

# Children and Young People Select Committee Supplementary Agenda

Monday, 11 December 2017  
**7.00 pm**, Committee Room 1  
Civic Suite  
Lewisham Town Hall  
London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Emma Aye-Kumi (020 8314 9534)

This meeting is an open meeting and all items on the agenda may be audio recorded and/or filmed.

## Part 1

<b>Item</b>	<b>Pages</b>
1. Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2017	F_PRO

This page is intentionally left blank

## **MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, 1 November 2017 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillors Luke Sorba (Chair), Liz Johnston-Franklin (Vice-Chair), Chris Barnham, Andre Bourne, Councillor Joyce Jacca, Hilary Moore, Jacq Paschoud, John Paschoud, Lilian Brooks (Parent Governor Representative), Monsignor N Rotheron (Church Representative) and Kevin Mantle (Parent Governor representative for special schools) (Parent Governor Representative)

APOLOGIES: Councillors Alan Till and Helen Klier and Gail Exon

ALSO PRESENT: Kate Bond (Head of Standards & Achievement), Stephen Kitchman (Director of Children's Social Care), Warwick Tomsett (Head of Targeted Services and Joint Commissioning), Sara Williams (Executive Director, Children and Young People), Emma Aye-Kumi (Scrutiny Manager), David Austin (Head of Corporate Resources), Dave Richards (CYP Group Finance Manager), Adeolu Solarin (LSCB Business Manager) and Jackie Jones (Service Manager - School Improvement)

### **1. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2017**

- 1.1. The Chair opened the meeting at 7:05pm and welcomed Lilian Brooks. Ms Brooks had been newly appointed as the Parent Governor Representative for primary schools.
- 1.2. RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2017 be agreed as a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

### **2. Declarations of interest**

- 2.1. Councillor Moore declared a non-registerable interest in respect of item 4 as the Safeguarding Officer for Lewisham and Southwark College and for her safeguarding responsibilities in her paid employment at Barking and Dagenham College.

### **3. Responses to Referrals to Mayor and Cabinet**

- 3.1. No responses were due.

### **4. Lewisham Safeguarding Children Board annual report**

- 4.1. Nicky Pace, Independent Chair of the LSCB introduced the report.
- 4.2. The following points were noted in discussion:
  - The MET dashboard is a visual way of providing clear performance data that can be shared across agencies

- Consultation on changes to the statutory guidance Working Together to Safeguard Children, new child death review guidance and new regulations was open until late December and the LSCB would be responding. A link to the consultation would be circulated to Members after the meeting in case they wished to respond.
- CAMHS waiting times –the service had been redesigned to focus on clearing the waiting list and was currently meeting demand. There was no wait for initial assessment and the length of wait for treatment depended on need. All treatment was commencing within the 18 week target.
- Self-harm prevention and suicide prevention protocols were in place and the LSCB was working with schools and others on this priority area.
- Peer on Peer abuse is a major of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in Lewisham. The council successfully bid for Mayor’s Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) funding and a year-long piece of work was commissioned from a national lead in the field of Child Sexual Exploitation, Violence and Trafficking, resulting in several pieces of work to improve the council’s CSE work.
- Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) - BME children accounted for 89% of all child deaths. This was disproportionate to the local population and repeated the pattern of previous years.
- Members felt it would be helpful if the report provided figures on the percentage of BME children in the overall local population as a comparator. BME children make up 74% of school age children in Lewisham. The % BME children in the under 5s and secondary school populations would also be useful to see in subsequent reports. The Executive Director for CYP to feed this back to CDOP.
- CAMHS outcomes - It was not easy to provide a comparison between Lewisham’s outcomes and other London boroughs. CAMHS outcomes were measured via the Children’s Global Assessment Scale and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, which was a subjective measure. However, as the measures were used across SLAM, Members felt it would be helpful to compare outcomes in Lewisham with Southwark.
- LSCB Training - The diagram on page 26 of the agenda pack did not capture the large amount of training that was happening in individual schools, agencies etc. For examples, schools are required to provide safeguarding training for all staff, including Chartwells who provide catering services to schools.
- Performance of the Disclosure and Barring System (DBS) – additional staff had been brought in to clear the backlog and the situation was improving. The backlog was a particular issue for foster care. A risk based approach was being taken in respect of overseas checks.
- Members asked the LSCB to think about opportunities for income generation through providing training to other boroughs. Three independent schools were already buying safeguarding training and the three boroughs are working

together via the South East London Teaching Partnership for social work with Greenwich and Southwark.

- S11 self-assessment – this is a process for measuring the cooperation of agencies around arrangements for safeguarding children. Lewisham LSCB is moving away from a single person within the agencies replying on the agency's behalf. Instead front line staff will now responding to questions to get a richer picture and to provide the LSCB with greater assurance.
- Previously there had been inconsistent use of toolkits. All agencies reporting Domestic Violence were now expected to use the same risk assessment toolkit. The Committee felt this should be highlighted in the report.
- The CAMHS threshold was high and members asked about the mental health services for those who were below the threshold. There was a good range of targeted and universal services such as Kooth online counselling but signposting and clarity around pathways needed to improve.
- The council had a challenging role in cases of peer on peer abuse, being responsible for the education and welfare of both the alleged perpetrator and the alleged victim.

4.3. RESOLVED that

1. the contents of the report be noted.
2. Scrutiny Manager to circulate the link to the consultation on changes to the statutory guidance Working Together to Safeguard Children, new child death review guidance and new regulations.
3. Executive Director for CYP to feed back to CDOP on the comments of the Committee.

4.4. The Chair amended the order of the meeting to take Item 7 ahead of Item 5.

**5. Item 7 - Update on Q11 savings proposal - Meliot Road**

5.1. The Director for Children's Social Care updated the Committee on Q11 savings proposal regarding the Meliot Road contact centre.

5.2. It was noted that:

- A £323,000 shortfall was expected this year due to the delay in the centre going 'live'.
- Higher savings were anticipated next year, the first full year of the centre being open.

5.3. It was RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**6. Item 5 - 6 month update: transition from primary to secondary school review**

6.1. The Service Manager – School Improvement presented the report.

6.2. The following was noted in discussion:

- Secondary Heads had valued the additional information from primary schools, but there had been a patchy response from primary schools
- Information sharing between primary and secondary SENCOs had been successful, with information being shared on vulnerable children (such as those with a Child Protection plan or Child in Need) as well as SEN children to enable strategies to be shared.
- Not all secondary schools had received a piece of Year 6 writing,. Secondary Heads were supportive of the idea but the writing received had varied in quality and length. Schools would be provided with more specific guidance eg one page of A4, relevant to transition.
- More work was needed on the secondary transfer form
- Sessions had been run for Year 5 children who were identified as vulnerable familiarise them with the secondary setting.
- A Transition training session for governors had been held and the recommendations shared. This had not been well attended.
- Teaching methods were a matter for individual schools and teachers to decide. Secondary school teachers needed to visit primary schools and vice versa to share schemes of work and best practice across core subjects.
- The committee asked for a further update in 12 months' time.

6.3. RESOLVED:

1. That the update be noted
2. That a further update be scheduled for 12 months' time.

## **7. Item 6 - Lewisham Future Programme - savings and overspend**

7.1. The Head of Corporate Resources presented the savings proposals.

7.2. The committee noted the following:

- Austerity was expected to continue until at least 2020 for local authorities as local government was not a protected spend area.
- If the savings could not be met then rejected proposals would need to be revisited
- It was not envisaged that further savings could be achieved simply through innovative ventures (e.g. property investment), without exposing the council to too much risk. Savings had been already been realised through joint commissioning.
- Lewisham had very limited scope for increasing business rates and also much of the scope for increasing council tax take through housing development was out of the council's control.
- Members were invited to attend Public Accounts Select Committee on 16 November.
- If pupil premium eligibility was automatic rather than on an opt-in basis, there would be a financial benefit to schools. There was support for the council to lobby central government to make this change
- SEN and Children's Social Care budget overspend areas had developed cost effective ways of improving the service, however these took time and

investment to implement - and increasing demand arising from the consequences of austerity in the community meant that there was no quick route to turning around the overspends.

7.3. It was RESOLVED that the report be noted.

## 8. Select Committee work programme

8.1. The Committee discussed the work programme and it was noted that:

- The final report of the in-depth review into the recruitment and retention of school staff would be considered on 11 December.
- The SACRE proposals for the RE syllabus that had been scheduled for consideration in January would no longer come to committee as it would not be available in time.
- Provisional GCSE results had been added to work programme for 11 December.
- The subject for the session with the Mayor should be “What do you see as the major challenges facing children and young people for the new Mayor during his or her term of office?”
- Members asked for a similar session with the new Mayor to be scheduled in for the summer
- Children’s Social Care Road Map – although some of the issues regarding the budget had been considered at PAC, Members still wanted to hear this item in January and for it to cover service planning and the future shape of the service.

8.2. It was RESOLVED:

1. That the revisions to the work programme be noted
2. That the Mayor be invited to attend on 11 December to respond to the following question:  
What do you see as the major challenges facing children and young people for the new Mayor during his or her term of office?

## 9. Referrals to Mayor and Cabinet

9.1. The meeting ended at 21:26.

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This page is intentionally left blank