

Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Monday 23 April 2012

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G01B - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1
2QH

Supplemental Agenda 1

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
5.	Review of parenting support - part 2 : Finalise report on support for parents & carers of disabled children	1 - 25
6.	Safeguarding - annual report presented by independent chair	26 - 53
8.	Review of universal Free Healthy School Meals : finalise report	54 - 69
9.	Rotherhithe School and Southwark free schools	70 - 72

Contact

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

Date: 20 April 2012

**DRAFT FINAL
report**

**Support for Parents and Carers of
Disabled Children and Young
people**

Report of the Education and Children's
Services Scrutiny Sub-committee

April 2012

DRAFT

Contents	Page
Introduction and background	1
Methodology	1
Context	2
Findings and recommendations	6
(Summary of recommendations – to be completed)	
Appendix	14

DRAFT

Introduction and background

The review's focus was a result of the sub-committee's interest in evidence which indicated that supporting parents had a major positive impact on their children's wellbeing and educational attainment. In the administrative year 09/10 the previous sub-committee had produced a report on the importance of parental involvement in children's education. This concluded that there should be an emphasis on enabling parents to have the skills, knowledge and confidence to help their children as evidence indicated that this would lead to a big impact on their children's ability to perform well educationally.

The committee produced a report in 10/11 focusing on support for parents during school admissions. Alongside this review the sub-committee is also looking at a volunteer programme developed by CSV which has demonstrated success in supporting parents in challenging situations, including addressing child protection issues, by using mentors to support parents. This will be the subject of a separate report.

This report is focused on the best way the council can support parents and carers, so that they in turn can have a better quality of life and be in the best position possible to parent their disabled children, look after their wider family and participate to community life. Given the focus of the review the committee prioritised evidence from parents and carers, organisations and evidence from council officers.

Methodology

Parents and carers

The committee put a call out for evidence from parents and carers and voluntary organisations that work with parents and carers of disabled children asking for comment on the following issues in particular:

- I. Experiences as a service user
- II. Practical and financial resources available
- III. How skilled and informed you feel
- IV. Parenting
- V. Caring
- VI. Maintaining family life
- VII. Employment and childcare
- VIII. Your physical and emotional well-being

Organisations that support families of disabled children and young people

In response to this the committee received evidence from two organisations that work in Southwark to support families; Contact a Family and Southwark Parent Carers Council (SPCC).

Contact a Family

Contact a Family is a national charity with a branch in Southwark that exists to support the families of disabled children whatever their condition or disability. They work with families; often at a time of crisis.

Southwark Parent Carers Council (SPCC)

The Parent Carer Council is peer led and their objectives are to positively change and enhance the lives of disabled children, young people and their families by working collaboratively with partners in Health, Education and Social Care, and to ensure parent carers participation.

Several parents of disabled children

The review received evidence from six families through a combination of written submissions and verbal evidence taken at meetings.

Council officers

The committee received several reports from Southwark Council children's services officers including:

- I. Comprehensive consultation reports on Short Breaks which took detailed evidence from a range of partners;
- II. Officer response to evidence received from family support organisations and parents

Context

Numbers of disabled children and young people in Southwark

The committee received evidence of work done previously by Contact a Family and the SPCC to identify the number of Children and Young People (CYP) with a disability and/or additional need and their parent carers.

Borough wide they estimate that there are approximately 2500 children and young people with a disability and/or additional need in the borough. Of these:

- I. Approximately 1500 children have a statement of special educational need
- II. Approximately 450 children are on the disability register
- III. Approximately 180 children receive a service through social care

Contact a Family and Southwark Parent Carer Council also submitted data on the numbers of families they are engaged with:

- I. There are approximately 590 families registered with Contact a Family in the borough
- II. There are approximately 240 families registered with SPCC

Of the families registered with Contact a Family:

- I. About half have a child on the autistic spectrum
- II. About half consider their ethnicity to be Black British, Black African, Black Other
- III. About one third have a child under 5, another third have a child aged 6 – 11 and the remainder have a child aged 12 – 19

Recession, Austerity and budget reductions

Local Government funding from central government has been reduced, and this has led to budget reductions across all sectors. The draft budget report to the overview and scrutiny committee of 13 December 2011 set out that “during 2011/12 £5.763m of savings have been achieved. When the significant reductions in government grants for children’s services are taken into account around £12m has been taken out of the budget. For 2012/13 the Children’s Services budget is proposed to be £86.4m. The total savings and commitments for the department remain unchanged from those agreed at council assembly in February 2011. “

Contact a Family reported that they have experienced financial cuts of 25 %, and that they are waiting to hear what will happen after April 2012. SPCC recently lost their worker because of budget reductions. The evidence received from these organisations considered both the effects of organisational budget reductions and how they were seeking to adapt, alongside recommendations on the best way to deliver council services and support families given shrinking funds.

The impact of the recession and austerity on families

National Contact a Family have produced a report called Counting the Costs 2010

Key findings from a survey of over 1,100 families with disabled children found:

- I. Almost a quarter are going without heating (23%). Up from 16% in 2008.
- II. One in seven (14%) are going without food. Down from 16% in 2008.

- III. More than half have borrowed money from family or friends (51%) to keep financially afloat or pay for essentials, such as food and heating. (42% in 2008)
- IV. More than 40% have applied for a charity grant. Up from 25% in 2008.
- V. Almost three quarters (73%) are going without days out and leisure time with the family. Up from 55% in 2008.
- VI. Almost 90 % said that financial worries had a detrimental impact on their family life

The full report can be found here:

www.cafamily.org.uk/pdfs/CountingtheCosts2010.pdf

National research on the needs of families and the outcomes carers would like from social care provision

Contact a Family have produced a national report titled "What makes my family stronger " .

Key findings of the report are:

- I. Almost 70% of families with disabled children said that understanding and acceptance of disability from their community or society is poor or unsatisfactory.
- II. Over 60% of families said they don't feel listened to by professionals.
- III. Vital support services such as short breaks, a key worker and childcare are unavailable to almost half of families.
- IV. Over 60% of families said they don't feel valued by society in their role as carers.
- V. Half of families with disabled children said the opportunity to enjoy play and leisure together is poor or unsatisfactory.

The full report can be found here: www.cafamily.org.uk/pdfs/wmmfs.pdf

The Social Policy Research Unit at York University published a report which is an easy introduction to the range of outcomes that carers would like to achieve from social care services.

These include:

- I. A life/identity of their own, over and above their role as parents/carers
- II. Having control over their life
- III. Spending 'quality' time with the person receiving support, over and above care-giving activities
- IV. Maintaining physical and emotional well-being
- V. Having adequate resources

- VI. Feeling skilled and informed
- VII. Maintaining family life
- VIII. Service process outcomes relating to positive relationships with professionals and working in partnership with services

The full report can be found at:

<http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/pubs/pdf/Outcomes.pdf>

Findings and recommendations

Fairer access to universal services

In their evidence to the committee SPCC reported that families understand that specialised services are under pressure so their recommendation was to improve universal services. They pointed out that only a small proportion, around 180 out of 2500 children with disabilities, receive a specialised service from the council so accessible universal services are therefore crucial to enable the majority of families to be included in community life. They reported that too often families are met with an attitude that it not helpful. Social isolation is a big issue for many families .They reported that families want to be included, and for their child to be included.

Contact a Family also highlighted this issue and they included evidence on their inclusion programme which offers a range of family inclusive activities to introduce families to new experiences. Many of these are within the borough and most are universal. Contact a Family's aim is to support families to enjoy activities which can be repeated independently. Examples gave included using local parks and libraries, taster sessions and courses at local swimming pools, and exploring local museums. Contact a Family also offers information and training to other settings and agencies to support staff to be inclusive in their practice.

Council officers acknowledged that families want fairer access to universal services and detailed work they are doing to meet some of that need through the Short Breaks programme. Evidence taken from the Short Break consultation indicated that universal settings in particular need to be more inclusive with the up skilling of frontline staff to better support disabled children and young people. The evidence identified there was a particular need to ensure hearing and visually impaired children and young people are included in service provision and access to activities, as these groups are often isolated. More sports clubs have been requested by families and children, but it was noted that the disability sports programme is no longer available. There was a particular interest in swimming including disability swim sessions. Parents have also requested activities for girls

supervised by female staff. Different kinds of activities to meet different needs (i.e. swimming classes delivered at different levels of ability) were also proposed.

Recommendation 1

Improve the accessibility of universal services by developing and promoting disability awareness training for staff in Southwark's sports and leisure facilities; such as libraries, museums, swimming pools and parks. Ensure this includes training on meeting the needs of hearing and visually impaired children and children with autism.

Recommendation 2

Encourage sports and leisure facilities to increase the accessibility of mainstream services and provide special sessions suitable for disabled children and young people.

Short Breaks

Evidence received from family support organisations and parents indicated that families would like to have regular breaks from their normal routine. They want good quality and meaningful experiences for their child and they want a chance to recharge their own batteries. The council has done an extensive consultation on this and Appendix 1 is attached: Shaping Future Service Delivery – stakeholder proposals. The recent Short Breaks services statement highlights the wide range of universal support already available, and is helping to promote the local offer to families and to identify gaps which services are working to fill.

Recommendation 3

Take forward the Short Break work plan.

The type of cuts being made, with a focus on under 5's rather than teenagers

Contact a Family reported that they work with families; often at a time of crisis. They reported that this is often before a diagnosis has been received as this is frequently a time of particular uncertainty and stress for parents. However, the service reported that families often also need particular support around times of transition, for example moving into school or college. Contact a Family reported that because of budget reductions officers were emphasising service provision for families of the under 5's, however their organisational experience is that there are just as many problems when a child enters puberty and becomes physically and sexually mature. Concern was raised that services often drop off during this challenging time. In Contact a Family's organisational view limiting services to under 5's is not a good idea.

Recommendation 4:

Evaluate the services in place to support parents and carers of disabled children over the age of 5; particularly recognising the evidence received of the additional stresses that families experience when young people reach adolescence and in times of transition .

Autistic children and young people

The evidence from SPCC highlighted what they termed as the “massive prevalence of autism”. Many of the parents giving evidence had a child or children on the autistic spectrum. The Short Breaks scheme indicated that there is a need for increased service provision for children and young people on the Autistic Spectrum. This report noted that children on the Autistic Spectrum often slip through the net as they may not qualify for mainstream and/or specialist services. Children and young people with dual diagnosis of ADHD and Autistic Spectrum Disorder are particularly vulnerable as they require 1 to 1 support to access services which required funding. Children and young people on the Autistic Spectrum with challenging behaviour are often hard to place, especially for overnight stays and respite care. The report recommended more suitable provision for these children, including enhanced training for carers. The evidence indicated that more provision is needed for children under 8 diagnosed with Autism, in particular.

Recommendation 5

Where resources allow provide additional services and support for children and young people with autism; particularly those with challenging behaviour or ADHD and for children under 8

Data registration

Parents and family support organisations said that they thought it was really important that the disability register was kept updated, even if families do not receive formal services. Parents and family support organisations emphasised that early help is much better and data registers could help with this. Better data recording would also give more accurate information as disabled children and young people could be on various data records because of a medical condition, having a statement of special educational need, being on Southwark’s disability register, being in receipt of social care through a eligibility assessment e.t.c. The evidence indicated that these data sets do not always relate to each other in clear and functional ways.

Recommendation 6

Keep Southwark’s Council Disability Register updated and set up a dialogue with partners on protocols to share data in ways are transparent, lawful and that will assist families and partner organisations supporting families.

How well medical and social care is integrated and communication with families

Parents complained that they have to tell services the same thing again and again, which is frustrating and dehumanising. They requested that the committee think about how the council can do data sharing better and more sensitively. A parent spoke about her experience; explaining that her child was referred to social workers by a medical professional, but the social workers were not particularly interested in the medical diagnosis and this meant that, despite the referral, she did not receive the assessment she needed. Parents spoke about the tension between the medical and social work teams, and the respective conceptual models that they used. Parents said that professionals from Health and Social Care teams do not have access to their respective records, even if they are co-located in places such as Sunshine House.

Recommendation 7

Explore how the council can do data sharing better and more sensitively. Particularly look at the request that social workers take into account information available from health practitioners when making assessments of children and families.

Assessment for services

Parents spoke of the delays they had experienced in getting an assessment from the disabilities/complex needs team (social care) and the Special Educational Needs (SEN) section. Parents found this difficult to understand, particularly if an assessment had been recommended by health service. A parent complained about delays from the SEN team when it comes to issuing a statement of special need. Her child had eventually received a statement; however she was dissatisfied that the process had taken too long and commented that her son has since been permanently excluded from secondary school. She said she felt sure that if the correct support mechanisms had been in place this would not have been the case. A number of parents expressed frustration that social care assessments are issued without full reference to the medical diagnosis. Parents thought this showed a lack of consistency and highlighted the disjuncture between social and health services.

Parents said that their perception was that the policy seems to be to say no the first time, then parents have to go back and make the case, then eventually you get what you need. Parents commented that this advantages more articulate and pushy parents. They said that services should be given to those who most need them, not those who shout the loudest. A parent contrasted their perception of how Health and Social Care respectively assess need in this way: the NHS admits you have a need and puts you on a waiting list; the council denies that you have a need at all. The waiting list approach was considered better in helping a family coming to terms with a child's diagnosis and likely prognosis.

Parents reported that the delays in receiving a service added to stress, and that a small amount of service, or early intervention, would be more cost effective as it prevented families escalating up the ladder of crisis. Parents stated that often a relatively small amount of support can enable families to support themselves and continue to function. Evidence received emphasised that assessments of children's needs for both care and education should be carried out early, when requested by another professional or by a parent, to enable the council to fulfil its commissioning responsibilities and plan ahead for future need.

A number of parents cited the work of Contact a Family in supporting them in accessing services and helping to negotiate the system. Parents from Contact a Family and SPCC explained that many parents do not understand what services are available or the laws surrounding access. They therefore need support in accessing them. SPCC stated that parents and carers need clear accessible information and that this cannot just be on the website. SPCC went on to explain that there needs to be more transparency, particularly on how decisions are made so that parents can be clear on the process.

Parents also said that once a 'statement of special educational need' has been received it is vital that this is adhered to. A parent commented that a child's statement is a vital tool for parents and teachers, as it is a legal document stating who our child is, what she needs and how those needs will be met.

Recommendation 8

Guarantee that all children will receive an assessment by social and educational services if referred by a professional. Undertake these as early as possible in recognition of the importance of timely support.

Recommendation 9

Provide clear advice and support to parents and carers on their rights, through publications and support organisations

Recommendation 10

Ensure that statements of special educational need are adhered to

Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and 'single point of access'

The Contact a Family manager commented on the importance of finding families before they go into crisis to prevent further difficulties. The manager reported that officers are saying that unless there is a Common Assessment Framework in place Contact a Family are being asked not to provide services. They reported that this creates difficulties as some people have had a bad experience of statutory services. Contact a Family emphasised that it is very important that

families can self refer so the organisation can meet the needs of these families. Officers stated that they believe families should be able to access services in the way that best suits them. They reported that the council is working with partners and voluntary sector partners, to develop a 'single point of access', which will make it easier and quicker for families to receive the support they need. Officers reported that the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) is an assessment tool designed to support the early identification of children with additional needs and reduce the number of times that parents have to tell their story. Officers envisage that as the tool is increasingly used by agencies it will ensure that detailed assessments are completed more quickly. Officers are developing systems to promote the identification of families so they can be supported and which bring systems together (this is related to Aiming High for Disabled Children, the Green Paper Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability, the Child Poverty Strategy and more).

Recommendation 11

Ensure that the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) enables organisations to support families of disabled children, that there are no unnecessary barriers and that the CAF acts as a collaborative system for statutory and voluntary services to identify and support families in need.

Family life

In the evidence received families pointed out they do not exist in isolation from the rest of the world. Their evidence spoke of the difficulties in sustaining paid employment and the impact on siblings of having a disabled child with limited support in difficult circumstances. They requested that in assessments and consultations the council takes into account parents' responsibilities for other children or work commitments when taking decisions about the services and support these families should receive.

Recommendation 12

Ensure assessments and consultations take into account parents' and carers' responsibilities for other children or work commitments, particularly when taking decisions about the services and support these families should receive.

Information

Contact a Family reported that families tell them it is hard to get good quality information. They reported that they offer one to one information and advice. They also produce a quarterly newsletter plus a monthly email update and use a variety of social media to keep people updated. SPCC also emphasised the need for good quality information. The Short Breaks consultation recommended regular updates of the Southwark Council website and Family Information Service with a peer review function, leaflets and brochures for distribution

through community locations; workshops on issues of relevance (Direct Payments/Personalised Budgets, Taxi Card, funding for holidays e.t.c) and an annual conference.

Recommendation 13

Provide families with information on statutory, community and generic services available through events, publications and support organisations.

Schools

As noted above parents want an early assessment for a Statement of Special Educational Needs. A parent raised concerns that families cannot highlight an Academy school for their children, if a statement is received. Parents expressed frustration with their relationships with schools; one parent indicated this had broken down. Other parents emphasised the importance of communication and the difficulties children have had at mainstream school. One parent reported that his child would be distressed because the support worker was not available, but the school had not informed him. The parent went on to say that he has even offered to train staff at the school but this has not been acted upon.

Recommendation 14

Work with all schools to promote better relationships and communication between home and school for families of disabled children and young people

Consultation

Evidence on consultations emphasised treating parents and carers with respect and truly seeking and valuing their contributions (and those of their children) when planning and evaluating services. A parent raised concerns about consulting on services that the council is legally required to provide. The Short Breaks consultation was given as an example of good practice.

Recommendation 15 Improve consultation and engagement by:

- I. Ensuring that results of consultations are shared; wherever possible explain why some requests cannot be honoured.
- II. Offer various methods to collect feedback (i.e. face to face consultation, questionnaire, electronic survey, telephone survey)
- III. Provide opportunities for parents to participate in the strategic planning of services wherever possible.
- IV. Use robust methods to engage children and young people and include their views .

Parents and carers as resource

SPPC explained that parents and carers want to work in partnership with professionals; they reported that parents are a resource and feel underused.

SPPC called on the council to understand the benefit and power of peer support. They requested the council recognise the value of interventions which enable families to use their own resources, develop resilience and have a quality of life. This was seen as the best way of delivering services in a time of shrinking resources.

Recommendation 16

Value parents as a resource and the power of peer support; particularly in times of scarce financial resources

Community and voluntary sector

Evidence called on the council to support community and voluntary sector agencies and groups in offering a wide range of opportunities to families. They wanted the council to collaborate with and value the sector. When commissioning, community organisations requested the council offer contracts which are long enough to allow security and development. Family support organisations emphasised developing systems to promote the identification of families so they can be supported and which bring systems together.

Recommendation 17

Commission contracts for as long as reasonably possible

DRAFT

Appendix 1

Short Breaks report

Shaping Future Service Delivery – stakeholder proposals

The following work plan has been collated based on consultation feedback and are suggestions and recommendations made by service users and providers including families.

WORK AREAS	DISCUSSION POINTS
Access to Services	
Eligibility Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clearer explanations of eligibility criteria and referral pathways into services (pre and post assessment).• Review of joint working agreement/protocol between Children with Disabilities Team and Referral and Assessment Team to ensure families are signposted and referred to appropriate services.
Emergency support services for parents/carers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the event that a parent carer has an emergency (i.e. hospital appointment, surgery, child in the hospital) where can they go to get help?• Many parents felt that in the first instance they would rely on their network of family and friends. As many CYP are not known to Social Care parents wouldn't feel comfortable contacting them in an emergency. In the event that a parent/carers was without support, where would they receive

<p>More inclusive/integrated activities</p>	<p>help in an emergency situation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal settings in particular need to be more inclusive with up skilled frontline staff to better support disabled children and young people. • Ensure Hearing and visually impaired CYP are included in service provision and access to activities, as these groups are often isolated. • More sports clubs requested (provision of disability sports program is no longer available); there is a particular interest in swimming including disability swim sessions. Parents have also requested activities for girls supervised by female staff. • Different kinds of activities to meet different needs (i.e. swimming classes delivered at different levels of ability) • Consider short breaks to provide different activities for different ability levels; CYP should have a choice of activities during short breaks programs wherever possible – mix of ages and CYP will support socialization skills and break down disability barriers. • More activities needed that offer support to all CYP within Southwark with an additional need – as the majority are not known to Social Services, they should still be able to access services. • Review of referral routes to ensure that CYP not known to Social Services can be referred by other professionals or self-referred by parents. • For families who don't receive services and/or funding from Social Services, how can they be supported to access activities for their children? It is viewed that better access to services in the long run will help prevent CYP and families
---	--

	<p>from escalating up the crisis ladder and are therefore more cost effective.</p>
<p>Publicity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southwark Council website including online regularly updated directory of services, but enhanced promotion of available services is needed included access criteria and cost to parent carers. • Family Information Service needs more regularly updated information from service providers. Consider a way to demarcate services in the online directory that families with disabled children have used and reviewed. • Leaflets, Brochures for distribution – accessible at Sunshine House, Libraries, etc. • Parent Conference for agencies to have information booths to provide information about services. • Offer parent carers including foster carers a series of workshops to explain more about: Short Break provision and what is available, Direct Payments/Personalized Budgets, Taxi Card and other issues of interest (i.e. funding for holidays).
<p>Transportation Strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessing short breaks is often difficult due to travel and transport arrangements. Some CYP will miss out on services, as it is too difficult for parent carers to bring them to/from activities. Ensure equal distribution of activities in the north and the south of the borough wherever possible. • How can CYP travel between school and local clubs/community activities? • Mobility allowance and Disability Living allowance can be used for transport to/from activities – may need to refresh this information with parents. • Some services have their own transport as Southwark has

DRAFT

contributed to the purchasing of vehicles; review of contractual agreements to ensure that drop off and pick up for CYP is included.

- Use of transport for out of borough provision needs to be included in the strategy, as currently there appears to be some difficulty with this (i.e. crossing into Lambeth). Commissioning of services and placements should align with/be supported by transportation provision.
- School transport is only used during term time, and before and after school – consider using these buses during the day, on weekends and during the school holidays to maximize transport provision.
- Transport for vulnerable young people post 16 who cannot travel independently would be useful, especially for working parent carers and/or those with other children to transport to school.
- Review of the assessment process for school transport to include parent carer work/shift commitments, other children in the household and logistics of travel for drop off/pick up.
- School transport currently is operating without designated/routine pick up times which can distress the children; parents are often having to take children to school so they arrive on time which adds extra pressure and stress (A new system is in place, still working through the logistics but is causing stress to some families).
- There are less buses being used for school transport so timing is less flexible – this creates difficulty for parents with other children (i.e. bus scheduled for pick up at 8:30, parent needs to leave by 8:20 to bring other children to school).
- Transportation is especially important, as parent carers feel

	<p>very protective of their children being out on the streets of Southwark; they need to feel that their children are in safe environments and arriving/departing a provision safely will help to foster this trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider use of taxi card for group transport to share costs? • Consider Dial-A-Ride minibus for group transport to improve access to services.
Commissioning	
<p>Cost Savings and good value for money</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate short breaks programs into universal services/core offer where possible. • Robust evaluation of services being provided and whether they are meeting the needs of service users. Service users may need tailor made/specialized care packages and some services could be more flexible with their care offer. • Utilizing in-house staff, partner agencies and parent carers to provide staff training and workshops around disability and safeguarding. • Sessional staff are only paid for hours worked; if a CYP does not attend an activity is Social Services still required to pay? Are parent carers still required to contribute? • Review of sites for short breaks in terms of value for money and facilities – are they meeting the needs of CYP and families? (I.e. Bacon’s College offer competitive rates, however they don’t have sufficient equipment for the Special Care Group during Playscheme; it is also not centrally located which adds transportation challenges). Can parallel activities be offered for other children at the same site?
<p>Early Years Provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission additional Early Years placements, especially for children under 3. Currently there is a limited portage service however this group of children needs more activities

	<p>with opportunities for social interaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some work to be undertaken with private nurseries, which often refuse to accept children with additional needs or who shortly after starting claim that they cannot manage their needs. At least one private nursery has claimed that only toilet-trained children are able to attend their setting.
<p>Increased service provision for CYP on the Autistic Spectrum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CYP on the Autistic Spectrum often slip through the net as they may not qualify for mainstream and/or specialist services; CYP with dual diagnosis of ADHD and Autistic Spectrum Disorder are particularly vulnerable as they require 1 to 1 support to access services which required funding; CYP on the Autistic Spectrum with challenging behaviour are often hard to place especially for overnight stays and respite care. Investigate more suitable provision for these CYP including enhanced training for carers. • More provision needed for children under 8 diagnosed with Autism. • Further investigation around services provided by Resources for Autism and IBA.
<p>Consultation</p>	
<p>Regular on going consultation with CYP, parents/carers/providers (i.e. 2-3 times per year)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> V. Ensure that results of consultations are shared; wherever possible explain why some requests cannot be honoured. VI. Offer various methods to collect feedback (i.e. face to face consultation, questionnaire, electronic survey, telephone survey) VII. Parents to participate in the strategic planning of services wherever possible. VIII. Robust methods to engage CYP and include their views and

	provide opportunities to introduce them to new and different activities (i.e. canoeing, sailing)
Resources	
Care package allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of current 'panel' process; consider a wider multi-agency approach to include input from various service areas across the sectors including an Independent Person to offer a wider range of services to families. Consider keyworker/lead professional to attend the panel meeting to advocate on behalf of the family and further explain specific requests for services. • Transparency in how care packages are allocated and the eligibility criteria for services. • Inform parents of other services they may wish to access in addition to what is provided by Social Services and/or by using Direct Payments.
Extended use of available facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of site provision to ensure maximum use and provide value for money. <p>For example: Orient Street has capacity on the children's side during school hours to provide a safe space for additional activities – i.e. under 5's stay and play or a drop-in service to give parent-carers a break (staff requirements would need to be reviewed); Work experience placements from Spa School could use the building during the school day; Occupational Therapy assessments. Consider using Orient Street as an activity hub and/or resource centre including as a provider of Independence Training. This would maximize the building, improve the profile of the provision and encourage professional relationships between agencies. A pricing structure would need to be agreed.</p>

	<p>Tuke School (and others) have comprehensive facilities available during half-term and holidays that could be utilized; hoists, multi-sensory rooms and hydrotherapy activities would be well received by program participants; school staff may even be interested in working in the scheme (contractual agreements permitting), providing consistency, understanding of local communities and need, with health and safety checks and training already in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider multi-use sites for after school and club activities where siblings can attend and/or activities for parents; parallel activities reduces travel time and cost, allows a break for the whole family and then parents/siblings can provide support for CYP with additional needs if required.
Staff Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider pool of carers needed to provide short periods of respite care, especially within the family home. Consider increased utilization of pool of sessional contact supervisors to provide cover when required; these are staff who would be employed by Southwark Council and would have undergone all required safety checks and training. • More foster carers needed – strict criteria and lengthy assessment processes means many carers don't qualify or move on before they are accepted. Improved process for vetting carers who can supervise CYP in their own home, working up towards an overnight/weekend break for the parent(s). • Agency staff are expensive and can be inconsistent; service providers and parents feel that agency staff often don't offer good value for money; it is also felt that in order to attract good quality carers, staff pay rates need to be re-evaluated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better paid/skilled/trained staff may mean less 1 to 1 support needed and can offer 1 to 2 support, which is more cost effective. This also helps to balance staff and client numbers in the event of an absence during scheduled activities. • Recruitment of more male carers, especially for boys. • More mentors, 'befrienders' and volunteers to work with CYP. This kind of service is well received by families and provides good value for money. • Consider designated Short Breaks Coordinator to ensure Southwark offers a comprehensive short breaks service integrating all CYP with special needs; would facilitate managing, arranging and monitoring service provision. • Consider Brokerage Worker role to support CYP and families to be provided appropriate services. • Further discussions around maximizing staff working with CYP in Southwark in lieu of using agency staff; i.e. the creation of a staff pool for staff who would like to work extra hours and work with CYP in different settings (possibly with different contractual arrangements to avoid overtime pay). This also supports staff continuity and stability for families.
Safeguarding Responsibilities and Integrated Service Delivery	
In-school support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop stronger links between mainstream and special schools for better support of CYP with additional needs. • Work undertaken with schools about disability awareness, building empathy and understanding how to meet the needs of individual CYP and developing in-school support programs for CYP without specialist or 1 to 1 support. • Review of incidents of bullying and exclusion of CYP with

	<p>additional needs from mainstream schools; with the expansion of Academies there are a limited number of mainstream school places for this group of vulnerable CYP so in-school support is essential to prevent exclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to be undertaken with schools to support cultural shift around supporting CYP with additional needs including refreshed strategies for in-school support. • Consider program to support CYP to travel independently to school – i.e. walking school bus, escort to school from home or pick up point (volunteers, 6th form or college students, older siblings) and organized ‘carpools’ between parents (i.e. taking a group of children to school on foot, by bus or car). This also supports working parents and those with several children to transport to and from school. • School governors to include parent(s) of CYP with additional needs to advocate and provide link to services and information.
Integrated Working and Information Sharing Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased use of CAF for information sharing and a more holistic assessment and referral process. • Further development of Key worker and Lead Professional roles • More structured approach to Team around the Child/Young Person/Family to ensure professional networks are working together to safeguard vulnerable CYP and their families.
Multi-agency working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More robust systems to encourage multi-agency working care planning and information sharing including shared IT system (i.e. eCAF/SharePoint). Integration between services and professional networks will have a significant and positive impact on service delivery and family experience.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For services where referrals are received by parent carers and/or social workers, information from other professionals is not shared or provided which may be critical for the CYP and the agency providing a service. • Best practice to be shared across the children's workforce.
Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well planned and managed transitions from Early Years provision to Reception, Primary to Secondary and from Children's to Adult Services for CYP who are 18+ including a Team Around the Child/Young Person meeting for professionals to share information and knowledge about each client. • Staged and managed transitions to new sites are also important, especially for CYP on the Autistic Spectrum for whom routines and consistency are essential to their safety and well-being.

DRAFT

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 23 April 2012	Meeting Name: Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub- Committee
Report title:		Draft Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2011-12	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Strategic Director of Children's Services	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That the Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee notes and provides comment on the draft Annual Report at Appendix 1 produced by the Southwark Safeguarding Children Board.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The draft Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2011-12 is presented to the Scrutiny Sub-Committee annually in order to consult and account on the progress of the Board.
3. The report when finalised and agreed by the Southwark Safeguarding Children Board will be shared with stakeholder agencies and will be formally presented to the Leader and the Chief Executive of the council and the Police Commander in order to strengthen accountabilities and in line with the Munro recommendations (Munro E (2011) Review of Child Protection: Final report A Child Centered System). Following the passage of legislation, the annual report will also be presented to the local Police and Crime Commissioner, the Director of Public Health and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. This is an early draft of the Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2011-12. Some of the information required to inform the report is not currently available e.g. final statistics for the Child Death Overview Panel and the year end budget. As a consequence this report may change in emphasis following consultation and as this information emerges. The final report is planned to be completed for June 2012.

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Draft Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2011-12

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Rory Patterson	
Report Author	Ann Flynn	
Version	final	
Dated	18 April 2012	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
List other officers here		
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Scrutiny Team	18 April 2012	

**Southwark
Safeguarding
Children
Board**

Appendix 1

**Southwark Safeguarding Children Board
Annual Report 2011-12**

DRAFT

Contents

Introduction from the Chair

Introduction

Governance and Accountability

Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Team

Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Budget

Key Issues addressed by the SSCB in 2011/12

Common Assessment Framework

Private Fostering

**Piloting use of SCIE Learning Together model for
Serious Case Reviews**

Reporting from Sub-Groups

Audit and Learning

Child Death Overview Panel

Human Resources

Practice Development and Training

Serious Case Review

Performance information

Conclusion

Appendix 1: Main and Executive Board Membership

**Appendix 2: Organisation Chart of Southwark
Safeguarding Children Board**

Appendix 3: Budget 2011/12

DRAFT

Introduction from the Chair

I am pleased to be able to make my second report to you on the work of the Southwark Safeguarding Children Board.

In my privileged position as Chair of the SSCB I have observed how agencies and their staff have worked hard to safeguard the children and young people of Southwark. This report reflects on this, but also identifies where we can further improve and the next steps to take on the new challenges arising from the Munro review.

This past year has consolidated much of the thinking and planning set out in my previous report of developing the theme of improving quality of safeguarding work across all our services and building a learning culture around child protection. We have a new productive partnership between the Board and the councils Organisational Development team, which worked together to host a significant conference in November addressing a key local priority in domestic abuse. This Conference was well attended with up to 230 partners joining together to consider the issues and reflect on the lessons learned from local Serious Case Reviews. However the partnership with Organisational Development stretches beyond that of the conference and the arrangements for the conference, which was itself a good milestone in achieving comprehensive cross-agency sign up to the My Learning Source online booking system for the SSCB training programme.

In my last report I spoke of the importance of an efficient engine room to drive the Boards agenda. This has been sustained through the council's internal reorganisation with a new Development Manager and our administrative support now managed by the Strategy, Planning and Policy team. This change has brought about increased capacity in the Development Manager post, and more closely aligns the work of the board with the wider strategic agenda influencing many of the partner agencies. The change also strengthens both the independence and the accountability of the board.

Our partner agencies face significant challenges in budget-making and the change agenda. The NHS and Community Care bill has now completed its passage through Parliament and commissioning structures have already changed, as has the delivery of health care in the borough, with community services moving to be managed by Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust. Early on, we identified this change programme as a significant risk to our safeguarding work, but because of the strong commitment and effective leadership of our health colleagues locally, the board has been reassured that the effectiveness of working together in safeguarding has been sustained.

The Ofsted inspection in February 2011 of Children's Social Care found many strengths including high morale within an increasingly stable work force in Referral and Assessment. Southwark awaits its Ofsted triennial inspection under the existing framework by July 2012 and the effectiveness of the board will be one factor in it.

I continue to apply that vital test to everything we do: ‘so what difference does all this make to the lives of children and families in the borough of Southwark?’ But to measure the outcomes of the board’s work in those lives remains a huge challenge. The focus of this year will be to own the Munro recommendations for data performance ¹and give them meaning IN Southwark; to help shape the borough’s “early help” offer; to consider how the government’s new troubled families initiative can enhance our safeguarding work; and to make new guidance relating to many areas (including Working Together and Serious Case Reviews) relevant and useful to our front-line workers. The board will also address how to bring children and young people, their parents and carers voices even more to inform the directions we take. In this, and other things, we will be strengthened by our new lay members, whose appointments I very much welcome.

Our over-riding ambition is that all front-line workers in Southwark should feel well-equipped to meet the demanding challenges of their responsibilities to safeguard children, which they undertake on behalf of the whole community. That demands enormous commitment and thoughtful deployment from managers, responding to ever-changing circumstances. I am confident that is, and will be, there across the Southwark partnerships.

I am grateful for the unswerving support of the board members, senior managers across the agencies, Romi Bowen and Rory Patterson on behalf of the council and, very importantly, the board’s dedicated support team, Ann Flynn, Tina Hawkins and Nina Scott.

¹ Department for Education (2012) Draft of Children’s Safeguarding Performance Information for Consultation

Introduction

The purpose of this Annual Report is to:

- Provide an outline of the main areas of activity and achievements for the Southwark Safeguarding Board² during 2011/12
- Reflect on the work plan covering this period and provide the public, practitioners and stakeholders with an overview of how well children and young people in Southwark are protected
- Map the challenges ahead in order that the multi agency partnerships can prepare to manage them

The key priorities of the Southwark Safeguarding Children Board as set out in the work plan dated 2011/12 are set out below. All these had advanced by the end of the year:

- Quality assurance of safeguarding in service delivery and commissioned/contracted work that agencies meet the required section 11 standards
- Safeguarding priorities progressed as identified in the 'staying safe' part of the children and young peoples plan.
- To adopt a commissioning role in training, based on sound needs based analysis, and including quality assurance of delivery.
- To build effective relationships with the new leadership structures emerging from the NHS changes, especially the community health provider management and the developing GP consortia
- To lead consideration of what follows from the current Munro review of child protection and the implementation of consequent changes
- In light of Munro report recommendations and government response to ensure co ordination across strategic partnerships in relation to safeguarding children
- In the light of changes from the Munro review, to review the capacity of the board and insure that it is sufficient to fulfil its key responsibilities
- To ensure that the revised sub-groups are working responsively and effectively to address particular local concerns identified through the boards activities and SCR's in the light of the Munro report recommendations and government response to ensure co-ordination across strategic partnerships in relation to safeguarding children
- Work to reduce the over use of inappropriate referrals to social care and drive forward practices that share responsibility for 'early help' and how all agencies will work together to support families and protect children improving all elements of the child's journey
- To find ways of listening better to the voices and views of children and young people about safeguarding in Southwark

² Southwark Safeguarding Children Board will be referred to as SSCB throughout report

- To build a network of designated safeguarding lead persons within agencies encouraging their effective use by practitioners, contributing to their professional development and encourage planning for their succession
- To review jointly with Lambeth Safeguarding Children Board the organisation and administration of the Child Death Overview Panel
- Share information of findings and actions from Ofsted inspections and to prepare for the triennial safeguarding inspection
- Ensure smooth transition of the proposed restructuring of the SSCB support team
- To disseminate the National Messages from Research (on neglect and emotional abuse) published November 2011.

Governance and Accountability

The Children Act 2004 placed a duty on every local authority to establish a Local Safeguarding Children Board by April 2006. This Board is the key statutory mechanism for agreeing how member organisation within Southwark work together to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The statutory guidance is set out in *Working Together* (2010).³

In Southwark there is now a well established SSCB partnership providing engagement at both a strategic and operational level to ensure that the work undertaken to protect children is properly co-ordinated and effective.

A strength of the SSCB is in the governance and board arrangements. In 2010 these were reviewed under the newly appointed independent chair and the current arrangements reflect this. The arrangements are that the Main board meets twice a year with the Executive board meeting three times. There is a framework of sub-groups (see appendix 2) addressing Auditing and Learning, Child Death Overview Panel, Human Resources, Practice Development and Training, Serious Case Reviews and the Designated and named Professionals. This streamlined framework has ensured a focus to the work and ensured progressive dialogue and compliance to improve individual safeguarding practices within the multi agency system.

In 2011 Lay members were sought to compliment the role of the professional agencies represented on the board. Unfortunately there were no appointments made. However in February 2012 following recruitment two offers of appointment were made and plans are in place for the Lay Members to join the spring boards.

³ Department for Education (2011) *Working Together* London HMSO

The streamlined Board and subgroups have brought a smarter way of working. The intention was to increase accountability and challenge, holding partners to account. In the year on which we are reporting, each agency reported in detail on its safeguarding arrangements, and was constructively challenged by its colleagues and their chair at an executive meeting. This “Section 11” audit process was reviewed at the September 2011 Executive Board meeting. The review identified major strengths, but areas to improve were identified for the next year of reporting: agencies need to be more detailed about their safeguarding training status, how they were ensuring that safeguarding in services outsourced or commissioned are evidenced in the commissioning and monitoring process, statutory services supporting young people in custodial (or remand) placements were asked to ensure their s11 audit report covers the welfare and safeguarding of children in such placements and finally how agencies ensure their service takes into account the views of children and their families.

The importance of the s11 reporting informing the Annual Report is emphasised where from this year it will be presented to the Director of Children’s Services, Chief Executive and Leader of the Council. Following the passage of legislation it will also be presented to the local Police and Crime Commissioner, the Director of Public Health and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board. It is anticipated that in reporting at this strategic level there will be a high level of awareness and accountability of emerging local issues and priorities.

The SSCB has a discrete agency and function as set out in Working Together. However it operates alongside the Children’s Trust Board (CAFT) and the relationship between the two has been clearly defined. The SSCB both advises and challenges the trust on safeguarding issues, with our chair being a member. In turn, we account to the trust for the effectiveness of our work.

This report, for the first time, will be formally presented to the leader and the chief executive of the council, and to the police commander, in order to strengthen our accountability, and in line with Professor Munro’s recommendations.

Strengths and Progress

- Clear governance with good compliance with s11 audit and reporting. This enables good accountability and preparation for possible inspections with a rolling resource available through which agency and interagency safeguarding standards can be evidenced and benchmarked.
- Good engagement of agencies through a period of change to both Board and single agencies

Priorities for improvement

- Review the induction process of board members in order to ensure systematic support and guidance to Lay Members and professional members of the board.

- Systematise service users engagement in the strategic review of services, policies and procedures
- Continue to develop the role of the board in challenge to how the multi agency system works to support early intervention and preventative services, so increasing use of CAF and reducing in use of specialist safeguarding intervention. Also in how the SSCB assesses the effectiveness of early help offered
- Implement the changes within the review of Working Together. These changes are likely to set out advice and frameworks to strengthen the role of Safeguarding Children Boards
- Internally review the s11 process and consider the use of the Pan London audit review framework in order to standardise response and report by exception.

Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Team

The SSCB team currently comprises the following: Independent Chair Chris Davies; Development Manager, Ann Flynn; admin support, Tina Hawkins and Nina Scott (Appendix 4)

Membership:

The statutory membership of LSCB's is set out in s 13(3) Children Act 2004 and Working Together to Safeguard Children 2011. Safeguarding Children Board members should have a strategic role in relation to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in their respective agencies. The membership in Southwark is set out in detail at appendix 2.

The majority of agencies attendance throughout 2011/12 has been good and this has led to a building of trust and confidence in local partnership working. The system of recording attendance has been reviewed and members will be subsequently contacted if they do not attend in order to identify any ways they may be supported to attend the next meeting.

SSCB Budget

The SSCB budget is comprised of partner contributions and these are for the reporting period:

Southwark Council	50,000
NHS Southwark	20,000
Police	5,000
SLaM	5,000
Probation	1,000
Lambeth (for CDOP admin charge)	5,000
Total	86,000

The end of year budget statement is attached at appendix 3 (to be added)
The positive balance to the budget at year end is largely due to the fact that Southwark did not have to host a Serious Case review.

The Executive has agreed that the carry-forward will be drawn-down in each of the next three years to avoid any increase in subscriptions. One of the commitments made by all agencies in that regard is that they will fully-fund any necessary Serious Case Review on a shared basis, the formula for which is to be agreed.

Key Issues addressed by Southwark Safeguarding Children Board in 2011/12

Common Assessment Framework

A series of steps has been taken by the board to support and underpin the development of early help and to progress the use of CAF record across the council. In November 2011 a letter sent from the chair of the SSCB was circulated to all key partner agencies advising them as to the need for effective use of the CAF.

Review of the process launched this refocus on CAF and the form and guidance was updated, a clear communication plan ensured key messages about CAF being linked to early help, being an organising tool for each agency's work with its children and families as well as being a referral form were reinforced. This was supported with a series of written briefings and face to face workshops running across all services. These arrangements were reinforced at the SSCB Domestic abuse conference in November 2011 when the Integrated Care Services team presented an information table to the delegates promoting CAF and training about CAF. The SSCB supported this initiative through covering costs for CAF leaflets explaining the process to parents in order to increase awareness.

The progress of CAF has been monitored strategically at the Main SSCB board meeting. The use of CAF is also discussed strategically in the development of the Munro Early Help response at both the SSCB and the Children and Families Trust meetings. Reconfiguring Early Help is a key priority of the local transformation agenda.

As a positive outcome in the refocus on CAF there has been a significant rise in referrals and the average age at which children are referred has reduced to age 2years old.

Case Study

Over the past year following the refocus on the Common Assessment Framework the Integrated Child Support Service reconfigured and enhanced its integration programme with a single front door access to a broad range of targeted and swifter pathways to access early help when a need is first identified. The service now focuses on improving the child's journey between needing and receiving help, ensuring a timely identification, assessment and then delivery through a multi agency Early Help Panel. The impact of the strategic changes to the service is demonstrated in the average age for a CAF to be undertaken in April 2011 was 7 years; however this has now fallen to 2

years old.

An example of this early help to support children and their families is: Sam (not his real name) was referred to Children's Social Care as his mother had mental health difficulties affecting her parenting. These issues were not something that met the criteria for Children's Services to become involved however it was clear the family needed professional support at this time. Children's Social Care shared the referral with the **EARLY HELP PANEL**. This took place with the mother's agreement for the information to be shared. The Early Help Panel proposed a behaviour specialist intervention from **Integrated Child Support Service**. The behaviourist specialist read his CAF, so was aware of the challenges that faced him. Sam is a sensitive boy, sometimes feeling angry and sad. The teacher had explained that Sam sometimes scratches his face when he is upset or if he feels adults are asking him to do too much. The teachers were concerned that this behaviour was affecting his self-esteem, his learning and relationships at home and at school.

At the beginning of our sessions, Sam told me, "I'm sad everyday". In the following sessions, which he called, "my special time", Sam and I talked about the things that make him feel sad, and the things that make him happy, and what he could do to make things better for him when he felt sad or angry. He said he feels sad when his mother has to go into hospital and he and his brother have to stay with family, but that going to church with his family made him happy, especially when singing in the choir. He also said that he loved school and his class, and sometimes brings his work in to show me.

The feedback from his teacher is that Sam seems more relaxed in class and has stopped hurting himself when things go wrong. He is able to think about things more calmly and that he is better at listening to adult instructions.

Sam is enthusiastic about his sessions, and is working hard to understand his world, but it is early days yet, and he has a long way to go to reach his potential.

Private Fostering

Southwark's private fostering service reports to the SSCB every year by way of an annual report. It is responsible for safeguarding and promoting the welfare of privately fostered children and thereby reducing the numbers of unknown private fostering arrangements. Private fostering has been a key priority for the SSCB and has worked in partnership with the fostering service to ensure the national minimum standards and Ofsted's recommendations for good practice are maintained. There has been media support to the issue for the national private fostering awareness week and the issue raised within training and conferences to raise awareness and aid identification. The authority has published on its website a clear statement of purpose, setting out its responsibilities in relation to private fostering

During 2011/12 Southwark's private fostering team received 77 private fostering notifications and took action in 74 of these, with 45 new arrangements made to support children. The private fostering placements have been monitored through rigorous arrangements and supported through monitoring, review, audit and scrutiny. Alongside the Annual Report on private fostering there are regular reports to senior managers, elected members and the SSCB. Statistical returns are routinely made to the Department for Education as required.

Piloting use of Social Care Institute for Excellence Learning Together (SCIE) model

The Serious Case Review sub-group commissioned the use of the SCIE⁴ Learning Together model to understand why good and poor practice occurred in an individual case. The model is based on a 'systems' approach and provides a supportive framework for practitioners, to understand professional practice identifying all the factors in the system that influence the nature and quality of work with families. This method requires the reviewers to engage those people who were directly involved in the case in a collaborative process as well as drawing on the formal documentation as a source of data. In this particular case, not only did the process support SCIE's trial of the programme but it advised the Serious Case Review subgroup as to lessons learned in the case and to the potential to use of this method in future.

Reporting from Sub-groups

Audit and Learning:

This sub-group is responsible for initiating and undertaking multi agency and single agency audits and reviews of safeguarding audit on behalf of the SSCB in order to ensure compliance with child protection and safeguarding procedures. The terms of reference for this sub-group include: co-ordination of a programme of multi-agency case reviews – these to be run in a way similar to the SCIE systems approach in order to provide transformational learning for front line staff during the review process, multi-agency audits of the Child protection process and organisation of learning events for front line operational staff around other themed reviews.

The sub-group met five times over the reporting period with five multi agency audits completed of children subject to child protection plan. Audits were circulated to agency leads to feedback to staff. Although the number involved is too small for significant analysis, some themes have emerged. In summary these evidenced that all parents attended the conference; no concerns required escalation to senior manager; generally child protection plans were appropriate; social work reports to conference were generally detailed and useful; however at times they could be overly long and in a minority of cases more analysis was required; reports from schools were variable; There were

⁴ Fish S, Munro E & Bairstow E (2008) Learning together to safeguard children: developing a multi-agency systems approach for case reviews SCIE

issues as to how to engage GP's and Police to attend conferences given their commitments; Police attended 2 of the 5 conferences. A police report was tabled in 4 conferences and there was variable attendance by health; 3 of the 5 conferences looked at involved physical abuse. In all of these cases there was a feeling that the physical abuse was dealt with well but the underlying emotional issues and family dynamics needed closer attention.

The group is currently piloting a small-scale 'systems approach' to case audit using the SCIE model previously mentioned. This involves working with a child protection core group plus the Child Protection chair and line managers to examine a case in detail and try to analyse and examine the way that agencies are working together with a family. A report about the usefulness of this approach will be presented to the SSCB meeting in May 2012.

The group is also carrying out a larger themed multi-agency audit on Domestic Abuse - this arose as a recommendation of a Serious Case Review.

There have been three inspections in this period. The Ofsted annual unannounced inspection of contact, referral and assessment arrangements took place in January 2011, fostering service in November and the Youth Justice Board inspection of the Youth Offending Service in December 2011.

The Ofsted unannounced inspection of contact referral and assessment in January 2011 identified many areas of strength. The issues arising as areas of development have provided a focus for the SSCB over the year. The areas highlighted as a high proportion of child protection conferences and a low number of initial conferences result in a child becoming subject to a child protection plan. Also that implementation of CAF requires development to ensure the consistent contribution of all key agencies and to support appropriate referral to children's social care.

The announced fostering inspection from Ofsted reported that the overall quality of fostering service was good, services in respect of protecting children from harm or neglect and helping them to stay safe were also assessed as good.

Child Death Overview Panel:

The Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) is a joint Southwark and Lambeth panel providing a rapid response to the unexpected death of a child. The panel brings together key professionals to enquire into and evaluate each death, and also in overview of all child deaths in a local area, with the aim of improving the understanding as to why children die in the area and where possible take action to prevent deaths in the future.

This panel has wide and good representation from local agencies. In 2011/12 there were 24 Southwark and 20 Lambeth children reviewed. This indicates that this CDOP is one of the busiest in London.

A review of the findings from all cases (from 2008-2011) was done in 2011 as part of the 2011 annual report which outlined key themes and made recommendations. The report went to both the Southwark and Lambeth Children Safeguarding Boards.

The function of the CDOP itself was reviewed locally in 2011 to improve its effectiveness. This identified several areas of change which are now underway: a neonate's⁵ only sub-group has been set-up; a simpler data collection form, the C1 is being piloted so as to improve efficiency and Public Health now chairs the Panel.

Ensuring awareness of and implementation of the annual report recommendations is a priority for CDOP. The current recommendations are:

1. The pilot will be evaluated in April to further develop the local CDOP function
2. Raising awareness of health improvement with the public relating to infant health e.g. co-sleeping, diet
3. Awareness/training for health and related professionals on e.g. sickle cell disease
4. A public health approach to youth violence (knife and gun crime)

Human Resources:

The Human Resources sub group has met four times over the year. Its objective is to improve safeguarding to children and adults services human resource practice and procedures, it emphasises that safeguarding is everybody's business, including carers, public and service providers and to continue to advance the awareness of safeguarding, safeguarding systems and Human Rights with regard to employment practice.

The sub group has reviewed good practice guidelines and compliance with safe recruitment practices in light of government regulation.

Allegations against professionals working with children

The SSCB Human Resources (HR) sub group maintains an overview of allegations against professionals in a position of trust. The investigations into these allegations are led by the Local Area Designated Officer (Lado). The Lado is contacted whenever there is an allegation of concern that any person who works with children in connection with their employment or voluntary activity has behaved in a way that has or may have harmed a child, possibly committed a criminal offence against or related to a child or behaved towards a child or children in a way that indicates they are unsuitable to work with children.

Since 1 April 2011 there have been 43 logged contacts in relation to allegations against professionals.

⁵ A child under 28 days old

In respect of outcomes there have been 51 strategy meetings that have been held using Lado procedures. Nine of the allegations have been substantiated, with 4 criminal investigations and 1 confirmed prosecution.

A significant number of cases do not involve direct allegation of abuse however raise issues about the professionals fitness to work.

Since September 2011 there has been focused joint work between the Quality Assurance Unit and Southwark's fostering service to support best practice in relation to allegation against carers. The Lado has also reviewed the outcome of investigations to identify themes and learning particularly in relation to education and early years staff, considering thresholds within the team and improving the reporting system.

Strengths and Progress

- Joint working across Adult and Children's services creates a joined up approach to safer recruitment
- The transfer of the Lado role to the Quality Assurance Unit has strengthened the link to practice and promoted its function. This has in particular supported the focus on the fostering service

Development priorities

- Continue to promote and use the employment practice self audit tool across the partnership and audit compliance of this noting impact on safer recruitment
- Progress work with commissioning team ensuring good practice is universal and gaps are followed up through contract monitoring
- Develop Lado reporting and audit to progress the lessons learned into safe practice

Practice Development and Training:

The Practice Development and Training sub group was redefined in May 2011. This is now co-chaired by the council's Head of Organisational Development and the designated Nurse for Child Protection.

Critical to support an approach of continuous improvement was the development of the Children Safeguarding Learning Strategy, with a structured delivery plan providing a focused framework to support future improvements.

The rationale for creating this strategy was two-fold: firstly, to create a universal understanding across the 'multi-agency' of the standard and quality of the training offer; secondly, to put in place an evaluation of the current good practice and to create improvements that are responsive to the future and the community organisations needs at a time of change.

The delivery plan for the year set out to establish and embed best practice, quality assured organisational learning, work force development, develop the

continuous learning framework using multi agency best practice forums, user group action learning and using accredited learning frameworks.

The Practice Development and Training sub-group worked to host a Conference in November presenting the theme of Domestic Abuse to a multi agency audience. The conference was a success and 230 delegates attended. This enabled a good forum to explore and progress different issues within the domestic abuse agenda and cascaded key messages and use of the Barnado's Risk Assessment tool to the multi agency audience.

Strengths and Progress

- In the past year the training programme has been advertised and accessed through MyLearningSource the online training site. The lead up to the conference in November enabled partner agencies to sign up to this resource with a 4 fold increase in registration and engagement.
- Good joint working between the Organisational Development team and the SSCB with a clear commissioning relationship developing
- The safeguarding e-learning awareness programme was launched in May 2010. To date 2,200 people have completed this programme making a significant impact to raising knowledge and awareness across a number of disciplines.
- The SSCB website homepage was substantially refreshed and now has links to all partners to the board, key information and link to MyLearningSource

Development priorities

- Quality assurance exercise to be completed on an annual basis to inform commissioning of future training
- Ongoing review of the current training programme to ensure it reflects current local and national evidence base in keeping children safe and this information to inform the commissioning of future training.
- Southwark council has successfully obtained a grant from the CWDC totalling £50K for the provision of safeguarding training. The sub group is planning as to how to optimise the impact of this grant on effective workforce development across the multi agency
- Regular meetings to consider professional development and practice based issues. These practice based issues to include lessons arising from Serious Case Review, Child Death Overview Panel, service user complaints and also government guidance e.g in the case of child trafficking, child exploitation, neglect and private fostering.

Serious Case Review:

A Safeguarding Board conducts Serious Case Reviews (SCR's) to learn lessons and improve the way in which agencies work both individually and collectively to safeguard children.

The key aims for the sub group are to advise the independent chair of the board as to when to commission a serious case review or other type of review, oversee and quality assure all SCR's undertaken by the board and to monitor whether the action plans meet the recommendations' from SCR's.

Although Southwark Safeguarding Board have not commissioned any SCR's in this reporting period key achievements for the sub group have been in reporting to three SCR's hosted in other local authorities. Themes emerging from these SCR's include: issues relating to protecting children in families where there is domestic abuse; risk assessment of domestic abuse; working together with other agencies and the courts to insure good communication and information sharing; managers ensure staff are routinely meeting children and families in their child protection work; to consider the additional vulnerability of children with disabilities when they are living in families subject to domestic abuse and strengthening management of families that are mobile and move across geographic boundaries.

The group has also participated in:

- Reviewing the learning arising from piloting the Social Care Institute of Excellence (SCIE) Learning Together model applied to a case. Learning from this case will be cascaded locally and inform the national development of this model with the Department for Education.
- The terms of reference of the group have been updated to reflect changes to Working Together and to strengthen the processes
- Four Management Overview Reports were commissioned in cases where the case did not meet the criteria for a SCR but it was thought there was single agency or interagency lessons to be learned.
- Feedback events from the author of current serious Case Reviews presented to conference and to a designated lead training event alongside Child Protection update seminars to multi agency group in order that key messages are disseminated and understood within agencies.

Development Priorities:

- A protocol to be developed to inform use of other types of review to learn lessons and develop practice when the case does not meet the criteria for a SCR but there are single agency or interagency lessons to be learned
- Further audit of the action points in previous cases (Jack, child I and child G) to ensure these lessons are embedded in agency practice.
- To implement revised Working Together guidance in respect of SCR and keep under review how to optimise learning from those cases that do not meet the criteria for a SCR but there are single agency or interagency lessons to be learned

Performance information ⁶

The SSCB ensures local safeguarding practice is understood in context of the regional policies and procedure. In this past year the SSCB has regularly presented overview of performance in relation to child protection.

Arrangements for a range of procedures, guidance and policy were streamlined resulting in an explicit policy change to use national and regional guidance rather than local guidance unless there is evidence that to do so will add value. Therefore use of the Pan London Child Protection Procedures was established, use of the Barnado's Risk Matrix to identify Domestic Abuse as examples of use of regional policies alongside Southwark SSCB policies such as Missing Children's Protocol, protocols for children and their families living with drug and alcohol misuse, disability and mental ill health.

The accountability framework for the SSCB changed over the year in that the SSCB management team changed line management to Strategy, Planning and Performance within the Strategy, Commissioning and Business Improvement division of Children's Social Care. This brought a clearer line of accountability with the corporate planning of the SSCB and the Children and Family Trust (CAFT) in order to better progress the Munro demands for improved interrogation of data by Boards and the change to Health and Well Being boards.

The following analysis is based on final published data from the Department for Education. The statistical first release was published on 30 November (and will be updated to reflect the final year end figures for the final report)

- Southwark continues to have a high volume and rate (per 10,000) of children in need in London.
- Contact rates and referrals have decreased by X % and initial assessments completed have risen slightly over the last 12 months.
- The proportion of referrals going onto initial assessments has improved over the last 12 months bringing us in line with national levels and better than the statistical neighbour average
- Initial assessments completed to timescales are now higher than the national and statistical neighbour averages and our rank in London has improved.
- Performance in completing core assessments within timescales remains high
- Re-registration numbers have risen but remain comparatively low.
- Performance for child protection plans lasting 2 years or more remains under review with in depth analysis planned into this area of performance to assist understanding. The initial outturn data for 2011/12 shows improvement

⁶ Child Protection Performance and Data (Provisional data as published by DfE 30/11/2011)

The rate of referrals going to Initial and Core assessment

- The rate of referrals going onto Initial assessments is 74% and above the national average but below the statistical neighbour (78.8%). Initial assessments completed within timescales (7 working days) onto initial assessments remains one which Southwark Children's Services gives good focus.
- Core assessments completed within timescales (35 working days) shows current performance at 90.4% and above the end of year performance of 87% and well above provisional 2010/11 performance for statistical neighbours, London and National (Will be updated to reflect final end of year figures for final draft report)

Profile of children subject to a Child Protection Plan (CPP)

Southwark has a population of around 285,600 with one fifth of the population aged 0-19 years old. Currently Southwark is the 9th most densely populated borough in London with the 6th highest birth-rate. It is estimated that 21% of Southwark's population moved either in or out of the Borough in one year (2005/6). The borough is ranked as the 41st most deprived borough in England and 12th most deprived in London.

The proportion of children from Black Minority Ethnic Groups within Southwark schools is identified as 75%. The largest communities represented are from Black African ethnic group (29%), followed by White British (24%).

Categories of Registration to Child Protection Plan

Categories of registration as percentage (to be updated at end of year)

Emotional abuse	29
Neglect	64
Physical abuse	4
Sexual abuse	3

There is currently a review of young people's participation in the child protection process. This involves reviewing the documentation, practice and processes with work being undertaken with young people and their families and the professional networks to see what can be done to improve this. However the Quality Assurance Unit report 77% attendance at child protection conferences by parents. In respect of children and young people attending it is a professional decision as to how appropriate this would be or the age of the child being too young. In 65% of cases it was felt the child was too young or it would not be appropriate. However children did attend in 12% of cases.

Conclusion:

The past year has consolidated changes put in place within the previous year. There was a strengthening of the governance and participation in the Safeguarding Children's Board. This also developed links with the Children and Family Trust in preparation to plan the transition to the Health and Wellbeing Board. The new SSCB sub group structure enabled a focus on key priority areas and this alongside the s11 audit reporting structure gave a good foundation for the SSCB to maintain oversight as to the effectiveness of safeguarding services across the partnerships.

The process of completing this Annual Report has enabled a review of the current position. Reviewing what we have done well and setting priorities for the coming 12 months. The purpose of the SSCB is to advise, develop support, coordinate and assure the quality of multiagency safeguarding activity in Southwark. Based on this current overview of our work our priorities for the coming year will be to:

- Continue to address the priorities for safeguarding as set out in the Children and Young Peoples Plan and support the development of the new plan
- To consider the ways in which the SSCB can systematically hear the voice of Children and young people in order to inform its work and meetings.
- To conduct a larger themed multi-agency audit on Domestic Abuse - this is a recommendation of a Serious Case review.
- Continue to respond to the guidance emerging in respect of the Munro review of child protection e.g embedding the new Working Together document and how to effectively use the Munro data set. Currently under consultation.
- Embed the s11 audit into the reporting structure in order to ensure it is an effective accountability framework for the SSCB to account for effectiveness of the work.
- Develop a strategic partnership with the adult safeguarding board through targeted activity for example: commission an audit with the Adult Board to sponsor jointly a programme of audits of Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference from a children's' safeguarding perspective; give focus to the transition to adulthood for children with disability and to ensure there is effective safeguarding as they develop from age 14.
- Develop responses and support within the emerging troubled family agenda and to support the troubled families agenda
- Areas of practice prioritised to be informed by local and national lessons learned in respect of private fostering, child trafficking, domestic abuse, child neglect and child sexual exploitation.

- To monitor the impact of the new structures and child protection accountability frameworks emerging from the NHS and Community Care legislation recently agreed by Parliament.
- Work with the newly appointed lay members to induct and develop their role within the multi agency. The lessons arising from this to be used to support future new members in inducting them in to the board process
- To update safer recruitment process following government guidance. The impact to be understood for all stakeholders
- Develop a stakeholder communication strategy in order to develop consultation on key areas eg annual report, policies, progress newsletter, inform webpage

Appendix:

1. Main and Executive Board Membership
2. Organisation chart of Southwark Safeguarding Children Board
3. Budget 2011/12

Appendix 1: Membership of the Southwark Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB)

Chair: Chris Davies CBE, DL Independent

Agency	Job Title	Name
Adult Social Care	Deputy Director	Sarah McClinton
Children & Family Court Advisory Support Services (CAFCASS)	Service Manager	John Mellor
Children's Services, Social Care	Strategic Director of Children's Services	Romi Bowen
Children's Services, Social Care	Youth Offending Service Manager	Jenny Brennan
Children's Services, Social Care	Head of Social work Improvement & Quality Assurance	Jackie Cook
Children's Services, Early Years	Quality Improvement Strategy Manager	Fiona Phillips
Children's Services, Education	Early Years & Children's Centres Strategic Manager	Neil Gordon-Orr
Children's Services, Social Care	Head of Strategy & Partnerships	Elaine Allegretti
Children's Services, Social Care	Business Manager for Assessment Safeguarding & Family Support	Paul Angeli
Children's Services, Social Care	Assistant Director of Specialist Children's Services & Safeguarding	Rory Patterson
Children's Services, Social Care	Assistant Director, 0-5 and Community	Mike Smith
Community Action Southwark (CAS)	Chief Executive Officer	Gordon McCullough
Community Safety/ Southwark Council	Head of Community Safety & Enforcement	Jonathon Toy

Divine Communications Trust (Voluntary Sector)	Chief Executive Officer	Viv Oyolu
Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	Deputy Chief Nurse	Val Carse
Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	Named Nurse for Child Protection	Debbie Saunders
GSTFT Community Health Services	Directorate General Manager Children's Community Service	Barbara Hills
Housing, Southwark Council	Area Housing Manager	Shaun Holdcroft
James Allen's Girls School	Headmistress (Independent Sector)	Marion Gibbs
Keyworth Primary School	Head Teacher Representative	Susi Whittome
King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	Named Doctor / Consultant Paediatrician	Martha Ford-Adams
King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust	Named/Lead Nurse for Safeguarding Children	Louise Morton
London Probation Service	Acting Assistant Chief Officer, Southwark	Becky Canning
Metropolitan Police (Child Abuse Investigation Team)	Detective Chief Inspector	Chris Smart
Metropolitan Police (Public Protection Desk)	Detective Chief Inspector	Dave Yarranton
NHS Southwark	Consultant Paediatrician/Designated Doctor	Dr Ros Healy
NHS Southwark	Named Nurse for Safeguarding Children	Helen Stewart
School Governors' Association	School Governor	Vic Wilson
SLaM NHS Foundation Trust	Director, CAMHS CAG	Paul Calaminus
SLaM NHS Foundation Trust	Acting Southwark Borough Lead for Addictions	Suzanne Long
SLaM NHS Foundation Trust	AMH Safeguarding Children Manager	Chris McCree
SLaM NHS Foundation Trust	Consultant Child & Adolescent Psychiatrist	Dr Tara Weeramanthri
Southwark Business Support Unit	Managing Director	Andrew Bland
Southwark Business Support Unit	Designated Nurse for Safeguarding Children	Mary Mason
Southwark Business Support Unit	AD of Nursing & Interim Head of Children's Integrated Commissioning	Gwen Kennedy
Southwark Council	Councillor Cabinet Member for Children	Catherine McDonald
Southwark Council	Head of Human Resources	Bernard Nawrat
Southwark GP Consortium	Doctor	Jane Cliffe
Southwark Safeguarding Children Board	Safeguarding Children Board Development Manager	Ann Flynn
St Saviours & St Olaves School	Deputy Head	Sue Long
United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA)	Asylum Case Owner	Philip Thorpe

Membership of the Executive Board**Chair: Chris Davies CBE, DL Independent**

Agency	Job Title	Name
Adult Social Care	Deputy Director	Sarah McClinton
Children's Services, Social Care	Strategic Director of Children's Services	Romi Bowen
Children's Services, Education	Deputy Director of Children's Services	Merril Haeusler
Children's Services, Social Care	Assistant Director of Specialist Children's Services & Safeguarding	Rory Patterson
Community Action Southwark (CAS)	Chief Executive Officer	Gordon McCullough
Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	Deputy Chief Nurse	Val Carse
Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust	Chief Executive	Ron Kerr
Keyworth Primary School	Head Teacher Representative	Susi Whittome
King's College Hospital	Chief Executive	Tim Smart
Metropolitan Police (Child Abuse Investigation Team)	Detective Chief Inspector	Chris Smart
NHS Southwark	Consultant Paediatrician/Designated Doctor	Dr Ros Healy
SlaM NHS Foundation Trust	Director for Southwark AMH and CAMHS	Paul Calaminus
South London & Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust	Chief Executive	Stuart Bell
Southwark Safeguarding Children Board	SSCB Development Manager	Ann Flynn
Southwark Business Support Unit	Managing Director	Andrew Bland
Southwark Business Support Unit	Designated Nurse for Safeguarding Children	Mary Mason
Southwark Council	Councillor Cabinet Member for Children	Catherine McDonald
Southwark Council, Housing Department	Strategic Director Housing Services	Gerri Scott

- **To be appointed to both Main & Executive Board: 2 x Lay Members**

SSCB Administration

Tina Hawkins SSCB Senior Administrator
 Nina Scott SSCB Administrator

Appendix 2:

SSCB Structure Chart 2012
Southwark Safeguarding Children Board
 Chair: Chris Davies CBE, DL Independent

Executive - Chair: Chris Davies Independent

Membership: Children's Services: Education, Specialist Children's & Safeguarding Services. Police (Borough & CAIT), Southwark BSU, SLAM NHS Mental Health Trust, Guys & St Thomas' Trust, Kings College Hospital Trust, Southwark Council Environment & Leisure Department, Community Action Southwark

Meets 3 times per year or as required

Safeguarding Children Board - Chair: Chris Davies

Meets 2 times per year or as required

Serious Case Review Sub group	Audit & Learning Sub group	Practice Development & Training Sub group	Human Resources Sub group	Child Death Overview Panel (joint with Lambeth)	Designated & Named Professionals Group
Chair: Rory Patterson Asst Director of Specialist Children's Services & Safeguarding Children's Services 4 times a year	Chair: Jackie Cook Head Of Social Work Improvement And Quality Assurance Children's Services 5 times a year	Co-chaired: John Howard/Mary Mason (JH) Organisational Development Manager (MM) Designated Nurse (JH) Children's Services (MM) Southwark BSU 4 times a year	Chair: Bernard Nawrat Head of Human Resources Southwark Council 4 times a year	Chair: Abdu Mohiddin Consultant in Public Health Lambeth PCT Monthly	Chair: Co-opted per day Designates to take responsibility on behalf of the SSCB for leadership in professional issues. Twice a year

Chair: Chris Davies CBE, DL Independent

Vice Chairs: Rory Patterson, Assistant Director of Specialist Children's Services & Safeguarding, Southwark Children's Services

Second vice Chair: Romi Bowen, Strategic Director of Children's Services, Southwark Council

Staff:

SSCB Development Manager

Ann Flynn Email: ann.flynn@southwark.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7525 3733

Senior Administrator:

Tina Hawkins Email: tina.hawkins@southwark.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7525 3306

SSCB Administrator:

Nina Scott Email: nina.scott@southwark.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7525 4646

Southwark Safeguarding Children Board

160 Tooley Street

PO Box 64529

London SE1 2QH

Tel: 020 7525 3306

Appendix 3

Budget to be inserted

DRAFT

Appendix 4: Southwark Safeguarding Children Board Team:**Independent Chair:**

The Independent Chair, Chris Davies commenced work in October 2010 and is employed for 24 days per year. Chris Davies is a registered social worker with over 40 years experience in social care, and nearly 17 years as a Director of Social Services in two Authorities. He has been a specialist adviser to a House of Commons Select Committee (for a study on looked after children) and chaired two national task forces in England for the Secretary of State for Health (violence to social care workers, and implementing Valuing People for and with people with learning disabilities working jointly with a learning disabled service user). He was part of the review team appointed by the Secretary of State to examine the care of people with learning disabilities in general hospitals and primary care after Mencap reported adversely on several deaths.

Chris Davies is also strategic adviser to the Social Services Improvement Agency in Wales; he is also non-executive Chair of a not-for-profit care provider, the Somerset Care Group. Chris Davies was President of Association of Directors of Social Services (ADSS) 1998/9, and was awarded the CBE in 2001. He was previously involved in development work in Russia in the years immediately after Perestroika.

Development Manager:

The SSCB Development Manager, Ann Flynn was appointed in September 2011. The post increased to full time. The post holder is responsible to the SSCB for the smooth running of its business. The post is line managed within the council by the Head of Strategy, Planning and Performance.

Admin support:

The SSCB is supported administratively by Tina Hawkins (senior administrator) and Nina Scott (administrator)

Visit: Surrey Square Primary School, Surrey Square, Walworth London SE17 2JY

Date: 28 March 2012

Present: School Business Manager; Kelly Rowles
Cllr David Hubber (Chair)
Cllr the Right Reverend Emmanuel Oyewole (Vice Chair)
Colin Gale, Universal Healthy Free School Meal lead
Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Project manager

Catering arrangements

The school has an in-house catering arrangement and directly employ all the catering staff. The school used to have external caterers, however they ended this because of the poor quality food; including turkey twizzlers, drinks with additives in and virtually no vegetables. The school looked at various options but decided that all the outside caterers were too commercially orientated.

Eventually they decided to move over the staff and employ them directly. They then improved pay and conditions. The school now follows the Food for Life programme initiated by the Soil Association and they have received the Silver Food for Life award. They are a flagship school.

The catering moved in house in 2007. Since the school moved the catering in house and improved the quality of the food they have noticed a big improvement in behaviour; on a Friday the children used to be served red jelly and there would be 20 or so children sent to the head for poor behaviour, now that is down to about 2.

The school is considering the possibility of buying more food collectively with other schools to get a bulk buying discount.

Universal Free School Meals and Packed lunches

Uptake had increase since the free meals option came in . Parents with children in upper years ask for meals at a reduced cost as some they can't afford it. The school makes arrangements to pay for some children's meals as they do not want children to go hungry.

They arrange food tasting events for parents to attend

They work with parents on improving the packed lunches, and send home information. Some children are very fussy and want control over the food eaten.

The school has invested in less intrusive ways of collecting information on free school meals.

They have over 80 % take up.

Children's input into the menu

The school went through a long process to involve children. They looked at food miles; for example a pizza from Tesco's uses 18,000 food miles, but one prepared in house only 150.

There is a school meals consultation programme; with good and bad suggestions. Children from the School Council are used to consult. The class council nominates a representative who then talks with the other children in the classroom. Parents are invited to give recipes. Menu suggestions and recipes are sent off to consultants for nutritional analysis and ingredients may be adjusted. Ones that they have been introduced include a handmade lamb burger, chicken curry and jollof rice.

Menus are refreshed regularly.

There is an international food day where 450 children cook and invite parents to attend and provide entertainment.

The school caters for dairy free and the meat is halal.

Links to gardening, urban agriculture and farming

The school has a well tended garden and they grow food in the garden. The kitchen prepares the food grown, such as potatoes and spinach. There are links to city farms and allotments and they have growing projects. The school has links with Surry Docks farm.

Year 6 go to a farm for a week for a working holiday.

They have invested in educating children about food and its provenance.

Serving arrangements

Lunch is served in a beautiful pavilion that is architecturally designed and purpose built, with a kitchen and hall to prepare and serve lunch. Special fold away tables are used with traditional cutlery and bowls.

There is staged service.

The children can sit where they like.

Children's comments

The children made positive comments about the food, garden, menu and appeared to be enjoying the meals.

Observations

Virtually all the children appeared to be eating the hand made lamb and home made chips. Not many were eating the salad options.

The quality of the food was very high.

The children were friendly and there was a good atmosphere.

Visit: Albion Primary School, Albion Street, Rotherhithe, SE16 7JD
Date: 17 April 2012

Present: Head teacher Penny White
 Cllr David Hubber (Chair)
 Cllr the Right Reverend Emmanuel Oyewole (Vice Chair)
 Cllr Adele Morris
 Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Project manager

Catering arrangement

The school uses an external caterer; ISS. The food is prepared in the school kitchen and is 95% cooked from scratch. The head explained that they have considered moving the catering in house on several occasions but decided what matters most is the quality of the cook. This is monitored closely and if standards drop then the caterer is contacted. The head is also very satisfied with the highly level of input into the menu. It was also explained that catering company can make use of economies of scale and the school does not have the catering responsibilities of ordering food.

Lunchtime arrangements

The head teacher explained that lunch is served for nursery school children in the class room. Each table has family sized serving bowls and they eat in social groups around tables.

Universal Free School Meals

The head explained that the school had almost 100 % take up because the school discouraged packed lunches because of the social and nutritional benefits of school dinners. This was achieved through lots of engagement with parents and this was easier as Albion is a small school. A high percentage, around 50 %, claim free school meals. The head was asked if the new arrangement to provide free school meals to younger years had increased the take up of both free school meals and school meals generally. The head responded that because the school policy was to encourage 100 % uptake through relationships built with parents and carers , most parents and carers had already been claiming free school meals, however there might have been one or two who were not claiming but were entitled . The free policy had helped to promote take up and in persuading a few parents to switch from packed lunch to school dinners, but uptake was already very high because the school policy.

The catering arrangements have not changed of with the introduction of the Free School meal offer.

The head praised the free school initiative.

The head teacher did not raise any concerns over costs.

Children's input into the menu

The caterers do menus three times a year. These go to school council – year 6 only are members

Links to gardening, urban agriculture and farming

The school has a garden, but does not grow food. The school has links to Surry Farm.

Serving arrangements

Traditional tables are used with cutlery and bowls and the school is moving to china and glass next year.

There is continuous service, with the little ones coming in first, which the Head said works as quite a small school

Year 6 helpers help serve the children salad and with seating arrangements. All year 6 contribute to this in a rota system. There are also lots other adult supervisors in attendance.

The children sit in tables of different age groups and are assisted by adult helpers. Each table has a year 6 helper or adult sitting at the head.

The school has an ethos that children should eat two servings of either vegetables or salad and this is actively promoted by the Head. The serving arrangements also promote this with year 6 monitors encouraging children to eat salad and supervised table arrangements, whereby the children need to ask to leave the table.

The head teacher eats in the canteen.

Children's comments

The children made lots of positive comment about healthy eating and complimented many of the menu items; chicken, fruit salad, cake etc. There were a few comments about undercooked food, for example carrots. There were also one or two comments that the taste could be improved.

Observations

Virtually all the children appeared to be eating a large amount of vegetables; although not all were eating the protein option.

The quality of the food was good.

The children were very positive and the social atmosphere was of a very high quality and well integrated.

Visit: John Donne Primary School, Woods Road, Peckham, SE15 2SW

Date: 28 February 2012

Present: Head Teachers; Nick Tildesley & Evelyn Holdsworth
 School Business Manager; Steven Hobbs
 Chef; Warren Simpson
 Cllr the Right Reverend Emmanuel Oyewole (Vice Chair)
 Cllr Sunil Chopra
 Colin Elliott
 Colin Gale, Universal Free School Meal lead
 Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Project manager

Catering arrangements

The school has an in-house catering arrangement and directly employs all the catering staff. The school used to have external caterers however they ended this. They identified a good cook as key to providing quality food; and if the external caterers provide one then all is fine. However they found that if the chef is not satisfactory, and it is an external arrangement, then this can cause a problem as it can be very hard to change staff. Moving the service in-house gave more control over staffing and menus. John Donne started in house catering in January 2011.

The school has made a big investment in improving the quality of food. This has combined moving the service in house, input from children and parents and building menus around the school. From a survey from done by the school councillors in the autumn term 68% of pupils liked the improvements to the school menu. There has been an increased take up of school dinners with 371 pupils eating lunches in 2012; up from 321 in 2011.

Colin Gale commented that, in his view, the school is at Silver Food for Life standard. The chef said that he would like to apply for the Gold Food for Life award.

The head teachers reported that measures to improve lunches have resulted in increased pupils concentration and performance, particularly after lunch.

Universal Free School Meals and Packed lunches

The school has received investment from the council to cope with additional demand with the introduction of universal Free Healthy School Meals.

This has enabled the school to:

- Purchase a new dishwasher to help ease the cleaning of plates, cutlery etc
- Purchase a new meat slicer
- Purchase new dinner plates, cutlery and other kitchen sundries.

There is some work done to promote healthy packed lunches.

The school reported that introducing the programme was not hard and the forms were easy to fill in. The number of pupils on FSM (benefit related) is 40%. The school undertook a big promotion of Free Healthy School meals with assemblies and parent days. They have nearly 100 % take up of school lunches for reception and year 1.

Children's and parents input into the menu

The school uses the School Council and surveys (attached) to get feedback from children. The School Council representatives consult with their classroom peers to get views and suggestions for the menu. This is compared with the survey data and evaluated.

There is class cooking.

Parents and teachers are encouraged to bring food in and submit menu ideas. These are then sent off for nutritional evaluation.

There is an international day each month where different food from around the globe is tried out. The school is very ethnically mixed.

Menus are refreshed regularly.

Links to gardening, urban agriculture and farming

The school has a two gardens and a green house and they grow food in the garden.

It was noted that when children grow the vegetables they more keen on eating them.

Serving arrangements

Lunch is served in the school hall with tables and flight trays.

There is staged service.

Children's comments

Children from the School Council shared lunch and showed the members around the garden. They were very positive about the menu, international dishes, their involvement, healthy eating and the garden. The children appeared to be enjoying the food.

Observations

Virtually all the children appeared to be eating a good variety of food including vegetables.

The quality of the food was very high.

All the children were friendly and sociable and the School Council children, in particular, took great pride in the quality of the school dinners and their contribution to the production of the meals, from gardening to testing out different international menu ideas.

SCHOOL DINNERS QUESTIONNAIRE

AUTUMN 2011

1) I am very happy with the new kitchen and pleased about all the improvements



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

2) I enjoy the school dinners



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

3) I am happy with the variety of the desserts



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

4) I would like some seasoning on the salad



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

5) I would like to see some international foods



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

6) I feel that the portions are big enough for a child my age



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

7) I feel the food that is offered is the same as what is written on the menu



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

8) I would like to be asked what I would like to eat



Agree



Not sure



Disagree

9) Is there anything else that is NOT on the menu that you would like to see?

10) Do you have any other comments? If so, write them here!!

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your answers will be given to the kitchen staff and we'll let you know their thoughts in the next school council meeting!!

SCHOOL DINNER QUESTIONNAIRE

RESULTS

KEY (According to Phil!)



Statistics are pleasing



Statistics are a concern and this topic needs to be looked at for further improvements



Statistics are a major concern and needs to be looked into further and changed as soon as possible.

words in bold represent a very common suggestion given by more than 4 children

Things to consider

- Some children might not have fully understood the question
- A small minority of children have packed lunch although still answered the questionnaire
- Some children were absent from school so not ALL children took part.
 - Only children from Years 2-6 were questioned.

YEAR 2 RESULTS

Question	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
1. Likes the improvements	79%	17%	4%
2. Enjoys school dinners	79%	15%	4%
3. Happy with variety of desserts	86%	6%	8%
4. Would like seasoning on salad	31%	22%	47%
5. Would like international foods	60%	19%	21%
6. Feel the portions are big enough	70%	10%	20%
7. Feel the food that is written on the menu is same as what is being offered	74%	13%	13%
8. Would like to be asked what they want to eat	77%	7%	16%

YEAR 3 RESULTS

Question	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
1. Likes the improvements	70%	19%	11%
2. Enjoys school dinners	51%	14%	35%
3. Happy with variety of desserts	94%	3%	3%
4. Would like seasoning on salad	56%	6%	38%
5. Would like international foods	71%	4%	24%
6. Feel the portions are big enough	68%	10%	22%
7. Feel the food that is written on the menu is same as what is being offered	38%	24%	38%
8. Would like to be asked what they want to eat	66%	6%	28%
9. Suggestions that are not already on the menu	Crisps, ice lollies, flapjack, pancakes, spaghetti, chips, hot dogs , smoothies		
10. Other comments made by pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the food is super tasty! • Why do we have the menu when the food isn't the same? 		

YEAR 4 RESULTS

Question	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
1. Likes the improvements	65%	21%	11%
2. Enjoys school dinners	51%	24%	24%
3. Happy with variety of desserts	78%	16%	6%
4. Would like seasoning on salad	41%	16%	43%
5. Would like international foods	88%	6%	6%
6. Feel the portions are big enough	49%	32%	19%
7. Feel the food that is written on the menu is same as what is being offered	24%	30%	46%
8. Would like to be asked what they want to eat	92%	6%	2%
9. Suggestions that are not already on the menu	Bubblegum ice cream, hot dogs, mango, spaghetti Bolognese, pancakes, angel delight.		
10. Other comments made by pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like more fried food • The food is nice 		

YEAR 5 RESULTS

Question	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
1. Likes the improvements	51%	38%	11%
2. Enjoys school dinners	23%	47%	30%
3. Happy with variety of desserts	55%	26%	19%
4. Would like seasoning on salad	35%	12%	53%
5. Would like international foods	78%	14%	8%
6. Feel the portions are big enough	47%	21%	32%
7. Feel the food that is written on the menu is same as what is being offered	17%	25%	58%
8. Would like to be asked what they want to eat	94%	6%	0
9. Suggestions that are not already on the menu	Bubblegum ice cream, carrot cake, hot dog, Jamaican food, sausage roll, fried rice, water melon		
10. Other comments made by pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like clean cups and cutlery • I enjoy using the cutlery • Most of the dinners are nice but some of the desserts aren't that good. • Year 4 and over should be able to serve themselves at the table • The peas and vegetables aren't that tasty • Could we have salt on the tables? 		

YEAR 6 RESULTS

Question	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
1. Likes the improvements	74%	21%	5%
2. Enjoys school dinners	28%	49%	24%
3. Happy with variety of desserts	51%	30%	19%
4. Would like seasoning on salad	42%	32%	25%
5. Would like international foods	68%	21%	11%
6. Feel the portions are big enough	44%	28%	28%
7. Feel the food that is written on the menu is same as what is being offered	24%	25%	51%
8. Would like to be asked what they want to eat	87%	6%	7%
9. Suggestions that are not already on the menu	Rice pudding, hot dogs, corn on the cob, bubblegum ice cream, chicken pie, cheesecake , flapjack, plantain, fajitas.		
10. Other comments made by pupils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So far the food is good but I hope it gets better each time • The food needs to taste better because it tastes like butter • We don't get enough meat/fish • I think people should be allowed seconds if there is food left over • I really like the food • The chicken has improved dramatically • The spoons used for the cake is put in water and sometimes makes it soggy • Don't say there is no more food then the kitchen staff starts eating it! • Please could we have more African food? • Are vegan meals available? • I would like the cups, plates and cutlery to be clean • More sauces/dressings • Fruit juice instead of just water 		

OVERALL AVERAGE RESULTS FOR YEARS 2-6

Question	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
1. Likes the improvements	68%	23%	9%
2. Enjoys school dinners	46%	30%	24%
3. Happy with variety of desserts	73%	16%	11%
4. Would like seasoning on salad	41%	18%	41%
5. Would like international foods	73%	13%	14%
6. Feel the portions are big enough	56%	20%	24%
7. Feel the food that is written on the menu is same as what is being offered	35%	23%	43%
8. Would like to be asked what they want to eat	83%	6%	11%

What are the general findings and potential improvements?

- ✓ The results show that as the children get older, the majority are not enjoying the school dinners although most children in the school like the improvements.
- ✓ Although contrary to the school council's opinion, it appears that most of the children are happy with the variety of the desserts.
- ✓ There is a clear divide in the wish for seasoning on the salad suggesting that this isn't a major issue for the children.
- ✓ Almost three quarters of the children would like to see more international food on offer.
- ✓ Interestingly, most Years 3 and 4 children feel the portions are big enough for a child their age whereas a big portion of Years 4-6 do not.
- ✓ A large percentage of children would like the menu to be the same as what they are being offered.
- ✓ 83% of the children would prefer to be asked what they would like to eat instead of having food put on their plate without them choosing.
- ✓ The most popular suggestions for new food ideas are hot dogs, bubblegum ice cream, chicken pie and cheesecake. These requests were seen throughout the year groups.
- ✓ The most common answers given by children when asked for any other comments were that they would like to see cleaner cutlery, plates, cups etc. Furthermore, fruit juices and sauces to be added if possible. There were a lot of positive comments about the improvements too!

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 23 April 2012	Meeting Name: Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub- Committee
Report title:		Southwark Schools for the Future: New School Rotherhithe, Compass and Southwark Free School	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Project Director, Southwark Schools for the Future	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Education and Children's Services' Scrutiny Sub-Committee note the briefing provided below.

BACKGROUND - NEW SCHOOL ROTHERHITHE

2. In 2007 Southwark's Outline Business Case (OBC) established the case for a new 5 form entry (750 place) secondary school with a further 150 place sixth form to meet the needs of an expanding population in Bermondsey and Rotherhithe that would be delivered as part of Phase 3 of Southwark's Building Schools for the Future (BSF).
3. In April 2010 Partnerships for Schools provisionally allocated £19.6m to fund the delivery of a new school in Rotherhithe.
4. In July 2010 Southwark was informed that all our projects, including New School Rotherhithe, were unaffected by the cuts to the BSF programme that were announced.
5. In October 2010 Partnerships for Schools (PfS) - the government's delivery agent for capital investment programmes in schools, informed the council that projects referred to as 'unaffected' in July would be subject to a value for money review to be carried out on behalf of the Department for Education (DfE).
6. In November 2010 the DfE wrote to the council advising us of their decision to no longer support New School Rotherhithe. The Council continued to argue the case to the DfE and PfS that there was a need to deliver the New School Rotherhithe to meet current local demand and anticipated future boroughwide need.
7. In April 2011 Southwark was invited by PfS to submit revised and current Pupil Place Planning data. This submission was made on the 18 April 2011 and it reiterated the need for investment to create new places.
8. This Pupil Place Planning submission concluded that new Year 7 places will be required boroughwide from September 2016, with 5 FE (forms of entry) required by 2019/20 – 150 Year 7 places. It is considered by the Council that these places should be provided in SE16 to respond to and support the ongoing regeneration in the area.

9. On 10 October 2011 the DfE advised that a 700 place University Technical College (UTC) for 14-19 year olds based at Southwark College's Bermondsey site will proceed to the pre-opening stage of the UTC development process with a view to it being open in September 2012.
10. Southwark is working closely with the College and Partnerships for Schools in regard to the progression of these proposals and has been asked to act as contracting party for the necessary development works.
11. The DfE have also advised that they have provisionally agreed to fund a new Free School sponsored by the Compass School Trust which intends to offer 500 mixed secondary places.
12. On the 21 December 2011 the Department for Education advised the Authority in a letter that, in light of the Local Authority's pupil place planning submission, it considered a further 100 secondary places were required in addition to those that would be delivered through Compass and the UTC.
13. The letter invited the Council to 'work with the Department and Compass to consider whether an expanded Free School could be the most appropriate solution to addressing basic need in the area, or whether the additional places could be provided through expanding an existing school. If the latter route proves to be more sensible, ...the Department would be prepared to release funding to the Authority for this purpose.'

UPDATE

COMPASS

14. All schools, including Compass, were advised of the content of the additional places letter and invited to express an interest in expansion. The City of London Academy, St Michael's Catholic College and Compass have responded to this invitation and their proposals are under review.
15. Compass School have yet to identify a site and this non-identification of a site, both permanent and temporary, is a significant risk to the school opening as proposed in September 2013.

UTC (University Technical College)

16. The DfE has now approved the deferral of the opening of the UTC to September 2013. This date remains challenging and there is uncertainty associated with the project as a result of the proposed merger of Lewisham and Southwark College and the potential for this to result in the non-availability of the site or the necessary ancillary facilities for the UTC.

SOUTHWARK FREE SCHOOL

17. In 2011 Southwark Free School (SFS) secured Department for Education pre-opening approval to open in September 2012. At the time of this approval the school was proposed to be established at a site in Great Dover Street.
18. In March 2012 SFS initiated a public consultation process seeking

feedback from local stakeholders in regard to proposals to establish a 420 place primary school at 399 Rotherhithe New Road.

19. The site is not in a condition that would enable the school to be established in September 2012 and Partnerships for Schools is therefore also seeking to identify a temporary site.

HARRIS FREE SCHOOL

20. Harris Federation has also secured pre-opening approval to open a 420 place primary school on the site of the Academy @ Peckham site in September 2012.

AUDIT TRAIL

Report Author	Sam Fowler	
Version	FINAL	
Dated	16 April 2012	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Cabinet Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Scrutiny Team	17 April 2012	

This page is intentionally blank.

**Children's Services and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2010/2011
Distribution List**

	Copies		Copies
<u>Members and Reserves</u>		<u>Council Officers</u>	
Councillor David Hubber (Chair)	1	Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Team [spares]	6
Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole (Vice-Chair)	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Sunil Chopra	1	Romi Bowen, Strategic Director of Children's Services	1
Councillor Adele Morris	1	Rory Patterson, Assistant Director of Specialist Children's Services and Safeguarding	1
Councillor Cleo Soanes	1	Mike Smith, Head of Early Prevention and Intervention, Children's Services	1
Councillor Rosie Shimell	1	Elaine Allegretti, Head of Strategy, Planning and Performance, Children's Services	1
Councillor Althea Smith	1	Pauline Armour, Assistant Director 5-11 Services and Inclusion, Children's Services	1
		Eleanor Parkin, Policy Officer, Children's Services	1
Councillor Darren Merrill (Reserve)	1	Merril Haeusler, Deputy Director of Children's Services - Education	1
Councillor Victoria Mills (Reserve)	1	Sarah Feasey, Principal Lawyer, Strategic Services	1
Councillor Lisa Rajan (Reserve)	1	John Bibby, Principal Cabinet Assistant	1
Councillor Nick Stanton (Reserve)	1	Alex Doel, Cabinet Office	1
Councillor Mark Williams (Reserve)	1	Paul Green, Opposition Group Office	1
		Kerry Crichlow, Assistant Director Strategy and Support, Children's Services	1
<u>Education Representatives</u>			
Revd Nicholas Elder	1		
Colin Elliott	1		
Leticia Ojeda	1		
Nick Tildesley			
<u>Other Members</u>			
Councillor Catherine McDonald	1		
Councillor Catherine Bowman	1		
Local History Library	1		
		TOTAL DISTRIBUTION	38