



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

# Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes

Tuesday 18 November 2014

## **PRESENT**

**Committee members:** Councillors Caroline Needham (Chair), Alan De'Ath, Caroline Ffiske (Vice-Chair), Donald Johnson and Natalia Perez Shepherd

**Co-opted members:** Dennis Charman (Teacher Representative) and Nadia Taylor (Parent Governor Representative)

**Other Councillors:** Sue Fennimore (Cabinet Member for Social Inclusion) and Sue Macmillan (Cabinet Member for Children and Education), and Ben Coleman

**Officers:** Steve Buckerfield (Acting Head of Children's Joint Commissioning), Laura Campbell (Committee Co-ordinator), Andrew Christie (Executive Director of Children's Services), Jackie Devine (Early Years and Childcare Commissioner), Alison Farmer (Tri Borough Assistant Director for Special Educational Needs), Angela Flahive (Joint Tri Borough Head of Safeguarding Review and Quality Assurance), Collette Levan-Gilroy (Business Development and Procurement Manager), Steve Miley (Director of Family Services), Krutika Pau (Interim Head of Commissioning, Early Intervention), Lynne Richardson (Schools Contract Manager), Kerry Russell (Policy Officer) and Rachael Wright-Turner (Director of Commissioning)

## **23. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED THAT:**

The minutes of the meeting of the Children and Education Policy and Accountability Committee held on 3 September 2014 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

## **24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Eleanor Allen (London Diocesan Board for Schools Representative), Nandini Ganesh (Parentsactive Representative), Philippa O'Driscoll (Westminster Diocese Education Service Representative) and Councillor Vivienne Lukey (Cabinet Member for Health

and Adult Social Care). Apologies for lateness were received from Dennis Charman (Teacher Representative).

## **25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Nadia Taylor (Parent Governor Representative) declared a significant interest in respect of agenda item 8, Proposals for the Commissioning of School Meal Schools, as she was a member of the school dinners working group. She considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion.

## **26. CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (CAMHS) - PROMOTING RESILIENCE AND EARLY INTERVENTION**

Steve Buckerfield, Acting Head of Children's Joint Commissioning, introduced the report which gave an overview of child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) in Hammersmith and Fulham (H&F) and particularly services for young people aged 13 years and above. It also included information on the current CAMHS initiatives, both local and national, local need and services for H&F young people. There had been a CAMHS Task and Finish Group report submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board, which was referred to in the report and it had been suggested that a further Task Group be set up to look at mental health.

Steve Buckerfield suggested that the Committee questioned what mental health looked like for young people and looked at the balance between specialist services and voluntary groups who supported local families, as well as schools who had funds dedicated to them for mental health. It could be asked how these groups come together, how the resources for young people in schools were used and how to link with other agencies when further support was needed.

Young people's mental health had been discussed nationally with a select committee working group looking at this area. The recommendations from this working group would be available in the Spring. Steve Buckerfield commented that one of the ministers had made it clear that young people's mental health services had not received the level of investment it should have and there was national criticism on the data available on mental health. Challenging conversations in respect of resources available would need to be had.

There was an organisation called Rethink which engaged with young people, that had found that young people wanted to see experts in respect of mental health but said that A&E was not the best place for this; specialists trained in children's health should be available.

Paula Murphy from Healthwatch, had kindly attended the meeting to present the findings of a survey done by Healthwatch on the user experience of mental health services, which had consulted young people, schools, families etc. The results of the survey had been reported back to the relevant officers

such as Steve Buckerfield. A copy of the presentation slides were circulated at the meeting. The interim conclusions of the survey included the following points:

- there was patchy provision of mental health information in schools
- unclear referral pathways and responsibilities for agencies – it had been found that if some people did not understand the model then they would not be aware of the support available.
- there was a lack of local inpatient beds – there was not always local beds available when local children needed them
- the impact of child diagnosis on the parent/carer and siblings required further consideration – a whole family approach was needed
- there was limited up to date resources for accessing and signposting services
- there were high levels of DNAs (do not appear appointments) – the DNAs were not followed up to see why young people do not appear at the appointments.

Paula Murphy also highlighted the following issues:

- it was hoped that there would be stronger links between agencies and further support available for parents/carers
- there should be a single referral pathway
- a wider approach was needed to be taken to include the whole family.

The Committee was then invited to ask any questions and the following was noted:

### **Prevention of Suicide**

In response to a question on the prevention of suicide in young people, there were small numbers of young people involved and there was a Public Health Prevention of Suicide Group which built on the work of the safeguarding board. Good work had been done with individual schools on suicide prevention.

### **Health and Wellbeing Strategy**

The priorities of the strategy, detailed on page 20 of the report, were referred to and it was questioned whether there should be a priority to reduce the number of young people accessing the services, as stated in the report. Andrew Christie responded that this was a good point and that there was a need to better identify more young people to access the services, not to reduce the number accessing it.

### **Engagement with Vulnerable Groups**

It was asked how the different vulnerable groups were reached and what intelligence there was to engage with the community to give support where needed. Steve Buckerfield commented that it was not clear what worked with young people to engage them; he referred to work done in respect of gangs and it was unclear what could be done to tackle them. It was reported that 59% of children in need were from a BME background and it was asked if community based groups and charities that supported the BME community would be better to reach out to those young people. It was noted officers with mental health expertise were in the health profession rather than the

voluntary sector, but this was something that a task group could look at, to talk to the different community and voluntary groups to see how they could engage with the different vulnerable groups. It needed to be made clearer to the community and voluntary groups where they could go for help and to let them know the pathways for referrals.

### **Tracking of Young People**

One of the co-opted members had experienced situations in schools where a child had been successfully referred but due to particular issues the provision collapsed. The school then came up with an ad hoc solution to help with the child's provision. It was asked what happened when a child was referred and then not appeared at the services provided, and questioned whether the child was tracked. It was noted that this depended on the support structure for the child; in some areas there was a programme in place that recognised where families needed support, such as the Troubled Families Programme, but it was not consistently in place. Andrew Christie commented that most secondary schools provide a range of services for young people for mental health and a discussions with schools was needed to see what they did and how they contributed.

Steve Buckerfield noted that young patients were discharged to GPs, but GPs did not get paediatric training. He referred to work done by Parentsactive that had met with GPs and produced an action plan where they provided training for GPs in respect of disabled children. Further work with GPs was needed so that if there was a break down in the attendance by young people, the GPs could track them. Some way to continue to track young people when referred was needed and one idea suggested was to look into using volunteers. Steve Buckerfield referred to a proposal in Westminster City Council to establish an integrated post in respect of health where the suggestion of tracking could be used.

### **Benchmarking**

It was asked whether CAMHS performance was measured against the performance in other boroughs and it was noted that there was performance information across North West London which could be compared. Steve Buckerfield also noted that there was some information on services in some other authorities such as in Liverpool, which could be looked at.

The Chair invited members of the public and representatives at the meeting to ask any questions and comment on their experiences of the current services. The director of Primary Intervention from the Courtyard AP Academy, commented that there was a need for more staff who could respond to the needs of children in respect of mental health. Some parents saw mental health as a stigma and there was an issue in respect of engaging with parents, as some needed support themselves. The one thing in the way of providing support sometimes was some parents accepting that support was needed.

The Chair reported that mental health was an area of concern for this Committee and the Health and Wellbeing Board. It had been proposed that a Task Group be set up to look at mental health, and Councillor Alan De'Ath

would be a member of this Task Group. It was noted that as part of its review the Task Group could look at the following:

- services in schools
- localities support – to look at the access in schools for services and to look at whether the network of support available for the school community worked. It was noted that every primary school met with the locality team once or twice a term. The locality team would be the first point of contact for if a family needed support and would be used as a link for other services. The localities team were not a health service but provided mental health support.
- to look at the engagement with families
- to talk to parents/carers, third sector providers and service users about their experiences
- to meet with Rethink organisation which had identified some young people who might want to get involved in co-designing the services
- young pioneers – this was a charity which focused on children who were bullied
- to engage with members of the Borough Youth Forum.

It was noted that the Committee would be kept informed of the work of the Task Group.

## **27. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were no issues raised as part of this item.

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

Andrew Christie introduced his update report. He reported that in respect of paragraph 3.1 of the report, the DfE now report that the students achieving 5 or more GCSEs at Grades A\*-C including English and mathematics was now 63% but this figure was still provisional. Schools were negotiating with the exam boards in respect of the results and it was expected that the percentage would go back up to 65%. These results would be finalised in January.

In respect of the Ofsted inspections, there was only now one school that had been judged as inadequate. Queensmill School and Normand Croft School had recently been inspected and the results had been published; Queensmill School had been judged as outstanding and Normand Croft School had been judged as required improvement. It was reported that Greenside School had moved from requiring improvement to being judged as good.

The Chair referred to the curriculum for life scheme and asked how this had been taken forward as this had been identified by the Borough Youth Forum. Andrew Christie responded that this scheme had been discussed with headteachers and could be continued to be worked on with schools. He noted that there was a range of initiatives in respect of providing new skills for young people and these initiatives could be reported back to the Committee for information. The Chair commented that this could be an item for the Committee to look at a future meeting and also to link in with the Borough Youth Forum for their feedback.

In response to a question on funding for children's centres, it was noted that there was provision to extend the contracts. It was also noted that the Childcare Task Group would also discuss with children's centres in respect of provision available at the centres.

The Committee was informed that the Passenger Transport Working Group continued to meet and a key issue raised was lateness and traffic delays, which the providers were looking at. Another meeting would be held the following week to follow up on this issue.

## **29. CABINET MEMBERS UPDATE**

Councillor Sue Macmillan also referred to the Passenger Transport Working Group, noting that there were still some significant issues which were being followed up. The next meeting of the group would be held on 1 December and it would report back to the Committee at the January meeting.

A meeting had been held with Parentsactive to discuss a number of issues and Councillor Macmillan was pleased things were moving forward quickly in respect of including the local offer on the website.

Councillor Macmillan continued to visit schools in the borough. She reported that Queens Manor School had raised an issue with her that due to the number of pupils with complex special needs, the results league table was affected. She was discussing this issue with officers to raise this with the DfE.

There was a new social work initiative, where an induction event had been held for all staff and there was significant training for staff, involving 25 days for each member of staff.

The Committee was told that a half day session was held with Councillor Macmillan and the Leader of the Council, where they looked into the details of the looked after children's cases.

In response to a question relating to the Bridge Academy, Councillor Macmillan reported that Cabinet had made a decision for a combination academy with Kensington and Chelsea to be at the Bridge Academy site. She noted that the Bridge Academy was a fantastic school and this was a significant investment. It was queried why there had been no consultation in respect of this proposal and why it had not come to the Committee, and the Committee was told that the proposal had already been agreed in principle by the previous Cabinet.

Councillor Sue Fennimore updated the Committee on the Sands End Adventure Playground (Sands End Associated Projects In Action (SEAPIA)). SEAPIA had been unsuccessful in applying for funding. The Council had reviewed the decision and agreed to extend the funding for SEAPIA for 12 months. The organisation would benefit from receiving management support. Aspirations Events worked closely with SEAPIA and also agreed to part fund

them, also choosing SEAPIA to be its charity for the Polo in the Park event. Councillor Fennimore commented that the Cabinet members were unhappy that this funding issue had occurred and therefore the whole third sector funding arrangements would be reviewed so that the Council could better support the third sector.

### **30. PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMISSIONING OF SCHOOL MEAL SERVICES**

Nadia Taylor (Parent Governor Representative) declared a significant interest in respect of this item, as she was a member of the school dinners working group. She considered that this did not give rise to a perception of a conflict of interests and, in the circumstances it would be reasonable to participate in the discussion.

Rachael Wright-Turner, Director of Commissioning, introduced the report that gave a summary of the re-commissioning of the school meals contract. The current contract had been extended to November 2015, giving an opportunity for the Council to review the current arrangements to see what worked and what did not. It was an opportunity to work with Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster to benefit from working together, not just for efficiencies of sharing the workload of the procurement process but also savings.

There was a lot of involvement with schools throughout this review, with also a working group set up, which Nadia Taylor was a member of. The team worked with the providers to test the provision and to get an understanding to whether the proposal was attractive to receive any bids for the contract. A discussion was held with the Procurement and Social Value Task Force to look at the social value aspect of the contract and it was noted that this Task Force might make some recommendations for the officers to look at when procuring the contract.

It was asked whether there could be any training to assist governors in their role in respect of this new contract for school meals, as the role of governors had changed. It was reported that there had been no final decision made on who would hold the contract, whether it was better for the school for the Council to hold it. In the event that the school felt comfortable in holding the contract, there was scope to provide support and training, but no decision had yet been made.

It was reported that there was a 60p difference between the cost of the school meal and the cost of the food provided. It was not known what the new cost of the school meals would be until this had been negotiated and gone through the contract process.

In response to a question, it was reported that it was not a statutory requirement to provide schools meals, it was up to the Local Authority to choose whether to do this. The funding of the school meals was in the schools' budgets; there were already a number of schools who made their own arrangements for the meals.

Concern was expressed that one of the current providers would continue to be used and it was reported that this could be a possibility but it was not known if that company had re-bid for the contract. All proposals put forward would be evaluated against the criteria. It was noted that the experience of the company could not be taken into consideration in the procurement process but it could be looked at in the bidding process.

The use of vending machines in schools was discussed and the Committee was informed that schools were advised not to have vending machines and those that did use them only used healthy food; there were only two vending machines used in the borough's schools and there was a strict control over the use of them.

The Chair asked if there could be an element of educating children about the food they were eating. The Committee was told that there was a minimum quality expected in the food and the contractors had to contribute to the cooking and health standards in the schools.

It was asked if school meals could be provided during the school holidays for different groups such as Parentsactive and play schemes that used the schools during the holidays. It was noted that this had been already requested by one of the early years centres. This provision was not part of the contract and the contractors currently did not have the ability to provide the meals during the holidays due to staff working times but this could be looked at whether school holiday provision could be included in future contracts.

Councillor Coleman, Chair of the Procurement and Social Value Task Force, commented that a large amount of money was spent every year procuring services, and this money should be used to better support the local community. He suggested that schools should visit the farms that grow local produce to help educate children.

The timing of the school meals was raised as some schools had split lunch times, and some schools had introduced a provision for pupils to get hot food at break times as the lunch time was not until 1.30pm. It was noted that schools were asked when they wanted the school meals and it was for them to decide what time they were provided.

### **31. RESPONDING TO CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION IN HAMMERSMITH AND FULHAM**

Steve Miley, Director of Family Services, introduced the report which gave an overview of the issue of child sexual exploitation (CSE) in H&F following a series of high profile investigations in other parts of the Country. It included a summary of the national context and recent developments along with an indication of known levels of local need. Steve Miley referred to paragraph 5.1 of the report which highlighted the circumstances in Rotherham and the findings of the report of the independent inquiry. He noted that in H&F there had been a concern for a number of years about CSE and the need to identify it, and the Council had put in place a specific service for CSE.



The Council had a contract with Barnardos where they established relationships with children and tracked them; an example of a case was included in the report. With the services put in place, the Council had been able to identify 30 cases; these were not extreme cases but involved young people who were vulnerable to be exploited by older men or by young peer groups. Services had been built on to piece together information on what abuse occurred. There were Multi-Agency Sexual Exploitation (MASE) meetings, where a number of agencies shared information, involving the police, health services, and were able to identify any problem profiles. Steve Miley commented that there had been no evidence of extreme cases in the borough but they were not complacent as there could be cases that officers did not know about. However services had been put in place to be aware of this issue and any cases identified would be looked at by MASE.

Angela Flahive, Joint Tri Borough Head of Safeguarding Review and Quality Assurance, reported that police intelligence was used in H&F in a more informal way and the Council was able to work closely with multi agencies through the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).

In response to concerns about the services being overstretched, as referred to in paragraph 5.2 of the report relating to the problems in Rotherham, it was noted that there was a degree of demand in the borough but this was carefully monitored and reported to the Director of Family Services and Cabinet Member.

It was asked if more was needed to be done in respect of girls and young women, as this was highlighted in the report in paragraph 12.1. Steve Miley responded that there were relatively low numbers concerned and these were considered at the MASE meetings. He noted that the number of children that had been identified had other social problems. More work could be done with staff to trigger awareness of CSE as this was not an issue dealt with in isolation. Schools, voluntary groups, faith groups etc should be encouraged so they felt confident to come to the Council with any concerns. One of the members commented that more work should be done in respect of identifying young boys at risk as he felt that more young boys were at concern and there was a stigma relating to this. Andrew Christie responded that this was an area for the Council to focus on.

It was suggested that the advice given on safeguarding given by the Council could be updated to include how to spot signs of CSE. It was also suggested that more work could be done in relation to gangs and young boys so that there was more awareness of the issues relating to CSE and this would be looked at; Andrew Christie noted that there were officers who worked with gangs and this would be looked at.

***Action: Andrew Christie***

Steve Miley also noted that training on intervention for those caught up in gangs was planned for the Youth Offending Service; this was a new area and the Youth Offending Service was looking at it.

It was reported that the LSCB had offered training for schools on safeguarding and schools needed to be encouraged to take up this training offer.

The contract with Barnardos was questioned and it was asked if any other charities had been looked at to work with. Steve Miley responded that information on the length and cost of the contract would be sent to the Committee for information. Barnardos was the only charity known to provide its service relating to CSE. Steve Miley was happy to explore further organisations when the contract was looked at.

**Action: Steve Miley**

In response to a question on whether safeguarding training was part of the contracts agreed with any third sector organisations, it was noted safeguarding policies and procedures should be part of every commissioning process and information on this would be reported back to the Committee.

**Action: Rachael Wright-Turner**

The Chair commented that CSE was a subject everyone should be aware of and people should be engaged in respect of safeguarding. This was an area that the Committee should look at in the future to ensure that children were being protected and that individuals and groups were actively reporting concerns.

## **32. E-SAFETY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

Angela Flahive, Joint Tri Borough Head of Safeguarding Review and Quality Assurance, introduced the report which gave an update on the work with children and young people relating to e-safety, following the LSCB working group that looked at this issue earlier in the year. The issues raised as part of e-safety also connected with mental health concerns. One of the main concerns in respect of technology was in respect of the victims of abuse who were unable to escape from it. The Council was looking at promoting e-safety through various groups such as youth services, the LSCB, and would look at training on this area to improve knowledge and expertise. The experts on e-safety were the young people themselves and their views and suggestions were sought so that an active plan could be produced to help keep them safe.

The Anti-Bullying Week was referred to and it was asked how this was promoted, as some members were not aware of this campaign. It was reported that there was a survey done in April to schools to highlight cyber bullying for children. Anti-bullying was part of the training package for schools, and schools were responsible for promoting awareness on anti-bullying. Angela Flahive noted that lack of knowledge on the Anti-Bullying Week campaign and would make sure that schools were aware of the Internet Day campaign that was coming up.

Addiction to games was discussed and it was suggested that schools could talk to children about this to help give an early warning of the dangers involved. The Chair mentioned that she had attended a conference on this

issue and expressed concern over the use of technology, such as tablets, by very young children. Andrew Christie responded that this was not something that had been looked at as part of safeguarding but this issue would be taken back to the service to look at. The issue of raising awareness was something that had to be looked at, as parents needed to be aware of the dangers of the materials accessed by young people and they should include filters on devices.

The Chair observed that there was no information on the website on e-safety and suggested that work was done with the communications team to promote in the H&F newsletter how residents could help protect children. Angela Flahive reported that information on e-safety would be given through the LSCB website and she would look at what information was there for parent/carers to access.

***Action: Angela Flahive***

The Chair commented that this subject of e-safety was something that she would like to keep under review and she would like the Council to plan an event in February to help promote awareness on e-safety.

### **33. CHILDCARE UPDATE**

The Committee received an update report on childcare, which gave information on the Childcare Task Group and also addressed questions raised at the previous meeting.

The Childcare Task Group had met twice so far and its aims and objectives were included in the report. The Task Group's final report on its review was planned to come to the Committee at the April meeting. A progress report would be considered in February.

In response to a question on whether mental health was included in the training for childminders, this information would be checked and reported back to the Committee.

***Action: Rosemary Salliss***

Andrew Christie noted that training on mental health should be in respect of the whole family not just the child's mental health.

The inspection of childminders who were not looking after children was referred to again. It was noted childminders had to be registered and Ofsted could visit the childminder at any time, which could be at a time when the childminder might not be looking after a child. Ofsted would look at whether the childminder would meet the standards should a child come under their care.

The number of vacancies of childminders in some areas of the borough was discussed and it was asked how the childminders were identified and supported. Krutika Pau, Interim Head of Commissioning, Early Intervention, commented that the Task Group would be undertaking a survey of childminders and parents/carers to ask what support they wanted. The Chair

of the Task Group noted that the group was engaging with the Quality Childminders Forum in the north and south of the Borough, to meet with childminders to get their feedback and she would raise the issues brought up at this meeting.

Concern was raised that children went into PVI (private, voluntary and independent providers) provision without previously being identified as SEN and it was questioned whether the PVI would have the same level of expertise as those in the public sector provision. It was asked that the Task Group looked at this.

One of the comments raised was the need for childminders to be trained in additional needs of children. Concern was expressed that the Council would not be able to plan ahead if children with additional needs were not identified in PVI settings. It was reported that the Council was moving towards ensuring very early referrals for a number of children. It also provided a list to childminders and PVI providers that includes information, advice and guidelines as to where to refer children who were identified as having additional needs. In response to a question on the number of children with a SEN statement, it was reported that currently there were no children who qualified for the two year old offer directly through the SEN eligibility.

#### **34. WORK PROGRAMME**

The agenda items scheduled for the next meeting were as follows:

- Looked After Children report
- Revenue Budget and Council Tax
- School Performance (including value added results)

The Chair referred to the issue of bi lingual children being used to interpret for their families and asked that a report on this be considered at the February meeting. She also asked that the report looked at how bi lingual children were supported from birth.

The changes to the English curriculum and the impact on the results was referred to and it was asked that the school performance report addressed how the new approach had affected the performance in schools in the borough.

***Action: Richard Stanley***

It was also asked that Committee considered the new introduction of primary school curriculums. It was noted that it would be interesting to hear about good practice at primary schools who have adapted to the new curriculum and hear from headteachers about their views on this.

#### **35. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Committee noted that it had been proposed that the next meeting date be changed from 12 January to 19 January. Once the change of date had been confirmed, the Committee Co-ordinator would contact the members of the Committee to let them know.

Meeting started: 7.05 pm  
Meeting ended: 9.40 pm

Chair .....

Contact officer: Laura Campbell  
Committee Co-ordinator  
Governance and Scrutiny  
Tel 020 8753 2062  
E-mail: [laura.campbell@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:laura.campbell@lbhf.gov.uk)