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## Recommendations:

A. That the Children and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Panel discuss and comment on the current levels of performance set out in the attached report.

## 1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 To provide the Overview and Scrutiny Panel with regular data on the performance of Children, Schools and Families Department and key partners.

2 DETAILS
2.1 At the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel meeting on 5th June 2007 it was agreed that the Children, Schools and Families Department would submit a regular performance report on a range of key performance indicators. This would act as a 'health check' for the panel and would be over and above more detailed performance reports relating to specific areas of the Department's activities - eg annual school standards report; safeguarding performance reports - which the Panel would continue to receive.
2.2.1 This indicator set has subsequently been refreshed. It reports data as available at the end of November 2011. Commentary is provided for measures where performance is not reaching targets set or where particularly good performance is being achieved. The data report is appendix1
2.2.2 The index is currently being reviewed. Appendix 2 shows the proposed new set for discussion, appendix 3 briefly describes the process behind the proposed set, appendix 4 contains current CSF indicators from which this proposed set was picked.

## CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE

## Line 2 and 3 Initial Assessments completed within 10 days and Core Assessments completed within 35 days

The last three months has seen a steady rise in completion rates within prescribed timescales for both initial and core assessments. There are reasonable caseloads within the team and the quality of assessments produced is improving.
For initial assessments there has been a significant upturn in performance in this area over the last quarter (92\% October, 93\% November and 96\% December). This is as a result of management action and sustained efforts of social workers.

Core Assessment completion rates are improving steadily, but remain a challenge. December figures are above target at $76 \%$. There is a continued focus on timescales and quality.

## Line 7 Children subject to a child protection plan for a second or subsequent time

The 2010/2011 outturn was $13.5 \%$, which is in line with national rates. The year to date figure is $8.2 \%$

## Line 10 \% of reviews held for Children in Care

Performance is at $96 \%$ well above the national rate of $91 \%$. 2 reviews were missed in October, one was late due to a placement move and the other was cancelled due to transfer to the Youth Justice Service.

Line 12 Number of children in care adopted during the year (includes SGOs)
To date 8 CYP have achieved permanency ( 6 adopted, 2 SGO). Currently there are 5 CYP either placed for adoption or in the process of receiving SGO's within this financial year..

## YOUTH INCLUSION

## Lines 13 Youth Re-offending rates

The definition for this measure is changing, the Youth Justice board will be supplying the definition and data in due course. The previous method was to take the cohort of first time offenders at the start of the year, and track how many offences this cohort committed on a quarterly basis, the number of offence was then divided by the number of young people in the cohort to give the indicator.

## Line 15 First Time Entrants to the Youth Justice System

Youth Justice - prevention services linking YISP/FIP/Parenting support and Triage to the police has significantly brought down first time entry to the
criminal justice system again a 59\% fall over 3 years. With the move to Sutton police station we need to ensure Triage relationships continue. There was an increase in Quarter 2.

## EDUCATION

## Line 19 Outcomes of School Inspections

28 of 43 schools are rated good or outstanding by Ofsted under the regime introduced in 2009. Performance has been revised to include schools previously rated good or outstanding who had inspections deferred in the current round as the performance data shows continued high levels of achievement.

Currently 73\% of Merton schools are rated as good or outstanding.

## SAFETY

## Line 23 CYP Road Accidents

The 2011 data shows there were 3 serious casualties this year compared to 2 last year and a $41 \%$ increase in slight injuries. It should be noted that the cohort size is small, which means small change affects the \% change significantly. All accidents happened away from designated crossing points. Though we are dealing with low figures all casualties are cause for concern and investigation.

## 3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

3.1The Panel's scrutiny work programme is determined by the members of the Panel

## 4. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.1 The Panel has agreed to consider the performance report on an annual basis
5. TIMETABLE
5.1 None relating to this covering report

## 6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None relating to this covering report
7. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS
7.1 None relating to this covering report
8. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS
8.1 None relating to this covering report
9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS
9.1 None relating to this covering report
10. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS
10.1 None relating to this covering report
11. APPENDICES - THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS

REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT •
Appendix 1 Performance data sheet
Appendix 2 Proposed new indicator set
Appendix 3 Scrutiny Performance index review - process

Appendix 4 Current CSF indicators - long list
12 BACKGROUND PAPERS
12.1. None

| Line | Indicator | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Merton } \\ 2009-10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | National <br> Average <br> 2010-11 <br> 2010-11 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Target } \\ \text { 2011-12 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Merton } \\ 2010-2011 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | April | May | June | Quarter 1 | July | August | September | Quarter 2 | October | November | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Traffic } \\ & \text { Light } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Childrens Social Care |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Rate per 10,000 Child Protection Plans | 30.9 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 28.6 | 26.8 | 25.1 | 28.4 |  | 29.1 | 30.0 | 26.8 |  | 30.3 | 30.3 | $\leftrightarrow$ |  |
| 2 | \% of initial assessments completed within 10 days |  | 79.6\% | 75\% | 63\% | 43\% | 29\% | 44\% | 38\% (YTD) | 58\% | 52\% | 69\% | 48\% (YTD) | 92\% | 93\% | $\uparrow$ | YTD 58\% |
| 3 | \% of core assessments completed within 35 days | 61\% | 75\% | 75\% | 65\% | 54\% | 35\% | 57\% | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \% \\ & \text { (YTD) } \end{aligned}$ | 64\% | 40\% | 48\% | 54\% (YTD) | 73\% | 59\% | $\downarrow$ | YTD 56\% |
| 4 | \% of Children with a Child Protection Plan with allocated a social worker | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | $\leftrightarrow$ |  |
| 5 | \% of reviews completed within timescale for Children with Child Protection Plans | 100\% | 97\% | 100\% | 99\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | $\leftrightarrow$ |  |
| 6 | \% of Children with Child Protection Plans visits due completed on time (Child Seen) | 89\% |  | 93\% | 94\% | 97\% | 99\% | 94\% |  | 95\% | 91\% | 97\% |  | 93\% | 94\% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| 7 | Children subject to a child protection plan for a second or subsequent time | 8\% | 13.5\% | 10-17\% | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 13 \% \\ (16 / 119) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 33\% (2/6) | 0\% | 0\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6.4\% } \\ & \text { (YTD) } \end{aligned}$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% (YTD) | 0\% | 38\% (5/13) | $\uparrow$ | YTD 8.2\% |
| 8 | Rate per 10,000 Children in Care | 33.0 | 59.0 | 35.0 | 31.4 | 30.7 | 31.0 | 32.4 |  | 31.7 | 32.1 | 32.4 |  | 31.9 | 31.0 | $\downarrow$ |  |
| 9 | \% of Children in Care with allocated social worker | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | $\leftrightarrow$ |  |
| 10 | \% of reviews held for Children in Care | 98\% | 91\% | 100\% | 98\% | 100\% | 97\% | 98\% |  | 97\% | 97\% | 97\% |  | 95\% | 96\% |  |  |
| 11 | Number of Children in Care using in-house foster care | 52 |  | N/A | 53 | 50 | 48 | 55 |  | 49 | 53 | 51 |  | 53 | 47 | $\downarrow$ |  |
| 12 | \% of Children in Care adopted/SGO during the year | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \% \\ & \text { (3yrs) } \end{aligned}$ | 12 CYP | 10\% (11) | 1 (1\%) | 3\% (3) | 3\% (3) |  | 3\% (3) | 4\% (4) | 4\% (4) |  | 6\% (6) | 8\% (8) | $\uparrow$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Youth Inclusion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Young people re-offending (from 4 cohorts presented as one number) | 96\% | TBC | 1.03 | 1.01 |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| 14 | The proportion of Youth Offenders who are in education, training or employment | 89\% | 73\% | 85\% | 88\% |  |  |  | 93\% |  |  |  | 92\% | N/A | N/A | $\downarrow$ |  |
| 15 | First Time Entrants to the youth Justice system (aged 10-17) | 188 |  | 200 | 144 |  |  |  | 20 (YTD) |  |  |  | 58 (YTD) | N/A | N/A | $\uparrow$ |  |
| 16 | Youth Service: Participation | 2,102 |  | 1,700 | 2,531 |  |  |  | 363 (YTD) |  |  |  | 708 (YTD) | N/A | N/A | $\uparrow$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Number of Pupil Exclusions Permanent Secondary | 19 |  | 0.15\% |  | 11 (0.14\%)1 | 12 (0.15\% | 15 (0.19\%) |  | 18 (0.22\%) | 24 (0.35\%) | 0\% |  | 0.00\% | 0.01\% (1) | $\uparrow$ | August figure is 10/11 outturn 3 to date in Dec ( $0.04 \%$ ). Additional 6PEx in process. <br> Bishopsford 2; Rutlish 4; Raynes Park 2; Ricards Lodge 1. |
| 18 | Number of BME Pupil Exclusions Permanent Secondary | 9 |  | N/A |  | 7 (0.14\%) | 7 (0.14\%) | 7 (0.14\%) |  | 8 (0.16\%) | 12 (0.29\% | 0\% |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |
| 19 | Outcome of School Inspections \% Outstanding/Good | 38\% | TBC | 60\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% |  | 67\% | 67\% | 65\% |  | 64\% | 65\% | $\uparrow$ | All schools = 73\% |
| 20 | Number of families living in $30 \%$ most deprived communities taking up universal services in children's centres |  |  | 2,891 | 2,395 |  |  |  | 1,342 |  |  |  | 2567 (YTD) | N/A | N/A | $\uparrow$ |  |
| 21 | Statements issued within 26 weeks without exceptions | 87\% | 83\% | 89\% | 91\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | N/A | N/A | $\uparrow$ |  |
| 22 | Statements issued within 26 weeks with and without exceptions | 90\% | 91\% | 89\% | 85\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 92.5\% | N/A | N/A | $\uparrow$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | CYP Road accidents - reported incidents Fatal/Serious/Slight | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 0/1/13 |  |  |  |  |  | 0/3/44 |  |  |  |  | Killed/Serious/Slight - January to September |

Appendix 2 - draft data


## Appendix 3 Scrutiny Performance Index Review

The panel requested a review of the performance index at the meeting on June $15^{\text {th }} 2011$.

Cllr James Holmes was designated as performance champion and agreed to work along with the chair ClIr Jeff Hanna and Michael Sutherland.

Two meetings have been held.
In the first meeting the approach was agreed. This was:-

- To compile a list of all key measures relating to Children's Services, excluding a raft of annual measures mostly relating to educational outcomes
- To indicate which of these indicators may potentially be benchmarked against statistical neighbours
- To indicate which indicators were reported to accountable central government departments
- To indicate the current traffic light status of measures were available.

This long list is included in appendix 4
At the second meeting a potential set of indicators was agreed
Indicators were chosen on the basis of

- Indicators which remain of consistent interest to the panel
- Traffic light status, most red and amber indicators were chosen
- Indicators which are a key focus of external accountability
- Indicators that will not be reported elsewhere -e.g annual education standards report
- Where possible indicators which can be compared
- Coverage of CSF activities

The draft list is included in appendix 2
This draft list requires potential amendment and agreement of the panel.

Appendix 4
Children's Social Care (Family Support, LAC and Safeguarding)

| Nu | PI | Stats |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Item 8 - appendix 4

| Nu | PI | Stats | Target |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Nu | PI | Stats | Target |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 81 | Numbers of CAFs |  |  |  |  |
| 82 | CAF - total number of professionals acting as lead practicioner |  |  |  |  |
| 83 | The percentage of looked after children at 31 March placed outside LA <br> boundary and more than 20 miles from where they used to live | y |  |  |  |
| 84 | The percentage of children looked after who went missing from care <br> during the year as a percentage of all children looked after during the year | y |  |  |  |
| 85 | The percentage of sessions missed due to overall absences for children <br> who have been looked after continuously for at least twelve months at 31 <br> March | y |  |  |  |
| 86 | The proportion of school-age looked after children who were attending a <br> school that was assessed as being below the floor targets at Key Stage 2 <br> or Key Stage 4 | y |  |  |  |
| 87 | The percentage of young people aged 19 who were looked after aged 16 <br> who were in higher education | y |  |  |  |

Youth Inclusion (Youth Service, Youth Justice, NEETs, Behaviour and Attendance)

| Nu | PI | Stats <br> Nieghbour | Target <br> 2011-12 |  | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NI 19 - Rates of Re-offending per 100 offenders | y | 1.03 | YJB |  |
| 2 | NI 43 - Young people within the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody | y | 7\% | YJB |  |
| 3 | NI 44 - Ethnic composition of offenders on youth justice system disposals | y |  | YJB |  |
| 4 | \% Young Offenders EET | y | 85\% | YJB |  |
| 5 | NI 46 - Young Offenders Access to accommodation | y |  | YJB |  |
| 6 | NI 111 - First Time Entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 | y |  | YJB |  |
| 7 | Total YJS caseload |  |  | YJB |  |
| 8 | New YJS cases |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Number of young people on remand in secure accommodation (STC's) |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | YJS Caseload per worker |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Youth Service Contacts |  | 2800 | Ofsted |  |
| 12 | Youth Service Participation rate (for 11/12 aged 11 upwards) |  | 1700 | Ofsted |  |
| 13 | Youth Service Accredited Outcomes |  | deleted |  |  |
| 14 | Primary School Attendance | y |  | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 15 | Primary School Persistent absence |  |  | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 16 | Secondary School Attendance | y |  |  |  |
| 17a | Secondary School Persistent absence (includes academies), 2.5 terms |  |  | DFE/Ofsted | Amber |
| 17b | Secondary School Persistent absence (LA) |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4.8 \% \\ \text { (service } \\ \text { plan) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DFE/Ofsted | Amber |
| 18 | Referrals to EWS |  |  | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 19 | EWS caseload |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Fixed Term Exclusions - Primary |  |  | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 21 | Fixed Term Exclusions - Secondary |  |  | DFE/Ofsted | Red |
| 22 | Permanent Exclusions - Primary |  |  | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 23 | Permanent Exclusions - Secondary | y | 0.15\% | DFE/Ofsted | Red |
| 24 | NI 117-16-18 year old NEETs | y | 5.6\% | DFE/Ofsted | Amber |
| 25 | NI 117-16-18 year old Not Knowns | y |  | DFE/Ofsted | Amber |
| 26 | NI 148 Care Leavers EET | y | 66\% | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 27 | NI 147 Care leavers in suitable accommodation | y | 100\% | DFE/Ofsted |  |

Education (SEN, Early Years, Extended Services, School Standards and Quality)

| Nu | PI | Stats <br> Nieghbour | Target 2011-12 |  | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NI 103A - Statements issued within 26 weeks without exceptions | y | 89\% | DFE |  |
| 2 | NI103B - Statements issued within 26 weeks with and without exceptions | y | 89\% | DFE |  |
| 3 | New Statements issued in year - overall |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | New Statements issued in year - non Merton maintained |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Total Statements - overall |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Total Statements - non Merton maintained |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | SEN Tribunals - Lodged and withdrawn or setteld (split by LA maintained, out of borough maintained, independent) (A) |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | SEN Tribunals upheld ((split by LA maintained, out of borough maintained, independent) |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | a) \% Tribunals as a result of review |  |  |  |  |
|  | b) \% attended by LA staff |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Vacancy Rate - ARPs in maintained schools |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SEN Transport cost - Cabs, Buses, escorts |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | SEN Out of Borough spend - independent and maintained |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | SEN Gap KS2 | y | 49\% | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 14 | SEN Gap GCSE | y | 45\% | DFE/Ofsted |  |
| 15 | Provision of Short Breaks |  | 430 | DFE |  |
| 15 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Childrens centres | y | 75\% | Ofsted |  |
| 16 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Child Minder | y | 66\% | Ofsted | Amber |
| 17 | Number of childminders good or better in areas of deprivation (30\% IDACI) (of those inspected on Early Years Register) |  | 60\% | Ofsted |  |
| 18 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Child Care - non domestic | y | 79\% | Ofsted |  |
| 19 | Number of childcare good or better in areas of deprivation (30\% IDACI) (of those inspected on Early Years Register) |  | 96\% | Ofsted |  |
| 20 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Nursery \& EYFS Primary | y | 81\% | Ofsted |  |
| 21 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Primary | y |  | Ofsted |  |
| 22 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Secondary | y |  | Ofsted | Red |
| 23 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - Special | $y$ |  | Ofsted |  |
| 24 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better -Primary/Secondary/Special | y | 60\% | Ofsted |  |
| 25 | \% Ofsted inspection score good or better - PRU |  |  | Ofsted |  |
| 26 | Number of CYP benefitting from parents taking up evidenced based programmes - CAF, R4S |  | $\begin{gathered} 400,160 \\ (40 \%) \text { on } \\ \text { CAF } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Payment by Results? |  |
| 27 | \% of total 0-4 year estimated ACORN estimated population whose families have accessed children's centre services |  | 60\% | Payment by Results? |  |
| 28 | \% of total 0-4 year estimated ACORN estimated population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30\%) whose families have accessed children's centre services |  | 60\% | Payment by Results? |  |
| 29 | \% of all children whose families have accessed children's centre services who live in areas of deprivations ( $30 \%$ IDACI) |  | 39\% | Payment by Results? |  |

Item 8 - appendix 4

| Nu | PI | Stats | Target |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Commissioning, Strategy and Performance

| Nu | PI | Stats <br> Neigbour | Target <br> 2011-12 |  | Red |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Number of Primary Appeals |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Number of Primary Appeals upheld |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Number of Secondary Appeals |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Number of Secondary Appeals upheld |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Surplus Places - Primary Schools |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Surplus Places - Primary Reception Year |  | 5\% |  |  |
| 7 | Surplus Places - Secondary Schools |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Surplus Places - Secondary Schools Year 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Number of Children without a school place - Primary |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Number of Children without a school place - Secondary |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Casual Admissions logged |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Admissions - Offers to places within regional timescales |  | 100\% |  |  |
| 13 | Contracts Quarterly monitoring - \% G/A/R |  | 95\% |  |  |
| 14 | Capital Projects on time - \% G/A/R |  | 90\% |  |  |
| 15 | Capital projects - to cost |  | 90\% |  |  |
| 16 | Number of R+I reports completed on time |  | 95\% |  |  |
| 17 | Number of R+I data collections completed |  | 100\% |  |  |
| 18 | R+I SLA buyback rate from Schools |  | 95.0\% |  |  |
| 19 | YMT Hits |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Numbers Attending parenting classes |  |  |  |  |

