

# Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee

## Agenda

Monday 21 September 2015

7.00 pm

COMMITTEE ROOM 1 - HAMMERSMITH TOWN HALL

### MEMBERSHIP

Administration:	Opposition
Councillor Caroline Needham (Chair) Councillor Alan De'Ath Councillor Elaine Chumney	Councillor Caroline Ffiske (Vice-Chair) Councillor Donald Johnson
Co-optees	
Eleanor Allen, London Diocesan Board for Schools Dennis Charman, Teacher Representative Nandini Ganesh, Parentsactive Representative Philippa O'Driscoll, Westminster Diocesan Education Service Representative Nadia Taylor, Parent Governor Representative Vacancy, Parent Governor Representative	

**CONTACT OFFICER:** David Abbott  
Committee Co-ordinator  
Governance and Scrutiny  
Tel 020 8753 2063  
E-mail: david.abbott@lbhf.gov.uk

Reports on the open agenda are available on the [Council's website:](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council_and_Democracy)  
[www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council\\_and\\_Democracy](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council_and_Democracy)

Members of the public are welcome to attend. A loop system for hearing impairment is provided, along with disabled access to the building.

Date Issued: 11 September 2015

# Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee Agenda

21 September 2015

<u>Item</u>		<u>Pages</u>
<b>1. MINUTES</b>		1 - 8
	To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2015.	
<b>2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>		
<b>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>		
	<p>If a Councillor has a disclosable pecuniary interest in a particular item, whether or not it is entered in the Authority's register of interests, or any other significant interest which they consider should be declared in the public interest, they should declare the existence and, unless it is a sensitive interest as defined in the Member Code of Conduct, the nature of the interest at the commencement of the consideration of that item or as soon as it becomes apparent.</p> <p>At meetings where members of the public are allowed to be in attendance and speak, any Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest or other significant interest may also make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter. The Councillor must then withdraw immediately from the meeting before the matter is discussed and any vote taken.</p> <p>Where Members of the public are not allowed to be in attendance and speak, then the Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest should withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is under consideration. Councillors who have declared other significant interests should also withdraw from the meeting if they consider their continued participation in the matter would not be reasonable in the circumstances and may give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Councillors are not obliged to withdraw from the meeting where a dispensation to that effect has been obtained from the Audit, Pensions and Standards Committee.</p>	
<b>4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</b>		
	<p>To invite questions from members of the public present.</p> <p>Members of the public with more complex issues are invited to submit their questions in advance in order to allow a more substantive answer to be given. Questions can be sent to the contact officer shown on the front page of the agenda.</p>	

<b>5.</b>	<b>DIRECTOR'S UPDATE</b>	9 - 15
<b>6.</b>	<b>CABINET MEMBERS UPDATE</b>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>CHILDCARE TASK GROUP - 8-6 EXTENDED NURSERIES PILOT</b>	16 - 33
	<p>This report covers lessons learned from the Department for Education 8-6 Extended Nurseries Pilot in London that tested whether an extended, more flexible early education offer could be delivered in school nurseries, providing additional local placements for two, three and four year olds between 8am and 6pm.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>THE WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS</b>	34 - 39
	<p>This report provides an overview of issues facing teachers in the borough which reflect national trends and concerns in relation to their workloads and the impact they have on recruitment and retention.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>SUPPORTING CARE LEAVERS – THE INDEPENDENT VISITORS SCHEME</b>	40 - 47
	<p>This report describes the role of the Independent Visitor's Scheme and other support services aimed at supporting the transition of Care Leavers to independence.</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>WORK PROGRAMME</b>	48 - 50
	<p>(1) The Committee is asked to give consideration to its work programme for the current municipal year.</p> <p>(2) Members of the Committee to feedback on any visits to schools that have been taken in respect of recent Ofsted Inspections.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
	<p>The next meeting is scheduled for 23 November 2015.</p>	



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes

Monday 15 June 2015

### **PRESENT**

**Committee members:** Councillors Caroline Needham (Chair), Alan De'Ath, Elaine Chumnerly, Caroline Ffiske (Vice-Chair), Donald Johnson and Sue Macmillan

**Co-opted members:** Eleanor Allen (London Diocesan Board for Schools), Dennis Charman (Teacher Representative) and Philippa O'Driscoll (Westminster Diocesan Education Service Representative)

**Other Councillors:** Sue Macmillan (Cabinet Member for Children and Education)

**Officers:** Margaret Brown, Steve Comber, Andrew Christie, Daniel Ekechi, Richard Stanley, and David Abbott

### 1. **MINUTES**

#### **Updates**

Page 7, paragraph 1 – **Child poverty and food banks** – A report on foodbanks was going to the 7 July meeting of the Health, Adult Social Care and Social Inclusion Policy and Accountability Committee.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sue Fennimore, Nandini Ganesh (Parentsactive Representative), and Nadia Taylor (Parent Governor Representative).

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **4. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR**

Councillor Donald Johnson, seconded by Philippa O'Driscoll, nominated Councillor Caroline Ffiske and it was unanimously resolved as set out below.

#### **RESOLVED**

That Councillor Caroline Ffiske be appointed Vice Chair of the Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

### **5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were no public questions during this item.

### **6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S UPDATE**

Andrew Christie presented the report that provided an overview of recent developments of relevance to the Committee and took questions from the Committee.

#### **Children Requiring Protection Plans**

A member asked what had caused the significant drop in the number of children requiring protection plans. Andrew Christie responded that the number had previously been exceptionally high (192 cases in February 2015) and was now returning to a more normal rate (147 by May 2015). The issue had been that children were kept on plans even when the risks that had triggered the plan had been mitigated. Practice had since been recalibrated to better reflect the specifics of each case, though H&F still had a relatively high number of protection plans compared with the rest of the country.

#### **Operation Makesafe**

A member asked if the Council was communicating the messages of Operation Makesafe to the voluntary sector and community organisations. Andrew Christie responded that those organisations were not a high priority as they were already integrated into the safeguarding system. Operation Makesafe was a police-led initiative aimed at organisations that were outside the traditional safeguarding arena (e.g. taxi companies, clubs, and bars).

A co-opted member suggested there could be a Makesafe sticker or badge that organisations and businesses could display with a number to call to report any concerns. Officers agreed to feed the suggestion back to the police.

Operation Makesafe had launched across London but H&F would be doing its own local launch of the programme to raise awareness across the borough. The Chair asked for a progress update at the September meeting.

**ACTION: Andrew Christie**

### **Other Developments**

A member asked how many schools in the borough would benefit from the 7000 free tickets provided by KidZania (an educational entertainment provider). Councillor Sue Macmillan responded that all schools would benefit.

### **Transition**

A joint task force had been commissioned between the Children and Education and Health, Adult Social Care and Social Inclusion Policy and Accountability Committees to consider the transition arrangements between Children's Services and Adult Social Care in more depth.

## **7. CABINET MEMBERS UPDATE**

Councillor Sue Macmillan, Cabinet Member for Children and Education, provided an overview of recent developments of relevance to the Committee and took questions from the Committee.

Since the previous meeting of the Committee, Councillor Macmillan had undertaken a number of visits to schools, family services, and social care. She had also attended the foster carer's lunch event to thank carers for their hard work and gave out long service awards to the longest serving carers in the borough.

### **SEN Passenger Transport**

Following the consideration of the issue at the Children and Education Policy and Accountability meeting on 8 July, a working party had been set up to resolve a number of troubling problems with the service. A revised vision for the service was to be presented to Cabinet, refocussing the service as the 'Travel Care and Support Service'. The new vision for the service included; putting travel care officers on site to ensure quality, varying the inter-authority relationship to give more control back to H&F, giving schools and parents more involvement in commissioning, and a more robust contract management framework.

The Chair requested that a review of the new service was added to the work programme for 23 November 2015 to ensure it was delivering against its metrics.

## **8. SUPPORT TO MULTI-LINGUAL FAMILIES**

Richard Stanley, Margret Brown, and Steve Comber presented the report that outlined the experience of being a multi-lingual child in the borough and made

recommendations about how the Council could support those young people more effectively.

Officers reported that there were over 100 languages spoken in H&F schools and 46% of children identified as being bilingual or having English as an additional language (EAL). While being bilingual had a number of educational advantages, some young people had to act as interpreters for their parents which could cause embarrassment, misunderstanding when talking about adult topics, and safeguarding issues.

Secondary schools will enter their pupils for community language examinations at GCSE level but community languages are rarely taught within the school timetable, instead young people rely on the support of parents and supplementary schools. Supplementary schools are supported by SOBUS, a Community Development Agency independent from LBHF.

A member noted that a number of parents had a negative attitude to EAL students, believing they used an unfair proportion of teaching resources and held back other students. How could the Council help to change those attitudes? Officers responded that any support given to bilingual students should be valuable and enriching for all students. Schools with large numbers of EAL learners were among the highest performing. Schools needed to continue to raise awareness of the benefits with parents.

A co-opted member noted that the EAL provision pilot at Fulham Enterprise Studio was an excellent idea but noted that finding and retaining staff to teach community languages was difficult due to the fluctuating need. Could provision be shared amongst a number of providers to mitigate this issue? Officers responded that there was potential to work with other partners to develop broader provision.

A co-opted member who volunteered to teach English to immigrants in the borough highlighted the following issues; it was difficult to impose a course structure because regular attendance was rare, at the first stage there was a total lack of confidence due to ability and familiarity, and sometimes there were modesty issues, e.g. fathers had to bring women into the class.

Michelle Akintoye, Founder of Britafrique (a voluntary organisation committed to mentoring young people through education, training and employment) addressed the Committee and noted that she found it difficult to get schools to 'open their doors' to voluntary groups. Schools needed to remove barriers to the community. Radicalisation of young people was also a major concern and there needed to be more support available to combat it.

A member asked if the continued underperformance of working-class white boys was being monitored. Officers responded that all groups were monitored carefully and the Council identified where performance was lower so officers could work with schools to improve performance. The Council took a 'whole school' approach to raising standards.

A co-opted member noted that there was relatively little research on why working-class white boys underperformed in comparison with their peers, though the group did perform better in London than in many other parts of the Country so it was not necessarily an issue of resources. It was requested that the issue be added to the work programme.

**ACTION: David Abbott**

The Chair asked what the Council could be doing to improve and enhance its relationship with supplementary schools. Officers responded that more needed to be done to cultivate relationships between mainstream schools and supplementary schools and suggested that the Committee looked at how best to do this.

The Chair noted that this was an area that the Committee needed to keep looking at and requested that the Council took a more proactive approach to encourage parents to acquire English language skills and highlight available language classes. The Chair also requested information from officers about what active encouragement was happening in schools in the borough.

**ACTION: Richard Stanley**

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee would investigate how the Council could improve and enhance its relationship with supplementary schools.
2. That the Committee would investigate how the Council could foster better links between mainstream schools and supplementary schools.
3. That the Committee encouraged the Council to take a more proactive approach to encouraging parents to acquire English language skills and signpost to available classes.

### **9. SUPPORT FOR YOUNG CARERS**

Daniel Ekechi presented the report that provided a summary of the work that took place to support young carers in the borough. A specialist provider, Spurgeons, was commissioned to identify young carers and address barriers to learning and achievement which resulted from their caring role.

Officers reported that there had been some issues with the contract, including; churn of staff at the provider, insufficient maternity cover to manage a complex contract, and legacy issues with the cohort of carers. However, officers had challenged recent performance and were beginning to see consistent improvements in the service.

A member asked why other boroughs provided monetary rewards for carers but H&F did not. Officers responded that they were not aware of this but would follow up with colleagues in those boroughs.

A co-opted member asked how carers could be 'hidden' with all of the monitoring that was done by schools and social services. Officers responded that Children's Services would only carry out an assessment if a child was



identified in a caring role. Andrew Christie noted that more needed to be done to make people in the system (e.g. teachers, GPs, and Council officers in other departments) more aware of young carers.

A member asked whether some young people would not identify themselves as a carer because of cultural expectations. Officers responded that family culture often dictated whether someone identified themselves as a carer and noted that there was a stigma around social services that they did not want to associate themselves with.

A member asked what impact being a young carer had on a young person's education. Officers responded that it varied from case to case, for example if a parent had low level mental health issues a child might not get learning support at home or time to complete homework. Officers agreed to circulate a selection of case studies outside of the meeting to give a sense of the experiences of young carers and the impact on their lives.

**ACTION: Daniel Ekechi**

The Chair asked if Spurgeons had a social media strategy, as a way to reach out to more young people. Officers responded that they would provide the Committee with that information outside of the meeting.

The Chair requested that Spurgeons provided a presentation on young carers to the Youth Council.

**ACTION: Daniel Ekechi / Spurgeons**

Officers reported that the contract would be re-commissioned in April 2016. The Chair requested that the Committee had an input into the re-commissioning options report at an appropriate time.

The Chair requested an update, in the Executive Director's Update item, on progress at the next meeting of the Committee.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive updates on the performance of the service.
2. That the Committee have an input into the re-commissioning options report in 2016.

## **10. WORK PROGRAMME**

### **Radicalisation**

A member suggested that the issue of radicalisation should be looked at with input from the police to understand the reality of the situation in the borough.

Andrew Christie noted that there was a highly organised prevention programme in operation within the borough and across London. The Council worked very closely with the police and a variety of provision had been put in place with funding from the Home Office. Officers could bring a report to the

committee covering the aforementioned provision, though there was only evidence of a few isolated events.

### **School Holiday Childcare Provision**

A member suggested that school holiday childcare provision from 9am to 5pm should be considered encompassing; what provision was available for working parents, what the costs were to parents, and what the level of demand was.

### **Recruitment and Agency Staff**

The Chair requested that the Committee considered an item on staffing issues and the use of agency workers. Officers had previously reported that recruitment was a concern in both schools and Children's Services. Agency staff were being used to fill recruitment gaps but had lower retention and cost more than salaried workers.

### **Workload of Teachers**

The Chair requested that schools (both teachers, Headteachers, and Governors) were invited to the next meeting of the Committee to share their experiences under the workload of teachers item.

**ACTION: DA to contact Dave Rogers / Schools**

### **Complaints**

A member suggested an item be considered on how complaints about the Councils services, with a focus on Children's Services, were dealt with. Councillors noted a number of negative comments from residents about the current process.

In addition to the items noted above the Chair requested that the following items be added to the work programme:

- Permanency planning
- SEN School transport

### **School Visits – Sullivan Primary School**

Following the recent Ofsted inspection of the school, Members of the Committee visited the school and spoke with the Headteacher about any issues raised in the Ofsted report.

The Chair presented the report and the following points were noted:

- The school had created a nurturing environment in which every child was assisted to achieve their potential.
- A strength of the school had been its resilience to the threat of closure and its renaissance as a school with a clear vision for the future including expanding their nursery provision to meet local demand.
- The school had engaged and supportive governors who had extensive knowledge of primary education and educational standards and monitoring.
- The point at which the school was inspected precluded the inclusion of a substantial part of the school year for which data had not then been

processed. A few weeks later the data would have shown excellent progress across more of the school year.

- An internal review had rated Sullivan Primary School outstanding and their strong commitment to sustained improvement (and recognition by the Secretary of State) led some to expect better than a 'good' rating by Ofsted. The Senior Management team recognised the high level of anxiety around an Ofsted visit may have led to some teachers not displaying their usual outstanding skills in leading their class to high achieving results.


## 11. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for 21 September 2015.

Meeting started: 7.03 pm  
Meeting ended: 9.02 pm

Chair .....

Contact officer: David Abbott  
Committee Co-ordinator  
Governance and Scrutiny  
Tel 020 8753 2063  
E-mail: david.abbott@lbhf.gov.uk

	<p align="center"><b>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</b></p> <p align="center"><b>CHILDREN AND EDUCATION POLICY &amp; ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE</b></p> <p align="center"><b>21 September 2015</b></p>
<p><b>DIRECTOR'S UPDATE</b></p>	
<p><b>Report of the Director for Children's Services</b></p>	
<p><b>Open Report</b></p>	
<p><b>Classification - For Information</b> <b>Key Decision: No</b></p>	
<p><b>Wards Affected: All</b></p>	
<p><b>Accountable Director: Andrew Christie, Director for Children's Services</b></p>	
<p><b>Report Author:</b> Andrew Christie, Director for Children's Services</p>	<p><b>Contact Details:</b> Tel: 020 8753 3601 <a href="mailto:andrew.christie@lbhf.gov.uk">andrew.christie@lbhf.gov.uk</a></p>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report provides a brief overview of recent developments of relevance to the Children's Services department for members of the Policy and Accountability Committee to consider.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The Committee is asked to review and comment upon the contents of this report.

## 3. EDUCATION

### 3.1. SCHOOL INSPECTIONS

Since the last CEPAC meeting, three schools in the borough have had reports published by Ofsted following inspections. Cambridge School was judged to be Good in June following an inspection in May 2015. At its previous inspection it had been graded as "requires improvement". Westside Alternative Provision Free School was also graded as Good in June 2015. West London Primary Free School was judged to be Outstanding in June 2015. This was the first time the school had been inspected by Ofsted.

### 3.2. PROVISIONAL EXAMINATION RESULTS 2015

Below are the provisional headlines from this year's school tests and examinations. A further more detailed school performance report will be presented to a future CEPAC, and will include updates on the data and information on the current Local Authority school improvement service priorities and actions. Individual primary school results will be available to the committee when the performance tables are published by the Department for Education (DfE) in December 2015. Provisional individual secondary school results will also be made available by the Department later this term (before 31<sup>st</sup> October) and this will be followed in January 2016 with the publication of the validated secondary performance tables.

#### **Primary**

##### **Early Years profile (Reception year)**

The percentage of the Reception cohort with a 'good level of development' was provisionally 68% in Hammersmith and Fulham, compared with 66% nationally (provisional). This was an eight percentage point increase from 2014, compared with a six percentage point national increase.

##### **Key Stage 1 (Year two – 7 year olds)**

Compared with 2014, there has been an increase in the percentage of pupils achieving a Level 2 and above (the expected level for the age) in writing (87% to 89%) and mathematics (92% to 93%). The percentage of pupils achieving a Level 2 and above for reading remained the same (91%). Performance was above the 2015 provisional national average at Level 2 and above, by one percentage point in writing, and the same as national performance in reading and in mathematics.

##### **Key Stage 2 (Year six – 11 year olds)**

The provisional percentage of Hammersmith and Fulham primary school pupils who achieved a Level 4 and above (the expected level for the age) in reading, writing and mathematics is currently in line with the 84% achieved last year, subject to final checks and validation. This is above the national percentage of 80%.

#### **Secondary**

##### **Key Stage 4 (GCSEs)**

Following the publication of GCSE results on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2015, results submitted by schools to the Local Authority indicate a provisional figure of 62% per cent of students achieving 5 or more GCSEs at Grades A\*-C including English and mathematics. This is considerably above the national average for 2014 (53%) but is two percentage points down on the 2014 figure for Hammersmith and Fulham. It is too early to provide a full analysis of the reasons for the dip, however there is some evidence of schools being affected by the continued volatility in outcomes following the changes to the examination formats, including

changes to examination board marking in mathematics and other subject areas. This is having a London wide and national impact on overall results. Last year the national average fell six percentage points.

### **Key Stage 5 (A levels)**

For A Levels, the percentage of papers awarded a Grade A\* was provisionally 9% in 2015, which was above the 2015 national average (8%); the percentage awarded A\*-A was 25% slightly below national (26%) as was the percentage awarded A\*-C grades (73% compared with a national figure of 77%). The overall percentage achieving a grade A\*-E was 98% and in line with the national average.

### **3.3. NEW SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION PROVISION**

The borough's educational offer has expanded at the start of the new school year with the opening of a new primary school and the expansion of a special school. Burlington Danes Primary Academy opened for reception age pupils in September, a two form entry school funded by the DfE's free school programme in a new building. This is due to be completed by March 2016 with a plan for the children to move into school before the end of the current school year. The school serves an area of increasing demand, especially in view of the major regeneration plans for the north of the borough. Until the new building is ready, the primary school will operate from the adjacent Ark Burlington Danes Academy. A 30 place nursery will also open in September 2016.

Queensmill School has also commenced a pilot through which 5 places are being offered to young people aged 19 who are on the autistic spectrum. This development is expected to improve the local offer of provision for young adults with special educational needs in line with the requirements of the Children and Families Act.

### **3.4. CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ACT IMPLEMENTATION**

The introduction of the Children and Families Act in September 2014 necessitated the implementation of a remodelling of the Special Educational Needs Service. This has included the recruitment of a new shared management team and the development of new frontline 'key worker' roles to deliver the specific requirements of the new legislation.

Similarly, 'statements' Special Educational Need have been replaced by Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans. During the last academic year there were 136 requests for assessment for an EHC Plan for Hammersmith & Fulham children and young people. Of these requests we have agreed to assess 79 young people and, of these, 76 plans have been issued or are due to be issued.

Following liaison with service users and key partners regarding their experience of services provided during the first year of delivery of the new legislation, we have identified the following priorities to :

- To enhance customer experience by significantly improving communications and levels of statutory compliance;
- Improved joint working between Education, Family Services and Adult Social Care to improve the transition arrangements for young people from the age of 14;
- Improving the local offer for young people aged 16-25 who are now eligible for a statutory plan;

#### **4. CHILDREN'S CENTRE INSPECTIONS**

Melcombe Children's Centre was inspected in the last school term and judged to be "good". Ofsted's report of 16 June 2015 commented on the high levels of registration, particularly from children from priority groups and those expecting children, the Children's Centre's role in helping children to be ready for school, the balance between targeted and universal services, the promotion of inclusion, and highly effective leadership, governance and management.

#### **5. SAFEGUARDING**

- 5.1. The service now has two embedded domestic abuse workers from Advance (the specialist organisation which supports women who have experienced domestic violence) and a further post working with perpetrators of domestic abuse will be in place by October. These additional resources will strengthen our response to domestic violence and abuse which are significant issues in over half of the statutory social work cases.
- 5.2. The previous Director's Update for CEPAC referred to the initial impact of service changes designed to reduce the number of children with child protection plans following recent increases. 145 children currently have child protection plans; a reduction from a peak of over 200 in 2014. This does not reflect a decrease in child protection concerns as referral rates are higher, however we are working differently with families, for example by using the "Strengthening Families" model which leads to better family engagement, greater clarity about what the concerns are and what families need to do, with our support. The Focus on Practice programme is also beginning to impact upon our interventions with families.

#### **6. CORPORATE PARENTING**

This year's examination and test results have been very positive for the borough's looked after children. Their GCSE results have improved year on year. In 2014/15, 37% of eligible pupils achieved over 5 GCSEs at grade A\*-C including English and Mathematics; 75% achieved over 5 GCSEs at grade A\*-C GCSEs. There have also been improvements in the proportions of pupils achieving a Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Maths at the end of Key Stage 2 in their final year at primary school.

Attendance rates have been maintained over the past 2 years with 90% average attendance rates for statutory school age children. There have been no permanent exclusions of our looked after children for the past 5 years. Fixed

term exclusion rates have dropped from 19% in 2013/14 to 12% in 2014/15. The numbers of care leavers who go to university have increased from 21 (13%) in 2014/15 to 24 (14%) in 2015/16. The ongoing improvements reflect a range of actions by the Virtual School team including ensuring high quality Personal Education Plans are in place for the children.

- 6.1. One of the borough's care leavers has recently returned from a 10 week expedition with Operation Raleigh International. Following a rigorous selection process including a three night residential, she spent 10 weeks in Costa Rica and Nicaragua working alongside local communities improving their access to water. The expedition also included a trek, carrying kit for 19 days through the jungle. The borough's Virtual School is working with Raleigh with the aim of securing similar opportunities for our care leavers next summer.
- 6.2. Over recent months there has been a significant pressure on services in the south east of England (and Kent in particular) resulting from increasing numbers of unaccompanied asylum seeking young people. As a result (and as a temporary measure rather than a longer term solution) it has been agreed that all London local authorities should be asked to accommodate one additional unaccompanied asylum seeking child each. Hammersmith and Fulham is now caring for a 17 year old young person through this arrangement.

## **7. COMMISSIONING**

### **7.1. SUMMER ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

A comprehensive range of activities in the Borough, were made available to children and young people over the school summer holiday through this year's "Summer in the City" programme. This included activities and programmes for disabled children, young carers, families. Anecdotal feedback from providers suggests that the programme was well publicised with good levels of participation from local children and young people in what was on offer. We will also be consulting with the Borough Youth Council for their views on what was provided and how it might be improved in future years.

### **7.2. TRAVEL CARE AND SUPPORT**

Work has been progressing to implement the revised vision for the Travel Care and Support service which aims to deliver a high quality service with a stronger emphasis on caring for those who use the service. Meetings have taken place with all providers of Travel Care and Support services to share the revised vision and expectations for the service and to discuss and plan as to how this will be achieved. The key changes and developments are:

- Recruitment of a Commissioning Manager who is based on site with providers to improve service delivery with a particular focus on staff training and development and communications with service users, schools and other stakeholders
- An enhanced performance management framework with key indicators. Work is now progressing with providers to set up processes and systems to gather the required information



- Letters from Councillor Macmillan were sent to all parents and carers of children and young people using home to school transport to inform them of the changes planned for the service. Four meetings also took place with parents and carers in June and July 2015 to discuss the changes and give parents and carers an opportunity to comment and provide their views
- The service development and improvement plan for the Transport Commissioning Team (TCT) is now fully in place
- Work is underway to negotiate contractual arrangements and changes where required, in order ensure full sovereign accountability and control
- Procurement of a new ICT system for the TCT with additional solutions to improve communication with service users and stakeholders. Phase 1 of this improvement is currently being implemented as a text messaging pilot with this service due to be available to all service users and their parents and carers by October 2015.
- The development of a strategy and service model for independent travel training

Officers have continued to support the work of the Travel Care and Support Working Party with a focus on service design, commissioning arrangements, performance monitoring and ongoing development.

Work has also taken place over the school summer holidays to ensure that details of all new starters and leavers who require transport to school were confirmed and shared to enable careful planning of arrangements at the start of the Autumn term. There has been a particular focus on: ensuring the vehicles used are fit for purpose; relevant training including refresher training for existing staff has taken place; up to date compliance with Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks; the meeting and greeting for children using the service for the first time and verification of route timing.

The Transport Commissioning Team has identified children with high levels of needs and arranged meetings with parents and occupational therapists to develop individual travel plans where required. Schools have been advised of the children travelling to their schools, including route numbers, drivers and escort details. A text messaging system to improve communication with families is being piloted for the first three weeks of September for 56 children who travel to Wood Lane and Cambridge schools. The Transport Commissioning Team resource has been enhanced for the first few weeks of the new school year to ensure speedy responses can be made to any enquiries or concerns which might emerge.

A total of 206 children are receiving home to school transport from the start of the new school year.

### 7.3. **SCHOOL MEALS**

The recommissioning of the school meals service contracts for Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster is moving into the final stage of procurement via three competitive call-off processes from the Framework. These will be conducted sequentially for each of the three authorities resulting in


sovereign contracts. The call-off, mobilisation and contract start are planned in a phased approach across each borough to ensure that service transition is a smooth process. Following consultation with the Schools Forums and School Heads groups, the first borough to call-off from the Framework Agreement will be Kensington and Chelsea, followed by Westminster and then Hammersmith & Fulham. Hammersmith & Fulham's call-off start date is scheduled for 11 January 2016 with the contract due to start in June 2016. There will be a standalone call-off process for each borough to ensure that the provider that is appointed best meets local needs and requirements. The three boroughs may appoint the same or different contractors.

Robust planning for the contract mobilisation phase is underway, overseen by a dedicated School Meals Contract Team who will also have responsibility for the contract management of the contracts once they commence. The team have a track record of working closely with schools and suppliers to ensure that there is quality provision in place and they have successfully managed previous school meal contract mobilisations.

#### **7.4. OTHER UPDATES – LONDON YOUTH GAMES**

Children and young people from the borough took part in 24 events in this year's London Youth Games over an 8 month period. There were participants from all of the borough's mainstream secondary schools including private schools in either trials or competition. Young people attending out of borough schools, and those involved in local sports clubs also took part. There were top ten finishes for our senior tennis team, female cricket, Paragames girls football, girls table tennis, girls cross country, hockey and swimming teams and male table tennis and football teams. Overall the borough finished in 29<sup>th</sup> position equalling the overall result from 2014.

# Agenda Item 7

	<b>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</b>	
	<b>CHILDREN AND EDUCATION POLICY &amp; ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE</b>	
<b>21 September 2015</b>		
<b>CHILDCARE TASK GROUP – OUTCOMES FROM THE DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION 8-6 EXTENDED NURSERY PILOT IN LONDON</b>		
<b>Report of the Chair of the Childcare Task Group, Councillor Elaine Chumney</b>		
<b>Open Report</b>		
<b>Classification - For Information</b> <b>Key Decision: No</b>		
<b>Wards Affected: All</b>		
<b>Accountable Executive Director:</b> Andrew Christie, Executive Director of Children's Services		
<b>Report Author:</b> Mike Potter, Head of Commissioning, Steve Comber, Policy Officer (Covering report)		<b>Contact Details:</b> Tel: 020 8753 2188 <a href="mailto:steve.comber@lbhf.gov.uk">steve.comber@lbhf.gov.uk</a>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The interim report of the Childcare Task Group (discussed at the CEPAC Meeting on 20 April 2015) identified several key areas for the task group to investigate in detail, reporting to CEPAC on each of these throughout the next municipal year. This report concerns the second of these key areas – the learning from the Department for Education 8-6 Extended Nurseries Pilot in London.
- 1.2. The pilot tested whether an extended, more flexible early education offer could be delivered in school nurseries, providing additional local placements for two, three and four year olds between the hours of 8:00 and 18:00.
- 1.3. A key principle of the pilot was that children should be able to access places that are available between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00, Monday to Friday and deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). A second key test was to ensure that the models developed were financially sustainable and did not impose a further burden on schools' budgets.

- 1.4. In some cases, financial modelling exercises undertaken as part of the pilot actually indicated that schools had the infrastructure, capacity and resource not only to provide a sustainable model, but also to supplement their budget with additional income from an 8-6 Nursery Offer. Many schools did not realise that this was the case prior to the financial modelling and therefore it is considered that more local schools should be encouraged to use the toolkit that the pilot has developed to undertake this modelling exercise and establish whether a viable provision could be delivered from their premises.
- 1.5. In Hammersmith and Fulham, Kenmont Primary School, Wendell Park Primary and Vanessa Nursery took part in the pilot, while in our neighbouring borough, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Colville Primary School also took part.
- 1.6. A full summary of the findings of the pilot and the experiences in each of these schools is attached to this report at Appendix 1 for the committee's consideration and comment.

## **2. CONTEXT**

### **National**

- 2.1. There is a strong relationship between employment and childcare. Childcare take-up is highest for working families and lowest in non-working families, while a high quality offer of flexible and affordable childcare is a key driver in enabling workless families to return to education, training and the workplace.
- 2.2. Providing nursery age childcare in the school provides benefits to the child (continuity and consistency of provision with potential for managed progression into reception classes), the parents (simplified childcare arrangements for families with both younger and older children, and a more affordable, flexible offer) and the school (stronger links with families in their catchment area through a potentially profitable venture).
- 2.3. In September 2011, the government relaxed the process that maintained schools had to go through when changing their school day. All schools now have the freedom to change their opening and closing times as they see fit.
- 2.4. It also brought forward legislation so that maintained schools in England will no longer have to consult when offering out-of-school-hours facilities, and will not have to follow advice about the provision of out-of-hours facilities from the Secretary of State or local authorities.
- 2.5. In the Government Report, 'More Affordable Childcare (2013)', the Government set out its vision for an increase in operating hours for schools to support childcare and early education:

*“Schools are central to their local community, trusted by parents. The government would like to see primary school sites open for more hours in the day, from 8-6 if possible, and for more weeks in the year, offering a blend of education, childcare and extra-curricular activities. But this should not be driven by a centrally prescribed approach. We trust headteachers with the education of our children during the school day, and we should trust them to make sensible decisions about how best to offer before and after school care. To be effective, headteachers need to make decisions that are right for their school, children and parents. Our focus is on removing unhelpful bureaucratic barriers.”*

- 2.6. There is also new government legislation that enables registered childcare providers to register more than one set of suitable premises in a single process, and to notify Ofsted of any new premises without completing a further registration process.
- 2.7. Furthermore, the key link between childcare and employment is reflected in the Government’s recent pledge to increase the free entitlement to early education for 3 and 4-year-olds from 15 hours to 30 hours per week for 38 weeks of the year for working parents. The exact plans for implementing the pledge are still to be confirmed; however, the Government has recently announced that it will be bringing forward the implementation by a year – with some families due to benefit from the new entitlement via a pilot that will start from September 2016.
- 2.8. All of these measures enable schools to more easily offer childcare and early education before and after the standard school day. However, with pressure on school budgets, any offer must be delivered within existing school funds and must therefore be based on a viable business model.

### **Local**

- 2.9. The importance of improving the offer of childcare, supporting parents in work and back into work and increasing the wrap-around offer of support by schools was reflected the Administration’s manifesto commitments to “work with the government, employers, schools and the third sector to deliver better, more affordable childcare” and to “encourage all schools to develop strong links and share resources with the local community”. Both of these commitments would be well supported if the work of the pilot was to be extended to additional schools.
- 2.10. Furthermore, the manifesto contained a commitment to “review the cuts to Sure Start with the aim of re-establishing an effective Sure Start service”. The pilot has demonstrated how a nursery and Children’s Centre can work in tandem to provide a viable extended childcare offer for children whose parents have a low income, which is linked to the additional support for vulnerable families that a Children’s Centre can offer. This may be a model that could be replicated elsewhere in the borough.

### **3. NEXT STEPS**

- 3.1. The Committee is asked to review and comment upon the attached report on the Extended Nurseries Pilot in London (Appendix 1). These comments will inform any wider implementation across the borough during the 2015/16 academic year.
- 3.2. Considering the initial findings from the pilot, as outlined in Appendix 1, it is proposed that the local authority encourage schools to:
  - Undertake a demand survey with parents to establish the extent of demand for an offer of 08:00-18:00 childcare and parental views on their needs for a flexible offer and how much they were willing to pay per hour
  - Do research to identify competitors, their offer and typical fee rates in the local market
- 3.3. If, following this initial survey, there is sufficient demand to drive the development of the provision, officers will support schools to use the toolkit produced by the pilot to undertake the following:
  - The development of a full cost financial model that encompasses appropriate transferable costs from other parts of the school budget
  - The establishment of a staffing model
  - The completion of a detailed business plan; including an action plan for each section to ensure that senior managers in the school were aware of:
    - lead & partners to be engaged
    - allotted tasks
    - resources allocated
    - milestones and timescales
    - monitoring and progress update arrangements
    - links to other plans.
- 3.4. In order to implement these recommendations successfully, there is a need to positively engage with headteachers and governing bodies to promote the benefits of providing 8:00-18:00 childcare provision. Officers will meet with the Heads Executive, and Heads Forum in the Autumn Term to outline the vision for the implementation and the support that is available from the local authority.

### **4. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1. As this report is intended to inform initial discussions of the members of CEPAC, there are no immediate equality implications. However any equality issues will be highlighted in any subsequent substantive reports on any of the items which are requested by the Committee.

**5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1. As this report is intended to inform initial discussions of the members of CEPAC, there are no immediate legal implications. However any legal issues will be highlighted in any subsequent substantive reports on any of the items which are requested by the Committee.

**6. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1. As this report is intended to inform initial discussions of the members of CEPAC, there are no immediate financial and resource implications. However any financial and resource issues will be highlighted in any subsequent substantive reports on any of the items which are requested by the Committee.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**

None.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **The Department for Education London 8-6 Extended Nurseries Pilot:**

A report for the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

---

#### **1. Overview of the 8-6 Extended Nurseries Pilot**

The Department for Education (DfE) pilot tested an extended, more flexible early education offer in school nurseries, including for two, three and four year olds entitled to the universal and targeted free offer. The pilot ran from November/December 2014 until 31 March 2015.

A key principle was that children should be able to access places which are available between the hours of 8am and 6pm, Monday to Friday and that deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS).

Furthermore, the pilots explored options for parents to purchase additional hours over and above the 15 hours free entitlement<sup>1</sup> and for their children to be able to access the entitlement over different times, e.g. two whole days for 7.5 hours each day or three days for 5 hours rather than the traditional three hour sessions five days per week over 38 weeks per annum. It should be noted that the primary focus of the project was to extend the time during which parents could select early years provision in schools, rather than having children spend all of these hours in early years provision.

A key test was to ensure that the models developed were financially sustainable and did not impose a further burden on schools' budgets.

The pilot was solely London based and there were 20 participating schools from the following boroughs:

- Bromley
- Hammersmith and Fulham
- Haringey
- Havering
- Lambeth
- Lewisham
- Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

---

<sup>1</sup> In the case of some participating boroughs, the free entitlement was a 25 hours+ offer, with the additional hours being funded by the local authority



- Wandsworth

Infants, primary and nursery schools attached to children's centres participated in the pilot. There were different governance arrangements in place and this ensured that the offer was tested in maintained schools and academies. The group included schools which were:

- Developing a new early years provision offer alongside the pilot
- Realigning their offer and developing sustainability plans against a backdrop of a changed funding relationship with their local authority
- Seeking to adapt traditional wraparound care through breakfast and after-school clubs to deliver an 8-6 early education offer
- Exploring partnerships that could lead to an integrated two, three and four year old offer a children's centre hub
- Exploring, as a group, an innovative option of an early years excellence hub to offer their experience and expertise to the whole early years and childcare sector in their local authority.

Family and Childcare Trust (FCT) were contracted by the DfE to support the schools taking part in the project, and this support involved:

- Development of a business plan for each individual school
- Production of a toolkit and case studies.

The case studies are thematic:

- Embedding an extended early education offer in the school system
- Getting the environment right for younger children
- Engaging with parents
- Business planning for quality, access and cost

Some key points emerging from the pilots:

- The greater awareness of broader demographics in the school's locality, which formed part of the approach taken in the work provides additional information and perspective to decisions around the school's role, function and activities within its catchment area
- A focus on embedding financial sustainability within new areas of activity for the school can also encourage thinking about new opportunities to develop training and job opportunities for staff and parents
- Whilst there can be no guarantee that children in school nurseries will be offered a Reception place at the same school, Heads in the pilot were confident that it would have a positive impact on stated first preferences
- There is no simple or single prescription to achieve financially sustainable extended, flexible provision. Each school takes a different journey depending on their particular circumstances.
- There is no single model for delivery of extended hours: pilots included schools expanding their own direct provision; working with PVI's, Children's Centres and other providers; and working towards a hub of dedicated EYFS provision.

Some key issues for schools to tackle when extending nursery hours:

- Good financial and business planning for sustainability and understanding the full costs of the provision in the context of the whole school budget
- Achieving quality in provision through the deployment of Early Years Educator experience
- Achieving a close working relationship with parents that allows the school to understand and respond to a diversity of family need in the locality and its change over time
- Having an approach that permits employment development opportunities for school staff and parents
- Using a school's unique educational advantages to provide the best opportunities, environment and standards for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage
- Integrating EYFS extended hours within or alongside wraparound care for older children.
- Knowing the market and understanding the school's place in the market
- Balancing quality and cost within the EYFS Statutory Framework:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/335504/EYFS\\_framework\\_fro\\_m\\_1\\_September\\_2014\\_with\\_clarification\\_note.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/335504/EYFS_framework_fro_m_1_September_2014_with_clarification_note.pdf)

---

## 2. Why 8-6 nurseries in schools?

The drivers to establish extended hours nursery provision as part of the school offer come from many directions, reflecting the benefits to the child, their parents/carers, the family and the school of good quality provision matched by a badge of quality and consistency across the full nursery day and the child's pattern of attendance.

There is also a new driver for schools to consider extended and more flexible early years provision through the new Government's commitment to extend the number of funded early education hours available to working parents.

### Benefits to the child

Flexible extended early learning provision in the school can more specifically benefit children through delivering:

- Continuity and consistency of high quality provision throughout the full day and across flexible patterns of use, creating a stable supportive learning environment and reducing the disruptions of patchwork childcare arrangements
- An age specific and, hence, improved out of core hours environment for younger children rather than being accommodated in pre and after school provision that caters for a wider and older age range.

### Benefits to parents

- A flexible extended school offer enables parents to simplify the patchwork of childcare and costs that many face when they are working or studying
- It also streamlines logistics of drop-off and pick-up of children and, hence, removes additional stress and pressure from everyday routines

- Parents tend to trust a school environment and are reassured by the quality and standards of teaching and staff skills usually present
- Evaluation of the early education offer for disadvantaged two-year-olds found a positive impact on parent-child relationships when children attended good quality settings.<sup>2</sup>

### **Benefits to the family**

- Flexible provision that fits family work patterns and is delivered in a trusted environment with streamlined logistics, removes a number of 'everyday' stresses and supports family wellbeing
- A common education setting for younger and older children that enables supportive relationships.

### **Benefits to the school**

- Schools that offer extended nursery provision<sup>3</sup> have reported measurable differences in the attainment and behaviour of the children who attend the nursery, particularly the more vulnerable
- A financially sustainable delivery model, built on knowledge of local family needs, can inform decisions about the school's role, function and activities within its catchment area.

## **3. The legalities**

There are no particular legal hurdles (or duties) on a school operating an 8am—6pm (or even 7am – 7pm) day. The relevant factors to take into account and corresponding legislation are as follows:

- The legal definition of school nurseries is set out in the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.
- Schools (including academies and free schools) may charge for EY (The Education (Charges for Early Years Provision) Regulations 2012).
- Maintained schools that use their community facilities powers can charge for any services they provide (section 27 of the Education Act 2002).
- Schools can now take two year olds without registering with Ofsted (Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Act 2015). Schools with younger children still need to register with Ofsted on the Early Years register.
- The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) framework 2014 is mandatory for all early years providers including maintained schools, non-maintained schools and independent schools.

In respect of the longer day:

- The Education (School Day and School Year Regulations) (England) Regulations 1999 state that a maintained school must meet for at least 380 sessions (190 days) per year, and that the school year starts after the end of July each year.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, R et al. [Early education Pilot for Two year Old Children](#). DCSF Research Report RR134. 2009

<sup>3</sup> From case studies collected by the DfE in 2014

- In 2011, the Government removed the prescriptive process schools had to go through when changing their school day. Every school in England has the flexibility to decide when their school day should start and finish, in the interest of their pupils.
  - The 2015 Deregulation Act amended Section 32 of the Education Act 2002 to give maintained schools to the power to set their own term dates (academies and free schools have been able to do it for a while).
- 

## 4. The current state of provision, demand and related factors

### 4.1 Existing data

There is good data on childcare in schools / schools providing access to before and after school care (see below) but **there is no data** on how many:

- schools are delivering a pure 8-6 flexible offer
- schools offer 8-6 wraparound in partnership with a PVI
- academies and free schools that offer 8-6 wraparound

Anecdotally, maintained nursery schools seem to offer flexible 8-6 provision much more frequently than other schools, perhaps because of their remits and the areas in which they are based.

Childcare data was collected for the first time in the school census 2015 (Does the school have an on-site offer of regular childcare for children aged under four for more than eight hours/day) and was completed on a voluntary basis. Then the collection becomes mandatory for the January 2016 census.

The Childcare provider survey 2014 estimates that just 52% of the 12,800 before school providers (6656) are schools or colleges (p51) and 40% of after school providers are schools.

### 4.2 Capacity

There may be significant school capacity to expand although there are many factors such as demand, ability to pay, space and capital that may impinge on that.

- 16,784 primary schools but **only 7,600 have reception and nursery provision** - only a few hundred of these take 2 year olds (increasing slowly) (Providers survey 2013, p34).
- 58% of parents surveyed said their child's **school offered before-school provision** and two-thirds (66%) said the school offered after-school provision before or after 6pm. (Parents survey 2012-13, p150).
- However, there is less spare school capacity in London [and other urban areas] than in other regions. (Providers survey 2013, p85).
- **Opening times for schools on an upward trend**

	Average length of time per day that settings are open				
	2013	2010	2008	2007	2006
Primary schools with nursery and reception classes	6h16m	5h56m	5h56m	5h25m	5h16m

- There is capacity in the system to open for **more hours of the day**. A school with average opening times that moves to 8am-6pm provision would, in theory, increase its capacity (in terms of hours) by almost 60%, without additional capital expense (DfE information).
- **Schools are already planning to expand provision** - around four in ten nursery schools that do not currently offer funded provision for 2 year olds **plan to start offering** it at some point. (Providers survey 2013, p109).
- **30 hours free offer** – the stated intention of the Government to instate a 30 hour universal free early education offer for three and four year olds was not on the horizon at the time of the pilot but its introduction means that the extended day must be part of future planning discussions.

#### 4.3 Contextual (employment / deprivation factors)

- There is a strong relationship between work and childcare - childcare take-up is highest for working families and lowest in non-working families (Parents survey 2012-13, p45)
- Flexible childcare could make a difference to maternal employment – 57% of lone mothers cited reliable childcare as a reason for going out to work, compared with 48% of partnered mothers (Parents survey 2012-13 p220).
- School-based nursery settings particularly important in deprived areas – 64% of nursery schools and 40% primary schools with nursery and reception classes are in deprived areas (Providers survey 2013, p33)
- School based nurseries overall higher quality than PVI's in deprived areas (Mathers and Smees, 2014).

#### 4.4 Contextual (parental demand)

- Overall, strong demand for school based provision – particularly London (Brind, R et al (2014) Table 6.6f & Table 4.15.)
- Strong parental demand for flexibility – especially in London where % of families working longer hours is high (2012 London Childcare report p20).
- Generally, schools show less flexibility (around six in ten allowing provision to be compressed into three days) compared to other settings (Providers survey 2013, p107).
- Significant numbers of parents want longer opening hours and / or childcare closer to home / work (Parents survey 2012-13, p147).
- Lone parents / parents with SEND children and parents from BMI background (working and non-working) are more likely to have problems finding flexible childcare than couples (Parents survey 2012-13, p143).

---

## 5. The pilot in Hammersmith and Fulham and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Four schools from across Hammersmith and Fulham and Kensington and Chelsea participated in the pilot. They were:

- Kenmont Primary School
- Wendell Park Primary School
- Vanessa Nursery and Cathnor Park Children's Centre
- Colville Primary School

Meetings were held with the schools individually throughout the period of the pilot (December 2014 to March 2015) and the schools were also formed into a cluster group that allowed for an exchange of views and experience on a variety of topics, including:

- Providing a high quality offer throughout the extended hours
- Placing the well-being of children at the heart of the offer
- The benefits of a foundation stage out of core hours<sup>4</sup> provision
- Sharing of expertise across the sector
- Conducting effective demand surveys
- Developing a charging policy and ensuring sustainability

The support provided to the schools individually was largely focussed on business and financial planning. As part of that planning, a number of tools were produced to facilitate the schools' work. The key tools were:

- A business planning template
- A financial modelling workbook
- An outline demand survey
- A guide to conducting a demand survey

These together with a number of other documents make up a toolkit which is currently with the DfE for final approval. Once the final version has been agreed, this will be available for all schools which wish to embark on developing an extended offer. The other documents contained in the toolkit are:

- A guide to setting up a nursery for schools which have not run their own provision previously
- FAQs: Schools and two year olds
- Assessing Parental demand and a marketing strategy

---

<sup>4</sup> The term out of core hours provision was used throughout the pilot to shift thinking away from full-time being the core school day and to embed the concept of the whole day being part of the EYFS rather than additional hours being considered as wraparound

- Parental contract financial elements
  - A draft flier on help with childcare costs
  - The likely features of sustainable provision
  - Early Years Pupil Premium documents
- 

## **6. Experiences of participating schools in Hammersmith and Fulham and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea**

### **6.1 Wendell Park Primary School**

Wendell Park was already aware of strong demand from parents for “wraparound care” through its Breakfast and After School Care provision. Wendell Park children attending the Breakfast club last year totalled up to 52 of which 12 are Nursery age children. There were 56 Wendell Park children on the After School Care register of which 11 were Nursery children.

The Reception and Nursery age children have been accommodated for both Breakfast Club and After school Care in the school’s Family Centre building. This has resources for young children and includes access to an outdoor area, which is designated for Family Centre use only (i.e. the environment fully meets the EYFS requirements). It is within the school grounds but separate from the school building, having controlled access from outside the school premises (for drop-offs and collections after school hours). Facilities include a kitchen so that a snack can be prepared and provided. Activities have, to date, not been planned (except for special occasions), but children are given access to drawing materials, games and other resources as well as using the Outdoor area.

The major issue in respect of delivery of the extended day in this case, was the content of the provision for EYFS children since totally non-planned and non-directed activity would not constitute early education for the purposes of EYFS.

In order to establish demand from parents, two surveys were conducted both by paper and electronic versions. Parents of Key Stage 1 and Early Years children were targeted in addition to prospective parents who have applied to the school for Nursery in September 2015. Also, parents using the Family Centre were surveyed.

#### **The first survey addressed parents’ attitudes to Nursery education and assessed the need for flexibility in hours.**

Whilst most parents (56%) rated the quality of education most highly, flexibility in hours was also highly rated by parents (24% placing it first). Most parents favour the full time places (only 14% considered sending their child to a different Nursery because it does not offer part time places).

However, there is a clear demand for flexible hours with 40% of replies wanting places with more flexibility such as part-time or flexi-time. 60% of replies wanted full time places, even if this meant paying top up fees over the 15 core hours. 26% wanted a mix of full days and part days (again being prepared to pay top up fees). 15% wanted to have part-time places – a small yet still significant number.

50% of the replies indicated they did not want to pay for education beyond the core 15 hours.

**The second survey was directed mainly towards families with an interest (past, present or future) in the extended hours of provision.**

Key to the findings was that relatively few parents (12%) wanted to increase the amount of education their child would receive. 18% wanted their child just to “chill out” whilst 70% wanted a mix of education and relaxation. Even allowing for parents not fully understanding the EYFS principles of learning through play, it suggests that parents want something of a relaxed approach in the earlier/later hours. This could be accommodated within the principles of EYFS.

Most parents (64% not minding and 14% being unsure) did not expect a consistency in staffing between the core hours of the Nursery and the 8-9 am and after school hours. Similarly, they appreciated that the children might be housed in a different setting for these hours – in fact, expressing a preference (65%) for going to a different place for these times.

There was some willingness to pay for more education during these times (38% were willing to pay more, whilst 35% said maybe and 26% were not willing).

As a result of these findings and the support of the pilot, a business plan was developed to implement a fully extended offer for two, three and four year olds from September 2015. The school intended to adapt the content of out of school provision to ensure that it fully meets the requirements of EYFS. The plan also took account of the (then) potential reduction in local authority funded hours of three and four year olds from September 2016. The 30 hour free early education offer, as indicated above, was not known as a policy development at the time of the pilot. The implementation of this business plan is on-going and the LA will liaise with the school on progress.

## **6.2 Kenmont Primary School**

Kenmont is a small primary school on the borders of Hammersmith and Fulham and Brent. It had 240 children on its roll last year. It has a 30 place nursery which is open from 9am-3.20pm (31.40 hours of free early education). The nursery was full in 2014-15.

The school also has a breakfast club from 7.45am-9am for the 3 -11 age group and parents pay £2 a day. It also provides an after school club from 3.30pm-6pm every day, (for the same age group) with a fee of £9 a day. The breakfast club experiences a very high demand. Both the out of core hours provisions are sustainable in their own right, with the after school provision having become a profitable venture.

The business planning undertaken was set in overall context of school planning for sustainability of the nursery provision. In general, the view of parents from demand survey was that the full core day offer plus out of core hours provision, as already established, met their requirements. The offer provides 8-6 wraparound through a breakfast club and after school club with low level charges.



Consideration was being given by the Head and Governors to changing current provision to create a separate out of core hours provision being offered for nursery and reception children, apart from the rest of the school population, in order to ensure age appropriate activities in line with EYFS. This is dependent on demand and sustainability within current school space and options for increasing space (and adding two year olds provision).

While the pilot programme helped the school to undertake the required business modelling and arrive at a reasoned conclusion, it was unfortunately proven that, as a small primary school, the extended offer which would involve a separate physical arrangement for the EYFS age group and deliver the EYFS framework, was not feasible in the current school space.

### **6.3 Vanessa Nursery and Cathnor Park Children's Centre**

The provision is a maintained standalone nursery with a children's centre and pre-school provision for two year olds. The current opening hours are 08.45-15.45 for the two year olds and 09:00-15.15 for nursery.

The three and four year olds access 31.15 hours of free early education and the entitled two year olds receive 16.5 hours free.

The nursery has 45 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) places and there is some flexibility about the offer. There are 16 FTE places for two year olds. Last year the provision was full with a waiting list.

Business planning for the purposes of the pilot explored the options for expansion and extension of the pre-school provision. The current space is small since the building houses both Children's Centre services and the pre-school. When the space was originally measured for registration, there was a capacity for 18 children but it was decided to offer 16 places for the purposes of the ratio of staff to children (1:4).

The Children's Centre has a large outdoor space and consideration is being given to a small extension which has been measured up and for which there are architect's drawings. This could accommodate four more two year olds at a time, thereby creating a space for 20 and a somewhat larger space could be explored as long as its creation would not affect the outside space. The outside space is shared with the Children's Centre and the pre-school is committed to providing the best outdoor experience to the two year olds, many of whom do not have an outside space at home.

Vanessa nursery does not have out of core hours provision at the moment. Some consultation was undertaken with parents of nursery age children and most did not have a need for additional hours because they have an established pattern of childcare. Parents of children in the two year olds pre-school provision (for children entitled to the free early education offer) were expressing a need for hours over and above the free entitlement. The proposal that emerged, therefore, was to start the extended day with two year olds and then obtain a flow through to the nursery. In order to establish the extended day offer, the Children's Centre planned to develop a cooking kitchen with funding from the DfE pilot and match funding from local authority. That work will be completed by September 2015.

To establish a sustainable proposal, financial modelling was undertaken on the basis of providing flexible and extended places over 52 weeks combined with places sold at the local market rate and subsidised additional hours for children whose parents have a low income.

## **6.4 Colville Primary School**

Colville Primary School is an inner city school in North Kensington (Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea) with a school total population of 368. The nursery caters for 58 children aged three to four years who have been able to access a flexible offer between 8.50 and 3.10. In addition, there are breakfast and after school clubs which nursery children have not been able to attend since the eligibility for these only extends to the 5-11 age range. The after school activities were run by RBKC until April 2015, at which point the school took it over to run it as a direct school provision.

Last year, before the pilot, the nursery provided 32.5 hours of free early education to 22 children and 15 hours to 30 FTE children.

Of the 30 FTE children, some topped up to full time (this was full-time core hours before the pilot i.e. 32.5 hours) and the rest either had only 15 hours or some additional hours but not the full 32.5. Monday to Wednesday proved to be the more popular days and Thursday and Friday in the afternoon were less busy.

In respect of flexibility, parents could choose every morning or afternoon or could do a mixture of 2.5 days. At the beginning of the school year, the school was more able to offer parents exactly the arrangements that they wanted but as the year went on, this became less possible. Such was the demand, some parents paid for the hours they wanted in advance in order to ensure a place at a later date.

The demand from parents for an extended provision showed a significant group who wanted additional hours only until 4.30pm to coincide with pick-up times from clubs for older children and others who worked and required care for their children until 5.30pm.

As a result of the business modelling that the pilot enabled, Colville began delivery of an extended offer for nursery aged children in January 2015. The offer consists of 8.50 am – 5.45pm on basis of demand and seven children were attending in March 2015, accessing a variety of combinations of hours. The school had plans to create an out of core hours Foundation Stage Unit from September 2015.

---

## **7. Conclusions from the pilots**

### **7.1 Planning for extended hours**

It was clear from the London pilots that good business and financial planning was key to ensuring the viability and sustainability of the provision.

The steps that were followed in the most developed pilot schools were:

- A demand survey with parents to establish the extent of demand for additional hours and parental views on their needs for a flexible offer and how much they were willing to pay per hour
- Research to identify competitors, their offer and going rates in the local market
- The completion of a detailed business plan, using the FCT template; this included an action plan for each section to ensure that senior managers in the school were aware of:
  - lead & partners to be engaged
  - allotted tasks
  - resources allocated
  - milestones and timescales
  - monitoring and progress update arrangements
  - links to other plans
- the establishment of a staffing model
- the development of a full cost financial model that encompassed appropriate transferable costs from other parts of the school budget.

For schools considering an extended offer, these would be the principal activities that should be undertaken.

## **7.2 Staffing provision and financial modelling**

There were many lessons learned from the pilot in relation to options for staffing the extended hours provision and financial modelling.

### **Staffing**

- Schools often required some shifting in thinking about the ability of non-teaching staff, in particular early years educators and childminders, to deliver a high quality early education experience to young children; this shift was a necessary step in developing a sustainable financial model (i.e. a system based on teacher only delivery was expensive and also brought other challenges in respect of the number of contact hours they could work and other contractual arrangements; this indicates that there is work to be done in educating schools on the qualifications and abilities of modern day non-teaching staff)
- Schools who engaged with their current staff found that they were often more than willing to work additional hours to staff the new provision
- There were professional development opportunities for staff and parents if these were seen as a positive possibility (and could lead to good partnership agreements with other local providers to learn from their experience as well as benefitting the local community and economy)
- Schools reported that they felt they were experts in the 5+ age group but lacked detailed expertise in the early years; this also pointed towards opportunities for partnership working with local maintained nurseries and other high quality providers.

## Financial modelling

- Creating a financial sustainable model was an important principle of the pilots and a bespoke Excel workbook was produced to enable schools to reach a true hourly unit cost for a place in their nursery
- It was clear that schools were not accustomed to separating out their nursery costs and income in order to establish a unit cost but found the exercise in the pilot informative and helpful; in some cases the exercise brought to light under capacity in the nursery with full staffing, leading to considerable projected deficits but schools were then able to put in place a strategy for closing the immediate gap, including filling vacancies with rising threes (children who are entitled to the two year old free early education offer who have become three but are not yet entitled to the three year old offer); another route schools took in light of these issues was to consider admitting two year olds in September 2016 (as soon as they could do so without registering with Ofsted separately for the two year olds)
- Good financial planning involves knowing the local market and seeing the school as a player in the market which, in turn, requires knowledge of local market rates for childcare and early education as well as the local offer; schools were encouraged to think about their USP; parents reported that they favoured schools as a place for early education in respect of quality, would pay for additional hours but often could not get the flexibility and hours that suited them in schools and went elsewhere;
- The financial modelling exercises that were undertaken showed that the extended day could be delivered sustainably; for example, calculations in one nursery reached a sum of £2.37 per hour for the additional hours (this was over a 52 week year) after staffing costs and income from the Free Early Education Offer were taken into account. The local market rate was £8-10 per hour. Even allowing for overheads, this led to a significant margin that permitted the option of a sliding scale of charges in order to offer less expensive places to parents with a low income
- In order to meet with parental demand, particularly parents who have the ability to pay higher charges (thereby creating a subsidy possibility for low paid parents as per the above), and increase sustainability, schools may need to consider an all year round model


### 7.3 Overall conclusions

It can be concluded that the model is attractive to parents, meets their needs and better meets those of their children and can be sustainable with good business and financial planning.

Schools, however, were clear that they needed assistance with the business planning, visioning and financial modelling since these were not activities that were necessarily within their skills base. As one headteacher said *'I started life as a primary school teacher and here I am trying to make sense of architect's plans, space and place planning, and pricing mechanisms!'*

Diane Dixon  
Family and Childcare Trust  
August 2015

# Agenda Item 8

	<p><b>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</b></p> <p><b>CHILDREN AND EDUCATION POLICY &amp; ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE</b></p> <p><b>21 September 2015</b></p>
<b>THE WORKLOAD OF TEACHERS</b>	
<b>Report of the Director for Children's Services</b>	
<b>Open Report</b>	
<b>Classification:</b> For Policy and Accountability review and comment	
<b>Key Decision:</b> No	
<b>Wards Affected:</b> All	
<b>Accountable Executive Director:</b> Andrew Christie, Director for Children's Services	
<b>Report Authors:</b> Richard Stanley, Assistant Director (School Standards); Steve Bywater, Policy Manager Dave Rogers, Interim Schools HR Manager	<b>Contact Details:</b> Tel: 020 7745 6444 <a href="mailto:richard.stanley@rbkc.gov.uk">richard.stanley@rbkc.gov.uk</a>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report provides an overview of issues facing teachers in Hammersmith and Fulham which reflect national trends and concerns in relation to their workloads. It reviews the impact that workload has on individuals as well as recruitment and retention more generally. It outlines the roles that key people such as head teachers, school governors and the local authority can play in managing workloads while acknowledging the significant role of external factors, over which local influence is limited.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The Committee is asked to review the content of this report and make recommendations as appropriate

## 3. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 3.1. Concerns about the workload of teachers are well documented. Results of a survey by the Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL) published in the

Guardian newspaper in February 2015<sup>1</sup> suggested that workload was the main reason that new teachers left the profession. 79% expressed concerns about the impact of workload on work-life balance. A quarter of respondents said they expect to quit in their first five years.

- 3.2. 26% pointed to the added pressures caused by being expected to take part in out of hours work. Just under half reported they work between six and 10 hours at the weekend during term time, with 28% working more than 10 hours.
- 3.3. Factors behind the need to work long hours can include the pressures on schools, head teachers and individual teachers to deliver increasingly challenging examination and test results, the potential impact of a negative Ofsted inspection judgement, the increasing need to demonstrate high levels of individual teacher performance and a general need to complete significant amounts of paperwork and administration.

#### **4. NATIONAL RESPONSES TO CONCERNS ABOUT WORKLOAD**

- 4.1. Two recent national developments have sought to respond to concerns that have frequently been raised about teachers' workload. These include a document published by Ofsted in October 2014 "Ofsted inspections – clarification for schools"<sup>2</sup> known as the "mythbuster" which sought to clarify expectations of schools when being inspected to "dispel myths that can result in unnecessary workloads".
- 4.2. A letter was written by the Secretary of State for Education to the teachers' unions on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015<sup>3</sup> following the publication of a "Workload Challenge" in October 2014. The letter acknowledged the level of concern about workloads and identified a number of strategies which the Secretary of State felt would address this concern. Strategies included a reference to Ofsted's "mythbuster", ensuring minimum lead-in times for changes to curriculum, qualifications or accountabilities of schools and a commitment not to make substantial changes affecting pupils during the school year or in the middle of a course resulting in a qualification. The letter expressed reservations about the robustness of surveys about teacher workload carried out to date and stated a need to track workload with intentions to run a new, large scale survey every two years.

#### **5. LOCAL AUTHORITY CONTEXT**

- 5.1. The degree to which the local authority can control or influence the practice in schools has reduced over recent years. Schools are subject to national

---

<sup>1</sup> "Workload forcing new teachers out of the profession, survey suggests" The Guardian, 27 January 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/teacher-network/2015/jan/27/workload-new-teachers-work-life-balance>

<sup>2</sup> Ofsted inspections – clarification for schools 17<sup>th</sup> October 2014, 11<sup>th</sup> March 2015 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ofsted-inspections-clarification-for-schools>

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Secretary of State to Unions [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/409771/Letter\\_from\\_Secretary\\_of\\_State\\_to\\_unions.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/409771/Letter_from_Secretary_of_State_to_unions.pdf)

guidelines and expectations which are interpreted and implemented through the leadership and governance provided by head teachers and boards of governors. However, there are a number of mechanisms through which the local authority can seek to influence schools or ensure best practice is shared. This includes through various partnership arrangement such as the head teacher's forum and consultative group. Also the School Improvement function provides advice and challenge on how schools can be managed more effectively and this can include some influence over how workloads are prioritised and managed.

- 5.2. Children's Services and the Human Resources team maintain an overview of recruitment and retention rates and have access to intelligence regarding why staff leave jobs in Hammersmith and Fulham schools. In the year 2014/15, 248 teachers of all grades left the borough's maintained schools and academies. The common reasons for leaving are similar across inner London. Pressures of workload are exacerbated by local shortages of appropriate housing which mean teachers often do not live near to their place of work and have long commutes at either end of their working day. When teachers leave posts in local schools, the trend tends to be that they move to work outside of London where housing is more affordable.]
- 5.3. The education service in the local authority coordinates a range of support for newly qualified staff (NQT) in their first year of teaching. The Guardian/ATL survey identifies this as being a point at which teachers are under significant pressure which can cause them to leave the profession early in their career. The local programme provided for NQTs is well regarded by schools and provides regular training, advice to schools on mentoring and opportunities for NQTs to establish support networks across schools.
- 5.4. The local authority also provides training programmes for Governors, head teachers and staff. This includes a range of courses for teachers at all stages to develop their careers and opportunities in a variety of contexts for school leaders to learn from best practice on being an effective and successful school where teachers would want to work.
- 5.5. The local Housing Strategy "Delivering the Change We Need in Housing" (May 2015) included seeking of views on whether groups, such as 'key workers' (potentially to include teachers) should be given greater priority under the HomeBuy allocation scheme.
- 5.6. At present the Council does not have an agreed definition of which professions might be considered to be 'key workers'. However, the current Housing Allocation Scheme allows the Council to adopt "Local Lettings Plans" in certain circumstances to allocate affordable housing in a different way. This has informed the allocations approach the council is adopting for a number of apartments on Edward Woods Estate. Through this, instead of letting to applicants on the borough's needs-based housing register, first priority was given to applicants who were teachers on the Home Buy Register.

## **6. THE VIEW OF THE TEACHERS' UNIONS**

- 6.1. Representatives from the main teaching unions were consulted about their experience of workload issues and the way that these are managed at the regular SJNC meeting in June 2015. They pointed to a number of factors which either exacerbate or reduce the pressures caused by workload.
- 6.2. It was felt that key developments such as the Ofsted “mythbuster” were not always actively considered and responded to by schools and that some schools continued to make demands of staff to meet requirements which were no longer expected by external bodies. This included policies on marking and planning which were seen by the union representatives as sometimes being bureaucratic and not contributing to better teaching and learning outcomes. It was suggested that staff working bodies should be set up in individual schools to consider and progress relevant guidance as it emerges nationally.
- 6.3. The union representatives also suggested there were examples of where changes in staffing or staff responsibilities had led to increased workloads. Reorganisations to achieve savings had reduced staff numbers, particular affecting the number of support staff, which led to remaining staff being required to take on some of the responsibilities previously held by staff who had left. It was also felt that support staff could have a greater role in general staff discussions, policy development and consultation, given their role in taking on the wider workload of schools.
- 6.4. Measures aimed at reducing workloads were interpreted differently by schools. There were local good practice examples of how some schools had maximised use of “Planning, Preparation and Assessment” time by enabling teachers to use this more flexibly. However, examples were cited of where the concept of “gained time” (which reduces timetable demands on staff who teach GCSE courses after examinations have finished) had been responded to in some schools by expecting the teachers affected to carry out non-teaching work during these periods.
- 6.5. Staff attitude and wellbeing surveys were seen as important tools to understand and inform responses to workload issues. However, it was felt that these were rarely carried out. Union representatives also highlighted the importance of schools having a clear complaints procedure as there was a perception amongst their members that it was often “not worth” complaining when expectations of staff were felt to be too great. Finally, the use of exit interviews may help to better understand reasons why staff leave particular schools although consideration needs to be given as to how these might best be best conducted.

## **7. OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPORT**

- 7.1. The Healthy Schools programme provides opportunities to raise the profile of staff welfare and implement measures which can ensure additional support to alleviate the stress that can result from workload. To achieve the Bronze Award schools need to demonstrate action to meet the needs of staff. This include identifying staff continuing professional development needs for health and wellbeing and then providing appropriate responses to meet such needs. This might include subject release time, staff social opportunities, induction



programmes and buddy programmes for all new members of staff, encouragement to get involved in staff yoga or fitness training, access to occupational health and counselling services and a Teacher Support Network.

- 7.2. As at June 2015, 19 Hammersmith & schools were engaged and working towards the Healthy Schools Bronze award. 20 schools had already achieved the award. Also 5 schools had achieved the Silver award with one (Wood Lane School) achieving the Gold award. To date, only 10 schools have achieved Healthy Schools Gold status in London.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

- 8.1. Managing the workload of teachers is an ongoing challenge for schools which are under significant pressures to perform under a range of indicators and need to recruit and retain high quality staff to deliver the best teaching and learning for children. This has been acknowledged at the national level with recent announcements from the Government which seek to address some of the related issues in the future. Locally teacher recruitment and retention has also been identified as a priority by schools, and links to managing teacher well being and workload have been made.
- 8.2. While the leadership and management of local schools is largely the responsibility of head teachers and governors, the local authority seeks to influence how workload is managed both through direct relations with individual schools as well as wider partnership arrangements and continuing professional development and support. Teaching unions in the borough have suggested a number of activities which may help reduce pressures upon teachers.

## **9. CONSULTATION**

- 9.1. This report includes a summary of issues raised at a regular consultation meeting which takes place between teachers' unions and council officers which is reflected in section 6.

## **10. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1. As this report is not recommending any specific actions, there are no equality implications. Any actions which may result from this report will need to be considered in relation to their impact on people with protected characteristics and the profile of the local teaching workforce.

## **11. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1. There are no direct legal implications resulting from this report. Implications verified by: Kevin Beale, Head of Social Care and Litigation, Legal Services, 020 8753 2740

## **12. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**


- 12.1. There are no direct financial implications resulting from this report

Implications verified by: Andrew Tagg, Head of Resources, Children's Finance,  
020 7361 2258

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**

None.

# Agenda Item 9

	<p><b>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</b></p> <p><b>CHILDREN AND EDUCATION POLICY AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE</b></p> <p><b>21 September 2015</b></p>
<b>THE INDEPENDENT VISITORS SCHEME</b>	
<b>Report of the Director for Children's Services</b>	
<b>Open Report</b>	
<b>Classification:</b> For review and comment	
<b>Key Decision:</b> No	
<b>Wards Affected:</b> All	
<b>Accountable Executive Director:</b> Andrew Christie, Executive Director of Children's Services	
<b>Report Author:</b> Glen McLean, Children's Rights Manager	<b>Contact Details:</b> <a href="mailto:glen.mclean@lbhf.gov.uk">glen.mclean@lbhf.gov.uk</a>

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee (CEPAC) requested a report describing the role of the independent visitor's scheme. This report informs members about the service along with other support services aimed at supporting the transition of Care Leavers to independence.

## 2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 For the Committee to review the report and recommend ways in which the Council can support recruitment of appropriate volunteers for the service.

## 3. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Local authorities have a number of statutory requirements in order to fulfil duties associated with being effective Corporate Parents. Corporate Parenting is the term used to refer to the collective responsibility of the Council to provide the best care and protection for children and young people who are 'looked after', that is, who are in public care and for those who have left care at 18 years of age and who are 'Care Leavers'. Effective Corporate Parenting needs the

commitment from all Council employees and elected Members and an authority wide approach. These responsibilities for Local Authorities were first laid out in the Children Act 1989, the Children Act 2004 and reinforced in the Children and Young People's Act 2008.

- 3.2 Government's Guidance for Councillors "If this were my child" reinforced the leading role of Councillors in ensuring that their Council acts as an effective Corporate Parent for every child in care, actively supporting standards of care and seeking high quality outcomes that every good parent would want for their child. "When you became a councillor you became responsible for ensuring that the Council acts as the 'corporate parent' for all the children in its care." This duty is to promote positive outcomes, which encompass their education, their health and welfare, what they do in their leisure time and holidays, how they celebrate their culture and how they receive praise and encouragement for their achievements.
- 3.3 Recently the Looked after and Care Leaving service has re-organised to two specialist looked after children's teams aged 0-15 and two teams for Care Leavers aged 16 -24 years of age. The aim of this re-organisation is to ensure that care leavers are able to develop and sustain a working relationship with their allocated social workers and to reduce the numbers of changes in those professionals supporting young people with their transition to independence. By ensuring that the service now has a fully qualified social work service it is also anticipated that service standards will improve.
- 3.4 Social workers working with Care Leavers are required to offer advice and assistance and will maintain contact with the young person on a regular basis up to the age of 21 (or up to the age of 24 for those completing an agreed course of education or training).

The level and nature of the contact will be specified in the young person's Pathway Plan and the Social Worker will monitor its progress through direct contact with the young person and the agencies and individuals identified in the Plan as providing a service or being significant. The key roles of the Social worker's in the 16 plus service are as follows:

1. To advise on and monitor progress of the young person's Pathway Plan Assessment;
2. To take a lead role in the preparation of the Pathway Plan;
3. To participate in reviews of the Pathway Plan;
4. To liaise with other agencies, including other local authorities in the implementation of the Pathway Plan and to advocate for the young person;
5. To coordinate the provision of services under the Pathway Plan and take steps to ensure the young person makes use of such services;

6. To keep informed about the young person's progress and well-being;

And to keep written records of contact with the young person monitoring the effectiveness of services in preparing the young person for a time when they will move to greater independence or when they cease to be looked after.

- 3.5 The social workers assessment of the care leavers needs will determine the level of support provided within the semi-independent accommodation and this can range from 3- 15 hours of support per week. Additionally we are seeing an increase of young people remain within their foster placement under 'Staying Put' arrangements i.e. 64 per cent of young people leaving foster care remained within their foster placement at the end of March 2015 which is a significant increase from 25 per cent in the previous year.
- 3.6 Other support services available to care leavers is the Virtual School teaching staff who are responsible for the tracking and monitoring of the looked after child's attendance, progress and attainment. The Education Development Worker holds a 3 day caseload of pupils in Years 12 and 13 and also has responsibility to ensuring each pupil in education has an up to date Personal Education Plan and targeted education support. The remaining 2 days are focused on offering advice and guidance to Leaving Care teams for students aged 19 and above. From October 2015 the team will also have an Education, Employment and Training Personal Adviser who will provide direct support to those aged 16 plus young people who are Not in Education, Employment or Training. The Virtual School is responsible for developing and organising the team's enrichment programme of activities and projects to support the achievement and learning of children.
- 3.7 Local authorities have a statutory duty through Section 23ZB of the Children's Act 1989 to appoint an independent visitor to visit, advise and befriend a looked after child or young person where it is believed to be in their best interests. The previous criteria of having limited, or no, family contact no longer exists. The purpose of Independent Visitors is to develop a consistent and committed relationship with potentially isolated children and young people which fosters inclusion and broadens experience.
- 3.8 Locally the Independent Visitor Scheme (IVS) is run under the umbrella of the Children's Rights Service for the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
- 3.9 In the borough, Independent Visitors are expected to befriend a child or young person who is looked after by Hammersmith and Fulham, providing support, and taking them out on engaging activities.

#### **4. THE LOCAL SCHEME**

- a. Advertising takes place for new volunteers. There is a particular need to identify male volunteers and those who are from different ethnic backgrounds to meet the particular needs of our children in care.
- b. Volunteers are recruited and fully trained by the borough's Children's Rights Service. Training includes involvement of guest speakers and home interviews. Once trained and following DBS checks, health checks and seeking of references, volunteers are asked to commit to the Scheme for at least one year
- c. Monthly outings between young person and their independent visitor with a £35 -£45 allowance dependant on location.
- d. The Scheme is promoted for children and young people via social workers for looked after children.
- e. Referrals for children/young people in care can be made directly from the child/young person, from social workers, teachers, carers etc. The Independent Visitors Project Worker then seeks to match referrals with appropriate Independent Visitors. The project worker follows up referrals with visits to the young people and their carers to ensure they are fully briefed about the scheme. A report recommending a match be also produced which is then considered by an Approval Panel, which includes a social work practitioner, and at least two young people who have previously used the Children's Rights or Independent Visitors service. The panel then deliberates and provides feedback on their view of the proposed match.
- f. Current matches between volunteers and young people are monitored including follow up on any safeguarding issues that may emerge.
- g. A regular support group is provided for volunteers along with individual support and ongoing training. Group outings such as bowling are also organised.

#### **5. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT RESOURCE AND MATCHES**

- a. There are currently 12 independent visitors. There is ongoing progress being made to increase this resource by the end of the year. There are 8 young people currently matched with volunteers with a further three going through the process of matching. Over the past 12 months (September 2014 to August 2015) there have been 14 enquiries about potential referrals from social workers and other professionals.

- b. In the last 6 months, four volunteers have been trained. One has since been matched with a young person and another is in the process of being matched. One is still undergoing relevant checks. Five training sessions were attended by each of them, covering topics including: the role of the IVS, communication skills and boundaries, safeguarding and the journey of a child in care.

## **6. SUPPORTING THE INDEPENDENT VISITORS**

- 6.1 IV support meetings provide opportunities to network, discuss challenges and offer support to each other through sharing experiences. It is also an opportunity to disseminate training information. Training and topics discussed at these meetings have included working with challenging behaviour, gangs and sexual exploitation; and mental health.

## **7. FEEDBACK FROM CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

- 7.1 This report includes some feedback from local children in care about their views of being matched with an independent visitor.

“I like having an independent visitor. It’s fun, but James needs to practise his football skills. I like the cinema, Princess Diana Park and Wetlands” (young person age 9)

“Having an independent visitor is good. It’s good to go out with someone separately and you get to go to some good places. My favourite places have been the Aquarium, rock climbing and Ripley’s Experience. Having an independent visitor is fun.” (young person age 16)

“My independent visitor is a perfect match for me. I can tell her anything and she helps me to overcome my problems. I enjoyed Ravenscourt Park, the Science Museum and the Ceramics Café. I would like to do horse riding in the future if possible. Independent visitors are great because they take you out and keep you safe and give their own time to be with you” (young person age 11)

“She (my independent visitor) is fun, energetic and very happy and good company and it’s nice to go out once in a while. I like my independent visitor very much and would really like to see her more often.” (young person age 10)

## **8. MEETING LOCAL NEEDS**

- a. Nationally, 80% of children who don’t have an Independent Visitor report that this is because they’ve never been offered one. (Independent Visitors: Children’s Rights Director for England 2012).

- b. In LBHF children and young people learn about the existence of the Scheme via their social worker, promotion made through Family Services and at looked after reviews where it is promoted by the IRO. All looked after children should be informed of the IV service. If a child or young person chooses to have an IV they would meet regularly and arrange fun activities, which are tailored to what they wish to do. Children and young people have an opportunity to further meet with the Independent Visitors Project Worker who will make themselves available to talk and answer any questions about the Scheme.
- c. The current Independent Visitor Scheme in the main have been able to provide IV's to those children and young people who are looked after and care leavers who live in London generally and Greater London who wish to be matched with an IV. All enquires are always followed through promptly whether this results in a child or young person being eventually matched or not. Promotion has to be consistent and active collaboration with Family Services is a must. This is essential, as the Scheme needs regular publicity. Some further work is required when considering recruiting volunteers who may need to be matched with disabled children and young people. We are envisaging raising the numbers of volunteers to between 18-22 as in the past year we have had enquiries into double figures (more than 10 but less than 20) and believe that will be about the same. We have previously had a waiting list of 3/4 children and young people and wish to avoid a waiting list for an independent visitor in the future.
- d. The Scheme is actively seeking to recruit more males as they are currently underrepresented in the Scheme. Also there is an idea of recruit of specifically targeting volunteers who may wish to work with disabled children and young people and either offer their experience or attain an additional skill set.
- e. The Scheme has 12 independent visitors currently and in terms of management of volunteers this number could be raised to 18-22 as previously mentioned. The Independent Visitors Project Worker works 18hrs a week and could cope with managing and supporting more volunteers.
- f. In terms of recruitment and how the Scheme seeks the support of the local volunteer service offers help to promote the Scheme. Promotion takes place across family services. Local community centres, gyms, shops and libraries are also targeted. The Scheme will also use an opportunity to promote itself at events that occur in the calendar organised by departments within Family Services. It will also be considering organising an open day at its offices for people to come along and find out more about the Service.



- g. The independent visitor's role is generally one of a befriender to a child or young person. IV's matched with young people have felt that it is a rewarding role and it's an opportunity to give back something to society. IV's may possibly participate in meetings which involve a looked after child or care leaver and may come as a direct request from themselves. IV's have found this useful as this provides them with a better awareness about the care system. Independent visitors do also feel that the support they receive from the Independent Visitor Project Workers (IVPW) and regularly meeting and sharing experience with other independent visitor's is an essential component in terms of the support received. Independent visitors range from people who have come from those who like to volunteer to persons in paid work and retired individuals.
- h. The Scheme has supported in the past and continues to support those care leavers who opt to be matched with an independent visitor. It helps those individuals who are making transitions from care to more independent living. An independent visitor is there to act as a befriender to a care leaver who could only have their social worker there and who could still be feeling isolated. It is a relationship and resource available for them personally.
- i. Young people value the voluntary commitment of the Independent Visitors involved in the scheme. They appreciate that Independent Visitors provide a different relationship from their local authority workers. The relationship can help improve self-esteem and social development, while the schemes provide opportunities to take part in fun activities that broaden the experience of the young people

## **9. CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The Scheme has operated in the Borough for about 7 years. Retention of independent visitors has been steady. Most children and young people who access the Scheme usually participate in the Scheme for more than the minimum required period of a year. The Service is seeking to stretch to a much bigger and wider recruitment as there are identified gaps in the provision.

The permanent IV Project Coordinator was seconded to another position in April 2014 and has now decided to take up a post elsewhere. Since then the position has been covered by an agency worker as we were unable to recruit to a fixed term contract despite several recruitment drives. Recruitment to the permanent position is due to commence but this is one of the main vulnerabilities in the Service at the moment.

## **10. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

Children and young people with some protected characteristics tend to be over-represented in the care system. This report highlights the need to recruit independent visitors from particular parts of the community to meet the needs of all the children who require this kind of support.

## **11. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Local authorities have a statutory duty through Section 23ZB of the Children's Act 1989 to appoint an independent visitor to visit, advise and befriend a looked after child or young person where it is believed to be in their best interests.

## **12. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

- 0.5 FTE IV Project Co-ordinator
- 0.2 FTE Administrative Support

Total IV Service costs including staffing = £33,530

If the scheme is to expand to reach a wider cohort of young people, beyond the 22 mentioned above, an increase in IV Project Coordinator hours will be needed and additional resources will be required to fund this.

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000** **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**

None.

## Children and Education PAC – Work Programme 2015-16

Item	Report Author(s)	Comments
<b>23 November 2015</b>		
<b>Executive Director's Update</b>	Andrew Christie Steve Bywater	
<b>Cabinet Members' Update</b>	Cllr Macmillan / Cllr Fennimore	
<b>SEN Passenger Transport</b>	Rachael Wright-Turner	
<b>Childcare Task Group – Role of Children's Centres</b>	Steve Comber	
<p><b>Staffing and Recruitment</b></p> <p>To consider the state of staffing and recruitment in Children's Services including: impact of DBS delays, impact of agency staff, staff retention, commissioned services aligning with council values, and the new workforce strategy.</p> <p>(More info available from DA)</p>		<p>Use of agency staff etc. Work force strategy – timescales?</p> <p>Scrutiny work undertaken in Barking and Dagenham?</p> <p>Possibility of standardisation between councils? (Teachers Direct website)</p>
<p><b>Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report (TBC)</b></p> <p>Chair requested a special report that focused on community engagement around safeguarding in H&amp;F – e.g. what were the key messages for the community to improve safeguarding. Should include case studies of positive work currently being done.</p> <p>Main annual report to go to members for info.</p>	<p>Jean Daintith, Chair of the LSCB</p> <p>Debbie Raymond / Angela Flahive (Safeguarding Leads)</p>	<p>Community Engagement theme.</p> <p>Chair requested additional training for members on safeguarding issues.</p>
<p><b>Review of School Councils</b></p> <p>To consider the role of school councils and the support provided to them. Youth Council views to be incorporated.</p>	Brenda Whinnett	

## Children and Education PAC – Work Programme 2015-16

<b>BRIEFING NOTE: Youth Council Update</b> Updates on the Youth Council Manifesto / Survey / Youth Mayor	Brenda Whinnett	Refresh in April 2016
<b>BRIEFING NOTE: Pupil Premium Update</b> Follow-up on report from 19 November 2013 meeting.	<b>TBC</b>	
<b>18 January 2016</b>		
<b>Executive Director's Update</b>	Steve Bywater	
<b>Cabinet Members' Update</b>		
<b>The Budget</b>	Andrew Lord Liz Nash Dave McNamara	
<b>Childcare Task Group - Improving Support for Childminders</b>	TBC	
<b>Care Leavers - Transition</b> To consider the options and support available around transition for careers advice, apprenticeships, and further education.		(Sister report to the LAC annual report)
<b>Looked After Children and Care Leavers Annual Report</b>	Glen Peache	
<b>School Performance Report</b>	Richard Stanley Ian Heggs	

## Children and Education PAC – Work Programme 2015-16

<b>February 2016</b>		
<b>Executive Director's Update</b>	Steve Bywater	
<b>Cabinet Members' Update</b>		
<b>School Organisation and Investment Strategy</b>	Alan Wharton	
<b>Childcare Task Group - Innovative Solutions for Growing a Skilled Workforce</b>	TBC	
<b>Children's Social Care Complaints</b>	TBC	
<b>Care Leavers – Housing and Accommodation</b>	TBC	