

London Borough of Islington  
**Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - Monday, 26 February 2024**

Minutes of the meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on Monday, 26 February 2024 at 7.00 pm.

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Councillors:</b>	Chapman (Chair), Bossman-Quarshie (Vice-Chair), Craig, Jegorovas-Armstrong, North, Ogunro, Pandor and Zammit
	<b>Co-opted Member</b>	Mary Clement, Roman Catholic Diocese
<b>Also Present:</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	Hamdache, Safi-Ngongo, Khondoker, Nathan, Shaikh, Turan, O'Halloran and Williamson
	<b>Guests</b>	Jeremy Corbyn MP, Member of Parliament for Islington North; Sophie McNeill, Nominated Primary Parent Governor Representative; Nick Turpin, Nominated Church of England Diocese Representative.

**Councillor Sheila Chapman in the Chair**

**174 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM NO. 1)**

There were no apologies for absence.

**175 DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (ITEM NO. 2)**

There were no declarations of substitute members.

**176 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM NO. 3)**

Councillor Jegorovas-Armstrong declared an interest regarding the Item for Call-In: The Executive decision on the Proposal on the future of Duncombe and Montem Primary Schools. The declared interest was as follows:

- Councillor Jegorovas-Armstrong was a signatory of the motion to call-in the Executive's decision.

The Chair confirmed that as a signatory of the call-in, Councillor Jegorovas-Armstrong would not be able to vote on this item, citing the provisions in the committee's Terms of the Reference that "no member may be involved in scrutinising a decision in which they have been directly involved", but as a member of the committee, would still be invited to ask questions and make representations during the deliberation of this item.

**177 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (ITEM NO. 4)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2024 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**178**      **CHAIR'S REPORT (ITEM NO. 5)**

The Chair confirmed that there would be three appointments to the Committee, effective from 29<sup>th</sup> February 2024, subject to confirmation at the Budget Council meeting on that date (29<sup>th</sup> February). These appointments would fill the three co-opted member vacancies and the nominees to these positions were:

- Sophie McNeill, a parent governor of Drayton Park Primary School, as the Primary School Parent Governor, who was also in attendance as a member of the public.
- Susie Graves, a parent governor of New River College as the Secondary School Parent Governor.
- Nick Turpin representing the Church of England Diocese, who was also in attendance as a member of the public.

**179**      **EXTERNAL ATTENDEES (IF ANY) (ITEM NO. 6)**

The following members were present in relation to the call-in:

- Councillor Hamdache, Councillor Russell, Councillor Nathan, and Councillor Shaikh. Councillor Jegorovas-Armstrong, a member of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee, was also a signatory of the call-in.
- Councillor Safi-Ngongo

There were four observing members in attendance:

- Councillor Khondoker, Councillor O'Halloran, Councillor Turan and Councillor Williamson.

Three members of the public were in attendance:

- Jeremy Corbyn MP, the Member of Parliament for Islington North.
- Nick Turpin, Church of England Diocese.
- Sophie McNeill, Parent Governor.

Additionally, the Corporate Director of Children's Services, the Director for Learning & Achievement, and the Chief Executive were also in attendance. The Monitoring Officer (the Director of Law & Governance) was in attendance in an advisory capacity.

**180**      **ITEMS FOR CALL IN (IF ANY) (ITEM NO. 7)**

In accordance with paragraph 42.2 of the Committee Procedure Rules in the Council's Constitution, the Chair varied the order of agenda items to allow the committee to consider the call-in at the start of the meeting.

**181**      **CALL IN OF THE EXECUTIVE DECISION ON THE PROPOSAL ON THE FUTURE OF DUNCOMBE AND MONTEM PRIMARY SCHOOLS (ITEM NO. 7A)**

The Chair outlined that following the meeting of the Executive on Thursday 8 February 2024, the Monitoring Officer had confirmed that a valid notice of call-in was received regarding the decision made on the 'Proposal on the Future of Duncombe and Montem Primary Schools', and that as this decision related to an education function, the Monitoring Officer had, in accordance with paragraph 66.5 (c) of the Council's Constitution, referred the call-in to this committee for consideration. The Chair then highlighted the options available to the committee. These were:

- To not agree with the call-in and to uphold the decision made by the Executive, in which case it can be implemented following this meeting.
- To agree, at least in part, with the call-in and refer the decision back to the Executive with recommendations that they should take into consideration when they review their original decision.

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

The Chair further outlined the procedure of the call-in and formally moved the motion to consider the item for call-in. Following this, the Chair invited the lead signatory of the call-in, Councillor Hamdache, to address the committee in support of the call-in. The representation was delivered jointly with Councillor Russell and included the following points:

- Councillor Hamdache stated that the Department for Education's intervention to grant Pooles Park Primary School academy status had left the Council in a difficult position, given the plans to close it as part of the school organisation plan. It was also stated in the representation that government policy had compounded the issue, as had an application from a further separate school in the borough, applying for academy status, which would affect school place planning going forward. Further points made to members included that Montem Primary School was a borough-leading ARP (Additionally Resourced Provision), that excelled in supporting disadvantaged children including those whose first language was not English, and that the decision on the future of the school had been questioned by parents and teachers alike. Councillor Hamdache made further points to members, including that Hackney, in dealing with their own plans, had bought in an independent body to assist with engagement; that the Executive's decision on the proposal for Duncombe and Montem would also have the effect of defederating Drayton Park Primary School; that it was the view of parents and teachers that the consultation from the Council had been insufficient and called for a pause to start a participatory process; and that this call-in was an important opportunity for the Council to consider parents' concerns.
- Councillor Russell stated that the number of children in Islington was decreasing, and the Council was at a critical point wherein some schools across the borough would need to close, but that a conversation should be had with every school in the borough about how best to protect the education of its children. Councillor Russell closed with further statements that the community of Drayton Park Primary School had not been properly consulted in the process and that members should refer the decision back to the Executive for further consideration and to engage with the community about what the next steps were.

The Chair then invited the, the Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families, Councillor Safi-Ngongo, to address the committee and outline the case for the Executive's decision. During this, the following points were made:

- The Executive Member stated that the issue underpinning the decision was a London-wide problem, with factors including falling rolls and population changes and that the Council's approach has been to safeguard education provision for the borough's children and young people by engaging in full collaboration with headteachers and governors, culminating in a borough wide strategy agreed by the Executive in October 2022. It was also stated to members that the Education Plan was presented to this community three times, citing this as an example of how seriously the Council took the education of its children and young people, that every decision was taken with the benefit of the borough's children in mind. The Council had recognised the significant numbers of children with special educational needs (SEND) across its schools and developed the SEND strategy to address this. Councillor Safi-Ngongo also made further points to members, including that 96% of Islington's were rated "Good", that the plans were being delivered in two phases for which the borough had been divided into six different planning areas, and that 60% of the Council's schools were projecting deficits which would equate to a £15 million deficit by 2026. Councillor Safi-Ngongo made further statements to members, including that doing nothing was not an option as schools would be

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

left unable to pay staff or provide services; that the schools themselves were asking the Council to act faster to safeguard a good education provision across the borough. Drayton Park Primary School had financial difficulties which were projected to increase by 2025, and the Council would work with the school to support them. Councillor Safi-Ngongo closed by urging members to consider the matter seriously, stressing that the decision was taken for the benefit of the children in the borough.

The committee were invited to ask questions of either Leader of the Opposition or the Executive Member for Children Young People & Families, with the Chair highlighting that some questions could be referred to the Corporate Director of Children's Services where required:

- Members questioned as to whether a lift would be installed to the Duncombe Primary School site, to which it was confirmed that if the decision were to go ahead, then this would be added.
- Members questioned the call-in signatories' proposal to bring in the use of an independent body, specifically querying as to what type of organisation that might be and what intervention would they deliver that hadn't already been done so within the plan. In response, Councillor Hamdache stated that Hackney Council had bought in an independent consultancy to add depth and capacity to the engagement of similarly affected schools in their borough. Councillor Hamdache referred to Drayton Park Primary School's financial deficit, stating that the proposals would worsen their finances and that the school had not been consulted adequately in the proposals, which would necessitate the need for further engagement to take place on the entire borough-wide process.
- Members expressed the view that from the official documents, Hackney's use of consultants appeared to be more process-based than strategic.
- Members stated that they had been reassured that the buildings were protected for educational use by statute but sought clarification as to why the Duncombe site had been chosen over Montem. In response, members were advised by both the Corporate Director for Children's Services and Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families, that the decision had been reached based on feasibility studies of both sites, factors in this evidence base including pollution, location and population in the vicinity, as well as the financial feasibility. Statistically, in terms of achievement there was little difference between the two schools and that this was not a significant factor of the decision, and that the decision had been reached in consultation with headteachers.
- Members asked what the consequences would be on delaying the proposals. In response, members were advised by the Corporate Director of Children's Services that pausing the borough-wide process for these two schools (Duncombe and Montem) would double the deficit for both of them and that doing nothing would result in a £15 million deficit across the school estate. There were currently 27 forms of entry surplus, which was the equivalent to 810 spare places, which in-turn equated to annual financial loss of £5.3 million. It was also stated to members that headteachers had urged the Council to address the matter faster; that the reason the plans had been phased was so that it could delivered in an organised manner, and that the consultancies used by other councils had been done so to help meet compliance rather than assist with the process.
- Members noted the remarks attributed to the Mayor of London that there was concern that councils were making long term decisions on what could be short term trends and urged councils not to make permanent decisions regarding falling birth rates. The Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families was asked if they were in agreement with this position. In response,

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

members were told that it was a London-wide issue; that neighbouring boroughs such as Camden were following a similar approach, and that further afield, other local authorities were consulting Islington for best practice. The Executive Member went on to state that the problem needed to be addressed now and had been compounded by government policy.

- Members noted that there were also plans for Samuel Rhodes School to relocate to a different premises, to which the Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families advised that this was separate to organisational planning and was to do with the suitability of the lift and facilities at the site which were deemed not fit for purpose for the school's needs.
- Members sought clarity on the governing arrangements should the proposal go ahead, to which the Director for Learning & Achievement advised that as an amalgamation rather than a closure, which was stated to be the Department for Education's (DfE) preferred approach in circumstances such as these, the current governors would remain; but Drayton Park Primary School, which was not within the remit of this proposal, would be defederated and have its own governing arrangements.
- Members sought clarification on how the Council would help Drayton Park Primary School become more financially sustainable. In response, the Director for Learning & Achievement informed members that Drayton Park had one of the most significant deficits in the borough and officers were already working with them to help achieve a balanced budget.
- Members noted that there had been concern among constituents about the potential spread of amalgamations and sought assurances that could be given to them. In response, the Director for Learning & Achievement advised that the situation was being looked at strategically, that schools were being included in the journey and where action was required, this would be done in conjunction with them.
- Members sought clarification on the risk that families would jump from school to school due to perceived instability. In response, the Director for Learning & Achievement stated that the Admissions team will be supporting parents; that students of Duncombe and Montem will have a place at the merged school; and that the merger of, rather than the closure of the two good schools would enable the Council to draw from expertise among the staff already delivering high levels of education.
- Members noted that they had received considerable public feedback regarding this call-in of the Executive's decision and that much of it expressed goodwill to the two schools affected by the proposal and concern about the provision for SEND children, to which members then asked for assurances that these children would be served well at the merged school. In response, the Executive Member stated that this was also raised during the consultation as a matter of concern by families, that meetings had taken place with families of SEND children, that detailed plans were in place to help the Council ensure their needs were met and that the teachers of both schools would also help maintain the provision at the merged school.

Members of the public were invited to ask questions of either Councillor Hamdache or Councillor Safi-Ngongo, with the Chair again stating that some questions could be referred to the Corporate Director of Children's Services where required:

- The Member of Parliament for Islington North, Jeremy Corbyn MP, noted that both schools were successful and asked whether the special needs provision can be sufficiently catered to at the Duncombe site, and also questioned the long-term use for the buildings that were surplus to requirements in conjunction with the wider school estate, and what was being done to support families from the Andover estate who were some of the borough's most disadvantaged residents. In response, the Corporate Director of Children's

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

Services stated that there would be a transition plan for SEND students and their families; that there would be safeguarding of the staff delivering SEND provision at the amalgamated school; and that families had real choice in terms of education, rather than just preference as had been in previous times and therefore it was an expectation that not all students would elect to transfer to the amalgamated site. The Corporate Director also stated that in terms of the building estate, the Council was mindful of future population changes; that officers would be attending a workshop with the Department for Education to look at policy, resources, system change and housing; and that one of the uses the Councils was considering for the Montem site was the expansion of family hubs.

- Sophie McNeill, a Parent Governor of Drayton Park Primary School, asked for clarity on the future governing arrangements should the proposals go ahead, particularly the number of positions available, given that it would result in the defederation of the Edventure Collaborative that currently governs the schools; on the timeframe for the changes outlined in the proposal for the implementation of the proposals, given that it would need to be in place for the new school year and on the financial position of Montem Primary School. In response, the Director for Learning & Achievement stated that adopting the current timeline would put the amalgamated school in a much better financial position, as although the deficit at Montem had seen a slight improvement, the long-term cumulative deficit would make it difficult for the school to continue to offer a diverse curriculum; it was also stated that projections had been based on information that the schools had provided to officers, and that in terms of the governing arrangements, the Council would work to ensure vacancies were filled and current governors were supported.

The committee were invited to make comments in support of either the call-in or of the Executive's original decision. This included the following statements:

- That among the members of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee there was a wealth of experience in education and the public sector, and that should they agree with any part of the call-in, the committee should vote to refer the decision back to the Executive.
- That after listening to all of the representations about merging two high performing schools and an excellent special needs provision, there should be more focus on the opportunity this presented, to shape an even more successful combined school.
- That there was a clear strength of feeling in the community about this proposal and that retaining the Duncombe name didn't give the impression of a combined community as it erased the longstanding Montem identity.
- That there were valued communities across the borough with whom the Council had consulted and school leaders whom conversations had been held with, which had helped ensure a sustainable solution and that it would be financially irresponsible to delay the proposal further.

Councillor Hamdache and the Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families were invited to make their final statements to the committee:

- Councillor Hamdache stated that they recognised that the Council was in a difficult position and thanked officers for providing clarity, but also stated that Drayton Park Primary School was facing financial difficulties and had not been consulted or considered in the scope of decision and that the concern was in only looking at Montem and Duncombe alone, the impact to Drayton Park had not been considered, which was material for a rethink of the Executive's decision. In closing, it was further stated that given the ambitious timeline, should the members consider the transition of SEND children or the planned

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

implementation of the proposals to be of concern, to refer the decision back to the Executive.

- The Executive Member for Children, Young People & Families stated that closing schools was always a last resort and that the decision to merge these two schools had not been rushed, that meetings had taken place with headteachers about projected deficits in their schools and means of addressing it; that transitions in the amalgamation of Vittoria and Copenhagen schools had been handled effectively, that ultimately doing nothing was not an option, with every decision made being done so with children and young people in mind.

The Chair moved recommendation 2.1 a) to a vote; that the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee does not object to the decision in question, in which case the decision shall take effect on the date of this meeting.

The motion was put to a vote and **CARRIED**.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee does not object to the Executive's decision on the Proposal on the Future of Duncombe and Montem Primary Schools and that the decision is upheld with immediate effect.

## **182 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (ITEM NO. 8)**

None.

## **183 THE CHILDREN'S WORKFORCE - WITNESS EVIDENCE (ITEM NO. B1)**

The Director of Safeguarding and the Assistant Director of Safeguarding & Quality Assurance introduced this item to the committee. In the discussion, the following points were raised:

- The most senior social worker in in any local authority was the Director of Safeguarding or named equivalent.
- Islington's social care workforce was comprised of suitable qualified practitioners, that were registered and regulated by Social Work England.
- A Social Work qualification was a mandatory requirement as the postholder would be expected to carry out statutory safeguarding duties on behalf of the Local Authority.
- The Workforce required qualified practitioners and managers to supervise and oversee key decisions e.g. case allocation, prioritisation, care planning, statutory decision making e.g. agency decision maker for adoption, permanency and fostering.
- Islington employed 250 Child and Family Social Workers
- Islington's social early help service had been rated outstanding by Ofsted.
- Nationally, research showed that no authority was confident that they will be able to recruit enough permanent Child and Family Social Workers to meet their needs in the next 12 months, and recruitment and retention was the top priority for service delivery for most local authorities.
- Experienced Children & Family Social Workers were the hardest to recruit / retain, followed by team leaders and senior managers. Newly qualified CFSW were easier to recruit, but it was getting harder.
- There had been a reduction in social work posts in the last three to four years, an increase in vacancies, agency positions and social workers leaving the profession. This had resulted in increased caseloads because there were fewer social workers. The sickness rate had also increased.

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

- Islington's position still remained stronger than the national average, with caseloads considerably less than the national average and sickness levels better also, at 1.8% compared to 2% nationally.
- The Council met its needs through several workforce initiatives, but it was becoming harder to recruit and retain experienced talent, which would only increase going forward. One of the initiatives in place to tackle the measure regionally, was the London Pledge, which aimed to standardise agency costs across London.
- Islington had a programme of benefits and allowances for harder to recruit posts including a retention bonus, Zones 1 and 2 Travelcard, and qualification increments for extra training.
- The Council would no longer be able to offer Key Worker housing for newly qualified social workers, from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2024, which had proved to be a popular draw for talent. There were six social workers at present that were still able to bid for properties before April 2024, the deadline for which had just been extended to May 2024, giving a month's grace. Since 2022 the Council had housed nine social workers (five in Council stock and four in Housing Association stock), but not every social worker was eligible for this scheme. This was a decision taken by Islington Council in line with the housing allocation scheme amid concerns there was not enough to stock to adequately cater to both key workers and care leavers, with both groups often in competition for these properties and the Council's duties as a corporate parent meant that care leavers took precedence in this instance.
- The Council had also worked with The Frontline and was engaged in the Step Up to Social Work programme.
- Officers were looking at how the Council trained its social workers as practice educators, ensuring that there was a pool of staff with an experience and knowledge of Islington that could also train up and coming, new talent.
- Agency pay caps may curb the outflow of social workers from local authorities, but it wouldn't stop them leaving the profession, and may further reduce supply.
- The workforce was currently representative of the Islington population, but not of the population children known to social care, which was different, and officers were working to address this.
- There was a controversial piece of research being undertaken by central government into the use of artificial intelligence in writing assessments, plans and research that would serve to cut down on bureaucracy.
- In response to questions from members about whether the Council was regularly benchmarking its benefits and allowances against neighbouring boroughs or comparative employers, and as to whether the Council also had a good understanding of pull factors that draw social workers to Islington over elsewhere, officers advised that the data showed that Islington had a stable workforce and much more stable caseloads than other boroughs. Combined with Islington's practice model, good supervision, and opportunities for growth, this helped sustain Islington's reputation as a rewarding and attractive employer. Regular benchmarking against local authorities was done as standard and Islington was in line with other authorities on retention. The Step Up to Social Work programme and higher education provision were also pull factors, as was how well staff were looked after.
- In response to members questions about whether there was anything unique in other boroughs' models of practice unique that Islington could adopt, officers advised that most local authorities now had a practice model that was relationship based. Islington's model was referred to as the motivational practice model whereas other authorities had different names for their models.



## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

- The further point was made by officers that trauma-informed practice was a model that had been shared across the council, in schools, housing, any interface that has contact with children and young people.
- Officers also advised that they were working with the Department for Education on authoring a career framework that seeks to establish how much more effectively social workers can be supported in the first two years of practice and pushing organisations to have one model of practice, which had a demonstrable impact on children's lives.
- The committee praised the work of the social workers, praised the leadership that facilitated such an environment and sought to see the good work being highlighted more widely.
- In response to members questions about what else can be done to convince agency workers to join the Council permanently, officers stated that some of Islington's most experienced, longtime social workers had been recruited through agency/temporary positions. There had been work done on making the transition from agency/temporary working to permanent staff as seamless as possible, but this had been challenging because of the competitive job market. Officers also engaged with staff on an individual basis, but noted the cost of living was a significant factor and welcomed any suggestions from members on addressing the issue.

### **ACTION:**

Officers to provide a breakdown of the social care workforce by age, ethnicity and gender.

### **ACTION:**

The Committee to work with Democratic Services to facilitate a discussion with the relevant officers and/or the Executive Member for Homes & Communities to establish what else can be done regarding the allocation of key worker housing.

### **ACTION:**

Officers to provide a breakdown of the social care workforce by age, ethnicity and gender.

### **ACTION:**

The Committee to work with Democratic Services to facilitate a discussion with the relevant officers and/or the Executive Member for Homes & Communities to establish what else can be done regarding the allocation of key worker housing.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

184

## **EXECUTIVE MEMBER'S REPORT (ITEM NO. B2)**

The Executive Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Safi-Ngongo, introduced this item to the committee: In the discussion, the following points were raised:

- The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic were still being felt not just by the borough's children and young people, but residents more broadly. There had been many pandemic-related mental health issues arising in the borough's children and young people and the Executive Member had attended a conference addressing this issue.
- The Executive Member also stated that there was still a significant crisis in housing the borough's care leavers. Officers in Housing Services were said to be doing their best but a corporate strategy was needed to resolve the issue, even if it meant the cost being met through Children's Services, as some of

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

these young people were being forced out of the borough or housed in private accommodation at high cost to the Council.

- The cost-of-living crisis and housing crisis was fuelling multiple interconnected crises in the borough. This included not just the lack of supply of accommodation for care leavers, but also falling rolls, with many families being rehomed outside of the borough.
- There had been significant interest not just nationally but internationally in the work Islington was doing in relation to Family Hubs.
- Early intervention was helping to prevent the number of looked after children and supporting the families where they were.
- In terms of education, the next plan was to tackle persistent absence, which was said to be significant at even the primary school level and was another COVID-19 related issue. Officers were working hard to find a different approach to getting children back into education.
- The Executive Member stated they were working with all members of the Executive to ensure Islington was a child friendly borough and that it was the responsibility of the entire organisation, not just Children's Services. The Executive Member cited an instance wherein at a meeting with children from global majority groups, children of black heritage in particular voiced their fears that riding bicycles would increase their risk of criminalisation/perceived as threats, which highlighted that there was still more work to be done with police and colleagues to empower all young people to feel part of the borough.
- The next step would be to review current policies to meet the changing need of young people and also to act upon the recommendations made by the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee in its 2022-23 scrutiny review.
- In terms of the support offered to children missing in education, this was something that both officers and the Executive Member were reviewing to see whether it could be improved.
- In terms of the Council's 2030 Child Friendly Ambition for "We will equip and empower every child and young person who attends our education settings with the learning and skills for life and the future world of work", and whether home-educated children and/or children missing from education had been taken into account, the Executive Member confirmed to members that it had been and work was being undertaken on that element of the recommendations that the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee had made in its 2022-23 review.
- Officers confirmed that the programme allocating laptops to students transitioning into year seven would again continue into the new academic year in September.
- In terms of tackling the increasing number of mental health issues among young people, it was said that early intervention mattered and as soon as it was known that a young person was in crisis, officers would act immediately, providing the support in whatever space that young person felt most comfortable with.
- The take up of the National Tutoring offer had been good on paper but not enough schools were taking up enough of the offer. While all schools were working on disproportionality and providing support to students with special educational needs and/or disability in compassionate way, the Council was still encouraging schools to take up this offer.

### **ACTION:**

Officers to provide a briefing to the committee on the pilot of the Additionally Resourced Provision hubs.

### **ACTION:**

## Children's Services Scrutiny Committee - 26 February 2024

Officers to provide data to the committee on the impact its measures are having on reducing the number of children missing from education.

### **ACTION:**

Officers to provide additional data to the Committee on the take up of the National Tutoring Offer.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

### **185 SCHOOL RESULTS 2023 (ITEM NO. B3)**

The Chair moved a motion to adjourn this item to the next meeting of the committee to the next meeting of the Committee, to allow sufficient time for members to effectively consider this item of business.

The motion was put to a vote and **CARRIED**.

### **RESOLVED:**

That consideration of Item B3 School Results, be adjourned to the meeting of 29th April 2024.

### **186 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF SEN & DISABILITIES TRANSITIONS - 12-MONTH UPDATE (INCLUDING UPDATE ON BASELINE REPORT FOR SUPPORTED INTERNSHIPS) (ITEM NO. B4)**

The Chair moved a motion to adjourn this item to the next meeting of the Committee, to allow sufficient time for members to effectively consider this item of business.

The motion was put to a vote and **CARRIED**.

### **RESOLVED:**

That consideration of Item B4 Scrutiny Review of SEN & Disabilities Transitions – 12-month update (including update on Baseline Report for Supported Internships), be adjourned to the meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024.

### **187 WORK PROGRAMME 2023/24 (ITEM NO. B5)**

The Chair informed members that following the motion to adjourn Items B3 School Results 2023 & B4 Scrutiny Review of SEN & Disabilities Transitions – 12-month update (including update on Baseline Report for Supported Internships) to the meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024, the consideration of two items at that meeting will also be moved. The SACRE Annual Report and the Quarter 3 Performance Report will no longer be considered at the meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024, but will instead be put forward to the committee's first meeting of the new municipal year in June 2024.

The Chair thanked members of the committee for their diligence in the call-in and also the members that triggered the call-in of the Executive's decision, as it allowed the committee the opportunity to interrogate that decision with an additional level of scrutiny.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the work programme be noted.

MEETING CLOSED AT 9.32 pm

Chair