

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CREATING OPPORTUNITIES AND TACKLING INEQUALITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH
ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Present: Councillors S Day (Chairman), Harper, Benton, Nadeem, Eley, Saltmarsh,
and J Shearman

Also present	Cllr John Holdich	Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University
	Alistair Kingsley	Parent Governor Representative
	Brian Opie	Parent Governor Representative
	Luke Pagliaro	Peterborough Youth Council
	Zain Awan	Peterborough Youth Council
	Stef Martinsen-Barker	Co-ordinator for KIDS
	Sam	Young Carer

Officers in Attendance:	Arian Loades	Executive Director, Children's Services
	Gary Perkins	Head of School Improvement
	Jonathan Lewis	Assistant Director Education & Resources
	Sue Addison	Lead Officer for Skills
	Felicity Schofield	Safeguarding and Children Board Chair
	Jenny Hepworth	Integrated Youth Support Strategic Policy Manager
	Paulina Ford	Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny
	Ruth Griffiths	Lawyer

1. Apologies

No apologies were received.

2. Declarations

No declarations of interest were received.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2011

The minutes of the meetings held on 26 July 2011 were approved as an accurate record. Councillor Nadeem wished it noted that he had attended the meeting on 26 July but that it had not been recorded in the minutes.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no requests for Call-in to consider.

5. Young Carers in Peterborough

The report informed the Committee on the progress of the work and developments with Young Carers in Peterborough since last reported to the Committee in November 2009. Key areas highlighted were:

- The contract to provide services to young carers had been awarded to KIDS in autumn 2010 and they had started to deliver services in November 2010.

- There had been an increase in the number of referrals to the service, an increase in the number of young carers and families supported and an increase in the range of activities/ services provided.
- The Young Carers Strategy had been endorsed and was being implemented.

A young carer, Sam was in attendance to talk about a day in her life as a young carer, and how she helped look after her disabled sibling. A representative from KIDS a national charity which had been commissioned to deliver the young carers service in Peterborough was also in attendance. Members were informed about the organisation and that it already supported fifty families and sixty young people locally and provided them with a range of support. The KIDS project helped safeguard young carers who were taking on significant responsibility for a parent or sibling who was ill or disabled, and gave those young people the opportunity to meet others, make friends, share experiences and have fun. They ran holiday and after school activities and clubs and held regular meetings outside of the family home. One of the main challenges was the cost of the venues to run events and finding space to hold them.

The Chair thanked the Young Carer for attending and providing an interesting insight into the life of a young carer.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the report and requested a further report in six months time. Future reports to include challenges and issues.

6. Presentation of 2011 Unvalidated Examination Results, EYSF – Key Stage 4 – A Level

The Head of School Improvement presented the report and informed the Committee that he led the team of School Improvement Advisers and Learning and Teaching Consultants. Early Years Foundation (EYFS) data and Key Stage One had been validated other results had remained unvalidated. Areas highlighted were:

Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) outcomes had improved by +5% in the key measure of % achieving at least 78 points and 6+ scale points in all Personal, Social and Emotional development (PSE) and Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL) scales. Outcomes in CLL, whilst improving overall by 3%, had shown only a 0.1 scale point improvement in the average score, and only a 0.2 average scale point improvement for the lowest 20% pupils. These areas would be a key focus for work in 2011-12. CLL outcomes had been below those expected, causing a negative effect when pupils began Key Stage 1.

Key Stage 1 (KS1) (Y2, age 7) LA Results. KS1 outcomes had been disappointing. Whilst consistently ahead of outcomes achieved in 2007 and 2008, they had fallen below the levels achieved in the past two years. Performance levels had been maintained, with some small declines, at the higher levels of L2b+ and L3, which remained some distance ahead of those achieved up to 2008. There had been a continuing difference in attainment levels between boys and girls and this year's focus would be on raising attainment in boys. Resourcing had been targeted at leadership of schools with Head Teachers and at class room teacher level to bring about an improvement in classroom teaching.

The gap to national performance had widened slightly in reading and writing, but less so in mathematics, where outcomes at L2+ had shown a slight improvement (+0.2%) from 2010.

Key Stage 2 (Y6, age 11) LA Results

- Performance at L4+ in English was 75%, unchanged from 2010 and 6% below the 2010 national average performance;

- Performance at L4+ in mathematics was 76%, unchanged from 2010 and 4% below 2010 national average performance;
- Performance at L4+ in both English and mathematics was 68%, 1% improvement on 2010 and 6% below the 2010 national performance;
- Performance at L5 in English was 22%, a 4% decline from 2010 and 10% below the 2010 national average performance;
- Performance at L5 in mathematics was 28%, a 1% decline from 2010 and 6% below the 2010 national performance.

Members were informed that validated data when returned in January 2012 was likely to show that L4+ English would be 78%, mathematics would be 79% and the combined subjects would be 71%. Those results would be the best that schools in Peterborough had ever recorded.

The number of schools judged to be Below the Floor Standard (BFS) had declined from 14 in 2010 to 6 in 2011.

The number of schools judged to be vulnerable had declined from 17 in 2010 to 12 in 2011.

Key Stage 4 (Y11, age 16) LA Results had been the best ever recorded by Peterborough schools for the third successive year. The unvalidated data reported that for the measure of 5 A*-C GCSEs including English and mathematics, Peterborough had scored above 50% for the first time ever and was for the first time, above the national average performance (2010);

Members were informed of plans to improve all key stage outcomes further through a range of both targeted and universal support.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members noted that KS1 results had been disappointing and that despite having a focus over the past few years on raising attainment in boys it had not shown as an improved outcome in 2011. Members were therefore concerned about how these results would affect the future of KS4 outcomes. *Members were informed that there were limited resources and these had been targeted at schools which needed the most input. These measures had shown improvements this year and the Head of School Improvement was confident that this would be reflected in future KS4 results.*
- Were you surprised at the Key Stage 1 Level 2b+ results? *There had been a very strong emphasis on improving attainment the year before last but schools had not maintained that emphasis last year. KS1 outcomes were dependant on teacher assessment and Head Teacher influence. The LA moderate 25% of the schools and evidence suggested that at schools where moderation has taken place results were higher. Some teachers had shown a reluctance to award higher levels at KS1 because it would impact on the amount of progress pupils were recorded as having made at KS2.*
- Could more detailed data be provided on all the secondary school results? *Data for individual schools would be difficult to provide at this time as the results had not been validated and different sets of data was still being received from many schools.*
- Members commented that some of the data provided in the report had been difficult to understand. Officers were asked to explain the KS2 Levels data. *Members were informed that Level 2 was the expected level of a child at aged 7. Level 2 was divided into three subsections Level 2c, Level 2b and Level 2a and Level 3 was for higher ability children. Level 2b was a significant measure as it was a secure Level 2 which indicated that a child was ready to move into KS3.*
- The Assistant Director Education and Resources offered to provide training for Members of the Committee on exam report data to enable more effective scrutiny.
- How far below the national average do you envisage Peterborough will be when the validated results come through? *Peterborough was currently between 4% and 5% below the national average with the 2% to 3% uplift it would then be 1% or 2% below the national average. That result would bring Peterborough higher than it had been for many years. The aim was to bring Peterborough inline with the national average and above.*

- Can you provide data to compare against our statistical neighbours and not just against the national picture? *Comparative data from statistical neighbours would be received at the end of September. This information would be incorporated in the January report to the Committee.*
- Do Heads from Peterborough Schools work with Heads from schools across the country to learn best practice. *This was happening and particularly with new Heads of Schools as part of their induction they would go to schools in other parts of the Country that were achieving outstanding results and demonstrating best practice teaching.*

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee requested that:

- The Assistant Director Education and Resources to arrange a training session for the Committee on the exam report data to enable more effective scrutiny. This to be provided before the Validated Exam report is presented to the Committee in January 2012.
- Comparative data from statistical neighbours to be provided with the Validated Exam results report to the Committee in January 2012.
- A member of the Scrutiny Committee to work with the Head of School Improvement to understand and identify any areas for improvement with regard to the reporting of examination results to the Committee.

7. School Developments across Peterborough

The report informed the Committee on school developments across Peterborough highlighting steps being taken to address the shortfall of school places.

The Assistant Director, Education and Resources presented the report and a power-point presentation on School Admissions and School Place Planning, which detailed the following:

- The Local Authority's responsibilities
- Admission process
- Size of schools and legal issues (Infant Class Size legislation)
- Types of schools
- Why there were pressures on school places
- Demography of Peterborough
- Current projects underway
- Future projects and funding

There had been several contributors to pressures on school places in the city:

- Birth rates had increased by 30% in the last 5 years. The current growth in under 5's would not reach secondary schools until 2020 at the earliest
- Migration – local, regional and international. There were 96 distinct languages in schools. It was not possible to predict further inward migration especially with opening of the EU to Turkey, Albania and Macedonia.
- Due to economic growth / stability / employment in the city people had stopped leaving the city.
- Success of schools gaining 'outstanding' status had attracted students from other local authorities

Large scale building works were being planned to address the current shortfall in places which would create around 4000 extra places. Funding was critical and came from various sources.

- Developer contributions – Section 106 agreements contributed about 25% to the development of new schools/ CIL (community infrastructure levy) some signed prior to LGR.
- Direct grant from government
- Funding financed by the council provided the bulk of the capital funding but there was still a shortfall. The pressure to find school places in the future remained.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- How much does it cost to home school a child and how many were being home educated. *Children educated at home would not cost the authority anything as it would be the responsibility of the parents. There were currently less than one hundred home educated children.*
- How many new primary schools are planned? *Currently six new primary schools were planned, some would be completely new developments and some would be within existing developments.*
- Members were concerned about school places in the PE1 area of Peterborough. *The PE1 area was heavily urbanised and there had been little available land to build new schools. Plans were in place to build a new junior school on the Thomas Deacon Academy site Alternative options were being looked at e.g. using former school buildings, former office accommodation and the expansion of existing schools.*
- Members commented that the Authorities response to the shortfall of places over the past three years had been good.
- How were the providers selected for the new Free School at the Hereward site? *The provider had been selected from five of the leading providers nationally and internationally for schools. Each of the providers had been visited to understand the context in which they worked. From the selected five providers one from Nottingham had been chosen who had worked in a similar context to the Hereward area of the city and had an educationalist background.*

The Chair thanked the Assistant Director Education and Resources for his report and acknowledged the challenges he faced going forward.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee noted the report and requested that regular updates are provided to the Committee via email.

8. Portfolio Progress Report

The Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University addressed the Committee and informed the Committee that the previous two items on the agenda had provided an update on the Educational area that fell within the remit of his portfolio. The Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University introduced the Lead Officer responsible for Skills who updated the Committee on the progress that had been made in that area of his portfolio.

Members were informed of the Peterborough Skills Vision which was a new initiative that had been launched in December 2010. It had been launched in response to conversations that had been held with local businesses who had found it difficult to recruit people with certain skills. City Businesses and Education providers were invited to sign up to the Peterborough Skills Vision and commit to:

- Actively encourage and support employees to gain skills and qualifications that help to meet the needs of their business, as well as assisting their future employability.
- Raise their employees' skills and competencies to improve their business performance by investing in economically valuable training.

- Engage with Opportunity Peterborough through an annual survey to share information on their existing and future skills requirements.
- Be positive about Peterborough's young people contributing to the workplace and be receptive to the concept of helping them to make the transition from education to employment.

In return for signing up to the Vision they would receive support with local and national skills, signposting in the right direction for available funding, expert advice, information on skills development opportunities and support from training providers.

280 Peterborough businesses had signed up to the Peterborough Skills Vision. The Members Directory could be found on the Opportunity Peterborough website.

Businesses who had signed up to the Vision were required to complete an annual Peterborough Skills Survey. By completing the survey businesses had an opportunity to influence what skills were needed to be delivered in the City and what would be funded in the City. An important part of the Vision was about young people and a new project called Peterborough Skills Service would be launched in October at the Annual Skills Summit. The service would broker work related learning. Schools and businesses were being asked to look at work placements in a different way. Instead of the traditional two week block of work experience a business might come into a school to give a work related lesson. The project worked closely with Opportunity Peterborough as this brand was recognised by businesses. Seventeen of the largest businesses in Peterborough were working with four secondary schools to pilot the project. The Peterborough Skills Vision had also been incorporated into the Council procurement service. A Young Peoples Conference was being organised for January to give careers advice and guidance to young people.

A member of the Youth Council commented that young people tended to be guided towards going to university at school and not enough careers guidance was being given about training and apprenticeships.

The Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University updated the Committee on 16 to 18 year olds not in Education, Training or Employment (NEET). The figure for NEET's up to the end of June 2010 was 14.3%, the current figure to the end of June 2011 was 11.9%. That compared favourably with statistical neighbours at 20.1%, East of England at 14% and nationally at 15%.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- What was Cranfield University going to bring to Peterborough? *Cranfield University would be sponsored by the Council and local businesses. The Chair of the University would recruit students from across a cluster of environmental companies offering masters courses and continuous professional development. This would develop skills in Peterborough. Algae research into bio fuels would also be part of the programme and providing training on wind and wave power.*
- How many applications have there been for places at University Centre Peterborough. *225 places had been taken up this year.*
- When will there be a hall of residence. *Developers have put offers forward to develop halls of residents but they need a guarantee that they would be filled before going ahead.*
- Members were concerned that there were no plans to increase the craft trades in Peterborough and felt that schools should promote these trades more. *Members were informed that uptake of apprenticeships had increased. There had been a recent campaign to increase apprenticeship take up. Young people were keen to do apprenticeships but there was no guarantee of a job at the end of it.*
- Had there been an improvement in the Ofsted school ratings. *There had been a great improvement in the Ofsted ratings in the city and more schools were now in the good and satisfactory category.*

- The examination results do not seem to match with the Ofsted ratings of the schools. *Ofsted do not only look at exam results. Ofsted would also take into consideration other elements like added value.*
- What is being done about the 5% of primary schools rated at inadequate? *The 5% related to one school. Interventions had been put in place to make improvements and move the school out of that category.*

ACTIONS

1. The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University report back to the Committee in six months to provide a portfolio progress report. The report to include updates on the Peterborough Skills Service and Universities.
2. The Head of Skills to send an invitation to the Committee to attend the Young Peoples Conference in January.

9. Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2010-2011

The report provided the Committee with information about the work of the Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board (PSCB) and an opportunity to comment on the annual report and business plan. The Annual report focused on the statutory responsibilities which were about having procedures and policies across agencies, the performance management role and raising awareness of safeguarding.

Members were advised that during an Ofsted inspection in March 2010 the Safeguarding Children Board had been criticised for not sufficiently challenging in terms of performance management and that some action plans from serious case reviews had not been implemented speedily enough. Those areas highlighted by the inspection had formed the focus of the PSCB during last year.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members referred to the recent Ofsted Inspection and the outcome of inadequate for Safeguarding. Members wanted to know if the Safeguarding Children Board had felt that they had been misled in information given to them. *Members were advised that the PSCB had reported to the inspectors that they had not received any reports from agencies expressing concerns about the performance of social care. The information received in reports had not indicated any concerns and targets set had been met up to the point of producing the annual report in March 2011.*
- Members wanted to know how the PSCB were able to validate the information received from other agencies and partners and were concerned that the information was based on trust rather than fact and evidence. *The Chair of the PSCB informed Members that she had been able to validate the information and it had been the same information that had been provided to the DfE and at previous Scrutiny meetings. The recent Ofsted inspection had highlighted that the information received had not shown the whole picture. The Director of Children's Services also confirmed that the information in the Annual Report had been accurate. The information that had been received for the report had depended entirely on quantitative measures. The question now had been more about was it the right information as the Ofsted Inspection had highlighted issues around the quality of work rather than the quantitative aspect.*
- A member of the Youth Council wanted to know if Quality Impact Assessments had been completed on the PSCB policies. He also advised that it was best practice that when the Quality Impact Assessment was conducted that it should be completed by an independent person not involved with writing the policy. *The policies were old policies and were due to be reviewed and Quality Impact Assessments would be completed on all of the policies reviewed. The Chair of PSCB noted the comment with regard to an independent person conducting the Quality Impact Assessment.*

- The new Director of Children's Services updated the Committee on the actions being taken with regard to the outcome of the recent Ofsted Report. Safeguarding arrangements had been assessed as inadequate. Members were advised that a Sector Led Improvement Model had been brought in to support improvement in Peterborough. The model meant that support would come from and be brokered by other local authorities. Actions that had already been taken by the Sector Led Improvement Model to improve social care were:
 - A new Director of Children's Services had been brought in from another authority.
 - Immediate work had started on 140 case files over the last six months to look at practice and what had happened to the referrals and arrangements within the contact referral and assessment system which Ofsted had focussed on.
 - A person had been commissioned to look at systems, processes and arrangements within the Councils contact referral and assessment area. This had been dealt with as a priority.
 - A person had been commissioned to look at Performance Management arrangements.
 - A review was being undertaken on capacity, capability and practice within Social care.
 - How children's services were being supported and interacted with the corporate and democratic arrangements in the council was also being looked at.

A whole system approach had been taken and not just the services inspected by Ofsted. The first stage had been to produce an action plan which would be completed by the end of October to secure immediate improvement.

- How could the Scrutiny Committee look beyond the figures and get to grips with the quality of the work as highlighted in the Ofsted report. *The Director of Children's Services offered to provide training in Social care practice for members, they would also need to be assured that a robust audit process was in place and that supervision was happening. There would be a range of indicators that would support those actions and could be monitored.*

Members wished it noted that the Committee had continually ask questions regarding safeguarding at previous meetings and had been assured that everything was on target and improving but the Ofsted outcome had shown a different outcome.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends that the Director of Children's Services:

1. Provide the Committee at its November meeting with a detailed report on the outcome of the Ofsted inspection with a detailed action plan. The report should give details of what immediate action has been taken and what short term and long term actions will be taken.
2. Reports on the progress of the action plan to the Committee at each meeting and it will need to be evidence based.
3. Ensure that officers responsible for areas of action must attend any scrutiny meetings to give evidence of actions being taken.

The Committee recommends that:

1. Two members of the Committee are assigned to work with officers on a reporting format for the action plan that is both clear, evidence based and detailed.
2. The Chair of the Committee and one other member of the Committee will meet with the Director and relevant officers over the coming year on a regular monthly basis outside of the formal scrutiny meetings to monitor progress of the action plan.

10. Forward Plan of key Decisions

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan and requested further information on Peterborough's Transport Partnership Policy for pupils aged 4-16 years.

11. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2010/11 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2010/11 and the Scrutiny Officer to include any additional items as requested during the meeting.

12. Date of the Next Meeting

14 November 2011

The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 9.31pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank