Merton Council Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

27 June 2018

Supplementary agenda

| 7 | Task group review: employment of vulnerable cohorts recommendations | 1 - 14 |
|---|---|---------|
| 8 | Department update report | 15 - 22 |



Committee: Children and Young Peoples Scrutiny Group

Date: 27th June 2018

Wards: ALL

Subject: Routes to employment for vulnerable cohorts - six month review

Lead officer: Director for Environment and Regeneration, Chris Lee

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Environmental

Sustainability and Regeneration.

Contact officer: Sara Williams, futureMerton, Programme Manager for Business and

Economy

Recommendations:

A. The Panel review the attached action plan (Appendix 1) detailing progress on the Children and Young Peoples Scrutiny Panel's Action Plan: vulnerable cohorts into employment task group recommendations report presented 17th January 2018.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a six month review of the agreed action plan to the Children and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny (CTPOS) Panel to demonstrate how the recommendations of the routes to employment for vulnerable cohorts Task Group have been implemented.
- 1.2 It is also to provide a response to member questions where it was agreed that the officer will explore further why it's not possible to ensure through standard contract terms that contractors and service providers offer apprenticeships for Merton residents.
- 1.3 To provide some case studies of the support delivered by Children Schools and Families (CSF) Youth Inclusion team to deliver opportunities for work experience and employment programmes for some of our vulnerable young people.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1. At their meeting on 21st October 2015, the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel decided to dedicate a task group activity to look at the support provided for vulnerable cohorts. Initially, the Panel took a broad approach considering:
 - The housing and health offer for care leavers and looked after children to prevent homelessness and unemployment; and
 - Educational attainment for disabled children and young people.

- 2.2. However, the Panel, as a result of its initial research, determined that the task group should focus more specifically on the support provided for vulnerable cohorts to progress into employment. By vulnerable cohorts the Panel agreed that this should specifically mean children and young people in care/care leavers and/or those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). The report and recommendations resulting from the task group review was presented on 20th March 2017.
- 2.3. The response and action plan were presented back to the Panel on 10th January 2018. The Panel requested a review six months into the action plan. The updates can be found on Appendix 1.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1. At the time of the January 2018 report the Panel were advised that Merton has 190 looked after children and care leavers of which 60 are not in employment education or training (NEET) There were 420 SEND young people of which 34 were seeking employment.
- 3.2. There were also 210 looked after young people and care leavers above statutory school age and 64 NEET'. The net target group equated to 158 young people requiring support with employment.
- 3.3. The Panel set out seven recommendations around supporting the vulnerable groups agreeing that this should specifically mean children and young people in care/care leavers and/or those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).
- 3.4. Many of the actions focus on Merton as the employer as well as Merton's ability to support residents through local procurement contracts. Partners support is recognised through the Sustainable Communities and Transport Partnership, in particular the partnership work carried out through the Economic Wellbeing Group (EWG).
- 3.5. Merton reviews opportunities to up skill and generate jobs for local people through major procurement contracts on a case-by-case basis, given that not all contracts lend themselves to providing these types of opportunities. For example, we will be seeking the use of local labour supply and/or apprenticeships when we go out to tender for our Highways contract later this year. We will also seek such opportunities when going out to tender through the Council's newly formed, wholly owned, Housing Company. Some examples of case by case work undertaken are included in Appendix 1 (Recommendation 2).

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options offered at this stage.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.1 The actions were discussed between officers in human resources, Looked After Children Permanency and Placements, Education Inclusion, Joint Commissioning and Partnerships, Commercial Services, futureMerton and Public Health.

4.2 The EWG were consulted during the Scrutiny Review and have been kept updated on proposed recommendations. The EWG Indicator Set acts as a list of the activities being delivered by the partners which supports routes to employment for the vulnerable clients concerned.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1 The Action Plan was presented in January 2018 and the Panel requested an update in June 2018. Please see the attached Appendix 1 for proposed dates on reporting outcomes/outputs back to Scrutiny.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The proposals were made in the main with the expectation that the actions can be implemented using existing resources. However, there are financial implications to implement Recommendations 2, 5 and 6.
- 6.2 The Panel should note that the cost to cover salaries (circa £14k per apprentice) and any necessary financial support for the target groups is required to meet Recommendations 2 and 5.
- 6.3 Any changes to the way in which we procure which has a cost implication to the Council (as suggested under Recommendation 6) will need to go to Procurement Board for approval prior to being considered by any other panel / forum.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The council has extensive legal duties with regard to LAC and care leavers – more to be added.

7.2 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

Supporting these vulnerable groups into employment is in line with the Council Human Rights, Equalities and community cohesion requirements. The Council acts as the corporate parent for looked after children and care leavers and as such has a responsibility to provide parental guidance in seeking and obtaining employment.

8 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Reducing unemployment can lead to the reduction in crime.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 None.

10 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

Appendix 1 - CYPOS Panel's Action plan: vulnerable cohorts into employment – six month review.

11 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 CYPOS Panel's Corporate Parenting Report found here
- 11.2 CYPOS Panel's monitoring of the recommendations made by the task group on routes into employment for vulnerable young people which you can view here (February 2017)
- 11.3 CYPOS Panel's Action plan: vulnerable cohorts into employment task group recommendations report found here (January 2018)
- 11.4 Apprenticeship funding: rules and guidance for employers version2 published May 2017 found here
- 11.5 Adult Skills and Employability 2013, Recommendation 3 (here) and Post 16 Career Pathways 2012 here

| Recommendation 1 | Actions - Pathways | Leads | Status – June 2018 |
|--|--|---|---|
| Recommendation 1 We recommend exploration of how to audit, keep updated and make accessible (to residents and all these working with vulnerable cohorts) information on current provision to support progression into mployment. | Merton web pages – Apprenticeship vacancies on recruitment pages A newly created "Young Merton" webpage which updates on events and shares any known apprenticeship vacancies. A further page awaiting IT sign off will provide links and information to local jobs and routes to employment via employment programmes, linking to local employers and training providers. 1EWG - Alerts for any internal apprenticeship vacancies are shared with the EWG partners via email to circulate to their clients. A list of programmes/services being delivered by EWG partners and the anticipated outcomes is shared amongst partners. HR - Alongside HR have an arrangement to liaise with social/key workers and prioritise any vulnerable young person's application for interview plus offer support around the recruitment process. | HR My Futures futureMerton EWG | The social media pages for My Futures have just been signed off and are being set up by IT. Monthly meeting of key works supporting NEET young people identifies cohorts and sets up bespoke provision to meet their needs. Alerts for internal apprenticeships are being circulated amongst the EWG partners as vacancies for roles become available Services are listed for EWG members in a shared Indicator Set managed through futureMerton. HR continues to liaise with social/key workers on apprenticeship opportunities as they arise. |

1

¹ Economic Well Being Group

| | Provide numbers of • work experience placements • apprentices by directorate. Sub-set data: • LAC supported and • SEND supported. | HR My Futures | The Council has launched a work experience programme and its aim is to offer 30 placements to LAC, schools and residents who live in the borough but attend school elsewhere.HR will evaluate scheme in August 2018 and consider a programme with young people. |
|--|---|------------------------|---|
| Recommendation 2 | Actions - Pathways | Lead | Status |
| We recommend that in order to better support target groups ² , work taster/work experiences be provided. This should include extending the work of the Merton | HR - Proposals for a work experience programme have been prepared and will go to the Workforce Strategy Board for agreement on 22 nd January 2018. | WSB | Part met - See comments under Recommendation 1 |
| Employment Team in offering wor Plaster/work experiences through the Council's contractors and other service providers (with exploration of how to build this as a requirement into standard contract terms and conditions). How these work taster/work experience opportunities are best delivered should be explored including consideration of the Traineeship framework, the Work Experience Quality Standard, the emerging Apprenticeship Strategy and the provision of a mentor to support each participant. | Procurement – Encourage contractors to replicate opportunities for work placements (Driven through the Social Value Act) | Commercial Services | A draft Social Value Toolkit has been circulated to Departmental Operational Procurement Groups and the Procurement Board for Comment. Comments received are now being incorporated into the final draft that will then be circulated to MVSC and the Economic Wellbeing Group for further comment in due course. The Toolkit has been created to support commissioners and procurers, along with potential providers of services to Merton Council, with embedding the principles of Social Value into the commissioning and procurement process. It has been created to inspire new thinking that will help to establish what is right for the service in the process of delivering Social Value as part of commissioning and procurement. |

² The Panel agreed that target groups should specifically mean children and young people in care/care leavers and/or those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

It must however be appropriate and proportionate to the particular service being tendered. Merton reviews opportunities to up-skill and generate jobs for local people through major procurement contracts on a caseby-case basis, given that not all contracts lend themselves to providing these types of opportunities. For example, we will be seeking the use of local labour supply and/or apprenticeships when we go out to tender for our Highways contract later this year. We will also seek such opportunities when going out to tender through the Council's newly formed, wholly owned, Housing Company. It should be noted however that there is an added complexity when it comes to facilitating work experience and apprenticeships for vulnerable young adults. For example, there is a need (or at very least a perceived need) to carry out a DBS check on anyone that would be working with vulnerable young people. This is not always practicable for third party organisations and as such, limits the number of organisations willing to assist the Council with this particular objective. Note also the following contracts that have been established: 1. CSF Commissioning team in collaboration with futureMerton has secured mechanical engineering work experience placements for a maximum of 4 YP at a time with Veolia at their Croydon and Merton workshops. The first cohort completed in May. All four

YP were known to YOT. One was successfully

supported by Veolia to apply for a 3 year

³ Commercial Services will not be able to keep a record of where this has been successful and where it has not.

| _ | | |
|----------|--|--|
| ູນ | | |
| Ď. | | |
| Page 8 | | |
| ∞ | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

apprenticeship, one was considered academically unsuitable for an apprenticeship but suitable for a post in the parts department which Veolia are creating specifically for him. The second cohort are 3 weeks into their 6 week placement. So far, 6 young people with vulnerable characteristics have benefitted from this project. Two of who applied for the opportunity while in youth detention centre. Veolia has committed to a rolling programme of placements.

- 2. CSF Commissioning team in collaboration with Future Merton has developed a pathway by which our young people aged 16 – 17 can obtain their Health, Safety and Environment, (HSE), certificate and sit the CSCS test, (A CSCS card is required for all personnel working on a construction site), with Merton QA alternative education provider has years of experience working with our disengaged YP. 8 Young men with vulnerable characteristics formed first cohort. Those who successfully obtain a CSCS card are then matched to suitable paid work experience placements sourced by futureMerton with commissioned contractors. In recognition of the lack of accredited courses and work related opportunities available in construction to this cohort, and following representation from CSF, the Construction Industry Training Board, (CITB), has made a national exception and awarded test centre status to a Merton approved provider.
- 3. CSF Commissioning team in collaboration with futureMerton has engaged the support of Subway Sandwich shop. Interested candidates put forward by the Council will take part in a 5 day trial during which they will receive £10 per day expenses. All suitable candidates will be offered PT or FT position in one of

| Page 9 | | | 8 locations including Morden. To date, 3 CVs have been put forward and trials are being arranged. 4. CSF Commissioning team in collaboration with futureMerton are in negotiation with UPS to provide work experience placements during which candidates will be trained to fulfil driver's mate position. UPS have committed to sourcing their seasonable driver's mates, (3 month paid contracts commencing in September 2018), from candidates successfully complete training over summer. Candidates will be paid £10 - £15 a day expenses over summer during training. 5. CSF Commissioning team in collaboration with futureMerton has successful secured commitment from Go Ahead bus company, (based in Collier Wood), to offer 2 work experience placements in September working as mechanical engineers. If candidates prove willing, Go Ahead have committed to develop apprenticeship opportunities based on candidates ability. Go Ahead have committed to provide this opportunity on an annual basis if pilot is successful. 6. CSF Commissioning team in collaboration with futureMerton are in the process of recruiting an Employer Engagement officer for 2 days a week to secure and manage additional placements. Post will be funded from s.106 funding until February 2019. |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|
| | | | |
| Recommendations 3 To reflect that the aim of | Actions- Pathways futureMerton - | Lead All officers | Status |
| improving routes into employment for vulnerable | All representatives are receiving minutes of the EWG meetings via email and through | working with vulnerable | Met |

| cohorts requires the involvement of teams across the Council (including HR, Children Schools and Families and futureMerton. We recommend that the Economic Wellbeing Group continue and be supported to be the main focus for reducing unemployment and increasing economic wellbeing in Merton. Attendance at the Economic Wellbeing Group for all appropriate departments, divisions and teams should be reinforced by making this a key performance indicator (KPI). | the Merton Partnership web pages. The EWG will continue as a sub-group of the Sustainable Communities and Transport thematic. Officers are invited to attend and will be alerted to agenda items pertinent to their service area. | young people. | |
|---|---|---------------|---|
| Recommendation 4 | Actions - Pathways | Lead | Status |
| We recommend how to engage target groups and demonstrate the Council's commitment to their | Corum have been commissioned to engage our LAC and Care Leavers. Outcomes to inform LAC and Care Leavers' Strategies. | 14+ Team | Report back to Scrutiny |
| employment be explored. This might be included in the Looked After Children/Care Leavers Pledge. | HR – 4WSB to monitor current progress of DMT's in creating apprenticeships roles and further explore opportunities to remodel the Councils recruitment methods with the aim of supporting more apprenticeships and give consideration to ways of supporting vulnerable young people. | WSB | Workforce Strategy Group is actively monitoring apprenticeships and using Senior leadership Meetings and DMTs to promote a wider take up. Please also see table inserted below for breakdown of apprentices by directorate. |
| Recommendation 5 | Actions-Pathways | Lead | Status |
| We recommend that Merton Council actively supports the target groups though traineeships and apprenticeship opportunities | HR - WSB to review the opportunities available to vulnerable young people and review the take up of the work experience placements | WSB | Workforce Strategy Group is actively monitoring apprenticeships and using Senior leadership Meetings and DMTs to promote a wider take up. |

⁴ Workforce Strategy Board

| that are advertised by the Council. It is proposed that a percentage of appropriate opportunities for our target groups is embedded in the Council's Apprenticeship Strategy and reflected in Merton's contribution to the public sector apprenticeship targets. | and apprenticeships taking into account Recommendation 4. | | Please also see comments under Recommendation 1 above. |
|---|--|----------------------------|---|
| Recommendation 6 | Actions-Pathways | Lead | Status |
| As recommended in previous task groups ⁵ , the Council should build a requirement for its contractors and other service providers to offer apprenticeships for Merton residents in its standard contract terms and conditions. How to promote apprenticeships to the target groups should be explored including use of London Ambitions. | Procurement Board — The Social Value Act will be used in all relevant procurements to encourage contractors to support apprenticeships for local residents. ⁶ HR Any opportunities that are made by contractors will also be advertised on the Merton website by using a link to the contractors webpage. | Procurement Board HR | Please see comments under Recommendation 2 above. Adverts will be managed as opportunities arise – no requests received to date. |
| Recommendation 7 | Actions – Pathways | Lead | Status |
| We recommend that the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel continue to receive data annually on the number of apprenticeships achieved through the Council. This is to demonstrate impact but also to inform practice in the future | Provide numbers of: | HR My Futures | Will be reported annually from March 2018. This will need further analysis – will be reported back to Scrutiny |

⁵ Adult Skills and Employability 2013, Recommendation 3 (<u>here</u>) and Post 16 Career Pathways 2012 (<u>here</u>) ⁶ Commercial Services will not be able to keep a record of where this has been successful and where it has not.

| provision of apprenticeships. | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Reporting should include the | | |
| number of apprenticeships | | |
| achieved, completed and the | | |
| destinations of those achieving | | |
| apprenticeships directly through | | |
| the Council (and in the future it's | | |
| contractors/service providers) | | |
| Subset data on those from our | | |
| target groups undertaking | | |
| apprenticeships should also be | | |
| provided. | | |

Page 12

Breakdown of all apprentices by directorate as of 30th May 2018:

| May-18 | In Progress New Apprentices | In Progress Existing staff | Pending | Total Including Pending |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| C&H | 2 | 5 | 10 | 17 |
| CS | 9 | 5 | 16 | 30 |
| CSF | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| E&R | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Non Schools | 12 | 15 | 29 | 56 |
| Schools | 0 | 5 | 18 | 23 |

Total

| U | |
|----------------|--|
| മ | |
| Ó | |
| Θ | |
| _ | |
| \overline{a} | |
| \sim | |

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

Committee: Children and Young People Overview and

Scrutiny Panel

Date: 27th June 2018

Wards: All wards

Subject: Departmental Update Report June 2018

Lead officer: Rachael Wardell, Director of Children, Schools and Families

Department

Lead member: Cllr Kelly Braund, Cabinet Member for Children Services

Cllr Caroline Cooper-Marbiah, Cabinet Member for Education

Contact officer: Mark Gwynne, Interim Head of Policy, Planning and Performance

Recommendations:

A. Members of the panel to discuss and comment on the contents of the report.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The report provides members of the panel with information on key developments not covered elsewhere on the agenda and affecting the Children, Schools and Families Department since the panel's last meeting in March 2018.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1 Harris Academy Wimbledon The school is opening as planned in Whatley Avenue SW20 in September 2018 and is fully subscribed. Harris Federation is undertaking minor refurbishment to ensure the building is suitable for two years and the planning application for the permanent site in South Wimbledon has recently been submitted. Despite 265 additional Year 7 resident applications for all schools this year the council has been able to make a reasonable offer of a place to all residents.
- 2.2 **School Ofsted Inspections** Further inspections have been held in the following schools where the report is yet to be published: Melrose Special School on 15th May 2018 and Liberty on 20th June 2018. No new reports have been published since the last meeting. This means that our results remain as previously reported, so we continue to have:
 - 100% of secondary schools being rated as "Good" or "Outstanding"
 - 93% of all schools now rated as "Good" or better; and
 - 95% of our pupils are educated in schools rated as "Good" or better.
- 2.3 Children's Centres The new centrally managed and reshaped Children Centre service for families with children under the age of 5, has competed its first year of delivery with data showing that by Quarter 3 there have been increasing numbers of families using the centres. By the end of the year nearly 60% of the total 0–4 year old population had accessed a Children's Centre service. There has been a focus on assertive outreach activities to ensure that services are promoted to families living

within defined areas of the borough, with additional services set up in certain children's centres and targeted plans to engage families known to be eligible for 2 year funding. Take up of 2 year old funded places for children meeting specific low household income criteria continues to be a priority for the service, working in partnership with the childcare sector to ensure sufficient and high quality places across the borough, near to where these cohorts of children live. In 2017/18, the outreach service supported 640 families to receive an eligibility code and made contact with over 950 families working towards an improved take up across the borough. In January 2018, 421 children took up a 2-year-old funded place and 964 families took up the additional 15 hours of funded childcare and education for working parents with children aged 3 and 4.

- 3,030 referrals were made in to the early years' service for signposting, preventative or early help services, with a high proportion coming from Health Visitors who have been co-located in the boroughs Children's Centres since 2017. These health visitors also deliver some of the child health services from the centres. Feedback from families, reported a high level of satisfaction with the services they accessed, with over 95% of all families stating improved outcomes due to the targeted intervention / programme they attended. Priorities for 2018/19 include: continuing to increase the take up of funded early education with a focus on 2 year olds and children with additional needs; supporting families in the completion of the programmes they attend (reducing drop out levels during the course); and to increase referrals from other partner agencies.
- 2.5 **Performance Management** Following implementation of MOSAIC in May 2017, we have been working hard to establish effective performance reporting to Scrutiny, at a team, directorate and corporate level and to meet statutory reporting requirements. This has entailed working to resolve a number of data quality and data migration issues, requiring an iterative process of exception reporting and data checking. Whilst this work continues to get the required level of data accuracy, we are now at the stage where we are able to report on a number of our performance measures with a relatively high degree of confidence. Through finalisation of the statutory returns and census returns over the course of the next month, some of these figures may change. These indicators within the current reporting framework are contained in Appendix 1. Having completed development of statutory reports, emphasis is now moving towards development of team and departmental reporting, enabling active performance management to be resumed after the summer.
- 2.6 Work continues to get the same degree of confidence around the other indicators and extra resource is being used in the directorate on an agency basis to progress this work as quickly as possible whilst ensuring that we are able wherever possible to meet our statutory reporting requirements and submission of our census data. Simultaneously, work is in hand to resolve the remaining data quality and migration issues some of which should be resolved through the system upgrade in June and others have been escalated to the system provider to resolve wider system issues.
- 2.7 **Merton Safeguarding Children Board** (MSCB) The MSCB is continuing to embed the working being done around Think Family, whilst developing proposals for the new partnership arrangements to succeed the MSCB during 2019 and revise the performance framework to deliver a new partnership dataset. The work on designing new partnership arrangements builds on the many strengths and outstanding judgement of the MSCB to ensure that we retain they partners around the table and are able to have an effective dialogue to lead, challenge and deliver upon our safeguarding commitments within the borough.
- 2.8 The new dataset builds on the existing performance management reporting to ensure clarity around partner contributions and enable effective oversight, management and

analysis of performance across the partnership. This will support greater alignment with other areas, minimising impact on the partners, whilst enabling timely collection, analysis and presentation of data.

- 2.9 **Family Drug and Alcohol Court (FDAC)** Working together with Croydon County Court, West London Family Court and the Inner London Family Court, the partnership will offer an alternative form of care proceedings for parents and children in those cases where substance misuse is a key factor in the decision to bring proceedings: known as the Family Drug and Alcohol Court (FDAC).
- 2.10 The FDAC service went live on the 1st January 2018 and the service overall currently has 25 referrals with Merton's contribution being 3 referrals. The council is funded for 5 referrals per year. There are no issues with the provider or partnership members and the service is currently working with all boroughs to identify reports required by each borough on their own referrals.
- 2.11 **Social Impact Bond (SIB)** The Pan-London Care Impact Partnership involving Merton, Tower Hamlets, Bexley, Newham and Sutton councils has been launched during January to deliver Multi-Systemic and Functional Family Therapy services for councils within the partnership, levering in financial resources using a (SIB). The aim of the programme is to keep vulnerable families together and prevent children from being taken into care. There are currently 3 Merton families receiving these therapy services and a further 3 families who have been recommended and are awaiting approval.
- 2.12 The project went live on 15th January 2018 and work is underway in Merton, and across the partnership, to design and implement a tracking mechanism, which is required to monitor the placement data of young people receiving either of the services provided.
- 2.13 Barking and Dagenham Council have submitted their proposal to join the Partnership and have been successful in their bid. They will not be entitled to lottery funding from the existing Partnership however have successfully approached the lottery fund for a 20% contribution. The impact on the provider is considered to be minimal however will be closely monitored. The Strategic Board has submitted a paper to the Big Lottery Fund asking for an increase in the fund's contribution to outcome payments, increasing these from 15% to 20% of the total £1.5m, awarded to the Pan London Service.
- 2.14 **Contextual Safeguarding** Over the past few months presentations have taken place with Merton Partnership Executive Board, the Children's Trust Board, schools and with parents in the community in order to raise awareness. Particular issues covered include gangs, youth violence (including the rising instances of knife crime and stabbings) and County Lines.
- 2.15 This work recognises that whilst instances of knife crime within Merton are low and the gang culture is not the same as some neighbouring boroughs, these issues make young people feel unsafe since large numbers through their connections and social media know of people who have been affected by the issues. The relationship between gangs and their respective alliances can cause rifts and engage Merton's gangs in conflict outside the borough. This is a significant area of focus at the current time and further awareness raising activities and presentations will ensure that this remains a high priority and area for sustained focus.

- 2.16 Peer Review The department is currently participating in a pan-London peer review programme, having developed a self-evaluation which is initially considered on a sub-regional basis prior to coming together across London. We are working with Sutton, Richmond and Kingston, with self-evaluations having been initially discussed during June. This was a constructive meeting which facilitated identification of a number of areas of common interest which will be considered for a more in depth peer review in the autumn once data and spend has been analysed.
- 2.17 Initial work on the peer review will feed into the self-assessment required for the ILACS (Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services) which will be submitted to Ofsted at the end of September. It is unlikely that the deep dive aspect of the peer review will have been started by this stage.
- 2.18 **Inspection Update** Preparations for upcoming inspections are in hand, along with progress on actions arising from last year's SIF inspection, as summarised below:
 - Ofsted Action Plan Progress an update on progress was provided to the last
 meeting identifying the significant improvements made regarding health histories
 and the refreshed Staying Put policy. Several actions are nearing conclusion and a
 more detailed update will be provided to the next meeting at which point we
 envisage that most actions will be concluded.
 - Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services (ILACS) this new inspection framework came into place in January 2018. We are required to submit a self-evaluation on an annual basis, in September this year, which is followed by a conversation between the director and lead inspector for the region to identify inspection or targeted visit proposals for the coming year.
 - **Youth Offending** a new inspection framework has been introduced for Youth Offending Teams and traditionally we have been inspected early on in the programme, so preparation is in hand with developing the self-evaluation and compiling documentation.
 - Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND) these inspections have been ongoing for 2 years to monitor implementation of the SEN Reforms 2014. Sutton was recently inspected, as have 10 other London boroughs, from whom we are learning to continue to refine our self-evaluation and ensure that we are as well prepared as possible. This is a local area inspection, jointly with the CCG.
- 3. FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS
- 3.1 No specific implications from this report.
- 4. LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS
- 4.1 No specific implications from this report.
- 5. HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS
- 5.1 No specific implications from this report
- 6. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS
- 6.1 No specific implications from this report.
- 7. RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS
- 7.1 No specific implications from this report.

- 8. APPENDICES THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT
- 8.1 Appendix 1 Performance Report
- 9. BACKGROUND PAPERS
- 9.1 None



Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel - Performance Index 2017/18



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | "tap |
|-------|---|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | | Target | | Benchmark | ing and trend | | | Merton 2017/18 performance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Performance Indicators | Frequency | 2017/18 | Merton 2016/17 | Merton 2015/16 | England | London | BRAG rating | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 / Q1 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 / Q2 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 / Q3 | Jan-18 | Feb-18 | Mar-18 / Q4 | Notes |
| Asses | ssments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Number of Common and Shared Assessments undertaken (CASAs) | Quarterly | Not a target measure | 422 | 589 | No benchmarking available | No benchmarking available | Not a target measure | | | 37 | | | 81 | | | 110 | | | 171 | Quarterly (Time lag in collatin CASAs from partner agencies YTD |
| 2 | % of Single Assessments authorised within the statutory 45 days | Monthly | 90% | 91% | 92% | 83% (2016/17) | 82% (2016/17) | | 91% (132/145) | | | | | | | | | | | | Year to Date |
| 3 | % of Education, Health and Care plans issued within statutory 20 week timescale (new, including exceptions) | Monthly | 55% | 19% (Jan 2017) | 58% (Jan 2016) | 58.6% (Jan 2017) | 52.7% (Jan 2017) | Red | | | 47% (23/49) | | | 45% (53/118) | | | 39% (73/185) | | | 38% (92/244) | Year to Date |
| Child | protection | | | | | ` | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Child Protection Plans rate per 10,000 | Monthly | Not a target measure | 27.2 | 30.0 | 43.3 (2016/17) | 39.1 (2016/17) | Not a target measure | 27.2 | 27.6 | 33.8 | 36.6 | 39.8 | 42.2 | 45.6 | 43.9 | 47.3 | 47.3 | 47.5 | 43.3 | Monthly - as at the en of the month |
| 5 | Number of children subject of a Child Protection Plan | Monthly | Not a target measure | 127 | 138 | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | 127 | 129 | 158 | 171 | 186 | 197 | 213 | 205 | 221 | 221 | 222 | 202 | Monthly - as at the en of the month |
| 6 | Number of family groups subject of Child protection plans | Monthly | Not a target measure | 66 | 72 | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | n/a | | | | | | | | | | | | Monthly - as at the en of the month |
| 7 | % of Children subject of a Child Protection Plan with an allocated Social Worker | Monthly | 100% | 100% | 100% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Green | 100% (126/126) | 100% (129/129) | 100% (158/158) | 100% (171/171) | 100% (186/186) | 100% (197/197) | 100% (213/213) | 100% (205/205) | 100% (221/221) | 100% (221/221) | 100% (222/222) | 100% (202/202) | Monthly - as at the en |
| 8 | % of quorate attendance at child protection conferences | Quarterly | 95% | 89% | 100% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Quarterly |
| 9 . | % of reviews completed within timescale for Children with Child | Monthly | 96% | 99% | 98% | 92% (2016/17) | 96% (2016/17) | | 100% (13/13) | | | | | | | | | | | | Year To Date (NI 67) |
| 10(| of Children subject of a CP Plan who had a 4 weekly CP visit thin timescales in the month | Monthly | Not a target measure | 94% | 71% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | 91% (103/113) | | | | | | | | | | | | Monthly - as at the en of the month - (reporting activities) |
| 11 I | % of Children that became the subject of a Child Protection Plan which second or subsequent time | Monthly | 16% | 13% | 23% | 19% (2016/17) | 15% (2016/17) | Green | 19% (3/16) | 17% (5/29) | 16% (11/68) | 18% (19/104) | 16% (20/126) | 13% (20/151) | 13% (23/176) | 14% (28/196) | 14% (31/220) | 14% (34/235) | 13% (34/252) | 13% (34/253) | Year To Date (NI 65 |
| Look | ed After Children | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Looked After Children rate per 10,000 | Monthly | Not a target measure | 33 | 36 | 62 (2016-17) | 50 (2016-17) | Not a target measure | 32.2 | | | | | | | | | | | 33.3 | End of the month snapshot |
| 13 | Number of Looked After Children | Monthly | Not a target measure | 152 | 163 | 72670 (2016-17) | 9910 (2016-17) | Not a target measure | 149 | | | | | | | | | | | 154 | End of the month snapshot |
| 14 | % of Looked After Children with an allocated Social Worker | Monthly | Not a target measure | 100% | 100% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | 100% (149/149) | | | | | | | | | | | 100% (154/154) | Year to Date |
| 15 | Average number of weeks taken to complete Care proceedings against a national target of 26 weeks | Quarterly | 27 weeks | 25 weeks | 30 weeks | 30 | No relevant benchmarking available | Red | | | 37 | | | 27 | | | 19 | | | 31 | Quarterly |
| 16 | % of Looked After Children cases which were reviewed within required timescales | Monthly | 96% | 97% | 97% | Not published | Not published | | 89% (25/28) | | | | | | | | | | | | Year To Date (NI 66) |
| 17 | % of Looked After Children participating in their reviews in month | Monthly | Not a target measure | 99% | 90% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | 100% (23/23) | | | | | | | | | | | | Year to Date |
| 18 | Stability of placements of Looked After Children - number of moves (3 moves or more in the year) | Monthly | 12% | 16% | 12% | 10% (2016/17) | 12% (2016/17) | | 0% (0/149) | | | | | | | | | | | | Year To Date (NI 62) |
| 19 | Stability of placements of Looked After Children - length of placement | Monthly | 66% | 71% | 68% | 70% (2016/17) | 69% (2016/17) | | 70% (23/33) | | | | | | | | | | | | End of the month snapshot (NI 63) |
| 20 | % of Looked After Children placed with agency foster carers | Quarterly | 42% | 44% | 37% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Quarterly |
| 21 | Number of in-house foster carers recruited | Quarterly | 15 | 15 | 13 | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Red | | | 5 | | | 6 | | | 7 | | | 11 | Year to Date |
| 22 | Number of Looked After Children who were adopted and agency Special Guardianship Orders granted | Monthly | Not a target measure | 17 | 16 | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | 0 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Year to Date |

| | | Target | Benchmarking and trend | | | | Merton 2017/18 performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Performance Indicators | Frequency | 2017/18 | Merton 2016/17 | Merton 2015/16 | England | London | BRAG rating | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 / Q1 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 / Q2 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 / Q3 | Jan-18 | Feb-18 | Mar-18 / Q4 | Notes |
| ldrens Centres and Schools | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) | Quarterly | 100% | 100% | 100% | 66% (31 August 2015) | 72% (31 August 2015) | Green | | | 100% (5/5) | | | 100% (5/5) | | | 100% (5/5) | | | 100% (5/5) | Year to Date. National and London Comparitors as at 31/08/2015. |
| % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services | Quarterly | Not a target measure | 68% | 72% | 89% (31 March 2017) | 93% (31 March 2017) | Not a target measure | | | 23% (1063 of 4718) | | | 33% (1582 of 4974) | | | 44% (2097 of 4785) | | | 58% | Year to Date Cumulates (Target 19% per quarter) |
| % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) | Quarterly | 91% | 91% | 89% | 89% (31 August 2017) | 94% (31 August 2017) | Green | | | 89% (48/54) | | | 89% (48/54) | | | 91% (49/54) | | | 93% (50/54) | Year to Date. National and London Comparitors as at 31/08/2017. |
| Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) | Monthly | Not a target measure | 0 (AY 2015/16) | 0 (AY 2014-15) | 1145 (AY 2015/16) | 105(AY 2015/16) | Not a target measure | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | August End of Acad. Yr. YTD (August data interim until November). September start of the new Acad. Yr. |
| Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) | Monthly | Not a target measure | 17 (AY 2015/16) | 19 (AY 2014-15) | 5445 (AY 2015/16) | 805(AY 2015/16) | Not a target measure | 10 | 12 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | August End of Acad. Yr. YTD. September start of the new Acad. Yr. |
| Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) | Annual | Not a target measure | 12% (AY 2015/16) | n/a | 13.1% (AY 2015/16) | 11.7% (AY 2015/16) | Not a target measure | | | | | | | | | | | | 8.4% | Annual Measure 6 half-terms DfE Published SFR maintained and academies |
| % of Reception year surplus places | Annual | 6% | 3.5 (AY | 6.2% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Red | | | | | | | | | | | 7.7% | | Annual measure |
| % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies | Annual | 5% | 6.5% (AY | 5.5% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Red | | | | | | | | | | | 9.6% | | Annual measure |
| g People and Services | | | 2015/16\ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | |
| Youth service participation rate | Annual | 1800 | NRTP | 3,695 | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Green | | | | | | | | | | | | 1967 | Annual Measure |
| of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) not in education, employment or ining (NEET) | Monthly | 3.5% | 1.5% (Q4) | 2.2% | 2.8% | No relevant benchmarking available | Green | 1.7% (64/3819) | 2.0% (70/3817) | 1.9% (71/3835) | 1.9% (72/3844) | 1.9% (75/3849) | 2.2% (84/3859) | 1.0% (40/3849) | 1.4% (54/3838) | 1.8% (68/3869) | 1.5% (58/3862) | 1.6% (61/3860) | 1.6% (61/3877) | Monthly (totals are adjusted) - reported a month in arrears |
| % of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) education, employment or training secus 'not known' | Monthly | Not a target measure | 1.5% (Q4) | 2.7% | 3.2% | No relevant benchmarking available | | 2.2% (84/3819) | 2.0% (77/3817) | 1.9% (73/3835) | 1.7% (67/3844) | 1.9% (75/3849) | 1.8% (68/3859) | 38.2% (1466/3849) | 15.3% (588/3838) | 2.1% (80/3869) | 1.2% (47/3862) | 0.9% (36/3860) | 0.9% (34/3877) | Monthly (totals are adjusted) - reported a month in arrears |
| Number of First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 | Monthly | 50 | 64 | 61 | 326.90 rate per 100,000 (2016) | 405.50 rate per 100,000 (2016) | Green | | | 12 | | | 24 | | | 37 | | | 47 | Year to Date |
| Rate of proven re-offending by young people in the youth justice system | Quarterly | Not a target measure | 0.55 | 0.88 | 1.04(2013) | 1.10(2013) | Not a target measure | | | 1.30 | | | 0.70 | | | 0.36 | | | 0.50 | Quarterly (NI 19) |
| TF: Number of Families engaged for year 1 of Expanded Programme | Quarterly | Not a target measure | 320 | 300 | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Not a target measure | | | 741 | | | 826 | | | 917 | | | 917 | Quarterly |
| % of commissioned services for which quarterly monitoring was completed | Quarterly | 100% | 100% | 100% | No relevant benchmarking available | No relevant benchmarking available | Green | | | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% | Quarterly (Time lag in collating from partner agencies) |
| | Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies geople and Services % of Secondary school of Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Secondary school of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Reception year surplus places % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies geople and Services Youth service participation rate Of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) not in education, employment or Dining (NEET) % of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) education, employment or training sous 'not known' Number of First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 Rate of proven re-offending by young people in the youth justice system TF: Number of Families engaged for year 1 of Expanded Programme % of commissioned services for which quarterly monitoring | ### Centres and Schools ### Outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) ### Outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) #### Outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) #### Outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) #### Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) #### Monthly #### Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) #### Monthly #### Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) #### Monthly #### Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places #### Annual #### Of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies #### Annual #### Of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) not in education, employment or Dinining (NEET) #### Of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) education, employment or training Secusivary for known' #### Number of First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 #### Rate of proven re-offending by young people in the youth Justice system ###### TF: Number of Families engaged for year 1 of Expanded Programme ################################## | rens Centres and Schools % outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Not a target measure Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Reception year surplus places % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Annual S% g People and Services Youth service participation rate Annual Annual Annual Annual 1800 Aof CYP (16 - 17 year olds) not in education, employment or Dinining (NEET) % of CYP (16 - 17 year olds) education, employment or training Solus 'not known' Not a target measure Monthly Not a target measure Not a target measure Monthly Not a target measure Monthly Not a target measure Not a target measure TF: Number of Families engaged for year 1 of Expanded Programme % of commissioned services for which quarterly monitoring % of commissioned services for which quarterly monitoring | rens Centres and Schools % outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Reception year surplus places Annual Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) Not a target measure | rens Centres and Schools % outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Not a target measure Not a target measure Annual Not a target measure Annual Not a target measure (AY 2015/16) (AY 2014-15) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) % of Reception year surplus places % of Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual Sw (Secondary school (Year 7) surplus pl | rens Centres and Schools % outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections (Number YTD (AY 0015/16)) Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Monthly) Not a target measure 17 (AY 2015/16) Monthly Not a target measure 18 (AY 2014-15) 19 5-445 (AY 2014-15) 2015/16) Not a target measure 12% (AY 04Y 2014-15) 2015/16) Not a target measure 12% (AY 015/16) Not elevant benchmarking available world known' Not a target measure 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | ens Centres and Schools % outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011, population from careas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % of total 0-5 year estimated Census 2011, population from careas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding overall effectiveness) % outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding overall effectiveness (Number YTD (AV 2014-15) (AV 2 | The secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions missed) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions Missed) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions More face) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more sessions More) Secondary persistent absenteeism (10% or more) Secondary per | ens Centres and Schools **Outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Outcome of Commissioned (DAC) 30% whose families have accessed children's centre services **Outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Outcome of School Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Number of Primary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) **Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) **Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) **Number of Secondary permanent exclusions (Number YTD Academic year) **Not a target measure **Annual Not a target measure **Annual Not a target measure **Annual School Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual School Secondary school (Year 7) surplus places inc. Academies Annual 1800 NRTP 3,695 benchmarking avoilable **Yor (Ye (16 - 17 year olds) not in education, employment or Dining (NEET) **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly Not a target measure **Youth service participation rate **Monthly | ### Control of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Outcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **Out total 05 vg are stimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg are stimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg are stimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg are stimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg are stimated Census 2011 population from areas of deprivation (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed children's centre services. **Out total 05 vg areas (IDACI 30%) whose families have accessed and total 2005/fall 3000/fall 3000/fall 3000/fall 3000/fall 3000/fall 3000/fall 3000/fall 30 | March Commission Commissi | ## Soutcome of all Children Centre Ofsted inspections good or outstanding (overall effectiveness) **More than a service services** **More than a services** **More than a service services** **More than a services** **More than a services** **More than a services** **More of School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness) **More than a services** **More than a services** **More of School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness) **More of School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of Sted inspections good or outstanding outerail effectiveness **More and School Of School Of School Of School Of School Of School Of School | ## 101/15 2015/15 2015/15 2015/15 England London April 20 May 27 Q1 May 27 Aug 27 | ## Commission of School (Near Park Street) ## Commission of Schoo | ## Contract and Schools ## Contracting (ported effectiveness) ## Contr | 2001/14 2016/37 2016 | ## Contract and Schools ## Con | ## Contract and Schools ## Contract and Schools ## Contract and Schools ## Contract and Criticis and Schools ## Contract and Criticis and Schools ## Contract and Criticis Centre Color Imperiors good or Contracting (word in Education) ## Contracting (word in Edu | ## Contract and Schools ## Con | The Contract and Schools **Contract and Schools **Co |