

NOTICE OF MEETING

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL

**Thursday, 19th December, 2019, 6.30 pm - Civic Centre, High Road,
Wood Green, N22 8LE**

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

Co-optees/Non Voting Members: Mark Chapman (Parent Governor representative), Luci Davin (Parent Governor representative), Yvonne Denny (Church representative) and Lourdes Keever (Church representative)

Quorum: 3

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business (late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with as noted below).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct.

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, Paragraph 29 of the Council's Constitution.

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 10)

To approve the minutes of the meeting of 7 November 2019.

7. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

An opportunity to question the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Councillor Zena Brabazon, on developments within her portfolio.

8. SCRUTINY OF THE 2020/21 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2020/21-2024/25) (PAGES 11 - 48)

To consider and comment on the Council's 2020/21 Draft Budget/5-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020/21 – 2024/25 proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panels' remit.

9. SUPPORT TO CHILDREN FROM REFUGEE FAMILIES - UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF SCRUTINY REVIEW. (PAGES 49 - 58)

To consider an update on the implementation of the recommendations of the scrutiny review of Support to Children from Refugee Families.

10. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 59 - 70)

To consider an update on the work programme for 2018-20.

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

12. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

- 2 March 2020.

Rob Mack, Principal Scrutiny Officer
Tel – 020 8489 2921
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk

Bernie Ryan
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF MEETING CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY, 7TH NOVEMBER, 2019, TIMES NOT SPECIFIED

PRESENT:

Councillors: Erdal Dogan (Chair), Dana Carlin, James Chiriyankandath, Julie Davies and Tammy Palmer, Mark Chapman, Luci Davin and Yvonne Denny

Co-opted Members: Mark Chapman and Luci Davin (Parent Governor representatives), Yvonne Denny and Lourdes Keever (Church representatives)

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dixon and Hakata.

3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

6. MINUTES

The Panel noted that exam results data for June 2019 was still provisional at this stage. In respect of the review on Alternative Provision, this would not now be finalised and submitted to Cabinet until February next year.

AGREED:

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

7. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - COMMUNITIES

Councillor Mark Blake outlined key developments within his portfolio:

- Funding that the Council had received from the Mayor's Young Londoners Fund had been used for Haringey Community Gold project and youth outreach work. Over 1,000 young people had been involved in a range of activities so far. Haringey Community Gold had also provided a significant part of the summer programme. In addition, training sessions and apprenticeships had also been offered;
- The Young People at Risk Executive Group had met on 19 September and would be meeting bi-monthly to provide strategic oversight of the strategy. It was chaired by the Director of Children's Services. A new delivery plan for the strategy would be developed in the new year;
- He had recently chaired a workshop on reducing the number of children that come into contact with the youth justice system that had been held with colleagues from the voluntary sector. Recommendations from the outcomes of this were currently being developed;
- There was a commitment to build a youth space for Wood Green as part of regeneration of the area. This would act as a hub for youth provision as well as providing a base for generic youth work. Some potential sites were being looked at and he was pressing regeneration colleagues for this to be progressed quickly;
- He had attended a meeting of the exploitation panel, which reviewed with high risk social care cases. He had been impressed with the work and commitment of staff. It was highly pressurised and challenging work and it was important that those who worked on the front line were listened to so that improvements could be made.

In answer to a question regarding the location of potential sites for the youth space in Wood Green, he stated that it was best that this was somewhere that was considered neutral territory in respect of "post code" issues. There was a wider culture of violence though, not all of which was linked to gangs. A lot of violent incidents were not reported to the Police.

In answer to a question regarding the use of schools for youth provision, he stated that he had been invited to speak at the Headteachers Forum. He was happy to develop a proposal jointly with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families to take this forward. He was mindful of the fact that many schools relied on the money that external lettings brought in but progress could still be made if only a few schools agreed to assist. The Panel noted that the latest bid to the Greater London Authority (GLA) included a commitment to work with two secondary schools and there were high hopes of a positive response.

He shared the concern of Panel Members regarding the safety of pupils returning home from school. The new Borough Commander had introduced changes to rosters though and these would provide a greater Police presence between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., which was when many problems occurred. The Police would need to be involved in any discussion regarding the expansion of after school clubs. There was a significant issue with knifepoint robbery and addressing this was a major priority for the Police.

In answer to a question, he stated that he shared concerns about postcode issues. A visit was being arranged with the Leader to Bruce Grove youth centre and he was

happy to discuss how the centre could be more inclusive to young people from other areas of the borough. He wished to develop mediation as a way of easing tensions. There were no easy solutions though but it was a high priority for the Haringey Community Gold initiative.

In answer to another question, he stated that he would support the setting up of multiple youth hubs in Wood Green but there would need to be the resources for this to happen. In respect of the Street Rangers that were being used in Wood Green, this project had been approved under the previous administration and was funded by the Wood Green Business Partnership. He would prefer that the borough had more uniformed Police officers instead. He agreed to respond in writing to the Panel regarding the feedback that had been received on the interaction between the Street Rangers and young people.

Panel Members noted that some schools did not currently have safer schools Police officers, although recruitment was currently taking place. The Cabinet Member stated that he was not in a position to ensure that all schools were provided with one but could request that this happened.

In respect of violent youth crime, he was supportive of the work being undertaken by the Borough Commander to change Police rosters to that they were better able to respond to incidents. In addition, officers from the Violence Task Group were providing some local investigatory support. There were currently discussions at a strategic level regarding the use of stop and search. He was sceptical about its effectiveness but was happy to look at relevant data. There were concerns regarding its use on younger children and in respect of first contact as these could create hostility to the Police. Youth work was being expanded but this was being done from a low base due to severe cuts that had taken place previously in Haringey. Increasing engagement with children and young people was a particular priority. He felt that there was a need for earlier intervention and a greater focus on strengths when assessing young people, rather than risk. An independent advisory group was being set up and consideration could be given to inviting them to a future meeting of the Panel.

He felt that there was a need for more early intervention but the focus of activity was at the acute end of the scale as early intervention was not statutory. Multi agency working could always be improved. In particular, there could be better engagement by the Probation Service. Ann Graham, the Director of Children's Services commented that there had previously been funding for early intervention but this had now ceased. However, services could still respond to children who were considered to be in need.

AGREED:

That a briefing note be provided by the Cabinet Member for Communities to the Panel on the interaction of Wood Green Street Rangers with children and young people in the area.

8. CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (CAMHS) TRANSFORMATION UPDATE

Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director for Commissioning, reported that the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) transformation programme had been developed following a review that had been undertaken in 2015. There were a number of risk factors, which included neglect and adverse childhood experiences. Access to services was being improved but there were disproportionate numbers of referrals between the east and west of the borough and from Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities. The review had identified a lack of early intervention and key partners had been working together to address the issue.

She reported that £1 million in additional funding had been obtained through the successful Trailblazer bid. This would be used to develop early intervention services in non-stigmatising settings and, in particular, schools in order to improve access. Work was also being undertaken to reduce waiting times for services, with a 4 week target. In addition, a successful application had also been made for inclusion in the Schools Link programme. Work was also being done to develop a different strategic structure for CAMHS. This involved moving from the current tiered structure to the "I Thrive" model of service. Further developmental work was needed on services for children and young people with autism and a learning disability and also to address waiting times.

Panel Members welcomed the developments and commented that it was important that they were communicated to school governors. In answer to question, Ms Pomery stated that the Trailblazer programme had emerged out of a government Green Paper. It was envisaged that the pilot project would eventually lead to a wider roll out programme. The learning from the pilot in schools in the east of the borough would be used to develop services elsewhere. In respect of the transition process to adult services, work was being undertaken to improve the process. The issue had also been referred to in the NHS long term plan. The Panel noted that a special joint meeting of the Panel with the Adults and Health Panel on transition had taken place in March and a further one was planned.

In answer to a question regarding the low percentage of young people who sought help from services, Ms Pomery felt that this was due to a range of issues. These included lack of awareness of mental health issues, lack of knowledge of access routes into services and the stigma associated with mental health in some communities. The long waiting times for services that there had been until recently had also acted as a deterrent.

Concerns were raised that the involvement of Bruce Grove Youth Centre in the More than Mentors programme to improve transition from primary to secondary school could act as a deterrent for children from other post code areas. Ms Pomery agreed to look into this issue and report back.

She reported that it was known from the Alternative Provision review and anecdotally that mental health was a significant issue in schools and gaps in support had been identified. Impact and activity data would be collected as part of the evaluation of the Trailblazer project in order to measure its effectiveness. This could be shared with the Panel. The Schools Link programme was aimed at raising awareness of mental health issues and understanding pathways.

AGREED:

1. That the Assistant Director for commissioning be requested to provide further detail on how any “post code” issues could potentially impact on the “More Than Mentors” initiative; and
2. That the evaluation of the Trailblazer scheme, including impact and delivery data, be shared with the Panel.

9. TACKLING CHILDHOOD OBESITY

Linda Edward and Marlene D’Aguilar from the Council’s Public Health Service reported on current action to address childhood obesity. It was a complex issue and there were clear links to deprivation. Data from over a 10 year period showed that the percentage of children who were obese had plateaued. However, there were clear inequalities and children in the east of the borough were three times more likely to be obese than those from elsewhere.

The approach that was being adopted was based on prevention with a range of services and activities were being provided. It was recognised that no single service could deal with the issue on their own and a whole systems approach was being followed with the aim of ensuring that health was in all policies. There were a range of initiatives taking place:

- Haringey had been the first local authority to ban the advertising of products with high fat, sugar or salt as part of its corporate advertising policy;
- Cycle training was now offered to children from the age of nine and up to and including adults;
- There was a commitment to introducing School Streets across the borough. This had been introduced at Lordship Lane School and was to be extended to other schools in due course. It involved the reduction of access for cars during school drop off and pick up times, with the aim of encouraging walking and cycling;
- Health Impact Assessments were being considered as part of larger planning and regeneration developments within the borough;
- Schools and residents could apply for their road to become a Play Street, which closed streets off for a period of time. In addition, there had been a Weekend of Play, which involved 80 small community events in parks;
- A community hackathon took place in August and the views of young people about physical activities were sought as part of this. They emphasised the importance of activities that involved the whole family. They also reported that youth violence deterred many young people from participating in activities;
- During the school summer holidays, a wide range of activities had been offered for children and young people, including ones specifically aimed at girls;
- 131 local businesses had signed up to the healthy catering commitment to reduce fat, salt and sugar in hot food takeaways. In addition, the new London Plan had allowed a 400 metre barrier to be placed around schools. No further hot food takeaways would be given planning permission within this. In addition, it would now be compulsory for all existing hot food takeaways within these areas to sign up to the healthy catering commitment;

- The clinical obesity pathway had been significantly revised. In addition, the role of the school health service had also been revised in order to give a stronger role for school nurses;
- An infant feeding strategy was being developed;
- There were now a number of water and milk only schools within the borough. Some schools had also introduced 15 minutes of physical activity every day as part of the active mind initiative; and
- The Healthy Start initiative, which provided free fresh fruit, vegetables and milk to low income families, had been updated with the aim of increasing uptake.

Public Health would continue to work with stakeholders and partners and aim to align with the Mayor's ambition to end childhood obesity and, in particular, his ten ambitions for London.

Ms D'Aguilar reported that work was being undertaken with Islington to develop healthy school meal standards for schools. Haringey had a number of different school meals suppliers. A "Sugar Smart" event had been arranged in April to which suppliers had been invited. She agreed to see if it could be determined if there was a correlation between receiving free school meals and obesity. Panel Members commented that Islington had invested in developing kitchens in schools so that they were able to cook meals on site. It was also felt that "one-off" events were unlikely to make a long term difference.

Councillor Brabazon, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, reported that nurseries and primary schools often produced high quality school meals, some using locally sourced and organic ingredients. It should therefore not be assumed that Haringey was starting from a low level. She felt that the Public Health approach was valuable. However, there was much to do and support was needed. She also highlighted the impact of housing. In particular, some families in temporary housing had limited access to cooking facilities and therefore had no choice but to eat processed or take away food. In such circumstances, a high quality school meal was particularly important.

Ms D'Aguilar stated that the importance of good housing was acknowledged and health and well-being was now being considered in all new housing developments. The reliance of many families in temporary accommodation on take away food made the provision of healthier hot food take aways even more important. In answer to a question, Ms Edward commented that many nurseries were involved in the London wide health early years initiative.

Panel Members commented that very few schools were within 400 metres of shops and would therefore be subject to the previously mentioned restrictions on hot food takeaways. It was felt that a more ambitious and joined up approach was required. Great encouragement needed to be given for walking and cycling. In particular, more cycle lanes needed to be provided so it was safer to cycle.

Ms D'Aguilar stated that Transport for London was promoting adopted a "healthy streets" approach to making streets more accessible. Public Health had provided training for a wide range of stakeholders regarding this, including Councillors. In addition, a walking and cycling strategy was in the process of being developed.

Ms Edward stated that there was regular contact with school governors to update them on progress with the healthy schools agenda. Consideration was being given to undertaking work with schools regarding their catering contracts, which a number had outsourced. A report on the progress of this could be made to a future meeting of the Panel. She reported that a number of schools were participating in the sugar smart initiative and were therefore only providing water and milk. The Chair raised the issue of advertisements in high streets promoting offers for junk food, which he felt, required attention.

AGREED:

1. That the Panel be provided with further information by the Public Health Service on whether there is a link between receiving free school meals and obesity; and
2. That a report be made to a future meeting of the Panel on the outcome of work by the Public Health Service and schools in respect on their catering contracts.

10. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND PERFORMANCE

James Page, Chief Executive of Haringey Education Partnership, reported on recent education attainment and performance statistics, as outlined in the report. He highlighted the following:

- In Early Years, there had been a considerable improvement in those pupils reaching the good level of development (GLD) standard from 50% in 2013 to 75% in 2019 and current performance was above the London and national average;
- In Key Stage (KS) 1, outcomes for the expected and greater depth standards were both above national averages in all subjects;
- For KS2 attainment, all subjects were in line with or above national averages at expected standard level. 66% of Haringey pupils achieved the expected standard in reading, writing and maths combined, which was above national but below the London average. Performance for reading within this had suffered a dip of 3.5% though. At greater depth standard, reading, writing and maths combined and writing separately were all above the London average;
- GCSE performance (KS4) had been strong. It was above the national average but below that for London. In respect of Progress 8 scores, these were higher than both the national and London averages;
- 'A' Level performance was also strong and the borough's results were 50th nationally. The number of young people taking vocational courses within the borough at post 16 level was very small though; and
- There was evidence that Turkish and Black Caribbean young people were not performing to the same levels as other groups.

Panel Members felt that the overall figures for the borough masked the impact of poverty by smoothing out considerable variations in performance between schools. Data on performance levels in different schools would be better able to highlight this. Children being tested in phonics were likely to find the tests very challenging if English was not their first language, especially if their mother tongue was not phonetically based.

Mr Page stated that there was a considerable amount of data available, including details of performance by individual schools as well as different groups within the borough. Variance between schools was tracked. Disadvantage was a major factor influencing performance and schools who were able to buck the trend were of particular interest. However, some lack and minority ethnic (BAME) groups were performing less well than the disadvantaged group as a whole and there were a range of other factors that also influenced performance. Work was being undertaken to address BAME achievement and, in particular, black Caribbean children and young people. Having English as an additional language could be factor for some younger children but the underperformance of some groups was present at all stages. The levels of underperformance were also greater for these groups with English as an additional language than in comparable local authorities. He reported that there was currently a programme to train an expert cadre of EAL trainers.

Panel Members expressed disappointment that there was a lack of detail in the report on programmes to address the performance issues that the test and exam results had revealed. They requested that future reports provided evidence that programmes were in place to respond to the issues highlighted within the data as well as targets and outcomes arising from action being taken. This would provide reassurance to the Panel that progress was being made. It was noted that statistics for those pupils categorised as disadvantaged would have been affected by the reduction in entitlement for free school meals.

In answer to a question regarding the sharing of best practice, Mr Page stated that it would be possible to provide scatter plots showed the comparative performance of different schools. There was a considerable amount of peer to peer work undertaken to spread best practice, which included work through the networked learning communities, the schools partnership programme and peer to peer reviews.

AGREED:

That future reports on educational attainment and performance provide:

- Data on the comparative performance of schools within the borough; and
- Clear evidence that programmes are in place to respond to performance issues highlighted within the data, including targets and outcomes.

11. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Panel Members felt that falling school rolls was a significant issue and could benefit from an in-depth review. It was noted that reduced rolls were already having a serious impact on some primary schools. The range of different types of schools within the borough and their respective status impacted on Council's ability to plan for school places. A review that addressed the range of different types of school within the borough could consider what would be the most effective response to the changes that had taken place. It was felt that falling school rolls should be included as part of a wider review on school structures.

AGREED:

That the Panel undertake an in-depth review on the range of school structures within the borough and its impact and that this include specific consideration of falling school rolls.

CHAIR: Councillor Erdal Dogan

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

- Report for:** Budget Scrutiny Panels
- Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, 16th December 2019
 - Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, 17th December 2019
 - Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, 19th December 2019
 - Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, 6th January 2020
 - Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 14th January 2020

Item number:

Title: Scrutiny of the 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2020/21-2024/25)

Report authorised by: Jon Warlow, Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer

Lead Officer: Frances Palopoli, Head of Corporate Financial Strategy & Monitoring

Ward(s) affected: N/A

**Report for Key/
Non Key Decision:** N/A

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 To consider and comment on the Council's 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020/21 – 2024/25 proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panels' remit.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Panels consider and provide recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), on the 2020/21 Draft Budget/MTFS 2020/21-2024/25 and proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panel's remit.

3. Background information

- 3.1 The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Constitution, Part 4, Section G) state: "The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall undertake scrutiny of the Council's budget through a Budget Scrutiny process. The procedure by which this operates is detailed in the Protocol covering the Overview and Scrutiny Committee".
- 3.2 Also laid out in this section is that "the Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Review process will be drawn from among the opposition party Councillors sitting on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall not be able to change the appointed Chair unless there is a vote of no confidence as outlined in Article 6.5 of the Constitution".

4. Overview and Scrutiny Protocol

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Protocol lays out the process of Budget Scrutiny and includes the following points:
- a. The budget shall be scrutinised by each Scrutiny Review Panel, in their respective areas. Their reports shall go to the OSC for approval. The areas of the budget which are not covered by the Scrutiny Review Panels shall be considered by the main OSC.
 - b. A lead OSC member from the largest opposition group shall be responsible for the co-ordination of the Budget Scrutiny process and recommendations made by respective Scrutiny Review Panels relating to the budget.
 - c. Overseen by the lead member referred to in paragraph 4.1.b, each Scrutiny Review Panel shall hold a meeting following the release of the December Cabinet report on the new Draft Budget/MTFS. Each Panel shall consider the proposals in this report, for their respective areas. The Scrutiny Review Panels may request that the Cabinet Member for Finance and/or Senior Officers attend these meetings to answer questions.
 - d. Each Scrutiny Review Panel shall submit their final budget scrutiny report to the OSC meeting in January containing their recommendations/proposal in respect of the budget for ratification by the OSC.
 - e. The recommendations from the Budget Scrutiny process, ratified by the OSC, shall be fed back to Cabinet. As part of the budget setting process, the Cabinet will clearly set out its response to the recommendations/proposals made by the OSC in relation to the budget.

5. 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020/21 – 2024/25

- 5.1 The MTFS agreed by Council in February 2019 recognised a budget gap of £13.1m in 2020/21 that would need to be closed through further budget reductions. The proposed 2020/21 new budget reductions required to help close this gap of £5.5m in 2020/21 (rising to £10.4m by 2024/25) are now presented for scrutiny.
- 5.2 The reason that the required level of budget reduction for 2020/21 has reduced compared to the February forecast is partly due to the announcements in the Spending Round 2019 (SR19). This confirmed social care funding at 2019/20 levels for 2020/21 as well as circa £5m additional funding. This level of Government funding had not been assumed in the last MTFS presented to Cabinet in February 2019. The Live Budgeting approach also contributed, as the Cabinet meeting in July 2019 approved a package of Invest to Save proposals put forward by the Children's service. This contributed budget reductions of £1.3m to the 2020/21 gap.

- 5.3 Even with the budget reduction options set out in Appendix C being approved when the budget is finalised in February, the draft 2020/21 Budget presented to Cabinet on 10th December 2019 still has a gap of £0.6m. Work continues to identify options to bridge this before the final Budget/ MTFs is submitted to Cabinet and Council in February 2020.
- 5.4 Based on the draft 2020/21 Budget/MTFS 2020-2025, further budget reductions of £23.2m will need to be identified across the period 2021/22-2024-25 as highlighted in Appendix B.
- 5.5 This meeting is asked to consider the proposals relating to the services within its remit and to make draft recommendations to be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23rd January 2020 for discussion, prior to approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration in advance of the Full Council meeting on 24th February 2020. For reference the remit of each Scrutiny Panel is as follows:
- Housing & Economy Priorities - Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
 - Place Priority - Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel
 - People (Children) Priority – Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel
 - People (Adults) Priority – Adult and Health Scrutiny Panel
 - Your Council Priority – Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- 5.6 As an aide memoire to assist with the scrutiny of budget proposals, possible key lines of enquiry are attached at **Appendix A**. This report is specifically concerned with Stage 1 (planning and setting the budget) as a key part of the overall annual financial scrutiny activity.
- 5.7 **Appendix B** provides a summary of the draft General Fund 2020/21 Budget / MTFs 2020/2025 by priority area.
- 5.8 **Appendix C** provides details of the new revenue and capital budget proposals. A summary is provided, followed by detailed information for each proposal. Any invest to save revenue proposal dependent on capital or flexible use of capital receipts for successful delivery has been clearly identified in the summary.
- 5.9 The then then Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government issued guidance in March 2016, giving local authorities greater freedoms over how capital receipts can be used to finance expenditure. The direction allows for the following expenditure to be financed by utilising capital receipts:
- “Expenditure on any project that is designed to generate ongoing revenue savings in the delivery of public services and/or transform service delivery to reduce costs and/or transform service delivery in a way that reduces costs or demand for services in future years for any of the public sector delivery partners.”*
- 6. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

6.1 The Budget Scrutiny process for 2020/21 will contribute to strategic outcomes relating to all Council priorities.

7. Statutory Officers comments

Finance

7.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. Should any of the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny generate recommendations with financial implications then these will be highlighted at that time.

Legal

7.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.

7.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution (Part 4, Section G), the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should undertake scrutiny of the Council's budget through a Budget Scrutiny process. The procedure by which this operates is detailed in the Protocol, which is outside the Council's constitution, covering the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Equality

7.4 The draft Borough Plan sets out the Council's overarching commitment to tackling poverty and inequality and to working towards a fairer Borough.

7.5 The Council is also bound by the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

7.6 The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.

7.7 The Council has designed the proposals in this report with reference to the aims of the Borough Plan to reduce poverty and inequality. The Council is committed to protecting frontline services wherever we can and the budget proposals have focused as far as possible on delivering efficiencies or increasing income, rather than reduction in services.

7.8 As plans are developed further, each area will assess the equality impacts and potential mitigating actions in more detail. Final EQIAs will be published alongside decisions on specific proposals.

7.9 Any comments received will be taken into consideration and included in the Budget report presented to Cabinet on 11th February 2020.

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Key lines of enquiry for budget setting

Appendix B – 5-year Draft General Fund Budget (2020-21) / Medium Term
Financial Strategy (2020/21 – 2024/25) - Cabinet 10th
December 2019

Appendix C – 2020 (New) Budget Proposals

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background papers: 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5-year MTFS (2020/21 –
2024/25) -Cabinet 10th December 2019

Financial Scrutiny: Understanding your Role in the Budget Process

This document summarises issues and questions you should consider as part of your review of financial information. You might like to take it with you to your meetings and use it as an aide-memoir.

Overall, is the MTFS and annual budget:

- A financial representation of the council's policy framework/ priorities?
- Legal (your Section 151 Officer will specifically advise on this)?
- Affordable and prudent?

Stage 1 – planning and setting the budget

Always seek to scrutinise financial information at a strategic level and try to avoid too much detail at this stage. For example, it is better to ask whether the proposed budget is sufficient to fund the level of service planned for the year rather than asking why £x has been cut from a service budget.

Possible questions which Scrutiny members might consider –

- Are the MTFS, capital programme and revenue budget financial representations of what the council is trying to achieve?
- Does the MTFS and annual budget reflect the revenue effects of the proposed capital programme?
- How does the annual budget relate to the MTFS?
- What level of Council Tax is proposed? Is this acceptable in terms of national capping rules and local political acceptability?
- Is there sufficient money in “balances” kept aside for unforeseen needs?
- Are services providing value for money (VFM)? How is VFM measured and how does it relate to service quality and customer satisfaction?
- Have fees and charges been reviewed, both in terms of fee levels and potential demand?
- Does any proposed budget growth reflect the council's priorities?
- Does the budget contain anything that the council no longer needs to do?
- Do service budgets reflect and adequately resource individual service plans?
- Could the Council achieve similar outcomes more efficiently by doing things differently?

Stage 2 – Monitoring the budget

It is the role of “budget holders” to undertake detailed budget monitoring, and the Executive and individual Portfolio Holders will overview such detailed budget monitoring. Budget monitoring should never be carried out in isolation from service performance information. Scrutiny should assure itself that budget monitoring is being carried out but should avoid duplicating discussions and try to add value to the process. Possible questions which Scrutiny members might consider –

- What does the under/over spend mean in terms of service performance? What are the overall implications of not achieving performance targets?
- What is the forecast under/over spend at the year end?
- What plans have budget managers and/or the Portfolio Holder made to bring spending back on budget? Are these reasonable?
- Does the under/over spend signal a need for a more detailed study into the service area?

Stage 3 – Reviewing the budget

At the end of the financial year you will receive an “outturn report”. Use this to look back and think about what lessons can be learned. Then try to apply these lessons to discussions about future budgets. Possible questions which Scrutiny members might consider –

- Did services achieve what they set out to achieve in terms of both performance and financial targets?
- What were public satisfaction levels and how do these compare with budgets and spending?
- Did the income and expenditure profile match the plan, and, if not, what conclusions can be drawn?
- What are the implications of over or under achievement for the MTFS?
- Have all planned savings been achieved, and is the impact on service performance as expected?
- Have all growth bids achieved the planned increases in service performance?
- If not, did anything unusual occur which would mitigate any conclusions drawn?
- How well did the first two scrutiny stages work, were they useful and how could they be improved?

Appendix B – Haringey Draft General Fund and Medium Term Financial Plan

	2019/20 Budget	Movement	2020/21 (Draft) Budget	Movement	2021/22 Projected	Movement	2022/23 Projected	Movement	2023/24 Projected	Movement	2024/25 Projected
Priority Area	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Housing	19,067	(816)	18,251	(709)	17,542	(136)	17,406	(136)	17,270	(136)	17,134
People - Children	59,293	(2,942)	56,351	(619)	55,732	(9)	55,723	400	56,123	300	56,423
People - Adults	83,535	(7,390)	76,145	(2,091)	74,054	(1,724)	72,329	3,174	75,503	3,102	78,605
Place	26,954	(2,505)	24,449	(2,061)	22,388	(1,053)	21,335	(64)	21,271	6	21,277
Economy	1,479	(390)	1,089	(120)	969	(130)	839	(120)	719	-	719
Your Council	37,811	(1,509)	36,302	(1,088)	35,214	(790)	34,424	(6)	34,418	-	34,418
Non-Service Revenue	18,530	11,070	29,600	10,144	39,744	10,785	50,529	9,540	60,069	6,266	66,335
Further Savings to be Identified	-	(612)	(612)	125	(487)	(1,209)	(1,696)	(6,946)	(8,642)	(3,766)	(12,409)
Council Cash Limit	246,669	(5,094)	241,575	3,580	245,156	5,734	250,889	5,842	256,731	5,772	262,503
Planned Contributions form Reserves	(5,487)	5,487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total General Fund Budget	241,182	393	241,575	3,580	245,156	5,734	250,889	5,842	256,731	5,772	262,503
Funding											
Council Tax	(101,981)	(5,130)	(107,111)	(3,224)	(110,335)	(3,321)	(113,656)	(3,421)	(117,077)	(3,524)	(120,600)
Council Tax Surplus	(3,850)	1,700	(2,150)	-	(2,150)	-	(2,150)	-	(2,150)	-	(2,150)
RSG	0	(22,030)	(22,030)	(441)	(22,471)	(449)	(22,920)	(458)	(23,378)	(468)	(23,846)
Retained Business Rates	(33,484)	11,664	(21,820)	(1,339)	(23,158)	(418)	(23,576)	(416)	(23,992)	(480)	(24,472)
Top up Business Rates	(65,196)	7,525	(57,671)	(5,089)	(62,760)	(1,133)	(63,892)	(1,126)	(65,018)	(1,300)	(66,319)
NNDR Growth	(3,084)	2,684	(400)	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total (Main Funding)	(207,595)	(3,586)	(211,181)	(9,692)	(220,873)	(5,321)	(226,194)	(5,421)	(231,615)	(5,772)	(237,387)
New Homes Bonus	(2,540)	341	(2,199)	-	(2,199)	-	(2,199)	-	(2,199)	-	(2,199)
Public Health	(19,677)	(551)	(20,228)	(405)	(20,632)	(413)	(21,045)	(421)	(21,466)	-	(21,466)
Other core grants	(11,370)	3,403	(7,967)	6,517	(1,450)	-	(1,450)	-	(1,450)	-	(1,450)
TOTAL (Core/Other External Grants)	(33,587)	3,193	(30,394)	6,112	(24,282)	(413)	(24,694)	(421)	(25,115)	-	(25,115)

MTFS Budget Reduction Proposals - Children's Services

REF	Priority	Category	Title	Description	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	Savings Total £'000	Capital Investment £'000
20/25-PE09	People - Children's	New Delivery Model	0-19 year old public health commissioned services - a new integrated commissioned service delivery model	Public Health is working with the commissioned service provider to change the current service provision of three separate services into one integrated service model. Currently three commissioned services are within the Council's Section 75 Agreement with the CCG. These are the Health Visiting Service (including the HENRY programme), the School Nursing Service and the Family Nurse Partnership programme. All services are provided by Whittington Health NHS Trust.	125	125	-	-	-	250	-
20/25-PE10	People - Children's	New Delivery Model	Reducing placement costs through effective management of the market	This proposal considers ways to shape the local residential care market for children by taking demand off the free market and creating some diversity in the care market. This will be done through reviewing the feasibility of a number of delivery approaches including opening bespoke childrens homes, ring fencing/blocking market purchasing of provision, working alongside the non-profit sector to grow this local offer, joint ownership of accommodation with Adult social Care and shared supported accommodation for young people with disabilities 18-25.	(100)	-	100	100	200	300	-
20/25-PE11	People - Children's	New Delivery Model	UASC Accommodation	Insourcing accommodation for unaccompanied asylum seekers from expensive private providers to local properties leased directly by Homes for Haringey.	150	-	-	-	-	150	-
20/25-PE12	People - Children's	Service redesign	Reduce operational costs in Schools and Learning and Commissioning	Identify any residual discretionary spend in Schools and Learning and reduce to deliver savings. Identify and reduce operational costs in Commissioning.	50	25	-	-	-	75	-
20/25-PE13	People - Children's	Stopping / reducing service	Review of spend on transport and taxis	Review of existing transport policy applicable to staff and foster carers to ensure: -Consistent application of policy -Clear statement of eligibility -Improved value for money by considering both transport chosen and cost of time spent travelling by individual staff members	-	-	75	-	-	75	-
TOTAL - PEOPLE - Children's Services					225	150	175	100	200	850	0

Financial Implications Outline

The savings will be achieved by a review of the current configuration of the public health nursing services with a view to align both services to a new 0-19 integrated service specification for delivery.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

4

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	01/03/2019	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	31/09/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No, as we need to give at least 6 months notice to the provider of the changes		

Implementation Details

Proposal implementation - Implementation will be led by the public health team in partnership with Whittington Health NHS Trust. There is a national public health 0-19 year old integration service specification available and the public health team will use this and add a number of local elements to it. **Implementation phase timeline** - 1st April 2020 - 31st December 2020. Discussions relating to the new commissioned integrated service delivery model are already underway with the provider and will continue. February 2019 - March 2019 discussions with the Council's Commissioning team identified and agreed the synergies with the integrated service provision for early years and the remodelling of the structure to achieve a 0-19 integrated service including Whittington Health NHS Trust. May 2019 - April 2020 discussions with the Council's children's services to identify and agree the synergies with the services early help model. After agreement and approval of the savings plan in winter 19/20, we have officially informed the provider (November 2019) of our intentions and aim for implementation of the new model by December 2020. **Successful implementation** will be measured through a series of quarterly and annual KPI's including the mandatory elements and others, for example, ante-natal visits, new birth visits, 6-8 week check, 1 year review, 2-21/2 year review, breast feeding rates, and the national child measurement programme.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

Impact on customers - We will be working with the council's children's services to consider options for co-location between services including early help and early years services this will provide a more streamlined service for families. An integrated service allows for a whole family approach to service delivery.

Negative Impacts

Public health will work with the provider to ensure the reach of the service to families is maintained during the implementation phase.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

The provider has welcomed the proposed integrated service model.

Negative Impacts

Public health will work with the provider to ensure staff and stakeholders are kept fully informed of the changes.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet **statutory requirements**?

Delivery of the appropriate mandatory public health requirements will continue to be delivered by the commissioned provider.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Vulnerable young and first time mothers not supported with their parenting needs	Medium	Low	A vulnerable parent pathway will be part of the integrated service model, therefore the needs of all vulnerable parents will be met.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqIA Screening Tool</u> Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

The investment and the net savings require detailed modelling following the outcome of an options appraisal. Additional investment will be needed to develop this transformation and influence the market. It is envisaged that £100K per year is needed to develop the market and the new provisions. The investment required will include the recruit of a strategic commissioner and support to develop the options appraisal and implement the recommendations. Additional investment may be required to establish a social investment vehicle. However funds from external social investment sources will be identified for this if this is one of the preferred options.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

3

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY		Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No - significant development work required to move this forward.		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

There is significant lead in time required to progress some of these ideas. If options such as working with local not for profit sector can be delivered more swiftly then these will be progressed.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

More local residential placements for children that meet their needs at a reduced cost. More effective management of the local market.

Negative Impacts

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

Opportunities for the local providers and the not for profit sector.

Negative Impacts

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet **statutory requirements**?

This option will support us in delivering our statutory duties to look after children who are at risk of harm.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation

<p>Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?</p> <p>EqIA Screening Tool</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Is a full EqIA required?</p>	<p>No - is merely a new delivery mechanism of the existing service provision.</p>

<p>Financial Implications Outline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered. •Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal? •If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?
<p>No up front investment required. Ongoing external costs primarily relate to lease costs (as determined by the landlord), and support costs for the cohort of UASC (as determined by the specific need to the cohort).</p>

Delivery Confidence

<p>At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out? (1 = not at all confident; 5 = very confident)</p>	4
--	---

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	01/08/2019	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	31/05/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	Whilst there is an opportunity for implementation before April 2020, there are two dependencies: Property being made available by landlord for use by LBH; and identification of a suitable cohort of UASC		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Presently children's services have:

Secured one property that will accommodate eight young people and which is expected to be made available by December 2019. Two further properties have been identified for UASC - handover dates remain to be established - present expectation is for one property to be made available around January 2020 and the second property at then beginning of the financial year 2020/21.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

None

Negative Impacts

None

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

None

Negative Impacts

None

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet **statutory requirements**?

The Council continues to meet it's statutory requirements in regard to accommodating UASC

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Accommodation unit cost increases as a result of voids at a property	M	M	the service maintains an appropriate number of internal places for UASC placement in regard to the total population of UASC within the borough. Voids are planned ahead wherever possible, and arrangements made to fill void from a more expensive private placement, where appropriate

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	No
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

No additional investment required to deliver the proposal.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
 (1 = not at all confident;
 5 = very confident)

3

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY		Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?			

Implementation Details

- *How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?*
- *Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.*
- *How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?*

No additional resources required.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

To be identified once saving identified.

Negative Impacts

To be identified once saving identified.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

To be identified once saving identified.

Negative Impacts

To be identified once saving identified.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet **statutory requirements**?

Only discretionary spend will be reviewed so there will be no impact on statutory duties.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	No
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

--

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
 (1 = not at all confident;
 5 = very confident)

3

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY		Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No - significant programme resource is required to deliver the invest to save proposals and capacity for this review will be identified once those projects are further down the delivery path.		

Implementation Details

- *How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?*
- *Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.*
- *How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?*

Project resource is required to deliver this review and project and this will only be available in 21/22.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

To be determined.

Negative Impacts

To be determined.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

To be determined.

Negative Impacts

To be determined.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet **statutory requirements**?

No impact.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	No
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Capital MTFS Schedule - People - Children's Services

REF	Directorate	Category	Description	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	Total £'000
119	People (Children's Services)	Borrowing	School Streets	600	600	600	600	600	3,000
120	People (Children's Services)	Borrowing	Children Services Estate Capital Maintenance	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
Total				10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	53,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Children's Services

School Condition Works 2020/21-2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
120	Children Services Estate Capital Maintenance	50,000	0	0	50,000

During 2018/9-2019/20 extensive surveys have been undertaken of the school's estate. This has identified a range of work that needed to be done immediately as they related to H&S issues. These works have been completed and the focus is now on further works to the school estate to ensure that the buildings are fit for purpose. Condition and Suitability Surveys have been undertaken on all secondary schools and 75% of primary schools. Based on data received to date it is estimated that the backlog for the school estate could be up to £250m. The surveys are being further refined to develop a detailed asset management plan which will guide where and when investment is put into the school's estate. The investment in the fabric of the school estate will also provide facilities that use less energy and reduce carbon emissions.

School Streets Initiative 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
119	School Streets	1,500	1,500	0	3,000

The proposal is for streets outside schools that will have a range of physical treatments to change travel patterns and behaviours to encourage more sustainable modes of travel to school, to improve the air quality and to provide a safer environment for children. These treatments could include some or all the following: have extended pavements, traffic calming measures, and enforcement cameras to stop people from driving to their children to school. It is estimated that on average each street will cost c£0.2m. The budget assumes that the Council's proposed investment will be matched by external funding.

Yearly Investments

People - Children's	2020/21 Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	Total (£'000)
Current Capital Budget	20,713	17,686	8,566	13,011	0	59,976
New Capital Bids	10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	53,000
Total	31,313	28,286	19,166	23,611	10,600	112,976

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Background

UASC/ UASC Care Leavers and NRPF

1.1 This report sets out a summary of the council's duties to UASC and UASC Care Leavers.

1.2 The report also aims set out the support offered to NRPF families.

2. Legislative background

2.1 The council has a legal duty to accommodate unaccompanied asylum-seeking children under 18 under the Children Act 1989. Such children become eligible for leaving care services at 18 when the council then has a duty in relation to them until they are able to establish themselves independently. Often to become independent, their immigration status needs to be resolved. Alternatively, they may be face a Home Office decision to not be granted indefinite leave to remain, once they achieve their 18th birthday creating social challenges for them to access public funds and remain in the UK. Knowing that this may be the case some care leavers cease to maintain contact their workers in Haringey's Young Adults Service. This places them at risk of exploitation and the service has evidenced the work to work with the through other partners to maintain contact even if they decline to inform the advisors of the address the address and people that they may be living with.

3. Haringey's UASC – November 2019

3.1 There are currently 10 (UASC) under the age of 16 in the Looked After Children's Service. All the UASC are accommodated under Section 20 of the Children Act 1989. Haringey more recently like many other Local Authority will seek care orders for UASC, who arrive seeking asylum under the age of 14. During the last 12 months we have accommodated 2 young people as UASC who were 14 when they started their looked after journey with Haringey. Once they reach 18, they are eligible for care leaver services.

3.2 There are 13 young people who have become UASC care leavers to Haringey in the last rolling year. They were all formerly Looked After and were also classified as Asylum Seeking Children.

3.3 Our UASCs and care leaver population is growing reflecting larger numbers arriving in the UK.

3.4 Our UASCs and asylum-seeking care leavers come from a range of countries including: Syria, Iran, Iraq, Eritrea, Afghanistan, Vietnam, and Albania. The numbers and countries of origin of UASCs vary significantly upon the stability of countries across the world. In recent years there has been a high volume of Albanian & Eritrean young men placed in London. It is a challenge supporting young people from countries where education and health services have been poor developed. It is also a challenge supporting them when they have experienced significant trauma such as being trafficked. Many have suffered trauma and some have witnessed, or participated in acts of war, leaving them with multiple and complex emotional and mental health support needs that can be challenging for Haringey agencies to meet.

4. Referral Routes

4.1 There were/are two potential referral routes for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children. The most common route is for them to be referred through the reinstated Pan London Rota. The rota was established over 15 years ago through a Pan London agreement that local authorities (LA) would take turns in supporting unaccompanied asylum-seeking children claiming to be 16/17 years of age. This was to ensure the fair distribution of young people to LAs in London. The rota was a voluntary arrangement. This arrangement was replaced with the National Transfer Scheme, in September 2017. The NTS protocol was created to enable the safe transfer of unaccompanied children from one local authority (the entry authority from which the unaccompanied child transfers)

to another local authority (the receiving authority). Only unaccompanied children that meet the definition of a UASC, as set out in the Immigration Rules, are eligible to be referred to the NTS. The transfer protocol was intended to ensure that unaccompanied children can access the services and support they need and was also a voluntary agreement made between local authorities in England to ensure a more even distribution of unaccompanied children across all local authorities. Challenges with the Home Office mechanisms for managing the volume of needs national meant that the London LA's have agreed to revert to the Pan London rota until the NTS remedial adjustments are completed.

4.2. Over the last 8 months significant numbers have presented to Tottenham Police station. The police response has been cautious subjecting UASC to police powers under s.46 of the Children Act 1989. Since April 2019, discussions with senior leaders has encouraged the police to examine the need to execute their s.46 duty of UASC. The HSCP will receive a report on the outcome of their considerations.

4.3 The increase in the presenting UASC has generated pressures with the CSC system. Specifically these are:

1. Higher percentage of 16-17 LAC proportionally
2. Higher proportion of male LAC as majority of asylum seekers are male
3. Increased demand for foster carers willing and able to work with UASC
4. Increase in missing episodes following refusal of asylum post 18th birthday

4.4 The second referral route is for UASC young people to present directly to children's social care in Haringey who accommodate them unless a local connection can be determined elsewhere. Over the last 8 months there has been a higher proportion of UASC presenting to Tottenham Police Station. Since April 2019 we have had 22 UASC's directly presenting themselves. Our threshold target is now 0.08% (49 cases) of which we exceed for the last 8 months, however we have recently reduced to 48 cases and consequently have accepted a case from the rota referral. In addition, more recently supporting Croydon by accepting responsibility to care for 1 additional UASC. Haringey has not yet moved to capping the number of UASC offered support.

4.5 Haringey has a well-developed multi agency approach to supporting UASC with effective systems across Health including First Steps the LAC CAMHS leads, Police, MASH partners, Emergency Duty Team, Substance misuse providers and Housing and Education. This is largely the result of the investments in Haringey's Young Adults Service. The YAS works well with the MASH and EDT accommodating UASC within 12 hours of being notified of their arrival in Haringey.

4.6 The funding received from the Government does not cover the total costs. This is even more the case for UASC care leavers of whom we have 85 over the age of 18 years old amongst our total care leaver population of 405 young people (open and active cases).

5. Support to assist young people with their legal status

5.1 The Young Adults Service,(YAS), has meet with the Coram's Children's Migrant Project to develop a bespoke advice service for Unaccompanied Minors and Care leavers in Haringey. The project advice line would be extended to provide a high-level service to Haringey social workers and would provide case reviews and guidance on the immigration process.

5.2 The YAS workers attend a wide range of core and specialist training to keep up to date with the legislation to enable young people who are eligible to achieve legal status. The team has received training on the Immigration Act 2016, NRPF, the emotional needs of UASC, and supporting LAC and Care Leavers seeking Asylum and Child Trafficking.

5.3 The YAS Team in conjunction with young people have delivered training to Foster Carers and Supervising Social Workers in relation to immigration, asylum process, expectations, and help to improve understanding of the complex issues that face separated children in the UK. The training was well received and there are plans for this to be delivered more frequently.

6. Repatriation

6.1 The YAS Team would like to focus on supporting eligible and consenting UASC post their 18th birthdays for return to their country of origin prior to and following any Home Office refusal and provide the young person with reference letters, and certificates of achievement, 1 month living expenses based on the country of origin if they are returned. This is particularly important given the challenges the young people may face upon their return. This practice has been highlighted as an example of good practice and being modelled in other Local Authorities.

7. Settled Status and Citizenship

7.1 Haringey has been successful in securing Home Office funding to support vulnerable community groups to apply for settled status. With effect from the 1st August 2019, structured work will commence to afford priority to UASC and children who are EU Nationals to be supported to secure settled status. There are 27 young people earmarked to benefit from this funding.

8. Education

8.1 Haringey ensures all UASC Looked after children attend local schools to their placements. A significant proportion of our UASC looked after children go on to higher education and do well.

8.2 For those where school is not applicable Haringey ensures our UASC and Asylum care leavers have access to ESOL as soon as they are placed. We have strong links with colleges in borough and ESOL providers such as UK Unsigned. Haringey has high aspirations for our care leavers and ensuring our young people are building on skills for their future.

9. Housing

9.1 Haringey have been successful in working closely with an accommodation provider to secure housing for both UASC Looked After Children and UASC Care leavers in borough to ensure our young people are able to benefit both from peer support, and being placed together where cultural needs can be met. By ensuring our migrant children are placed together we have been able to undertake direct pieces of work to meet their assessed needs, but also to encourage their attendance at the UASC Hub, specifically set up for newly arriving UASC's.

9.2 We also have 3 UASC care leavers currently Staying put with their foster carers, and we work closely with preferred accommodation providers who have extensive years of experience in working with UASC's and where need has been assessed we also access appropriate IFA carers to ensure appropriate cultural matches.

9.3 Haringey fostering service also have a small number of carers who specialise in UASC young people and although the carers are also approved to take non UASC, the carers have been able to build a specialist knowledge in home office and immigration status issues. As a result, the carers preference is UASC young people. The carers advocate on the young person's behalf and often accompany the young people to their home office appointment. Carers are able to communicate by but using google translate and as a result able to support the young person's needs.

10. Financial implications

10.1 Haringey receives grant funding for UASC children under 18 and some contributions to Asylum seekers over 18. The grant funding received does not sufficiently fund the London living costs for accommodation needs. This is the subject of a review.

11. NRPF – children and their families.

11.1 There are currently 86 children, (48 families), whose parents are NRPF, open to the Children’s and Families Social Care NRPF Team. The remit of NRPF Team:

- To undertake s17 CA 1989 Assessments
- Provide Accommodation for NRPF/Destitution Families
- Make subsistence payments (monitor)
- Undertake 8 weekly statutory Child in need visits
- Undertake 3 monthly Child in need reviews

11.2 In addition the Team also assist families with the following

- Educational vouchers for under 4 years.
- Access to food banks
- Access to Children Centre’s
- Access and support to engage with Domestic Violence services
- Co-ordinating of EHCP’s
- Progressing applications for leave to remain via the NRPF Connect Web tool.

11.3 The NRPF Team and senior managers have set out a proposal to use the NASS rates as the benchmark for awarding subsistence payments.

The rates are

Situation	Weekly payment
Parents, where both are living with the child	75.50
Lone parent living with the child	37.75
Child aged 16-17	37.75
Child aged 4-15	37.75
Child aged 1-3	40.75
Child aged under 1	42.75

11.4 Support will be paid at the foregoing rates for the parent/s and for the first, second and third child or children only. For larger families with four or more children, the Council will decide on assessment, the council will decide on assessment the level of subsistence payable for the additional child or children having regard to the total payment to the family, and if so will determine the level thereof, the final decision to be that of the Head of Service.

Appendix 1. CYPS RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY

Recommendation & Action	Lead & others to be involved	Timescale	Agreed Partially/ Agreed / Not Agreed	Comments
1. That the Council will request to formally appoint a Member to act as a Trustee to the Haringey Migrant Support Centre.			Not agreed	<p>This recommendation sits outside the responsibilities of CYPS. Councillors are invited to contact Haringey Migrant Support Centre directly to become a Trustee in accordance with their constitution.</p> <p>Closed</p>
2. That as part of the future work plan for Overview and Scrutiny that panel receives updates on progress with implementing and improvements identified as required by the practice audit that was undertaken on the work of the NRPF team and the relevant voluntary sector organisations be requested to provide feedback as part of the process	Assistant Director Social Care – previously agreed in 2018	Date for progress report as part of Overview and Scrutiny work plan to be confirmed.	Agreed	<p>Previous Commitment The service will provide high level feedback on progress against the requirements of the practice audit. Voluntary sector organisations will be contacted for their views as part of the progress report.</p> <p>Current Position Assistant Director of Social Care will provide a report to Scrutiny on the work completed from April – October 2019 for the next scrutiny panel. Significant changes made as a result of the Service Review full report to be submitted to scrutiny on the 2nd March 2020</p> <p>Action Place on Forward plan</p>

3. That substance levels for NRPF families are reviewed so that they are based on a clear and justifiable rationale and comply with levels that relevant advice suggests appropriate	Assistant Director, Social Care	August 2018	Agreed	<p>Previous Commitment A review of the NRPF service is underway and includes a review of the budget and financial arrangements.</p> <p>Current position Subsistence levels recommended to fall in line with NASS rates. See section 11 of Support to UASC and NRPF families. Report.</p> <p>Achieved and Closed.</p>
4. That, where there are disputes with other local authorities on responsibility for the support of specific families with NRPF, addressing and meeting their needs be prioritised and dealt with before such issues are addressed	Assistant Director, Social Care	As and when	Agreed	<p>This is an “as and when” action due to the way that families present themselves for support. Each case will be assessed on its own merits. Where immediate support is assessed as required this will be provided in line with legal duties.</p> <p>Completed by previous AD</p> <p>Ongoing and Closed.</p>
5. That a report be made to a future meeting of the Panel on how families with NRPF are assisted in accessing good quality immigration advice so that they are better able to resolve their status quickly	Assistant Director, Social Care	Date for progress report as part of Overview and Scrutiny work plan to be confirmed.	Agreed	<p>Report will be completed as requested and presented to panel in March 2020.</p> <p>Action Place on forward plan.</p>

6. That action be taken to improve the information available from front facing services on sources of support and advice for NRPF families	Assistant Director, Social Care	July 2018	Agreed	<p>The first meeting took place in April 2018 with Migrant organisation and was reported to be facilitated by the previous AD. Senior managers met with Migrant Organisations to agree Terms of Reference and sequence of regular quarterly meetings.</p> <p>Meetings have been agreed and have taken place – Closed</p>
7. That, in order to provide a stronger focus on resolving the immigration status of families, specific consideration be given to splitting responsibility for the support of NRPF families between a small team to address issues relating specifically to NRPF and mainstream social care services	Director, Children’s Service, and Assistant Director, Social Care		Partially agreed	<p>The structure of the team is currently able to deliver the required service to children and families. However, the service will always consider ideas and best practice from elsewhere for consideration for service improvement. Service delivery has improved since the initial audit reported to Overview and Scrutiny in March 2018.</p> <p>Haringey is also part of NRPF Connect.</p> <p>Ongoing and Closed.</p>
8. That the Panel be informed of whether an application has been made for Controlling Migration funding and, if not, consideration be given to rectifying this.	Assistant Director, Children’s Social Care	Update Sept. 2018	Agreed	<p>The Council have received an allocation of the fund in respect of UASC for 2018/19 and 2019/20</p> <p>Achieved and Closed.</p>
9. That the Children and Young People’s Service establish a system to collect information on the refugee status of	AD Children’s Social Care and AD Schools and	ongoing	Agreed	<p>Currently the School Admissions Service already collects information about whether a child has refugee status on the in-year form. This is in order</p>

children applying for school places where this is known for sharing with schools so they are able to make the necessary plans for support in advance of the arrival of children at school.	Learning			to assess whether a child qualifies under the In-Year Fair Access Protocol. Aside from qualification under this protocol, the School Admissions Code applies. Achieved and Closed.
10. That social care staff supporting children from refugee families be made aware of the importance of including the refugee status of children applying for school places on school admissions application forms	Social care colleagues under the direction of the Assistant Director Children's Social Care and the Joint Assistant Director for Schools and Learning	Update Sept 2018	Agreed	The in-year school application form does include two places where the refugee status of the child can be noted - one of which is an explicit question asking whether the child is a refugee or asylum seeker. The form, where appropriate, is completed by social care officers. This is now conducted as part of business as usual. Achieved and Closed.
11. That clarification be provided to schools regarding the extent of their responsibilities for sharing information on the immigration status of individual children	Joint Assistant Director, Schools and Learning	From Sept. 2018	Agreed	Schools should consult their own data protection policies regarding data exchange, however it is already a standard requirement for state schools to pass on information about a child, including safeguarding, SEN, behaviour and educational attainment information, to any subsequent schools which the child attends. However, this information should not be shared until the child has been offered a place at the following school, and it is strictly prohibited for receiving schools to delay admission of a child until paperwork etc. is received. Ongoing as part of business as usual practices. Achieved and Closed.

12. Networked Learning Communities to establish the feasibility of establishing English language classes for the parents/carers of children from refugee children	Head of School Standards, thereafter AD Schools and Learning	Ongoing	Agreed	Head of School Standards via the chairs of the NLCs during the summer term 2018. Thereafter, it will be pursued via the HLP as appropriate. Ongoing as need arises. Ongoing and Closed
13. CYPS work with accommodation providers to establish greater clarity for families with school age children on the length of time families are likely to remain in temporary accommodation to enable children to maintain school placements	Assistant Director of Safeguarding	Ongoing	Partially agreed	Commitment provided to make every endeavour to maintain connections with schools and support families to be supported with accommodation within Haringey as far as possible. Ongoing and Closed
14. That schools be reminded of the availability of training for staff by CAMHS on mental health issues, including trauma	Joint Assistant Director of Schools and Learning to liaise with CAMHS	Summer term 2018 and ongoing	Agreed	UASC access support from First Steps – a CAMHS provision and referrals made for NRPF children as appropriate to CAMHS Ongoing and closed
15. That consideration be given to extending access to support from the Virtual School to children from NRPF	Head of Virtual School	NA	Not agreed	Schools in Haringey are aware that children whose parents are NRFP face vulnerabilities and can access support and advice from voluntary sector organisations and the consultation service within MASH. Not Agreed – Closed
16. That training be offered to	Joint Assistant	Update for September	Partially	Structured programme to be delivered under the

schools on the provision of support for children from refugee families including issues relating to immigration status and external sources of support	Director of Schools and Learning	2018		Children's Academy and support from HEP. Ongoing and closed.
--	----------------------------------	------	--	--

Report for Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel – 19 December 2019

Title: Work Programme 2018-20 - Update

Report authorised by: Ayshe Simsek, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

Lead Officer: Robert Mack, Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
Tel: 020 8489 2921, e-mail: rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: N/A

**Report for Key/
Non Key Decision:** N/A

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 This report provides an update on the Panel's work plan for 2018/20.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Panel notes its current work programme, attached at **Appendix A**, and considers whether any amendments are required;
- 2.2 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked to endorse any amendments to the workplan at its next meeting.

3. Reasons for decision

3.1 The work programme for Overview and Scrutiny was finalised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 19 November 2018. Arrangements for implementing the work programme have progressed and the latest plans for the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel are outlined in **Appendix A**.

4. Alternative options considered

4.1 The Panel could choose not to review its work programme but this could diminish knowledge of the work of Overview and Scrutiny and would fail to keep the full membership updated on any changes to the work programme.

5. Background information

5.1 The work programme for the Committee and its Panels that was agreed is for two years – 2018/19 and 2019/20. It was finalised following a wide ranging consultation process that included partner organisations, stakeholders, the community and voluntary sector and local residents. There is nevertheless scope for flexibility and the Panel may update and amend it to taken into account any emerging issues not currently included as it feels fit.

- 5.2 A copy of the current work plan for the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel is attached as Appendix "A" to this report.

Scrutiny Review Projects

- 5.3 At its last meeting, the Panel agreed to set up an in-depth review on the range of different types of school within the borough and the implications of this, particularly in respect to the response to falling school rolls. A scope and terms of reference for the review and currently being developed by the Chair in consultation with relevant officers and will be circulated to the Panel for approval in due course.

Forward Plan

- 5.4 Since the implementation of the Local Government Act and the introduction of the Council's Forward Plan, scrutiny members have found the Plan to be a useful tool in planning the overview and scrutiny work programme. The Forward Plan is updated each month but sets out key decisions for a 3-month period.

- 5.5 To ensure the information provided to the Panel is up to date, a copy of the most recent Forward Plan can be viewed via the link below:

<http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RP=110&RD=0&J=1>

- 5.6 The Panel may want to consider the Forward Plan and discuss whether any of these items require further investigation or monitoring via scrutiny.

6. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 6.1 The contribution of scrutiny to the corporate priorities will be considered routinely as part of the Panel's work.

7. Statutory Officers comments

Finance and Procurement

- 7.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations set out in this report. Should any of the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny generate recommendations with financial implications these will be highlighted at that time.

Legal

- 7.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from the report.
- 7.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme falls within the remit of the OSC.

- 7.4 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an OSC has the power to appoint one or more sub-committees to discharge any of its functions. In accordance with the Constitution, the appointment of Scrutiny Panels (to assist the scrutiny function) falls within the remit of the OSC.
- 7.5 Scrutiny Panels are non-decision making bodies and the work programme and any subsequent reports and recommendations that each scrutiny panel produces must be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such reports can then be referred to Cabinet or Council under agreed protocols.

Equality

- 7.6 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:
- Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act. These include the characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (formerly gender) and sexual orientation;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 7.7 The Panel should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them within its work plan, as well as individual pieces of work. This should include considering and clearly stating;
- How policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics;
 - Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate;
 - Whether there is equality of access to services and fair representation of all groups within Haringey;
 - Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.
- 7.8 The Panel should ensure equalities comments are based on evidence. Wherever possible this should include demographic and service level data and evidence of residents/service users views gathered through consultation.

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel; Work Plan for 2018/20

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

N/A

Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

Work Plan 2018 - 20

1. Scrutiny review projects; These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Project	Comments	Priority
Special Educational Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEND children are growing in numbers. They can often find difficulty in accessing services due to stretched Council budgets or lack of clarity on how parents can access services; • Families can find it a struggle to obtain a formal diagnosis for their children, which is often a prerequisite in getting extra support at school and/or at home; • Some groups of SEND children have an increased risk of exclusion from school and there can also be poor outcomes in the classroom, which can have a detrimental impact on families struggling to cope; • Early intervention, including diagnosis, is key in order to put relevant support measures in place so that children with SEND can have fulfilling lives with good educational outcomes. <p>The review will examine and review the role and the effectiveness of the current service children with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) issues and autism receive. It will aim to establish;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking in particular at their interaction with the Council and schools, what are the experiences of parents with SEMH and autistic children in trying to access support for their children? • What are the waiting times for parents requesting an assessment, obtaining a diagnosis and 	1.

	<p>receiving the extra support required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the outcomes of children with SEMH and autism in relation to their diagnoses? • As local authorities move away from statements to Education Health and Care (EHC) plans, what are the challenges parents face in obtaining EHC plans? How many children currently have a statement or EHC plan and how many apply for it? What are the rejection rates of children trying to obtain an EHC plan and what are the reasons? 	
<p>Fragmentation of school structures</p>	<p>The review will consider the range of different types of school that there currently are within the borough. The resulting fragmentation presents challenges for local authorities. These include the planning and co-ordination of school places and ensuring that all schools are providing a good standard of education. In addition, schools are subject to varying degrees of local democratic control.</p> <p>The scope and terms of reference for the review have yet to be finalised but, amongst other issues, it could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek to identify the range of schools that there are within Haringey and their respective status as well as the challenges that this presents for the Council; • Consider ways that might be available to the Council to co-ordinate and influence all schools within the borough and what might work most effectively; and • Look at practice in other local authority areas and what appears to have been most effective. 	
<p>Alternative Provision</p>	<p>The review will look at Alternative Provision (AP) services provided to students who no longer attend mainstream education for reasons such as exclusion, behavioural issues, school refusal, short/long term illnesses as well as any other reasons. The main areas of focus will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the reasons why children in Haringey enter AP? • Once entering alternative provision, what are their outcomes and attainment levels when compared to mainstream schools? • How many children going through the AP route later enter the youth justice system? • How many children enter alternative provision as a result of SEND needs and how many have a statement or a EHCP plan? • The demographics of children entering AP including ethnicity, gender, areas of the borough where 	

	<p>children in AP are drawn from and levels of children receiving free school meals prior to entering AP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the challenges schools and local authorities face and what can we do better to meet the needs of children so as to avoid AP altogether? • Are the outcomes from AP providers uniform within Haringey? • How cost effective is AP. 	
--	--	--

<p>2. “One-off” Items; These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.</p>	
Date	Potential Items
<p>6 September 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference • Service Overview and Performance Update • Cabinet Member Questions; Children and Families and Communities (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within their portfolios). • Work Planning; To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year.

<p>8 November 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families. • New Safeguarding Arrangements. • Financial Monitoring; To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 1. • Joint Targeted Area Action Plan – Update.
<p>18 December 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Scrutiny • Cabinet Member Questions – Communities
<p>4 February 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational Attainment Performance; To report on educational attainment and performance for different groups, including children with SENDs. Data on performance broken down into different groups, including children with SENDs, as well as ethnicity, age, household income etc. To include reference to any under achieving groups. • School Exclusions; To consider an overview of current action to address school exclusions and, in particular, the outcome of the detailed analysis of fixed term exclusions. • Chair of LSCB & Annual Report. • Review on Support to Children from Refugee Families (N.B. including NRPF): Update on Implementation of Recommendations

<p>19 March 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition (to be jointly considered with the Adults and Health Panel). • Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families • Ofsted Inspection – Action Plan • Services to Schools • Review on Child Friendly Haringey: Update on Implementation of Recommendations
<p>2019 - 2020</p>	
<p>13 June 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference • Work Planning; To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for year. • Cabinet Member Questions – Communities • Youth Services • Review on Restorative Justice: Update on Implementation of Recommendations • Apprenticeships

<p>19 September 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families • Alternative Provision • Financial Monitoring • Multi Agency Safeguarding Arrangements • The Role of the LADO • Independent Reviewing Officer (Annual Report) • OFSTED Action Plan – Progress
<p>7 November 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions – Communities • Childhood Obesity • Mental health services for teenagers and young people (CAMHS) • Educational Attainment Performance; To report on educational attainment and performance for different groups, including children with SENDs. Data on performance broken down into different groups, including children with SENDs, as well as ethnicity, age, household income etc. To include reference to any under achieving groups. • School improvement and action to address under performance by particular groups of students.

19 December 2019 (Budget Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget scrutiny • Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families • Support to Children from Refugee Families – Update on implementation of recommendations of scrutiny review
2 March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Play and leisure • Chair of LSCB & Annual Report • Unregistered schools • Home schooling and safeguarding

TBA:

1. Joint meeting on Transitions
2. Nurseries and the two and year old offer

This page is intentionally left blank