

Time commenced – 6.00pm
Time finished – 8.12pm

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE BOARD 22 JANUARY 2013

Present: Councillor Whitby (Chair)
Ian Jennison, Maurice Lawrence and Councillors Bailey, Bolton,
Campbell, J Khan, Martin, and Williams

In Attendance: Councillor Rawson

49/12 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received for Alison Brown and Councillors Atwal and F Winter.

50/12 Late Items to be Introduced by the Chair

There were no late items.

51/12 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

52/12 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

53/12 Call-in

There were no items.

54/12 School Achievement

The Board received a presentation from the Head of Quality, Standards and Performance on Pupil Outcomes for 2012. It was reported that validated outcomes were available for Foundation stage, KS1, KS2 and A level, but GCSE outcomes were awaiting validation.

Members asked whether data was collected on entry into Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). It was reported that data was not collected on entry, but an assessment was carried out at the end of the Foundation Stage. Members noted that it was a priority to narrow the gap between the lowest achieving 20 per cent and the rest of the cohort in the EYFS.

It was reported that improvements had been made at Key Stage 1 in reading, writing and mathematics (Level 2B+). It was further reported that as improvements had also been made at a national level, there was still a gap that had to be narrowed.

It was reported that improvements had been made in 42 out of 56 schools at Key Stage 2 for English and mathematics (Level 4+). It was further reported that only five schools and one academy remained below 60 per cent threshold compared to 18 in 2011. Members asked which schools and academy were below the threshold. They were listed as:

- Osmaston Primary School
- Sinfin Primary School
- Allenton Primary School
- Alvaston Primary School
- Lakeside Primary School
- Moorhead Primary School

Members asked whether the academy or any of the five schools had an Interim Executive Board (IEB) in place. It was reported that none did. Members asked how the local authority decided which schools required an IEB. It was reported that the local authority would look at such things as the management of the school, safety and how the school engaged with local authority support. Members noted that the local authority needed to gain approval from the Secretary of State, before an IEB could be appointed.

Members asked whether figures were kept for certain groups, such as those from the European Community. It was reported that figures were kept on different groups, such as ethnic groups and those with Special Education Needs and that these could be brought to a future meeting of the Board.

It was reported that improvements had taken place for children receiving Free School Meals (FSM), but that there was still more work to be done. Members asked whether all the children eligible for FSM were claiming for them. It was reported that schools had got much better at encouraging parents to apply and that assistance was provided to school business managers to help them in the work.

Resolved to note the presentation.

55/12 Feedback from Ofsted Inspection

The Board received a report from the Strategic Director for Children and Young People on Ofsted Inspection of Arrangements for the Protection of Children. The report and a presentation were presented by the Director of Specialist Services and the Improvement Officer for Children and Young People. It was reported that on Monday 3 December 2012 Ofsted arrived in Derby to undertake an unannounced inspection of services for the protection of children. Members noted that the inspection lasted until Wednesday 12 December 2012, when informal feedback was presented to the Director of Children's Services. It was reported that the final report was published on the Ofsted website on Monday 21 January 2013. Hard copies of the report were circulated to Members.

It was reported that judgements were made against four key areas:

1. Overall effectiveness was judged to be good.
2. The effectiveness of the help and protection provided to children, young people, families and carers was judged to be good.
3. The quality of practice was judged to be adequate.
4. Leadership and governance was judged to be good.

Officers outlined all actions, recommended by Ofsted, to be taken by the local authority and its partners within the next three month and six months.

The Board wished their thanks to be passed on to employees for all their efforts.

Resolved:

- 1. to note the presentation; and**
- 2. to note any actions recommended by Ofsted in the final inspection report on Derby's services for the protection of children.**

56/12 Youth Unemployment and Those Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)

The Board received a report from the Strategic Director of Children and Young People on Raising the Participation Age (RPA)/Participation in Education or Training and NEET 16-18. The report was presented by the Head of Locality 1 & 5. It was reported that the first phase of RPA was due to become statutory in 2013, with the second phase in 2015. It was further reported that the Local Authority had statutory duties (Education Act 2008 and 2011) to fulfil its RPA responsibilities which would need resourcing and capacity. Members noted that in addition to the RPA duties there were continuing responsibilities around supporting young people, ensuring sufficient and appropriate provision post 16, delivering the 'September Guarantee' and encouraging, assisting and enabling young people to participate. It was highlighted that the current data around NEET and 'Unknowns' was showing greater numbers of young people in these categories.

Members noted that the following counted as participation:

- full time education (school, college or independent provider for at least 540 hours)
- home education
- apprenticeship
- full time work including at least 280 hours of education

Members noted the 280 hours of education and asked whether some types of training would not count towards that total. It was reported that if the training was not nationally recognised, it could not count towards participation.

Members asked whether small training agencies could benefit from the changes. It was explained that the funding streams for training agencies were different as they were funded through achievement, but changes to funding streams could give more flexibility.

Resolved:

- 1. to note the statutory and performance monitoring requirements;**
- 2. to note the staffing structures, roles and responsibilities that reflect the service requirements which will enable the local authority to fulfil its statutory duties; and**
- 3. to note the statutory reporting and tracking requirements and how these are incorporated into the IT developments currently underway across the Council.**

57/12 Priority Families

The Board received a report from the Strategic Director of Children and Young People on Priority Families. The report and a presentation were presented by the Director of Commissioning and the Priority Families Coordinator. It was reported that the Government's commitment to deal with troubled families had resulted in the development of a national results based programme that would provide local authorities and their partners with financial incentives to turn around the lives of families. Members noted that the Priority Families Programme in Derby had an agreed national target to identify and work with 660 families over the next three years 2012 – 2015.

Members asked whether getting involved as a priority family would be voluntary. It was reported that the programme would be about engaging with users to achieve better outcomes and clearly explaining the possible consequences of non-engagement.

Members asked whether involvement in gangs would be one of the criteria for identifying Priority Families. It was confirmed that involvement in gangs would be one of the factors that would fall under the local discretionary criteria.

Members noted that another criterion was to identify households affected by truancy or exclusion from school and asked how exclusion was going to be measured. It was explained to Members that the exclusion measurement would be three or more exclusions over the course of three consecutive terms. Members noted that a potential risk was that of academies being unwilling to publish exclusion figures, but the solution was to work with them and explain that support would be available. It was further explained that to be identified as a priority family, another criteria would have to be met under either crime/anti-social behaviour or work.

Resolved:

- 1. to note the programme developments to date; and**
- 2. to request a further report in six months time.**

58/12 Council Cabinet Forward Plan

Resolved to note the Forward Plan.

59/12 Special Educational Needs Green Paper

The Board received a presentation from the Head of Inclusion and Intervention on Special Educational Needs (SEN) reforms. It was reported that the reforms had now progressed to a white paper.

Members noted the following planned major changes:

- replacement of the present statement for a single Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP)
- giving families with an EHCP the right to a personal budget for their support and the right to express a preference for a place at a state-funded school (special or mainstream, maintained or Academy or Free School)
- moving from two school-based categories of SEN (School Action and School Action Plus) to a single category
- introducing a range of measures aimed at developing the expertise of staff
- introducing measures aimed at improving the support available to parents and families

Members noted that schools would stop having School Action and School Action Plus and that a single category would be created. Members were concerned that a family with an EHCP might question why another family with an EHCP appeared to be getting more support. It was reported that provision mapping would be undertaken and then budgets would be allocated accordingly. It was further reported that although there would be no requirement for a school to have School Action and School Action Plus, they could still choose to phrase the EHCP in this way.

Resolved to note the presentation.

MINUTES END