CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE
SCRUTINY PANEL

Agenda

Place
Committee Room 6 - Town Hall, Wellington Street, Woolwich SE18 6PW

Date
Thursday, 17 January 2019

Time
7.00 pm

This meeting is open to the press and public and they are entitled to take photographs, film or record the proceedings.

Councillors

Ivis Williams (Chair)    Labour    Ann-Marie Cousins    Labour
Linda Bird    Labour    Mariam Lolavar    Labour
Angela Cornforth    Labour    Anthony Okereke    Labour
Gary Dillon    Labour    Patricia Greenwell    Conservative

External Education Appointees

Monsignor Rothon    Roman Catholic Representative
Pauline Sheath    Church of England Representative
Pastor Eghafona    Primary Schools
Michael Freeman    Secondary Schools

Members are reminded that Officer contacts are shown at the end of each report and they are welcome to raise questions in advance with the appropriate Officer. This does not prevent further questioning at the meeting.

If you require further information about this meeting please contact the
Corporate Governance Officer:

Anthony Soyinka
Telephone: 020 8921 2230
Fax: 020 8921 5864
Email: anthony.soyinka@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
1 **Apologies for Absence**
   To receive apologies for absence from Members of the Panel.

2 **Urgent Business**
   The Chair to announce any items of urgent business circulated separately from the main agenda.

3 **Declarations of Interest**
   Members to declare any personal and financial interests in items on the agenda. Attention is drawn to the Council's Constitution; the Council's Code of Conduct and associated advice.

4 **Minutes**
   Members are requested to confirm as an accurate record the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2018.

   No motion or discussion may take place upon the Minutes except as to their accuracy, and any question on this point will be determined by a majority of the Members of the body attending who were present when the matter in question was decided. Once confirmed, with or without amendment, the person presiding will sign the Minutes.

5 **Elective Home Education Annual Report**
   To review the annual report on Elective Home Education and agree areas for further improvement and action.

6 **Children Missing from Education Annual Report**
   To review the annual report on children missing education and agree areas for further improvement and action.
7 **Children Missing from Home and Care Annual Report**
To review the annual report on children who went missing from home and care during the year ending 31 March 2018, note and comment on areas for further improvement and action.

8 **Joint Targeted Area Review Action Plan**
To note and comment on the contents of the report.

9 **Children and Young People Plan Quarter 2 2018/19 Performance Monitor**
To note performance, as at the end of the second quarter of the 2018/19 reporting year, against the key measures covering the four fundamentals underpinning the Children and Young People Plan (CYPP).

10 **School Attendance and Persistent Absence**
To inform members of Children and Young People’s scrutiny about our statutory responsibilities in regard to attendance and our powers.

11 **Commissioning of Future Reports**
To note the work items that are scheduled to be presented to the meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel taking place on 28 February 2019 as outlines in the body of the report.

**Date of Issue**
Wednesday, 9 January 2019

**Debbie Warren**
Chief Executive
Filming and Recording Meetings

This meeting may be photographed (without the use of flash), filmed or audio recorded, except where the public is excluded because confidential or exempt items will be discussed. Any footage is likely to be publicly available.

By entering the room where the meeting is being held, you will be deemed to have consented to being photographed, filmed or audio recorded, and that will apply to any representation you make to the meeting. You will also be deemed to have consented to the possible public use of any images and sound recordings.

If you have any queries regarding the recording of meetings, please contact the Corporate Governance Manager on 020 8921 5134.

Safety

Fire and Emergency Procedures

Users of the Committee Rooms and the Council Chamber are asked to note the following fire and emergency procedures:

When you hear the continuous ringing of the fire alarm bells, please make your way out of the building in an orderly manner. The nearest exit from the Council Chamber and the Committee Rooms is through the main exit leading to Wellington Street (at the front of the building). Do not use the lift and do not stop to collect personal belongings. Once outside the Town Hall please make your way to the Assembly Point between Sainsbury’s and The Vista via Market Street or Polytechnic Street.
### CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Item NO</th>
<th>WARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interests</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIEF OFFICER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Decisions Required**

   The Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel is requested to:

1.1 Note the list of Councillors’ memberships (as Council appointed representatives) on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies.

1.2 Request that Members orally declare any personal or financial interests, including those detailed, in specific items listed on the agenda as they relate to matters under discussion.

2. **Members’ Interests**

2.1 Appended to this report is a list of the outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies that each member of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel has been appointed to by the Council or the Leader. The list does not include bodies with which a Member is involved in a personal or private capacity.

**Personal interests**

2.2 A Member has a personal interest where any business is likely to affect:

   (a) them, or

   (b) a relevant person or a relevant body (where the Member is aware that they have the interest);

   more than a majority of those in the ward you represent.
A **relevant person** is defined as the member’s spouse or civil partner, a person who they are living with as husband and wife or as civil partners, or a person with whom they have a close association.\(^1\)

A **relevant body** is defined as (a) any organisation, school governing body or outside committee or trust which they have been appointed to by the Royal Borough or by the Leader, or (b) any other voluntary organisation, school governing body or commercial organisation where you are a management committee member, school governor, trustee or director.

2.3 Members must declare the existence and nature of any personal interest at the start of the meeting, or when the interest becomes apparent. Members must say which item their interest relates to.

2.4 A Member who has a personal interest may stay, speak and vote, except where the business:

(a) affects the financial position of the Member or any person or body described in paragraph 2.2 above, or

(b) relates to an interest that would be affected financially or relates to the determining to any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to the Member or any person or body described in paragraph 2.2 above

**Financial Interests**

2.5 A Member has a financial interest where any business relates to or is likely to affect an interest set out in paragraph 18 of the Code of Conduct, and which is the Member’s interest or the interest of a person described in paragraph 2.2(a) above.

2.6 Members must declare the existence and nature of any financial interest at the start of the meeting, or when the interest becomes apparent. Members must say which item their interest relates to.

2.7 A Member who has a financial interest must leave the meeting, but may attend to make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the business, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, and provided they leave the meeting immediately after doing so. The Member must not participate in the discussion nor the vote.

---

\(^1\) See the guidance in Annex I of the Code of Conduct
General

2.8 The Code also requires Members to declare interests in relation to relevant bodies for six months after ceasing from being a member and take the appropriate action in relation to financial interests.

Background Papers
Agenda and Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council – 23 May 2018

Report Author: Anthony Soyinka – Corporate Governance Officer
Tel: 020 8921 2230
Email: anthony.soynika@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Gurdeep Sehmi - Corporate Governance Manager
Tel: 020 8921 5134
Email: gurdeep.sehmi@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Governorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Widehorizons Outdoor Education Trust</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Town Twinning Association Executive Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Joint Health Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Greenwich Starting Blocks</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Fostering Panel</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornforth</td>
<td>MIND Management Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Bannockburn Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornforth</td>
<td>Wiseman &amp; Withers Exhibition Foundation</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins</td>
<td>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Joint Health Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins</td>
<td>LGA General Assembly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon</td>
<td>Greenwich Leisure Ltd - Libraries Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Thorntree Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon</td>
<td>Greenwich Wildlife Advisory Group</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon</td>
<td>Greenwich Housing Rights</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Haimo Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolavar</td>
<td>Blackheath Joint Working Party</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolavar</td>
<td>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Joint Health Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okereke</td>
<td>Meridian Home Start Ltd</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okereke</td>
<td>LGA General Assembly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, I</td>
<td>Walpole Estate Management Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESENT:

Members:
Councillor Ivis Williams (Chair), Councillors Linda Bird, Angela Cornforth, Gary Dillon, Ann-Marie Cousins, Mariam Lolavar, Anthony Okereke and Patricia Greenwell

External Education Appointees
Monsignor Rothon (Roman Catholic Representative)
Pauline Sheath (Church of England Representative)

Under Standing Orders
Councillor David Gardner (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Schools)

Officers
Director of Children's Services, Assistant Director Commissioning and Resources (Children's Services), Permanence Group Leader C, Early Help Strategic Lead, Senior Public Health Manager and Corporate Governance Officer

Item
No.

1 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

Apologies for lateness were received for Councillor Angela Cornforth
2 Urgent Business

The Chair advised that the running order for considering the items would be amended and the Panel would consider Agenda Items in the following order 8, 5, 6, 7.

3 Declarations of Interest

Resolved –

That the list of Councillors’ memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies be noted.

4 Minutes

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meeting of the Children and Young Peoples Scrutiny Panel held on 6 September 2018 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

5 School Place Planning Report

The Assistant Director of Commissioning and Resources introduced the report informing the Panel of the Royal Borough of Greenwich’s statutory responsibilities for ensuring there are sufficient education places to meet the level and pattern of demand from residents. This included provision for children with special educational needs and disability (SEND), whilst also ensuring fair access to schools and protecting the interests of the most vulnerable pupils.

The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools advised the Panel that the Local Authority was in a position of duty to fulfil its statutory responsibilities, however held limited to no power and lacked the required level of funding. That going forward the Education and Skills Funding Agency would be accountable for funding education and skills for children, young people and adults. He advised that as part of next year’s work programme that the School Place Planning Report be presented to the Panel for pre-decision scrutiny.

With regards to the educational outcomes for Key stage 4 and 5, the Assistant Director of Commissioning and Resources stated that this was an area of particular focus and she was currently working closely with schools
and the Assistant Director, Inclusion Learning and Achievement to implement strategies for improvement. That those groups within the cohort that consistently underperformed would be subject to continued monitoring to ensure they had the required support around key issues such as exclusions, attendance and family.

In response to questions raised, the Director of Children’s Services informed the Panel that there was a dialogue between the authority and some of the academies but not all, expressing the importance to continue to invite them all to attend scrutiny to facilitate discussions on educational outcomes as it was vital to maintain a good working relationship. That there had been meetings with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools to discuss key stage 4 results and to identify what the short and long term strategies were, which would subsequently be shared with head teachers. She added that the Assistant Director of Commissioning and Resources was leading on an intensive piece of work on disadvantaged children. In 2017, Key Stage 4 results were above the national average however fell short of the London average and the authority were determined to change that.

In respect of the expansion of Boxgrove School, the Assistant Director of Commissioning and Resources advised that projections are tested and re-run throughout the year to keep checks on proposed demand. That the area Boxgrove School was in had previously indicated it to be one of increasing demand however updated reports showed this demand did not materialize. Therefore, the works did not result in an expansion and instead a proposed consultation would be made to Cabinet to utilise the space to establish a designated provision for children with autistic spectrum disorder.

The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools advised that in respect of school place provision that over-providing school spaces significantly added to the cost base of the school therefore getting the balance right was key, as not to have a debilitating effect on a schools finances.

In response to questions raised, the Assistant Director of Commissioning and Resources confirmed that there were sufficient secondary school places available for children in the borough for 2019.

At 8.29pm Councillor Cornforth joined the meeting.

In response to questions raised, the Director of Children’s Services advised that they were implementing strategies to bring down costs in relation to pressure on the General Fund for associated transport support; this included robust decision-making and reviewing transport routes that would be subject
to budget review board meetings. She added that the Schools Forum had made the decision to transfer funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block as head teachers and governors recognize it as an area that is consistently challenging, in need of more investment and a pressure felt across the country. That high needs spend required continued monitored.

Resolved –

That the Panel noted the demand for places at Royal Greenwich schools and post 16 provision, and the action being taken by the Council.

6 Corporate Parenting Board Progress Report

The Senior Assistant Director Children’s Safeguarding and Social Care introduced the report.

In response to questions raised, the SAD Children’s Safeguarding and Social Care clarified that the Promise sets out the Council's commitment to:

Provide young people with a safe and happy home
Respect them and their identity
Offer them support and guidance throughout their time in care
Make sure they get a good education and help them achieve their aspirations
Involve them in decisions about their life
Support them to be active and stay healthy
Ensure they feel fully prepared for their transition into adulthood.

She stated that the Corporate Parenting Board had a lot of work to do in ensuring that the whole of the Council and wider council partners recognized their corporate parenting responsibilities. She added that immediate outcomes such as health, education and placement stability were monitored, stating there were measures in place, which could be matched against the Promise made to Looked After Children in Greenwich.

The Director of Children’s Services stated that the decision was made to develop a stand-alone Corporate Parenting Board as it was felt that the change from a scrutiny function to an active board would ensure a more focused work plan and greater engagement of elected members and directors. That this change had already led to increased opportunities for apprenticeships and Housing were providing training and skills that could be utilized in the workplace.

The Panel thanked officers for the report.
The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools addressed the Panel informing them of a recent attendance at an awards event for Looked After Children where he spent time meeting and talking to foster parents and found them to be passionate and committed. He stated that the Virtual School played a significant role in promoting educational outcomes and raising attainment of all children looked after by Royal Greenwich.

Resolved –

That the Panel noted the progress of arrangements for the Corporate Parenting Board since its establishment in May 2017.

7 Fostering and Adoption Annual Reports

The Service Leader of Permanence and Care Leaving Services introduced the reports. He stated that Greenwich had an innovative fostering service, which had a good reputation across London and the sector that despite challenging circumstances continued to grow. That it was one of the first local authorities in the country to pilot the mockingbird model and few chosen by the national fostering stocktake team to be visited to look at how it supported its foster carers. Greenwich had a leading adoption service across London in terms of the number of children adopted and one that continues to actively seek and recruit adopters.

The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools advised that Greenwich’s record for rated adoptions of 9% and the productivity of its adoption service, in terms of the number of adoptions managed per member of staff was far superior to most other London Boroughs. He stated that collaboration made sense however, there were concerns that the regional adoption arrangements may have unintended negative impact on the practice in Greenwich. He added that alternative arrangements were being explored and a report on the available options would be presented to the Panel at a future meeting.

In response to questions raised, the Service Leader of Permanence advised that as a fostering service, they took an innovative approach towards supporting carers and did not differentiate between support groups for family and friends foster carers or career carers, both of whom have access to the full training program. That where appropriate family and friends foster carers are encouraged to foster a non-related child however have found that a number who had indicated interest did not have spare rooms to facilitate this.

In response to questions raised, the Service Leader of Permanence advised that having a criminal record was not an automatic bar to becoming a foster carer and would expect prospective fosterers to be truthful about their
history. He added that all would be subject to a thorough assessment process, which included statutory checks, references, local authority checks, Disclosure and Barring Services on all household occupants and health assessments.

With regards to fostering applications which were withdrawn by the applicants, the Service Leader of Permanence stated there were a variety of reasons stemming from apprehensive landlords, home security in relation to tenancy, troubled relationships and impact on the prospective fosterers own children.

In response to questions raised, the Service Leader of Permanence advised that the adoption service were committed to finding adoptive families for harder to place children and recognized that although it took longer to identify the right family and placements for them that the service did not give up. He added that Royal Greenwich worked together with consortium partners, Bromley and Lewisham with the aim of recruiting prospective adopters and achieved the second highest number of approved families within the consortium in 2017/18.

The Service Leader of Permanence stated that there had been no adoption disruptions for the past 4 years, which reflected the quality of work within the adoption team.

**Resolved –**

That the Panel noted the work and performance of the Fostering and Adoption Services in 2017-18 as outlined in the reports.

**8 Update on Healthy Weight in Greenwich**

The Senior Public Health Manager introduced the report.

The Panel expressed concerns on the 2016-17 overweight and obesity levels for children in reception and Year 6 in a number of wards that indicated higher percentages. They requested further information on the relationship and link between obesity, diabetes and deprivation.

**Action: Public Health/DCS**

The Senior Public Health Manager informed Members that if ward specific information on health initiatives was required this could be provided upon request.

The Senior Public Health Manager advised that a borough wide response would be required to address the issue of childhood obesity, which had been
recognized as a priority for the borough. She stated that Cookery Clubs, Food and Veg stalls were available in RBG children’s centres providing support to families to adopt healthy practices. She added that 14 schools had signed up to the food for life awards which aimed to put food at the heart of the curriculum bringing schools and their surrounding communities together around the core ethos of healthy, tasty and sustainable food.

The Director of Children’s Services stated that tackling obesity was a complex area of work and schools in the borough were undertaking numerous initiatives to address the issue and commended them for being very creative and imaginative. That the Greenwich Sugar Smart programme and Daily Mile initiative which most of the schools visited had engaged in had encouraged their communities to reduce sugar intake in food and drinks and made a significant difference to the activity levels of young people.

In response to questions raised, The Senior Public Health Manager stated that GS+ the main contractor providing school meals was providing quality and gold standard Food for Life accredited school meals.

The Panel expressed the need to work in partnership with schools to encourage them to monitor policies in practice like reviewing the amount of salad wastage.

The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools stated that the Public Health team in Greenwich were outstanding in London. He added that the Healthy Weight Taskforce chaired by the Cabinet Member for Adult’s Social Care, Health and Anti-Poverty were overseeing and monitoring the healthy weight action plan, ensuring all relevant council departments and strategic partners are held to account for progress.

The Senior Public Health Manager added the taskforce were piloting ‘Super Zones’ which would implement a health zone of 400m around schools trialling a number of interventions.

The Panel expressed that they would send a recommendation on concerns of obesity and its impact on Children and Young People in Greenwich to Planning.

**Action: Chair/CGO**

**Resolved –**

That the Panel noted the most recent obesity data (October 2017) and considered the local response, including the focus of the new RBG Member-level Healthy Weight Taskforce.
9 Commissioning of Future Reports

The Chair advised Panel members of the work programme for the upcoming meetings.

Resolved –

That the Panel noted the work items that are scheduled to be presented to the meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel taking place on 17 January 2019.

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm

___________________________
Chair
1. **Purpose of the report**

1.1 Children and Young People’s Scrutiny are asked to review the annual report on Elective Home Education and agree areas for further improvement and action.

2. **Current Legal Context**

2.1 The responsibility for a child's education rests with their parents. In England, education is compulsory, but school is not. Article 2 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights states that:

“No person shall be denied the right to education. In the exercise of any functions which it assumes in relation to education and to teaching, the State shall respect the right of parents to ensure such education and teaching is in conformity with their own religious and philosophical convictions.”

2.2 Under current legislation parents have a right to educate their children at home. Section 7 of the Education Act 1996 provides that:

"The parent of every child of compulsory school age shall cause him to receive efficient full-time education suitable - (a) to his age, ability and aptitude, and (b) to any special educational needs he may have, either by regular attendance at school or otherwise."

2.3 An "efficient" and "suitable" education is not defined in the Education Act 1996 but "efficient" has been broadly described in case law as an education that "achieves that which it sets out to achieve".

A "suitable" education is one that, "primarily equips a child for life within the community of which s/he is a member, rather than the way of life in the country as a whole, as long as it does not foreclose the child's options in later years to adopt some other form of life if s/he wishes to do so".
2.4 Local authorities have a statutory duty under section 436A of the Education Act 1996, inserted by the Education and Inspections Act 2006, to make arrangements to enable them to establish the identities, so far as it is possible to do so, of children in their area who are not receiving a suitable education. The duty applies in relation to children of compulsory school age who are not on a school roll, and who are not receiving a suitable education otherwise than being at school. The guidance issued makes it clear that the duty does not apply to children who are being educated at home.

2.5 Local authorities have no statutory duties in relation to monitoring the quality of home education on a routine basis.

2.6 However, this year, elective home education has received a renewed focus in the media and from government, with two consultations and a call for evidence released by the Department for Education, as well as the progression of Lord Soley’s Home Education (Duty of Local Authorities) Bill. This Bill is proposing to make provision for local authorities to monitor the educational, physical and emotional development of children receiving elective home education. This Bill will have its second reading in the House of Commons on the 23rd November 2018. This registration of Home Educated children is also being supported by Ofsted.

3. National Context

3.1 The Initial Findings of the Association of Directors of Children’s Services (ADCS) Elective Home Education Survey was published in October 2018. The survey was issued to all 152 local authorities (LAs) in England to understand better the volume and characteristics of children and young people who are known to be home schooled, the different reasons behind a family’s decision to home school, to understand how LAs across the country are supporting these families, and how resources are being deployed in this area. ADCS received a total of 106 valid responses from Local Authorities.

3.2 Across the 106 LAs completing this survey, a total of 40,359 children and young people were known to be home schooled as of 4 October 2018, the first school census day of the current academic year. It can therefore be estimated that there were 57,873 children and young people being home schooled across the 152 LAs in England on 4 October 2018. This represents an increase of approximately 27% from 5 October 2017. Greater awareness of home education, rising birth rates and improved LA recording techniques in part may account for some of the reasons for this growth in the cohort.
3.3 105 LAs answered a question regarding year-on-year increases in the known home schooling cohort from 2013/14 – 2017/18 providing the number of children and young people known to be home schooled on the final day of previous academic years. Not all of the LAs had data for the past five years, with 96 respondents providing data for 2013/14. The number of known home-schooled children and young people has increased in each of the past five years, increasing by an average of approximately 20% each year.

![Number of children and young people home schooled by year](chart)

3.4 The survey tried to capture the in-year churn and 105 LAs responded to a question on the cumulative total of children and young people known to be home schooled at any point across the 2017/18 academic year. A total of 54,204 children and young people were known to be home schooled, meaning it could be inferred that somewhere in the region of 78,466 were known to be home schooled across the 152 LAs in England during the 2017/18 academic year. When compared with the number of children and young people being home schooled on the final day of the 2017/18 academic year (see chart above), this represents an in-year variation of 30%.

A more substantial report from ADCS is expected soon.
4. **Royal Borough of Greenwich Data for 2017-2018**

Total number of pupils being registered as EHE and new referrals

4.1 There were 364 Elective Home Education pupils in total who were registered at some point during the academic year 2017-18. 151 Primary, 203 secondary and 10 Post 16.

4.2 The table below shows the breakdown of total EHE in key stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 There were 182 new EHE referrals (84 primary and 98 secondary), this is comparable to last year when there were 177 new referrals (88 Secondary and 89 primary). RBG has seen referrals rates remain similar to last year. This is related to the work that our EHE officer does with our schools at pre referral stage, providing parents with appropriate advice to avoid inappropriate referrals.
5. **Primary: Total EHE by Year groups**

5.1 The graph above shows a disproportionate total number of year 4 pupils being educated at home; this is reinforced by the graph below which highlights year 4 as having the second largest amount of new referrals in the primary stage. The main reasons given by parents were ‘dissatisfaction with school’ and ‘waiting for another school place’.

5.2 The graph below highlights the increase in new referrals for Reception aged pupils becoming EHE. There were 18 in total, of which six are now in school. A number of parents have informed the EHE Officer that their decision was influenced when their child was not offered a place at their first choice school.

**Primary: New EHE referrals by Year groups**
Referrals by Primary Schools for KS1 & KS2 pupils:

5.3 84 (decrease of 5) referrals were made for pupils between Reception and year 6. This too is related to the work that our EHE officer does with our schools at pre referral stage, providing parents with appropriate advice to avoid inappropriate referrals.

6. Secondary: Total EHE by Year groups

The graph above shows a disproportionate number of year 8 pupils being educated at home; this is understandable when you see the graph below highlighting the increase of EHE referrals for year 8 being made last year. Where parents have stated a reason for the decision to home educate, anxiety and bullying appear to be the main reasons.

Secondary: New EHE referrals by Year groups
Referrals by Secondary Schools for KS3 & KS4 pupils

6.2 This is based solely on new EHE referrals that year.

6.3 98 (increase of 10) referrals were made for pupils between year 7 and year 11
Secondary schools with highest number of EHE referrals or distinctive trends noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCWA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halley (formally Corelli)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The John Roan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead Manor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Academy Greenwich</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Garrard Academy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formally The BAB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhaven (Inc NEST)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Free School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Academy of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tallis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Polytechnic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Although we can see a rise in referrals from two of our schools, all the EHE referrals go through a robust referral procedure and all referrals were appropriate. This information was shared with the Head of Inclusion. Where there are concerns re off rolling this is challenged with the individual schools.
7. **Number of month’s pupil was recorded as being EHE, based solely on pupils whose cases were closed during that particular academic year**

![Chart showing the number of months pupils were recorded as EHE](image)

7.1 Although 21 cases (13.81%) were closed less than one month from being referred, on the whole there was a decrease in young people being registered as EHE for less than three and twelve months. This is partially due to the robust referral process which has resulted in positive relationships and more joined up working with schools to prevent parents from taking the option to EHE. The EHE officer has seen an increase in parents contacting her to seek advice about home education, prior to actually taking the decision. There was an increase in cases being closed that were educated at home in excess of twelve months; 28 of these were educated at home for more than two years.

7.2 Of the 364 young people registered as Elective Home Education (EHE) the EHE Officer was able to meet with 156 either at home or at a neutral venue, some required a further meeting. In total 205 meetings took place. Based on the resources available the EHE officer will continue to prioritise and carry out as many visits/meetings as possible.

7.3 If there are concerns following a home visit, these will be followed up appropriately, different concerns will prompt different action. If it is a safeguarding concern a referral will be made to MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub). If the education is unsuitable a referral will be made to the Fair Access Panel (FAP).

7.4 If a parent informs the EHE Officer that they are moving, a forwarding address is requested in order to inform the new local authority. If a child is moving abroad every attempt is made to get a forwarding address together...
with an education provision if appropriate. If this is not forthcoming, it may be necessary to refer to the Child Missing Education (CME) Officer.

8. **Processes and Protocols**

8.1 The Royal Borough of Greenwich employs an Elective Home Education (EHE) Officer 32 hours a week. The Officer works within the Attendance Advisory Service.

8.2 The majority of referrals come from schools, admissions and the Child Missing Education (CME) Officer following receipt of a letter from parents stating their intention to educate their child/ren at home. A small number of referrals (possibly three or four a year) come from other agencies such as Accident and Emergency admissions and anonymous calls from the public.

8.3 Safeguarding checks

- When a referral is received, the following actions are taken: Child’s details are checked against Impulse and Framework. Impulse is updated. Details are added to EHE database. Every individual (family) referral has an electronic file.
- A Child Risk Analysis is completed on all new referrals using Framework.
- If Framework indicates that there are current safeguarding concerns, contact is made to the allocated social worker and priority will be given in regards to arranging a home visit.
- If a pupil has previously been known to safeguarding, but the case is closed, an email with the child’s details are sent to the Quality Improvement Service for a Safeguarding overview.
- If necessary a home visit will be prioritised.
- Introduction letter and Information for Parents and Carers leaflet sent to child’s home (includes information about a home visit)
Total number of EHE pupils known on FWI.

8.4 This does not necessarily mean that there were any safeguarding concerns at the point of EHE referral.

8.5 In 2017-2018 47.25% were known currently or historically to social care, this is a positive decrease and a continuing trend; as in 2016-2017 54.20% and in 2014-2015 59.17%.

8.6 If a parent refuses to liaise with the EHE Officer and there are safeguarding concerns, the EHE Officer will continue attempts to work with the family and will liaise with appropriate agencies such as Early Help in order to gain insight into the suitability of the education. If families can no longer be contacted at given address, appropriate checks will be made via council tax and if necessary a referral is made to the CME officer.

8.7 If parents decline the offer of a meeting and there are no safeguarding or other concerns this is respected, in line with current legislation (Education Act 1996). Further information will be sent out that may be useful or of interest to the family. A number of parents will send either evidence of work or their annual education plan.

8.8 When a home visit is conducted, the officer makes a judgement as to whether the education is suitable. Where education is deemed unsuitable, advice and guidance is given as well as time for the quality of the education to improve, if the parent genuinely wants to home educate. A further visit is then undertaken. If the education continues to be unsuitable then a referral is made to the Fair Access Panel and a school or Alternative Provision placement found. A School Attendance Order is initiated if necessary.

In 2017-2018 the EHE Officer referred 27 pupils to the Fair Access Panel. Nine School Attendance Orders were initiated, compared with five the previous year. No parent was prosecuted as plans were put in place to return all pupils to education.
8.9 If education at home is not what the parent wants in the long term then advice and support is given to look at alternative education. Visits are undertaken on an annual basis, unless greater support is needed to improve the standard. Visits are then undertaken as frequently as needed. Some families appreciate the extra visits for advice and reassurance.

9. **Special Educational Needs**

9.1 Last year there were seven pupils registered as Elective Home Education (EHE) who had an Education Health Care (EHC) plan or statement. EHE referrals are only accepted following a meeting with SEND officer, school and parent. This number is a fraction of the total number 67 of EHE pupils who are recorded as having a special educational need based on information supplied by the school or parent, for example, they may have an ASD diagnosis, or the child was receiving SEN support at school.

10. **Ethnicity**

10.1 There is no apparent disproportionality in regards to ethnicity. The top four categories were as below with 68 children either being unknown or ethnicity category being declined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBRI/White British</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black Caribbean:MWBC</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean:BCRB</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller Irish Heritage:WIRT</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/declined</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Gender**

11.1 There is no disproportionality in regards to Gender. Of the new referrals, there were 90 female and 92 male. The total of all children registered as EHE is 179 female and 185 male.
12. Reasons for EHE based solely on new EHE referrals that year

12.1 The main reason given for choosing to home school their child is parental choice. We are working with families to understand the real reason behind the decision, despite parents continuing to just state the standard text provided by education otherwise. Where a reason has been given, dissatisfaction with school and anxiety are the most common reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reason for home schooling-new ref's only</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parental choice</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusion/prevent further/permanent exclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid prosecution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfaction with school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting for another school place</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school cannot meet the needs of child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reason given</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary school transfer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family planning to move</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelling community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2 In the chart below is the top 5 reasons given by parents/carers for choosing to home educate their child, as captured in the previous 5 academic years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>parental choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>waiting for another school place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>dissatisfaction with school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>avoid prosecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Item No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **Partnership Working**

13.1 The Officer facilitates opportunities for EHE parents and their children to meet up and network, through coffee mornings and annual picnics. Maintaining good relationships with parents is paramount. Many EHE parents use social media to engage with other EHE parents; which includes their experiences with our EHE Officer. In 2017-2018 the parents of 28 pupils declined to meet with/engage with the local authority, which is comparable to 2016-2017. Following an anonymous call received in regards to one family, stating that the education at home was unsuitable; our Officer was able to use EHE guidance and legislation in regards to this and persuaded parent to agree
to a home visit. The outcome was positive and the children continue to be registered as EHE.

13.2 The Officer is a member of the South East Elective Home Education Officers Forum and networks at a local and national level to keep abreast of any changes in legislation and to share best practice. We have representation on Select Committee meetings. Lord Soley’s Bill from 2017 giving Local Authority a duty to monitor children receiving home education had its second reading in the House of Lords and has progressed to the House of Commons. A provisional sitting is scheduled for 26/10/2018.

13.3 We have a good partnership working with other agencies. All EHE year 11s are referred to a ‘Careers Practitioner’, who makes contact with them in regards to post 16 advice & support. Updates are made on a termly basis. All year 11 pupils are signposted to ‘The Point’. Following changes in data protection GDRP, how we do this will change in the new academic year.

13.4 The EHE Officer works in close partnership with the OXLEAS Immunisation Team and regularly sends out letters and information to the relevant year groups in regards to The Childhood Flu Vaccination and HPV Vaccination.

13.5 Although a number of EHE pupils take GCSEs independently. Newhaven for the second year running facilitated GCSE exams for EHE students.

14. Update on actions from 2017-18

14.1 Continue to work closely with the SEND team, to ensure clarity re process and monitoring of children with an Education, Health and Care Plan, both at the point of referral and at Annual Reviews.

SEND now have a named Officer responsible for EHE pupils who the EHE Officer works closely with.

14.2 EHE Officer made a total of 200 home visits. EHE Officer will endeavour to make less repeat visits to families and use the SAO process more systematically to direct children back into education. This year with new administration support, this should make the above process more rigorous.

Although the EHE Officer did not receive any additional administration support, her hours were increased from 28hours to 32hours a week. As stated in the report, the EHE Officer undertook more home visits; more young people were referred to the Fair Access Panel and there were
more School Attendance Orders initiated compared to the previous year,

14.3 EHE Officer will continue to keep abreast of national changes to assessment, curriculum updates and exam syllabi. This information will be used to support parents.

The EHE Officer was able to provide support on curriculum to families who requested it and called on the school improvement teams expertise where necessary.

15. Challenges and Priorities for 2018-2019

15.1 Continue to work with the SEND team, meeting regularly with the named officer, to ensure clarity regarding process and monitoring of children with an Education, Health and Care Plan, both at the point of referral and at Annual Reviews.

15.2 EHE Officer will look at ways to record ‘the voice of the child’ in relation to home education.

15.3 Further work will take place regarding GDRP and how this will impact on data collection and information sharing.

15.4 There continues to be an ongoing challenge of balancing and prioritising the needs of the service, based on the resources available. If the Bill is successful and there are new requirements requiring the registration and monitoring of all EHE children we will look at service design and delivery.
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1. **Purpose of the report**

1.1 Scrutiny are asked to review the annual report on children missing education and agree areas for further improvement and action.

2. **Background**

2.1 The Royal Borough of Greenwich employs a Child Missing Education (CME) Officer, 17.5 hours a week. The CME Officer works within the Attendance Advisory Service (AAS).

2.2 The purpose of this post is to:

- Identify children missing from education, locate them and offer a school place within identified timescales via the Fair Access Panel (FAP).

- Identify Children Missing Education, who have ceased to attend schools or cease to be resident within the borough, without forwarding a school and or address details, and track these children as far as reasonably possible, using all resources and investigative tools available, to establish their safety.

3. **Children Missing Education Statutory Guidance 2016**

3.1 The revised statutory guidance (published in January 2015) relating to Children Missing Education (CME) states that this group of children are at significant risk of underachieving, being victims of abuse, and becoming NEET (not in education, employment or training) later on in life:

*Local authorities should have robust procedures and policies in place to enable them to meet their duty in relation to these children, including appointing a named person that schools and other agencies can make referrals to. Local authorities should undertake regular reviews and evaluate their processes to ensure that these continue to be fit for purpose in identifying and dealing with CMEs in their area.*
The purpose of the section 436A of the Education Act 1996 is to ensure that local authorities’ arrangements enables them to establish the identities of children in their area who are not registered pupils at a school, and are not receiving suitable education otherwise than at a school. The LA should consult the parents of the child when establishing whether the child is receiving suitable education. Local authorities should have procedures in place to prevent children at risk of becoming CME. Those children identified as not receiving suitable education should be returned to full time education either at a school or in alternative provision.

3.2 The legislation was introduced by the Department for Education to further strengthen the robustness of local authority procedures in identifying children missing education. The main changes from 1 September 2016 were:

- All schools (including academies and independent schools) must notify their local authority when they are about to remove a pupil’s name from the school admission register under any of the fifteen grounds listed in the regulations. This duty does not apply when a pupil’s name is removed from the admission register at standard transition points, or when the pupil has completed the final year of education normally provided by that school.

- When removing a pupil’s name, the notification to the local authority must include: (a) the full name of the pupil, (b) the full name and address of any parent with whom the pupil normally resides, (c) at least one telephone number of the parent, (d) the pupil’s future address and destination school, if applicable, and (e) the ground in regulation 8 under which the pupil’s name is to be removed from the admission register.

- Schools must make reasonable enquiries to establish the whereabouts of the child jointly with the local authority, before deleting the pupil’s name from the register if the deletion is under regulation 8.

- All schools must also notify the local authority within five days of adding a pupil’s name to the admission register at a non-standard transition point. The notification must include all the details contained in the admission register for the new pupil. This duty does not apply when a pupil’s name is entered in the admission register at a standard transition point – at the start of the first year of education normally provided by that school. When adding a pupil’s name, the notification to the local authority must include all the details contained in the admission register for the new pupil.
4. **Identified groups of young people who are at risk of becoming CME**

4.1 There are many circumstances where a child may become missing from education so it is vital that the CME Officer makes judgements on a case-by-case basis. The CME Officer uses safeguarding and child protection knowledge and training, when in receipt of and investigating a CME referral, adhering to the five priorities of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board. These include:

- **Pupils at risk of harm/neglect** - Children may be missing from education because they are suffering from abuse or neglect.

- **Children of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) Families** – research has shown that many children from these families can become disengaged from education, particularly during the secondary school phase.

- **Families of Armed Forces** - Families of members of the Armed Forces are likely to move frequently – both in UK and overseas and often at short notice.

- **Missing children/runaways** - Children who go missing or run away from home or care may be in serious danger and are vulnerable to crime, sexual exploitation or abduction as well as missing education.

- **Children and young people supervised by the Youth Justice System** - Children who have offended or are at risk of doing so are also at risk of disengaging from education.

5. **Why Children become Children Missing Education**

5.1 Children are categorised as CME when they are of statutory school age, but are not in an educational provision or are educated otherwise (Elective Home Education).

5.2 There are many reasons why a child might not be in education or stops attending the school they are on roll to, typically;
• They may move into or out of the local authority without an identified school place.

• They may cease to attend the school they are on roll to, without informing the school of where they are moving to and/or what school their child is transferring to.

• They may inform the school that the family are moving abroad, without providing proof.

• The parent may refuse the allocation of a school place.

5.3 In any circumstance, where a child is found/believed not to be in receipt of an education, investigations, in line with Child Missing Education Statutory Guidance, must be undertaken, in order to ascertain the education provision of the child, or ensure the child is returned to/receiving suitable education.

6. **The Stages for processing CME cases in Greenwich**

6.1 There are 5 distinct stages of a referral:

1. Where a child ceases to attend their educational provision. The education provider is expected to follow school absence procedures in line with identified guidelines. If the absence continues, without communication from the parent, the education provider must undertake action in line with safeguarding procedures following ‘keeping children safe in education’ and ‘working together to safeguard children’ and undertake reasonable enquiries to try to establish the whereabouts of the child under CME procedures.

2. Pre-referral - At this stage the source referrer should engage in consultation with the schools Attendance Advisory Officer, as appropriate and/or the CME Officer to identify what actions have been undertaken, to seek advice and support, and see if a CME referral should be made and when. Joint reasonable enquiries and preventative work is implemented to identify the needs of the child and support the referrer to take steps to prevent the child becoming CME.

3. Referrals – Once a referral has been received it becomes ‘Active’. At this stage investigation and casework is undertaken to establish the whereabouts of the child(ren) with emphasis placed on working collaboratively with schools and other partner agencies.
4. Closing Referrals - If a child has been located and returned to suitable education (school/EHE, Alternative Provision) then the case can be closed.

5. Unable to Locate - If the CME Officer has been unable to locate a child, despite exhaustive efforts and following a risk assessment, then a referral will be closed and logged as ‘Unable to locate’. The details of the child are held on file and reported to the MASH Education Officer, who will update Frameworki with an alert to contact the CME Officer if the child subsequently becomes known to the borough. The child’s information will be uploaded to S2S Lost Pupil database either in Local Authority, National or Global User groups and Immigration Services.

7. Partner Agencies for investigative purposes:

- NHS
- Corporate & Anti-Fraud Team (which would have access to all databases including housing; council tax; benefits etc.)
- RBG Housing
- RBG Council Tax
- RBG Troubled Families
- Performance Analysis Service (PAS) Team
- Education Officer – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)
- CME officers in other Local Authorities
- School Admissions
- Schools
- Special Educational Needs Department (SEND) and Special Educational Needs & Disability Information, Advise and Support Service (SENDIASS)
- Youth Offending Service (YOS)
- Children’s Services Social Care;
- UK Visas and Immigration - formally UK Border Agency (UKBA)
- Police Services (for joint home visits with safeguarding concerns)

8. Partner Agencies referred to for supporting CME children and their families:

- Early Help
- Youth Offending Service
- MASH
- Fair Access Panel (FAP)
- SEND Information, Advice Support Service (SENDIASS)
- Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)
9. **Data Sharing:**

9.1 The CME data is provided to the PAS Team on a monthly basis.

9.2 Data is shared between applicable services to identify any links between children who go missing, children not attending school, children linked to gang activity and/or at risk of sexual exploitation and is used to identify patterns and trends and any links between individual children and the individual services.

9.3 The data is used by operational leaders in Children’s Social Care to maintain a strategic overview, to check what action is taken for individual children and its impact on reducing the risk of children becoming missing from education again.

10. **The Referral Sources for CME cases**

\[ \text{Chart: Source of referral} \]

*CME Data - Children’s Services*

The total number of CME referrals for 2017-2018 academic year was **192**

10.1 As at the end of the academic year 2017-18 there were **74 ‘active’ CME cases**. At the time of this report there were **31 ‘active’ CME cases**.
10.2 The CME Officer undertakes a vast amount of pre-referral work with potential referrers, assisting with undertaking ‘joint reasonable enquiries’, in line with legislation, in order to avoid young people becoming CME’s. This reducing the overall number of CME referrals.

10.3 Primary and Secondary schools are the highest referrals for CME cases, due to children ceasing to attend and/or moving out of the Borough with no forwarding address/school details. All Schools, including academies and independent schools are required to follow the CME guidelines.

10.4 Training and detailed guidance, in line with legislation and statutory guidance has been provided to all schools has contributed to a lower level of CME referrals. RBG Schools, including academies and independent schools are clearer about the actions they are required to undertake to establish the whereabouts of children, prior to undertaking CME referrals.

10.5 Out of borough CME referrals have increased, whereby children have moved into the RBG, without the provision of a school place. Temporary housing and increased mobility being significant factors.

10.6 There were 10 CME referrals received from Admissions during the academic year 2017-18. This is significantly reduced from previous academic years. This is mainly contributory to new procedures outlined below;

- In previous academic years, the level of CME referrals from Admissions was higher as;

  1) Some parents would make the decision to keep their children out of school, pending their appeal against the Local Authority, when their children were not offered their first choice of school in Reception or Year 7. Admissions Officers would refer these children as CME.

  2) Children who arrive in the borough and who may have been out of school for some time would be referred. An example of this would be; often families move into temporary accommodation or with relatives and apply for a school place, sometimes using friends/family and other/online translators, to make school place applications. Unfortunately, when they are then contacted by Greenwich Admissions, they would have possibly moved on, or would be unable to provide or understand the need for ‘Proof of Address’ requests/communication from Admissions. Admissions Officers would refer these children as CME.
At the end of the academic year 2016-17, in preparation for the academic year 2017-18, it was agreed that further action by Admissions Officers, could reasonably take place at the stage of application, including the use of the legislative powers of the Local Authority, to deal with the non-school attendance:

- The issues were addressed and a new protocol was agreed between the Team Manager, Attendance Advisory Service and the Head of Admissions.

- CME guidance clearly indicates the actions that need to be undertaken by ‘schools’ prior to a referral being made to the CME officer. For the academic year 2017-18, a protocol for Admissions, was established, identifying clear actions to be undertaken by Admissions Officers, prior to making a CME referral and in order to where possible, ‘prevent’ the classification of CME, and/or delaying the offer of a school place. (Flowchart attached for information).

- Whilst following their Admissions processes, Admissions Officers follow CME Guidance, using all resources available, in order to enable equal access to services to vulnerable client groups where their first language may not necessarily be English or if there are other communication difficulties.

- During the process of investigative action, liaison with the CME Officer seeking advice at an early stage of a child being out of education is encouraged.

- The Legislative powers of the Local Authority in the form of ‘School Attendance Orders’ are in place and used where necessary now, by the Admissions Officers dealing with the parents/carers who refuse school places offered, without judicious reason.

- These pro-active interventions now in place, undertaken specifically by schools and Admissions, have had a significant impact on preventing CME referrals and ensuring school places are secured as swiftly as possible.
11. **The Profile of CME children referred:**

11.1 **Gender**

![Referral by gender chart]

*CME Data 2 - Children’s Services*

Whilst referrals for male children remain higher, there is no significant gender split.

11.2 **Ethnicity**

![Ethnicity breakdown chart]

*CME Data 3 - Children’s Services*
11.3 In previous years, there were a high level of “Unknowns” identified within the ethnicity analysis. This was in part due to Admissions Services being unable to ask for ethnicity information and/or the referrer, just not providing such information. However, the CME officer now follows up all referrals with the referrer or returns them prior to acceptance, if not sufficiently completed. This has resulted in the data being more accurate.

11.4 Having detailed information of the ethnic origin of the client groups we are dealing with, enables us to intervene and support more effectively. Using resources available to the CME Officer in ensuring the timely location of CME and their return to education.

11.5 Being aware of any changes in the demographic of the local authority population, enables the targeting of resources and assists on planning for future needs.

11.6 **Profile by Year group**

![Referral by year group - 2017/18](image)
12. **Joint Targeted Area Inspection - February 2018 – Evidence of Effectiveness**

12.1 Children Missing Education practice in Royal Borough of Greenwich.

“Strong arrangements are in place to ensure that children missing from education (CME) are identified and, where possible, located. Good liaison is in place with the MASH when children are missing from education. The CME Team is diligent in their efforts to locate children, for example by checking with Housing colleagues, health colleagues and other local authorities“.

13. **Improvement and Actions Identified during 2016-2017 and Implemented during 2017-2018:**

13.1 Admissions play a key role in the prevention of CME cases. They have been second highest referrer during 2015-16 and 2016-17 (20% and 25% of all CME cases).

13.2 The CME Officer, Admissions Team and Attendance Advisory Service are working on the new approach in dealing with children missing education (As referred to in Section 11.8 and 11.9), using the legislative powers of the LA, when it is clearly the parent/carer not undertaking their parental responsibility (under section 444 of the Education Act 1996) by not ensuring their child’s access to sufficient full time education. Through refusal to accept the school place offered by the Admissions Service, a School Attendance Order (SAO) is now a route pursued to getting a child into education as opposed to making a CME referral. Using the legislative power to issue a SAO is not to criminalise, but to ensure the parents/carers are aware of their legal responsibilities in relation to their children’s education and the implications of non-compliance.

- Number of SAO referrals received from Admissions - 9
- Number of SAO’s withdrawn as school places taken up - 7
- Number of SAO’s presented to Magistrates Court – 2

13.3 Schools follow their safeguarding procedures (‘Keeping Children safe in Education’ and Working Together to Safeguard Children’) when encountering children missing from education.

13.4 The CME legislation, ‘Children Missing Education Statutory Guidance 2016’ has been implemented and schools, including academies and independent schools are aware of their obligations to comply with the statutory guidance and of the expectation to inform the Local Authority when adding or
removing a pupil from the school’s roll. We continue to use the dedicated email system to do this –

- ‘School-Register-Reporting@royalgreenwich.gov.uk’,
- Attendance Advisory Officers work with schools on ensuring adherence to legislation and statutory guidance.
- Continued liaison and a sample of independent school websites in the borough indicates that they are aware of the legislation and have incorporated it into their policies and procedures.

13.5 Partnership working is improving and ensures more accuracy of data recording, specifically ethnicity data, as sensitivity to individual/cultural needs is paramount when dealing with all families. Admissions cannot request ‘ethnicity’ information from families, so census data and other sources are sought to ensure our cohort profile data is as complete as possible.

13.6 The Attendance Advisory Service officers and the CME Officer have made themselves available to all their schools for consultation on possible CME matters.

13.7 Collaboration with other local authorities is in place.

14. Actions Identified for further improvement during 2018-2019

14.1 Use of Interpreting Services may increase as further work is undertaken to liaise with vulnerable families and families where English is not the first language.

14.2 The Statutory Guidance is to be reviewed by the DfE in September 2019. In preparation for this the CME procedures have been reviewed. This will be an ongoing process. Guidelines provided to schools and Admissions remain relevant and suit purpose, sufficiently and effectively. The CME referral form has been revamped in order to improve the administration and data collection for the referrer and the CME Officer.

14.3 Developing working relations with internal/external partners continues.

14.4 Further CME Training will be offered to schools on request and to new schools opening in Greenwich. Further training will be arranged this academic year, specifically focusing on independent schools within the borough, and those who do not have a dedicated AAO.
14.5 The CME Officer has been granted (as of October 2018) direct access to the ‘Advise and Benefits Service Information Systems’.

- This access will mean the CME Officer is not wholly reliant on other officers/departments when investigating a CME referral. They will be autonomous and able to speed up the process of locating a child missing from education.

14.6 The new IT system, Synergy, is still in the process of being implemented. Once implemented, the CME Officer and Admissions Officers, will be able to share and access information simultaneously.

14.7 General Data Protection Regulation 2016 and Data Protection Act 2018

- The CME Officer and Officers of the Attendance Advisory Service are compliant with the GDPR and DPA. Necessary information is obtained and processed within the legal obligation imposed on the authority under the Education Acts, for the administration of justice or for the exercise of statutory functions, to ensure that children of compulsory school age receive suitable full-time education.

- The impact on CME and the length of time children are out of school, due to changes to the FAP protocols in line with GDPR, will have to be evaluated.

Report Author: Sylvia Francis, CME/CE Officer
Tel No. 020 8921 8505
Email. sylvia.francis@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Jillian O’Beirne, Assistant Team Manager – Attendance Advisory Service
020 8921 8515
jillian.obeirne@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Sally Kelly, Head of Inclusion/Headteacher Virtual School
Tel No. 020 8921 5821
Email. sally.kelly@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
1. **Purpose of the report**

This report makes the following recommendations:

1.1 That the Scrutiny Panel review the annual report on children who went missing from home and care during the year ending 31st March 2018, and note and comment on areas for further improvement and action.

2. **Introduction and Background**

2.1 This report has been prepared by the Quality Improvement Service and the Performance Analysis Service (PAS) to inform the Scrutiny Panel of the profile of children missing from home and care in Greenwich.

2.2 The key aims of this report are:

- Understand the trends in the number of children who go missing children from home and care between 1st April 2017 and 31st March 2018.
- Identify the prevalent and associated risk factors that are relevant to children living in Greenwich.
- Report to Scrutiny Panel on the multi-agency interventions aimed to reduce the risk of children going missing and to share learning across the network on ‘what works’ to reduce the incidence of children going missing.

2.3 Scrutiny is asked to note the contents and are invited to identify if there are any further issues on which they would like to be briefed.

2.4 Areas of strength in 2017-18 include:

- Strong partnership and shared commitment from all partner agencies to work together and improve outcomes for this cohort of children.
- Calm and reflective approach to leadership in children’s social care and a commitment to learning and developing child focused practice.
• Performance management and a wide range of audit activities are well embedded leading to the identification of areas for improvement and action plans to address the issues

3. **Definitions**

3.1 The revised statutory guidance relating to children who go missing was published in January 2014 and includes new definitions that the Police use to respond to children who are reported missing.

- **missing**: anyone whose whereabouts cannot be established and where the circumstances are out of character, or the context suggests the person may be subject of crime or at risk of harm to themselves or another; and
- **absent**: a person not at a place where they are expected or required to be.

4. **Overview**

4.1 It is recognised that children who go missing from home and care are potentially at risk of significant harm. There is no precise data on the number of missing incidents, but in 2014-15, based on police reporting, it was estimated that there was a 24% increase of children going missing since 2011 in England and Wales. The data for 2015-16 shows a 16% increase of children reported missing on the previous year (NCA Missing person data report 2014-15 & 2015-16).

4.2 Children who go missing are at increased risk of being drawn into gangs, crime and being sexually exploited. Children go missing for a number of reasons; some will be running away from something, known as push factors; others will be running to something, known as pull factors. The majority of young people who go missing are teenagers which can be a confusing and challenging time for many young people, their parents and professionals working with them. It is essential for the multi-agency network to work closely together and alongside families on individual cases to reduce the risk. There is also a need to consider the missing young people on a strategic level.

4.3 Children at risk of exploitation by gangs, are a recognised priority in the Children and Young People Plan (2017-2020) as well as a priority of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board (GSCB).
5. **The role of the Local Safeguarding Children Board**

5.1 The statutory guidance identifies that the GSCB has a role to play in meeting its statutory responsibilities by ensuring that

- the GSCB partnership work effectively together to prevent children from going missing and to act when they do go missing
- the GSCB receives reports from the local authority analysing data on children who go missing including learning from return interviews and reports from providers of children’s homes that the local authority uses.

6. **GSCB Missing Group**

6.1 In 2017-18 the GSCB Missing Group continued to meet bi-monthly. The Missing Group ensures that:

- There is a multi-agency focus on children who go missing;
- Our responses to missing children are quality assured by analysing data and sharing learning;
- An understanding is developed of the local factors.
- There is effective information sharing between different organisations with differing roles who respond to children who go missing, children who get drawn into gang activity and children who are at risk of sexual exploitation.

6.2 The group is well established, has good multi-agency attendance, which has broadened over the year. The group has continued to contribute to the improved multi-agency response to children who go missing. The GSCB Missing group has strong links with the CSE MASE to ensure a joined up response.

6.3 In 2017-18, the GSCB Missing Group contributed to or led on:

- Further strengthening of partnership working and information sharing between the police and other multi-agency partners to improve identification, prosecution and protection. This has been helped by an increase in Police capacity
- Published Missing fact sheets for young people, parents /carers and professionals
- Completed multi-agency audits in relation to children who have stopped going missing to examine what works with findings disseminated

6.4 The GSCB recognises that different forms of exploitation leading to abuse are often co-present in the lives of children and the strong link with children
going missing, especially when this happens more than once. The GSCB has decided to combine the functions of the CSE MASE and the Missing Work Group into one for 2018-19; the Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group (SMACE)

6.5 The GSCB Missing Group, along with the CSE MASE were key in developing a new multi-agency meeting, the Greenwich Risk Adolescent Safeguarding Prevention (GRASP) to share information across services about adolescents effectively and in a timely way in order to reduce harm.

6.6 The focus of GRASP is on protecting children, disrupting harmful activity and bringing perpetrators to justice. From January 2017, the GRASP has been meeting weekly to discuss any young person (under 18 years) that has come to the attention of the Police in the previous 7 days for: Violence, knives, badly beaten, serious incident, guns; harmful Sexual Behaviour; Gangs, including drug supply, county lines, trafficking, cuckooing; and new arrivals of high risk young people who have moved into Royal Greenwich. There are also three cohort groups in relation to CSE, regular high risk missing children, and young people on Intensive Order with the Youth Offending Service.

6.7 The GRASP identifies actions on individual cases that are followed through in all agencies to reduce risk. Peer networks, venues & geographical locations are discussed, including online spaces such as social media and websites. The meeting also considers the needs of siblings and vulnerable adults connected to the young person. Information shared at the GRASP is used to develop a problem profile of the Borough that is used in a number of ways including identifying “hotspots” to enable targeting of services to prevent harm and crime and to inform strategic decision making. This information will be shared at the Strategic Multi Agency Child Exploitation Group.

7. **Joint Targeted Area Inspection**

7.1 In February 2018 Ofsted, CQC, HMICFRS and HMI Probation undertook a joint inspection (JTAI) of the multi-agency response to children who go missing, who are at risk of child sexual exploitation and who are at risk of criminal and other forms of exploitation through gangs. The report stated: “There is strong partnership working in Greenwich and a shared commitment to improving services to all children at risk of harm. Strategic arrangements for the management and oversight of the multi-agency response to children who go missing and are at risk of exploitation are well developed.”
The JTAI identified areas of practice strength which included:

- Strong partnership and shared commitment from all partner agencies to work together and improve outcomes for this cohort of children.
- Strategic arrangements for the management and oversight of the multi-agency response to children who go missing and are at risk of exploitation are well developed.
- High profile work leads to increased investment and development of new and innovative approaches such as GRASP.
- Effective GSCB and good links across strategic boards.
- Evidence of impact from the activity of the GSCB – section 11 audits, multi-agency deep dive, challenge, influence, learning through training and awareness raising.
- Practitioners in the MASH are confident and knowledgeable about their area of business and support staff across the partnership by delivering training and development sessions.
- Effective Preventative Work through VOCU training sessions in school, community safety and YOT, VCS. Organisations understand thresholds and know how to make referrals to MASH and Early Help services.
- Calm and reflective approach to leadership in children’s social care and a commitment to learning and developing child focused practice.
- Performance management and a wide range of audit activities are well embedded leading to the identification of areas for improvement and action plans to address the issues.
- Children's views are well captured and help inform planning.
- Political support has ensured that resources for children’s services are protected.
- Clear commitment from the local police to developing a resilient and coordinated structure in which to safeguard children.
- Strong commitment by health leaders contributing to the work of GSCB and local strategic groups.
- Public health commissioners have made good progress in ensuring that front line services meet needs.
- A strong YOS with staff who understand that building trusting and meaningful relationships is especially important with this group of children.
7.3 The JTAI also identified areas for further development which included:

- The understanding and response to risk is variable across all of the agencies and for some children not sufficiently explored or known because information sharing is not robust enough
- When a new concern is referred to social care about a child whose case is already open it is not always prioritised to lead to a timely response
- Not all assessments include enough analysis of historic factors or multi-agency information or sufficient analysis of the complex and dynamic nature of children’s needs and the impact on children and their families
- Multi-agency plans do not always evidence a strong enough grip or focus to allow services keep pace with changing events in a young person’s life
- The MPS have a pan London profile however locally there is a lack of analytical capability and currently no local police profile in relation to children going missing and child sexual exploitation
- The contribution of health staff to operational meetings was less effective than strategic meetings.
- Low level of referrals from community health services reflect that there is no specific emphasis on exploitation as a significant priority area
- The GSCB could strengthen its work by evidencing the impact and outcomes of the work is has done so far and by having specific priorities for individual members and for sub groups to include timescales

7.4 A multi-agency workshop was held to develop these findings into a JTAI Improvement Plan. This plan is being progressed and is monitored by the Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group. See appendix 1.

7.5 A specific action was identified in the JTAI Improvement Plan relating to missing children: In order to ensure a more timely, co-ordinated response to children who go missing and a more tailored approach to meeting individual needs, reducing risk and improving outcomes, a multi-agency task & finish group will focus on developing a practice framework. The focus will be on securing a better understanding of why adolescents go missing not on what happens when missing. The effectiveness and purpose of Return Home Interviews, safe & well checks and other interviews with the children and young people will be reviewed to determine whether different approaches should be taken. There will also be a focus on safety planning with adolescents.
8. **Children who go missing from home**

8.1 All Police Merlin’s (children coming to police notice) reports are screened and evaluated by staff in the MASH. All young people who go missing are referred for an independent Return Home Interview (RHI) when found. MASH or allocated social workers will review information to determine whether further services are needed for the young person and their family.

8.2 There were 105 children and young people who went missing from home for more than 24 hours in 2017-18. This is an increase on last year and a greater percentage increase when compared to national data. Analysis evidences that this rise may relate to a greater cohort of children involved in criminal activities and suspected gang involvement over the past year linked to a lack of secure and stable secure base at home. In some cases, the young people are not in full-time education, which increases the risks of them going missing. Increased parental awareness of the risks of going missing are likely to have resulted in some increased reporting. A better understanding is needed of the reasons for the increase in numbers of missing children in Royal Greenwich to inform both strategic service development and risks to individuals.

![Graph showing young people missing from home over 24 hours]

**Legend**:

- 2015/16: 50
- 2016/17: 75
- 2017/18: 105
8.3 This year has seen a slight increase in the proportion of boys who go missing from home, 60% in 2017-18 compared to 54% in 2016-17.

8.4 The age of the children who go missing is 13+ which is consistent with previous years.
8.5 The vast majority of children go missing only once (79 out of 105). This is positive in that it evidences that missing does not become an established pattern of behaviour for most children.

8.6 All children who go missing from home are visited by the Police, known as “Safe and Well” checks. They are also offered Return Home Interviews from an independent commissioned service.

8.7 When analysing the missing reports the majority of the episodes occur when children do not return home at the expected time or ‘wander off’ with friends and are not at the place they are expected to be; this is particularly relevant to the younger age group. Many children who go missing from home do not require any additional intervention from Children’s Safeguarding and Social Care, Early Help, Police or Community Safety. The police check and Return Home Interviews with children are sufficient and proportionate in these cases given the low level of assessed risk.

8.8 Where there are identified risks or vulnerabilities children and young people are referred for a Child & Family Assessment in Children’s Social Care or for an Early Help intervention depending on the level of need.

9. **Children Missing from Care**

9.1 There has also been an increase in the number of children missing from care. There are 58 young people in the 2017-18 missing from care cohort. This is an increase on previous years. A significant number of this cohort are older young people who have been moved into semi-independent accommodation and their missing episode is linked to a breakdown in communication. For
others in the care cohort, missing was an entrenched pattern before they came into care, again gang involvement is a significant feature.

![Bar chart: Young people missing from Care for over 24 hours](chart1)

9.2 The increase in the number of boys going missing from care is significant. This is now 59% in 2017-18 compared to 40% last year. This is linked to young people entering the care system late when they appear to be already entrenched in gangs, as evidenced by information leading to the care episode, and there are challenges in disrupting this pattern of behaviour. There is a cohort of nine children who have been missing over 10 times over the year.
10. **Return Home Interviews**

10.1 It is a statutory requirement that all children who go missing from home of care are offered a Return Home Interview. (RHIs)
In May 2016 there was an inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers in Royal Greenwich carried out by Ofsted. This included inspecting our response to children who go missing from home and care. Ofsted noted that Royal Greenwich should “Embed the management process for undertaking return home interviews of children who go missing, and analyse the information to identify patterns and trends in order to aid planning.”

An action plan was developed and implemented in relation to this recommendation. Analysis shows that more young people received an interview and a higher proportion of those referred received an interview in 2017/18 than 2016/17. However, fewer children were referred for RHI in 2017/18 compared with 2016/17. This is due to our approach changing for young people who frequently go missing. A decision is now taken by the Team Leader and Group leader as to when to offer an interview. This is to ensure that while regular RHIs are offered to support the young person the targeted approach aims to reduce the risk of disengagement if interviews were to be offered after every episode.

The Head of Quality Improvement continues to work closely with the independent provider, NYAS. Key areas of focus have included:

- To ensure that social workers are aware of information shared in RHIs, all records are saved onto the child’s electronic file so that social workers have access to them. In addition, the independent interviewers will contact social workers to share relevant information. The NYAS co-ordinator regularly sits within the CSC MASH and with the Young People’s Teams to enable discussion and raise awareness of the service.
- To develop better monitoring data from the RHIs to inform the understanding of trends and themes to inform our problem profile. This has enabled better understanding of the push and pulls factors for young people which are routinely shared with the service. The NYAS co-ordinator is part of the GSCB Missing Group which provides a different perspective at times, and helps the group hear the voice of the young person.
- To ensure that any intelligence gathered in RHIs is routinely shared with the Police in a timely way

Going forward, our approach to RHIs will be considered as part of the JTAI Improvement Plan.
11. **Update on improvement actions for 2017-2018**

11.1 The Improvement plans for the Safeguarding and the Permanence service include actions to improve the response to missing children by:

- Using information from NYAS Return from Missing Interviews to prioritise the appropriate support to children most in need. *This has been achieved but remains an area for further development. As part of the JTAI Improvement the purpose and effectiveness of RHIs is being further considered.*

- Promoting good practice guidance on asking the right questions to secure useful intelligence for the police about possible perpetrators. *Guidance has been circulated to social workers on what might be useful intelligence from a Police perspective. A challenge remains that most vulnerable, and highest risk young people, particularly where they are involved with gangs, are the least likely to engage in RHIs.*

- Timely completion of case records confirming whether police notification involved a child going missing. *Audits have shown that the recording of Police information in relation to missing episodes where children are not allocated in Children’s Social care is timely. However, further work is needed on allocated cases where risks and vulnerabilities are complex and change rapidly and frequently. There is an action in the JTAI Improvement Plan to address this.*

11.2 The Quality Improvement Service will support this work through ensuring that where needed recommendations around safety planning around children who go missing are incorporated into plans. *This is improving but remains an area for further work, again picked up in the JTAI Improvement plan.*

11.3 The GSCB Missing group have identified the following priorities:

- The group has reviewed a number of tools that are used across services in relation to working with missing children and plan to produce a GSCB fact sheet next year for parents, carers, professionals and young people. *Completed.*

- They will complete a multi-agency case audit and focus on a cohort of young people who have stopped going missing to examine what changed their behaviour. *Completed.*
The CSE MASE has developed a multi-agency task and finish group to look at an Adolescent at Risk meeting whose purpose will be to share information in order to:

- Reduce risks to individual young people which may be risk of becoming a victim or a perpetrator – crime reduction and harm reduction.
- More timely multi-agency responses to emerging concerns about individual young people
- A better contextual understanding of the risks in Royal Greenwich – mapping the problems to inform both strategic service development and risks to individuals

The multi-agency weekly GRASP meeting has been in place since January 2018. A review of the GRASP is being undertaken to analyse the impact in these areas.

The Group Leaders across CSC need to complete their work on Brilliant Basics around missing and ensure on-going routine sampling of cases. Completed and on-going.

Improvement actions for 2018-19

We recognise our approach to supporting young people who go missing remains an area for development and we are reviewing our approach within the JTAI Improvement plan.

The plan identifies the need for a timelier, co-ordinated response to children who go missing and a more tailored approach to meeting individual needs, reducing risk and improving outcomes. Actions include convening a multi-agency task & finish group to focus on developing practice framework that focusses on why adolescents go missing not on what happens when missing; reviews the purpose of RHIs, safe & well checks and other interviews with YP – could a different approach be taken and safety planning with adolescents. The task and finish group will learn from other local authorities where positive outcomes have been achieved. A thematic audit of missing children is planned for September and October in Children’s Social Care to inform this work.

Other actions include:

- The Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation group (SMACE) to update and develop their terms of reference
- SMACE to monitor and drive forward the actions in the JTAI Improvement Plan. See appendix 1.
• The SMACE will support the dissemination of the Early Identification Tool – contextual risk alongside the Learning & Development GSCB Work Group to support practitioner confidence in using the tool.
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Safeguarding and Social Care
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Reporting to: Florence Kroll – Director of Children’s Services
Tel No. 020 8921 8230
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1. **Purpose of the report**

   Scrutiny are asked to note and comment on the contents of the report.

2. **Links to the Royal Greenwich high level objectives**

   2.1 This report relates to the Council’s agreed high level objectives as follows:

   - Support and protect children and families in need

3. **Introduction and Background**

   3.1 In February 2018 Ofsted, CQC, HMICFRS and HMI Probation undertook a Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) of the multi-agency response to children who go missing, who are at risk of child sexual exploitation and who are at risk of criminal and other forms of exploitation through gangs. The subsequent report stated:

   “There is strong partnership working in Greenwich and a shared commitment to improving services to all children at risk of harm. Strategic arrangements for the management and oversight of the multi-agency response to children who go missing and are at risk of exploitation are well developed.”

   3.2 The JTAI identified areas of practice strength which included:

   - Strong partnership and shared commitment from all partner agencies to work together and improve outcomes for this cohort of children.
   - Strategic arrangements for the management and oversight of the multi-agency response to children who go missing and are at risk of exploitation are well developed.
   - High profile work leads to increased investment and development of new and innovative approaches such as GRASP.
• Effective GSCB and good links across strategic boards.
• Evidence of impact from the activity of the GSCB – section 11 audits, multi-agency deep dive, challenge, influence, learning through training and awareness raising.
• Practitioners in the MASH are confident and knowledgeable about their area of business and support staff across the partnership by delivering training and development sessions.
• Effective Preventative Work through VOCU training sessions in school, community safety and YOT, VCS. Organisations understand thresholds and know how to make referrals to MASH and Early Help services.
• Calm and reflective approach to leadership in children’s social care and a commitment to learning and developing child focused practice.
• Performance management and a wide range of audit activities are well embedded leading to the identification of areas for improvement and action plans to address the issues.
• Children's views are well captured and help inform planning.
• Political support has ensured that resources for children's services are protected.
• Clear commitment from the local police to developing a resilient and coordinated structure in which to safeguard children.
• Strong commitment by health leaders contributing to the work of GSCB and local strategic groups.
• Public health commissioners have made good progress in ensuring that front line services meet needs.
• A strong YOS with staff who understand that building trusting and meaningful relationships is especially important with this group of children.

3.3 The JTAI also identified areas for further development which included:

• The understanding and response to risk is variable across all of the agencies and for some children not sufficiently explored or known because information sharing is not robust enough.
• When a new concern is referred to social care about a child whose case is already open it is not always prioritised to lead to a timely response.
• Not all assessments include enough analysis of historic factors or multi-agency information or sufficient analysis of the complex and dynamic nature of children’s needs and the impact on children and their families.
• Multi-agency plans do not always evidence a strong enough grip or focus to allow services keep pace with changing events in a young person’s life.
• The MPS have a pan London profile however locally there is a lack of analytical capability and currently no local police profile in relation to children going missing and child sexual exploitation.
• The contribution of health staff to operational meetings was less effective than strategic meetings.
• Low level of referrals from community health services reflect that there is no specific emphasis on exploitation as a significant priority area.
• The GSCB could strengthen its work by evidencing the impact and outcomes of the work is has done so far and by having specific priorities for individual members and for sub groups to include timescales.

3.4 See appendix A for the full report.

3.5 A multi-agency workshop was held to develop these findings into a JTAI Action Plan. See appendix B.

3.6 The Multi-Agency Action Plan was submitted to Ofsted in July and is being progressed and is monitored by the Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group. (SMACE)

3.7 The plan was last reviewed and updated in September 2018. The plan is scheduled for further review by SMACE in January 2019.

3.8 In November 2018, OFSTED published their report on the findings of the three JTAIs completed in Dorset, Southend-on-Sea and Royal Greenwich. “Protecting children from criminal exploitation, human trafficking and modern slavery” See appendix C. The report identified good practice and many of these examples were from the practice they saw in Royal Greenwich. The report concluded that:

• All children are vulnerable to exploitation, not just specific groups.
• Children’s needs and safety must come first. Well-trained practitioners need to respond to the range of risks they face and ‘stay with’ the child.
• Not all agencies in local areas are sharing their intelligence to enable them to recognise, understand and respond to the risks of exploitation to children.
• Agencies should learn from, and build on, successful multi-agency work to respond to child sexual exploitation while also developing best practice on wider exploitation.
The GSCB Multi-Agency Action Plan has actions to address all of these findings that are already being progressed.

4. **Summary of progress to date**

4.1 The Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation (SMACE) group has met monthly. Terms of reference and membership have been agreed. The group is co-chaired by the Senior Assistant Director for Children’s Social Care and the Police. There was some initial drift in progressing the SMACE due to several changes in Police leadership and a change in leadership in Children’s Social Care. However, the group is now functioning well with good attendance and commitment from all partners.

4.2 The SMACE is a strategic partnership group which is responsible for working collaboratively to ensure a tactical response to Child Exploitation including child sexual exploitation (CSE), criminal exploitation, missing, county lines, gangs and modern day slavery. The group focuses on the prevention, intervention, diversion and disruption and monitors the progress of the Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) action plan in order to reduce the impact and risk of child exploitation across the community.

4.3 Actions from the JTAI Action Plan completed to raise awareness across the partnership of child exploitation include:

- The Violent Organised Crime Unit (VOCU) attended the school Designated Safeguarding Leads’ (DSL) meeting in May to raise awareness and understanding of gang activity in Royal Greenwich. The session included supporting DSL’s to spot early warning signs and highlighted the need to report incidents to the Police.
- Early Help presented information on their work with vulnerable adolescents to the Health Safeguarding Group.
- Awareness raising sessions with RG foster carers and our children’s home.
- Child exploitation is incorporated into many Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board (GSCB) training courses and there are also specific courses on CSE and on-line safety.
- Safer Communities deliver a range of courses which includes gangs, CSE and trafficking.
- In October 2018 the GSCB held their annual conference on “Safeguarding Children from Gangs: What Works?” The conference included presentations from national and local experts and workshops.
on supporting gang affected boys, supporting gang affected girls, interactive mock Greenwich Risk and Adolescents Safeguarding Panel (GRASP) and Early Help with children at risk of exploitation. The conference was well-attended by colleagues from across the partnership and positively received. The presentations are available at the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board website. www.greenwicksafeguardingchildren.org.uk

4.4 Actions completed to promote good practice in relation to child exploitation include:

- The development and dissemination of a “Contextual Risk Early Identification Tool” designed to support practitioners in universal and targeted services and in particular schools to help link what may seem like unrelated concerns and a general sense of unease about the child’s welfare and to differentiate between general worrying teenage behaviour and concerns that may suggest a degree of risk, including grooming for and active child exploitation, which could be sexual as well as criminal.
- The GSCB Neglect Strategy and Practice Guidance has been finalised and widely disseminated which includes guidance on adolescent neglect and the resulting increased vulnerability to exploitation
- The joint Adult Safeguarding Board and GSCB “See the Adult. See the Child” protocol has been launched which includes awareness raising for both child and adult facing services of exploitation and is underpinned by a whole family approach
- Education is a key protective factor for all children and in the same way that safeguarding is everyone’s business, “education is everyone’s business” is being promoted across the partnership. This includes ensuring that absence of vulnerable adolescents from school is clearly understood as a risk factor
- Guidance for all practitioners from The Children’s Society on sharing soft intelligence with the Police in relation to exploitation has been disseminated

4.5 A range of audit and data analysis actions have been progressed which include:

- Attendance of health professionals at child protection conferences, results pending.
- Dip sample of GP records to ensure that child protection conference records are on children’s medical files, which they are.
• Thematic audit by Children’s Social Care on Missing Children, results pending.
• GSCB Neglect Survey of practitioners across the partnership which included a focus on adolescents. Results indicated a need to continue to promote awareness of the issue.

4.6 Other work from the JTAI Multi-Agency Action Plan that is also being progressed includes:

• A task and finish group is underway to develop a multi-agency framework for adolescent risk. There are representatives from Health, Police, SEND, Safer Communities, Youth Offending Services and Children’s Social Care.
• A task and finish group looking at persistent absence including children who are on child protection and child in need plans. Consideration is being given to extend the contract of “Welfare Call” to include children on a child protection plan to provide real time information on attendance.
• A review of the Greenwich Risk Adolescent Safeguarding Prevention (GRASP) meeting has been completed and its recommendations are being considered and progressed. Following this review additional business support to GRASP will be provided by Children’s Social Care to improve data collection and therefore reporting ability in relation to identifying themes.
• To be informed by the results of the Missing audit, a multi-agency task and finish group on Missing is being progressed.
• Work with the Head Teachers’ Partnership is underway to look at the use of fixed term exclusions to develop a strategy and training to reduce their use.
• A successful bid to the Department for Education with Lewisham and Bexley for early adopters funding for testing out the new safeguarding arrangements which includes exploring different ways of sharing learning with frontline practitioners with exploited children identified as a priority area.
• Tiath, a Barnardo’s funded project, started in Sept 2018. Year 1 is focused on working with the borough on assessment and intervention for those children where there are concerns of sexually harmful behaviour. Years 2 and 3 will widen the network to include schools, children’s social care and early help.
4.7 The JTAI Action Plan will continue to be monitored by the SMACE. Two particular future actions to note include:

- The need to increase analytical capacity across the partnership to enable well-informed, agile problem profiles alongside information to help individual risk reduction. It is hoped that this may be achieved through the Knife Crime and Serious Youth Violence Task Group initiatives.
- The GSCB will be repeating the multi-agency audits on children who go missing, who are at risk of child sexual exploitation and who are at risk of criminal and other forms of exploitation through gangs to measure the impact of our JTAI improvement actions to date. This is planned for Spring 2019.

5. Conclusions

Children who go missing, who are at risk of child sexual exploitation and who are at risk of criminal and other forms of exploitation through gangs are a complex cohort to engage with, and high risk in terms of outcomes. This group of vulnerable children remain a high priority for Royal Greenwich, the GSCB and the wider partnership. Work is evolving across London to develop best practice in relation to this group. Royal Greenwich are engaged with the wider developments and using good practice identified elsewhere to inform our multi-agency practice and the Knife Crime and Serious Youth Violence Task Group initiatives.

The JTAI Action Plan will continue to be progressed, monitored and will need to evolve in response to changing need and understanding.

6. Report Appendices

The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- Appendix C: Protecting children from criminal exploitation human trafficking modern slavery November 2018
Report Author: Henrietta Quartano – Senior Assistant Director, Children’s Social Care  
Tel No. 020 8921 4470  
Email. Henrietta.quartano@royalgreenwich.gov.uk  

Reporting to: Florence Kroll – Director of Children’s Services  
Tel No. 020 8921 8230  
Email. Florence.Kroll@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
Dear local partnership

Joint targeted area inspection of the multi-agency response to child sexual exploitation, children associated with gangs and at risk of exploitation and children missing from home, care or education

Between 12 and 16 February 2018, Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission (CQC), HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) and HMI Probation (HMI Prob) undertook a joint inspection of the multi-agency response to children who go missing, who are at risk of child sexual exploitation and who are at risk of criminal and other forms of exploitation through gangs. The inspection included a ‘deep dive’ focus on a number of cases in which these issues were known to be concerns where children were involved.

This letter to all the service leaders in the area outlines our findings about the effectiveness of partnership working and the work of individual agencies in Greenwich local authority.

The inspectorates recognise the complexities for agencies in intervening to help children who are at significant risk when affected by the combination of gang affiliation, going missing and child sexual exploitation. Inspectors found that inspection in this area of practice is likely to highlight the significant challenges to the partnership in improving practice. Inspectorates found that traditional methods of assessment, planning and interventions may not always effectively reach or have an impact on this group of children and their families. Cases that were scrutinised by inspectors, particularly in the ‘deep dive’ aspect, involved specific risks and difficulties that make positive change and improved outcomes difficult to achieve and sustain.
In addition, many of these children also have mental health and additional learning needs, with an Education, Health Care Plan (ECHP) in place.

There is strong partnership working in Greenwich and a shared commitment to improving services for all children at risk of harm. Strategic arrangements for the management and oversight of the multi-agency response to children who go missing and who are at risk of exploitation are well developed. This is high-profile work that has led to increased investment from partners and the development of a number of new and innovative multi-agency approaches, including the introduction of the weekly Greenwich Adolescent Risk, Safeguarding and Prevention meeting (GRASP). This multi-agency forum was developed to enable and improve information sharing, enable the earlier identification of risk and provide a ‘real time’ response to emerging concerns. These improvements are leading to increased identification of those at risk and, increasingly, a more effective response to children when these risks are first identified.

There is no doubt of the commitment from partner agencies to work together to improve outcomes for this particular cohort of children. The effective work of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB), strong leadership in many agencies and a shared belief in a partnership approach provide fertile ground for practice to further evolve and improve. However, there is a need to ensure that the operational response from key agencies recognises quickly and consistently the risks posed to these children. Further work is required to fully embed robust practice to ensure that there is timely information sharing to inform assessment and planning. The partnership is aware of the areas that require improvement, and during the inspection demonstrated an openness to continuously improve practice to safeguard children.

Key Strengths

- Inspectors identified many features of effective leadership in Greenwich. When children are at risk of exploitation or are missing from home and school, there are effective multi-agency arrangements to identify and support them. There are good links between the Greenwich Safeguarding Children’s Board (GSCB), the Health and Wellbeing Board, the Children’s Services Strategic Partnership, the Violence and Organised Crime Unit (VOCU), the Safer Communities Team and other boards. Priorities identified in the Children and Young People Plan are agreed by all the boards and have been adopted by them.

- Such arrangements play a key role in enabling the collation and analysis of information from a broad range of services to provide these services effectively. For this reason, there is a good understanding of the local context of older young people, who are largely gang-affiliated, exploiting younger children in organised drug dealing along ‘county lines’.
Partners within the borough have proactively sought additional resources through both the Department for Education (DfE) innovation fund and the Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC) funding. Examples of DfE innovation and MOPAC funded initiatives include: SafeCORE (breaking the cycle of relational domestic abuse); South London Commissioning Consortia for placements for looked after children; training for staff about gang affected young women; workshops in schools to prevent young people becoming involved in gang crime and serious youth violence; and intensive mentoring for young people who are victims, or at risk of becoming victims, of peer-on-peer abuse, violence and exploitation.

Local resources and GSCB funding have also been used creatively to support initiatives that include specialist training for children regarding the safer use of the internet and the commissioning of ‘Chelsea’s Choice’, a theatre production developed by young people to raise awareness of child sexual exploitation, in secondary schools and alternative provision.

Governance arrangements are to be further strengthened following a decision in January 2018 to merge the GSCB Missing Strategic Group with the Child Sexual Exploitation Multi-Agency Strategic Group. This merger supports arrangements to monitor and identify emerging trends or patterns, while further improving information sharing between children’s services, police, the safer communities team and other partner agencies. The panel is co-chaired by the police and children’s services and its work is held to account by the GSCB.

Children at risk from gangs, exploitation and child sexual exploitation have been a priority for the GSCB for the past three years. There is clear evidence of impact from the activity of the board. For example, section 11 audits demonstrate an increased awareness across the workforce of the issues of child sexual exploitation and gang-related exploitation, and an increased confidence in dealing with the issues following training events. Through targeted training and awareness raising, the GSCB has influenced police practice in terms of understanding the issues for young people who are affiliated with and exploited by gangs. Staff across agencies are aware of learning from serious case reviews.

The GSCB undertakes multi-agency ‘deep dive’ audits on individual cases. This activity involves speaking to children, families, carers and professionals to gain a sense of how effectively children have been protected. Consideration is given to how well families have been supported, as well as to areas for improvement. These audits provide more detailed information about the quality of practice than file audits alone. Frontline practitioners across agencies are informed...
about areas for improvement following reviews, and there is evidence of the chair challenging agencies who do not promptly follow up with actions. The GSCB monitors attendance of professionals at child protection conferences and other meetings and monitors whether reports are provided by agencies. There is evidence of challenge from the chair to partner agencies who do not do this.

- Across the partnership, the participation of children and young people is a strength. Case auditing evidences persistent attempts by practitioners to engage with children and to help them to understand concerns.

- There is a commitment from the National Probation Service (NPS) to attend GSCB meetings. This ensures that staff are aware of Greenwich safeguarding procedures, including those pertaining to exploitation and going missing. Attendance also builds working relationships across agency boundaries. Staff are expected to participate in at least one of the GSCB joint training events each year. The ‘see the adult, see the child’ GSCB campaign was promoted within the Greenwich NPS team, which encourages a child-centred approach for practitioners who mainly work with adults.

- Since 2016, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has made a concerted drive to focus more on child protection, working closely with safeguarding agencies at a pan-London level to improve its responsiveness and thus protect children better. Territorial policing crime fighters’ meetings scrutinise safeguarding activity, and cover a range of areas, including missing persons and child sexual exploitation. These meetings are forums at which senior officers can be briefed and discuss current aspects of child protection and other matters affecting the MPS. At a force-wide level, they have produced a child sexual exploitation 2016 pan-London profile (supported by partnership information) and more recently a London organised crime profile. However, locally there is a lack of analytical capability and currently no local police problem profile in relation to children going missing and child sexual exploitation.

- Arrangements at the front door are effective in recognising and responding in a timely manner to risks to children. Referrals into the MASH from partner agencies provide comprehensive information about children, and thresholds are well understood and consistently applied, including for children who are sexually exploited or who have been missing. Police and health services have dedicated staff to check referrals before they are sent to the MASH, ensuring that enough detail is provided to specifically identify risks to children. This enables swifter, better-informed decision-making. Additionally, inspectors saw evidence of timely information sharing by partners, which helps to inform the analysis of risk. For example, the youth offending team (YOS) has a dedicated duty worker who responds to requests for MASH information. This enables
relevant information to be shared to inform decision-making and next steps, including for those at risk of exploitation.

- Decisions are timely about whether a case will progress for a social work assessment, will pass to early help services or will be closed. They take into account the needs of brothers and sisters who may be gang affiliated, as well as previous family history. Managers sign off decisions and record their rationale and reasoning, which is reported back to the referring agency. This means that partners within the MASH know what level of support children will be given.

- When children are identified as being at risk from gangs, child sexual exploitation, criminal exploitation and repeat episodes of going missing, agencies have agreed, through a shared protocol, to a mandatory reporting of these concerns through the MASH. All staff spoken to within the MASH, early help and duty teams are aware of the protocol and understand the high-risk factors associated with this cohort of children. This enables the timely identification of risk and a multi-agency response to address concerns.

- Practitioners in the MASH are confident and knowledgeable about their area of business, and support other staff across the borough by delivering training and development sessions. This helps to increase recognition and understanding of the mechanisms used by perpetrators and gang members to engage in exploitative behaviour and expose children to risk.

- Effective preventative work is taking place with children to help them understand the risks associated with affiliation with gangs and with child sexual exploitation. For example, the Violent Organised Crime unit regularly delivers awareness sessions in schools to children about the realities of gang affiliations. This innovative work has been aimed at pupils in Years 8 and 9 because research and data has shown that this age group is especially vulnerable to being targeted by gangs. Because the initiative commenced in January of this year, the impact is yet to be evaluated.

- A shared approach underpins joint working between the local authority, partners agencies and voluntary organisations, which are commissioned to provide a good range of support to young people who are at risk of gang involvement. Community safety and youth offending teams play an important role in collating and analysing information from a range of sources to better understand and respond to the local picture. This is improving awareness and helps tailor responses to need.
Sexual health services, Charlton Athletic Community Trust, and the Safer London ‘Empower’ project offer creative packages of support designed to prevent children from becoming involved with and at risk from gangs. Charlton Athletic Community Trust runs the universal youth service on behalf of the local authority and offers a variety of diversionary activities. Young people who are at risk of child sexual exploitation are supported by the ‘Empower’ project. This is a new initiative for Greenwich, and will have the capacity to offer intense support to seven young people annually.

Voluntary and community services report positive relationships with the local authority. Thorough commissioning and funding arrangements are in place, and performance of commissioned services is closely monitored. This ensures that services are effective and monies are well directed for maximum impact. Agencies report a strong focus on safeguarding for children. They have a clear understanding of thresholds and know how to make referrals to the MASH and to early help services.

Voluntary agencies are very well informed about the techniques used to exploit children, the fast pace at which this can happen, and how gangs operate within communities. This heightened awareness and recognition has led to an increase in referrals and means that these vulnerable children can be helped more quickly.

The newly re-modelled integrated early help service is developing approaches to strengthen responses to children who are affiliated with gangs or exploited, or where child sexual exploitation is an issue. Recognising the very serious impact of exploitation, good consideration has been given to develop a range of practice models, including systemic family work, restorative-based practice and trauma-informed practice. This work is still at an early stage and it is too soon to measure impact. However, the work is evidence based and research based and there is a track record of the interventions that are reducing risks to children.

Strong arrangements are in place to ensure that children missing from education (CME) are identified and, where possible, located. Good liaison is in place with the MASH when children are missing from education. The CME team is diligent in their efforts to locate children, for example by checking with housing colleagues, health colleagues and other local authorities.

The procedures of the Fair Access panel ensure that when young people are not attending school full-time, they receive high-quality alternative provision that meets their needs. A well-commissioned range of provision is available for young people to access across the borough when it is clear that mainstream
schooling is not suitable or they have been temporarily excluded. At present, 243 pupils are registered to receive elective home education. The elected home education officer works closely with social work colleagues to ensure that all safeguarding processes are robust and any concerns are highlighted at the earliest opportunity.

- There is a calm and reflective approach to leadership in children’s social care and a commitment to learning and developing child-focused practice. Performance management and a wide range of audit activities are well embedded, leading to the identification of areas for improvement and action plans to address the issues.

- Senior managers in children’s social care have developed an environment in which social workers can provide a high-quality service to children and their families, with a key focus on knowing children well and understanding their wishes and feelings. Children’s views are well captured and help inform planning. Professionals know children well and are committed to their welfare. Visits are regular and children are seen alone and are able to express their views, which are evident in reports and work completed with them.

- Workloads are manageable and social workers receive regular, supportive supervision and management oversight of their work. This enables social workers to undertake direct work with children and build trusting relationships. The workforce is generally stable and staff are happy to work in Greenwich.

- Political support from elected members and the leader of the council has ensured that resources for children’s services are protected. Leaders are focused on and committed to children and see them as a priority in the borough.

- The safer communities team has a project officer dedicated to working on youth violence, vulnerability and exploitation who works closely with the VOCU as well as children’s services staff and schools. The project officer gives advice to caseworkers and schools on gang-related risks and through this work gathers and interprets information to update a constantly developing picture of overall gang dynamics and related risk factors. This overview is shared with partners to inform decisions on operational tactics, service development and commissioning.

- A clear commitment is shown by the local borough police to developing a resilient and co-ordinated structure in which to safeguard children. This is evident by the numbers of police staff working within the MASH and local police safeguarding teams. The MPS has an internal media campaign, ‘Spot It to Stop
It’ (with the strapline ‘Think Child, Think Safeguarding’). The messaging concentrates on four themes: child sexual exploitation, child abuse, missing children and child criminal exploitation. This demonstrates the high profile given to these issues by the police.

The police have recently recognised a number of gaps in the way that they were identifying and responding to criminal exploitation and ‘county lines’. They have worked with the missing person, child sexual exploitation and the violent and organised crime unit (VOCU) teams to develop clearer awareness and a stronger response to the issue. However, the force has some information technology limitations that frustrate the visibility of information, and the MPS is seeking to overcome these through the introduction of the new Met Integrated Policing Solution (MIPS) system.

More locally, a method has been introduced to identify individuals of concern in the area to ensure that information is linked and more visible through the use of the crime recording system (CRIS). In addition, the safer communities team has a youth violence, vulnerability and exploitation project officer, who assists in gathering intelligence from partner agencies in order to identify and manage children and young people at risk of gang exploitation, as well as with other contextual safeguarding.

There is a strong commitment by health leaders to the multi-agency partnership and to improving services for children who are exploited or missing. This includes contribution to the work of the safeguarding children board and to local strategic groups, such as the ‘MASE’, the ‘Missing’ and the violence against women and girls groups, where the designated professionals play a key role in the development of strategy and practice.

There are clear and responsive integrated health safeguarding governance processes involving commissioners and providers that have been effective in improving safeguarding practice in health services. This responsiveness is evident in the improvements seen in frontline practice since a health safeguarding inspection undertaken in 2017. Commissioners have made good progress in ensuring that frontline services for young people meet their needs, as is illustrated by work in The Point, as exemplified below.

Health leaders assure the quality of safeguarding work through a range of activities. These include a regular scheduled audit programme, which has demonstrated improvements in practice. Safeguarding professionals from the two principal providers of health services for children contribute to the local operational panel that directs work with children at risk of exploitation. This ensures that information is shared and decisions are made by health staff with
appropriate expertise and seniority from both the acute and community services.

- Training on the risks and issues around child sexual exploitation and other forms of exploitation is embedded within existing safeguarding training programmes. All GPs and pharmacists in Greenwich that are commissioned to provide sexual health services are accredited as ‘You’re Welcome’ services. They receive training on the issues around child sexual exploitation as part of this process. For this reason, referrals have been received from local pharmacies about young people potentially at risk of child sexual exploitation.

- There is good oversight of decisions made about children and young people at risk in the acute hospital services. Weekly multi-disciplinary safeguarding meeting in the Accident and Emergency department reviews concerning presentations from the preceding week and any follow-up action are agreed. The weekly maternity safeguarding meeting reviews the plans put in place by the community midwives for vulnerable pregnant teenagers who may be at risk of child sexual exploitation or gang-related activities. These cases can be discussed and reviewed at any stage of the pregnancy and are normally discussed on more than one occasion.

- Greenwich local authority has maintained a strong YOS. Frontline YOS staff are positive about the service and describe good training opportunities and supportive managers. Staff demonstrate a strong value base and high level of commitment to building relationships with young people. Inspectors saw examples of staff determined to remain in contact and trying to engage vulnerable children who were involved in gangs or at risk of exploitation in work to reduce the risks to them. Staff understand that building trusting and meaningful relationships is especially important with this group of children.

- There are effective systems in place for sharing information and reviewing work with young people. For example, inspectors observed a youth offending service health workers’ forum in which information was shared and cases discussed to ensure that children are receiving the support they need. Greenwich local authority has not reduced the services available to the YOS model. The team continues to include social workers, nurses and specialist support workers, who are providing a coordinated service for children.

- The YOS has worked with Greenwich University to develop training videos around criminal exploitation and ‘county lines’ for a range of professionals. Trauma-informed practice training has been delivered to all YOS staff, and was funded through a bid to MOPAC. Staff are able to describe how the training had impacted on their practice, for example by leading to them having a better
understanding of trauma and responding better to traumatised children. Additionally, restorative justice practice with cases involving sexually harmful behaviour has been developed and has improved outcomes for families, including improved relationships and reduced numbers of family breakdowns.

Case study: highly effective practice

The local area pays good attention to commissioning and delivering services that connect with what young people want, reflect the daily challenges they face and professionals actively work together to promote their engagement.

The Point offers a welcoming space for children and young people to share their concerns and helps reduce risks to their safety and well-being. Children and young people are able to access a range of youth, care and health services under one roof during one visit. This model of support promotes timely access to a range of services, and increases opportunities for sharing information and early intervention for young people at risk of sexual or criminal exploitation. The approach to identifying and meeting need is holistic, with a lead professional sensitively coordinating the involvement of other relevant professionals. Joint training and monthly multi-agency reviews enable shared learning about what works best for each child and young person, enabling consistent approaches and effective tracking of risks.

Areas for improvement

- The understanding and response to risk is variable across all of the agencies, and for some children not sufficiently explored or known because information sharing is not robust enough. This means that decisions are sometimes made without the benefit of all available information. On occasion, it has taken too long for information to be gathered from all agencies when it is already known that a child is involved with, for example, ‘county lines’ activity. This has led to a small number of delays to inform planning for the children.

- When a new concern is referred to children’s social care about a child whose case is already open, it is not always prioritised to lead to a timely response. This may delay the completion of assessments when information from all agencies cannot be gathered. This in turn can inhibit swift action to help children when circumstances change or risks escalate.
While many assessments are thorough, timely and accurately reflect the issues for the child and family, some others do not include enough analysis of historic factors or multi-agency information, which would enrich the understanding of the child’s situation. Assessments do not always include sufficient analysis of the complex and dynamic nature of children’s needs and the impact on children and their families.

While multi-agency plans are in place for children at risk from child sexual exploitation and exploitation from gangs, they do not always evidence a strong enough grip or focus to allow services to keep pace with changing events in a young person’s life. The complexity of these particular issues are not always recognised in plans and are therefore not making enough difference for children and their families.

There is a lack of analytical capability within the borough police, which hampers the police’s ability to research and analyse a range of information and data sources. This means that, for example, there is currently no supporting local police problem profile in relation to children going missing and at risk from exploitation. There is more to do to understand the extent and nature of child sexual exploitation and children going missing, as at present police practice and awareness is under-developed.

While senior health staff attend multi-agency strategic meetings, the contribution of leaders to the GRASP meeting observed during the inspection was less effective. The contribution of safeguarding practitioners who attended the meeting was limited and did not add to the decisions made during the meeting. Information that ought to have been made available by both health trusts was not provided at the meeting and so the situations of the children under discussion were not fully understood.

The attendance of health practitioners at child protection conferences is variable. When practitioners do not attend, reports are not always provided, and this impairs the ability of the conference to make fully informed decisions. There is then a failure to inform assessment, planning and the appropriate delivery of services to meet the needs of those children at risk of exploitation. In addition to this, reports and documents from conferences are not always included in health records. This means that health practitioners are not fully aware of emerging concerns or progress made on plans for children at risk of exploitation.

Community health services support children through universal and early help services to identify emerging risks of exploitation. However, there is no specific emphasis on exploitation as a significant priority issue and the low numbers of
referrals of missing or exploited children to the MASH from health services reflect this. Additionally, work needs to be undertaken with child and adolescent mental health services staff to further develop the understanding of exploitation and the links with mental health.

- The MPS has a central pan-London audit function which has examined cases thematically. Themes include child sexual exploitation and missing children. These audits are designed to identify good practice and areas for learning and improvement. The MPS safeguarding performance dashboard provides information both for frontline staff and managers on a range of safeguarding areas. While it holds comprehensive information on missing children, it is less well developed for examining or auditing the theme of child sexual exploitation.

- It is a positive step that missing and exploited children have been a priority for the GSCB for three years. The GSCB has a business plan that identifies tasks and actions to be completed by agency, sub group or individual as well as timescales for completion. It is acknowledged, however, that it is not always possible to link action taken by the board with improved outcomes for children and young people and the impact on frontline practice.
Case Study: areas for improvement.

Inspectors found that schools are communicating with all relevant agencies to proactively identify risks when children are missing from education, including in some cases when young people have associated with gangs. However, the local area does not consistently provide alternative education quickly enough for children on education, health and care plans (EHCP) when they have been excluded from school. This means that some young people have had extended periods during which they have not attended school.

In one case considered, decision-making had been mostly appropriate to the level of risk presented, although these risks were not always addressed in a timely manner. For example, the child had been out of school for 18 months, which placed them at risk of exploitation, gang involvement or criminal behaviour. The EHCP was also delayed, potentially contributing to increased risk.

Thorough, prompt and comprehensive risk assessment completed by the school in the case had accurately identified risks of child sexual exploitation, going missing and potential gang involvement, reflected in escalating criminal behaviour. However, a key risk not sufficiently identified was non-school attendance. The young person had not attended school for some considerable time and was therefore left unsupervised in the community while their parents were at work.

The young person has recently started attending other specialist provision. However, they are not yet accessing a full curriculum and it is too soon to say if this new education placement will prove successful in helping to reduce risk-taking behaviours.
Next steps

The director of children’s services should prepare a written statement of proposed action, responding to the findings outlined in this letter. This should be a multi-agency response involving NPS, CRC, the police, the clinical commissioning group and health providers in Greenwich local authority.

The response should set out the actions for the partnership and, where appropriate, individual agencies.

The director of children’s services should send the written statement of action to ProtectionOfChildren@ofsted.gov.uk by 16 August 2018. This statement will inform the lines of enquiry at any future joint or single agency activity by the inspectorates.

Yours sincerely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ofsted</th>
<th>Care Quality Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Stanley</td>
<td>Ursula Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Director, Social Care</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HMI Constabulary</th>
<th>HMI Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Williams</td>
<td>Helen Mercer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary</td>
<td>Assistant Chief Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Royal Greenwich JTAI Action Plan August 2018

### 1. Across the multi-agency partnership, the risk to young people of child sexual exploitation, children associated with gangs and at risk of exploitation and missing from home, care or education is consistently understood, recognised and responded to.

**JTAI Findings:**

- The understanding and response to risk is variable across all of the agencies and for some children not sufficiently explored or known because information sharing is not robust enough.
- Community health services support children through universal and early help services to identify emerging risks of exploitation. However, there is no specific emphasis on exploitation as a significant priority issue and the low numbers of referrals of missing or exploited children to the MASH from health services reflect this.
- Additionally, work needs to be undertaken with child and adolescent mental health services staff to further develop the understanding of exploitation and the links with mental health.
- Traditional methods of assessment, planning and intervention may not always effectively reach or have positive impact of high risk adolescents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of Improvement action - Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Evidenced by</th>
<th>Links to other plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Across the multi-agency partnership, there is good understanding and awareness of the risk to young people of child sexual exploitation, children associated with gangs and at risk of exploitation and missing from home, care or education.</td>
<td>The GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements will continue to provide and promote training and awareness raising sessions. The Strategic Safeguarding Adolescent Group, now known as Strategic Multi Agency Child Exploitation Group (SMACE) will disseminate tools, research and learning from other local authorities and nationally to promote awareness and understanding. The awareness of risk to young people of child sexual exploitation, children associated with gangs and at risk of exploitation and missing from home, care or education will be promoted in schools via the established Designated Safeguarding Leads network, school based safeguarding training and the GSCB School Safeguarding Group. The awareness of risk to young people of child sexual exploitation, children associated with gangs and at risk of exploitation and missing from home, care or education will be also be shared via the established forums with Independent Fostering Agencies, care providers and semi-independent units and incorporated into our in-house fostering development workshops.</td>
<td>The Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group (SMACE) Co-chairs – Senior AD Social Care and Police</td>
<td>Immediate/ on-going</td>
<td>Attendance at training, and feedback/ evaluation of it</td>
<td>Safer Greenwich Partnership Community Safety Strategy 2017 to 2020 Children and Young People plan – Priority 3: Healthy relationships, tackling violence and exploitation Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board Strategic Priorities Youth Justice Board Plan 2018 to 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Community health services are alert to the signs of adolescent risk and respond appropriately. They are aware that young people with additional mental health needs and conduct disorders can be more vulnerable to exploitation.</td>
<td>Wider analysis of available data to inform an action plan if needed. This will include an analysis of: - Referrals made by health agencies to Early Help and CSC re adolescent risk</td>
<td>Jane Downing – Oxleas, Anita Erhabor – CCG and Karen Scholtz, CSC and Sue Regan, Early Help</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>Audit of referrals - defined outcome measures to be developed as part of audit action.</td>
<td>Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Safeguarding, managing risk and demand – C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Thresholds for referrals to Early help and Children’s Social Care are understood and applied.

- Referrals logged by Early Help CSC from health
  - Single agency analysis in relation to exploitation awareness
- Disseminate the Adolescent Risk Identification Tool now named Contextual Risk – Early Identification Tool, and support with targeted workshops
- Review and refresh the GSCB Threshold document in light of the new Working Together and Early Help arrangements and promote discussion and use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The multi-agency response to adolescent risk is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informed by information from all agencies as well as children and their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Actions are timely in response to rapidly changing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plans to reduce risk are SMART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Research and tools are available to inform practice in relation to multi-agency contextual safeguarding in relation to adolescent risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements disseminate and make available on their website a range of research, tools and factsheets including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contextual Risk – Early Identification Tool,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Neglect tools that identify adolescent neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Domestic Violence, professional curiosity &amp; Disguised Compliance fact sheets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Downing – Oxleas</td>
<td>GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from workshops GSCB/ Safeguarding Arrangements online survey – exploitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group (SMACE) Co-chairs – Senior AD Social Care and Police</td>
<td>GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The multi-agency response to adolescent risk is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informed by information from all agencies as well as children and their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Actions are timely in response to rapidly changing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plans to reduce risk are SMART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Research and tools are available to inform practice in relation to multi-agency contextual safeguarding in relation to adolescent risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements disseminate and make available on their website a range of research, tools and factsheets including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contextual Risk – Early Identification Tool,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Neglect tools that identify adolescent neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Domestic Violence, professional curiosity &amp; Disguised Compliance fact sheets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Risk assessments, plans and interventions are aligned across the partnership and agile in response to rapid changing situations. All work is underpinned by robust and timely information sharing and outcome focussed plans to reduce risk.

JTAI Findings:
- The attendance of health practitioners at child protection conferences is variable. When practitioners do not attend, reports are not always provided, and this impairs the ability of the conference to make fully informed decisions.
- Reports and documents from conferences are not always included in health records. This means that health practitioners are not fully aware of emerging concerns or progress made on plans for children at risk of exploitation.
- Community health services support children through universal and early help services to identify emerging risks of exploitation. However, there is no specific emphasis on exploitation as a significant priority issue and the low numbers of referrals of missing or exploited children to the MASH from health services reflect this.
- While many assessments are thorough, timely and accurately reflect the issues for the child and family, some others do not include enough analysis of historic factors or multi-agency information, which would enrich the understanding of the child’s situation.
- Assessments do not always include sufficient analysis of the complex and dynamic nature of children’s needs and the impact on children and their families.
- There is a lack of information from health to inform assessment, planning and the appropriate delivery of services to meet the needs of those children at risk of exploitation.
- Thorough, prompt and comprehensive risk assessment completed by the school had accurately identified risks of child sexual exploitation, going missing and potential gang involvement, reflected in escalating criminal behaviour. However, a key risk not sufficiently identified was non-school attendance.
- While multi-agency plans are in place for children at risk from child sexual exploitation and exploitation from gangs, they do not always evidence a strong enough grip or focus to allow services to keep pace with changing events in a young person’s life. The complexity of these particular issues is not always recognised in plans and is therefore not making enough difference for children and their families.
- Decision-making had been mostly appropriate to the level of risk presented, although these risks were not always addressed in a timely manner.
- When a new concern is referred to social care about a child whose case is already open it is not always prioritised to lead to a timely response
- More timely, co-ordinated response to children who go missing and a more tailored approach to meeting individual needs, reducing risk and improving outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of Improvement action - Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Evidenced by</th>
<th>Links to other plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 Child Protection Conferences have the right professionals present and the right information available to enable robust, informed decision making in relation to adolescent risk and vulnerability. | Audit to be completed on health attendance at Child Protection Conferences. Focus to include:  
- Were the right health practitioners invited?  
- Did the right health professionals attend?  
- Was relevant information made available to the Conference to understand risk, inform decision making  
- Sample of cases to be looked at to assess whether health needs were robustly addressed in plans to improve the outcomes for children  
- Findings to be reported to Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group (SMACE)  
- SMACE to develop and monitor any resulting actions | Henrietta Quartano, Head of Quality Improvement, Jane Downing – Oxleas | Oct 2018 | Audit outcomes on health attendance and sample audit of agency records |
| Across the partnership, records from Child Protection Conferences are routinely uploaded onto children's records and available to relevant professionals. | Sample audit of agency records to check availability of Child Protection Conference records and action taken if needed. | Henrietta Quartano, Head of Quality Improvement, Jane Downing – Oxleas, Anita Erhabor, CCG | | |
### 2.2 Child & Family Assessments by CSC are timely, reflect key risk factors, analyse historical information and are holistic and informed by information from multi-agency partners. Assessments address the complex and dynamic nature of children’s needs and the impact on children and their families.

Our work with adolescent risk is underpinned by a whole family approach, which considers needs and risks including siblings and parental capacity to protect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Child facing and adult facing services practice is underpinned by a whole family approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Review of existing practice guidance in CSC on assessments to determine whether it captures sufficiently assessing adolescent risk, to include:
  - Management oversight
  - Decision making involving all partners including health
  - Use of chronologies
  - Risk ID Tool
  - Think fathers
  - Regular updating assessments
  - Professional curiosity
  - Non-school attendance
  - CME
  - Asking the right questions
  - Reflective practice opportunities
  - Role of GP

- Ongoing single agency audits to determine whether there has been improvement

- Launch the GSCB and Adult Safeguarding Board joint “See the Adult, See the Child” protocol and support awareness and understanding through workshops

#### Henrieda Quartano - Head of Quality Improvement

Review every 3 months

- Dip sample of cases to ensure information was shared, timely responses, and outcomes improved.

- Analysis of Fixed Term exclusions for year shared with Heads at FAP review group. Improvers share good practice. Decliners are visited.

- Schools called after 3 Fixed Term Exclusions to discuss support options.

- Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Education, skills and employment – B2

- Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Performance, quality assurance and Evaluation - G2

### 2.3 All professionals are alert to the additional risks of non-school attendance and fixed term exclusions and respond appropriately.

- Need to map out existing processes and systems across education, health and social care and understand the interface and gaps. Where needed develop new systems and guidance.

- Ensure that across the partnership education is understood to be a key protective factor for children

#### Joanne Burgess - Head of Performance Analysis, David Borland - Head of Joint Commissioning

- Tracy Russell - Senior AD for Inclusion, Learning and Achievement, Patricia Denney - Senior AD for Social Care

Review every 6 months

- Dec 2018

- Oct 2018

- Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Education, skills and employment – B2

- Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Performance, quality assurance and Evaluation - G2

### 2.4 Multi-agency plans including CAMHS Care Plans, EHCP, Child Protection Plans, Child in Need Plans and Looked After Children Care Plans are aligned and evidence a clear focus on reducing risk and include consideration of likely future risk to keep pace with changing events in a young person’s life.

- Review existing systems and guidance to ensure that they support practitioners to be aware of other plans and understand the need to align these.

#### Patricia Denney - Senior AD for Social Care, Jane Downing – Oxleas, Tracy Russell - Senior AD for Inclusion, Learning and Achievement

Review every 3 months

- Oct 2018

- Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Safeguarding, managing risk and demand – C3

- Youth Justice Plan 2018 to 2019
| 2.5 | **When new information is shared with CSC on allocated cases this is shared promptly with partner agencies leading to a timely response** | Review guidance and practice regarding timely information sharing by CSC:  
- Management oversight of new concerns including Police Merlins on open cases  
- Clear timescales  
- Information sharing with partner agencies  
- Agile, adaptive plans  
This will need to be incorporated into the work on formalising a multi-agency practice framework for adolescent risk | Patricia Denney - Senior AD for Social Care, | Dip sample of Merlins to evidence improvement in management oversight  
Quarterly Quality Assurance Audit: Child Protection Plans, Child in Need Plans and Looked After Children Care Plans |

| 2.6 | **More timely, co-ordinated response to children who go missing and a more tailored approach to meeting individual needs, reducing risk and improving outcomes** | Multi-agency task & finish group to focus on developing practice framework:  
- Focus on why adolescents go missing not on what happens when missing  
- Purpose of RHIs, safe & well checks and other interviews with YP – could a different approach be taken  
- Trigger for trigger plans  
- Safety planning with adolescents  
Use the learning from the pan-London Rescue & Response project to feed into local learning. | Henrietta Quartano - Head of Quality Improvement | Jan 2019 | Outcome measures to be implemented as part of action plan including No of return home interviews and other related measures |
3. Professionals across the multi-agency network are alert to the wide ranging and multiple needs and risk factors. When children are being exploited or involved in risk taking behaviour, alongside assessing and reducing risk, professionals must be alert to and address additional needs. Equally professionals must be aware that children with additional needs such as Autistic Spectrum Disorder or mental ill-health, can be more vulnerable to the risk child sexual exploitation, exploitation associated with gangs risks and missing from home, care or education.

JTAI Findings:
- There is a lack of information from health to inform assessment, planning and the appropriate delivery of services to meet the needs of those children at risk of exploitation.
- While many assessments are thorough, timely and accurately reflect the issues for the child and family, some others do not include enough analysis of historic factors or multi-agency information, which would enrich the understanding of the child’s situation.
- Assessments do not always include sufficient analysis of the complex and dynamic nature of children’s needs and the impact on children and their families.
- Decision-making had been mostly appropriate to the level of risk presented, although these risks were not always addressed in a timely manner.
- The EHCP was delayed, potentially contributing to increased risk.
- The local area does not consistently provide alternative education quickly enough for children on education, health and care plans (EHCP) when they have been excluded from school.
- The young person has recently started attending specialist provision. However, they are not yet accessing a full curriculum in helping to reduce risk-taking behaviours.
- The local area does not consistently provide alternative education quickly enough for children on education, health and care plans (EHCP) when they have been excluded from school.

### Aim of Improvement action - Intended Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Evidenced by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Across the multi-agency partnership, there is good awareness that children with additional needs can be more vulnerable to exploitation. Systems support effective information sharing to ensure an understanding, informed by all agencies, of a child’s individual needs. EHCPs are completed in a timely way and used to inform multi-agency work in reducing risk and improving outcomes for children with additional needs. All agencies work together to ensure that the educational needs of children with additional needs are prioritised leading to timely provision of alternative education where needed to reduce risk and improve outcomes.</td>
<td>Existing processes and systems across education, health and social care are mapped to understand the interface and gaps. Where needed new systems and guidance are developed to ensure that across the partnership there is relevant data to make decisions about the child. A shared understanding of the additional vulnerabilities of children with additional needs and with EHCP. A good awareness that education is a key protective factor for children. That delays in meeting educational need are minimised. Children are robustly supported to reintegrate into school. That systems allow us to see quickly: Which children have additional needs including EHCP. Where educational needs are not being met either through delays in EHCP or provision of schooling.</td>
<td>Joanne Burgess - Head of Performance Analysis, David Borland - Head of Joint Commissioning, Tracy Russell - Senior AD for Inclusion, Learning and Achievement, Patricia Denney - Senior AD for Social Care</td>
<td>Dec 2018 Oct 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Links to other plans**
- Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Strategy
- SEND improvement plan
- Children’s Services Business Plan – Focus area: Safeguarding, managing risk and demand – C3
4. Individual and strategic interventions are informed by a strong analytical understanding that informs a well-developed local problem profile.

**JTAI Findings:**
- There is a lack of analytical capability within the borough police, which hampers the police’s ability to research and analyse a range of information and data sources. This means that, for example, there is currently no supporting local police problem profile in relation to children going missing and at risk from exploitation. There is more to do to understand the extent and nature of child sexual exploitation and children going missing, as at present police practice and awareness is under-developed.
- The MPS has a central pan-London audit function which has examined cases thematically. Themes include child sexual exploitation and missing children. These audits are designed to identify good practice and areas for learning and improvement. The MPS safeguarding performance dashboard provides information both for frontline staff and managers on a range of safeguarding areas. While it holds comprehensive information on missing children, it is less well developed for examining or auditing the theme of child sexual exploitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of Improvement action - Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Evidenced by</th>
<th>Links to other plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Across the multi-agency partnership, interventions, both individual and strategic, are informed by a clear analysis of available data and a local problem profile.</td>
<td>Greater analytical capacity is needed across the partnership. Funding to be identified from across the partnership to recruit to a dedicated analyst to support this work</td>
<td>The Strategic Safeguarding Adolescent Group (SMACE) Co-chairs – Senior AD Social Care and Police</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>Data set completed to inform measures. Well informed agile, problem profile and information available for individual risk reduction</td>
<td>Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel Work program: Service Performance Reports – changes to reporting on police crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreed data set to be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children and Young People Plan: Fundamentals – Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information held by all partners about this cohort needs to be pulled together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using the existing Family Information Hub (FIH) to be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The FIH to be used to inform individual/tactical interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The FIH to be used to develop a local problem profile to inform strategic actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the GRASP to be completed:</td>
<td>Henrietta Quartano - Head of Quality Improvement</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>GRASP reviewed, action plan implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus to be on whether there is an impact on reducing risk and improving outcomes for young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Findings to be reported to Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group (SMACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SMACE to develop and monitor any resulting actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements, supported by the work of the Strategic Multi-Agency Child Exploitation Group, robustly monitors the progress and impact of this action plan and other activity to reduce risk and improve outcomes for young people affected by child sexual exploitation, association with gangs and at risk of exploitation and missing from home, care or education.

JTAI Findings:
- It is a positive step that missing and exploited children have been a priority for the GSCB for three years. The GSCB has a business plan that identifies tasks and actions to be completed by agency, sub group or individual as well as timescales for completion. It is acknowledged, however, that it is not always possible to link action taken by the board with improved outcomes for children and young people and the impact on frontline practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of Improvement action - Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Evidenced by</th>
<th>Links to other plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 The impact of strategies and tools on improving practice and outcomes for children is evidenced and understood. | • Embed the SMACE  
• Evaluate the impact of the Contextual Risk - Early Identification Tool  
• Extend the GSCB Annual Conference to the JTAI cohort  
• Review current GSCB/Safeguarding Arrangements training offer on having difficult conversations with young people and parents | Nicky Pace, Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Children's Board | Jul 2019 | Evidence to be included in report on outcomes; which will be informed by overall work of this action plan. | Children’s Services Business Plan Focus area: Quality of Practice and Service Delivery - D1-D3 |
Protecting children from criminal exploitation, human trafficking and modern slavery: an addendum

This report is about the findings from three joint targeted area inspections, carried out in the spring of 2018 that examined ‘the multi-agency response to older child exploitation and children missing from home, care or education’. It is an addendum to our 2016 report: ‘Time to listen’ – a joined up response to child sexual exploitation and missing children’.

This report considers the most significant learning from three inspections of local authority areas with a focus on criminal exploitation of children. The inspections were carried out jointly by Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation. The inspections reviewed practice in children’s social care, education, health services, the police, youth offending services and probation services.

The report recognises that much has been done by agencies to address child sexual exploitation, but it calls for agencies to learn the lessons of the past in responding to criminal exploitation of children and county lines. All children are vulnerable to exploitation, and agencies, locally and nationally, do not yet fully understand the scale or level of risk to children. Family-focused services are not always appropriate for dealing with the exploitation of children outside of a family setting - agencies need to be flexible and respond quickly to changing risks.
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Introduction

The programme of joint targeted area inspections (JTAs) began in January 2016 and brings together four inspectorates – Ofsted, Care Quality Commission (CQC), HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) and HMI Probation (HMIP) – to ‘examine how well agencies are working together in a local area to help and protect children’. Each set of JTAs focuses in depth on a particular issue.

We conducted these JTAs as part of our process of re-visiting previous deep dive themes. We wanted to focus again on child sexual exploitation and children missing but also extend the scope of the inspections to include criminal exploitation. We know that many children who are criminally exploited are also sexually abused and/or exploited. This report should be read as an addendum to our 2016 report: ‘Time to listen’ – a joined up response to child sexual exploitation and missing children’. 1

This report is based on inspections of three local areas: Greenwich, Southend-On-Sea and Dorset.

This report is an opportunity to share the most significant learning from these inspections to help drive improvements in practice, knowledge and understanding around identifying and responding to the exploitation of children. The report should not be read as a summary of all of the findings from the three inspections. A letter that provides an overview of all the findings has been published for each inspection.

These JTAs, beginning in February 2018, examined the multi-agency response to child exploitation, including criminal exploitation. The Home Office defines child criminal exploitation as:

‘Child Criminal Exploitation... occurs where an individual or group takes advantage of an imbalance of power to coerce, control, manipulate or deceive a child or young person under the age of 18. The victim may have been criminally exploited even if the activity appears consensual. Child Criminal Exploitation does not always involve physical contact; it can also occur through the use of technology.

Criminal exploitation of children... includes for instance children forced to work on cannabis farms or to commit theft’. 2


As we reported in 2016, understanding exploitation of children ‘is not simply about identifying the characteristics of children who are vulnerable to abuse... it requires a wider perspective and understanding of the contexts, situations and relationships in which exploitation [of children] is likely to manifest’.3

There is a real need for urgency in this work. In these inspections, we found that there were children who were criminally and sexually exploited in all the areas visited. We found that some agencies were identifying risks to children and responding well to those children who were being criminally exploited. However, some agencies were too late in recognising the scale or the extent of the problem in their local area. For some children, this meant that risk was not addressed quickly enough.

Children who are being exploited cannot wait for agencies that are lagging behind or failing to recognise this issue. We must ensure that the mistakes that some partners made in being slow to recognise the risk of child sexual exploitation in their local areas are not repeated in response to other forms of exploitation, including criminal.

In this report, we have included examples of the good work we have seen across all agencies, as well as areas for improvement in addressing the exploitation of children.

All case examples have been anonymised. We have not identified which areas the children were living in. We have also changed the details and characteristics of the children and cases so that they cannot be identified.

**Background**

Criminal exploitation has received considerable media coverage in the last year and there is a particular focus on the risks of county lines activity. This is when individuals or gangs use vulnerable children and adults to transport and sell Class A drugs, primarily from urban areas into market or coastal towns or rural areas to establish new drug markets or take over existing ones. They also use children to transport and hide weapons and to secure dwellings of vulnerable people in the area, so that they can use them as a base from which to sell drugs.

County lines is about modern slavery, human trafficking and exploitation, alongside drug supply and violent crime.

It is a highly lucrative illegal business model. Those who are running county lines can earn thousands of pounds per day. The adults running these networks are removed from the frontline activity of dealing – they exploit children who are at high risk transporting and selling drugs often many miles from home.

---

There are high levels of violence and intimidation linked to this activity. Children are often groomed and/or tricked into working before they recognise the dangers. We have seen during these inspections that children can be very quickly groomed into criminal activity often before parents or professionals realise what is happening.

Jake came from a loving, caring and supportive family. Until the age of 13 he was doing very well at school and was described as a caring and active child who played basketball and represented his school team in national competitions.

Over a few weeks, his behaviour changed rapidly and he became aggressive, abusive and dishonest. He disengaged from his family and from school. His mother thought initially that he might be being bullied at school and kept asking him about this. In fact, Jake had been introduced to some men by boys at his school. At first, he was approached and asked to take a package to a local house and offered £30 to do so. He did this a few times but was then given train tickets and packages of drugs to transport to a house in a town 100 miles away and promised much more money. It was only when he arrived at the house that he found it was full of adults taking drugs, including injecting heroin, and he realised he was at risk and had become involved in something beyond his control.

Jake was, for a time, not able to leave that house and while he was there he was not given food and found the adults to be very aggressive. One of them stole some of the drugs he was carrying and because of this he was now indebted to the dealer and forced to ‘work’ for free and threatened with violence if he did not continue to do so.

As such, he frequently went missing from home and was found repeatedly in houses across the country living in very neglectful conditions. He was forced by his dealer to carry drugs internally and on one occasion when he lost some of the drugs he was carrying he was brutally attacked by other boys involved in county lines. Jake would often return home suffering with injuries, such as stab wounds, as a result of the violence linked to county lines.

Jake was eventually taken into care with the agreement of his parents due to concerns about his safety and the safety of his siblings. However, while in care, he moved many times, frequently went missing and his mother feared for his life as he was still subject to threats of extreme violence, as were his family. His mother has lost her job, experienced depression and there has been a severe impact on the well-being and sense of safety for all the family, including his brothers and sisters.
Some children are forced to carry the drugs in harmful ways that are abusive and could result in their death. For example, ‘plugging’ is commonly used, which is when children can be forced by an adult or another child to insert and carry drugs in their rectum or vagina.

This is a common feature of county lines activity and a clear example of child sexual abuse. We also found in our inspections many children who were both criminally and sexually exploited by the gangs or individual running the county line. We also found examples where sexual violence was used as a form of punishment.

Children may be sent to another area of the country to live with a vulnerable adult whose home has been taken over by the gang in exchange for a continued supply of drugs. This is known as ‘cuckooing’.

While living in a vulnerable adult’s home, far away from their own home, children may be required to set up or be part of a new drug market or expand an existing one. This involves children putting themselves in extremely dangerous situations with vulnerable adults who are strangers who want to buy Class A drugs from them. Other dealers in the area may also target these children to prevent them taking over their ‘patch’. Some children have been stabbed and killed by rival gangs or dealers. Often, the first time that the police become aware of county lines activity in their area is as a result of a significant increase in knife crime and youth violence.

County lines may involve the commission of the offences of ‘slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour’ and ‘human trafficking’ as defined by the Modern Slavery Act 2015. Children’s travel may be ‘arranged and facilitated by a person, with the view to them being exploited’, which amounts to human trafficking according to section 2 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015. Children may then be forced to work for the drug dealer, often held in the vulnerable adult’s home against their will and under the force of threat if they do not do as they are told. This meets the definition of ‘slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour’ in section 1 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015.

Tactics used by perpetrators include staging a fake robbery where the drugs and money concealed on the child are stolen by their own gang. In these cases, the child believes they have lost money, drugs or phone contacts that are valuable to those running the county lines and that they must work for free to repay the debt. Gangs might also threaten the safety of their family or parents, including directly at their homes.

Younger siblings are often recruited through fear, violence and intimidation against the family of older exploited children. All criminally exploited children are at risk of neglect, emotional harm, sexual exploitation and abuse, as well as substance misuse and extreme forms of violence. The trauma caused by intimidation, violence, witnessing drug use or overdoses and continued threats to themselves or to family members leads to significant mental and physical ill-health of exploited children.
While being exploited, sent away from home or becoming a victim of modern slavery and/or human trafficking, those around the child may know something is wrong but not know what. These children will go missing, perhaps infrequently at first but over time for longer and longer periods. Their mental health will suffer and they may become withdrawn, or display aggressive or violent behaviours. Children who were once captain of their school football team, musically gifted or academically excelling may lose interest in activities that were once very important to them. Recognising the signs of criminal exploitation is crucial.

County lines activity is a problem across England. In a report from the National Crime Agency, 88% (of the 38 police forces that responded to a survey) reported county lines activity.4

The National Crime Agency recently assessed that there are more than 1,500 lines operating nationally, with evidence of increasing levels of violence. County lines activity affects many areas of the country, including market and seaside towns and areas of relative affluence, such as Tunbridge Wells and Cheltenham, that we might not naturally associate with organised crime.

A recent case in Gloucestershire illustrates the extent of county lines and the risks to children and vulnerable adults.

In September this year, drug-dealing gangs were given jail sentences of more than 200 years. The police launched ‘Operation Tarak’ in 2016, which has seen more than 200 arrests linked to county lines. Adult offenders receiving sentences were from London, Birmingham, Cheltenham, Hertfordshire, Coventry, Lincolnshire and Surrey. Thirty-seven children were involved, some as young as 13.

Two high-profile murders in 2016 brought county lines to the police’s attention. These were of a 17-year-old child who was exploited to sell drugs in Cheltenham and a vulnerable adult murdered by two teenagers who had taken over his house in Gloucester to use as a drugs base.

Findings

- All children are vulnerable to exploitation, not just specific groups.
- Children’s needs and safety must come first. Well-trained practitioners need to respond to the range of risks they face and ‘stay with’ the child.
- Not all agencies in local areas are sharing their intelligence to enable them to recognise, understand and respond to the risks of exploitation to children.

---

Agencies should learn from, and build on, successful multi-agency work to respond to child sexual exploitation while also developing best practice on wider exploitation.

**Part 1: Protecting exploited children**

**All children are vulnerable to exploitation**

All children are vulnerable to criminal and sexual exploitation, not just specific groups. The scale and nature of child exploitation in England in the 21st century are shocking. The impact is devastating for the children, their families and their communities. Professionals and parents should not assume that the most vulnerable children are the only vulnerable children.

Children targeted for the purpose of county lines come from a wide range of backgrounds. Local children can be groomed into selling drugs, as well as children from outside the area. County lines activity is dynamic and perpetrators will change their method of exploitation quickly, such as by targeting new groups of children to exploit in order to avoid detection.

Examples include:

- grooming affluent children attending public school, who are less likely to be identified as ‘drug running’ by the police
- targeting vulnerable older children, such as those who are neglected and less likely to be reported missing by parents
- targeting other groups of children who may be particularly vulnerable, such as those who have special educational needs, looked after children, children with poor mental health and children not in full-time education.

Exploited children come from a wide range of backgrounds. For some, their homes will be a place of safety and security; for others this will not be the case. Whatever the child’s home circumstances, the risks from exploitation spread beyond risks to the child. Their families may also be threatened or be highly vulnerable to violence from the perpetrators of criminal exploitation.

---

We saw variable practice in how partnerships worked together with families in protecting and supporting children, including some examples of strong and effective practice.

In one area, families are consistently included in interventions and support to exploited children. Professionals do not work with children in isolation.

We heard how professionals consistently support parents to keep children safe by, for example, helping them to put clear boundaries and structures in place for children who frequently go missing from home. In some cases, this support from professionals was very flexible, such as home visits at the weekends and in the evenings to monitor a child’s safety.

**Raising awareness**

A whole-system approach is required to address the perpetrators and to protect and support victims. It requires engagement across:

- the whole council
- children’s and adults’ social care
- police
- probation services
- youth offending teams
- health
- education
- housing
- transport
- community safety
- the local safeguarding partners
- local businesses.

A whole-system approach needs to not only protect and support children but to try to prevent exploitation through raising awareness in the community and disrupting criminal activity.

This requires agencies and professionals to work together with parents and children to alert them to the signs of grooming, exploitation and county lines. When children begin to go missing, have mood swings, become secretive or quiet or display other unusual behaviours, parents who do not know that county lines exists, or the effects it has on children, are not able to protect them.

There needs to be a multi-agency coordinated approach to awareness-raising with children, parents and the wider local community, as well as disruption and prevention of those perpetrating exploitation.
In Greenwich, the police, the youth offending service and partners regularly deliver awareness-raising sessions in schools about the realities of gang affiliations.

This innovative work is aimed at Years 8 and 9, because research and data have shown that this age group is especially vulnerable to being targeted by gangs.

Children in this borough also benefit from a youth service that offers a range of activities to divert children away from involvement in gangs and risks of exploitation.

The local voluntary sector organisations in Greenwich commissioned to work with vulnerable older children play an important role because they understand the very fast pace at which children can be groomed into exploitation and have a thorough knowledge of local gangs and how they operate.

Partnerships also need to think of ways of promoting awareness and understanding about child exploitation within and across agencies and with other professionals. Multi-agency systems need to respond quickly, building specialist knowledge that they can then share across services.

In Dorset, named GPs are working to prevent child sexual exploitation. They lead effective programmes of continuous improvement to equip local primary care practitioners with the knowledge and tools required to protect children at risk of exploitation.

‘Stay with’ children who do not want to engage

Children’s needs and safety must come first. This means that professionals need to work flexibly and continue to ‘stay with the child’, even when they are unwilling to engage. Many of the current systems to manage individual children within the child protection system are based around risk in the family. They are not always the most effective means of meeting the needs of children who experience abuse outside of the family, including exploited children.

For example, a system that uses monthly reviews may not be appropriate for exploited children because their risks can quickly change. Some areas have put processes in place to address the specific needs of vulnerable children who are at risk of exploitation.

Partners in Greenwich have set up weekly adolescent risk, safeguarding and prevention meetings. The aim of the meeting is to enable partners to track and monitor changing risks and needs of children through timely information-sharing. They can then identify the changing nature of the risk and provide real-time responses to emerging concerns.
However, having the right system is not enough. These arrangements are only effective when a wide range of agencies are represented and able to share relevant, up-to-date information. Multi-agency meetings must result in clear action planning, coordination of work across agencies and close monitoring of plans so that children are protected and supported.

Services need to be coordinated and easily accessible if children, particularly those who have been exploited and may be reluctant to engage, are to use them and access help and support when needed.

In our inspections, we found that sexual health and school nurse services are well placed to identify exploited children, but children need to be able to contact professionals quickly and easily when they need help.

Children in Greenwich can access these health services by text. We found that this provided a prompt and easy method of contact, which meant that children could get help quickly. It supported staff to identify children at risk of exploitation.

Further, having a range of services in one place can support exploited children who may have complex needs. 'The Point', a young person’s drop-in centre in Greenwich, provides a welcoming space for children to share concerns and seek help from youth and health services. A lead professional works sensitively with the child to manage the help they may need.

**Seeing and ‘staying with’ the child**

We need to change how we see and understand vulnerable older children. Some areas and agencies need to do more to recognise the complexity of some children’s lives. The behaviours that children present with, such as offending or violence, may result from exploitation outside the home and/or from abuse at home. Any interventions need to take into account all risks and needs. We must all understand that children who have been criminally exploited are the victims of crime.

All agencies working with children need to understand that children’s behaviours, such as offending behaviour, should be seen in the wider context of other vulnerabilities such as criminal and sexual exploitation.

Unless agencies understand the context of the child’s behaviour as well as the impact (for example, trauma, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), mental health issues or substance misuse), it will not be possible for multi-agency partners to respond effectively. This means that they cannot meet the child’s needs nor prevent future risk and abuse. This is particularly relevant for children exploited through county lines activity.
In our recent JTAIs on neglect, we found that older neglected children often have multiple experiences of abuse: both neglect in the home and exploitation outside of the home. They had been let down by adults many times and were therefore less likely to want to engage with professionals. In addition, children who have been exploited may not recognise that they need help.

The value of building trusting relationships with children who have been exploited was evident in the exploitation JTAI inspections. Relationships between children and professionals that were based on consistency, stability and respectful communication were having the most impact in supporting effective interventions with exploited children.

Some of the services we visited in the JTAIs were using this approach, including some youth offending teams. Most youth offending teams that we inspected seemed well prepared to identify risk and work with exploited children. Staff were trained on the impact of exploitation. Children were engaging well with staff and building positive relationships. Staff understood the significance of pieces of information that children might share with them, for example signs of exploitation such as children being given drugs for free and then being indebted to dealers who use this to manipulate them.

In Southend, signs of exploitation are recognised early. This means that children can receive early intervention from the youth offending team to prevent risk escalating.

Also in Southend, we saw many examples of professionals ‘going the extra mile’ to keep young people engaged, for instance staying in touch by text when young people were missing.

We saw that young people had positive relationships with a key professional and were supported by a consistent group professionals. Building trust and stability is vital to bringing about change with this vulnerable group. We saw young people contacting their trusted workers when they were at risk to seek advice and support.

Staff in Greenwich received training on trauma-informed practice to underpin their approaches to interventions. This helped youth offending workers, youth workers, and health and specialist support workers to better understand the needs of exploited children.

---

Staff understood the value of investing time and effort to establish meaningful relationships with children who will have been let down and abused by adults.

We saw many agencies engaging well with children at risk of exploitation. However, we still found some cases when children’s social care teams closed children’s cases prematurely because children did not engage with professionals, even when there was clear evidence of exploitation and high levels of risk. Professionals need to understand the impact of exploitation and patterns of engagement and disengagement of older vulnerable children. They need to ‘stay with’ the child.

**Part 2: Working in partnership**

**Working together in local partnerships**

First, all agencies need to get the basics right. Ensuring that there are clear systems in place at the ‘front door’ of services is essential, so that children at risk of exploitation are identified and receive a prompt and appropriate response.7

Greenwich uses a shared protocol for mandatory reporting on concerns about the risk of gangs, child sexual and criminal exploitation and repeat episodes of children going missing. This means that all agencies are clear on what to do if they identify risks to a child.

Staff within the multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH) and early help and duty teams understand the high risks these children face and the need to promptly coordinate a multi-agency response. Practitioners in the MASH train other staff about the methods that perpetrators use to groom children so that they can identify the signs.

The different stages of development and performance in each agency inevitably impact on how effective the partnership is. This is thrown into sharp relief when new, complex risks emerge for children in need of a coordinated multi-agency response.

In one area, we found that only the police had fully recognised the fact that children were being criminally exploited. The lack of an adequate response from other agencies meant that the police were left to use innovative tactics to work with children themselves when other partners failed to safeguard the children.

Other agencies in the partnership had not been curious enough about this group of children. They had not shared and interrogated the intelligence they had about highly vulnerable children that would have helped them to

---

see patterns of exploitation. Not only did they not recognise and respond to the risks to local children but they did not adequately safeguard children who had come into the area and showed signs that they may have been trafficked and were at risk of possible criminal exploitation.

Local partnerships cannot run the risk of thinking: ‘this does not happen in our area’. They cannot respond ineffectively to children coming in from other areas who have been missing from home and have the signs of involvement in county lines. The dangers of delayed responses to any child who may have been criminally or sexually exploited can have very serious consequences for the child, and other children linked to them.

Schools and colleges are essential partners in the whole-system approach. Some schools are working hard to understand, reduce and prevent the risks of county lines. However, this awareness needs to be developed and supported across the country.

There are well-documented links between children missing education and safeguarding risks, including the risk of exploitation. Even being absent from school for a short time, such as being missing for part of the school day, can increase the risk of both sexual and criminal exploitation.

Recent Home Office guidance for professionals on county lines identified children excluded from mainstream school as one group that gangs may target for exploitation. In our inspections, we found that children who were not in regular education or who were missing from school were at heightened risk. They had more time on their hands and were vulnerable to abuse. This is a particular concern given the recent figures on school exclusions. It is essential, therefore, that when schools are considering exclusions they also consider the safeguarding risks to the child.

Using intelligence and information well to understand local risk

We have highlighted many times how important it is to have effective systems for collating and sharing information, both strategically and in response to individual children. Sharing intelligence and information is crucial when developing multi-agency approaches to preventing criminal exploitation.

---


Patterns of criminal exploitation in a local area will vary and the impact of county lines may be different from one region to another. In developing a response, it is crucial that partners understand the risks in their area.

We saw how children can be very quickly groomed into county lines activity and are then at risk of neglect, extreme physical violence, sexual abuse and sexual exploitation. Therefore, the partnership needs to use all resources available to exchange and analyse information quickly if it is to keep pace with the changing risks to, and needs of, exploited children. Having dedicated resources, such as an analyst who has access to a range of relevant information, can make a real difference to agencies’ abilities to identify risk and respond quickly.

The exploitation JTAI showed that not all areas had the capacity to develop multi-agency intelligence on local risk. In Dorset, we found that the police had developed detailed local profiles. These informed a more sophisticated understanding of the prevalence, nature and scale of criminal exploitation and county lines activity, alongside similar profiles for sexual exploitation and children missing. The police use the profiles to prioritise their activity to ensure that those who are most at risk receive a timely response. However, other agencies were not using this intelligence to plan and develop a response to exploitation. In one other area, we saw a lack of analytical capability and no police ‘problem profile’ of child exploitation.

**Working together strategically across regions**

Large urban areas need to link strategically and operationally with regions into which children are trafficked to sell drugs.

If a child goes missing from, for example, Manchester and the police find them in a seaside resort in another county in possession of Class A drugs, there needs to be good communication and information-sharing between the police and children’s social care in both areas. This will support planning to protect the child, help to identify any other children in need of protection and support any criminal investigation.

We found that this work was not happening in all of the areas we visited.

In one area, we found that children's social care teams did not have enough professional curiosity to understand the risks and needs of missing children found locally who had come from other areas.

This meant that staff did not recognise the risk of criminal exploitation, information was not shared and children's need for help and protection not adequately met.
The recently established National County Lines Coordination Centre\(^{11}\) will support a more sophisticated understanding of national intelligence. This should then inform a more coordinated approach to disrupt and prevent county lines. It will help support local areas to develop a multi-agency response to local risk and need. The centre has only just been established, so it is still vital that local, regional and national police forces share information on known risks, work together across boundaries and work with other agencies to fully understand the extent and nature of criminal exploitation.

**Training and information for professionals**

Working with children at high risk of exploitation and who are reluctant to engage can be challenging. Children need professionals who are well trained, skilled and persistent and who recognise the risks.

Greenwich has a dedicated project officer for youth violence, vulnerability and gangs who works closely with the police, community safety, children’s services and schools. The officer gives advice to frontline staff across agencies, gathering and analysing information to continually update the overview of gang dynamics in the local area and the related risks. They share this with partners to inform decisions on operational tactics, service development and how to commission services to meet local need.

We saw other examples, however, of health professionals in frontline services, including some GPs and staff at emergency and accident departments, who did not always recognise the signs of exploitation or share critical information with other professionals. For example, they did not share information about children known to be at risk of exploitation having injuries as a result of an assault or about children’s underlying health concerns that put children involved in county lines exploitation at increased risk. Staff working in the National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies do not always have a full understanding of the many ways in which young people can be exploited. As a consequence, staff do not always recognise and respond when children are at risk of exploitation.

Police forces should be working to develop a more consistent approach, using modern slavery and trafficking legislation to target gangs, individuals and groups that exploit children to transport and sell drugs. Understanding the links across child exploitation, modern slavery and trafficking will help all agencies to respond more effectively to support children but also to work together to identify perpetrators.

Earlier this year, well-informed and well-trained police officers were able to secure the first conviction of a drug dealer for human trafficking of a child.

In October 2018, Zakaria Mohammed was jailed for 14 years, having admitted to trafficking children. This is the first time a drug dealer has

been convicted under the Modern Slavery Act and is seen as a landmark case.

He admitted to using two boys aged 15 and a 14-year-old girl to deal drugs on his behalf from a flat in Lincoln occupied by two heroin users. The police said he made profits of £500 a day while the children were found ‘drawn, tired and hungry’, living alongside two hard-drug users and ‘surrounded by used syringes’.

Staff who work with children should be aware of the National Referral Mechanism,12 which is the framework for identifying victims of human trafficking and modern slavery and ensuring that they receive the right support. They should be clear about when it is appropriate to refer a child and the mechanism for referral.

In Southend, the police have recently amended their missing person’s policy so that children who frequently go missing are considered for referral to the National Referral Mechanism because of the potential for trafficking.

**Learning the lessons from the past**

Agencies need to apply the lessons they have learned from the response to child sexual exploitation. All organisations that work with children need to ensure that frontline staff recognise the signs of criminal exploitation and understand that a child may be being criminally exploited, even if the activity appears consensual.

In reality, this presents challenges to agencies, not least the police. It is clear from our JTAIs that police officers need training and support to recognise the signs of modern slavery in the context of criminal exploitation.

Not all frontline police officers will have had the training to help them identify a vulnerable child, although any child coming into custody should be treated as vulnerable. When they find a young person in possession of weapons and drugs, they need to:

- ask ‘is this a vulnerable child?’ and ‘has this child been criminally exploited?’
- assess the risk of exploitation when considering whether to charge the young person

This is where we need a shift in culture, similar to what we saw in relation to child sexual exploitation. Clearly, a child in possession of Class A drugs or a weapon presents a child protection issue.

---

In areas we inspected, police had made some progress in recognising the context of criminal exploitation when identifying children who were found in possession of drugs. In most cases, this enabled them to recognise the fact that children who were perpetrating crimes were, in fact, victims of crime. All police forces admitted, however, that it was still possible that a child who has committed an offence may still be prosecuted despite clear evidence of exploitation.

It is essential that frontline health professionals, particularly GPs, staff at A&E departments, sexual health staff and schools nurses, are equipped to recognise the signs of exploitation. They need to ask the right questions when they meet a child who is depressed, self-harming or misusing substances and/or who has an injury. They also need to recognise that both boys and girls can be the victims of criminal and sexual exploitation.

While there are different challenges, there are lessons to be learned from multi-agency models that are working well in many areas to prevent and reduce child sexual exploitation.

In Southend, we found that some agencies have learned valuable lessons from a specific operation to prevent and reduce child exploitation.

The police and the local authority had to respond quickly to emerging and increasing risks of county lines activity in their area. They consulted other police forces and national organisations that had developed expertise. They developed a range of work to respond to the impact of county lines on individual children and the local community.

They shared learning from this joint operation with other agencies, both at a strategic and operational level, to improve practice.

As a result, they enlarged and made permanent the multi-agency team that was established to work with the exploited children. The team was building expertise in engaging with and working with vulnerable exploited children - skills that could be transferred to work with other vulnerable older children.

**Working with the police to disrupt exploitation**

Disrupting and preventing the criminal exploitation of children are real challenges. However, we saw some positive progress in some of the areas we visited.

The National Working Group has recognised Southend community policing team’s work in supporting vulnerable young people as a model of good practice. The team’s work includes positive outreach and disruption between the police and the street engagement service, which involves identifying streets and houses used for county

---

13 [www.nwgnetwork.org](http://www.nwgnetwork.org).

---
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lines activity. The police make good use of civil orders, such as community protection notices and child abduction warning notices, to safeguard vulnerable children.

In Dorset, the police have weekly meetings focusing on intelligence-gathering on county lines activity. They use this to plan disruption and investigation activity. Incidents posing the most threat result in a response from the neighbourhood patrol teams. Regional police resources then disrupt criminal activity. This strong police response means that the police can identify risks early and disrupt exploitation.

Conclusion

Preventing and responding to child criminal exploitation and sexual exploitation are big challenges for agencies and professionals nationally and locally. It can be done, but agencies must ensure that they have the building blocks in place to work effectively and quickly.

All agencies need to get the basics right. Effective and efficient ‘front door’ services that prioritise training on exploitation for staff are crucial in the identification of children who are being exploited. When a child presents with offending, or other concerning behaviour, professionals need to be curious and compassionate and ask: what is happening in this child’s life that is causing them to behave this way?

Agencies should not wait until they uncover a high-scale operation to respond to criminal exploitation. If they have not already done so, partners need to work together to plan how to respond to criminal exploitation. Everyone involved must understand local issues of exploitation and gangs so that responses can be carefully coordinated to meet local need. Partnerships need to not only identify and respond to the risk of exploitation, but work with children, parents and local communities to prevent exploitation through awareness-raising.

When children are identified as being exploited, professionals need to ‘stay with’ the child. These children have been groomed and threatened and might not recognise that they are being exploited. Professionals must not give up on children or their families. Both are in danger and need their help, support and protection.

The only way of responding to and preventing highly organised criminal operations that exploit children is to have a highly coordinated multi-agency and whole-council approach. Local partnerships need to be aware of the risks of exploitation in their local area. They must be curious at a strategic and operational level about what is happening in their locality. We must ensure that the mistakes that some partners made in being slow to recognise the risk of child sexual exploitation are not repeated.
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1. **Decision required**

   This report makes the following recommendation:

1.1. The Scrutiny Panel is asked to note performance, as at the end of the second quarter of the 2018/19 reporting year, against the key measures covering the four fundamentals underpinning the Children and Young People Plan (CYPP).

2. **Introduction and Background**

2.1. This report provides a summary of performance as at the end of the second quarter of 2018/19 with respect to the key measures underpinning the CYPP 2017-2020 fundamentals.

2.2. The fundamentals describe our aspirations for all children and young people and identify the different types of support children require according to their level of need.

   **CYPP Fundamentals**

   - **Strong Foundations**: we want all children and young people in Greenwich, whatever their background or circumstances to have the best possible start in life, particularly during their first 1001 days. Greenwich is a forward looking area for education and we want all children and young people to have ambition and aspiration and to be supported by effective support services, resilient families and good schools. We want them to have ambition and aspiration to achieve throughout their education, to reach their full potential and to make the most of opportunities available from living in Royal Greenwich and in London. We want them to not only be healthy and well but to have a sense of belonging, to feel safe, supported and secure in their families and their community. This will help children cope with and bounce back from challenges they encounter as they grow up.
• **Prevention:** we believe that a good education together with supportive parents or carers gives children the best chance to flourish. Some children and families will need more support than others. For them we will have more chance of helping them make sustained change in their lives if we intervene early to help them regain their resilience and overcome challenges. It is really important that the right help is provided at the right time for children to get back on the path of achieving their full potential.

• **Safe and Secure:** some children need a lot more help than others. Children with special educational needs and disabilities, children in care, care leavers and those who are at risk of significant harm will always be a priority for us. It is really important that children who face the most challenges in life get the right education and support to achieve their full potential.

• **Resilience and good mental health:** this is a cross cutting fundamental recognising the importance of resilience and good mental health for all children

2.3. This quarterly report provides a highlight summary of performance with the full performance monitor as an appendix. Two year trend data is provided along with comparator data for London and National to give context to current performance. ‘Red Amber Green - RAG’ rating of performance is agreed at the Children’s Services Strategic Partnership and is based on professional judgement as well as comparator performance. This will support an improved focus on areas that require monitoring or focused action.

2.4. The performance judgements are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>No significant performance concerns and/or improvement plan / monitoring in place and making impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Monitor- action may be required/ plan in place not yet making impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Significant performance concerns - focused action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Judgement not applicable at current reporting point (or applicable to specific measure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Quarter two performance summary**

3.1. The following section summarises key performance updates as at the end of the second quarter of the 2018-19 reporting year. Reporting is by exception, highlighting some areas of good or improving performance and those where concerns are emerging and/or clear performance issues exist.

3.2. **Strong Foundations**

3.2.1. *Children have the best possible start – 1001 days*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF 1</td>
<td>Percentage of women who smoke at time of delivery (Source: HSCIC/PHOF) (1001 DAYS)</td>
<td>8.6% (2016/17)</td>
<td>8.5% (Q3, 2017/18)</td>
<td>5.0% (Q4, 2017/18)</td>
<td>10.8% (Q4, 2017/18)</td>
<td>9.7% (Q4, 2017/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 5</td>
<td>Under 18 rolling annual conception rate Source: ONS data (calendar year)</td>
<td>29.2 per 1000 (2015)</td>
<td>20.9 per 1000 (Q4, 2016)</td>
<td>17.1 per 1000 (Q1, 2017)</td>
<td>18.5 per 1000 (Q1, 2017)</td>
<td>22.0 per 1000 (Q1 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Latest data shows a reduction in the percentage of women who smoke at time of delivery, back to levels in 2016/17 and 2017/18. Our priority is to sustain a downward trajectory and bring Greenwich more in line with the London average. A new communications and engagement plan is in development as part of a campaign directed at pregnant women and training has been delivered to midwives around perception of risk by pregnant women as part of a hard hitting intervention who would not ordinarily engage with tobacco treatment. New posters are also being rolled out at QEH to go alongside existing public health resources.

- The rolling quarterly teenage conception rate has increased slightly again, placing Royal Greenwich fifth highest in London and it is clear the pace of progress has reduced somewhat. We know that the increased take-up of long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARC) is an effective way to reduce unintended pregnancy amongst young women. In response to this through our recent commissioning cycle, we have increased access to LARC for young women by locating services in areas of greatest need. These services are actively monitored on a quarterly basis with key performance indicators shaped to reflect the priority for supporting young women.
3.2.2. *Children are healthy and well*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 42a</td>
<td>Proportion of <em>Reception</em> aged pupils who are overweight or obese</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>26.5% (17/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 42a</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15/16)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(17/18)</td>
<td>(17/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 42b</td>
<td>Proportion of <em>Year 6</em> aged pupils who are overweight or obese</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>40.5% (17/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 42b</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15/16)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(17/18)</td>
<td>(17/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel received a report on the action being taken to promote healthy weight and reduce childhood obesity at its meeting in November. The reasons for and solutions to obesity are recognised as being complex, requiring change at many levels over the long term. Healthy weight remains a priority in the Health and Wellbeing strategy. A Member level Healthy Weight Taskforce has recently been established to oversee the healthy weight action plan that is about to be refreshed. Some highlights include:
  - Implementing the Local Authority Declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthy Food (scaling up Good Food in Greenwich, Sugar Smart, the Healthier Catering Commitment, Breastfeeding Welcome);
  - Rolling out the Physical Activity and Sports strategy for the borough with a focus on walking and cycling;

- Healthy weight remains a priority in the Healthy Early Years Awards which will be expanding to include childminders next year, this will support children prior to reception.
- Within the primary phase, The Healthy Schools, Food for Life and Sugar Smart programmes all promote healthy weight and many schools take part in the Daily Mile.

3.2.3. *Children achieve and reach their full potential*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF 30a</td>
<td>Percentage of pupils achieving a grade of 9-4 in both English and maths at Key Stage 4 (A*-C data given for context for 2016)</td>
<td>60.8% (2016)</td>
<td>62.7% (2017)</td>
<td>67.7%* (2018)</td>
<td>59.1%* (2018)</td>
<td>58.3%* (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 33</td>
<td>Progress 8 Overall VA Score (VA score of 0+ is ‘good’)</td>
<td>-0.01 (2016)</td>
<td>-0.05 (2017)</td>
<td>0.22* (2018)</td>
<td>0.00 (2018)</td>
<td>-0.18* (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Provisional until performance tables published (Dec for KS2 and Jan for KS4&5)

- Attainment at Early Years and Primary remains strong with all headline measures above England and London (in line with London for key stage 2 higher standard). Rankings are as follows:
  - Early years Foundation stage: 6\textsuperscript{th} in England and 4\textsuperscript{th} in London\textsuperscript{1};
  - Key stage one: Reading – joint 17\textsuperscript{th} in England and joint 13\textsuperscript{th} in London; Writing – joint 4\textsuperscript{th} in both England and London; Maths – joint 13\textsuperscript{th} in England and joint 12\textsuperscript{th} in London;
  - Key stage two: Expected standard in RWM – joint 23\textsuperscript{rd} in England and joint 17\textsuperscript{th} in London; Higher standard in RWM – joint 18\textsuperscript{th} in England and joint 15\textsuperscript{th} in London.

- Provisional key stage four results for 2018 place Royal Greenwich bottom in London for three headline measures\textsuperscript{2}. Whilst this is a very disappointing and a concerning position, it should not detract from recognising that some schools and many individual young people performed exceptionally well this year.

- With regards to key stage five the picture is similar to previous years, the point score measures above reflecting that fewer students in Royal Greenwich achieve the highest grades. There has also been a performance dip in applied (vocational) courses of study where Greenwich has previously ranked very well. This may be linked to the marked reduction in the number of vocational courses studied and we will be looking at this closely in terms of whether there has been a change in the profile of students taking them.

---

\textsuperscript{1} Note: The Isles of Scilly and City of London usually don’t count in the rankings due to insufficient numbers but are included for 2018; with them excluded the rankings would be 4\textsuperscript{th} England and 3\textsuperscript{rd} in London

\textsuperscript{2} joint bottom for SF 30b grade 9-5 in English and maths; SF 33 progress 8 is not ranked
A dedicated report on educational outcomes and standards in schools will be presented to Scrutiny in February 2018 and this will address the actions being taken to improve key stage four and five performance.

3.3. Prevention

3.3.1. The right help at the right time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>2018-19 Performance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Number of children (under 18) receiving early help as at end of quarter (snapshot of allocated cases):</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Help - Connect</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Help - Core</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Help - Total</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Number and percentage of children stepped down to early help who remain below the threshold for social care and/or YOS (cumulative)</td>
<td>100% (32/32) (Apr - Jun 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Percentage of children who have been referred to early help and achieved and sustained positive outcomes for (rolling cohorts):</td>
<td>97% (2728/2814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 months:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As the model for early help changed, measures are not comparable to previous years; there are also no London or England comparators for early help.

Early Help continues to have a positive impact in terms of supporting families to make sustained change. All cases stepped down to the service in the first two quarters of the year have remained below the statutory threshold and of all children supported by Early Help and tracked over a longer period, nearly all have seen sustained change for six months and 4 in 5 for a 12 month period. Going forward, this measure will be extended to also track over 24 months.

3.3.2. Supporting young people to behave well and achieve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17. Rate per 100,000 10-17 year olds. Source: YNC/PNC data (subject to lag)</td>
<td>434 (Oct - Sep 16)</td>
<td>455 (Oct - Sep 17)</td>
<td>394 (Oct - Sep 17)</td>
<td>304 (Oct - Sep 17)</td>
<td>443 (Jan-Dec 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First time entrants based on YOS data (cumulative)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We continue to see fewer young people entering the youth justice system this year compared to previous periods. Whilst this is a positive picture it remains a priority area for the Youth Offending Service and the wider partnership and features in CYPP Priority 2: “Supporting disadvantaged boys and engaging well
with men” which is looking in particular at tackling the disproportionality of boys within this cohort.

3.4. Safe and Secure

3.4.1. Supporting young people to get back on the path to behaving well and achieving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 1</td>
<td>Local rate of proven re-offending by offenders (Annual rolling cohort)</td>
<td>23.2% (19/82) (Apr 16 - Mar 17)</td>
<td>35.1% (19/54) (Apr 17 - Mar 18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38.8% (19/49) (Jun 17 - Jul 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of proven re-offending by offenders (3 month tracking)</td>
<td>42.3% (Jan 16 - Mar 16)</td>
<td>48.1% (Jan 16 - Mar 16)</td>
<td>42.1% (Jan 16 - Mar 16)</td>
<td>34.5% (19/55) (Apr 16 - Jun 16)</td>
<td>54.25% (26/48) (Jul 16 - Sep 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>Number of custodial sentences given in court presented as a rate per 1,000 young people in the 10 to 17 population (i.e. 23,716 in 2013). Note: Quarterly figures are cumulative</td>
<td>0.48 (Apr 16 - Mar 17)</td>
<td>0.76 (Apr - Mar 18)</td>
<td>0.66 (Jan 17 - Dec 17)</td>
<td>0.38 (Jan 17 - Dec 17)</td>
<td>0.17 (Apr - Jun 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018-19 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of sentences (cumulative)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of young people (cumulative)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Whilst our local re-offending tracking data shows a relatively stable position year to date, the Youth Justice Board 3 month measure (that is based on older data) reflects an increase. We anticipate this will improve over time as their measure starts to pick up more current information but as with first time entrants, our priority is to sustain reductions long term.

- New measures introduced to tackle re-offending include two new projects using a restorative approach towards peer to peer conflict. This addresses the increase in violence within such offences and is designed to prevent reprisals or further offences and support children and families for return home either from care or custody. We recognise that the age of children who re-offend has decreased. To respond to this the youth offending team have received systemic training and a new casework model based on this approach is in development. Additional support for girls is being provided by specialist services focused solely on the particular impact for girls involved in county line drug dealing and gang affiliations.

- Four additional young people have received custodial sentences since quarter one however the increase seen in the actual rate of custodial sentences largely relates to two young people within the cohort receiving multiple sentences.
3.4.2. **Supporting our most vulnerable children to achieve their full potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>The percentage of children looked after continuously for 12 months who achieved the expected national standard or higher in reading, writing and maths at Key Stage 2</td>
<td>35% (2016)</td>
<td>45% (2017)</td>
<td>42% (2017)</td>
<td>32% (2017)</td>
<td>54%* (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>The percentage of children looked after continuously for 12 months who achieved Grade 9-4 in both English and maths at Key Stage 4</td>
<td>25% (2016)</td>
<td>21% (2017)</td>
<td>20% (2017)</td>
<td>17.5% (2017)</td>
<td>25.5%* (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We await the England comparator data for the attainment of children in care however we expect the outcomes for Greenwich to continue to compare well. The provisional figures above demonstrate a significant achievement for our children, particularly at key stage four, many of whom have multiple and complex difficulties. Further detail on these outcomes is contained within the dedicated report of the 2017-18 annual report of the Virtual School Headteacher, which the panel received in November 2018.

3.4.3. **Keeping our most vulnerable children safe and secure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 18</td>
<td>Percentage of re-referrals in the last year (cumulative)</td>
<td>12.7% (440/3459)</td>
<td>14.0% (446/3184)</td>
<td>16.2% (16/17)</td>
<td>21.9% (16/17)</td>
<td>15.7% (134/852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.3%* (241/1481)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Whilst the rate of re-referrals to social care (within 12 months) remains well below the England average, there has been a slow and steady increase during the year and the service are monitoring this closely. A review of all 241 repeat referrals has taken place and the findings include:
  - The figures include a number of large sibling groups – the 241 repeats relate to 231 individual children, including 40 sibling groups six of which are 4+ children in size;
  - Most referrals relate to domestic violence, mental health and parental substance misuse;
  - Commonly repeat referrals will be for the same primary factor as the first however in some of these cases a different reason has been identified;
  - Learning has been identified in relation to ensuring appropriate support is in place when Children’s Social Care step down a case and that there is consistent, robust triangulation of information rather than an overreliance on self-reporting by parents. Systemic training for social workers is addressing these two points.
3.5. **Resilience and good mental health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Percentage of children accessing specialist CAMHS Level 2 interventions reporting improvement in Routine Outcome Measures across all pathways</td>
<td>80.7% (Q4, 16/17)</td>
<td>75.9% (246/324) (Q4, 17/18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76.4% (42/55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Percentage of young people who have completed a programme of support reporting an improvement in their emotional health and well-being (Tier 2 - delivered by Family Action)</td>
<td>89% (52/58)</td>
<td>100% (27/27)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% (11/11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1. As reported to Scrutiny in quarter one, we continue to have concerns with regards to the low numbers of young people completing the tier 2 emotional health and wellbeing service and the relatively low numbers of children receiving specialist CAMHS support with reported outcomes. Whilst outcomes for those being supported are generally positive and above target expectations, numbers need to increase and this is being monitored rigorously through action plans with the providers. The tier 2 emotional health and wellbeing service will end in March 2019 and commissioners are currently identifying a pilot for this support in 2019/20 which will inform our Start Well health and wellbeing commission for 2020.

4. **Consultation**

4.1. The Children and Young People Plan 2017-2020 was developed in consultation with children, young people, parents/carers and practitioners. The performance monitor reporting approach has been developed in consultation with senior officers represented at the Children’s Services Strategic Partnership.

5. **Report Appendices**

5.1. The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:
- *Appendix A: 2018-2019 Quarter two performance monitor*
6. **Background Papers**

6.1. The Children and Young People Plan 2017-2020 is available on the Royal Greenwich website at: [http://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/childrenplan](http://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/childrenplan)

Report Author: Joanne Burgess, Head of Performance Analysis Service  
Tel No. 020 8921 3579  
Email. joanne.burgess@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Louise Mackender de Cari, Assistant Director, Strategy, Performance & Commissioning  
Tel No. 020 8921 3461  
Email. louise.mackenderdecari@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Florence Kroll, Director of Children’s Services  
Tel No. 020 8921 8230  
Email. florence.kroll@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
**Royal Greenwich Children and Young People Plan 2017-2020:**

**Performance Monitor: Q2, 2018/19**

For Children & Young People Scrutiny on 17 January 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience and good mental health is important for all children</th>
<th>Strong Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* We want all children and young people in Greenwich, whatever their background or circumstances to have the best possible start in life, particularly during their first 1001 days. We want them to have ambition and aspiration and to achieve throughout their education to reach their full potential and to make the most of opportunities available from living in Royal Greenwich and in London. We want them to not only be healthy and well but to have a sense of belonging, to feel safe and secure in their homes and their community. This will help children to cope with and bounce back from the challenges they encounter as they grow up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will have more chance of helping children and their families make sustained change in their lives if we intervene early to help them regain their resilience and overcome challenges. It is really important that the right help is provided at the right time for children to get back on the path to achieving their full potential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safe and Secure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some children need a lot more help than others. Children with special education needs and disabilities, children in care, care leavers and those who are at significant risk of harm will always be a priority for us. It is really important that children who face the most challenges in life get the right support to achieve their full potential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to performance monitor**

- Performance data provisional at time of reporting so may be subject to change

- No significant performance concerns and/or improvement plan / monitoring in place and making impact

- Monitor - action may be required/ plan in place not yet making impact

- Significant performance concerns - focused action required

- Judgement not applicable at current reporting point (or applicable to specific measure)

- Performance measure is new (NEW), revised (REV) or in development (DEV) and/or performance data has been added for the first time this quarter

- Performance data relating to the first 1001 days of child’s life

- Performance data relating to Social Mobility

- Reflects measure did not exist / was not captured at that point

- N/A Reflects no England or London comparator data available
## STRONG FOUNDATIONS

**Children have the best possible start in life - 1001 days**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>SF 1</td>
<td>Percentage of women who smoke at time of delivery (Source: HSCIC/PHOF) (1001 DAYS) Where smoking status is unknown, women are reassumed to be non-smokers.</td>
<td>8.6% (2016/17)</td>
<td>8.8% (2017/18)</td>
<td>4.7% (Q1, 2018/19)</td>
<td>10.4% (Q1, 2018/19)</td>
<td>9.7% (Q4, 2017/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>SF 2</td>
<td>Percentage of mothers initiating breastfeeding (within 48 hours)</td>
<td>82.2% (2016/17)</td>
<td>84.0% (2017/18)</td>
<td>87.4% (2016/17)</td>
<td>74.6% (2016/17)</td>
<td>84.8% (Q4, 2017/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>SF 3</td>
<td>Breastfeeding prevalence at 6-8 weeks from birth Note: Quarterly performance is non-cumulative. The outturn is based on Q4 data. (1001 DAYS)</td>
<td>71.1% (Q4, 16/17)</td>
<td>73.1% (Q4, 17/18)</td>
<td>73.7% (Q4, 17/18)</td>
<td>49.8% (Q4, 17/18)</td>
<td>73.1% (Q4, 17/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>SF 4</td>
<td>Under 18 quarterly conception rate. Note: The 1998 Greenwich baseline was 62.7 conceptions per 1000 girls aged 15-17. There is a 14 month lag on this data. Source: ONS data (calendar year)</td>
<td>29.2 per 1000 (2015)</td>
<td>21.2 per 1000 (2016)</td>
<td>17.2 per 1000 (Q2, 2017)</td>
<td>18.2 per 1000 (Q2, 2017)</td>
<td>24.3 per 1000 (Q1, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>SF 5</td>
<td>Under 18 rolling annual conception rate Source: ONS data (calendar year)</td>
<td>20.9 per 1000 (2016)</td>
<td>16.9 per 1000 (Q2, 2017)</td>
<td>18.2 per 1000 (Q2, 2017)</td>
<td>22.0 per 1000 (Q1, 2017)</td>
<td>23.5 per 1000 (Q2, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>SF 6</td>
<td>U18 conceptions (number)</td>
<td>130 (Jan-Dec 2015)</td>
<td>92 (Jan-Dec 2016)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SF 7</td>
<td>ChildminderInspections (% judged good or better) (1001 DAYS)</td>
<td>89.2% (222/249) (Dec 16)</td>
<td>90.0% (216/240) (Dec 17)</td>
<td>90.3% (Mar 18)</td>
<td>93.8% (Mar 18)</td>
<td>90.6% (222/245) (Mar 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SF 8</td>
<td>Childcare - Non-Domestic Inspections (% judged good or better) (1001 DAYS)</td>
<td>96.7% (87/90) (Dec 16)</td>
<td>92.3% (84/91) (Dec 17)</td>
<td>92.3% (Mar 18)</td>
<td>94.8% (Mar 18)</td>
<td>93.7% (93.7) (Mar 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SF 9</td>
<td>Nursery School Inspections (% judged good or better) (1001 DAYS)</td>
<td>100% (4/4) (Mar 17)</td>
<td>100% (Mar 18)</td>
<td>99% (Jun 18)</td>
<td>98% (Jun 18)</td>
<td>100% (June 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Children are healthy and well

<p>| Public Health | SF 42a | Proportion of Reception aged pupils who are overweight or obese | 27.0% (15/16) | 24.3% (16/17) | 21.9% (17/18) | 22.4% (17/18) | 26.5% (17/18) |
| SF 42b | Proportion of Year 6 aged pupils who are overweight or obese | 43.9% (15/16) | 43.0% (16/17) | 37.5% (17/18) | 34.3% (17/18) | 40.5% (17/18) |
|--------------|-----|------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------------------|
| CCG          | SF 10 | A) Number of A&amp;E attendances in quarter for children and young people aged 0-17 in Greenwich (by GP registration) | 37558 | N/A | N/A | 9539 | 7778 |
|              |      | B) Of A, number of Type 1 emergency attendances (main A&amp;E) | 17230 | N/A | N/A | 3863 | 3351 |
|              |      | C) Percentage of Type 1 emergencies (measure B) who arrived by ambulance | 15.7% (2710/17230) | N/A | N/A | 16.8% (648/3863) | 17.3% (579/3351) |
|              |      | D) Percentage of Type 1 emergencies (measure B) who were admitted to hospital | 31.5% (5430/17230) | N/A | N/A | 33.2% (1281/3863) | 31.6% (1060/3351) |
|              |      | E) Of A, number of Type 3 emergency attendances (urgent care centre) | 20061 | N/A | N/A | 5580 | 4348 |
| CCG          | SF 11 | Early Access for Women to Maternity Services Booking appointment between 0 and 70 days gestation (target 50%) | | | | | 44.2% (Jan-Mar 18) | 46.0% (Apr-Jun 18) |
| Public Health| SF 12 | Rate of FCEs (Finished Consultant Episodes) where a tooth extraction was performed on a child aged 10 years and under, due to tooth decay, per 100,000 resident population. (NHS Outcomes Framework set 3.7) | 554.5 per 100,000 (2015/16) | 501.9 per 100,000 (2016/17) | 567.6 per 100,000 (2016/17) | 421.7 per 100,000 (2016/17) | Avail. Q4 |
| CCG          | SF 13 | Antenatal sickle cell and thalassaemia screening – timeliness of test: percentage of mothers having antenatal sickle cell and thalassaemia screening that have a conclusive screening result by 10 weeks gestation (ST2) | 43.2% (Q2 position) | 42.6% (Q2 position) | 37.7% (2016/17) | 53.1% (2016/17) | NYA |
| CCG          | SF 14 | Directly standardised rate (U19) per 100,000 of emergency admissions for children with lower respiratory tract infections (CCG Outcomes Indicator Set 3.4) | 549.9 (Oct 15 - Sep 16) | 463.9 (Oct 16 - Sep 17) | 245.7 (Oct 13 - Sep 14) | 446.4 (Oct 16 - Sep 17) | 397.6 per 100,000 (Jan 17 - Dec 17) | 388.7 per 100,000 (Apr 17 - Mar 18) |
| CCG          | SF 15 | Emergency gastroenteritis admissions for under 1s (rate per 100,000 admissions for under 1s) | 684 per 100,000 (Q4, 2017/18) | N/A | N/A | 642 | 650 |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------------------|
| SF 41 | Number of children accessing 30 hours free childcare through RBG settings | N/A     | N/A     | 1,118  | (Spring 2018) | 1,529               |
| SF 19 | Primary School Inspections (% judged good or better)                      | 96.8%   | 98%     | 93%    | (June 18) | 87%                 |
|       | (61/63)                                                                 | (62/63) | (Mar 18)|(June 18) | (June 18) | (June 18)          |
| SF 20 | Secondary School Inspections (% judged good or better)                    | 79%     | 85%     | 87%    | (June 18) | 76%                 |
|       | (11/14)                                                                  | (12/14) | (Mar 18)|(June 18) | (June 18) | (June 18)          |
| SF 21 | Achievement of a good level of development across the EYFS                | 79%     | 78%     | 74%    | (2018)    | 72%                 |
| SF 22 | Percentage achieving the expected national standard or higher in reading  | 81%     | 80%     | 78%    | (2018)    | 75%                 |
| SF 23 | Percentage achieving the expected national standard or higher in writing  | 76%     | 76%     | 73%    | (2018)    | 70%                 |
| SF 24 | Percentage achieving the expected national standard or higher in maths at | 82%     | 81%     | 79%    | (2018)    | 76%                 |
| SF 25 | Percentage achieving the expected national standard or higher in reading, | 64%     | 71%     | 69%*   | (2018)    | 64%*                |
| SF 26 | Percentage achieving a higher standard in reading, writing and maths      | 10%     | 13%     | 13%*   | (2018)    | 10%*                |
| SF 27 | Average progress in reading between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2           | 1.3     | 0.7     | 0.8    | (2017)    | 0.0                 |
| SF 28 | Average progress in writing between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2           | 2.5     | 1.4     | 1.0    | (2017)    | 0.0                 |
| SF 29 | Average progress in mathematics between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2       | 1.5     | 1.1     | 1.6    | (2017)    | 0.0                 |
| SF 30a | Percentage of pupils achieving a grade of 9-4 in both English and maths   | 60.8%   | 62.7%   | 67.7%*  | (2018)    | 59.1%*              |
| SF 30b | Percentage of pupils achieving a grade of 9-5 in both English and maths   | 41.6%   | 48.5%*  | 39.9%*  | (2018)    | 39.2%*              |
| SF 31 | English Baccalaureate Average Point Score (average highest score from     | 4.41*   | 3.83*   | 3.91*  | (2018)    | 3.91*               |
| SF 32 | Attainment 8                                                               | 49.6    | 45.9    | 49.2*  | (2017)    | 44.3*               |
| SF 33 | Progress 8 Overall VA Score (VA score of 0+ is 'good')                     | -0.01   | -0.05   | 0.22*  | (2018)    | -0.18*              |
|--------------|-----|------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------------------|
|              |     |            | Q1      | Q2      |        |         |                     |
| Children's Services | SF 37a | % 16-17 year olds who are NEET or whose activity is not known | 5.0% (Dec 16 - Feb 17) | 3.9% (end of Mar 18) | 5.3% (Dec 16 - Feb 17) | 6.0% (Dec 16 - Feb 17) | 4.4% (of which 2.2% NEET) (end of May 18) | Next reported in Q3 |
| Children's Services | SF 37b | Underlying cohort numbers that make up the NEET and unknown group | 221 of which 111 NEET | N/A | N/A | 252 of which 128 NEET |
| Children's Services | SF 38 | Number of children receiving accreditations/ qualifications through accessing universal youth services (cumulative) (annual target is 317 in total) | 354 | 368 | N/A | N/A | 111 | 213 |
| Children's Services | SF 39 | Number of children receiving accreditations/ qualifications through accessing summer provision | 31 | 55 | N/A | N/A | 55 |
| Children's Services | SF 40 | RBG pupils progressing to higher education | 56% (2015) | 58% (2016) | 59% (2017) | 50% (2017) | 54% (2017) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>2018-19 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 1</td>
<td>Number of children (under 18) receiving early help as at end of quarter (snapshot): Early Help - Connect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Help - Core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Help - Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 3</td>
<td>Number and percentage of children stepped down to early help who remain below the threshold for social care and/or YOS (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of children who have been referred to early help and achieved and sustained positive outcomes for (rolling cohorts): 6 months:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 months:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 6</td>
<td>Percentage of young people completing the Tier 2 Skills for Change programme and reporting reduced Substance Misuse (target 75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Supporting those at risk of poor outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children's Services</th>
<th>P 7</th>
<th>Percentage of disadvantaged two year olds taking up their 15 hours free early education entitlement in Greenwich (including both DWP and local priority identified 2yos)</th>
<th>75% (Feb 17)</th>
<th>77% (Apr 18)</th>
<th>61% (Jan 18)</th>
<th>72% (Jan 18)</th>
<th>82% (Jun 18)</th>
<th>Avail. Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children at end of period that are EHE (Reception to post-16)</td>
<td>262 (March 18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>262 (Jun 18)</td>
<td>226 (Sep 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 21</td>
<td>Number of children at end of period that are CME</td>
<td>67 (Feb 18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>73 (Jun 18)</td>
<td>31 (Sep 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 21</td>
<td>Number of children at end of period that are in Alternative Provision: Attending Newhaven</td>
<td>139 (Jan 18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>170 (May 18)</td>
<td>143 (Oct 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placed through FAP</td>
<td>101 (Feb 18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>99 (June 18)</td>
<td>67 (Sep 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Partner</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>2018-19 Performance</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 8</td>
<td>Percentage of half days missed due to total absence in maintained primary schools</td>
<td>3.7% (Aut &amp; Spr 15/16)</td>
<td>3.7% (Aut &amp; Spr 16/17)</td>
<td>4.1% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>4.2% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>3.9% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 9</td>
<td>Primary school persistent absence rate at 10%</td>
<td>8.2% (Aut &amp; Spr 15/16)</td>
<td>8.6% (Aut &amp; Spr 16/17)</td>
<td>9.4% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>9.6% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>9.2% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 10</td>
<td>Percentage of half days missed due to total absence in maintained secondary schools</td>
<td>4.7% (Aut &amp; Spr 15/16)</td>
<td>5.0% (Aut &amp; Spr 16/17)</td>
<td>4.9% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>5.4% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>5.0% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 11</td>
<td>Secondary school persistent absence rate at 10%</td>
<td>11.8% (Aut &amp; Spr 15/16)</td>
<td>13.4% (Aut &amp; Spr 16/17)</td>
<td>11.8% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>13.6% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td>13.9% (Aut &amp; Spr 17/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 12</td>
<td>Rate of fixed term exclusions from school (figures relate to academic years)</td>
<td>4.7% (15/16)</td>
<td>5.3% (16/17)</td>
<td>3.36% (15/16)</td>
<td>4.3% (15/16)</td>
<td>Avail. Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 13</td>
<td>Fixed term exclusions from school involving children receiving SEN support as a percentage of all children with SEN support (measure excludes EHC plans)</td>
<td>10.6% (15/16)</td>
<td>11.7% (15/16)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13.7% (15/16)</td>
<td>Avail. Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 14</td>
<td>Fixed term exclusions from school involving children on EHC plans as a percentage of all children on EHC plans</td>
<td>22% (15/16)</td>
<td>31.0% (15/16)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15% (15/16)</td>
<td>Avail. Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting young people to behave well and achieve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>2018-19 Performance</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 15</td>
<td>First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17. Rate per 100,000 10-17 year olds. Sources: The YNC/PNC data is the source for the annual outturns and the source for quarterly figures are from the YOS</td>
<td>434 (Oct - Sep 16)</td>
<td>455 (Oct - Sep 17)</td>
<td>394 (Oct - Sep 17)</td>
<td>304 (Oct - Sep 17)</td>
<td>443 (Jan-Dec 17)</td>
<td>419 (Apr 17-Mar 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First time entrants based on YOS data (cumulative)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>P 19</td>
<td>Number of families who have achieved change across identified areas required under the troubled families programme</td>
<td>32% (891/2780)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>37% (1032/2780)</td>
<td>43% (1208/2780)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local rate of proven re-offending by offenders (Annual rolling cohort)</td>
<td>23.2% (19/82) (Apr 16 - Mar 17)</td>
<td>35.19% (19/54) (Apr 17 - Mar 18)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38.8% (19/49) (Jun 17 - Jul 18)</td>
<td>35.5% (22/62) (Oct 17 - Sep 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of proven re-offending by offenders (3 month tracking)</td>
<td>42.3% (Jan 16 - Mar 16)</td>
<td>48.1% (Jan 16 - Mar 16)</td>
<td>42.1% (Jan 16 - Mar 16)</td>
<td>34.5% (19/55) (Apr 16 - Jun 16)</td>
<td>54.25% (26/48) (Jul 16 - Sep 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of custodial sentences given in court presented as a rate per 1,000 young people in the 10 to 17 population (i.e. 23,716 in 2013). Note: Quarterly figures are cumulative</td>
<td>0.48 (Apr 16 - Mar 17)</td>
<td>0.76 (Apr - Mar 18)</td>
<td>0.66 (Jan 17 - Dec 17)</td>
<td>0.38 (Jan 17 - Dec 17)</td>
<td>0.17 (Apr - Jun 18)</td>
<td>0.46 (Apr - Sep 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of sentences (cumulative)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of young people (cumulative)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serious Youth Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 37 NEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>A) Number of offenders</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) Number of offences</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young offenders’ engagement in suitable education, employment and training</td>
<td>77.7% (143/184) (April - Sept 17)</td>
<td>82.0% (150/183) (April - Sept 17)</td>
<td>51.0% (April - Sept 17)</td>
<td>42.6% (April - Sept 17)</td>
<td>86.4% (38/44) (Apr - Jun 18)</td>
<td>79.1% (72/91) (Apr - Sep 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of young offenders achieving a standard pass (4+) in both English and maths at Key Stage 4</td>
<td>6.1% (2016)</td>
<td>14.7% (2017)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Avail. Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The percentage of children looked after continuously for 12 months who achieved the expected national standard or higher in reading, writing and maths at Key Stage 2</td>
<td>35% (2016)</td>
<td>45% (2017)</td>
<td>42% (2017)</td>
<td>32% (2017)</td>
<td>54%* (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The percentage of children looked after continuously for 12 months who achieved Grade 9-4 in both English and maths at Key Stage 4</td>
<td>25% (2016)</td>
<td>21% (2017)</td>
<td>20% (2017)</td>
<td>17.5% (2017)</td>
<td>25.5%* (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 9</td>
<td>A) Total EHC plans issued in quarter vs total due to be issued</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>(55/110) (69/92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) Of new plans issued in quarter, EHC plans issued within 20 weeks</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 10</td>
<td>Percentage of care leavers (aged 17 to 21) in touch who are EET</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(179/270)</td>
<td>(177/279)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(51/72)</td>
<td>(92/136)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 11</td>
<td>All care leavers in employment, education or training at ages 17-21</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(includes those not in touch etc.)</td>
<td>(180/281)</td>
<td>(177/293)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(51/80)</td>
<td>(92/149)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB: Performance not comparable prior to 2015/16 as figures included ages 19-21 only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS 12</td>
<td>Care leavers (aged 19-21) in higher education (includes those not in touch etc.)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20/194)</td>
<td>(22/218)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(5/54)</td>
<td>(10/109)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAFE AND SECURE

### Keeping our most vulnerable children safe and secure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 14</td>
<td>Number of young people with one or more instances of <strong>missing from home (over 24 hours)</strong> during the period (cumulative)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 15</td>
<td>Of missing from home number above, number of young people who have been missing on 2+ occasions (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 16</td>
<td>Number of young people with one or more instances of <strong>missing from care (over 24 hours)</strong> during the period (cumulative)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 17</td>
<td>Of missing from care number above, number of young people who have been missing on 2+ occasions (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of re-referrals in the last year (cumulative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 18</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>16.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(440/3459)</td>
<td>(446/3184)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(134/852)</td>
<td>(241/1481)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In quarter data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(102/604)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step up from Early Help - Referrals where 'Early Help' was the outcome of a previous contact received by MASH (cumulative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 35</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>22.4%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(254/1031)</td>
<td>(299/1027)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(60/281)</td>
<td>(112/501)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPP rate per 10,000 under 18s population as at the end of the period. The reported figures use U18 ONS mid-year population estimates. For 2016/17 this is 67,400, for 2017/18 outturns this is 68,479, for 2018/19 this 69,613 (cumulative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 21</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of children who were subject of a CPP as at the end of the period.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 22</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>219*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of children becoming the subject of Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time, within two years of the previous plans end date (DB 5) (cumulative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 23</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12/347)</td>
<td>(18/360)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2/50)</td>
<td>(5/89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of social care case audits - of the audits completed in the period, proportion that were judged to be good or outstanding (Cumulative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 36</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>(150/215)</td>
<td>(158/198)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50/71)</td>
<td>(81/112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 24</td>
<td>Looked after children rate per 10,000 under 18s population. The reported figures use U18 ONS mid-year population estimates. For 2016/17 this is 67,400, for 2017/18 outturns this is 68,479, for 2018/19 this 69,613 (cumulative)</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>50 (16/17)</td>
<td>62 (16/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers of looked after children</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 25</td>
<td>Percentage of children in care who are placed outside the borough</td>
<td>75.1% (364/496)</td>
<td>73.6% (362/492)</td>
<td>63.8% (16/17)</td>
<td>40.0% (16/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 26</td>
<td>Percentage of children in care who are placed within the borough or neighbouring boroughs Previous outturns and London/national comparators not available</td>
<td>53.0% (263/496)</td>
<td>50.4% (248/492)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 27</td>
<td>Stability of placements of looked after children: Length of placement</td>
<td>80.1% (145/181)</td>
<td>80.3% (151/188)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70% (16/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of looked after children achieving permanence through (cumulative):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A) Adoption</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) Special Guardianship Orders</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C) Child Arrangements Orders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 29</td>
<td>Average time between a child entering care and moving in with their adoptive family, for children who have been adopted (days) (A1) - CURRENT YEAR</td>
<td>418 (9185/22)</td>
<td>374 (8236/22)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average time between a child entering care and moving in with their adoptive family, for children who have been adopted (days) (A1) - 3 year average</td>
<td>446 (27181/61)</td>
<td>419 (27683/66)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>520 (3 yr average 2014-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 30</td>
<td>Average time between a local authority receiving court authority to place a child and the local authority deciding on a match to an adoptive family (days) (A2) - CURRENT YEAR</td>
<td>149 (3267/22)</td>
<td>142 (3129/22)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average time between a local authority receiving court authority to place a child and the local authority deciding on a match to an adoptive family (days) (A2) - 3 year average</td>
<td>186 (11357/61)</td>
<td>181 (11921/66)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>220 (3 yr average 2014-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 31</td>
<td>Care leavers in suitable accommodation at ages 17-21 (cumulative)</td>
<td>89.7% (252/281)</td>
<td>88.1% (258/293)</td>
<td>83.6% (16/17)</td>
<td>84.8% (16/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 32</td>
<td>% of young people reporting successful completion of the Tier 3 Substance Misuse programme and being drug free (target 33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of young people reporting successful completion of the Tier 3 Substance Misuse programme and occasional drug use (target 47%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>SS 33</td>
<td>% of young people reporting successful completion of the Tier 3 Substance Misuse programme and being alcohol free (target 33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of young people reporting successful completion of the Tier 3 Substance Misuse programme and occasional alcohol use (target 50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our most vulnerable children are healthy and well
## RESILIENCE AND GOOD MENTAL HEALTH

### Supporting children to have good mental health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Percentage of young people who have completed a programme of support reporting an improvement in their emotional health and well-being (Tier 2 - delivered by Family Action)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100% (11/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Percentage of children accessing specialist CAMHS Level 2 interventions reporting improvement in Routine Outcome Measures across all pathways</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>76.4% (42/55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Emotional and behavioural health of looked after children. Source: Strengths &amp; Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) Good performance is indicated by a low number</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Avail. Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Number of children (under 18) attending A&amp;E due to self harm (cumulative) Definition changed in 18/19 to reflect the most serious incidents of self harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 | Q2
1. **Purpose of the Report**

   1.1 As Scrutiny are aware there has been an increase in our Persistent Absence (PA) from school at both primary and secondary phases. A definition of PA is found at point 3.3 of this report. This report aims to inform members of Children and Young People’s scrutiny about our statutory responsibilities in regard to attendance and our powers.

   1.2 To agree the action points we are implementing to improve the attendance of our children at school.

2. **Parental Responsibility for School Attendance**

   2.1 Under Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, the parent is responsible for making sure that their child of compulsory school age receives efficient full-time education that is suitable to the child’s age, ability and aptitude and to any special educational needs the child may have. This can be by regular attendance at school or by education otherwise.

   2.2 Compulsory school age is defined as being from age five. A child should attend school from the start of the term commencing on or after his/her fifth birthday. A child continues to be of compulsory school age until the last Friday of June in the school year that they reach the age of sixteen.

   2.3 If it appears to the Local Education Authority that a child of compulsory school age is not receiving a suitable education either by regular attendance at school or otherwise, then under Section 437 of the Education Act 1996 the LA begin procedures for issuing a School Attendance Order.

   2.4 If a child of compulsory school age who is registered at a school and fails to attend regularly at school then the parent is guilty of an offence under Section 444(1) and 444 (1a) of the Education Act 1996.
2.5 There are some limited defences to these offences:

- The Headteacher authorised the absence.
- The child could not attend because of sickness or ‘unavoidable cause’ in an emergency. Case law has held that stress arising from bullying, behavioural or mental health difficulties or a ‘chaotic lifestyle’ should not be considered an ‘unavoidable cause’.
- The child was absent on a day exclusively set apart for religious observance.
- The school is outside of the statutory walking distance of the child’s home and the Local Authority has a duty to make travel arrangements in relation to the child under and has failed to discharge that duty.
- The child is not registered at the school and the parents are providing a suitable alternative education.
- The parents’ trade or business requires them to travel from place to place.

3. **Definition of absence**

3.1 **Authorised absence**

3.1.1 The school will make the decision that the absence is legitimate/valid.

3.1.2 A school will authorise an absence if:

- the child is too ill to attend and the school accepts this as valid (although if the child is off for long periods the school might ask for proof from the doctor);
- the parent has got the advance permission of the school e.g. for a holiday, religious observation;
- the child has a medical or dental appointment;
- the child is on study leave;
- the child is being educated off-site;
- the child has been excluded;
- An exceptional circumstance e.g. family bereavement.

3.2 **Unauthorised absence**

3.2.1 The following are reasons that are given for children taking time off school - the Headteacher will decide whether the absence is marked as authorised or
unauthorised. Examples of unauthorised absence are going on holiday or travelling abroad, days off for birthdays, shopping trips, feeling tired, bad weather, non-urgent appointment, and parental illness.

3.3 Persistent Absence (PA)

3.3.1 In line with the Education Act 1996, a child of compulsory school age is required to attend school each day and on time, equating to 100% attendance. If a child’s attendance falls to 90% and/or below, they are identified by the government and the Local Authority as being persistently absent from school. This is regardless of whether the child’s absence is authorised or unauthorised, as a clear correlation between attendance and attainment has been identified.

3.3.2 PA prior to 2011 was set at 20% by Department for Education. A reduction to 15% was directed in 2011, as all Local Authorities required schools to act early in addressing patterns of poor attendance. Statistics showed PA had fallen from 6.8% in 2009-2010 to 4.6% by 2012-2013. In January 2015 Local Authorities were directed to reduce PA from 15% to 10%.

3.3.3 Schools are required to take action to prevent pupils reaching PA, currently 33 sessions of absence by May half term, when they enter their returns to the Local Authority and the Department for Education.

3.3.4 To determine the schools PA level, they are required to divide the number of (PA) pupils, the number (of compulsory school aged children) on roll, then times by 100, equalling their PA%.

3.3.5 We must be mindful that schools with a very small number on roll may/will have a higher PA than schools with higher pupils on roll.

3.3.6 For example;

- A school with 240 children on roll, with 20 PA children, equates to 8.3% PA
- A school with 1,800 children on roll, with 20 PA children, equates to 1.1% PA.
4. **Absence and Persistent Absence Data 2015/16 – 2017/18**

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015/16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Absence</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Absence</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised Absence</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Absence</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016/17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Absence</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Absence</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised Absence</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Absence</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017/18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Absence</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Absence</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised Absence</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Absence</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016/17 (Aut/Spr only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Absence</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Absence</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised Absence</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Absence</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Despite an increase in PA overall school attendance in Royal Greenwich remains above the national average between 2012 and 2018.

**Table 2**

**Persistent Absence rates in Royal Greenwich Secondary Schools**

- Ranked 51st for Primary and 74th for Secondary nationally in 2017/18

*provisional*
5. The Attendance Advisory Service

5.1 The Attendance Advisory service sits within Inclusion, Learning and Achievement and is tasked with the monitoring and improvement of attendance rates in our schools. The service works with all maintained schools and is commissioned by a number of academies.
5.2 The team consists of a team leader (who manages the service and leads on court work), two 0.5 assistant team leaders, three full time attendance officers, three term time only attendance officers, two 0.5 attendance officers, the Elective Home Education officer, the Child Missing Education officer and a part-time admin support worker.

6. **In our thinking about why there might have been an increase in Persistent Absence, the following has been discussed:**

- Exclusions have increased both nationally and locally over the last 3 years. The rate of fixed term exclusion in Greenwich continues to be higher than other London boroughs. What contribution does exclusion make to the overall level of PA?

- Stretched school budgets have led to a reduction in support and pastoral staff in some schools – does reduced support for vulnerable children lead to greater amounts of time out of school?

- What affect is the increasing level of deprivation, faced by some families, on regular school attendance e.g Housing / Mobility – Temporary Accommodation, use of food banks, period poverty, lack of uniform etc.

- Role of the Attendance Advisory Service, procedures and processes used, training provided both to attendance officers and the training programmes for attendance staff in our schools.

- How Attendance interfaces maximise the Early Help service to better support some families.

- Are we making maximum use of our statutory powers? How effective is it for us to issue penalty notices or to prosecute?

7. **Actions the Attendance Advisory Service has taken?**

7.1 **Used their legal powers**

7.1.1 The Education Act 1996 allows the local authority to prosecute parents for failing to ensure the child attends school regularly. It also allows the local authority to issue penalty notices to parents as an alternative to prosecution. A penalty notice requires the parent(s) to pay a fixed amount as a fine for their child’s irregular attendance and avoid a court appearance. The fine is £60 to be paid within 21 days. The 21 day period begins 2 days after the date shown on the Penalty Notice. If the fine isn’t paid within 21 days, it rises to £120 for a further 7 days. If it is still not paid, the matter may be sent for prosecution (not for the unpaid fine but the original offence).
7.1.2 Number of Prosecutions 2016-2017 = 141  
Number of prosecutions 2017-2018 = 152

7.1.3 In 2016-2017 186 penalty notices were issued, of which 63 of these were referred to Magistrates Court.

7.1.4 In 2017-2018 238 penalty notices were issued of which 110 were referred to Magistrates Court.

7.2 **More effective use of Data**

7.2.1 Based on the 2016-2017 PA data, the Attendance Advisory service identified any primary school with a PA level above 8.7% as being in the neediest category of support and rated them as a RED school. This meant that the Attendance Advisory Officers would increase the level of service delivery and look deeper at what the causes for absence were, and the schools practice and procedures/attendance policy.

7.2.2 There were 29 RED primary schools. All of these schools were written to regarding their persistent absence and requested to reduce their PA by 2% to 5% and complete a school attendance action plan showing how this was going to be achieved. Support was then given.

7.2.3 8.6% was the national primary PA 2016-2017; all schools between 5.1% and 8.6% were rag rated as AMBER primary schools. There were 21 schools identified as AMBER. This indicated that the schools were doing ok, but still needed regular visits and their attendance strategies reviewed.

7.2.4 5% PA and below schools were rag rated as GREEN. There were 13 green primary schools; it was decided that these school would have a named Attendance Advisory Officer who would visit as and when the school had attendance concerns, or once a term. Schools would provide attendance data every 6 weeks in order for on-going monitoring to be maintained.

7.2.5 By doing this it allowed officers to focus more of their time on the RED and AMBER Schools.
7.2.6 Secondary Schools were also rag rated; the service delivery was based on need in a similar way to the primary schools.

There were:
- 10 secondary schools rated as RED with PA above 9.6%
- secondary schools rated AMBER with PA between 6.5% and 9.5%
- secondary schools rated Green with PA below 5%.

7.2.7 Attendance Advisory Officers also analysed their school attendance data for the first and second halves of autumn terms. There was evidence that showed between October and December there were high levels of absence. Code analysis identified a large increase in absence was due to illness. Health authorities stated that the mild weather for the time of year had impacted on this.

7.2.8 The Attendance Advisory Officers used supervision to identify school issues and attendance practice, these schools were targeted with training and deep dives (intensive register and attendance practice audits).

7.2.9 Team managers and Attendance Advisory Officers identified a number of schools that needed further advice and training; these sessions were carried out during the officer’s allocation times. The schools with the most serious need based on their attendance data had visits carried out where register audits and data analysis were conducted. A number of schools were incorrectly coding pupil’s attendance/absence; this impacted on the schools overall attendance, and their attendance procedures referral process. A report was provided to the school giving a summary of need on how to make the changes and improve their attendance.

7.3 **Code analysis**

7.3.1 Schools have been supported to better use attendance data and code analysis reports to identify the reasons for absence. This is beneficial for overall attendance and enables a more targeted response. For example:

- The high level of ‘E’ code (authorised absence) for Exclusions;
  - Looking at what other strategies and resources can be used prior to a physical off site exclusion.

- The ‘M’ code (authorised absence) for medical appointments;
  - Does a child need to be absent all day if their appointment is in the afternoon, emphasising that the morning would be an unauthorised absence would prompt the parent/ carer to bring the child to school.
• The ‘C’ code (authorised absence) is used for absence due to exceptional circumstances.
  o It can be used too often by schools when they are not sure how to code an absence or when they are unsure for how long the absence should be authorised. This is an exceptional circumstance code, and should only be used for one day at a time based on the reason for absence i.e. a funeral.

• The ‘G’ code (unauthorised holiday in term time)
  o There is a high number of absences recorded with the ‘G’ code, this is due to families going on holiday in term time or at the start or finish of a holiday and taking additional days off in the school term. The current procedure would be for the Attendance Advisory Officer to take a referral, and issue a Court Warning /Penalty Notice Warning letter. If the child had a good attendance level prior to the holiday and then good attendance on their return the Penalty Notice would not be issued – therefore there is no consequence to taking a child out of school for a holiday in term time. Many other Local Authorities’ issue a Penalty Notice for 5 days unauthorised absence Greenwich currently does not.

7.4 Practice and procedures

7.4.1 The service tries to work as efficiently and effectively as possible in order to cover all maintained schools, and Academies (with Service Level Agreements);

7.4.2 Our work with schools has enabled them to undertake more pro-active and productive pre-referral work with children whose attendance is between 90% - 95%. This included;

• Working with schools to ensure that they take ownership of their attendance.
• Clear guidance provided on appropriate school action to undertake to address absence.
• Clear guidance provided to all schools, including academies and independent schools, on school action to address Children Missing Education.
• Further promotion of Fast Track ensuring schools take timely action to address and improve attendance.

ITEM NO: 10
• Schools are supported to identify what child and family support could be provided in order to prevent absence before making a referral to the Attendance Advisory Service;

• Schools are supported in identifying if families need an Early Help referral or if the child needs to be referred to CAMHS, Educational Psychology (EP) services or other services.

7.4.3 When all/some of these are actioned, Attendance Advisory Officers are able to receive a referral and progress a case quicker to either assist in the improvement of attendance, a Penalty Notice being issued and/or a case being referred to Magistrates Court.

8. **Moving Forward Actions for 2018-19**

8.1 Many of the actions taken in 2017 – 18 will continue as these need to be embedded in both the LA and school’s work and we need to be able to measure the impact of this work. It is vital that schools recognise the importance of good attendance and that attendance is everyone’s responsibility. We will disseminate best practice to enable learning from each other and through established networks bring learning back into the borough from other LAs. Training sessions for schools will be run as appropriate.

8.2 We will continue to RAG rate our schools and deliver a more intensive service in those which are ‘red’. The ‘red’ schools will again be asked to produce a specific focused action plan to reduce their level of PA and we will support our schools to achieve this. We will use the six weekly data returns to further direct our interventions.

8.3 Further to this we will analysis the impact of the use of penalty notices and prosecution to see whether there is a direct correlation with an increase in attendance levels and for how long this is maintained. We will also reconsider the use of penalty notices for any term time holiday (we will seek information from other boroughs as to the effectiveness of this action).

8.4 The local authority is going to explore its powers of carrying out register audits for schools which do not purchase our service. It is hoped that this will be seen as a supportive action whereby we can provide schools with information as to how they could improve attendance levels and tackle PA and to inform them of the services that the local authority could provide as a commissioned service.

8.5 For some children and young people we know that persistent absence is linked to exclusion due to behaviour that challenges or because of difficult family
circumstances so the Attendance service will work on developing their links with the behaviour team and the Early Help service to ensure that the skills and strategies of others are effectively employed, with a seamless interface between services.
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1. **Purpose of the Report**

1.1 The Panel is asked to note the work items that are scheduled to be presented to the meeting of the Children and Young People scrutiny panel taking place on 28 February 2019.

1.2 The Panel is asked to consider the scope of forthcoming reports and specify any detailed requirements.

2. **Report**

2.1 Panel agreed its 2018/19 work programme (as attached) at their meeting on 5 July 2018.

2.2 The Panel is scheduled to receive the following reports at its meeting on 28 February 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Standards and Achievement - Report to include a section on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross phase work to support transition from primary to secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Commission – a report on the work of the progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning of Future Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 The Panel is asked to consider the items above and to determine any specific requirements, prior to those reports being commissioned. This will ensure that its lines of enquiry are addressed, information provided is relevant and appropriate and scrutiny practice is effective and well directed.
Background papers:
None
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## APPENDIX

### Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel – 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Reports / items</th>
<th>By Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting No 1 – 5 July 2018</td>
<td>• Cabinet Member Report (Verbal Update)</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for C&amp;YP CGO/Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2018/19 Work Programme Schedule. To agree a theme for review</td>
<td>AD, DCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2017/18 Outturn Performance Monitoring Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting No 2 – 6 September 2018</td>
<td>• School Place Planning Annual Report (Deferred to next meeting - 8/11/18)</td>
<td>Cabinet Member Asst. Director, DCS Asst. Director, DCS Head of Complaints, DCS / Asst. Director, DCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Qt 1 Performance Monitor 2017/18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DCS Complaints – Annual Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting No 3 – 8 November 2018</td>
<td>• Corporate Parenting Board Progress report</td>
<td>DCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fostering and Adoption Annual Reports</td>
<td>Asst. Director, DCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children’s Healthy Weight</td>
<td>Director of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting No 4 – 17 January 2019</td>
<td>• Elective Home Education – Annual Report.</td>
<td>AD, DCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Children Missing from Education – Annual Report.</td>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A report on the outcomes of the Feb 2018 joint targeted area inspection – including progress on improvement plan/s</td>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Qt 2 Performance Monitor</td>
<td>Director of DCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting No 5 – 28 February 2019</td>
<td>• Education Standards and Achievement Report to include a section on cross phase work to support transition from</td>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Concentrating just on education) | Primary to secondary schools.  
  - Fairness Commission – a report on the work of the progression partnership | Asst. Director, DCS |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| **Meeting No 6 – 18 April 2019** | **Cabinet Member Report.**  
  **School Admissions – Annual Report.**  
  **A report outlining findings of any review that has been agreed**  
  **Qrt 3 Performance Report.**  
  **2019/20 Work Programme discussion** | Cabinet Member Head of Admissions, Systems and Resilience Chair/CGO/Director of DCS  
  Asst. Director Chair and Panel Members |
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