

Report of: Corporate Director of Children, Employment & Skills

Meeting of:	Date	Ward(s)
Children's Services Scrutiny Committee	10 January 2019 [deferred to 4 March 2019]	All

Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt
------------------------------	--	------------

**SUBJECT: Children's Services Performance 2018/19:
Quarter 2 Update****1. Synopsis**

- 1.1 This Quarter 2 performance report provides an update on progress against the relevant Corporate Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for 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 As well as the Corporate KPIs, a wider basket of measures has been reported to Children's Services Scrutiny. However, as this basket of measures had been set over two years ago, and due to the improvements made since, performance against many of these were no longer a concern. Therefore, some of these measures have not been included in the latest report. On the other hand, some key measures that reflect the overall quality of services, such as inspection outcomes, are retained in the basket of measures used, even though performance remains strong in these areas. Measures relating to the number and rate of looked after children have also been added.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To consider Children's Services performance in Quarter 2 2018/19.

3. Background

- 3.1 The main body of this report is set out under the outcomes within the Corporate Plan for 2018-22. 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.

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 the first half of 2018/19 were diverted away from the criminal justice system. This is in line with performance during the whole of 2017/18, and an improvement on performance in the same six month period during last year.

The Targeted Youth Support (TYS) team has a primary focus on providing robust early intervention and prevention to young people and adolescents within the borough who are in need of support and help. Whilst maintaining the standard methods of engaging such cohorts of young people, such as through the duty system with CSCT and through detached work in area ‘hotspots’, other key strategies are being employed. For example, the schools offer has been enhanced, whereby a TYS lead has been allocated to be the conduit for most secondary schools in the borough and, as such, resources can be targeted more swiftly where necessary. In addition, staff are delivering more group work and targeted sessions in schools, particularly those which have higher levels of fixed-term exclusions. Work has also continued with the initiative, in conjunction with the Police, to offer support to young people (and their families) where a case has received a No Further Action outcome. When combined with the triage work, this is ensuring that more young people who are coming to notice are supported and diverted away from criminal activity and offending behaviour.

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

There were 25 first time entrants in the first half of the year, which is five below the number reported during the same period in 2017/18 (a 17% reduction).

The Youth Justice Board (YJB) report on the rate of first time entrants for each local authority, to allow comparisons to be made between different areas. Islington’s latest reported rate was 401 per 100,000 10 to 17 year olds, for July 2017 to June 2018 financial year. This is a 6% drop compared to the same period during the previous year.

Improvements continue to be seen in Islington, for this indicator, at a time where almost all of our statistical neighbours and other inner city boroughs in London have seen marked increases. Some of the reasons for the amelioration was evidenced in the commentary for 1.1, but are also applicable to this indicator. 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. The commissioned youth-orientated services which have been procured to assist with the youth crime reduction agenda are also likely to be contributing towards these reductions. All this activity has seen a marked decrease in young people entering the Criminal Justice System and the figures reached an all-time low in Quarter 2 of 9 young people.

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, 18 had reoffended as at the end of Q2 2018/19 (41%). This is a slightly higher percentage than what was reported at the end of Q2 in 2017/18.

The YJB report on two different measures of reoffending, based on a rolling cohort of young offenders in one quarter, and their levels of reoffending over the following 12 months. This means that the figures are eighteen months behind. The Corporate Indicator is based on a fixed cohort of young offenders in one quarter of the year, with their reoffending being reported cumulatively during the following year. Additionally, the YJB allow a significant time lag in their reporting, to allow for potential delays in the recording of outcomes, nationally. The latest data for the YJB reoffending ‘binary’ measure is for the October – December 2016 cohort of offenders, 51.3% of whom reoffended in the following 12 months. This compares to 44.4% reoffending across London and 40.4% across England as a whole. The Islington figure represents a slight increase compared to the previous quarter. In relation to the YJB ‘frequency’ measure, Islington still ranks highly out of our comparators.

The review of our top 25 most prolific offenders has assisted in driving the strategic response in relation to this area. For example, the Youth Offending Service has implemented Trauma Informed Practice in order to strengthen the quality of the assessment, planning and delivery of interventions to the cohort; we are analysing and reviewing issues relating to the fact that young BME people are over-represented in the YOS and prolific cohorts and we have strengthened our ETE offer by recruiting an educational psychologist and an employment advisor into the YOS. 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. We are also continuing to use the Youth Justice Board's 'live tracker' tool to identify, track and monitor the cohort and to identify trends and needs

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).

It is recognised that with a low First Time Entrants rate and over 50% reduction in the YOS cohort that those young people known to the YOS are likely to be entrenched in offending and have a multitude of complexities.

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

After a large drop in the number of custodial sentences between 2016/17 and 2017/18, there was an increase in Q1 of 2018/19, compared to the same period of 2017/18, with 11 young people sentenced to custody in the quarter receiving 12 custodial sentences. However, in the second quarter of the year, there were only three additional custodial sentences, bringing the total for the first half of the year to 15.

The YJB report on custodial sentences based on rates per 1,000 10-17 year olds during a rolling 12-month period, to allow comparisons to be made between different local authorities. The latest data, for October 2017 to September 2018, reports Islington's rate as 1.50 custodial sentences per 1,000 population, which is better than the previous quarter (1.63). Islington's rate remains higher than London (0.57) and England (0.31). The Islington rate was relatively high compared to our statistical neighbours based on this annual data, but when the performance is looked at on a quarterly basis Islington had the 14th lowest rate in London for Q2 2018/19.

The performance of Q1 was concerning and the young people and offence types have been analysed to assess whether there were options other than custody and whether there were any lessons learnt in terms of service delivery. Given the nature and volume of offences which the young people had been convicted of, the auditor was of the view that a custodial sentence was the only option for all 11 young people. The fact that Q2 only saw the imposition of three custodial sentences shows that inroads are still being made to keep the use of custody to a minimum and that the intensive work that has taken place to ensure this has been effective is still being undertaken. In recent times, we have had a number of young people sentenced to community penalties where custody was being considered by the courts. However, the quality of the Pre-Sentence Reports, the advocacy skills of the caseworker/s and the offer of the Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme, as an alternative, has helped immensely. We are also now seeing the embedding of Trauma Informed Practice being utilised by officers which helps the courts to see more young people in a 'child first, offender second' way. We are also continuing to analyse the disproportionality issues that exist when it comes to the sentencing of young BME people who are more likely to receive custodial sentences, via a tracking tool, and by our presence at a multi-agency, cross borough YOS steering disproportionality group.

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

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 13 in September 2018. The September total is higher than the same period in 2017/18 (9 children), but lower than the figure in June 2018 (14).

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 13 in September 2018. The September total is higher than the same period in 2017/18 (9 children), but lower than the figure in June 2018 (14).

The data evidences that there has been a slight increase in the number of children missing from care for more than 24 hours during the first quarter of 2018/2019, with 55% of children who go missing from care returning

within less than 24 hours, and 74% returning within one day/overnight. Work has been completed with placements and supported accommodation providers and we are of the view that this has increased provider's knowledge of the missing process and likely impacted on the timeliness of children being reported missing from care.

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.

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 and quarter 2, 24 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. The council and its partners have developed the 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 child sexual exploitation (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. In Q1 and Q2, the data identifies that 21% of missing episodes were for children identified at risk of CSE and 40% of episodes were children identified as gangs at risk or gang nominal. This demonstrates a significant correlation between children who go missing from care and children who are at risk of exploitation. The Exploitation and Missing Team provide consultations to the social work teams and support with risk assessment and safety planning. The team also chair gangs, CSE and exploitation strategy meetings where required. In November 2018 the child's database system launched a flagging system for those young people who run 'County Lines'. This will enable further analysis and cross referencing between children who go missing from care and children who are identified as at risk of exploitation through County Lines. Q3 and Q4 data will provide further analysis in relation to this.

Most children and young people stay in touch with a professional whilst being missing and once they return they are offered a 'Return Home Interview' by an independent person who explores why they went missing and what harm they may have come to whilst missing.

The Exploitation and Missing Team continue to provide training across the council and through the Islington Safeguarding Children Board which explores the link between children that go missing and risk of exploitation. There is continuous scrutiny and senior management oversight of children who do go missing with briefings provided every Friday.

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

Corporate Indicators and associated targets relating to Employment, Skills and Culture have been agreed and will be reported on during 2018/19 and beyond. These will be reported to the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee. However, any of these measures that relate particularly to children and young people will also be reported to Children's Services Scrutiny.

2.3 - Corporate Indicator: Number of children completing the summer reading challenge

The Summer Reading Challenge is a national initiative which is designed to get children to read six or more books from the library over the summer holidays. Children receive special rewards each time they finish a book and there's a certificate for everyone who completes the Challenge. These certificates are presented at an award ceremony which all libraries hold, usually during October half term. We have successfully promoted the Summer Reading Challenge and have worked with schools to ensure that we reach as many children and their families as possible. Library staff visit local schools to promote the scheme at assemblies, parents' mornings and summer fairs.

900 children took part in the Summer Reading in 2018. This was below the target of 1000. Colleagues across London have also reported that their completer numbers are down this year. This may have been related to the exceptional Summer weather this year, or the theme may not have been as popular or relevant to children as in previous years. However, although we didn't reach our target for completers over 70% of children joining actually read at least 1 book and 52% of starters completed the Challenge, which is our highest ever completer rate.

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 across many of these indicators should be considered in the context of the current priorities set out in the refreshed service plan for Learning and Schools. In line with the school led self-improving system, these have been shared with headteachers, leaders and governors in schools. Current provisional data indicates that these are the correct priorities and action across the priorities is now being taken.

- 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 SEND self-evaluation
- Increasing the percentage of 2 year 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

3.2 - 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. Provisional data for the Autumn term suggests there were 630 2 year olds in funded places in the Autumn Term 2018/19. This is very slightly lower than the 641 in funded places during the previous term. However, the number of eligible parents is falling at a faster rate, so the overall proportion of places taken up has risen slightly, to 64%.

The last scrutiny report provided an analysis of why numbers of funded 2 year olds taking up a place has fallen and outlined some of the key findings from the DFE's Natcen report into the low take up in London. Further information has since been made available by the GLA. The findings are based on a target group analysis and focused parent groups. General low awareness of and confusion about the offer continues to be the main barrier to take up, together with cultural barriers within certain groups.

We are reshaping our communications strategy to take into account the key learning points from both reports. This will include making much greater use of social media, particularly Facebook, and simplifying and clarifying the message. A process mapping task has been carried out to tighten and make consistent how and when families are contacted with information about the offer and the statistical analysis of take up will now allow Bright Start area teams to target housing estates where take up is low. Given that there was a drop in take up in Islington which coincided with the introduction of the online portal, we have introduced an assisted application process for families needing such support.

Given that this is such a high priority for the service, plans to introduce a golden ticket approach are being explored. This involves giving a place to all children who appear on the eligible list which we receive from the DWP. It makes the process simpler as families do not have to check their eligibility through the portal and has been highly successful in increasing take up where it has been implemented in other boroughs. To overcome some of the cultural barriers, we are also developing our community offer on the estates to engage families with children age 1 -2 years, so that discussions about the benefits of good quality early learning can be had with families over a longer period of time.

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

Published data confirms that 71.1% of Islington pupils achieved a Good Level of Development (GLD) in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP), up from 69.9% in 2016/17. Comparator data has now been published, showing the London average rose from 73.0% to 73.8% over the same period, and the national average rose from 70.7% to 71.5%. The Islington figure rose by more than our comparators in 2017/18, and we have narrowed the gap between the borough and the London and England averages.

The GLD is the proxy indicator used to measure children's development and learning at age 5. A summary of Islington results were included in the last scrutiny report. The publication of national statistical release confirms that the direction of travel is positive and we are continually closing on the national and London averages. However, the rate of improvement slowed slightly, meaning that we have not completely closed the gap with the national average.

Breaking down the cohort by Free School Meal (FSM) eligibility we find that the proportion of Islington pupils not eligible for FSM gaining GLD was higher than the national average in 2018 (75% in Islington, 74% nationally). Similarly, the proportion of pupils eligible for FSM in the borough gaining GLD, at 61%, was 4 percentage points higher than England for this group (57%). The reason why Islington's performance for these subgroups is better than the national equivalents but the borough average is lower than that for England is due to Islington having a greater proportion of pupils eligible for FSM. We are in line with the London and statistical neighbour GLD scores for NFSM children but slightly below them for FSM children.

A similar pattern can be seen when Islington scores are broken by other groups (EAL, SEN) with Islington above the national but either in line with or below the London and statistical neighbour averages. The Islington GLD score for EAL children was 68% compared with 66% nationally. 30% of children receiving SEN support achieved the GLD compared with 28% nationally.

A higher proportion of children in Islington with an EHCP (9%) achieve the GLD compared with the national average (5%), that of London (5%) and statistical neighbours (4.5%).

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

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

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 is now available for the same period. This shows that the persistent absence rate for primary schools across London and England also rose compared to the same period in 2016/17 (from 9.0% to 9.4% for London, and from 8.7% to 9.6% for England overall), although the Islington rate rose faster than our comparators.

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 the persistent absence rate for secondary schools across England as a whole rose from 12.8% in the Autumn and Spring terms of 2016/17 to 13.6% in 2017/18, putting Islington at the national average. The London rate rose from 11.4% to 11.8%.

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.

Our strategy for tackling PA at primary schools includes ensuring that:

- Parents meet their responsibilities for their child to attend school regularly through improved information and positive reinforcement from the earliest stages
- All schools have effective leadership and management of attendance in place, a culture of good attendance, strong relationships with parents, early intervention and rigorous governance (supported by good data and high quality analysis)
- Good attendance is seen as everyone's business, with all agencies ensuring that good school attendance is a key outcome as well as a safeguarding matter.
- The Local Authority continues to challenge and support schools to ensure measures taken to improve attendance are effective including prosecution, through full and effective use of legal powers

We are working with targeted schools (i.e. those with highest persistent absence) to develop action plans, and to consider legal action where other interventions have failed to secure improved attendance.

3.14 – Number of children in Alternative Provision

The number of pupils in Alternative Provision (AP) at the end of Q2 2018/19 was 59 pupils. This KPI has been amended for 2018/19 to now look at all pupils in Alternative Provision, including AP directly commissioned by schools. 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), so historical data is not comparable. 59 is a drop on the 83 in Alternative Provision at the end of June. Based on trends for the previous measure, we would expect a gradual increase in the numbers of pupils in Alternative Provision throughout each academic year, before a drop as pupils leave at the end of Year 11.

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. AP provision and processes around it continues to be a focus in the secondary headteacher briefings. Headteachers support the premise that only in exceptional circumstances should children and young people not be provided for in a main stream setting.

Local and national data confirms that mainstream schooling offers the best outcomes and life chances for most 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 attending AP. All of our Secondary schools have identified a contact person to facilitate the sharing of data in relation to students attending AP. This information is collected on a monthly basis prior to the Securing Education Board meetings and the LA pupil database updated accordingly in line with GDPR requirements.

3.15 – Corporate Indicator: Average Attainment 8 Score

The published provisional Attainment 8 figure for Islington schools for 2017/18 is 46.2, an increase on the 2016/17 average of 45.6. Provisional comparator data shows the average score across London rose by a smaller margin, from 48.9 to 49.2, whilst the national average fell slightly, from 44.6 to 44.3. The Inner London average also fell, from 48.2 to 48.1.

Attainment 8 measures achievement across 8 qualifications.

3.16 – Corporate Indicator: Average Progress 8 Score

The published provisional Progress 8 figure for Islington schools for 2017/18 is 0.15, an increase on the 2016/17 provisional average of 0.14. Provisional comparator data shows the average score across London stayed at 0.22 in 2017/18, whilst the national average score fell from -0.03 to -0.08.

Progress 8 captures the progress a pupil makes from the end of key stage 2 to the end of key stage 4. It compares pupils' Attainment 8 scores with the average Attainment 8 score of all pupils nationally who had a similar starting point (or 'prior attainment'), based on their assessment results from the end of primary school.

Significant changes in curriculum and in assessment and accountability measures continue to impact on GCSE assessments nationally. Challenges for schools will continue over the next year or so with the system gradually coming to terms with the ongoing changes. This makes year on year comparison difficult for the time being. In spite of this, Islington secondary pupils have continued to performed very well in relation to Attainment 8 and Progress 8 and have performed strongly in other measures.

3.18 –Corporate Equalities Indicator: Narrowing the gap in attainment between Black-Caribbean (BCRB) pupils and the LBI average at KS4 (gap in Progress 8 between BCRB pupil and LBI average)

and

3.19 –Corporate Equalities Indicator: Narrowing the gap in attainment between White British pupils eligible for Free School Meals and the LBI average at KS4 (gap in Progress 8 between White-British FSM pupils and LBI average)

Based on provisional results, the average Progress 8 score for Islington's Black-Caribbean pupils in 2017/18 was -0.28, a fall from -0.09 in the revised 2016/17 results. This meant the gap between Islington's Black-Caribbean pupils and the borough average has widened to 0.43 points, from 0.22 points in 2016/17.

The average Progress 8 score for Islington's White-British pupils who were eligible for Free School Meals in 2017/18 was -0.64 in the provisional 2017/18 results, a fall from -0.51 in the revised 2016/17 results. This meant the gap between Islington's White-British Free School Meals-eligible pupils and the borough average has widened to 0.79 points, from 0.64 points in 2016/17.

It is disappointing that the progress gaps for both groups of pupils have increased in this year's set of results. However this re affirms the need for this to be a key priority. Work around closing this gap is made more challenging because of more GCSE subjects moving over to the 9-1 grading system, and because of DfE calculations of Progress and Attainment 8 which give more weight to the higher grades and less weight to the lower grades. The Attainment 8 score of all Islington FSM pupils has decreased in this year's results, however that of Black Caribbean and White UK FSM pupils has decreased more than other ethnic groups. This is a persistent national trend. Whilst the new assessment regime has several positive aspects (focus on progress and attainment across eight subjects, for example) it does also have the potential to polarise results and make it more difficult for disadvantaged students to achieve. Whilst we battle to improve the achievement of these two groups of students, it is important to recognise that the system is potentially making it harder. Our efforts must therefore be redoubled and strategic.

Thus far we have focused on challenging and engaging schools on initiatives to improve engagement and outcomes for these two groups. This work will continue so that schools are engaged in a sustained programme of improvement. There are five main directions for our work in this year. Firstly, we have established a strategic 'Plan on a Page' document that identifies clear priorities and actions for moving forward and an Equalities Reference Group with representation from community and schools has been established to review progress of the plan on a half termly basis. Through this group we are also systematically identifying effective practice that school leaders think supports their school to 'buck the trend' on progress and attainment for these groups. Secondly, equalities is the theme of the Deputy Heads Conference in February. This includes sessions on cultural competency to address issues such as institutional racism and unconscious bias. Thirdly, the Islington Community of Schools intend to establish within their workstream on partnerships a strand to support the achievement of these groups of pupils. Fourthly, successful school based working parties, enrichment and support initiatives from last year are being encouraged and supported to continue – the focus of this work is on improving progress and attainment. Finally, academic research begun last year into the engagement and achievement of White British Disadvantaged pupils continues, with fieldwork scheduled to start in two schools in January.

The underachievement of these two groups of pupils is a complex and persistent problem which has existed at both borough and national level for many years. It will need joined up and sustained thinking and relentless effort to make progress. Children, Employment & Skills are committed to doing this.

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

This indicator relates to children who have had a social care assessment and intervention which has resulted in their case being closed and who have then been referred again within 12 months of the case closure. Our auditing of these cases suggests that the majority of these children relate to children living with domestic abuse and where either the level of risk has apparently diminished or where the family no longer wants social work intervention and the needs are not so great as to warrant statutory child protection processes being instigated. Audit of the cases when they are referred is indicative of new incidents of domestic abuse or an escalation of the original concerns.

For the last few years our re referral rate has remained fairly constant at about 20%, which has been similar to the national average. However the proportion of re-referrals within the last 12 months has reduced from 16.8% at the end of 2017/18 to 15.1% at the end of Q2 2018/19. The reduction in the re-referral rate may be an early indication that the Motivational Practice approach is now having a sustainable and longer term impact on the wellbeing of children and their 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 15.7% in 2017/18 to 17.6% at the end of Q2 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.

Comparator data for 2017/18 has now been published. The proportion of children who became the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time was higher in Islington than the London average, but lower than the national average. Islington's rate was the 30th lowest out of the 149 local authorities who had a figure published.

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.

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

Provisional data shows that only 20 out of Islington's 320 looked after children had had 3 or more placements during the year 2018/19, as at the end of the second quarter. The proportion of all looked after children who have had 3 or more placements is 6.3%, which is lower than at the same point in 2017/18 (6.8%, relating to 24 out of 351 children).

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 Q2 2018/19, 62.2% of Islington's looked after children who had been looked after long term were in stable placements. This is lower than performance as at the end of the first

quarter of the year, and lower than at the same time during 2017/18. However, it is in line with performance at the end of 2017/18.

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.

3.30 – Number of looked after children

and

3.31 – Rate of looked after children

At the end of Q2 2018/19 there were 320 children looked after by Islington. The number of looked after children has been generally falling since December 2017. The last time the number of children looked after by Islington has been at this level was during the summer of 2014.

The Islington rate of Looked After Children fell in 2017/18 to 82 per 10,000 under 18 residents. Although Islington remains above the rates of our comparators, the national rate increased, so Islington is narrowing the gap with the national rate.

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

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 for 2018/19. 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 September 2018, the same level as at the end of Q1. There have been 2 short inspections since the end of Q1, in which both schools retained their previous inspection outcomes (one Good – St Joan of Arc - and one Outstanding – Richard Cledesley) and no full inspections. Over the same period, the proportion of schools judged good or outstanding has fallen slightly across London and the country as a whole. Islington has retained the rank of 23rd in the country in terms of school inspection results 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 (5/5)
- 75% of Pupil Referral Units (3/4)

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:

2 January 2019

Carmel Littleton

Corporate Director of Children, Employment and
Skills

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