



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND SCHOOLS SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: WEDNESDAY, 22 JULY 2015 at 5:45 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Dr Moore (Chair)

Councillor Cole (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Aldred

Councillor Grant

Councillor Chohan

Councillor Gugnani

Councillor Malik

Co-opted Members:

Mr Mohammed Al-Azad, Parent Governor Representative (Primary/Special Needs)

In Attendance:

Councillor Russell, Assistant City Mayor - Children, Young People & Schools

Also Present:

Faduma Abdi – Youth Representative

Anu Kapur – Leicester Secular Society

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from the following people:-

- Councillor Senior
- Mr Peter Flack (Teaching Unions representative)
- Ms Rabiha Hannan (Faith Representative – Muslim)
- Ms Carolyn Lewis (Church of England Diocese representative)

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Dr Moore declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, as her company was teaching two Looked After Children.

Councillor Malik declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, as he was the Chief Executive of a youth and community association. This association received no funding from the Council, but offered services used by the Council.

Councillor Cole declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, in that he taught at De Montfort University. He also declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, as his wife worked as a teacher. He further declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, in that he was the Chair of a school governing body.

Councillor Aldred declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, in that she was a volunteer at the Thurncourt Road Youth and Community Centre and helped with youth groups there.

Although not a member of the Commission, as a regular participant Councillor Russell declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, in that she was the Chair of Governors at King Richard Infant School.

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, these interests were not considered so significant that they were likely to prejudice the respective Councillors' judgement of the public interest. They were not, therefore, required to withdraw from the meeting.

### **3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission held on 24 February 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **4. PETITIONS**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no petitions had been received.

### **5. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no questions, representations or statements of case had been received.

### **6. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

NOTED:

The Terms of Reference for the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission.

## **7. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION 2015/16**

### **NOTED:**

The membership of the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission for the 2015/16 municipal year.

## **8. DATES OF COMMISSION MEETINGS 2015/16**

### **NOTED:**

That the correct dates of meetings for the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission for the 2015/16 municipal year are as follows:

Wednesday 22 July 2015  
Tuesday 15 September 2015  
Tuesday 10 November 2015  
Tuesday 5 January 2016  
Tuesday 23 February 2016  
Tuesday 12 April 2016

## **9. INTRODUCTION TO THE COUNCIL'S EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

The Strategic Director Children's Services gave an overview of the Council's Education and Children's services, drawing particular attention to the following points:-

- This was a complex area, with a lot of its work written in statute. This included the Strategic Director's and Lead Member's roles;
- Performance was very important, with the services' main focus being on their impact on children, young people and families. Training on this could be provided if required;
- Continuous improvement was a theme running through all services. This was a wider focus than just the recent inspection report by the Office for Standards in Education(Ofsted), (see minute 11, "Lessons Learned from the Recent Ofsted Inspection of Services for Children in Need of Help and Protection, Children Looked After and Care Leavers and Review of the Effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board", below);
- Adult skills were part of the portfolio of the Assistant City Mayor with responsibility for Jobs and Skills and were scrutinised by the Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission;
- The city had high performing secondary schools, but less consistent primary schools. The Council was working with the education community to improve standards;

- Reforms to Special Educational Needs and Disability services had introduced multi-agency care plans, in line with national practice. These were now being implemented;
- School place planning was a very significant area of work;
- Multi-agency working on services for young people and families was critical, especially in the improvement journey being made following the recent Ofsted inspection;
- The vacant post of Director of Commissioning and Performance was being reviewed, to consider the best way of developing this area; and
- Key issues for all of the services were the focus on improvement and maintaining a clear vision of what was required to have outstanding services, working with other partners and ensuring that everything that was done made a difference.

Councillor Russell, Assistant City Mayor with responsibility for Children, Young People and Schools addressed the Commission at the invitation of the Chair, explaining that some interim directors had been appointed, as the posts were considered to be too important to leave vacant while recruitment was undertaken. The Council was aiming to appoint staff of calibre as high as that of the interim directors. The vacant senior posts would be advertised in September 2015. Other posts currently were going through the recruitment process.

In respect of the Director of Learning, Quality and Performance, the normal processes to appoint a director had been followed, but the candidates who had applied did not have the right qualities for the service and so were not interviewed. Job descriptions and salary levels currently were being compared to neighbouring authorities, which was why recruitment had been delayed until September.

It was recognised that there currently were challenges with the services at the Council, but this appealed to some people and did not appear to have deterred candidates to date. However, a lot of officers nationally were choosing to take jobs on an interim basis.

A difficulty with employing a Director of Learning, Quality and Performance was that many authorities no longer had a Learning Division, so finding staff with appropriate experience was more difficult. Comparisons were being made with appropriate authorities, to ensure that this Council's offer was suitable.

It was noted that, if the directors appointed were not already those people working in the post on an interim basis, the new directors would work alongside the interim directors for a period of time, so that services were not interrupted.

The Strategic Director Children's Services then explained the range of services in her service area:-

- Early Help Specialist services referred to those such as the Youth Offending Service, Connexions, (which covered education, employment, training and the careers service), and youth engagement activity;
- Early Help Targeted services were those offering more intensive, specialist help. This included things such as language services for very young children, specialist family support services, services relating to the government's agenda for troubled families, children's centres and the 0-5 offer. These services covered children and young people aged 0 – 19;
- The differentiation between the two parts of Early Help was quite complex and training could be provided for Members on this;
- Children In Need covered a range of services. They were provided for children identified by Social Services as needing additional support as they were at risk. This was the stage before they became Looked After Children, so many of the services were focused on preventing children coming in to care. However, they also included services such as those for children with disabilities or Special Educational Needs;
- Secondary schools in the city performed well, as many children entering them had not achieved well at primary school. The progress they made at secondary school therefore was significant in terms of value added to their education;
- As primary schools in the city improved, secondary schools would have to ensure that the rate of progress was maintained, which would mean achieving more than they currently did, as the children would be starting from a higher level; and
- The performance of primary and secondary schools was discussed through a strategic partnership, giving confidence that the performance of secondary schools would continue to be good.

## **10. CORPORATE PARENTING ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15**

Councillor Russell, Assistant City Mayor with responsibility for Children, Young People and Schools, introduced the Corporate Parenting Annual Report for 2014/15.

Councillor Russell explained that the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) had identified improvements for the Corporate Parenting Forum to make, such as making the best use of data to improve the lives of Looked After Children (LAC) and improving training.

There had been good engagement with the Forum by partners, such as the Children in Care Council, senior officers and representatives of foster carers. However, although some Councillors had attended meetings of the Forum regularly, other Councillors' attendance was inconsistent.

It therefore was recommended that a standing group of members be established, who could receive additional training to help them fulfil the corporate parenting role. It was hoped that the reconstituted group would meet monthly, from September 2015, with the first meeting including training for members of the Forum. The Forum's terms of reference would be reviewed as part of its reorganisation.

Representatives of the Children in Care Council had indicated that they would prefer the Corporate Parenting Forum to be a standing group, as this would reduce the need for them to keep repeating their experiences for new members.

The Interim Director Children, Young People and Families reminded the Commission that all Councillors had a corporate parenting responsibility. This was summarised in the approach "as if this were my child". The Children in Care Council had identified the type of people they would like to be involved with. This included things such as people who were passionate, trustworthy and would listen to them.

Priorities for the Corporate Parenting Forum included responding to the views of the Children In Care Council, undertaking the Council's statutory responsibilities for corporate parenting and helping in the Council's improvement journey following the recent Ofsted inspection, (minute 11, "Lessons Learned from the Recent Ofsted Inspection of Services for Children In Need of Help and Protection, Children Looked After and Care Leavers and Review of the Effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board", referred).

It also was recommended that the Corporate Parenting Forum should take over the role and function of the Safeguarding Children Panel. The Panel previously had met in private with a small number of Councillors as members, but best practice recommended that the matters discussed should be heard in public, under the umbrella of the Corporate Parenting Forum.

Members requested that meetings of the reconstituted Corporate Parenting Forum be held at a time convenient to most Members. In reply, Councillor Russell noted that a meeting time of 5.30 pm was being recommended, so that Councillors and Children in Care Council representatives would be available to attend.

It was noted that an Executive Group of the Corporate Parenting Forum would be established, to drive forward the business priorities of the Forum. A fixed number of members of this Group had not been set, to enable the membership to change to reflect current need. For example, representatives from Clinical Commissioning Groups, University Hospitals Leicester or the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services could be invited to join at different times.

Members noted that the Executive Group would need to look at detailed information in order to establish recommendations for the Forum to take

forward. This would help to filter the Forum's very large workload by identifying topics, drawing together the various strands within topics and helping the Forum to focus where needed. The Executive Group also would identify, if needed, who from the Forum's partners should take particular pieces of work forward.

Councillor Russell stressed that the role of this Scrutiny Commission was far broader than the role of the Corporate Parenting Forum. The latter had a very specific function, but the data presented to the Commission would be a lot broader. Also, officers were members of the Corporate Parenting Forum as well as Councillors and so also were part of the delivery.

The Commission drew attention to the finding of the Ofsted report about the lack of performance reporting. In reply, the Strategic Director Children's Services explained that there were over 40 performance indicators relating to corporate parenting. These included things such as the stability of the workforce, stability in the number of social workers employed and whether Children in Care had received health assessments. Performance measures that could be understood by non-professionals were being developed for reporting to the Corporate Parenting Forum.

The Commission questioned the statement in the Corporate Parenting Forum's Annual Report that there was a stable workforce, but was advised that the high turnover experienced had been in the Children in Need services. The Annual report referred to Looked After Children services, which had a stable workforce.

The Commission asked that, to assist its understanding of the report presented, some background information be provided to Members on who the partner agencies were, the number of Looked After Children over the last five years and reasons why these numbers appeared to be increasing.

To assist with this, the Strategic Director Children's Services offered to provide an information session on "Working Together", the statutory guidance provided by the government. In addition, the Performance Book that had been established following the recent Ofsted report would, over time, provide performance data and a narrative on that data that had not been available before.

The youth representatives welcomed the inclusion of the Children in Care Council's views about the Corporate Parenting Forum in the Annual report, stressing the importance of taking account of these views.

In response to a question from the Commission about how corporate parents looked after children on a day-to-day basis, Councillor Russell explained that this included a range of things. For example, consideration could be given to opportunities for young people and Children In Care such as swimming lessons or visits to different places, establishing culturally sensitive placements, and monitoring statistics and qualitative information from Children In Care Council representatives. Part of the Corporate Parenting Forum's role would be to consider, and make recommendations on, what more could be done.

It was noted that the Council employed a virtual head teacher, who was responsible for all Looked After Children. When the reconstituted Corporate Parenting Forum met, the virtual head teacher would attend its meetings to report on how Looked After Children were doing with their education, including providing comparisons to national data. From this, problems could be identified and ways of addressing them discussed.

Kinship relationships could be very important for Looked After Children and it was noted that some Looked After Children retained contact with their parents. As a result, some lived with their parents, some were in kinship situations and others were with foster carers or in residential children's homes. In general, Council officers tried to place all younger children either with foster carers or kinship parents. If the courts had ordered that children be adopted, they were placed in a residential home as near as possible to their family, unless there were reasons to move them away.

If children had to be placed away from their families, this could mean moving them away from the city. Children also could be placed away from the city due to a shortage of foster and residential care in the city. Reasons for placing children away from the city included them being at risk of Child Sexual Exploitation, being unable to stay with their parents for a variety of reasons, or having specialist needs that could not be met in the city. These children kept their own social worker and Independent Reviewing Officer. Council officers made quality assurance visits to the settings used.

Further explanations of these arrangements could be provided for Members if required. This could include a breakdown of how many Looked After Children were placed in each setting.

Grooming of Looked After Children in terms of Child Sexual Exploitation was another important issue for the Council. The recent Ofsted report had been fairly positive about how the Council dealt with Child Sexual Exploitation. However, it was a very complex area and it was suggested that it could be useful for the Commission to look at this, either through undertaking training, or as a scrutiny review.

Councillor Russell stressed that, although there was a statutory cut-off date at which Looked After Children had to leave care, the Council often continued to support them beyond that time. For example, foster carers often had continuing relationships with those they had cared for, such as while they were undertaking education, and the Council provided advice and support through a personal adviser for each care leaver.

In addition, the Council had a statutory obligation to support children with disabilities who were going in to higher education up to the age of 25, (rather than 21, as for others going in to higher education). They also would retain their personal advisers up to those ages.

The Commission welcomed the information provided and the Chair encouraged members of the Commission to volunteer for membership of the Corporate



Parenting Forum, in order to strengthen the links between the Forum and this Commission.

AGREED:

- 1) That the Strategic Director Children's Services be asked to arrange workshop / training sessions for members of the Commission on the following:-
  - a) helping them understand the recent report from the Office for Standards in Education on Services for Children in Need of Help and Protection, Children Looked After and Care Leavers and Review of the Effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board;
  - b) the statutory guidance "Working Together";
  - c) where Looked After Children were placed, the reasons for making these choices and the number of Looked After Children placed in each setting; and
  - d) Child Sexual Exploitation, if not to be undertaken as a scrutiny review; and
- 2) That the Strategic Director Children's Services be asked to provide the following information to members of the Commission:-
  - a) details of the Corporate Parenting Forum's partner agencies;
  - b) numbers of Looked After Children for the last five years, including comparisons with other authorities;
  - c) reasons for the increase in the number of Looked After Children over the last five years;
  - d) details of the actual figures for the percentages given on page 8 of the report, (page 20 of the agenda); and
  - e) the Children's Pledge.

**11. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE RECENT OFSTED INSPECTION OF SERVICES FOR CHILDREN IN NEED OF HELP AND PROTECTION, CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER AND CARE LEAVERS AND REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD**

The Chair noted that it was important that the many positive elements of the recent report by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) on "Children in Need of Help and Protection, Children Looked After and Care Leavers and Review of the Effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board" were recognised.

However, she also noted that it was important not to be complacent. She therefore proposed that a Task Group be established to consider the historical context of the recent Ofsted inspection of services for Looked After Children, including examination of the Improvement Plan being used for the services' improvement journey. The Chair assured officers and Councillors that this review would be undertaken sensitively and responsibly. Individuals would not be named in the report of the review.

A scoping document for the proposed review was tabled and is attached at the end of these minutes for information.

The Commission welcomed the suggested review, suggesting that it could make it easier for Members to understand what had happened, what needed to be done to rectify the situation and to ensure that the right actions were being taken.

Members noted that the previous Ofsted inspection before the 2015 one had been made in 2011. However, Ofsted's inspection framework had changed since then, so the findings of the 2011 inspection were not directly comparable to the findings of the 2015 inspection.

Councillor Russell, Assistant City Mayor with responsibility for Children, Young People and Schools, advised the Commission that:-

- A full Action Plan was in place as a result of the recommendations made by Ofsted. This had been approved by Ofsted and the Department for Education;
- The Leicester City Children's Improvement Board (LCCIB) was chaired by someone independent of the Council;
- The LCCIB looked at each point made by Ofsted, considered what action was needed in response to these points, the timescale for this and how the services would look when they were classed as "good"; and
- The Improvement Plan set out how the specific recommendations from Ofsted would be addressed.

The Strategic Director noted that Ofsted had recommended that training on the scrutiny of children's services be provided for Members. The scoping document for this review included an offer of this training.

The Chair advised the Commission that she had had discussions with the Chair of the LCCIB and wanted to ensure that there was no duplication of work being done. Contact with the Chair of the LCCIB therefore would be maintained regarding the work being done by each.

The Chair suggested that scrutiny of the Improvement Plan would probably be an ongoing task for the Commission over the coming year and expressed confidence that the review would produce a good piece of work that would help

Members prepare for this.

AGREED:

- 1) That a Task Group be established to undertake a review of the historical context of the recent Ofsted inspection of services for Looked After Children;
- 2) That the remit of the Task Group established under resolution 1) above be as set out in the scoping document attached to these minutes;
- 3) That the Chair of this Commission contact members of this Commission to request expressions of interest in being part of the Task Group referred to under resolution 1) above;
- 4) That the final report of this review be shared with the Strategic Director Children's Services and the Assistant City Mayor with responsibility for Children, Young People and Schools before it is circulated or published elsewhere; and
- 5) That the Strategic Director Children's Services be asked to provide training for members of this Commission on the Action Plan, Improvement Plan and Performance Book established following the Inspection of the Office for Standards in Education referred to above.

## **12. WORK PROGRAMME**

The Commission received a draft work programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

The Chair advised the Commission that she would be reviewing this to ensure that appropriate items were included.

## **13. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.38 pm



**5th Draft**

## **Leicester City Council Scrutiny Review**

---

A review of the historical context of the recent Ofsted inspection of services for looked after children.

Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission  
Chaired by Councillor Moore

22<sup>nd</sup> July 2015

---

## **Background to scrutiny reviews**

Determining the right topics for scrutiny reviews is the first step in making sure scrutiny provides benefits to the Council and the community.

This scoping template will assist in planning the review by defining the purpose, methodology and resources needed. It should be completed by the Member proposing the review, in liaison with the lead Director and the Scrutiny Manager. Scrutiny Officers can provide support and assistance with this.

In order to be effective, every scrutiny review must be properly project managed to ensure it achieves its aims and delivers measurable outcomes. To achieve this, it is essential that the scope of the review is well defined at the outset. This way the review is less likely to get side-tracked or become overambitious in what it hopes to tackle. The Commission's objectives should, therefore, be as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Time-bound) as possible.

The scoping document is also a good tool for communicating what the review is about, who is involved and how it will be undertaken to all partners and interested stakeholders.

The form also includes a section on public and media interest in the review which should be completed in conjunction with the Council's Communications Team. This will allow the Commission to be properly prepared for any media interest and to plan the release of any press statements.

Scrutiny reviews will be supported by a Scrutiny Officer.

### **Evaluation**

Reviewing changes that have been made as a result of a scrutiny review is the most common way of assessing the effectiveness. Any scrutiny review should consider whether an on-going monitoring role for the Commission is appropriate in relation to the topic under review.

**For further information please contact the Scrutiny Team on 0116 4546340**

**To be completed by the Member proposing the review**

<b>To be completed by the Member proposing the review</b>		
<b>1.</b>	<b>Title of the proposed scrutiny review</b>	'A review of the historical context of the recent Ofsted inspection of services for looked after children'.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Proposed by</b>	<b><u>Councillor Moore, Chair of CYPS</u></b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Rationale</b> Why do you want to undertake this review?	<p>State what prompted the review e.g. media interest /public feedback / new legislation / performance information.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <u>Ofsted found children's social care services in Leicester to be inadequate following a recent inspection (published in March 2015).</u></li> <li>2) <u>This was one of the most critical issues challenging the governance of the council in the last term</u></li> <li>3) <u>Therefore, to ensure transparency, it is imperative that the lead-up to this event should be closely examined</u></li> <li>4) <u>An understanding of this historical context is essential for a newly constituted Children, Young Persons and Schools Commission to carry out a full and effective critique of the Children's Improvement Plan</u></li> <li>5) <u>This topic is of high media / public interest</u></li> </ol> <p><b>Elected Members have a unique responsibility for ensuring that the Council and partners are effective in safeguarding and promoting the welfare of all children.</b></p>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Purpose and aims of the review</b> What question(s) do you want to answer and what do you want to achieve? (Outcomes?)	<p>Defining clearly the key questions that the review is seeking to answer is critical to setting a clear scope and approach. E.g. it could be that the commission wants assurances that the service is delivering to a specific community or wants to assess the impact of a change in service.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>What were the long term processes and the context both local and national which led to the Ofsted grading?</u></li> <li>2. <u>What can be learned from successes and failures about performance management for Children's Services?</u></li> <li>3. <u>Are these covered sufficiently in the Improvement Plan?</u></li> </ol> <p><b>Scrutiny can play an important role in making sure there are robust performance and quality assurance mechanisms, clear accountability arrangements and a system of checks and balances that provide effective challenge.</b></p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Links with corporate aims / priorities</b> How does the review link to corporate aims and priorities?  <a href="http://citymayor.leicester.gov.uk/delivery-plan-2013-14/">http://citymayor.leicester.gov.uk/delivery-plan-2013-14/</a>	<p><b><u>This review links to:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <u>Corporate Parenting Strategy 2014 – 2016</u></li> </ol>

6.	<p><b>Scope</b> Set out what is included in the scope of the review and what is not. For example which services it does and does not cover.</p>	Leicester City Councils Children's Services.
<b>Develop a draft Project Plan to incorporate sections seven to twelve of this form</b>		
7.	<p><b>Methodology</b> Describe the methods you will use to undertake the review.</p> <p>How will you undertake the review, what evidence will need to be gathered from members, officers and key stakeholders, including partners and external organisations and experts?</p>	<p><u>Evidence will be gathered from:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Examination of key events over time within safeguarding practice since previous Ofsted report</li> <li>2) Interviews with stakeholders</li> <li>3) Policy documents and minutes leading up to the 2015 Ofsted report, including a critique of the Monro report and the consequences of its implementation</li> <li>4) Location of Ofsted report within the national context</li> <li>5) The content of the Improvement Plan</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Witnesses</b> Set out who you want to gather evidence from and how you will plan to do this</p>	<p><b><u>The commission will review minutes of key meetings including Scrutiny and Corporate Parenting, and gather relevant evidence from:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ex executive lead</li> <li>2) Director of service</li> <li>3) Union representatives</li> </ol>
8.	<p><b>Timescales</b> How long is the review expected to take to complete?</p>	8 weeks
	Proposed start date	End of July 2015
	Proposed completion date	End of September 2015
9.	<p><b>Resources / staffing requirements</b> Scrutiny reviews are facilitated by Scrutiny Officers and it is important to estimate the amount of their time, in weeks, that will be required in order to manage the review Project Plan effectively.</p>	Existing resources of scrutiny.



	Do you anticipate any further resources will be required e.g. site visits or independent technical advice? If so, please provide details.	Minutes of relevant meetings.
10.	<b>Review recommendations and findings</b>  To whom will the recommendations be addressed? E.g. Executive / External Partner?	The findings of this review will be presented to: City Mayor and Executive
11.	<b>Likely publicity arising from the review</b> - Is this topic likely to be of high interest to the media? Please explain.	Yes, high profile issue, likely to attract wide media interest
12.	<b>Publicising the review and its findings and recommendations</b> How will these be published / advertised?	Commission meetings and councils website
13.	<b>How will this review add value to policy development or service improvement?</b>	This review will seek to be assured that the council is covering all bases in its Improvement Plan so as to provide a fair, effective and improved Children's Services.
<b>To be completed by the Divisional Lead Director</b>		
14.	<b>Divisional Comments</b>  Scrutiny's role is to influence others to take action and it is important that Scrutiny Commissions seek and understand the views of the Divisional Director.	
15.	<b>Are there any potential risks to undertaking this scrutiny review?</b>  E.g. are there any similar reviews being undertaken, on-going work or changes in policy which would supersede the need for this review?	A key recommendation from the Ofsted report is to: <b>Ensure effective oversight and examination of data and practice by the Scrutiny Commission.</b> It is important that Scrutiny consider their role in light of the above recommendation and if this review achieved a set of actions for Scrutiny to implement it would demonstrate to our external challengers (Improvement Board Chair, DfE and Ofsted) that we are addressing some of the issues raised about leadership.

		<p>In order for Scrutiny to fulfil its function training could be offered on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ofsted inspection framework</li> <li>• The role of Children's Social Care</li> <li>• Analysis of specific performance indicators</li> </ul> <p>This scrutiny review as it stands presents risks to the Department as it potentially will distract from our improvement journey. The Improvement Board meets every four weeks and requires Officers to provide work which relates to the Improvement Action Plan. It is not possible to divert Officers from this work. Officer time is being focussed on the priorities for maintenance and improvement work in the service being accountable to the Improvement Board as required by the DfE/Ofsted. A number of activities have taken place which may provide reassurance to Scrutiny that lessons learnt have been taken on board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview and Scrutiny meetings April 2015</li> <li>• Ofsted Improvement Seminar April 2015</li> <li>• Meetings with City Mayor, DFE , Improvement Chair post Ofsted</li> <li>• Production of Improvement Plan which was submitted on time, signed off by Improvement Board and Executive. The feedback from Ofsted has been positive.</li> <li>• Presentation at Improvement Board focusing on the issues and what actions have been taken to date at the first Board.</li> </ul> <p>It is also worth noting that the Ofsted inspection framework has changed since the 2011 Inspection, and the focus of inspections has changed.</p> <p>A clear message has been given that we have understood the improvements that need to be made and this needs to be our focus. Relationships are good with the DfE and Ofsted in terms of our response to the Inspection, the pace and the fact that the Board was established quickly. A retrospective look may place our credibility at risk and question whether Scrutiny is focussed on the right issues and perhaps should be considering their role in overseeing the Improvement Plan.</p>
<p><b>16.</b></p>	<p><b>Are you able to assist with the proposed review? If not please explain why.</b>  In terms of agreement / supporting documentation / resource availability?</p>	<p>Assistance will be limited. The Divisional Director will be focussed on Improvement work and will not be taken off this work to support the review. Ofsted are returning for their first a two day visit as part of their support programme and this requires preparation, input during the visit and follow-up afterwards.</p> <p>The following can be offered from the Department: a one off session with Scrutiny using the presentation that was used with the DfE/Improvement Board Chair and subsequently the Improvement Board which highlights the issues that Ofsted identified, some reflections about lessons learnt and actions that have been taken.</p> <p>Scrutiny will also have access to various minutes and reports of any formal meetings.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, in order for Scrutiny to fulfil its function</p>

		<p>training could be offered on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ofsted inspection framework</li> <li>• The role of Children's Social Care</li> <li>• Analysis of specific performance indicators</li> </ul> <p>Training for Scrutiny has been identified as an action in the Improvement Plan.</p>
<b>Name</b>	Frances Craven	
<b>Role</b>	Strategic Director of Childrens Services	
<b>Date</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> July 2015	
<b>To be completed by the Scrutiny Support Manager</b>		
<b>17.</b>	<p><b>Will the proposed scrutiny review / timescales negatively impact on other work within the Scrutiny Team?</b> (Conflicts with other work commitments)</p>	<p>This has the potential of being a large review and it is important that the scope and rationale of the review is adhered to, in order to focus the work of the supporting officers. It may mean that whilst this review is ongoing that another review may not be able to be fully supported.</p>
	<p><b>Do you have available staffing resources to facilitate this scrutiny review? If not, please provide details.</b></p>	<p>Yes, the lead SPO should be able to adequately support this review but given the depth of work involved I will continually review this with the SPO.</p>
<b>Name</b>	Kalvaran Sandhu	
<b>Date</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> July 2015	

