	n/a	n/a	n/a

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