

Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

Thursday 15 October 2020 at 2.00 pm

To be held as an online video conference

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

Membership

Councillors Mick Rooney (Chair), Mike Levery (Deputy Chair), Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt, Francyne Johnson, Alan Law, Joe Otten, Kevin Oxley, Colin Ross, Jim Steinke, Alison Teal, Garry Weatherall, Sophie Wilson, Cliff Woodcraft and Anne Murphy

Education Non-Council Members

Alison Warner, Sam Evans, Peter Naldrett, Vacancy and Vacancy

Healthwatch Sheffield

Alice Riddell (Observer)

Substitute Members

In accordance with the Constitution, Substitute Members may be provided for the above Committee Members as and when required.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

The Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee exercises an overview and scrutiny function in respect of the planning, policy development and monitoring of service performance and other general issues relating to learning and attainment and the care of children and young people within the Children's Services area of Council activity. It also scrutinises as appropriate the various local Health Services functions, with particular reference to those relating to the care of children.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk. You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked * on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Scrutiny Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Scrutiny Committee meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Committee may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

If you require any further information about this Scrutiny Committee, please contact Alice Nicholson, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email alice.nicholson@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:alice.nicholson@sheffield.gov.uk)

FACILITIES

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

**CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILY SUPPORT SCRUTINY AND POLICY
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA
15 OCTOBER 2020**

Order of Business

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest** (Pages 5 - 8)
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meetings** (Pages 9 - 28)
To approve the minutes of meetings of the Committee held on 21st May and 26th June, 2020
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Return to School in Covid-19 - Update on Schools Fully Opening** (Pages 29 - 58)
 - (a) Report of the Executive Director, People Services and
 - (b) Presentation from the Director of Education and Skills and the Chief Executive Officer, Learn Sheffield
- 8. Draft Work Programme 2020/21** (Pages 59 - 62)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Thursday, 19th November, 2020, at 10.00 am

This page is intentionally left blank

ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
 - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
 - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
 - the landlord is your council or authority; and
 - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
 - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
 - (b) either -
 - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
 - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Audit and Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development
Committee

Meeting held 21 May 2020

(NOTE: This meeting was held as a remote meeting in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.)

PRESENT: Councillors Mick Rooney (Chair), Mike Levery (Deputy Chair), Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt, Francyne Johnson, Alan Law, Joe Otten, Kevin Oxley, Colin Ross, Jim Steinke, Alison Teal, Sophie Wilson and Cliff Woodcraft

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Sam Evans, (Diocese Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Alice Riddell (Healthwatch Sheffield – Observer).

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 In relation to Agenda Item 6 (Call-In of the Cabinet Decision on Investing in Young People), Sam Evans declared a personal interest as, until very recently, he was the Project Manager for Forge Youth, and continued to undertake work for the Charity, and indicated that he would not take part in any vote.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 Jane Peters asked the following question:-

I am writing to alert you to a gross injustice regarding your constituents and future voters.

Much has been made over many years of what a "problem" home education is, often tenuously associating it with lack of socialisation and poor outcomes, not to mention child abuse. There have been many hours of parliamentary, committee, and council time devoted to commissioning reports and campaigns around compulsory registration.

In addition to this, there are further costs associated with officers checking on the appropriateness of provision and progress of "known" home educators.

Here is how you can quickly and easily improve the situation in Sheffield.

For more than four years I have been requesting that Sheffield provides these students with access to examinations (functional skills, GCSEs, IGCSEs, A levels etc). This will provide the LEA with measurable results, aid future planning, improve college entries and career progression for these students and therefore also have a positive impact on benefits claims in the long term. It will also provide clarity for both families and EHE officers as to possible outcomes and encourage engagement.

From this summer there will be no exam centres/schools within a 40 mile radius (offering a good range of subjects) who are willing to accept private candidates (eg Home Educated Students).

This makes successful outcomes almost impossible. What is the point of checks, registration etc if students cannot access qualifications as proof of the standards they have reached?

Due to the lack of a local centre, costs are now spiralling - addition of travel costs, parking, accommodation etc. See the links below for some examples of exam fees from the nearest centres. Costs escalate further if you have SEN's and require access arrangements (eg extra time, room, scribe, computer use, reader etc) therefore one GCSE can cost £500-£1000. (This does not include tuition, books, resources etc)

<https://www.macclesfieldtutorialcollege.com/examination-fees/>
<https://www.tutorsandexams.uk/fees-list/>

Often, home educated students stagger exam entries, usually from Yr9 onwards, to manage costs but these prices are too high for many families and are not representative of the actual examination cost (usually around £50).

The cancelling of this summer's exams has meant the majority of home educating students will have had their entries through centres withdrawn, their education and progress will be halted and monies lost. This is despite initial government assurances to the contrary.

For November and next summer, it is likely that centres will have more entries than they can cope with. This may again, leave many students unable to take exams they have prepared for and unable to move on to college, university or work.

In Sheffield, you are responsible for an LEA with one of the highest rates of home education per head of population. It is likely there are enough home educated students to fill a large primary/small secondary school.

Where is the money going that would have been allocated for each of these students?

Is it really beyond the ability of the local authority to put in place a few rooms, desks, invigilators, a couple of times a year and provide the basic administration required for examinations or alternatively pay one or more schools/education providers to supply these services?

Again, where is the money going that would normally be allocated for the education of these students?

You are letting these students down, you are limiting their future choices. You are penalizing families who have provided their children with high quality education in line with the laws of this country. For many, home education is a positive and successful experience, but currently, within Sheffield, students are being actively prevented from completing their studies. Is this morally acceptable?

Are you allowing your focus on this subject to be drawn by salacious newspaper gossip? Or are you able to look at the facts and work towards a more positive model for home education?

May I ask you to seriously consider the consequences of the current, and on-going difficulties, ask questions and raise these issues with your colleagues, work with a sense of urgency towards a successful result - a place to take examinations in Sheffield for those not in school (this is an even larger group of students but includes home educators).

I look forward to your response and am happy to try to answer any further queries.

- 4.2 Councillor Abtislam Mohamed (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills) stated that she would provide a detailed, written response to Ms Peters.

5. CALL-IN OF THE CABINET DECISION ON INVESTING IN YOUNG PEOPLE

- 5.1 The Committee considered the following decision of the Cabinet, at its meeting held on 18th March, 2020, regarding Investing in Young People:-

- (a) notes the findings of the Leader Review of Youth Services;
- (b) endorses and approves the ambitions and proposals set out in this report, to support and improve the lives of young people in Sheffield;
- (c) notes the concurrent decision made in the Council meeting of 4th March, 2020 to invest an additional £2m to further develop young people's services in 2020-21, and to identify additional mainstream funding through the Council's budget process in future years; and
- (d) agrees not to re-tender the current contract for Youth Services when it expires.

5.2 Signatories

The lead signatory to the call-in was Councillor Mike Levery, and the other signatories were Councillors Steve Ayris, Penny Baker, Tim Huggan and Cliff Woodcraft.

5.3 Reasons for the Call-in

The signatories wanted more details on the impact on young people and the financial viability of Sheffield Futures as a charity and equalities impact.

5.4 Attendees

- The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore)
- Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children and Families)
- Councillor Abtisam Mohamed (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills)
- Councillor Steve Ayris (signatory to the call-in)
- Councillor Penny Baker (signatory to the call-in)
- Councillor Tim Huggan (signatory to the call-in)
- Dawn Shaw (Director of Communities)

5.5 Councillor Mike Levery, as lead signatory, stated that the two main reasons for the call-in related to the background and process and financial implications of the decision. Councillor Levery provided a brief historic background regarding Sheffield Futures, indicating that it had been established in 1998, and had been contracted to deliver youth services, on behalf of the Council, since 2002, on a 50 year contract. The contract had been reviewed a number of times, resulting in the charity being contracted to the Council for approximately 20 years. Councillor Levery made reference to a report submitted to the Cabinet, in July 2018, on a review of young people's services, and which contained details of a number of possible delivery models. He stressed that at this stage, there was no reference to a preferred option. One of the recommendations was for the Council to review the service and to report back to the Cabinet by October, 2018 in a series of service delivery options but, to date, as far as he was aware, no such report had been submitted. Councillor Levery stated that it was his understanding that one of the recommendations set out in the report submitted to the Cabinet on 18th March, 2020, was not to re-tender the current contract for Youth Services when it expired, which, in simple terms, meant that the Council would not be renewing its contract with Sheffield Futures. He stated that, in his view, a decision had only been made to insource the services, unless there were good reasons not to do so, therefore, he believed that the decision to then look at alternatives did not make sense. He stressed that it was the Council's role to provide a "wrap around" service, whilst not expecting to deliver all the different services itself, particularly as a number were of a specialist nature. He believed therefore that such specialist services could not be delivered in-house. Councillor Levery believed that the findings of the review should have been considered by this Committee first. With regard the financial implications of the decision, he stated that charitable organisations, such as Sheffield Futures, were able to access grants in order to supplement their operating income, and raised concerns with regard to further potential costs of

insourcing, which included the costs associated with TUPE arrangements, the pension liability which Sheffield Futures currently held, and which would transfer back to the Council, the costs of transferring those staff who were currently on different pension schemes, back to the South Yorkshire Pension Scheme and a potential increase in salaries following the transfer of staff. In the light of these potential costs, he queried how much of the additional £2m funding would be used towards these.

- 5.6 Councillor Cliff Woodcraft stated that it was clear that no other options, other than insourcing, had been considered by the Council, including whether changes could have been made to the existing arrangements. He considered that such action had resulted in no consideration being given to a whole range of partnership, collaborative or outsourcing solutions, which could bring in expertise from a number of different areas. Councillor Woodcraft expressed concerns as to why such other options had not been explored, and considered that they should be in order to provide best value for money and provide the best services for young people in the City.
- 5.7 Councillor Steve Ayriss expressed similar concerns, raising a number of questions with regard to the financial implications of insourcing, as well as querying what would happen to the Sheffield Futures brand, which had become well recognised and well regarded.
- 5.8 Councillor Tim Huggan stated that there was no information in terms of how the transition would take place. He also made reference to comments made at meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, as part of its review of the Council's governance arrangements, at which suggestions had been made that there could be a scope for such major decisions to be scrutinised prior to any decision being made. Councillor Huggan believed that there was a case for such pre-scrutiny in this regard, particularly given the major changes for the youth of the City.
- 5.9 The Leader (Councillor Julie Dore) stated that she was surprised at the decision to call the item in, on the basis that it involved £2m additional investment in services for young people. She made reference to various decisions over the last few years which had impacted adversely on services for young people, particularly during austerity, and therefore considered that the additional investment represented a positive step. She stated that the Council looked at every contract which was due to terminate and with regard to this particular contract, a decision had been made not to retender. The primary reason for this was that if the Council did retender, there was no guarantee that Sheffield Futures would be successful and, in fact, there was a possibility that the tender could be awarded to the private sector, resulting in a possible risk to young people's services in future. The reasons as to why the Council wished to invest an additional £2m funding, as well as why it wished to integrate the service, were clearly set out in the report. It was also clear in the report how it was envisaged that all the different services would be arranged, in that not all services would be insourced as a number of specialist services were likely to continue to be delivered by third parties. Councillor Dore stressed that it was not the responsibility of the Council to safeguard the financial position of contractors.

- 5.10 Councillor Jackie Drayton stated that the recommendations in the report submitted to the Cabinet in 2018 stated clearly that bringing the services in-house was one possible suggestion, and this issue had been referred to this Scrutiny Committee at the time and, at which stage, no Members indicated that this should not be an option. Councillor Drayton stated that there were advantages and disadvantages to delivering services in-house and externally. She stressed that the review, as requested at the meeting of the Cabinet in 2018, had taken so long as it had been so complex, including a number of different services for young people. Councillor Drayton stated that due to austerity, the funding used towards delivering services for young people in the city took the form of an area based grant but over the years, there had been around a £13m reduction in funding for the Council to deliver such services.
- 5.11 Councillor Abtisam Mohamed stated that the additional £2m funding would enable the Council to deliver a more holistic service for young people in the City, and therefore represented a positive step.
- 5.12 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-
- It was accepted that Sheffield Futures were a strategic partner of the Council, just by the numerous other partners who worked on behalf of the Council. The Council would continue to work with, and support, Sheffield Futures. When the contract was remodelled, there was the possibility that certain services could be recommissioned to Sheffield Futures. The only decision taken at this stage was not to retender, which the Council would be forced to do under European legislation, on the basis that there was no guarantee that Sheffield Futures would have been successful in the tendering process.
 - Historically, services for young people in Sheffield had been delivered by third party organisations, with the funding allocated directly to the Council being used only for the most vulnerable. There was an expectation that third party organisations would, with the help and support of the Council, bid for additional funding/grants. It was expected that Sheffield Futures would continue to do this.
 - The Council would use the additional funding to look at an appropriate model of delivery, for the benefit of every young person in the City. This work would include the undertaking of a detailed cost benefit analysis.
 - Whilst it was accepted that there could be on-costs associated with insourcing contracts, the £2m additional funding would be allocated solely to the delivery of services for young people. Details as regards how the funding would be allocated would come to light following the completion of the review.
 - It was not the policy of the current Administration to insource services in those cases where it was likely to result in a poorer service. The

presumption was to insource unless there were good grounds not to do so. However, if there is evidence to show that a particular service could be improved by outsourcing, such as where considerable additional funding could be attracted, such as the highways contract, this would be done.

- The Council's contract with Sheffield Futures was due to expire on 30th September, 2020 and, by law, the Council was required to retender. The £2.6m contract with Sheffield Futures represented only a small part of the overall package of investment in young people in the City. The review undertaken did not just look at Sheffield Futures, but all various services relating to young people, particularly in the light of the adverse impact on young people following austerity. The performance of Sheffield Futures was irrelevant as the Council had to retender by law.
- The Council was aiming to deliver the best service possible for young people in the City, and it was believed such a service would be enhanced by the additional £2m funding. As part of the review, the Council was looking at how such services could best be delivered, whether it be by the Council or by third parties. Regardless of who provided the services, the overall aim was to provide a high quality provision for young people. The Council had extended the contract with Sheffield Futures on a number of occasions, but had now received legal advice that it could not extend the contract any more. Previous reports on the services for young people had included proposals with regard to both insourcing and outsourcing.
- Whilst the Council wanted to look at providing services for younger children, the age range in respect of this particular contract referred to teenagers (14+).
- The Council would be subject to the same pension liabilities if the services were insourced as if Sheffield Futures failed to be successful in terms of the contract.
- The Council received a number of views from young people about existing services and their needs. In particular, they repeatedly told the Council that they didn't like having to keep 'bouncing around' support services, having to 'tell their story' repeatedly to new keyworkers in different services, and would value having a more joined up and consistent support service that could meet a range of needs without needing to keep referring them on. It was also important that trusted adults or mentors and /or youth workers provided consistent professional guidance, advice and wraparound support. Every young person needed to be able to achieve their outcomes, and be defined by their contributions, aspirations and talents, rather than by problems or deficits.
- The priority of the current Administration was to invest £2m additional funding in services for young people, increasing the total contract value with Sheffield Futures to £4.6m. None of the additional funding could be used for any on-costs involved in terms of redesigning any services in the future. If the Council was simply looking at the financial side, it would go out to tender

to the private sector as they were likely to provide a cheaper service. The Council simply wanted to provide a better, and more integrated, service for young people.

- Regardless of whether the Council would have gone out to retender, it would still have requested a review of services.
- Ideally, the Council would have wanted the academies to co-operate with the Council statutorily but, unfortunately, there was currently no legislation requiring them to do this. Generally, however, the Council had a good relationship with schools and academies, through Learn Sheffield.
- At present, the services were delivered by a number of different workers, including Youth, Prevention, Targeted Youth Support and Youth Justice, and the aim was to make it easier for the young person, and stop them from having to go to each different service for individual support and advice. Whilst there was a need for the Council to revisit the role of community organisations and the voluntary sector in connection with the provision of services for young people, the Council was mindful that whilst it would still want volunteers, it would not want volunteers to replace paid workers. Schools and academies had to be very receptive in terms of collaborating with community organisations.
- The new service model gave details of how the Council could engage better with young people. Youth Clubs did not work for all young people, and there was now a need to trial new activity methods. The £2m additional funding would help the Council do this. There was also a need to ensure that communities were engaged in this work.
- It was still important that investment was made in services for younger children, although the young people in this contract were aged 14 or above. The Amber Project worked with young people in connection with criminal and sexual exploitation, and included representatives from a number of different organisations including the police, health, social services and community organisations, who all worked very closely with the young people.

5.13 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) requests that the decision be deferred until the Scrutiny Committee has considered all relevant issues and made recommendations to the Executive, specifically to ask for (i) more information referred to in the original report to Cabinet as being available in April this year and, in particular, what aspects of the Service would be done in-house, and what would be provided externally and (ii) an impact assessment on the capability of the existing service provider to maintain other aspects of the provision currently contracted to the Council

(NOTE: The votes on the resolution were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For the resolution (6) - Councillors Colin Ross, Kevin Oxley, Joe Otten, Mike Levery, Alison Teal and Cliff Woodcraft.
- Against the resolution (5) - Councillors Alan Law, Mick Rooney, Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt and Sophie Wilson.
- Abstained (1) - Councillor Francyne Johnson.

(NOTE: Prior to the passing of the above resolution, an amendment moved by Councillor Mike Chaplin and seconded by Councillor Julie Grocutt, to replace paragraph (b) with the following, was put to the vote and negated:-

“Take no action in relation to the called-in decision.”

Votes on the amended Motion were ordered to be recorded, and were as follows:-

- For the Amendment (5) - Councillors Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt Alan Law, Mick Rooney and Sophie Wilson.
- Against the Amendment (6) - Councillors Mike Levery, Joe Otten, Kevin Oxley, Colin Ross, Alison Teale and Cliff Woodcraft.
- Abstained (1) - Councillor Francyne Johnson.)

6. SCRUTINY DURING COVID-19 - AREAS OF INQUIRY

- 6.1 This item was withdrawn from consideration, and the issues would be discussed outside the meeting.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 7.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on a date to be arranged.

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

**Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development
Committee**

Meeting held 26 June 2020

(NOTE: This meeting was held as a remote meeting in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.)

PRESENT: Councillors Mick Rooney (Chair), Mike Levery (Deputy Chair), Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt, Alan Law, Joe Otten, Kevin Oxley, Colin Ross, Jim Steinke, Sophie Wilson and Cliff Woodcraft

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Sam Evans, (Diocese Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)

.....

(NOTE: This meeting was held as a remote meeting in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alison Teal, and from Alice Riddell (HealthWatch Sheffield) and Alison Warner (School Governor Representative – Non-Council Non-Voting Member).

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 In relation to Agenda Item 7 (Request by the Scrutiny Committee for Further Information Following the Call-in of the Decision on Investing in Young People), Sam Evans declared a personal interest as the Project Manager for Forge Youth, which has been involved in early intervention work, similar to some of the work of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS).

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2nd March 2020, were approved as a correct record, subject to the amendment of (a) Item 4 – Declarations of Interest, by the substitution of the following words after the words ‘Forge Youth’ in paragraph 4.1(b) – ‘which had been involved in early intervention work, similar to some of the work of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health

Service (CAMHS), and (b) Item 8 – Children and Young People’s Mental Health Transformation Programme – Update, by the substitution of the word ‘strong’ for the word ‘strongly’ in the 5th bullet point in paragraph 8.5.

4.2 Arising therefrom:-

- (a) the Policy and Improvement Officer (Alice Nicholson) reported that due to the current position regarding the Covid-19 pandemic, there had been no progress following the completion of the work of the Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group on the Voice and Influence of Young People; Ms Nicholson reported that she would look into this and see how this issue could be progressed;
- (b) the Chair reported that, in the light of the current situation regarding the Covid-19 pandemic, he would meet with the Deputy Chair of the Committee (Councillor Mike Levery) and Ms Nicholson, to review the minutes of previous meetings in order to identify any issues that require action; and
- (c) further to a query raised by Councillor Julie Grocutt with regard to the levels of service being provided by the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) during the Covid-19 pandemic, Ms Nicholson reported that she would discuss this with her colleague, Emily Standbrook-Shaw (Policy and Improvement Officer for the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee), to check the scope of the Mental Health item programmed for that Committee. Councillor Jackie Drayton reported that the Council had invested additional funding into the CAMHS, which had included the funding of the Kooth Project, an online, anonymous and free telephone service for use by young people. Councillor Drayton suggested that this Committee could hold a joint meeting with the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, or request a Task and Finish Group, to look at the issue of mental health on young people during the Covid-19 pandemic.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Helen Thompson, on behalf of the Sheffield Futures Board of Trustees, raised the following questions:-

- (1) How does the Council propose to manage the £10 million pension deficit it has underwritten?
- (2) What is the rationale for the withdrawal of the contract extension in respect of Covid-19 restrictions when all the contracts have had extensions in this period?
- (3) Is the Council confident that it has adequately qualified people in-house to ensure a smooth transition within the tight timescale?
- (4) Is the Council certain that the timescale offers sufficient time for the

consultation period? (Unions have written to the Council concerned that there is not enough time to adequately consult with their members during the current Covid-19 period.)

- (5) Can the Council offer reassurance that the transition will not have any impact on the young people's services?
- (6) What assurances can the Council give that the additional well-respected services of Sheffield Futures are going to be able to be maintained?

5.2 John Macilwraith (Executive Director, People Services) provided brief responses to the questions raised, as follows, and indicated that he would send more detailed, written responses to Ms Thompson:-

- (1) With regard to the pension deficit, initial conversations had been held with South Yorkshire Pensions on the expiry date of the contract, which had included discussions on the treatment of any pension deficit. These preliminary discussions had not raised any particular concerns at this stage. A final, agreed position would be reached as part of the due diligence process, as the Council engages more formally with Sheffield Futures.
- (2) & (3) Whilst it was not necessarily the case for all Council contracts, as they were all considered on a case by case basis, it was appreciated that there was a high level of uncertainty regarding the provision of services for young people over the last few years, given the announcement of the review two years ago. In order to try and reduce such levels of uncertainty for both the young people and the staff of Sheffield Futures, every effort would be made to progress the transition of the service in line with the end of the contract as at 30th September 2020.
- (4) It was believed that the timescale of 30th September 2020, in terms of the transition, could be achieved. The primary objective was to ensure the smooth transition of the services as they currently operated to ensure that the Council continued to maintain a focus on the young people. Every effort would be made to ensure that all young people, particularly the more vulnerable, continued to receive the same level of support they currently received.
- (5) As part of the due-diligence process, the Council would be working very closely with Sheffield Futures to understand those contracts in more detail, which would include working to mitigate any challenges. The Council would also like to confirm ongoing engagement from other agencies on the basis that it wouldn't want there to be a reduction in the provision of services for young people. Discussions would therefore continue with Sheffield Futures and the other agencies to ensure that there was continued support.

6. REQUEST BY THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR FURTHER INFORMATION FOLLOWING THE CALL-IN OF THE DECISION ON INVESTING IN YOUNG

PEOPLE

- 6.1 The Committee received a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer (Alice Nicholson) setting out the position with regard to the decision on 'Investing in Young People'. The report indicated that the Committee had called-in the decision made by the Cabinet on 18th March 2020, at its meeting held on 21st May 2020, and at that meeting, the Committee agreed that the Cabinet be asked that the decision be deferred until the Committee had considered relevant issues and made recommendations to the Cabinet. The Cabinet gave further consideration to the issue on 17th June 2020, and a report was submitted to that meeting titled 'The Future Delivery of Youth Services'. The purpose of this meeting was to consider that report as the further information requested, and make recommendations to the Cabinet thereon.
- 6.2 John Macilwraith (Executive Director, People) introduced the report on the Future Delivery of Youth Services which had been submitted to, and considered by, the Cabinet at its meeting on 17th June 2020. The report set out the background, indicating that since 2002, youth and careers support services funded by the Council had been delivered through a contract with Sheffield Futures. The contract was due to end on 30th September 2020, having previously been extended to allow a strategic review to be undertaken. On 18th March 2020, a report was submitted to the Cabinet proposing a new strategic approach to services to support young people in the City, with the aim that such services would be more inclusive, ambitious and collaborative. Other proposals included the investment of an additional £2 million into the service; ensuring that there were trusted adults or mentors and/or youth workers to provide consistent, professional guidance, advice and wraparound support; connecting support across a wide range of provision depending on the needs of young people; focusing resources on the specific needs of teenagers (age 14+) supporting their journey into successful young adulthood and the rest of their lives; and developing this into a City-wide approach through partnerships with key stakeholders, including young people themselves, and the City's voluntary and community faith partners and statutory partners, such as the NHS and South Yorkshire Police. It had been identified that there was a greater need for a new approach due to the current situation with regard to the Covid-19 pandemic, and reference was made to the fact that some of the services may be insourced. In order to manage the transition, a Project Board, currently chaired by the Head of Communities, and shortly to be chaired by Mr Macilwraith, had been established to manage this process. It was hoped that throughout the process, any mitigations would be identified at an early stage, and it was hoped that, by engagement with Sheffield Futures, the transition of the service would be completed by 30th September 2020. The process also provided an opportunity to integrate more widely with other Council services, and drive forward the ambition with regard to a more integrated approach regarding improving services and achieving better outcomes for young people across all the Council services.
- 6.3 Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children and Families) reported that the Council was aware of the fact that when the contract was due to end, on 30th September 2020, it was not legally able to extend it for a further period, therefore, the service had to go out to retender. The Council had undertaken a

considerable amount of work in terms of the contract, including bringing some elements in-house. In-depth discussions had been held with Sheffield Futures staff, and had involved the unions, prior to the Leader of the Council's review of the service. With the additional £2 million, and the fact that the contract had to end, the Council had taken the opportunity to review how to go forward. Councillor Drayton made it clear that the proposals did not adversely reflect on the work of Sheffield Futures in any way, but the Council simply had to retender the service. The Council wanted to work with Sheffield Futures going forward, and had every confidence in Council officers providing the service. She made reference to Mr Macilwraith's background in youth work, indicating that as Chair of the Project Board, such experience would be invaluable. Councillor Drayton stressed that the most important thing was to focus on all young people in the City achieving their full potential. The Council had been aware of the adverse effects of the Covid-19 pandemic, with regard to youth unemployment and mental health issues, and stressed that there was a need for the Council to work together with all partner agencies to ensure that all young people had a positive future.

6.4 Members of the Committee raised questions, and the following responses were provided:-

- The Council acknowledged the views with regard to relationships between young people and youth workers being of primary importance, and this was why the Council was clear about its wish to ensure a smooth transition. It was difficult to provide any detail at this stage with regard to any potential financial risks to Sheffield Futures on the basis that there had not been any detailed negotiations. Sheffield Futures were a well-established provider of youth services, and able to attract external funding. The plan was for the Council to continue working closely with them to help them attract such additional funding, but also to understand any potential risks. The Council would not want to see a reduction in services to young people by the loss of such a well-established provider. There was a need to get a better understanding of the levels of external funding outside of the Council's contract with Sheffield Futures, including details of the timeline of contracts and their primary function, in order to try and work through the process in a co-ordinated way. This was very difficult as the level of detail was not known at this stage, and would only come to light as part of the due-diligence process. If there were any financial risks, this would be reported back to the Cabinet. The Council would not want any organisation to fail, and there were several other organisations in the City working with young people, many of whom were struggling financially at this time.
- It was hoped that once the recommendations from this meeting had been sent to the Leader of the Council, she would then determine the final position. Only at that stage could the Council commence the detailed due-diligence work with Sheffield Futures, including the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE) Regulations arrangements.
- There had been informal discussions with Sheffield Futures with regard to the transition, and it was accepted that the decision would have an impact on the

Organisation.

- The Project Board would shortly be chaired by John Macilwraith and comprised other officers, including the Head of Communities (Dawn Shaw) and Project Officers representing Legal and Governance, Human Resources, Finance and Equalities. The Board had first met on 23rd June 2020, and had agreed broad terms of reference. A Project Implementation Group had also been established, chaired by Dawn Shaw, to lead on the more detailed operational activity, and report to the Project Board. It was hoped that there would be a positive and co-operative relationship with Sheffield Futures. The terms of reference for the Project Board would be circulated to Members of the Committee, when agreed.
- It was hoped that the proposals with regard to ensuring that there were trusted adults or Members and/or youth workers to provide consistent professional guidance, advice and wraparound support for young people, would be developed as part of the new service. This would not only be relevant for Council services, but also with regard to supporting young people to manage independently in terms of interacting with other organisations. It was planned that there would be detailed discussions on the transformational elements of services after the transition had been completed.
- Due to the decision to transfer the service in-house by 30th September 2020, the transformation of what the service would look like going forward was secondary to receiving the service in-house. The Cabinet paper referred to a more integrated and community-based approach, with more youth workers/trusted adults, and would give the Council scope to be more ambitious and collaborative. Youth workers would join up better with other Council services, and the unique services provided by youth workers would be able to be used better across the Council. The details of the service going forward would be discussed in detail towards the end of September 2020. A report on the proposals would be submitted to this Committee to seek its views. The priority at the moment was to ensure the smooth transition of the service, and ensuring that no young person was forgotten about. The Council wanted to build on the services that Sheffield Futures had established over the years. The job of the Project Board was to ensure that the transition went smoothly. The vision as to the service had been set out in the Cabinet paper on 18th March 2020, with the details to be worked up afterwards.
- It was accepted that the timescale would be a challenge. A detailed plan was currently being developed, and would include discussion with regard to accommodation costs with Sheffield Futures, and it was hoped that they would be able to remain in Star House. There were no details at the present time with regard to any potential financial implications which would underpin this model.
- All the buildings and assets used by Sheffield Futures were formerly under the ownership of the Council, when the service was transferred to the Organisation, therefore the Council was aware of the details of the

accommodation.

- Further discussions would be held with Sheffield Futures with regard to the safeguarding of young people.
- The service, when transferred back in-house, would be a similar service. The key was how the service would be developed in the future, and it was hoped that there would be an opportunity to enhance the service. A similar number of staff would be transferred, therefore the service was likely to be very similar. It was likely that there would be a number of improvements in the service, particularly with the use of the additional £2 million. Whilst the scrutiny process was appreciated, the process would have been much further on if the decision had not been called-in. There had also been delays due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Sheffield Futures have an excellent reputation, as do a number of other youth providers across the City, who don't receive any funding from the Council. The Council was aware that Sheffield Futures was undertaking excellent work with regard to their contract with the Clinical Commissioning Group, as well as contracts with other organisations. The Council would continue to work closely with Sheffield Futures as it wanted them to survive and succeed. It was the plan to use the additional £2 million to recruit more staff, including trusted adults/advocates and to develop more activities for young people.
- There were a number of strategic objectives around a more community-based/more integrated approach. There were plans to discuss how the services would look beyond 30th September 2020. However, due to the timescale, the primary objective was to ensure the smooth transition of the service, as it stands, back to the Council. The Cabinet paper of 18th March 2020 set out a vision and details of the general overall service required. It was always the plan to work up the final detail once the service had been transferred in-house. The TUPE transfer was a formal process, and would include a formal assessment of every member of staff's contracts currently held with Sheffield Futures. Officers will work through this detail as and when provided. Frontline staff currently undertaking work contracted by the Council would transfer to the Council under the TUPE process. There will be some staff who have variable contract arrangements, as in they could be funded by more than one source, therefore these needed to be worked through individually. It was difficult to elaborate on cases where staff were likely to suffer a reduction in their salary on the basis that they were being paid under different contracts. This would need to be discussed with the other organisations.
- It was accepted that there could be potential redundancies and that the TUPE arrangements would apply to frontline staff as well as support staff. These issues would be considered by the staff from Legal and Governance and Human Resources on the Project Boards.
- It was believed that Sheffield Futures Board would have undertaken an

assessment as to how losing the contract would impact on how they could attract external funding, as well as the impact on staff and services for young people. Sheffield Futures would need to share this with the Council.

- It was accepted that completing the transfer by the deadline of 30th September 2020, would represent a challenge, and there was a need to engage with Sheffield Futures and work through the various issues. If any issues came to light as part of such discussions, advice would be sought from colleagues from Legal and Governance and Human Resources and if necessary, be reported back to the Cabinet. The issue of the timescale had been raised at the Cabinet meeting on 17th June 2020, at which officers gave assurances that the target date would be met.

6.5 Members of the Committee also made the following comments:-

- It was believed that significantly more than 50% of Sheffield Futures' business would be affected, and would result in major implications in terms of cashflow/liability that cannot divest, which were not clearly understood prior to the decision being made. There are major concerns that this analysis had not been undertaken.
- Frustration at the lack of a detailed plan, despite the Council having two years to undertake this work.
- Concerns with regard to the timescales, particularly as there were only 68 working days until the target date of 30th September 2020, to undertake a considerable amount of work.
- The Council simply wanted what was best for the young people in the City.
- There was a need for a detailed benchmarking exercise in order to assess what services would be better provided in-house.
- There was a need to safeguard the future of Sheffield Futures.
- It was considered that the process being adopted by the Council was the wrong way round, in that the service was being transferred in-house, then decisions made in terms of what services were required, as opposed to deciding exactly what the Council wanted first, and re-tendering on that basis.
- No staff should be made redundant as part of the transfer of staff under the TUPE arrangements.
- The transfer of staff from Sheffield Futures to the Council would be a complicated process, as it would include a number of support staff who cross various elements. If the majority of their work involved youth work, they would be transferred. It was believed that there would be more than the expected 90 out of 180 staff affected by the proposals, which had been highlighted

following the receipt of the letter from Unison.

- An assessment should be undertaken by the Council, or external consultants, as to the impact upon the ability of Sheffield Futures to raise funds or provide youth work in the City that otherwise couldn't have existed through Sheffield Futures' additional fund- raising or by being brought into the City.
- It was unreasonable if there's no set deadline, as it was not fair on the staff affected. There is a need for a definitive date.
- The process was avoidably messy and confusing, and should have included clearer proposals regarding the long-term future of Sheffield Futures and the in-sourcing arrangements. Such detail should have been provided earlier.

6.6 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) on the basis that it has been clearly demonstrated, by both the current provider and the predominant trade union representing its affected members, and the outstanding decisions still be to made in the report, that the timescale is inadequate for implementing the new arrangements, requests the Leader, should it be legally possible, to agree and implement the original extension of six months offered to the current provider.

NOTE 1: The votes on the resolution were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For the resolution (11) - Councillors Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt, Alan Law, Mike Levery, Joe Otten, Kevin Oxley, Mick Rooney, Colin Ross, Jim Steinke, Sophie Wilson and Cliff Woodcraft.

Against the resolution (0) - None

NOTE 2: Prior to the passing of the above resolution, an alternative motion, moved by Councillor Mike Levery and seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as follows, was put to the vote and negated:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) (i) on the basis that the Council is under a general duty of best value to 'make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness'; under the duty of best value the Council must therefore consider overall value including economic, environmental and social value when reviewing service provision before selecting the option it

believes does deliver Best Value; the Council also has a number of statutory duties relevant to youth and young people services; in order to deliver best value, recommends a re-tendering exercise which will include an internal submission so that the duty of best value has clearly been exercised; and

- (b) (ii) on the basis that it has been clearly demonstrated, by both the current provider and the predominant trade union representing its affected members, and the outstanding decisions still be to made in the report, that the timescale is inadequate for implementing the new arrangements, requests the Leader, should it be legally possible, to agree and implement the original extension of six months offered to the current provider.”

The votes on the alternative motion were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For the alternative motion - Councillors Mike Levery, Joe Otten, Kevin Oxley, (5) Colin Ross and Cliff Woodcraft

Against the alternative - Councillors Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt, Alan Law, motion (6) Mick Rooney, Jim Steinke and Sophie Wilson

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 7.1 It was noted that the date of the next meeting will be on a date to be arranged.



Report to Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee 15th October 2020

Report of: Executive Director, People Services

Subject: Update on Schools opening fully

Author of Report: Andrew Jones, Director of Education and Skills
Stephen Betts, CEO, Learn Sheffield

Summary:

All schools were partially closed from 23 March 2020 except for vulnerable children, children with EHCPs and children of key workers. From 15 June, Sheffield schools opened more widely offering provision to children in Foundation Stage 1 and 2, Year 1 and Year 6 as well as the original groups of children. Children and young people in Year 10 and Year 12 were also offered some face to face part time education. This report provides an update on the return to schools from September and the support provided during the pandemic so far.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	x
Other	

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

The Committee is being asked to do consider the briefing paper and provide views and comments on the update.

Category of Report: OPEN

Report of the Director of Education and Skills

Update on schools opening fully

1. Introduction/Context

- 1.1 The local authority has communicated regularly (often daily) with all schools and academies throughout the period of the pandemic.
- 1.2. Our planning and support for schools opening fully this term has, therefore, built on and developed the planning and support provided throughout the period of the pandemic so far.
- 1.3 Our support for schools is a whole-Council response. Here is summary of key plans and support from:
 - Public Health
 - School Transport
 - Health and Safety and Wellbeing

2. Public Health

- 2.1 The PH team have supported early years, schools and University settings with planning ahead of the new academic year. This has included:
 - Continuing to provide updated Public Health guidance and information to all settings, including supporting schools to interpret and implement national guidance.
 - All settings will continue with the social protective bubble model of cohorting pupils in classes or year groups. This supports contact tracing.
 - Settings have been supported with scenario testing planning (what action to take if settings have cases, clusters or outbreaks). This has included attendance at head teacher virtual meetings arranged via Learn Sheffield (in the primary, secondary and special sectors) and individual meetings with Sheffield College, Sheffield Hallam University and the University of Sheffield.
 - Working with DST and the Comms Team a Getting Back to School Safely campaign was launched on Monday. This included social media advertising and a web page written by Public Health to advise and reassure parents/carers planning their child's return to school <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/BackToSchoolSafely>
 - Each setting has a Standard Operating Procedure written jointly by PHE and the LA Public Health Team. This provides and process and plan to follow to manage cases and outbreaks.
 - PH guidance and advise has supported the development of a robust template risk assessment for schools to follow and the PH team has

provided bespoke advice to individual settings based on their particular buildings, circumstances and logistics.

- Schools will often open with staggered start and finish times. PH have advised on school transport and minimising virus transmission via the introduction of a zoned travel approach on school buses where pupils sit in designated year group seating areas. There's also been a requirement placed on schools to obtain a list of pupils who will be frequent bus travellers over the autumn term.
- Following the announcement re face coverings guidance and information has been distributed to all schools and information uploaded for parents/carers on the Getting Back to School Safely campaign.
- The LA PH team has a dedicated inbox for EYs, Schools and Universities. This is monitored 7 days a week and responses are provided across the 7 days. This inbox also is used to report positive confirmed COVID-19 cases.

2.2 A STORM phone line has now been set up and contact details will be shared with all settings. This will operate alongside the Inbox. Consideration is being given as to whether this should be available during Mon-Fri and also across the weekend. Discussions are ongoing about capacity to cover this alongside the 7 day rota that is currently in place.

3. SEN Transport

3.1 We have worked closely with Transport Services, Public Health, School Leaders and Directors/Managers across the council to ensure that all appropriate steps have been taken to enable children and young people using SEN Transport to return to school on a fulltime basis from the start of the new academic year. This follows government guidance, and has been approved by colleagues in Public Health as well as IMG.

3.2 This work has included the creation of 'transport bubbles', clear advice around sanitising of hands before and after travelling, seating plans to support contact tracing, staff use of PPE and robust cleaning arrangements, as well as clear plans to respond to symptomatic pupils or where a case is confirmed.

3.3 Communications for parents/carers have been developed with the Parent/Carer Forum and SENDIASS, and sent direct to all service-users, as well as asking schools to distribute electronically to parents. In addition this has been published on the Local Offer and the PCF Facebook page, and sent to schools via the weekly email bulletin.

3.4 In addition, the bulletin has included information aimed at schools, which has also been via direct email to Special and IR Heads.

4. Mainstream School Buses

4.1 We have worked closely with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE), Public Health, School Leaders and

Directors/Managers across the council to ensure that the safety and capacity of school buses are maximised for the start of the new academic year. Again this follows government guidance, and has been approved by colleagues in Public Health as well as IMG.

- 4.2 This work has included gaining DfT approval to re-categorise school buses so they are no longer accessible to the general public and are instead classed as 'dedicated school transport', the provision of additional routes to ensure capacity and minimise the number of pupils using public transport where possible, and engaging with all schools (predominantly secondary) affected by transport to understand their local context and needs. Year group bubbles are supported by creating clearly identified zones for each cohort on buses, and schools are to keep a list of pupils who are likely to use each route during the autumn term – both measures support contact tracing. In addition, robust cleaning arrangements have been established, as well as clear plans to respond to symptomatic pupils or where a case is confirmed.
- 4.3 We have developed clear advice about the sanitising of hands before and after travelling, use of tissues and hand sanitiser, maintaining distancing (especially at pinch points such as bus stops), the use of face-coverings for ages 11+ (unless exempt), no food or drink to be consumed on transport, and no sharing of food or drink at any time.
- 4.4 Communications with parents/carers have been jointly developed with SYPTE, and shared with all schools to distribute to parents via the weekly schools bulletin, as well as being published online by SYPTE. In addition, the bulletin has included information aimed at schools, which has also been sent out via SchoolPoint. A 'child-friendly' version is being created and will be published shortly.

5. Health, Safety & Wellbeing

- 5.1 We have produced the model risk assessment (Version 8) for Schools to adopt and amend to suit their individual setting. Once Schools have completed their risk assessment they have shared it with us for comment.
- 5.2 We have been in regular contact with Headteachers throughout the pandemic providing support and helping them with any concerns they may have.
- 5.3 In addition to the model risk assessment we have produced:-
- A risk assessment for staff working from home
 - An individual risk assessment for staff who are shielding / BAME / pregnant / extremely clinically vulnerable / clinically vulnerable
 - A cleaning guidance for Schools
 - A guidance for Administering first aid, administration of medicines and providing intimate care in Schools
 - A risk assessment for support staff (based at Moorfoot) visiting Schools with SEN
 - A risk assessment for support staff (based at Moorfoot) visiting SEN pupils in the Home

6. Free school meals

- 6.1 A significant challenge during the pandemic lockdown was ensuring the consistent provision of food to children eligible for free school meals. There are a number of catering providers operating within the city, and there were also a number of schemes that were available to schools. An audit was conducted in May which showed that almost all schools in the city had signed up to the National free school meals voucher scheme which was launched during the Sheffield schools Easter holiday. However, there were significant operational and delivery issues relating to the National scheme. So, where as almost all schools had signed up to the scheme, not all successfully managed to issue vouchers from the scheme to parents and families.
- 6.2 Prior to the national scheme being launched, schools and their catering providers had used a variety of approaches, including: issuing locally purchased vouchers; making individual food grab bags for parents and families to collect; making hampers with sufficient food in for the week. All of these arrangements were paid for from school budgets. The national voucher scheme was paid for directly by the government. The value of a national voucher is £15 per child per week, which is slightly above the cost of five days of school meals. This recognised the fact that parents cannot bulk buy in the way that catering providers can.
- 6.3 We encouraged schools to use the national voucher scheme for a variety of reasons: it is fully funded by national government, it is funded above the level of a regular free school meal, and vouchers are a more resilient way of getting a food resource to families. Initially, the range of supermarkets included in the scheme was limited, but was extended to include Aldi and McColls.
- 6.4 Even where schools successfully registered and issued the national free school vouchers, some of them continue to provide food over and above the voucher. Watercliffe Meadow Primary School, for example, issued the national voucher to all its eligible children, and on top of that also issued over 100 hampers to families each week, with varying ingredients, week by week, and recipe ideas to go with the ingredients.
- 6.5 Schools that were successful in issuing the national vouchers continued with local arrangements, which included local vouchers, hampers and grab bags. We lobbied hard to our representatives at the DFE about school holidays, and also the longer six week summer holiday. We highlighted to the DFE that food poverty and hunger is likely to be cumulative.

7. Position last month

- 7.1 All schools in Sheffield have opened successfully for all children. We have been in regular contact with schools. We have been informed of a number of parents who are refusing to return their children to school – some on

medical grounds and some through not feeling that schools are safe. Attendance officers are contacting any families in this position to explore concerns and to provide relevant advice and support. There has been an increase in the number of children whose parents have decided to electively home educate (EHE) them.

- 7.2 Attendance figures are collected by the DfE and not the Council. The Council accesses the DfE portal in order to determine attendance and, so far, attendance in all types of school is lower than the norm at this time of the year. Sheffield secondary school attendance is in line with the currently national average but attendance for primary and special schools is below the current national average.

8. Learn Sheffield COVID Recovery Festival

- 8.1 Learn Sheffield organised a COVID Recovery Festival which took place across the month of September. This is comprised of a series of events throughout September to support the COVID recovery work that is happening across the city. All of the sessions in this festival were held online and available for participating schools to attend and also recorded so that colleagues can access the sessions whenever it is most convenient. It is hoped that this will also enable colleagues to use the content in their own leadership meetings and staff training.

- 8.2 The programme of events is available on the Learn Sheffield website: <https://www.learnsheffield.co.uk/Training-and-Events/COVID-Recovery-Festival>. The range of sessions covered four themes: Curriculum, Leadership, Mental Health and Sheffield and the contributors are a mixture of national and local speakers.

- 8.3 The reflections on the sessions will contribute to the development of a COVID Recovery Plan which will outline the key areas of COVID related work for Learn Sheffield over the coming months.

9. Issues

- 9.1 Despite all schools opening for all children this term, there has been a rising number of children and adults in schools who have contracted COVID19 in their home or community settings. As symptoms are not always apparent, these children and adults have worked in schools, sometimes exposing other children and adults to the virus. All schools in this position have received help, support and guidance from Public Health England (PHE) and the Local Public Health Team in Sheffield City Council (SCC PH). Clearly, any confirmed or reported cases tend to be unnerving for children, parents and school staff alike. Many cases have been openly reported in the local media.

- 9.2 Schools have reported issues in being able to report cases to PHE. This is largely due to capacity issues. Schools have, alternatively, contacted SCC PH who have, instead, provided advice. Where cases have been confirmed this has resulted in children and adults needing to go home to self-isolate. We continue to gather information about home learning work provided but

schools have not yet been able to take full advantage of the new DfE laptop scheme which provides laptops for children working at home where they do not have sufficient “kit” at home to do this. Another issue that we are watching is that these children are self-isolating at home – not just working at home, as before the Summer. This means that they cannot have any direct contact with other professionals providing support e.g. CAMHS.

9.3 There has been an issue with access to tests for those in schools. Because of increased demand for tests it has proven harder to secure test appointments for symptomatic children and adults alike. This, potentially, means that children are at home for longer than they need to be (if they ultimately test negative) and, also that adults working in schools awaiting in tests are not able to work. There is a risk that the testing situation will lead to significant levels in the closure of school bubbles caused by staff absence rather than positive cases. Whilst some level of this is inevitable the testing issues have the potential to transform this quickly into a significant problem.

10. Home learning and catch up programmes

10.1 Schools are now under a duty to ensure that children working at home, by virtue of self-isolation, receive quality provision that is commensurate with that which would have been delivered in school. The DfE have introduced a new laptops scheme designed to provide devices to children working at home who do not have sufficient kit to work effectively. This is currently being administered and while no orders have been completed yet, schools have been promised a quick turnaround once orders are initiated. An imminent review of lessons learned for schools will look at the adequacy of provision for children at home.

10.2 The DfE is planning a national catch up programme. Nationally £1bn has been set aside for this. £350m has been ringfenced for a national programme of 1:1 tutoring which schools can access for their children provided they commit 25% of the cost. The remaining £650m is being allocated directly to schools for them to provide individualised support. This is early days for this programme but we anticipate that schools will benchmark where children currently are in order to plan for personalised programmes. Individual school allocations have yet to be agreed but Sheffield’s overall allocation is c£5m to be used in the current academic year up to June 2021.

11. Summary

11.1 Schools have made substantial and significant plans to open fully in September and school leaders report positively about the positive way that pupils and staff have returned. However, there are a number of variables some of which are entirely unpredictable. It is currently very challenging as schools navigate new public health systems and significant challenges in the availability of testing, as well as dealing with cases of infection while, at the same time, endeavouring to maintain the confidence of the children, the parents and the communities that they serve.

This page is intentionally left blank

Sheffield City Council CYP&FS Scrutiny Committee 15 October 2020

Andrew Jones

Director of Education and Skills

Stephen Betts

CEO – Learn Sheffield

Page 37

Learn
Sheffield In collaboration.

Sheffield City Council

Sheffield
City Council



COVID19 response since March

- The Council, with our partners in Learn Sheffield have provide a strong lead, advice and guidance to:
 - All early years settings and providers
 - All maintained schools, academies and private schools in Sheffield
 - All post 16 providers
 - All schools and providers outside of Sheffield where Sheffield children and young people attend

Timeline

- All schools were partially closed from 23 March 2020 except for vulnerable children, children with EHCPs and children of key workers.
- From 15 June, Sheffield schools opened more widely offering provision to children in Foundation Stage 1 and 2, Year 1 and Year 6 as well as the original groups of children.
- Children and young people in Year 10 and Year 12 were also offered some face to face part time education
- All schools and settings opened for all children and young people from September 2020

Support provided

The Council as a whole, along with Learn Sheffield has provided a wide range of tangible help, support and guidance to schools/education and childcare settings

Public Health – support provided

- Response has been for EYs, Schools and Universities
- Providing PH advice and guidance: Case & Risk Management
- Supporting interpretation of national guidance so as to open and function following COVID-19 secure guidelines
- Getting back to school safely campaign and comms
- Providing Public Health advice on virus transmission & risk = delayed wider opening of schools by 2 weeks.
- Current position focuses on continued PH response. Case, cluster and outbreak management where required. Supporting and enhancing PHE role.
- Local current position reflects increasing levels of community/household transmission of COVID-19. Majority are single cases in year groups and staff. Settings role is to mitigate and slow down transmission therefore PH provide technical advice to settings on what action to take and follow.
- Single cases, clusters and outbreaks reflect what we would expect to see in relation to the epidemiology of the pandemic. Focus is community transmission rather than linked setting transmission

Issues

- Proportionate response required regarding level of risk
- System wide capacity – DfE and PHE system is overwhelmed requiring localised response which means technical local PH capacity is required
- Schools resilience: School Leadership are providing a PH response. They are doing a fantastic job in identifying contacts and seeking guidance from the LA PH team frequently.
- Resilience of the EYs and school sector to remain open with staff and pupils isolating.
- Balance of education and risk of virus transmission. Therefore PH advice carefully assesses risk and potential impact.
- Winter/Autumn – Flu season in addition to management of COVID-19.
- Wider impact of University opening and increase of cases

School Food

Since March

- 4,600 free school meals (FSM) food parcels were delivered to homes in the Easter holidays
- A spike in Universal Credit lead to 2,871 FSM applications but only 48% were authorised
- A 'discretionary' FSM category was introduced so no child got lost in the system through hardship grounds
- The council's School Catering Contract served 94k meals in school and 25k meals as either weekly or daily food parcels

Page 43 Current position

- Meal numbers steadily rising - running at 72% take up against Sept 2019
- Schools now trying to move to a full hot meal provision

Issues, Concerns & Challenges

- FSM applications far exceeds FSM eligibility – many families will be living with an element of hardship as the spike in Universal Credit does not bear out with an equivalent FSM
- Emergency FSM food parcels for children who are isolating at home – 240 FSM 'grab bags' delivered to families this week for 1 school at short notice
- Serving food in 'bubbles' - there are other food safety risks emerging as displaced dining creates other problems and costs that schools have to confront. We are helping schools to manage this.

Community Food Supply Operation

- Staff from Lifelong Learning working with colleagues across the authority established the service with a 4 day lead-in
- The operation was launched on 3rd April running through to 31st July during which time it delivered 1300 7-day food parcels supplying 2000 individuals with food, including 25 infants supplied with baby formula and nappies
- This was followed by an Emergency Over-Night service running throughout August during which 40 24-hour food bags were supplied to individuals at most risk
- Alongside this 20 Food-Banks were provided with food sourced and delivered by the team; from April to July 97,000 kgs of food was provided
- In addition 2,000 Easter Eggs were delivered to care homes, schools and children's centres, 12 deliveries of pet food was supplied
- The operation was based at Sheaf, the Moor Market and the Winter Garden, and it received support and donations from; Nestle', Costco, Fair-share, The Sheffield College

SEND – Activity during lockdown

- Children with EHCPs a priority group for access – all schools had systems in place
- All special schools remained open throughout
- Suggested minimum contact frequency – EHCPs weekly, SEND fortnightly – positive feedback where done well
- Advisory service contact with schools fortnightly to risk assess and offer support and advice
- Risk assessment of all children with EHCPs to offer support
- Statutory processes continued as far as possible
- Special school and IR heads met weekly to share support needs
- SEN school transport remained in place for those attending
- Parent / carer survey on concerns for return to school completed with over 350 responses – particular concerns re mental health and lost learning – positives identified for some families in lockdown due to reduced stress and anxiety

SEND – Current position and concerns

- All children with SEND should be back in school
- All special schools have completed risk assessments to identify specific SEN needs in line with DfE guidance
- Statutory duties to deliver provision in EHCPs now back in force
- Advice and support offered to schools around individual cases and how to meet needs including through individual risk assessment
- 39 children in special / IR where parents have not sent back due to concerns re risk of covid – schools and LA looking to support in each case (as of 28/09/20)
- Growing number of schools struggling with pressure of staffing who are isolating whilst waiting for tests which is putting additional pressure on specialist provision to be able to remain open
- High numbers in some special schools who are symptomatic and waiting for tests or isolating via track and trace
- Support for children who require specific medical interventions is being resolved where new issues have been identified around areas such as oral and nasal suction
- Special schools are learning to manage the ‘new normal’

Health, Safety & Wellbeing Team

- Since the start of the pandemic we have produced the model risk assessment – Version 8 (Currently on version 9) for Schools to adopt and amend to suit their individual setting.
- Once Schools have completed their risk assessment they have shared it with us for comment and feedback.
- We have been in regular contact with Head teachers throughout the pandemic providing support and helping them with any concerns they may have.

In addition to the model risk assessment we have produced:-

Page 47

- A risk assessment for School staff working from home
- An individual risk assessment for staff who are shielding / BAME / pregnant / extremely clinically vulnerable / clinically vulnerable
- A cleaning guidance for Schools
- A guidance for Administering first aid, administration of medicines and providing intimate care in Schools
- A risk assessment for support staff (based at Moorfoot) visiting Schools with SEN
- A risk assessment for support staff (based at Moorfoot) visiting SEN pupils in the Home

As government guidance changes, the risk assessment will be updated to take on board any changes required.

Statutory HR

Some key points on what has been done since March

- Provision HR advice for COVID 19 (local advice and guidance - e mail briefings) to all educational settings in Sheffield.
 - Communication with external school HR providers to ensure consistent information and messaging to Sheffield schools - incorporating national advice from DfE / LGA and local SCC. Reinforcing expectations with regard to the role of external HR providers for advising their client schools on operational matters.
 - Collaborating with colleagues from Health & Safety and Public Health on developing Risk Assessments for schools.
- Working closely with school based Trade Union representatives via weekly meetings to address concerns and to facilitate Sheffield schools remaining open from March and subsequently wider to full re-opening from September.

Page 48

Key points on the current position

- Continue to address Employee Relations issues raised by trade union representatives and maintain a close / collaborative working relationship.
- Reinforce consistent messaging to HR providers about SCC expectations about “doing the right thing” when they advise their schools operationally.

Remaining issues/concerns/challenges

- Funding particularly in light of increased pressures due to staff being required to self-isolate or to take time off as a result of child/caring responsibilities. If not possible for staff to work from home or take paid leave, potential for expectation that this is unpaid leave. An issue already highlighted by TUs with potential for discrimination claims being flagged.

SEN Transport

- SEN Transport **operated throughout the pandemic**, following all appropriate government guidance and public health advice
- Operating procedures were brought to **IMG** for discussion/approval ahead of the full return to school in September 2020. The recommendations were supported by ICMs, Senior Managers, Public Health, and subsequently approved by IMG
- The vast majority of **parent/carers and schools** affected have been understanding and supportive
- Outstanding issue – further clarification required regarding **different vehicle types used as SEN Taxis**. Options paper planned to go to IMG w/c 5 October

Mainstream School Buses

- Mainstream School buses did **not** operate during the pandemic
 - DfT approved a **change of classification for school buses**, so they are no longer accessible to the general public. The reclassification as 'dedicated school buses' helped to avoid a major capacity problem
 - Operating procedures were also brought to **IMG** for discussion/approval ahead of the full return to school in September 2020. The recommendations were supported by ICMs, Senior Managers, Public Health, and subsequently approved by IMG
- No significant operational concerns have been** reported since the start of the school year in September
- Additional funding allowed SYPTTE to arrange **extra routes** where required to minimise the number of pupils using public transport through to the October half term
 - Some of this funding will extend to the Christmas break, depending on national levels of need. **It is not clear if this will be extended** into the Spring Term

School attendance

- Data collected daily from schools
- Some schools not regularly returning information – current data covers approx 90% of the City's young people
- Year to date attendance is lower than the same period in previous years
- Latest national data is showing an attendance rate of 93% for primary and 86% for secondary
- Approx 2.7% of pupils are isolating due to suspected or confirmed covid

Elective Home Education and Inclusion

Sept 2020	158	Sept 2019	33	Sept 2018	23	Sept 2017	30	Sept 2016	34
Total 2020	210	Total 2019	243	Total 2018	184	Total 2017	155	Total 2016	144
Remain	192	Remain	109	Remain	67	Remain	56	Remain	42

- Page 52
- The de-registration for EHE have increased over and above numbers expected and continuing to rise significantly daily. Every family is contact by both Children Missing Education and the Advisory Teacher for Elective Home Education.
 - 326 sessions of exclusions have been issued over September, this has affected 166 children. (149 Secondary age and 17 Primary)
 - There have been 11 permanent exclusions issued over the last 14 days. (9 Secondary and 2 Primary) there are 3 that may be withdrawn.
 - 35 Reduced Time Tables have been logged since the start of term. 18 of these are Primary, 5 attending special school, 12 are for children in secondary.
 - 7 of the RTTs have been for reasons of anxiety, 28 behaviour.

Laptops for learners at home

- June/July DfE scheme provided c1800 laptops to vulnerable children
- New DfE laptop scheme has been established for children without access to IT devices at home. This applies to children in years 3-11 who have been sent home due to confirmed cases of coronavirus.

Page 53

All Sheffield secondary and primary schools have been allocated a limited number of laptops based on need and school size

- Schools must complete an educational settings status form and provide a number from DHSC in order to access laptops
- LA officers have provided contact information for all schools to both DFE and DHSC.
- Information and updates about the laptop scheme has been shared with schools through the regular school bulletin

COVID-19 catch-up premium

£1 billion of funding to support children and young people to catch up. This includes a one-off universal £650 million catch-up premium for the 2020 to 2021 academic year to ensure that schools have the support they need to help all pupils make up for lost teaching time.

£350 million National Tutoring Programme to provide additional, targeted support for those children and young people who need the most help.

Eligibility: The £650 million of universal catch-up premium funding will be available for all state-funded mainstream and special schools, and alternative provision.

Funding allocation: £80 for each pupil in years reception through to 11.

Special, AP and hospital schools will be provided with £240 for each place for the 2020 to 2021 academic year.

This means a typical primary school of 200 pupils will receive £16,000 while a typical secondary school of 1,000 pupils will receive £80,000

COVID-19 catch-up premium

Payments: This funding will be provided in 3 tranches. First payments have been made.

Payment 2 early 2021

Use of funds: schools should use this funding for specific activities to support their pupils to catch up for lost teaching over the previous months.

National Tutoring Programme: £350 million National Tutoring Programme to provide additional, targeted support for those children and young people who need the most help.

The programme will comprise of at least 3 parts in the 2020 to 2021 academic year, including:

- a 5 to 16 programme
- a 16 to 19 fund
- a reception year early language programme

Sheffield COVID RECOVERY FESTIVAL



- Festival ran across September - sessions live online and recorded so colleagues could watch at a time convenient to them.
- Just over 400 people watched the 23 sessions live.
- Just over 300 people had watched recordings by the end of the month – this will continue to grow significantly.
- The festival included:
 - 2 Public Health sessions
 - Leadership – Sir David Carter
 - 2 Mental Health sessions – Zoe Brownlie (Health Minds)
 - Listening & Empathy – Jenny Mosley
 - Disadvantaged Gap – Marc Rowland
 - SEND – David Bartram
 - EEF Guide to supporting school planning – Julie Kettlewell
 - Governance – Emma Knight (NGA)
 - Professional Development – David Weston
 - 2 sessions about remote learning – EdTech Demonstrator School
 - Curriculum inputs – maths, early reading & phonics, science, music, PE, physical activity, swimming, educational visits, role of creativity.
- Session [reflections](#) on the website.

Sheffield COVID RECOVERY FESTIVAL



Page 57

- Next step is to take the learning from the festival and the first month of term to identify the key issues for schools to plan support for the rest of the year.
- **COVID Recovery Plan** will seek to bring together resources from different partners into one coherent support plan for Sheffield schools and academies.
- This includes identifying support to access and use national programmes (for example **catch up funding, tuition, laptop distribution**, etc.) effectively.
- It will also include seeking to support schools and academies to **identify and address gaps which have potentially widened** so far and which may widen further during the months ahead. These will include gaps for **disadvantaged** pupils, pupils with **SEND**, pupils with **health needs** and those affected by issues relating to **digital access and connectivity**.
- It is likely to also address **remote learning, mental health & wellbeing** (pupils and staff), **curriculum** development, **professional development, support for governance and school leaders**.
- Out for comments, suggestions and information **before half term**.

Support is ongoing

- The support for schools and childcare settings continues
- A number of Council services have returned to onsite activity where it is safe to do so and does not compromise the measures put in place by schools and childcare settings



Report to Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee Thursday 15th October 2020

Report of: Policy and Improvement Officer

Subject: Draft Work Programme 2020/21: Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

Author of Report: Alice Nicholson, Policy and Improvement Officer
alice.nicholson@sheffield.gov.uk

This report aims to assist the Committee in determining a programme of work for the remainder of municipal year 2020/21. The usual pattern of meetings has been disrupted by Covid-19, however meetings are being held virtually, and this Committee met in May and June to consider a Call-In of a decision on Investing in Young People. There are three more meetings now scheduled over November 2020, January 2021, and February 2021.

Section 2.0 of this report is a list of items that have been put forward so far by members of the Committee, it is for the Committee to consider and agree draft work programme, and prioritise items for remaining meetings. Scrutiny work programmes are live documents, so are subject to change, there may be occasion when other appropriate items have to be swapped in to the schedule. Section 3.0 is a guide to assist in determining a work programme.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	X

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Consider, identify, and agree topics for draft work programme 2020/21, and prioritise items for remaining meetings

Background Papers: [Sheffield Council Constitution](#)

Category of Report: OPEN

Draft Work Programme 2020/21: Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee - Thursday 15th October 2020

1.0 What is the role of Scrutiny?

1.1 Scrutiny Committees exist to hold decision makers to account, investigate issues of local concern, and make recommendations for improvement. The Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (formerly the Centre for Public Scrutiny) has identified that effective scrutiny:

- Provides 'Critical Friend' challenge to executive policy makers and decision makers
- Enables the voice and concern of the public and its communities
- Is carried out by independent minded governors who lead and own the scrutiny process
- Drives improvement in public services and finds efficiencies and new ways of delivering services

1.2 The Centre for Governance and Scrutiny has updated its activity with several blogs and handy advice for scrutiny in Covid-19, and the Covid Act. These can be found on their web pages - <https://www.cfgs.org.uk/> .

1.3 Scrutiny Committees can operate in a number of ways – through formal meetings with several agenda items, single item 'select committee' style meetings, task and finish groups, and informal visits and meetings to gather evidence to inform scrutiny work. Committees can hear from Council Officers, Cabinet Members, partner organisations, expert witnesses, members of the public. Scrutiny Committees are not decision making bodies, but can make recommendations to decision makers.

2.0 List of possible items put forward for 2020/21

2.1

Work programme topics for prioritisation 2020/21
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• GCSE/A Levels/BTech results 2020 and scenario for 2021 exams
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Future restrictions in Covid-19 - impact on schools and Young People
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Educational disadvantage – has Covid-19/lockdown increased the gap?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Youth Services – current position after bringing in house
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• MAST – update on provision, now and future
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Home schooling – impact of Covid-19, an alternative to school; and safeguarding of those home schooled
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ryegate House – impact of Covid-19, accessibility to services

3.0 Determining the work programme

3.1 It is important the work programme reflects the principles of effective scrutiny, outlined above at 1.1, and so the Committee has a vital role in ensuring that the work programme is looking at issues that concern local people, and looking at issues where scrutiny can influence decision makers. The work programme remains a live document, and there will be an opportunity for the Committee to discuss it at every Committee meeting, this might include:

- Prioritising issues for inclusion on a meeting agenda
- Identifying new issues for scrutiny
- Determining the appropriate approach for an issue – e.g. select committee style single item agenda vs task and finish group
- Identifying appropriate witnesses and sources of evidence to inform scrutiny discussions
- Identifying key lines of enquiry and specific issues that should be addressed through scrutiny of any given issue.

3.2 Members of the Committee can also raise any issues for the work programme via the Chair or Policy and Improvement Officer at any time.

4.0 Meeting Dates 2020/21

4.1 Meetings have been scheduled for Thursdays 10am-12pm on the following dates:

- 19th November 2020
- 21st January 2021
- 25th February 2021

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Consider, identify, and agree topics for draft work programme 2020/21, and prioritise items for remaining meetings

This page is intentionally left blank