

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY 13TH JUNE 2019

PRESENT:

Councillors: Tammy Palmer, Dana Carlin, James Chiriyankandath, Julie Davies, Erdal Dogan (Chair) and Mike Hakata

Co-opted Members: Mark Chapman (Parent Governor representative), Luci Davin (Parent Governor representative) and Yvonne Denny (Church representative).

18. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda item 1 in respect of filming at this meeting and Members noted the information contained therein.

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Dixon.

20. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

22. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

23. MINUTES

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of 19 March 2019 be approved.

24. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIPS

AGREED:

That the terms of reference, protocol for Overview and Scrutiny and policy areas/remits and membership for each Scrutiny Panel for 2019/20 be noted.

25. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - COMMUNITIES AND EQUALITIES

Councillor Mark Blake, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Equalities, reported on developments within the areas of his portfolio that fell within the Panel's terms of reference as follows:

- The Children at Risk strategy had now been finalised and this had established a strong framework for addressing key priorities, such as youth violence. The challenge now was to deliver results and attract additional funding, particularly from external sources. Detached youth workers were to be employed as part of the Haringey Community Gold initiative but there were only six of them and there were limits to the areas of the borough that they were able to cover. They would nevertheless be able to play an important role in engaging with young people, especially those at risk, and working with Police colleagues;
- The Community Gold projects had been established and would be a major part of the summer programme. They would include basketball and the Exodus project to divert young people away from gangs. There was a young person's advisory group that had been established as a requirement of the funding to provide feedback. Progress reports would be provided to the Panel in due course;
- Engagement had taken place with a community provider in Tottenham that worked with young women at risk of criminality or sexual exploitation in order to develop a community advocacy scheme. Previous engagement with young people had shown a large amount of distrust and estrangement between young people and state agencies and, in particular, there had often not been good relationships with the Police. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) showed Haringey currently had the lowest level trust and confidence in the Police. However, the mistrust amongst some young people was wider than this and also covered children's services, schools and the NHS. There was a potential role for community organisations in providing advocacy for young people and to support better engagement with a range of services; and
- A seminar would take place during the autumn on reducing the criminalisation of children, which was an objective within the Borough Plan. The purpose of this would be to consider with community and voluntary sector organisations and partners how this could be progressed. There were particular concerns regarding the demographic of young people who were coming into contact with the Police and discussions were already taking place regarding this.

In answer to a question regarding the meeting on knife crime that had taken place in Muswell Hill, he reported that it had been organised by local parents and they had invited him to attend. The Council would be arranging some meetings on concerns relating to violent crime and Muswell Hill would be included within these. The Panel noted that a letter had been read out at the meeting from the Headteacher of Fortismere School. Parents had felt that they needed to take action and it appeared that there had been a lot of under reporting of incidents. The Headteacher of Woodside High School had held a meeting of parents in March to which over 200 parents attended.

Ms Hendricks reported that the Youth at Risk Programme would be supporting up to 40 schemes that were aimed at supporting young people. At the moment, the scale of interventions was being mapped out. She agreed to provide further details on the

number of opportunities that were being created, the number of youth workers employed and what it was hoped that the overall impact would be. She estimated that the total number of youth workers employed was in the region of 50.

Panel Members commented that the top priority for Homes for Haringey residents was more youth services and suggested that there might be scope for these to be offered under resident services. Ms Hendricks thanked Members for their suggestion and agreed to raise it with Homes for Haringey.

In answer to a question regarding Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams, the Cabinet Member reported that he had recently spoken to the new Borough Commander regarding the need for Police on the street in violence hot spots within the borough. He felt that there had not been enough consideration of the Police's role in developing relationships within communities. However, there were constraints on what the Police were able to do due to the effects of austerity. The Mayor had recently increased the mayoral precept to the maximum possible though and all the additional funding had gone to the Police.

In answer to a question regarding Section 60 stop and searches, the Cabinet Member stated that he had written to the previous Borough Commander expressing concern at the lack of consultation that there had been regarding changes to this that had been announced by the Home Secretary. The new Borough Commander had acknowledged the need for proper consultation on such issues. This was particularly pertinent for Haringey due to its history. The tensions that could arise from stop and search did not normally concern Haringey based Police officers but ones brought in from outside the borough. There was no specific issue about the Section 60 powers. When used effectively, its use could prevent violence and disorder but it could also generate resentment if used inappropriately. There were particular concerns at the potentially negative impact of stop and search on younger children.

AGREED:

1. That the Cabinet Member be requested to provide further details of the Exodus programme to the Panel; and
2. That the Assistant Director for Safeguarding and Social Care be requested to provide further details for the on the Youth at Risk programme and, in particular:
 - The number of opportunities that were being created;
 - The number of youth workers employed; and
 - What it was hoped that the overall impact would be.

26. YOUTH SERVICES

Carolann James, Head of Early Years and Prevention, reported that the Youth Service had suffered from cuts in its budget of £1.6 million between 2011 and 2015. However, funding had been increased since 2017 although by a modest amount and the service was now able to provide both universal and targeted services. As a result of the additional Young Londoners funding that had been obtained for the Haringey Community Gold scheme, there were now detached youth workers working within the community and who were able to address areas of concern. Funding had also been

offered for a programme of activities during the school holidays. The activities to be provided would include arts, leisure and sport. There was also a programme of youth mentoring and targeted activity which was being funded in addition to the Community Gold programme. A successful bid for £1.5 million had been made for Troubled Families funding and some of the youth initiatives had been funded by this.

Panel Members highlighted the abortive plans that had been made to develop a Youth Zone on a single site in the borough. They asked whether the money that had been earmarked for investment in the scheme could now be used to develop provision across the borough rather than on a single site. Schools had been provided with funding through the Networked Learning Communities initiative to develop their facilities and it was therefore felt that they should be used as venues for youth activities.

In response, Ms James agreed to report back to the Panel on further plans for the development of youth provision. She also stated that the Bruce Grove Youth Centre did not just provide a service on a single site but worked across the borough. The Cabinet Member reported that the issue of the potential use of schools for youth activities had been raised with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

In answer to a question on attendance levels of young people who attended Bruce Grove Youth Centre, Ms James reported that there were approximately 150 young people there on a Monday evening. She agreed to provide the Panel with more comprehensive figures. She stated that the Centre was very welcoming but acknowledged that there might be barriers, perceived or otherwise, to some young people attending it. Peripatetic work was therefore also taking place in the community including provision of a youth bus to undertake outreach work. It was nevertheless acknowledged that more needed to be done. She also reported that engagement had taken place with young people regarding the venues where they would like to go to for activities, including schools and Children's Centres.

Beverley Hendricks, Assistant Director for Safeguarding and Social Care, reported that the Youth Council was very active. There was a core group within it that included the leadership team and there was also an outreach team. The Youth Council followed the UK Youth Parliament model. It had addressed a number of big issues for the borough including recruitment, policy issues and how services aimed at young people should be shaped. She agreed to draft a detailed note on the impact of work undertaken by the Youth Council during the past year.

Panel Members stated that children and young people in the west of the borough could often be as vulnerable as well as those in the east and that there was a lack of places for them to go where they felt safe. Councillor Mark Blake, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Equalities, stated that he wanted to see more Police officers on the street at peak times and the new Borough Commander had taken this issue on board. He had recently attended a meeting organised by parents in Muswell Hill on knife crime. Those who had attended wanted to see a visible Police presence on the street. A number of positive ideas had come out of the meeting, including approaching schools regarding the use of their premises for youth activities. There had been cuts to many early intervention services and this had been a factor in the

increase in violent crime. Whilst the new resources that had become available for services were welcome, more was needed. It had been noted that although a number of acute services were statutory, this was not the case for early intervention services. Early intervention had the potential to save a lot of money that was spent on acute services by preventing problems from escalating.

The Panel felt that there was a need to involve the voluntary and community sector, including faith communities. Not all of these were linked to the Bridge, which acted as the voluntary and community sector umbrella organisation for the borough and the Council could play a role in co-ordinating provision. One idea that had come out of the meeting in Muswell Hill was that first aid courses be provided for children and young people in schools. Ms James reported that youth services had recently began doing some first aid training with schools. Ms Hendricks commented that consideration needed to be given as to how professionals and parents could be empowered to reduce the burden on young people that taking responsibility for matters like first aid could entail.

Panel Members reported that parents who had attended the meeting in Muswell Hill had requested training on when and how to intervene if they witnessed young people in difficulties. There appeared to be an escalating level of fear and concern and it was important that a community response was developed.

AGREED:

1. That a briefing note be prepared for the Panel on alternative proposals for the further development of the Youth Service following the decision not to proceed with the proposal to establish a Youth Zone, including how services will be spread across the borough;
2. That further details be provided to the Panel on:
 - Attendance levels at Bruce Grove Youth Centre; and
 - The impact of work undertaken by the Youth Council during the past year.

27. REVIEW ON RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

In answer to a question, Ms. Coyle reported that a presentation on the issue would be made to the Secondary Headteachers Forum and measures were being taken to embed the role of schools within this. It was an issue that Headteachers were particularly interested in. Restorative Practice had been shown to be very effective elsewhere when good relationships had been established with schools. The Panel suggested that there was also a role for school governing bodies in developing it and Ms. Coyle agreed to give this issue further consideration when developing the action plan. In addition, Panel Members suggested that the views of young people be sought and Ms Coyle also agreed to consider this further.

The Cabinet Member commented that some schools would engage on this issues whilst others might not. The Council now had an agenda around inclusiveness but not all schools would necessarily have the same priorities. Restorative practice was a fantastic concept and some schools were already undertaking good work that was

based on it. However, schools were facing funding challenges and these could make progress more difficult.

In answer to a question, Ms Hendricks reported that Waltham Forest had used Restorative Practice very successfully in its work with looked after children.

AGREED:

That the Children and Young People's Service be requested to consider engagement with school governing bodies and children and young people in developing Restorative Practice further.

28. APPRENTICESHIPS

Steve Carr, Assistant Director for Economic Development and Growth, reported that the Apprenticeship Levy was a national programme that was financed by a levy on employers above a certain size. It covered the costs of training only. Employers could pass on the cost of up to 25% of their contribution. In Haringey, there was a borough wide target for the creation of 200 apprenticeships. This target was shared with schools.

The Haringey employment and skills team was currently based at Wood Green library and was shortly to be re-branded as Haringey Works. The function of the team was to market opportunities. They had recently held a successful event with Transport for London which had resulted in 19 residents taking up a range of opportunities. Discussions were taking place with a range of other employers, such as the BBC, Open Reach and the Metropolitan Police regarding possible similar future events. The strategy was now to try and attract employers to come into the borough rather than encouraging young people to attend careers fairs elsewhere.

The other area of development was the construction programme, which involved requiring building contractors to take on apprentices. Other contractors had taken apprenticeship pledges as part of their pitches to do business with the Council. There were also apprenticeship requirements in planning, with all developers with Section 106 obligations required to take them on. Benchmarking was taking place with other London boroughs. Statistics from London Councils suggested that Haringey had a way to go to achieve the same level of success as other London boroughs, many of which had more mature apprenticeship programmes that had been running for a number of years.

£700,000 per year was so far being collected. The target for 2019/20 was for 130 apprentices to be taken on by the Council and schools. Work was currently taking place with Human Resources to see how a better support mechanism could be developed for apprentices so that training plans can be developed and there was greater pastoral care. Consideration was also being given to how apprenticeships could be promoted more effectively alongside other opportunities, particularly within schools. An Apprenticeship Strategy and Programme was starting to be developed and he was happy to report further to the Panel on this once further progress had been made.

Panel Members noted that Islington's Fairness Commission had led to them to require every contractor to provide apprenticeships and that their procurement function had facilitated this. The cost of the wages of an apprentice was not high and unlikely to be a major barrier to employing them. Homes for Haringey currently employed a significant number of apprentices and it was felt that there was scope for the Council to do more and to be ambitious.

Mr Carr reported that the Council had learnt from Homes for Haringey and was now trying to embed apprenticeships as part of its own provision. New procurement processes required contractors for contracts over a certain size to offer apprenticeships. These would start to come through this year. Consideration was being given to how much pay would be appropriate for apprentices and the possibility of offering graduate level apprenticeships. Directors were now having to consider including provision for apprentices in any restructuring exercise.

In answer to a question, Mr Carr reported that the Cabinet Member for Local Investment and Economic Growth had raised the issue of a more co-ordinated London wide approach to apprenticeships with London Councils and the possibility of obtaining assistance from the Mayor's office. Most apprenticeships lasted between 18 months and 2 years. The Council was currently working with Haringey Business Alliance and through Tottenham Opportunity Investment Fund to promote apprenticeships in smaller companies and there had been some notable successes. The Cabinet Member wished to progress the Community Wealth Building agenda and saw apprenticeships as a key part of it.

Panel Members commented that the Apprenticeship Levy had been in place since 2017 and progress had been slow until recently. The previous lack of a Human Resource function had been a barrier to progress. It was noted that there were currently more people over the age of 65 working for the Council than under 25 and there were also approximately 500 agency or supply staff. There was a need for rapid progress so that the need to return funding was avoided.

Mr Carr responded that the development of apprenticeships was a triangular process involving economic development, procurement and human resources. He was unaware of any need to return funding but would check and report back. In answer to another question, he stated that apprenticeship levy funding had been used as a training fund and included training for middle managers. Creative ways of using the funds were being explored.

Panel Members felt that bringing back services in-house could provide additional opportunities for promoting apprenticeships. In addition, partnerships could be formed with charities and further education institutions. It was noted that a wide range of Council services were involved in developing the Apprenticeship Strategy, including youth services. The needs of care leavers were also being considered, which was of particular importance in view of the Council's corporate parenting responsibility.

AGREED:

That the Assistant Director for Economic Development and Growth be requested to confirm to the Panel that there has not been a need for the Council to return any funding received under the Apprenticeship Levy.

29. WORK PROGRAMME 2018-20

The Panel noted that the current workplan was for two years, including the remainder of the current year. The review on Special Needs and Disability (SEND) was continuing and would require at least one additional evidence session.

The following suggestions for further issues to be added to the work plan were made:

- Nurseries and the two and year old offer;
- School place planning and the impact of falling school rolls on primary school finances;
- School capital estates planning. School governors were aware of condition surveys being undertaken of schools but were unclear of the status of this exercise;
- Borough Plan. There were educational aspirations within this but there was as yet no delivery plan on how they would be implemented;
- School improvement. When exam performance had been discussed previously, the under performance of certain groups such as Turkish and African Caribbean children had been highlighted. Haringey Education Partnership could be requested to provide clarity on what their strategy there was for addressing these; and
- Academies and free schools. It was suggested that the status of schools and the implications of this for the Council and its partners be looked at.

In view of the limited space within the workplan, it was agreed that the issues regarding the school capital estates planning and the Borough Plan be raised in Cabinet Members Questions for the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, at the next meeting of the Panel.

AGREED:

That, subject to the above mentioned comments and additions, the work plan for the Panel be approved.

CHAIR: Councillor Erdal Dogan

Signed by Chair

Date