

Education and Business Scrutiny Commission

Monday 7 October 2019

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1
2QH

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
4.	Minutes To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meeting on 10 September 2019. Draft minutes are enclosed.	1 - 7
7.	Review: School Exclusions - additional information Commission members requested more information on Free School Meal eligibility criteria and school reporting requirements for pupils leaving a school role. This is enclosed.	8 - 10
9.	Work Programme The review scopes and Commission work-plan are enclosed.	11 - 24

Contact

Julie Timbrell on 020 7525 0514 or email: julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk

Date: 5 October 2019



EDUCATION AND BUSINESS SCRUTINY COMMISSION

MINUTES of the Education and Business Scrutiny Commission held on Tuesday 10 September 2019 at 7.00 pm at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Peter Babudu (Chair)
Councillor William Hougbo (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Karl Eastham
Councillor Renata Hamvas
Councillor Eleanor Kerlake
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Eliza Mann
Lynette Murphy-O'Dwyer
Martin Brecknell

**OTHER MEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**OFFICER
SUPPORT:** Duncan Whitfield, Strategic Director of Finance and Governance
Doreen Forester Brown, Director of Law and Democracy. The chair then invited questions.
Nina Dohel, Education Director
Alasdair Smith, Director Children's and Families
Jenny Brennan, Assistant Director Family Early Help & Youth Justice.
David Bromfield, Education Adviser
Julie Timbrell, scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Karl Eastham gave apologies for lateness.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS.

Councillor Karl Eastham declared he was a teacher at the Globe, an ARK secondary school in Southwark. Councillor William Hougbo declared he was a self employed business consultant; however he does no work with the council.

4. INTRODUCTION TO PROCUREMENT AND SOCIAL VALUE

The Commission received a presentation from Duncan Whitfield, Strategic Director of Finance and Governance; and Doreen Forester Brown, Director of Law and Democracy. The chair then invited questions.

Officers were asked how Brexit would impact on procurement law and future plans. The Director of Law said The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 adopted the present procurement rules going forward for large contracts; there maybe a further relaxation later to promote local suppliers.

A member asked how Human Trafficking is being tackled. Officers explained that here are four paragraphs on Modern Slavery in the Southwark Council's Fairer Future Procurement Framework; these include whistle blowing and a commitment to terminate contracts with convictions.

A member expressed disappointed that the awarding of contracts to BAME organisations has been an issue for the last ten years but she has seen little progress in achieving equality. The Director of Law responded that it is hard to judge if progress has been made or not, as the data dose not capture this. A member said her observation is that there are BAME sub contractors rather than BAME lead contractors. The Strategic Director said the Fairer Future Procurement Framework was an ambitions programme that has a social value element, which includes BAME employment. The weighting for social value will be 15% going forward giving the council important leverage. Commission members said adequate data monitoring is crucial to monitor diversity in the awarding of contracts. Officers indicated this could be a review recommendation.

There was a discussion on the BAME indicators that the council ought to be monitoring. One member said that he thought the priority ought to be ensuring that the business employment policies are good, rather than measuring the protected characteristic of individual business owners, which do not necessarily translate into better employment practices. Directors are also more likely to be in a good socio-economic position, whereas he thought inclusion for people lower down the scale is more of a priority. Another member said that monitoring at director level and seeing if it is representative of the broader population is a good measure and indicator of equalities progress, and that data capturing and monitoring ought to consider both employment practices and the diversity of business owners. Officers highlighted that the procurement function is devolved to

different department and this creates challenges in monitoring. Some of the smaller contracts also require a quick turnaround too.

A member said that the Blacklisting and Construction charter commitments are very good and ahead of many other councils; scrutiny could test the implementation of the commitments. She asked if large providers are expected to have similar policies around equal opportunities. The Strategic Director said implementation is tested through the audit process. This uncovers good practice as well as issues to improve.

Members asked if there was monitoring of apprenticeships. Officers said it is not as consistent as it could be. All contractors over 1 per million are required to have at least one apprentice. Members suggested this is low. Officers said that in many industries, such as the building trade there will be more, however in IT, or other similar specialised industries, it tends to be lower. A member raised concerns about the Shard and the monitoring of the construction training and apprenticeships that that arose from this.

Officer advised that apprenticeships are one approach to social value - there are other measures. Social value implementation is in development so this is timely review.

The chair thanked the officers for their presentation.

5. BID PERSPECTIVE

Michael Hill, Better Bankside gave a verbal presentation. He started by saying that in Southwark only 20% of people are employed locally, whereas in Newham 60% are employed locally – more could be done to improve this by the council through procurement. He thought one of the issues for small companies is sharing information on equalities as he was concerned this could breach confidentiality, however he did think that asking if companies employed a diverse range of people (with a protected characteristic) was a good thing to ask.

Winning council contracts is dependant on having specific skills as the Government bidding process is technical. Providing training and support would be useful Understanding the procurement process is the most important factor.

He also suggested that the council take risks and bring people with the council on a journey - for example starting the contract with a Minimum Wage requirement and expecting that to rise to a Living Wage in 6 months.

His personal experience was that the apprenticeships programme was a nightmare because the support was inadequate.

He advised that BIDs are good forums for the council to work with small

business on the above, however he advised they ought to be supplemented by engaging with other forums and outreach.

6. REVIEW 1 - IMPROVING ACCESS TO PROCUREMENT FOR SMES AND COMMUNITY BUSINESSES

Members discussed the lack of baseline information being a significant problem. One of the principle review recommendations ought to be to ensure that the council is asking for the right information to be able to monitor diversity.

This review will be a minor strand to the review on Exclusions.

7. INTRODUCTION TO SCHOOL EXCLUSIONS AND ALTERNATIVE PROVISIONS

The following officers presented:

- Nina Dohel, Education Director
- Alasdair Smith, Director Children's and Families
- Jenny Brennan, Assistant Director Family Early Help & Youth Justice.
- David Bromfield, Education Adviser

The chair then invited questions and comments.

A member asked about Fixed Term Exclusions. These are accumulative and potentially lead to permanent exclusion if a pupil has received 45 days in one year. Officers were asked if these Fixed Term Exclusions could arise out of minor issues, such as a shirt hanging out for 45 days. The Director of Education said this was unlikely and exclusions are usually the result of more serious risks and disruption.

The council data on Fixed Term Exclusion is not adequate or consistent, with the council only receiving notification of a small fraction of incidences, even though schools are required to report this data to the council. Members asked what can be done if accurate information is not provided. Officers said their powers are limited and they are largely reliant on the data provided, particularly if the relationship is not there. Generally, however, there are good relationships with Head and officers are able to pick up issues, but there are variable inclinations to share information. Officers can go into schools on a safeguarding brief.

Officers said they intend to look more at Fixed Terms Exclusion as they do recognise this is a risk factor for young people. They are now reminding schools and adding administrative capacity in order to do this. As part of this they are trying to get numbers to add up. This is part of a national programme and there is a call to strengthen local authority powers with schools to enable this.

Members asked more about the characteristics of children who are

excluded, and if the large proportion with a Care Plan for Neglect is proportional to other types of child abuse. Members were also interested on the how the proportion of Free School Meals (FSM) equates with the borough average and the criteria.

Officers asked if they had looked at Key stage one attainment for excluded children. Officers said analysis had revealed a range; some analysis showed average, as well as some children with high attainment. A member said if schools are being cynical then a cohort they could seek to remove are pupils with potentially high attainment, but low progress, as the school Progress 8 scores would be adversely affected.

Members asked about the requirements to report Managed Moves. These do not have to be reported to the council; there is a school forum that discusses Managed Moves and also a survey. A Managed Move works for about 1/3 of children. Members were concerned about the pupils where a Managed Move did work and their outcomes.

Members requested more information on off rolling data. Officers explained that there is an obligation for a school to inform the council when a child is removed from the school roll. However there are difficulties. For example there can be conversations with parents suggesting they take the child out of school or the child would be expelled. Under the new Ofsted framework there will be more consequences for schools that are found to have off-rolled. The Timpson recommendation was that a school remain responsible for Progress 8.

A member commented she is aware of a number of parents who have sought advice for 15 children who were heading for low marks and were off rolled to a local collage from one school. That school went on to get top marks. There are also reports of year 12 pupils being moved on when schools have low expectations for their final grades.

Members recommended that the social profile of pupils going to different schools is examined to see if this is a factor in the lower rates of exclusion at most Church schools compared with the higher rates of exclusion in most of the schools in Academy chains (noting that there is variability here).

Officers were asked about the quality of Alternative Provision, bearing in mind that Exclusion is rarely the best choice for the individual child but can be for the wider community and other pupils as some children are disruptive. Officers said the SILS cohort is changing, with an increase in the scale of need and range. There is more than one form of provision. Currently both on-line and home support is provided, however the preference is always for a setting where children will physically be taught with other children. Costs for Alternative Provision are escalating. Southwark only use providers with a Good or better Ofsted rating.

Members asked how schools and the council are meeting the needs of children with mental health. Officers said that they do work with CAMHS and hospital schools.

8. SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT - FORGOTTEN CHILDREN: ALTERNATIVE PROVISION AND THE SCANDAL OF EVER INCREASING EXCLUSIONS

This was noted.

9. REVIEW 2 - SCHOOL EXCLUSIONS AND ALTERNATIVE PROVISION

There was a discussion on the breadth and depth of the scope, with members suggesting that the Commission focuses the majority of its time and energy on Off-rolling and Exclusions, particularly given Alternative Provisions are rated quite highly and there is plan to improve performance. However it was noted that school Exclusions and Alternative Provision are linked and therefore it makes sense to retain this as an element. The issue of addressing the mental health of children and young people, particularly around puberty, will be included.

The additional people and organisation will be contacted to inform the review:

- National Association of Headteachers
- Headteachers from feeder schools.
- Parents
- Campaigns with and by young people on the theme.
- The young people and teachers affected by exclusion and off-rolling directly and indirectly
- Diocese for the prospective of headteachers from schools performing well on Exclusions

RESOLVED

The following information will be sought:

- Clarity on the criteria used to measure FSM by schools
- Socio- economic profile of children joining different schools
- Clarification on what needs to be reported when children leave the roll of a school
- The action plan for the PRU.
- The proportionality of Neglect being the biggest factor for excluded

children with Care Plans.

10. WORK PROGRAMME

The chair reminded the Commission that this is a roving commission and therefore other topic may need to be addressed.

Officer briefing on Removing children from school register and Eligibility criteria for free school meals

Nina Dohel, Director of Education, Children's Services

A Removing children from school register – (off rolling)

1. Most children leave the school they are attending at standard transition points – i.e. at the end of year 6 to move from primary school to secondary school, and at the end of secondary school or sixth form education. Some children will leave a school at other times, and there are strict regulations about the process for recording this and notifying local authorities. These are set out in the Department for Education guidance on 'School Attendance' (2019) and 'Children Missing Education' (2016).

2. It is a legal requirement for all schools to maintain an admission register containing the personal details of every pupil in the school, along with the date of admission to the school, information regarding parents and carers and details of the school last attended. The admission register is often referred to as the school roll, i.e. the list of all the children in the school.

3. When a child ceases to attend a school, a pupil may be deleted from the admission register. However this is only lawful on certain grounds, which are set out in the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006. These reasons include:

- a. child has moved to another school;
- b. child has ceased to attend and is no longer living within reasonable distance of the school (i.e. child has moved out of area);
- c. child has ceased to attend for more than 20 days and neither school or local authority know their whereabouts;
- d. parent has given written notice that they wish to home educate the child;
- e. child has been permanently excluded;
- f. child is in custody for four months or more;
- g. child has died.

4. It is unlawful for schools to remove a child from the admission register on grounds not set out in the regulations. For instance, a child cannot be removed from school register if they are not attending due to sickness (unless there is medical evidence that they will be unable to attend before reaching school leaving age).

5. All schools must notify the local authority when a pupil's name is to be deleted from the admission register, including contact details for parents, destination school and the grounds for deleting them. In Southwark this process is overseen by the Pupil Tracking and Licensing Team in Education Access. Schools are asked to complete an online form with required details, and forms will not be accepted if lawful grounds for removing child from register have not been evidenced. Where

the school informs the Council that the child is now being home educated, the Team contact parents to confirm this. Where there is no destination school or home education, the child will be logged as a 'child missing education' and action taken to get them back into education.

6. Nationally there has been concern about 'Off-rolling'. Ofsted have defined this as the practice of removing a pupil from the school register without using a permanent exclusion when the removal is primarily in the best interests of the school, not the pupil. This would include unlawfully removing child from register without proper grounds, but could also include cases which may be technically legal but not in the child's interests – such as pressuring a parent to remove their child to home educate. DfE 'School Attendance' guidance states that: 'Schools should not seek to persuade parents to educate their children at home as a way of avoiding excluding the pupil or because the pupil has a poor attendance record'.

7. Whether an individual case amounts to inappropriate off-rolling is a matter of judgement based on the details of the case, so there is no data available on the extent of this practice. However, Ofsted are now taking this very seriously and where inspectors determine a school to be off-rolling then the leadership and management of the school are likely to be judged inadequate.

B Free School Meal eligibility criteria

In April 2018, the criteria used to determine which pupils are eligible for free school meals was updated to reflect the introduction of Universal Credit and the phasing out of other income-based benefits¹.

The full list of qualifying benefits for free school meals eligibility is on page 5 of the guidance

Under the updated criteria, it is estimate that by 2022 around 50,000 more pupils will benefit from a free school meal compared to the previous benefits system.

Steps were taken to protect free school meals for those families that would otherwise lose eligibility following this criteria change. These protection arrangements are described on page 10 of the guidance.

Eligibility criteria for free school meals

Section 512 of the Education Act 1996, as amended, places a duty on maintained schools, academies and free schools to provide free school meals to pupils of all ages that meet the criteria.

Who is eligible for free school meals?

Free school meals are available to pupils in receipt of, or whose parents are in receipt of, one or more of the following benefits:

- Universal Credit (provided you have an annual net earned income of no more than £7,400, as assessed by earnings from up to three of your most recent assessment periods)
- Income Support
- Income-based Jobseeker's Allowance

- Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
- Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
- The guarantee element of Pension Credit
- Child Tax Credit (provided you're not also entitled to Working Tax Credit and have an annual gross income of no more than £16,190)
- Working Tax Credit run-on – paid for four weeks after you stop qualifying for Working Tax Credit

In addition, the following pupils will be protected against losing their free school meals as follows (please see page 10 for further details):

- From 1 April 2018, all existing free school meals claimants will continue to receive free school meals whilst Universal Credit is rolled out. This will apply even if their earnings rise above the new threshold during that time.
- In addition, any child gaining eligibility for free school meals after 1 April 2018 will be protected against losing free school meals during the Universal Credit rollout period.
- Once Universal Credit is fully rolled out, any existing claimants that no longer meet the eligibility criteria at that point (because they are earning above the threshold or are no longer a recipient of Universal Credit) will continue to receive free school meals until the end of their current phase of education (i.e. primary or secondary).

The Universal Credit rollout is currently expected to complete in March 2022.

A pupil is only eligible to receive a free school meal when a claim for the meal has been made on their behalf, and their eligibility has been verified by the school where they are enrolled or by the local authority.

Free meals in Further Education

The 1996 Education Act requires further education (FE) funded institutions to provide free meals to disadvantaged students. Further guidance on eligibility criteria and funding arrangements for free meals in further education is available here.

Reference

*Free school meals: Guidance for local authorities, maintained schools, academies and free school.
Updated April 2018*

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/700139/Free_school_meals_guidance_Apr18.pdf

Scrutiny review proposal

1 What is the review?

School exclusions, off-rolling and alternative provision performance

2 What outcomes could realistically be achieved? Which agency does the review seek to influence?

Reducing exclusions, improving coordination

Improving outcomes for young people in PRUs, improving PRU provision

3 When should the review be carried out/completed? i.e. does the review need to take place before/after a certain time?

Immediately

4 What format would suit this review? (e.g. full investigation, q&a with executive member/partners, public meeting, one-off session)

Likely multiple sessions

5 What are some of the key issues that you would like the review to look at?

- Build on work of Serious Youth Violence (SYV) panel - final report and recommendations
- Clarity on numbers and data trends ; both exclusions and off-rolling
- At risk cohorts and themes: off-rolling & home schooling; SEND; young people at risk of gang involvement, mental health of young people, particularly around puberty
- Examine information sharing (between officers, schools, academy chains, and the police)
- Look at how far the council is utilising it's somewhat limited role and powers
- Internal exclusion / provision
- Performance of the PRU, in terms of:
 - a) young people's reintegration into mainstream education and educational outcomes
 - b) Alternative Provision good practice and meeting different young people needs (e.g. trauma, behaviour, SEND, home schooling)

6 Who would you like to receive evidence and advice from during the review?

- Briefing from the Education Director, Nina Dohel and Director of Children & Families Early Help, Alasdair Smith on Early Help.
- Claire Burton, Regional Schools Commissioner
- Ofsted regional inspector
- Local parent and Guardian journalist Warwick Mansell
<https://www.theguardian.com/profile/warwick-mansell>
- Harris, Ark and Diocese executive leads
- A contributor to the Timpson review
- Akala: <https://schoolsweek.co.uk/akala-schools-need-universal-code-on-exclusions/>
- FFT Education Datalab
- Young people, parents and community leaders
- National Association of Headteachers
- Headteacher networks – secondary and primary

7 Any suggestions for background information? Are you aware of any best practice on this topic?

Select committee report: Forgotten children: alternative provision and the scandal of ever increasing exclusions. July 2018.

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmeduc/342/342.pdf>

Timpson review into exclusions

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/807862/Timpson_review.pdf

Knife Crime and Serious Violence Plan

The theme 'PROTECTING AND EDUCATING YOUNG PEOPLE' is relevant to the commission review, and particularly the actions recognising the importance of prevention and working alongside schools:

- Point 10: Monitor exclusions data through local education arrangements and also six monthly at CSP. The aim is to improve monitoring and review; leading to more timely intervention and reducing numbers of exclusion. Lead Jenny Brennan. LBS Family Early Help & Youth Justice. Note: *This will form part of the Violent Crime dashboard discussed at the Safer Communities Delivery Group. This is only possible if we get data from schools on Fixed Term Exclusions as currently data is only sent when child is permanently excluded and the decision cannot be reversed. There are capacity and IT issues involved in monitoring this data which are currently being worked through.*
- Point 2: To improve partnership works with schools. Meeting with Academy Chief Executives to be scheduled with Police Borough Commander and Council Chief Executive to discuss joint working. Improved joint working will lead to more timely response to serious youth violence with earlier discussion, implementation of prevention and intervention measures

Southwark Youth Violence Panel

The Southwark Youth Violence Panel has called for more to be done to reduce school exclusions as a key way to prevent young people getting involved in crime.

Key recommendations include:

- Collective action to reduce school exclusions and ensure they are used as a **last** resort

See more summarising the work here:

<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/news/2019/jul/southwark-youth-violence-panel>

The panel sessions are detailed here:

<http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=514>

Evidence session 2: Early years and Education, Southwark Youth Violence Panel
Wednesday 23 January 2019 5.30 pm is particularly relevant

<http://modern.gov.southwark.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=514&MId=6327&Ver=4>

Warwick Mansell journalist investigation

Author of an article highlighting concerning trends re offrolling

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/nov/06/academy-trusts-gcse-students-disappearing-prior-to-exams>

TES investigation into home education and off rolling

<https://www.tes.com/news/rolling-fears-about-home-education-1-5-las>

Ofsted report

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/jun/26/300-schools-picked-out-in-gcse-off-rolling-investigation>

Investigation by FFT Education Datalab on children missing from school rolls

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/jun/21/thousands-of-pupils-missing-from-english-school-rolls-study>

Government's statutory guidance on exclusions

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/641418/20170831_Exclusion_Stat_guidance_Web_version.pdf

Education Endowment Foundation evidence

Report on improving behaviour in schools

https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Publications/Behaviour/EEF_Improving_behaviour_in_schools_Report.pdf

Alternative provision

Department for Education commissioned a literature review to explore the evidence for effective strategies that support young people in alternative provision to increase attainment at key stage 4 and to make a successful transition to post-16 provision. This includes reporting on any differential effects by pupil characteristics, including gender, ethnicity and special educational needs and disability (SEND).

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/585550/Alternative_provision_effective_practice_and_post-16_transition.pdf

Case studies from NFER that are of interest

<https://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/APSN02/APSN02.pdf>

Case studies of innovative provision:

<http://www.redballoonlearner.org/Life-at-RB-Centres-centre>
<https://www.stonesoupacademy.org.uk/about-us/>
<http://www.dallaglorugbyworks.com/what-we-do/case-studies>

8 What approaches could be useful for gathering evidence? What can be done outside committee meetings?

e.g. verbal or written submissions, site visits, mystery-shopping, service observation, meeting with stakeholders, survey, consultation event

Stakeholder representation that speaks to the session and frames our work, e.g. a parent of an excluded child

Session in school in due course – e.g. a school that has had success in reducing exclusions.

Outward facing community event with high profile speakers to engage parents, carers and young people.

Scrutiny review proposal

1 What is the review?

Accessibility of procurement for SMEs and community businesses, with a particular emphasis on procurement from underrepresented groups in business across the protected characteristics.

The protected characteristics are: race, disability, sex, pregnancy and maternity, gender reassignment, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief and marriage or civil partnership.

2 What outcomes could realistically be achieved? Which agency does the review seek to influence?

- Improved levels of SME procurement by council
- Even further improvements in incorporation of social value into new procurement strategy

3 When should the review be carried out/completed? i.e. does the review need to take place before/after a certain time?

Informing roll out of Fairer Future Procurement Strategy and providing evidence for one year 1 review.

4 What format would suit this review? (e.g. full investigation, q&a with executive member/partners, public meeting, one-off session)

1-2 sessions

5 What are some of the key issues that you would like the review to look at?

- Clarify current statistics around SME procurement by protected characteristic
- Known issues and plans to address these
- Consideration of broader social value contributions in procurement decisions

6 Who would you like to receive evidence and advice from during the review?

Officers, including broader look at new strategy. Relevant departments and business units could include Legal, Finance, Local Economy and Regeneration.

Relevant stakeholders including SMEs which has been unsuccessful in winning contracts / accessing procurement opportunities with the council.

Best practice in procurement utilised by other councils e.g. South Tyneside.

Social Enterprise UK

Federation of Small Business

Business Improvement Districts:

- Nic Durston, South Bank BID
- Natalie Raben, We are Waterloo
- Nadia Broccardo, Team London Bridge
- Peter Williams, Better Bankside
- Russell Dryden, Blue Bermondsey

Chamber of Commerce

7 Any suggestions for background information? Are you aware of any best practice on this topic?

Council

Southwark Council's Fairer Future Procurement Framework (FFPF):

<http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s83221/Appendix%201%20Fairer%20Future%20Procurement%20Framework.pdf>

Economic Wellbeing and Skills Strategies:

<http://www.southwark.gov.uk/business/economic-wellbeing-strategy>

<http://www.southwark.gov.uk/business/skills-strategy>

Previous scrutiny report:

<http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s51814/Report%20Overview%20and%20scrutiny%20recommendations.pdf>

Supply South Tyneside

Supply South Tyneside is an initiative to support local businesses and help them to identify, bid for, and win public sector contracts. The initiative set a target to increase the amount of money the council spend with local businesses from the 2009/10 baseline of 32%, to 40% by 2013/14, then to 50% by 2016. By 2018/19, the council paid more than £207.5 million for goods and services, of which almost £115 million (55 per cent) was spent locally. One of the aims is to protect local jobs by using local suppliers.

See: <https://www.southtyneside.gov.uk/article/33534/Supply-South-Tyneside> and <https://www.lgafirst.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/First-637-July-2019.pdf>

Social Value

LGA: Profit with Purpose report this report particularly focuses on realising social value through the expansion of councils' commercial activity.

https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/11%20173%20-%20Profit%20with%20a%20Purpose_V05_web.pdf

Government introduction to social value (2018)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/690780/Commissioner_Guidance_V3.8.pdf

Preston Model : Community wealth building

The “Preston Model” is a term applied to how the council, its anchor institutions and other partners are implementing the principles of Community Wealth Building within Preston and the wider Lancashire area.

The city council is committed to implementing this approach and, as the “place leader” for the city, is promoting the concept to other anchor institutions in and around Preston and to the private sector.

The implementation is something that is being shared across a range of Preston based anchor institutions, including:

- Lancashire County Council
- University of Central Lancashire
- Preston’s College
- Cardinal Newman College
- Community Gateway Housing Association
- Lancashire Constabulary.

This is important as many of these institutions have significantly greater spending power and assets than the City Council and by working together the city council

can have a significantly greater impact on the future well-being of the city.

Community wealth building offers an opportunity for local people to take back control, to ensure that the benefits of local growth are invested in their local areas, are used to support investment in productive economic activities and that people and their local institutions can work together on an agenda of shared benefit.

This work is linked to an EU programme; the Procure network, which is one of 211 networks commissioned through the European Union's URBACT III programme. This seeks to enable transnational exchange and learning between cities around a particular theme. The Procure network seeks to connect cities and build success around the theme of procurement. The purpose of the Procure network is to support cities to enhance procurement processes so that they bring greater benefits for their city economy and in social and environmental terms.

The Procure network is being led by Preston City Council from the United Kingdom, supported by expertise from Matthew Jackson. Matthew is the Deputy Chief Executive of the **Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES)**. CLES is a think-tank and research organisation based in Manchester, the United Kingdom

Preston was joined initially in the Procure network by four cities: Lublin (Poland); Koszalin (Poland); Albacete (Spain); and Almelo (The Netherlands). Later they were joined by: Satu Mare County Intercommunity Development Association (Romania); Metropolitan City (Cimet) of Bologna (Italy); District 9 Prague (Czech Republic); Koprivnica (Croatia); Candelaria (Spain); and Nagykallo (Hungary).

<https://www.preston.gov.uk/thecouncil/the-preston-model/preston-model/>

Centre for Local Economic Strategies CLES is the UK's leading, independent think and do tank realising progressive economics for people and place, which aims to achieve social justice, good local economies and effective public services for everyone, everywhere.

<https://cles.org.uk>

Recent work by CLES with London local authorities:

https://cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/New-Municipalism-in-London_April-2019.pdf

NEF

NEF have done a range of work around the value of keeping money circulating locally to grow the local economy and maximise community benefit (cf Community Wealth Building).

<https://neweconomics.org/2002/12/the-money-trail/>

<https://www.nefconsulting.com/our-services/evaluation-impact-assessment/local-multiplier-3>

They have also produced this procurement focused publication:

<https://neweconomics.org/2005/07/public-spending-public-benefit>

South London Procurement Network

The South London Procurement Network (SLPN), which was established by Shell Centre redevelopers Qatari Diar and Canary Wharf Group plc, has worked with South London SMEs (small and medium sized enterprises) across a range of different sectors, generating multiple leads and contract wins in the area since its inception in 2012.

The South London Procurement Network works to ensure local businesses are part of the long term economic growth of the region by providing a service to compete with local supply chains. They are focused on making a real difference to the sustainability of local businesses.

SLPN is working in partnership with Southbank BID.

See: <http://slpn.org.uk/>

<https://group.canarywharf.com/media/press-releases/local-procurement-network-generates-over-1-5million-for-south-london-businesses/>

Social Enterprise

Supply Change is a UK marketplace platform that matches public sector buyers to social enterprises. <https://www.supplychange.co.uk/>

Started in 2018 arising out of a research project for Orbit housing. This research focused on how social enterprises are accessing Orbit and other Social Housing supply chains. Research with large Social Housing organisations and social enterprises identified financial and cultural barriers. Social enterprises found it difficult to access contracts as they did not have wide visibility of opportunities because of the numerous bureaucratic processes in individual large Social Housing organisations. There was an appetite from large organisations to use social enterprises, but large organisations need information on relevant providers and assurance on viability. The supply change portal arose from this research and aims to provide visibility to Social Enterprises and assurance to large organisations.

Orbit is a founding organisation of Supply Change, which is now testing with a pool of local authorities, and there is an opportunity for Southwark to be a founding partner, who can help develop the platform.

Supply Change has shared research done with Orbit with the Commission. They are also doing work with Coventry looking at other anchor organisations, with a completion date 20 September, and could also potentially share.

Buy social campaign and specific asks of local authorities:

<https://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=fbfcd5c3-d183-4b56-a950-c7cae98973c2>

More general guidance and asks of local authorities:

<https://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/with-councils>

8 What approaches could be useful for gathering evidence? What can be done outside committee meetings?

e.g. verbal or written submissions, site visits, mystery-shopping, service observation, meeting with stakeholders, survey, consultation event

Stakeholder representation that speaks to the session and assists in framing and scoping the review e.g. a small business leader that's systematically struggled to navigate our procurement processes; a representative of SME group or network.

Education & Business (Roving) Scrutiny Commission Workplan

Timetable

Date	Item
Meeting 1, Tuesday 10 September	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School exclusions 2. Procurement and SMEs 3. Initial discussion of work plan
Meeting 2, Monday 7 October	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School exclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advocacy Academy 2. School exclusions - Faith conference feedback on Exclusions and Serious Youth Violence 3. School Exclusions – officer update FSM and Managed Moves reporting requirements 4. School Exclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional School Commissioner, Claire Burton 5. Agreeing scope of workplan and priority item for Meeting 4
Meeting 3, Monday 16 December	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interview of Cabinet Member for Jobs, Business and Innovation 2. Interview of Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Adult Care (re Education) 3. Schools Exclusions: Ark CEO, Harris CEO and Faith schools 4. Headteachers networks 5. Alternative provision performance
Meeting 4, additional date TBC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procurement – best practice 2. Additional priority item from other topics of interest/main OSC 3. Agreeing additional priorities for meeting 5 4. Discussing recommendations for (i) exclusions and alternative provision and (ii) procurement reports
Meeting 5, Tuesday 24 March	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional priority topic from longlist/main OSC 2. Sign off school exclusions and alternative provision report 3. Sign off procurement report
Meeting 6, Additional date TBC	TBC – Community event (Exclusions)

School exclusions and alternative provision

The Commission will build on work of the Southwark Youth Violence Panel and seek to understand

- the extent of permanent exclusions and quasi exclusions (e.g. forced home schooling and off-rolling) across the borough, total levels, where it is concentrated and what are the key trends
- alternative provision across the borough, its quality, its role in managing permanent exclusions and the quality of service it is providing our young people

We will explore exclusions by:

- Speaking to local school representatives, young people who have been excluded and/or their parents,
- Reviewing the prior investigations by the Council of exclusions and the extent
- Looking at best practice from beyond the borough both in terms of managing exclusions and delivering alternative provision
- Speaking to officers and the lead Cabinet member regarding what they see to be the main issues regarding current rates of exclusion in the borough and how they can move towards zero

Procurement: SMEs, social value and diversity

On SME procurement, I'd like to clarify current stats around sme procurement by protected characteristic, known issues, plans to address and additional ideas from external actors on how can further improve. Officers and relevant stakeholders - let's discuss who that is.

Southwark Council is a major procurer of services and has recently introduced a new Fairer Future Procurement Framework. We will be exploring the Council's procurement strategy with a particular focus on how accessible the Council's procurement processes are for SMEs, how well the Council's procurement approach is incorporating social value legislation and the opportunities it brings, and how well the council is at being accessible to and encouraging diversity through its procurement.

We will explore procurement by:

- Exploring current data regarding procurement performance from an SME, diversity and social value perspective
- Investigating the Council's preferred approach for incorporating social value
- Looking at examples of good practice from elsewhere in encouraging procurement from elsewhere
- Speaking to historic bidders who have experienced Southwark's procurement processes
- Reviewing the new procurement process to understand potential unintended side effects to some of the policy improvements that have recently been incorporated

Other Topics of interest to the Commission

As this is a roving Commission, the Commission will maintain bandwidth to either pick up additional topics of interest from the shortlist below, or to pick up urgent matters arising from main OSC.

- *Youth provision in Southwark*: Looking at the Council's plans to refresh youth provision across the borough
- *Race disparity in Southwark*: Conducting a race disparity audit for discrete parts of the Council as a precursor to a more in-depth exercise

- *Care leavers provision and support*: Looking at the Council's work to support care leavers via a dedicated trust and other pre-existing channels
- *Rogue landlords*: Council's use of new powers to discourage bad landlord practices
- *High streets*: Looking at the Council's work to strengthen high streets across the borough

