

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

Monday 18 July 2016 at 1.00 pm

**To be held at the Town Hall, Pinstone
Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

Membership

Councillors Ian Saunders (Chair), Steve Ayris (Deputy Chair), Andy Bainbridge, Olivia Blake, John Booker, Terry Fox, Craig Gamble Pugh, Kieran Harpham, Karen McGowan, Mohammad Maroof, Abtisam Mohamed, Josie Paszek, Colin Ross, Alison Teal and Cliff Woodcraft

Education Non-Council Members

Gillian Foster, Jules Jones and Alison Warner

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 Diane Owens, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email diane.owens@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:diane.owens@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
18 JULY 2016**

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 1 - 4)
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meetings** (Pages 5 - 40)
To approve the minutes of the special meetings of the Committee held on 9th March and 18th May, and the scheduled meeting held on 14th March, 2016, and to note the responses to the public questions raised at the special meeting on 9th March, 2016
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. The Implications of the "Educational Excellence Everywhere" Government White Paper** (Pages 41 - 44)
Report of the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families
- 8. Annual Meeting with Young People 2016** (Pages 45 - 48)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Draft Work Programme 2016/17** (Pages 49 - 58)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 10. Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, 19th September, 2016, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall

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 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

Special meeting held 9 March 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs (Chair), Mohammad Maroof, Pat Midgley, Chris Peace, Lynn Rooney, Colin Ross, Ian Saunders, Cliff Woodcraft (Deputy Chair), Peter Rippon and Brian Webster

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Jules Jones, (Parent Governor Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)
 Joan Stratford, (Diocese Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)
 Alison Warner, (School Governor Representative - Non-Council Non-Voting Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received and substitutes attended the meeting as follows:-

<u>Apology</u>	<u>Substitute</u>
Councillor Nasima Akther	No substitute nominated
Councillor John Booker	No substitute nominated
Councillor Katie Condliffe	No substitute nominated
Councillor Sheila Constance	No substitute nominated
Councillor Aodan Marken	Councillor Brian Webster
Councillor Karen McGowan	No substitute nominated
Councillor Jack Scott	Councillor Peter Rippon

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 There were no declarations of interest.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 The following questions were received from members of the public:-

- (a) Mike Hodson (Carterknowle and Millhouses Community Group) questioned whether the Committee was aware that the report to the Cabinet meeting on

17th February 2016, regarding the school places consultation and recommendations, was not correct in claiming that the proposal to build a new secondary school on the Bannerdale car park was formally consulted on, and thoroughly explored. Mr Hodson stated that there was no Council proposal to this effect and it was a third-party proposal. It was only included on the Council website in the 'alternative option' document on 27th November 2015 – the day the consultation finished. The original single proposal – only for buildings on the Holt House site, and subsequent piecemeal changes to Council proposals, were both probably illegal and certainly against the Local Government Ombudsman's good practice guidelines.

- (b) Umberto Albarella raised the following three questions:-
- (i) The 'consultation' document of the Council, rather at the last minute, added the following proposals – 'Build a new 3-4 entry primary school at Ecclesall Infants and allow Ecclesall Junior to be the junior phase for Clifford'. No more detail was provided and this is now the proposal that the Council is supporting. How can a consultation that provides such minimal level of detail, and so little time, be regarded as credible, particularly when most of the local community was kept in complete darkness?
 - (ii) Many in the local community supported the expansion of the Infant School to three classes per year, which would feed the Junior School, and with Clifford allowed to expand locally. This project would have solved the issue of the extra need of school places and would have been much more cost effective. Why was such much more logical choice ruled out, rather than opting for a project that will have a devastating impact on the Ecclesall community?
 - (iii) Access to the Ecclesall Infant School playground is very difficult at the moment, with 180 children hosted on site. An increase to 630 children will obviously require a substantial change to the access to the ground, with massive problems for the people living in the area. Will houses be knocked down and why did such a serious issue not feature at all in the consultation document?
- (c) Nicole Brown raised the following questions:-
- (i) was there a right to reply in this meeting and could members of the public offer further explanation if the reply to their questions contained inaccuracies?
 - (ii) why did there appear to be an issue in terms of the Council investing in faith schools?
 - (iii) what was the Council's definition of the word 'over subscription'?

- (iv) why was Silverdale School built for 150 per year in 2009?
- (v) why do Councillors appear to be making decisions based on poor information and inaccurate advice?
- (d) Jen Hardy referred to a number of questions she had raised at the Cabinet meeting on 17th February 2016, to which she had not yet received responses. Ms Hardy questioned the clarity of the way forward to secure junior places for Clifford children within a through school. She considered the suggestion that children go to a reduced single-form entry, under-funded school, under split leadership, was unacceptable. Clifford need a designated, funded junior phase.
- (e) Ted Gunby stated that the planning permission for the Bannerdale site arose from almost two years' consultation with the community. In particular, the consultation reached firm agreement about the need to protect open space in the area. Would the Committee please scrutinise the way in which the Cabinet disregarded the planning permission for the site and other statements by the Council. Mr Gunby added that, in the planning documents, the Council stated 'should a future applicant wish to develop any of the open space, instead of the housing area, it must have a compelling rationale, showing how the open space could be replaced within the site' and "quantitative shortage of open space in the area means that proposals for the loss of open space will not be permitted" (Core Strategy Form B). Furthermore, he stated that the Cabinet decision is also in conflict with (i) Sports England licensed the building of the car park on sports pitches for a limited time (now expired) with the condition that the green space would be restored and (ii) the planning documents which stated "the north of the area (including the car park) is a former tip, which has poor ground condition, which means the area precludes housing development".
- (f) Ann Blair (Governor at Clifford School) questioned how many Councillors had seen the document produced by Clifford Governors, which outlined the way forward.
- (g) Neil Fitzmaurice requested that the decision be deferred until the Scrutiny Committee had considered relevant issues and made recommendations to the Executive. Mr Fitzmaurice stated that there were so many aspects to this complex issue, which needed to be considered calmly and fairly, outside pressures from those wishing to close down the decision, and suggested that more time was needed, and alternatives should not be ruled out. He added that he was very concerned at the implications of traffic which he considered to have been a consideration in rejection of other options. In addition, he commented that schools were closing down green spaces, not just during school hours, but also in holidays and at weekends.
- (h) Fiona Greensit raised the following questions:-

- (i) Would it still not be easier, and presumably less expensive, to allow Clifford to expand on its current site, rather than build a whole new primary school on one Ecclesall Junior site? This would also serve to alleviate the issue of pollution and traffic problems, and stop the Infants from losing a lovely playing field, which also serves the Juniors.
 - (ii) Can you please explain why it is better to build a new school rather than support the current schools in expanding?
 - (iii) Ecclesall Junior School currently offers 1200 church places to the local community. This is going to be reduced to 120 – why?
 - (iv) If the new through school does go ahead, how is the transfer going to happen from the old junior school to the current primary school? Has the Council thought about how this will affect the children and their families?
- (i) Helena Jones raised the following questions:-
- (i) When Tapton, Silverdale, King Egbert and Newfield, and possibly other schools, are willing to expand, why are you proposing to spend money on a new school?
 - (ii) Although not discussed in the consultation in detail, catchment areas will be radically changed, and this will lead to upset and disruption. All this can be avoided if current schools are expanded. If child numbers drop in the future, one school will inevitably be left as the least popular, and individuals' choice will lead to another under-filled school. Why disrupt catchments and spend money on a new school, when local schools are ready and willing to expand?
- (j) Jason Leman raised the following questions:-
- (i) Can the promised 'Big Conversation' after the decision by the Cabinet, include consideration of whether a housing development is built on the Bannerdale site, or whether the whole site is used for the proposed secondary school?
 - (ii) King Egbert and Newfield have both offered to expand, along with Silverdale, which had the potential to take projected demand in the short-term at least. Why can't the founding of the new school be delayed to allow a fuller process of development, rather than rushing the decision?
 - (iii) The HSBC recreation ground has been muted as an alternative site, in a similar area to currently oversubscribed schools. Why was this proposal not seriously considered in the Cabinet report?

- (iv) Is there an actual plan of the new school proposed on the Bannerdale site?
 - (v) How much money would the sale of the Bannerdale site for housing raise?
 - (k) Peter Scott raised the following questions:-
 - (i) What alternatives were considered to the development of the Ecclesall Infant School site to include the Junior School?
 - (ii) If alternatives were considered, what were they, and why were they discounted?
 - (iii) What efforts were made to invite residents near Ecclesall Infant School (not parents) to participate in the consultation process?
- 4.2 The Chair stated that all the questions raised would be referred to the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, who would arrange for written responses to be provided.

5. CALL-IN OF THE CABINET DECISION ON SCHOOL PLACES IN SHEFFIELD

- 5.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer, Diane Owens, submitted a report regarding the call-in of the decision of the Cabinet made on 17th February 2016, to:-

“Authorise the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, and where necessary, in consultation with the Executive Director, Place, to take all necessary steps, including bringing forward the necessary capital approval submissions to Cabinet, to:-

- (i) commission a new 11-18 school on the car park area of the former Bannerdale site, as described in this report;*
- (ii) support the temporary expansion of Silverdale to provide an additional 60 secondary school places in 2016/17 and 2017/18, as set out in this report;*
- (iii) undertake a 4-week consultation on a proposal to expand Ecclesall Infant School to become a through primary school, offering 90 places per year, as set out in this report; and*
- (iv) commission a new 2-18 school on the former Pye Bank School site, as described in this report.”*

5.2 Signatories

The Lead Signatory to the call-in was Councillor Aodan Marken, and the other signatories were Councillors Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy

and Colin Ross.

5.3 Reasons for the Call-in

The signatories had confirmed that they wished the Committee to scrutinise the decision to ensure that the proposal provides the best allocation of school places.

5.4 Attendees

- Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families)
- Councillor Robert Murphy (Signatory and acting for the Lead Signatory to the call-in)
- Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed (Signatory to the call-in)
- Jane Ludlam (Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families)
- Antony Hughes (Children's Commissioner and Director of Inclusion and Learning)
- Alena Prentice (Assistant Director, Inclusion and Learning Services)

5.5 Councillor Robert Murphy addressed the Committee, as representative of Councillor Aodan Marken, Lead Signatory, indicating that he had a son who attended a school in the south west of the City. He stated that he fully understood the need for more school places in the south west of the City, and had raised this issue with the Cabinet Member on a number of occasions. He commented that, in his opinion, the decision to close Abbeydale Secondary School was taken too hastily, without proper consideration being given to the needs of the local community, or in terms of future planning. In terms of the consultation process regarding the present proposals, Councillor Murphy stated that it was difficult to consult on something, when all the options had not been made clear, and considered that calling-in the Cabinet decision would give the public, and Members, more time to give proper consideration to the proposals.

5.6 Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, thanked everyone for attending the meeting, particularly the members of the public, and indicated that her comments would both provide an explanation of the Council's position in this regard, as well as providing an initial response to the questions raised by members of the public. She also stated that every effort would be made for written responses to be sent to the questioners, as early as possible. Councillor Drayton stated that, although the Council consulted on a set of proposals with regard to school places in the City, the initial consultation was undertaken as a statutory requirement, but it had been made clear that, following people's views on the proposals, further proposals could come to light, and would be placed on the Council website, as a means of further consultation. This had included the receipt of detailed proposals from Clifford School. The Council had based its proposals on a clear set of criteria, which included looking at where school places were needed, the need to protect green space, the need to provide additional housing, where possible, and the need to provide good quality schools for children in the City. As part of the consultation, a number of people raised concerns with regard to potential traffic congestion and reduction in air quality, as

well as concerns regarding over-development in terms of the Holt House School proposals. A number of people stated that they were happy with the schools as they were and where they were, and details of the proposals to enlarge Ecclesall Infant School to become an infant and junior school, were placed on the Council website. Based on all the comments received as part of the consultation, the proposals were submitted to the Cabinet at its meeting held on 17th February 2016.

- 5.7 Councillor Drayton stressed that Ecclesall Junior School would be retained as the feeder school for children at Clifford Infant School. The Council was very mindful of the number of appeals made by parents in connection with the allocation of places at schools in the south west of the City, which had included, in some cases, parents who actually lived in the school's catchment area. This referred mainly to Silverdale School, and it was considered that the proposed expansion of the school, to provide an additional 60 places, would alleviate the problem. Councillor Drayton stated that Members and officers had met with the Head and Chair of Governors of Clifford School to discuss the proposals, and would continue with such meetings to ensure the proposals progressed satisfactorily. It was appreciated that there could be traffic implications in terms of Ecclesall Infant School, and any concerns would be addressed as part of a statutory four-week consultation process, together with the planning process. In terms of the Bannerdale site, there had been extensive consultation, which had resulted in a considerable number of responses and comments received from members of the public. Whilst this site was deemed suitable for housing, the Council was very mindful to maintain the open space on the site, and there were no plans to fence off this open space. The decision to close the former Abbeydale Secondary School had been made in the light of falling school numbers, which resulted in it no longer being financially viable to keep the school open. The Council had looked at all the options, including possible development of the HSBC site, in accordance with the agreed criteria, but it had been considered that this land would be too expensive, whereas the Council currently owned the Bannerdale site.
- 5.8 In terms of the issues raised with regard to catchment areas, Antony Hughes stated that a full consultation would be held later in the year with regard to proposals for admissions to the new secondary schools.
- 5.9 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-
- A number of suggestions had been made as part of the consultation regarding Clifford School, which had included a suggestion to move the provision at Clifford to the Ecclesall Junior School site on Ringinglow Road, which would have to be agreed by the Diocese, and the Governors of both schools.
 - The proposals regarding development on the Ecclesall Infant School site would be considered as part of a further consultation exercise, as well as part of the planning process.

- It had been identified, based on projected population forecasts and demand for places, that there would be a need for additional provision at secondary schools in the south west of the City, and plans were being made to increase the capacity at Silverdale, which would result in ten forms of entry by 2023/24.
- A formal assessment in terms of air quality and traffic congestion had not been undertaken in respect of the proposals regarding Ecclesall Infant School, as this would be done as part of the next stage of the proposals.
- It was believed that there had been a proper and extensive consultation exercise undertaken in connection with the proposals, and Members would like to express their thanks and appreciation to the officers responsible for this work. The original proposals, together with any additional or amended proposals suggested following consultation, were all included on the Council website, in order to provide an opportunity for members of the public to comment, and a number of people had submitted multiple comments. All the responses received as part of the consultation exercise were lodged in the Council Leader's Office and all Cabinet Members were notified of these and given the opportunity to view them prior to the meeting on 17th February 2016. Consideration would be given to making all the consultation responses public, but this would need to be clarified with Legal Services, in the light of possible confidentiality issues.
- The reason for the urgency in terms of making the decision at the Cabinet meeting on 17th February 2016, was that there was now a considerable amount of work required, including further consultation and planning applications and, where relevant, negotiations with Academy sponsors, to ensure that the additional capacity was ready by 2018.
- Council Members and officers had met with the Governors of all the schools involved, to discuss the proposals and listen to their views, and they were all in favour of the current proposals. Arrangements would remain for further meetings to be held with the Governors as the proposals progress.

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

- The Diocese did not want to see a reduction in faith places in the south-west of the City, and would be responsible for funding the expansion plans at Ecclesall Junior School.
- As part of the planning process, members of the public were entitled to attend meetings of the Planning and Highways Committee to put forward their views.

5.11 As a summary, Councillor Jackie Drayton again expressed her thanks and appreciation to the Council officers in terms of the excellent work undertaken regarding the consultation exercises in respect of the various proposals, and to all those groups and members of the public who had responded to the Council as

part of the consultation. She stated that she believed that the proposals would go a long way to solve the problem of shortages of school places in the south west of the City and, consequently, reduce the number of appeals parents had been compelled to make as a result of such a shortage.

5.12 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the reports now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses provided to the questions raised; and
- (b) agrees to take no action in relation to the called-in decision, but consider whether issues arising from the call-in need to be added to its Work Programme 2016/17.

(NOTE: Prior to the passing of the above resolution, an alternative motion, moved by Councillor Brian Webster and seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, in the following terms, was put to the vote and negated:-

“This Committee:-

- (a) recommends that no further action be taken in respect of recommendations (ii) and (iv);
- (b) notes flaws with the initial consultation process for the provision of additional primary and secondary school places in the south west of the City and, in particular, the addition of further options in the course of that consultation;
- (c) further, notes with concern that the current proposals risk being to the detriment of local green space, air quality, traffic flow and community cohesion; and
- (d) therefore, refers this decision back to the Cabinet, with the recommendation that a full and proper consultation be held, for a period of no fewer than six weeks, on all possible options for primary and secondary school provision in the south west of the City.”)

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

6.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday, 14th March 2016, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

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

Meeting held 14 March 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs (Chair), Katie Condliffe, Aodan Marken, Mohammad Maroof, Karen McGowan, Pat Midgley, Chris Peace, Colin Ross, Ian Saunders, Jack Scott, Cliff Woodcraft (Deputy Chair) and Nasima Akther

Non-Council Members in attendance:-

Gillian Foster, (Diocese Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)

Jules Jones, (Parent Governor Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)

Joan Stratford, (Diocese Representative - Non-Council Voting Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Booker and 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 8 (Fostering Service – Annual Report), Councillor Ian Saunders declared a personal interest as a foster carer, and indicated that he would leave the meeting during the consideration of that item.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25th January 2016, were approved as a correct record, and the Committee noted the attached Actions Update.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 There were no questions raised or petitions submitted by members of the public.

6. ADOPTION SERVICE - ANNUAL REPORT

6.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted the Annual Report in terms of the Adoption Service, which provided an overview of the main developments and priorities relating to the Service during the period April 2015 to February 2016.

6.2 The report was supported by a presentation by Suzanne Whiteley, Adoption and Fostering Service Manager. Ms Whiteley reported on the national adoption agenda and how Sheffield had responded to the numerous Government initiatives and policy changes over the last four years. She referred to adoption statistics for the City, details of outturns and projections regarding indicators on the Adoption Scorecard, and what the various Government initiatives and policy changes had meant for the people of Sheffield.

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

- The measures that were reported included the time from the child being placed with adopters to the time they applied for an Adoption Order. The adopters could apply for an Adoption Order over a 10-week period. Because of this, there were cases whereby if there was some reason as to why the Adoption Orders hadn't been applied for, this affected the average figure across the Local Authority. The Council have had two such cases, one being a child who was placed four years ago. The Council have been working with the adopters to address the issues that had arisen, and had now secured a positive outcome for this child.
- The figure of 34 new adopters related to homes, and not individuals.
- In terms of moving forward regarding the A1 and A2 indicators on the Adoption Scorecard, a number of changes had been made with regard to family finding processes over the last few years, which had resulted in newer cases going through the system a lot quicker. However, the Service needed to be mindful of those cases where there were delays. Whilst the Government had set a threshold, in terms of a number of days it wished to see such targets being met, the Council needed to make sure the assessment was undertaken correctly and that a suitable match was made. It was accepted that the Government's threshold was very low and that in many cases, mainly due to the complex needs of the child, there were delays, making it very difficult to achieve this target. Considerable work was being undertaken, however, in an attempt to address this issue.
- The Council did not wish to see local children moving outside the City, unless it was absolutely necessary. It was important that

the Council had links with the other authorities in South Yorkshire as this helped to ease the process regarding children moving to these areas.

- It was not clear as to why the Government had set such a low threshold, particularly in the light of an increase in the number of children requiring adoption. It was believed that such thresholds had been set simply to ensure that Authorities completed the adoption process as quickly as possible. It was acknowledged that it would be very challenging to meet these targets. The Council, however, would not be forced into quickening up the adoption process if it was not in the interest of the child to do so. There was nothing set down in terms of consequences for the Council, if it did not meet the Government's threshold targets, although there would be a requirement for the Council to explain any delays that occurred. The outturns in respect of Adoption Scorecard Indicator A2, which were all somewhat above the Government's threshold during 2011 and 2014, was considered as a legacy in terms of some of the children who had gone through the process during this period, who had very complex and challenging needs. Considerable work was being undertaken to address the delays, which included holding monthly meetings at a strategic level, as well as out in the community with frontline staff. Whilst the Council did not want to cause any unnecessary delays in the process due to service issues, there had been some service issues, which were currently being dealt with, and it was considered that sufficient safeguards were now in place to enable the Service to make the necessary improvements to address the delay issues. It was believed that the Government set the threshold for local authorities to ensure that any incidents of children 'drifting' in the system were being minimised. There were benefits for the Authority in having such thresholds in that, although the Authority had to be flexible, and strike the right balance in the light of the needs of the children and adopters, they also provided the Authority with the incentive to try and work through the adoption process as quickly as possible. Whilst the Service had to deal with a number of children with very complex and difficult needs, this was not used as an excuse as it was appreciated that other local authorities, some of which performed much better than Sheffield, were forced to deal with children with similar needs.
- There were no barriers in terms of the ethnicity, race or sexual orientation of any prospective adopters.
- Information with regard to the distribution/spread of children in terms of the number of days they had been in the adoption system could be provided in respect of two cohorts – children who had been adopted this year and children currently in the

system.

6.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the information reported as part of the presentation and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) thanks Suzanne Whiteley for attending the meeting, making the presentation and responding to the questions raised.

7. FOSTERING SERVICE - ANNUAL REPORT

7.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report containing an overview of the main developments and priorities of the Fostering Service from April 2015 to February 2016.

7.2 The report was supported by a presentation from Suzanne Whiteley, Adoption and Fostering Service Manager, who reported on Sheffield Fostering Service, referring to foster carer initiatives, training issues, statistics and key priorities for the Service.

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

- Whilst statistics were not available in terms of retention rates regarding foster parents, such information was presently being collated by the Service's Communications Team, using a demographic-based model. The Communications Team had used social media, with the results of this exercise being awaited, to see if such an initiative had an impact. It was considered that a 'drip drip' method of advertising for foster carers often proved more effective than one-off targeting campaigns. In terms of sharing good practice, officers were due to meet with the Marketing Manager in the Fostering Team at Leeds City Council, which Authority had recently run a very successful recruitment campaign. It was considered that the Council had a very successful brand in terms of fostering, which tended to be more effective for the younger children.
- Whilst the figures regarding the deregistration of foster carers were not available in respect of the last few years, it was believed that, more recently, the number of carers deregistering had reduced. It was believed that the reasons for the deregistration of the majority of such carers was due to general concerns regarding the standard of care provided. In terms of those cases where foster carers had been deregistered by the Authority, of which there have been three, such action had been

taken as the standard of care provided had not been deemed sufficient. The cases did not include any incidences of neglect. Similarly, there were a number of different reasons as to why foster carers withdrew from the fostering process. One of the reasons was due to the complexity of the system, and the consequent difficulties faced by some prospective foster carers in dealing with this. Whilst it was appreciated that such a system needed to be highly regulated, it was considered that the system needed to be simplified, particularly for prospective foster parents for unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Officers in the Fostering Service regularly liaised with colleagues in terms of how they could engage better with representatives from different communities within the City. Representations had recently been made at a national level in terms of looking at different regulations with regard to foster placements that were culture-specific, and the outcome of such discussions was still awaited. The reasons as to whether children were placed with permanent foster carers or placed with task carers was dependent on the individual plan for each child. When a child first came into care, they were registered with short-term foster carers, known as task carers. When it was deemed a long-term placement would be suitable for the child, the Council would look at providing a placement, where the foster carer involved was able to commit longer-term.

- Whilst it was accepted that young people remaining to live with their foster carers after the age of 18 could have an impact on the number of foster carers available, the Council was very keen to support the extension of young people's placements in a way that allows them to progress to more independent living, whilst remaining with their foster carers, which was known as 'staying put'.
- There were currently four foster carers who provided out of hours foster provision, and there were very few occasions where the Council was not able to provide any remand provision.
- The details in terms of whether the recent poster campaign in terms of foster carer recruitment had resulted in an increase in enquiries and/or applications were not available at the meeting, but could be provided to Members at a later date. However, there were generally fluctuations with regard to recruitment statistics throughout any given year. Also, there were no details available in terms of the effectiveness of recruitment campaigns with regard to BME and other hard to reach communities. There had been a small number of approvals from BME communities, but it was accepted that the numbers needed to be higher, and the Service would welcome any ideas or suggestions in terms of how such communities could be targeted more effectively in

terms of publicity. The information on this, together with the details relating to the recent poster campaign, were being handled by the Service's Communications Team, and could be circulated to Members at a later date.

- The post of Training and Development Officer in the Service had been vacant for some time as a result of the post-holder being on sick leave.
- Information regarding (a) the impact of the recent poster/leaflet recruitment campaign, currently being analysed by the Fostering Service's Communications Team and (b) the ethnic diversity of current foster carers on the list would be circulated to Members.

7.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the information reported as part of the presentation and the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks Suzanne Whiteley for attending the meeting, making the presentation and responding to the questions raised; and
- (c) requests that any issues of concern regarding the Fostering Service that arise prior to the next Annual Report, be reported to Members.

(NOTE: Councillor Ian Saunders declared a personal interest in this item, and left the room during the consideration of the item.)

8. CARE LEAVERS, INDEPENDENT ADVOCACY SERVICE, CHILDREN IN CARE AND INDEPENDENT VISITOR SERVICE - ANNUAL REPORT

8.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report containing an annual review of the Independent Advocacy Service, Children in Care Council and Independent Visitor Service.

8.2 The report was supported by presentations from Becky Towle, Service Manager, Care Leavers, and Clare Humberstone, Children's Involvement Team Manager, as follows:-

8.2.1 Care Leavers

- (a) Becky Towle commenced by referring to a definition of a care leaver, and reported on the various different categories of care leavers, together with the Local Authority's responsibilities to such people. She reported that, at the present time, there were 324 care leavers in Sheffield, 300 of whom were still in touch with the Authority. Ms

Towle referred to the issues in terms of young people leaving care, and moving to independence, and reported on the various health issues surrounding care leavers and on the transition of care leavers from Not Engaged in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) to Engaged in Education, Employment and Training (EET). Specific reference was made to the educational achievement of children in care, in 2015, which highlighted the fact that whilst the attainment gap between this cohort and the whole City had narrowed since 2014, it still remained a significant difference. Ms Towle reported on the various activities and initiatives care leavers could become involved in, referring specifically to the Care Leavers Council.

- (b) In response a question from a Member of the Committee, with regard to young people who chose to remain with their foster carers after the age of 18 (“Staying Put”), Ms Towle commented that although the Council’s involvement with the carers would not be as detailed, in terms of training requirements and other issues, the Service would still provide a level of support for the foster carers.

8.2.2 Children in Care Council and Independent Advocacy Service

- (a) Clare Humberstone reported on the work undertaken by the Children’s Involvement Team, during the last year, referring specifically to the Children in Care Council. She reported that the Council had now been running for a year, with an entirely new group, comprising eight members. The Council had drawn up a Work Plan for the year, and the first topic had been improving their relationship with Social Workers. The Council had arranged an event ‘Let’s Talk About Social Workers’ to showcase its work and ideas, and get sign-up from Councillors and Council officers from the City Council’s Corporate Parenting Board, to take it forward. Reference was made to the Council’s hopes for the year ahead, which included designing and launching its own website, with Facebook and Twitter accounts, developing the work undertaken around Social Workers into training and practice, and moving on to its next two topics, which would include looking at their money and how it was spent, and foster and residential placements.

Ms Humberstone also reported on the Advocacy Service for children and young people in care and the Independent Visitor Scheme. She stated that the Advocacy Service had been available since April 2015, and comprised issue-based advocacy, which included instructed and non-instructed advocacy. The Team aimed to ensure that children and young people’s wishes, views and feelings were heard and considered in important decisions about their lives, and that from April 2015 to date, the Team had received 37 referrals, with 11 currently open. Reference was made to statistical information with regard to the age of children and young people requesting an advocate, referral routes and advocacy issues. Ms Humberstone reported on the

position with regard to Independent Visitors who, after being matched with a child or young person, would visit them on a regular basis, with the aim of establishing a consistent and positive adult-child relationship. It was reported that 16 matches had been made, and 15 young people were waiting for a match. 13 volunteers had undertaken two days of training and were part-way through the recruitment process, awaiting interview and DBS checks before they would be matched with young people.

8.3 In response to questions from Members of the Committee, it was stated that the age range of the children the Team worked with depended on the referrals its received, although the Team did provide for children from the age of five years old. The Children in Care Council did influence service design, with one example of this being that they had designed a booklet – to be filled in by social workers, and taken to the first meeting with the young person. Also, a number of issues raised by the young people were being discussed by the User Voice Group chaired by the Principal Social Worker.

8.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the information reported as part of the presentation and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) thanks Becky Towle and Clare Humberstone for attending the meeting, making the presentations and responding to the questions raised.

9. YOUTH SERVICES IN SHEFFIELD

9.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report providing an update on youth services in Sheffield. The report set out information in terms of the current provision of youth services, as commissioned and organised by the Local Authority, and set out the changes that have taken place since 2010, with the start of the Coalition Government's austerity programme. The report also set out the future challenges facing youth services, and included details of a proposal that the Council was developing with partners for the creation of a Youth Trust for Sheffield, from 2017.

9.2 In attendance for this item were Sam Martin, Assistant Director, Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities, and Gail Gibbons, Chief Executive, Sheffield Futures.

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

- There were no firm proposals at the present time in terms of the

Youth Trust, other than it was envisaged that the Trust would sit outside the Council, with the Council having a role in its organisation. There were plans to speak to commissioners in the NHS and the Police and Crime Commissioner, in connection with proposals to potentially pool resources and create a jointly-commissioned provision, if possible.

- It was difficult to demonstrate the impact open access youth work makes, and youth services nationally have struggled with this issue. It had been identified that, with regard to the proposed Youth Trust, there was a need to do something different, particularly with regard to the procurement process, and officers were currently working with colleagues in Legal Services to look at different ways of how this could be done. Whilst Sheffield Futures received funding other than that received from the Council, there would be a considerable impact if Sheffield Futures were to close down, namely with regard to staff, pensions and service continuity. However, the Council also needed to ensure it was spending public money effectively and ensuring adequate competition for contracts. There was a need for an options appraisals process, and having Sheffield Futures as the Youth Trust was one possible option to be considered, along with a range of other possibilities. The youth services contract between the Council and Sheffield Futures was not only about youth work, but also involved casework, one to one support and family support for people Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs). It was, and always had been, very difficult to track the impact of youth club provision on young people. It had however, been possible for Sheffield Futures to track casework and group work.
- The reason for the proposed changes was due to a combination of factors, with the Government's austerity measures being the major driver. The Council was trying to improve its youth services, whilst being mindful of the budget position.
- Gail Gibbons agreed to raise the issue regarding the way other providers' services were promoted via the careers information services or Sheffield Futures with the Communications Manager at Sheffield Futures.
- The Service welcomed any suggestions in terms of the wording in the Youth Pledge, accepting that there was a need to have some reference to vulnerability.
- The Council would look at a number of different possible funding models, one of which would include a social investor putting up the money for delivery, with the Council then paying out according to an outcomes-based tariff model which, if

successful, would ultimately repay the original investors. Whilst any new proposed model would not entirely replace what the Council was putting in in terms of funding, it would hopefully result in a system which was favourable to the Council over time. Most schemes of this nature work over a three to five year basis, with outcome payments being set up in a number of different ways, such as payments to investors being triggered when certain milestones were met.

- The Youth Trust should be used as a vehicle to enable discussions with other groups/organisations in the City, with regard to service provision. There needs to be some kind of financial model, which was not just about commissioning a service, but also a wider partnership approach to meeting the needs of the young people of Sheffield.
- Universal careers guidance was now the responsibility of individual schools, and it was acknowledged that careers officers, based in, or employed by schools, should always give impartial advice at all times and should always focus on the needs of the young person. When Connexions ended, schools then had the responsibility of providing their own careers advice. Sheffield Futures now provided a bought-in service for around 75% of secondary schools, with the rest buying in their own service. The Council continued to support a network of lead teachers responsible for careers education and advice, and held a forum to discuss issues, maintain standards for the City and encourage best practice.
- The youth clubs operated by Sheffield Futures at the present time had very high attendance.

9.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) requests the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, (i) in liaison with a Working Group, including Members of this Committee, to investigate the proposal to develop a Youth Trust and Youth Pledge, feeding in the comments and questions raised at this meeting, and to report back on progress to this Committee by November 2016, and (ii) to submit a report back to this Committee in early 2017, on the final findings and recommendations.

10. WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

10.1 The Committee received its draft Work Programme 2015/16.

10.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the draft Work Programme 2015/16, namely that the next meeting on 20th April 2016 would comprise the Committee's annual meeting with young carers and young people, and which was not a formal, public meeting; and
- (b) requests that a further report on the progress made in respect of the Parent/Carers' Forum "State of Sheffield 2014 Report" be added to the list of topics for consideration as part of this Committee's Work Programme 2016/17.

11. JOAN STRATFORD

11.1 The Chair reported that Joan Stratford, who had been a Diocese Representative on this, and former Education-related Committees of the Council, since January 1998, was attending her last formal meeting.

11.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee places on record its thanks and appreciation for the excellent work undertaken by Joan Stratford, during her time as a Diocese Representative on this, and former Education-related Committees of the Council, since 1998.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

12.1 It was noted that the next formal 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 18 May 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Ian Saunders, Steve Ayris, Andy Bainbridge, Olivia Blake, John Booker, Terry Fox, Craig Gamble Pugh, Kieran Harpham, Karen McGowan, Mohammad Maroof, Abtisam Mohamed, Josie Paszek, Colin Ross, Alison Teal and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

2. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND DEPUTY CHAIR

2.1 RESOLVED: That Councillor Ian Saunders be appointed Chair of the Committee and Councillor Steve Ayris be appointed Deputy Chair.

3. DATES AND TIMES OF MEETINGS

3.1 RESOLVED: That meetings of the Committee be held on a bi-monthly basis, on dates and times to be determined by the Chair, and as and when required for called-in items.

This page is intentionally left blank

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email

Dear Jason

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March.

As I explained at the meeting, we cannot defer the commissioning of the new school, because there would not be enough time to complete the construction scheme by the opening date of September 2018. At that point we need to have 180 extra places available in the area and with further growth expected, we will need more in future years. This would simply not be achievable by expanding the other local schools.

The Bannerdale site is in the centre of the area where the school-age population has been growing most, namely the Greytones, Dobcroft and Ecclesall catchment areas. So, compared to the HSBC site, it would be convenient for students to get to and minimise car journeys. I also explained at the meeting that the Council must consider using its own land first because of the prohibitive cost of purchasing privately owned sites.

There are no drawings for the new school at this stage. These will be developed over the next period during the feasibility and design stage of the construction programme, and will in due course be submitted for planning approval. The planning process will include a full consultation.

As I am sure you will understand, we cannot give details of the likely receipt for the Bannerdale housing site as this is commercially sensitive information.

In answer to your final question, there will of course be full consultation on the physical plans for the new school as part of the planning process. However, the Council has been clear that it must meet its commitments to the provision of land for housing and the housing development is expected to go ahead. We will, however, ensure that there is a holistic approach to the planning so as to optimise the wider usage of the site.

All good wishes



Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Dear Helena

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March.

As I explained at the meeting, we did consider very carefully the options for making the extra secondary places available in the South West. The alternative of expanding existing schools was explored but what we found was that even if it were possible to expand all the local schools, it would simply not be enough places in the longer term for the number of children coming through the primary schools.

I understand your concern about catchment areas, but please be reassured that there will be a full consultation on the proposals before anything goes ahead. We will be starting to work on the options once a sponsor for the school is on board, and the consultation will be in the autumn.

Selecting the sponsor is an important first step, because we want parents in the area to know that the school will be an outstanding provision from the start, with an ambitious vision for education and a leadership with a strong track record of success. Our intention is to deliver a school that will meet the aspirations of local parents and be the school of choice alongside others in the area.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads 'Jackie'.

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Dear Mike

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March.

In response I do need to explain that the consultation period in the Autumn was about how the Council should provide more school places to meet the needs of a growing population. As part of that consultation a range of options were considered and the decision the Council took was to commission a new 11-18 secondary school for the South West, naming the Bannerdale car park site as the location.

The implications of development on the Bannerdale site will be considered as part of the planning process which will now go ahead. The design and layout of the school buildings will form part of a holistic plan for the site and will of course be subject to planning permission. As part of that process there will be a full consultation at the pre-application stage.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads 'Jackie'.

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Dear Jen

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March. As I explained at the meeting, the Council is not proposing any change to arrangements for Clifford Infant to feed to Ecclesall Junior as currently happens.

However, we are working with the Diocese of Sheffield, Clifford Infant and the two Ecclesall Schools to look at the implications of the enlargement of Ecclesall Infant School prior to coming out to consultation in the Summer. There are a number of potential options for the future which may help to support Clifford's vision of becoming a through primary school.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jackie".

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email

Dear Dr Habgood

Thank you very much for submitting your petition for Cabinet on Wednesday 9 March requesting that the sale of any part of Bannerdale be stopped prior to consultation on new school site plans.

I welcome the interest that has been generated about how the new school can be developed successfully on the Bannerdale site. We all want to see that the new school provides an outstanding education and that it can inspire families and young people living in the local area. So it is really important that we also get the physical development of the buildings right.

I am sure you will understand that we are at very early stages in that process. Our initial consideration of the site has assured us that the car park space is sufficient to accommodate the footprint of buildings required. However, as with any building scheme, we need to start with assessing the ground conditions and doing the technical exploration of the site. This will enable us to come up with options for the layout of the buildings.

As the Leader explained at the meeting, there is no decision at this point in time for the housing development to go ahead. The preferred developer of the housing site will need time to consider the Council's decision about the location of the school and we will need to work with them to explore how the two developments can work alongside each other. We are committed to a holistic approach to planning these developments so that we can optimise the layout and facilities provided on the wider site for all users. As part of this approach we will consider the access road and drainage elements you highlight.

Thank you for your continued interest in these proposals. I genuinely welcome your involvement and the passion you have shown about getting the right outcome for the new school.

All good wishes



**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email

Dear Ted


Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March.

I would like to explain that the decision that Cabinet took on 17 February was a statutory school organisation one to commission an 11-18 school for the South West of Sheffield. The car park area of the Bannerdale site is named in the recommendation because it is important that we state the location we are intending for the new school. However, no decisions were taken about the layout of the buildings or plans for the site.

I understand that you have concerns about the implications for the open space. I want to reassure you that this will form part of the next stage of the process which will be to work up the layout and design of the buildings as part of a holistic plan for the site. This will include developing plans for optimising the wider site and community usage, sporting and community facilities and access arrangements. These plans will be subject to planning approval during which full consideration will be given to any previous planning advice. The planning process allows for full public consultation on the plans once they are developed, and we are also committed to engaging with key stakeholders in the formative stage over the coming weeks.

So please be assured that you can continue to submit your views as part of this process and that we will be doing all we can to ensure that the development of a school will be an enhancement to the Bannerdale site.

All good wishes



Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Response by email



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Dear Neil

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March.

I understand your concerns about the complexity of the proposals, but as I explained at the meeting, we have no scope to defer the decision about commissioning a new secondary school for the South West. We need to deliver the additional school places by September 2018, and to delay any further would mean that the construction scheme would not meet that deadline.

However, the proposals for Ecclesall Infant which you are particularly concerned about will be subject to statutory consultation in the Summer Term and you will have the opportunity to put forward your views at that point. The plans for the physical development of the site and the impact on traffic will be assessed during the planning permissions stage which would follow if the proposals were approved.

I explained at the meeting the reason why schools have had to restrict access by the public to their playing fields and sites. I am sure you will understand that the safeguarding of children is the overriding priority and schools have had to introduce measures to manage that safeguarding responsibility in terms of access to their site.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jackie".

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Response by email

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Dear Umberto

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March. Your questions cover a number of issues which I will try and cover in turn.

I know there is disappointment that we could not support the Clifford proposal. It was not an issue of whether or not to invest in faith schools. There were two through school proposals put forward and unfortunately the Council could not support both of them. The Council has decided to propose a through school to match the expansion of places at Ecclesall Infant School and in so doing to enable 90 children per year to benefit from continuing their primary education within one school setting. This will be subject to statutory consultation in the Summer.

As we said at the meeting, I would be very happy to ask officers to explain the secondary school allocations to you. There was no scope to discuss the detail of that in the meeting. Silverdale was rebuilt under the BSF programme with 180 places, matching the capacity they had at the time. However, with the growth in pupils now coming through in the area, it is appropriate that we look again at the number of places they offer. The 60 additional places offered at Silverdale in September have been vital to enabling us to offer a local school place to children in the area.

In relation to the point at 6.9 of the report, as I confirmed at the meeting, we received a response to the consultation from the Ecclesall Schools that was quite clear that a through primary school was their preferred option. This view was also confirmed in meetings that I attended. I am therefore clear that the information in the Cabinet report was accurate. The consultation that follows in the Summer will enable everybody to express a view and any concerns about the way forward to be clarified.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Jackie'.

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016



Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Ms Ann Blair



Dear Ann

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March.

I can confirm that as Cabinet Member responsible for Children Young People and Families, I have had a detailed conversation with the Head and Chair of Governors of Clifford Infant School about their proposal. The document you highlighted at the meeting was presented to me at a meeting during the autumn consultation and I had the opportunity to look through it in detail before any decisions were taken at Cabinet in February.

Thank you for bringing it to my attention again.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jackie".

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016



**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward**

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Ms Marina Cerialdi



Dear Marina

Thank you for submitting your petition at Cabinet on 9 March objecting to the creation of a new through primary school on Ecclesall Infant School playground.

I do understand that there is a level of concern amongst the local residents about the prospect of increasing the size of Ecclesall Infant School. This came through clearly in autumn consultation in response to our proposal to increase the number of places offered at the Infant school. A number of residents attended one of our public workshops and helped to clarify these concerns very clearly. I am sorry if you felt the consultation did not alert enough local people, but I did get the feedback about your concerns very clearly.

We will ensure that when we come out to consultation in the Summer Term about the proposed enlargement we will make sure that local residents are alerted so that they can contribute their views. The consultation will need to be four weeks long because that is the legal requirement and the timing will allow for a decision by Cabinet in July. Please also note that if the proposal is approved, the plans for development of the buildings will be subject to planning permission and you will be able to have your say as part of that process too.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jackie".

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016

Ms Fiona Greensit

[REDACTED]



Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Dear Fiona

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 9 March. There are four points to your question which I will answer in turn:

1. On the issue of Clifford's option of expanding on Psalter Lane, there were two proposals put forward to create through schools. Unfortunately the Council could not support both of them. The Council has decided to create the through school to match the expansion of places at Ecclesall Infant School and in so doing to enable 90 children per year to benefit from continuing their primary education within one school setting.
2. We considered all the options for very carefully for making the extra secondary places available in the South West, including the expansion of the existing schools. The reason why it is necessary to commission a new school is that even if it were possible to expand all the local schools, it would simply not be enough places in the longer term for the number of children coming through the primary schools.
3. Ecclesall CE Junior School currently offers 240 places, and there is no change proposed. We are working with the Diocese of Sheffield to look at the implications of enlarging Ecclesall Infant School.
4. As I explained at the meeting, there is no change to the current arrangements that Clifford Infant feeds to Ecclesall CE Junior. The implications of enlarging Ecclesall Infant School will be worked through with the governing bodies prior to consultation in the summer and there will be further details at that point about how the process will be managed.

Thank you again for coming to the meeting.

All good wishes

Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD

Telephone: (0114) 273 5380

Email: jackie.drayton@sheffield.gov.uk

Your reference:

Our reference: JD/

Date: 11th April 2016



Cabinet Member for Children, Young People
and Families, Lifelong and Community
Learning and Councillor for
Burngreave Ward

Town Hall
Sheffield
S1 2HH

Mr Peter Scott
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Dear Peter

Thank you very much for attending and submitting your question at Scrutiny Committee on 9 March.

The main alternative option to adding junior places at Ecclesall Infant school was for Clifford Infant to have a junior phase by expanding in its current location on Psalter Lane. Both of these options were put forward during the consultation and the Council could only support one of them. Cabinet decided to propose consultation on a junior phase at Ecclesall Infant because there was already a need to increase the number of places offered at the Infant school. Ecclesall is where most parents said they wanted additional places in the area to be provided. The enlargement of Ecclesall Infant would mean that all of those children can continue within the same primary school up to Year 6 and benefit from that continuity of education.

We will be coming out to consultation on this proposal in the summer. As has been requested, we will make sure that the local residents are informed and can contribute their views.

All good wishes

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jackie".

**Councillor Jackie Drayton
CABINET MEMBER AND COUNCILLOR
FOR BURNGREAVE WARD**



Report to Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee Monday 18th July 2016

Report of: Executive Director Children, Young People & Family Support

Subject: The implications of 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' Government White Paper

Author of Report: Antony Hughes, Director, Inclusion and Learning Services and Children's Commissioner

Summary:

This report identifies the implications of the Government White Paper 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' published in March 2016 and specifically focuses on:

- The continuing role and responsibilities of the local authority in terms of education.
- The future role of governors – including in the context of academies
- The future role of Learn Sheffield.

This information has been requested by Cllr. Ian Saunders, Chair of the CYPFS Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee.

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

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	x
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:

- Have a clear understanding of the proposed changes to the role and functions of the Local Authority with regard to schools and education.
- Be aware of the future role of Learn Sheffield in working with partners to meet the requirements set out in the White Paper.

Background Papers:

'Educational Excellence Everywhere' – Government White Paper, March 2016

Category of Report: OPEN

Report of Executive Director Children, Young People & Family Support

Title of report: The implications of 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' Government White Paper.

1. Introduction/Context

1.1 In March the Government published its White Paper setting out its plans for further education reform over this Parliament. It builds on the recent Education and Adoption Act 2016, which significantly increased the powers of the Education Secretary and the eight Regional School Commissioners to intervene in schools.

The White Paper contains a clear policy aim that every school in England will become an Academy by 2022. This equates to roughly 15,000+ schools converting to Academy status over the next five years across the country. In Sheffield, it means approximately 111 schools to convert.

The Paper also clarifies the Government's stated policy around local authorities and education as well as the key commitments in the White Paper concerning schools.

2.1 The changing role of local authorities

The White Paper proposes that by 2022 local authorities will no longer maintain schools and their role will be redefined to focus on three core duties which are outlined below:

- 1. Ensuring every child has a school place:** including school organisation so that there are sufficient school, special school and alternative provision places to meet demand. However, Government will reserve the right to intervene if local authorities do not engage with the free school programme. Local authorities will be handed back control of co-ordinating all in-year admissions and appeals. The local authority will retain responsibility for school transport policies and "take the lead in crisis management and emergency planning"
- 2. Ensuring the needs of vulnerable pupils are met** – incorporating existing duties around Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND), safeguarding; promoting school attendance and tackling absence; ensuring that alternative provision is "available for headteachers to commission" for excluded pupils; Children Missing from Education; children at risk of radicalisation; working with schools on safeguarding; acting as corporate parent for looked after children and having a Virtual Head role.

- 3. Acting as champions for all parents and families** - including “working alongside elected mayors”; supporting parents through admissions; supporting parents of children with SEND and “co-producing local SEND policies, services and commissioning” and “championing high standards locally for all pupils”.

It is very likely that the three functions described above will result in local authorities retaining significant statutory duties relating to vulnerable pupils and school organisation. This will not become clear however, until the Government publishes its Education Bill.

- LAs are expected to encourage top performing multi-academy trusts (MATS) to support weaker schools and also set up new schools, with the approval of the Regional Schools Commissioners.
- The White paper states that “to retain expertise in the system and ensure children continue to benefit from the best talent in local authorities, we expect that some individuals working in local authority teams will leave to set up new trusts or join existing ones and become academy sponsors”
- The Government will “review local authority functions and responsibilities” including the “implications for the role of Director of Children’s Services and Lead Member for Children”. This will probably mean some deregulation of some existing duties around school improvement.
- For “maintained community schools” that convert, the land “will transfer to the Secretary of State, who will then grant a lease to the Academy trust”. This is very different from now, where the LA retains the land and leases to the Academy Trust.

Further legislation will be forthcoming shortly.

2.2 The future role of great leaders and governors

- There will be an increased focus on leadership development training, delivered by successful schools, including teaching school alliances and multi-academy trusts.
- Stronger expectations on governing boards to fill skills gaps, including through training and help to recruit skilled people.
- A new competency framework for governance in different contexts to be developed.
- A database to be established of everyone involved in governance.
- New legislation to be created so that unsuitable individuals can be barred from being governors of maintained schools. This is already the case in academies and independent schools.

2.3 The future role of Learn Sheffield

- During its first year of existence, Learn Sheffield has established strong relationships with schools in the primary, secondary and specialist sectors, regardless of schools’ maintained or academy status. This has been a real strength in its aim of improving outcomes for all Sheffield children.

- Learn Sheffield has further developed a school led system of school to school support through the brokering and commissioning of school improvement support from strong schools working with weaker schools and those identified as causing concern.
- Learn Sheffield has worked extensively with school leaders to identify a set of school improvement priorities and action plans which will form the structure of its work in the academic year 2016/17 and beyond.
- Learn Sheffield has built upon the existing locality based school networks to further strengthen joint partnership working across Sheffield in the key areas of school improvement.
- School leaders in the primary and secondary sectors are currently trialling a new school categorisation process ready for full implementation in September 2016. This work has been led and co-ordinated by Learn Sheffield and will identify the focus for school support next year.
- Learn Sheffield has co-ordinated and facilitated the work of the teaching school alliances, both Sheffield universities and local authority based teams so that schools across the city have access to a comprehensive range of professional development and support.
- Sheffield City Council officers continue to work in strong partnership with Learn Sheffield, holding it to account and ensuring support for schools, children and families is co-ordinated and effective.

3 What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?

- The Government White Paper heralds some significant changes to the role, responsibilities and funding of Local Authority services to schools. However, the LA will be expected to retain its responsibilities for vulnerable children and for school organisation. Many of the proposed changes have been anticipated here in Sheffield with the creation of Learn Sheffield.
- Learn Sheffield has made an excellent start to its work with schools to improve outcomes for all Sheffield children and the proportion of schools achieving good or better judgements from Ofsted is higher than it has ever been. Learn Sheffield is also well placed to consolidate its position in leading and driving the school improvement agenda in the next academic year and beyond.
- We continue to share our aim to ensure that each and every child fulfils their own potential and is supported to grow into confident young people, able to enjoy their life experiences and contribute positively to the economy and their community.

4 Recommendations

- To be aware of the implications of the White Paper for schools, the Local Authority, children and parents.
- Understand how the government White Paper 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' aligns with The Education and Adoption Act 2016.
- Agree how this report can contribute to any further work Scrutiny may wish to undertake with regard to the proposed educational legislation.



Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee Monday 18th July 2016

Report of: Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & policy Development Committee

Subject: Annual Meeting with Young People 2016 – Report & Recommendations

Author of Report: Diane Owens, Policy & Improvement Officer
0114 27 35065 diane.owens@sheffield.gov.uk

Summary:

In April 2016 the Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee held its annual meeting with young people. Members of the committee met with young people who represent the Sheffield UK Youth Parliament and Sheffield Youth Cabinet. This report outlines some of the key points raised during the session and makes a number of recommendations.

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	
Other: e.g. Scrutiny Committee- draft Report and recommendations	X

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Approve the report and recommendations as outlined in section 4.0

Background Papers: n/a

Category of Report: OPEN

Most reports to Scrutiny Committees should be openly available to the public. If a report is deemed to be 'closed', please add: **'Not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph xx of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).'**

Annual Meeting with Young People – April 2016

Report & Recommendations

1. Background

1.1 In April 2016 the Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & policy Development Committee held its annual meeting with young people.

1.2 The session was organised with Emma Hinchliffe, Young People's Involvement Worker, Sheffield Futures. The format was a series of short informal workshops, with 2 topics selected by the young people and 1 by the scrutiny committee

1.3 The session was attended by members of the Scrutiny Committee and 9 young people representing Sheffield UK Youth Parliament and Sheffield Youth Cabinet. The Young people were accompanied by 2 Youth Workers from Sheffield Futures, Emma Hinchliffe, Young People's Involvement Worker and Lee Raven, Young People's Involvement Worker. Sam Martin (Assistant Director - Lifelong Learning and Skills) and lead officer for the Children Young People and Families Portfolio on the Scrutiny Committee also attended the session.

1.4 In advance of the session the young people were asked to select the topics they would like to focus on, in return they asked that scrutiny select one topic. The 3 topics identified are as below:

- Curriculum / life skills
- Disability discrimination
- Measuring the impact of youth work (topic selected by scrutiny)

2. Matters for consideration

This report outlines some of the key points raised during the session and makes a series of recommendations.

Curriculum / life skills

- The PHSE curriculum needs to include topics such as mental health, politics, voting and life skills, such as setting up a bank account, paying a bill, understanding taxes etc.
- It should also include careers advice and job advice and support, including:
 - How to get a job
 - Developing your CV
 - Filling in an application form
- PHSE needs to be taught in primary schools with progression through to secondary
- The education system / curriculum has become too academia focussed, people also need to learn life skills and to be treated as individuals
- Foreign language needs to have high priority / parity with other subjects and be taught consistently and from an early age

Disability Discrimination

- A lot of disability is “hidden disability” e.g. mental health
- There needs to be more disability awareness raising and education in schools with both staff and young people
- There are still issues of labelling and stigmatization
- The cuts to disability funding including SEN are a real issue and impact on education

Measuring the Impact of Youth Work

- Provision needs to have inclusive activities and not just be physically based e.g. music,
- There isn't enough provision, especially in some areas of the city where there is little / no activity
- We need to capture positive case studies and hear directly from young people themselves
- Should we have a common framework for all youth work providers? If so, what would SCC's role in this be?

3 What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Committee welcomed the opportunity to hear the views of a group of young people in Sheffield. Many of whom are actively involved in voice and influence work and advocate the views of young people in Sheffield.

4. Recommendations

That the Committee approve the report and the following recommendations;

- 4.1 That this report is shared with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families Cllr Jackie Drayton, the Executive Director for Children, Young People & Families Jayne Ludlam and Stephen Betts, Learn Sheffield, Interim Chief Executive and that they are asked to consider the points raised in terms of future planning and developments.
- 4.2 That this report and the full notes from the session are shared with the Disability Hub, which is part of [Sheffield Council's Equality Hub Network](#)
- 4.3 That the Scrutiny Committee adds the topic of “Emotional Health & Wellbeing in Schools” to its work programme for 2016/17.
- 4.4 That the committee continue to engage with young people as part of their ongoing work throughout the year.
-

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

Monday 18th July 2016

Report of: Policy & Improvement Officer

Subject: Work Programme 2016/17

Author of Report: Diane Owens, Policy and Improvement Officer
diane.owens@sheffield.gov.uk
0114 273 5065

A draft work programme is attached at Appendix 1 for the Committee's consideration and discussion

The proposed work programme aims to focus on a small number of issues, in depth. This means that the Committee will need to prioritise the issues which will be included on formal meeting agendas. In doing this, the Committee may wish to reflect on the prioritisation principles attached at Appendix 2 to ensure that scrutiny activity is focussed where it can add most value.

Where an issue is not appropriate for inclusion on a meeting agenda, but there is significant interest from members, the Committee can choose to request a written briefing.

The work programme remains a live document and is brought to each committee meeting.

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Consider and discuss the committees work programme for 2016/17
- Provide comment / feedback on the draft work programme
- Identify priority topics for inclusion in the work programme

**Children, Young People & Family Support Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee
Draft Work Programme 2016-17**

Chair: Cllr Ian Saunders

Vice Chair: Cllr Steve Ayris

[Meeting Papers on SCC Website](#)

Meeting day/ time: Monday 1-4pm

Please note: the work programme is a live document and so is subject to change.

Topic	Reasons for selecting topic	Lead Officer/s
Monday 18th July 1-4pm		
The implications of 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' Government White Paper	To understand the implications of the 2016 government White Paper, including the continuing role of the local authority in education and the future role for governors and of Learn Sheffield (Sheffield's not for profit schools company).	Antony Hughes, Children's Commissioner & Director of Inclusion & Learning Pam Smith, Head of Primary & Targeted Intervention Stephen Betts, Learn Sheffield, Interim Chief Executive – tbc
Annual Meeting with Young People 2016 – Report & Recommendations	To provide feedback on the committees meeting with young people that took place in April 2016.	Diane Owens, Policy & Improvement Officer
Draft Work Programme 2016-17	To consider and discuss the committees work programme for 2016/17.	Diane Owens, Policy & Improvement Officer

Monday 19th September 2016

Children & Families Act 2014 (& SEN Services & Support)

The Committee last received an update on the [Children & Families Act in September 2015](#) and requested a further update in 12 months' time.

This report would outline further progress with regards to implementing the requirements of the Children & Families Act 2014; the committee could also choose to focus on 1-2 specific areas, including:

1. SEN services and support
2. The implications of the act and progress with regards to young carers.

The report could also outline the new Ofsted framework for inspection.

SEN Services & Support - meeting with parents:

A sub group of the committee (3/4 members) can meet with a small group of parents prior to this session to discuss their experiences of SEN services and support.

This session would take place w/c 12th September at a local school between 10am-2pm.

Dorne Collinson, Director of Children and Families

Alasdair Duerden, Programme Manager, SEN Reforms

Other attendee's tbc.

Agenda item 2?

Monday 21st November 2016

Page 52

<p>Emotional Health & Wellbeing in Sheffield Schools</p>	<p>The proposal to look at this topic in part reflects a recommendation in the report following the committee's annual meeting with young people in April 2016.</p> <p>Research has shown that the mental health of teenagers can be put at risk in numerous ways, often leading to stress-related illnesses such as, depression, eating disorders and self-harm. The Department for Education, working with NHS England, has allocated £3.2m of funding for 22 pilot areas to help promote the emotional health wellbeing of pupils; Sheffield is one of these pilot areas. Sheffield is also one of only five places nationally to be selected to pilot a study addressing the mental health needs of the most vulnerable young people in schools. The aim of the pilot is to create stronger working relationships between schools and CAMHS with each learning from the other.</p> <p>The committee could receive a report on the work taking place across this area and provide comment.</p>	<p>Depending on the focus, possible individuals / organisations to engage with include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ STAMP (Support, Think, Act, Motivate, Participate). STAMP is a group of young people aged 14-25 who are working to improve the mental health and emotional wellbeing of young people across the City. ○ Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) ○ Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust ○ Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) ○ HealthWatch Sheffield ○ A local School involved in the pilot study.
<p>Agenda item 2?</p>		
<p>Briefing Paper Sheffield Parent Carer Forum, State of Sheffield 2014 Report - update report</p>	<p>To receive a further update (following on from the report in January 2016) with regards to the actions taken and responses to Sheffield Parent Carer Forum's State of Sheffield 2014 Report.</p>	<p>Tim Bowman, Head of Inclusion and Targeted Services</p>

Monday 19th December 2016		
<p>Attainment 2015-16 – citywide attainment outcomes in schools & academies</p>	<p>The committee will receive a detailed report on the attainment statistics for Sheffield schools and academics, including analysis in terms of the available national data / comparators. The last report was received in January 2016.</p> <p>Linked to this item we will run a Data Analysis Training Session - as outlined in the training section below.</p>	<p>Antony Hughes, Children's Commissioner & Director of Inclusion & Learning</p> <p>Pam Smith, Head of Primary & Targeted Intervention</p> <p>Kate Wilkinson, Service Manager - Performance & Analysis Service</p> <p>Other attendees tbc</p>
<p>Briefing Paper CYP&FS Prevent Task Group – an update in response to the recommendations contained in the Task Groups report</p>	<p>During 2015-16 the Committee set up a Task Group. The focus of its review was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To understand the implications of the recent Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 in terms of the statutory requirements around Prevent and the implications for children and young people. - To consider how we are responding to this in Sheffield and identify any recommendations <p>The committee will receive an update report from the service in response to the 10 recommendations outlined in the Committees Prevent Task Group report.</p>	<p>Sam Martin, Assistant Director - Lifelong Learning and Skills</p>

Monday 20th February 2017

Sheffield Children's Safeguarding Board - Annual Report 2015-16

The Committee consider this report on an [annual basis](#) to enable them to consider priorities and performance over the past 12 months.

Jane Haywood, Chair of the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board
Victoria Horsefield, Assistant Director, CYPF - Children and Families
Other officers tbd

Sheffield Sexual Exploitation Service Annual Report 2015-16

To consider the work of the Sexual Exploitation Service and partner agencies working to address child sexual exploitation (the last report was received in [November 2015](#)).

Jane Haywood, Chair of the Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board
Victoria Horsefield, Assistant Director, CYPF - Children and Families
Other officers tbd

Agenda item 3?

Page 54

Monday 3rd April 2017		
<p>Youth Services in Sheffield</p> <p>Skills development in Sheffield</p> <p>(This will be presented as 2 separate reports)</p> <p>Page 55</p>	<p>To understand the latest developments in terms of work to look at the future of youth services in Sheffield. This follows a report received by the Committee in March 2016 on "Youth Services in Sheffield", which the committee requested a further update on.</p> <p>The Sheffield City Region Devolution Deal would give the region £1.3 billion to spend over the next 30 years. The Deal would offer new powers and funding to improve infrastructure, transport, skills, housing and other drivers of business growth. In terms of improving skills this would mean investing in education infrastructure, better skills, employment and adult education</p> <p>The committee could receive a report to enable them to understand the implications of these proposals and future developments specifically in terms of skills development for young people.</p>	<p>Sam Martin, Assistant Director - Lifelong Learning and Skills</p> <p>Other officers tbd</p> <p>Tony Tweedy, Director - Lifelong Learning and Skills</p> <p>Other officers tbd</p>
Agenda item 3?		
<p>Briefing Paper Adoption Annual Report</p>	<p>The committee receive an annual report to enable them to consider priorities and performance over the past 12 month.</p> <p>The committee could also look at the implications of the 2016 Children & Social Work Bill in terms of adoption and fostering services.</p>	<p>John Banwell, Assistant Director - Provider Services</p>
<p>Briefing Paper Fostering Annual Report</p>	<p>As above (the last report was considered in march 2016).</p>	<p>John Banwell, Assistant Director - Provider Services</p>

Training etc.		
<p>Data analysis training session (attainment data)</p> <p>1-2 hour training session to be held in the Town Hall</p>	<p>This session will be held prior to the committee considering the attainment report on 19th December.</p> <p>The Policy & Improvement Officer will liaise with colleagues in Performance & Analysis to arrange this session.</p>	<p>Diane Owens, Policy & Improvement Officer</p>

Selecting Scrutiny topics

This tool is designed to assist the Scrutiny Committees focus on the topics most appropriate for their scrutiny.

- **P**ublic Interest
The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny;
- **A**bility to Change / Impact
Priority should be given to issues that the Committee can realistically have an impact on, and that will influence decision makers;
- **P**erformance
Priority should be given to the areas in which the Council, and other organisations (public or private) are not performing well;
- **E**xtent
Priority should be given to issues that are relevant to all or large parts of the city (geographical or communities of interest);
- **R**eplication / other approaches
Work programmes must take account of what else is happening (or has happened) in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort. Alternatively, could another body, agency, or approach (e.g. briefing paper) more appropriately deal with the topic

Other influencing factors

- **Cross-party** - There is the potential to reach cross-party agreement on a report and recommendations.
- **Resources**. Members with the Policy & Improvement Officer can complete the work needed in a reasonable time to achieve the required outcome

This page is intentionally left blank