



SCRUTINY BOARD (CHILDREN'S SERVICES)

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on
Thursday, 17th May, 2007 at 9.00 am

*(Please note that there is **NO** pre-meeting scheduled prior to this meeting)*

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

- J Bale (Chair) - Guiseley and Rawdon
- J Chapman - Weetwood
- B Cleasby - Horsforth
- R D Feldman - Alwoodley
- A Harrison - Garforth and Swillington
- V Kendall - Roundhay
- J Lewis - Kippax and Methley
- L Mulherin - Ardsley and Robin Hood
- K Renshaw - Ardsley and Robin Hood
- B Selby - Killingbeck and Seacroft

Co-opted Members (Voting)

- Mr E A Britten - Church Representative (Catholic)
- Prof P H J H Gosden - Church Representative (Church of England)
- Mr R Greaves - Parent Governor Representative (Secondary)
- Mr C Macpherson - Parent Governor Representative (Special)
- Mrs S Knights - Parent Governor Representative (Primary)

Co-opted Members (Non-Voting)

- Mr T Hales - Teacher Representative
- Ms C Foote - Teacher Representative
- Mrs S Hutchinson - Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership Representative
- Mr P Gathercole - NCH Representative
- Ms T Kayani - Youth Work Partnership Representative

Agenda compiled by:
Telephone:
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR

Gerard Watson
247 4325

Principal Scrutiny Advisor:
Kate Arscott
Tel: 247 4189

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25 of the Access to Information Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded)</p>	
2			<p>EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</p> <p>To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public</p>	
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>To declare any personal/prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 13 of the Members' Code of Conduct</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence from the meeting</p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
6			<p>INQUIRY INTO THE IMPLICATIONS OF TRUST SCHOOLS FOR THE LOCAL AUTHORITY</p> <p>To receive a report from the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which invites Members to formally agree the Board's final report and recommendations following its inquiry into the implications of trust schools for the local authority. Members are also invited to request that officers formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in the new municipal year</p>	1 - 14
7			<p>INQUIRY INTO YOUTH SERVICES</p> <p>To consider a report from the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which invites Members to formally agree the Board's final report and recommendations following its inquiry into Youth Services. Members are also invited to request that officers formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in the new municipal year</p>	15 - 30

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: Kate Arscott

Tel: 247 4189

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)

Date: 17 May 2007

Subject: Inquiry into the implications of Trust Schools for the Local Authority

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) has now completed its Inquiry into the implications of trust schools for the local authority. The Board is now in a position to report on its findings and its conclusions and recommendations resulting from the evidence gathered.

1.2 The draft final report is attached for consideration.

2.0 Consultation

2.1 Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 16.3 states that "where a Scrutiny Board is considering making specific recommendations it shall invite advice from the appropriate Director(s) prior to finalising its recommendations. The Director shall consult with the appropriate Executive Member before providing any such advice. The detail of that advice shall be attached to the report".

2.2 The relevant Directors have indicated that there is no specific advice that they wish to provide at this stage, before the Board finalises its report.

2.3 Once the Board publishes its final report, the appropriate Directors will be asked to formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in the new municipal year.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 The Board is requested to:-

- (i) Agree the Board's final report and recommendations.
- (ii) Request that officers formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in the new municipal year.

This page is intentionally left blank

Implications of Trust Schools for the Local Authority

Draft Scrutiny Inquiry Report

Introduction and Scope



Introduction

1. At the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) meeting in December 2006, members agreed to carry out an inquiry into the implications for Leeds City Council of the new legislation relating to Trust Schools.
2. The Education and Inspections Act 2006, which is expected to come into force in Summer 2007, will enable schools to become Trust Schools. The proposals form part of the Government's choice and diversity agenda. Schools, or groups of schools, that choose to take up the new arrangements will be backed by a charitable trust. According to the DfES, *"Trusts offer schools greater opportunity to secure the support of partners to strengthen their leadership and to develop their own ethos. In doing so, they will build diversity in the school system."*
3. The Government launched 28 "Pathfinder" Trust School projects in September 2006, selected to represent a broad range of school and trust types. A further 7 Pathfinders have been added since. The DfES is working closely with the 70 schools involved in the Pathfinder projects, providing them with support. Pathfinders are intended to explore the process of becoming a trust, help develop and spread good practice and provide practical examples of what trusts offer.
4. Members were interested to find out more about the Pathfinder projects, particularly the Leeds Pathfinder, which involves schools in Garforth, a higher education college in Horsforth and, potentially, other partners.
5. At these early stages in the development of the Trust Schools concept, the Board felt it would be timely to look at the implications of Trust Schools for Leeds as a Children's Services Authority, to make sure that the Council can be proactive in responding to any opportunities and concerns associated with this potentially significant change.
6. Board Members were keen to talk to a wide range of stakeholders to find out more detail about the Trust School proposals and their possible implications and learn about the Pathfinder project in Leeds.
7. During the inquiry, we spoke to representatives from
 - the DfES
 - Education Leeds
 - Children Leeds
 - Trade Unions
 - Leeds Schools (including the Pathfinder Secondary School)
 - the David Young Community Academy

Introduction and Scope

8. We are grateful to all those who gave their time to participate in this inquiry, to provide information and share their views.

Scope

9. Terms of reference for the Inquiry were approved at the Board meeting on 11 January 2007.
10. Board members agreed that their inquiry would make an assessment of, and where appropriate, make recommendations on the
 - developing arrangements for Trust Schools
 - potential impact for Leeds
 - ways in which Trust Schools can help deliver the Universal and targeted elements of children's services provision
 - long term implications of the establishment of Trust Schools
11. This inquiry concentrates on the issues involved for the Local Authority, raising concerns and flagging up opportunities. The Board hopes that its report will help the Council to prepare for the introduction of Trust Schools in the summer of 2007.

Conclusions and Recommendations



- 1 Throughout this inquiry, we have received information on the developing arrangements for Trust Schools, including the Pathfinder and Early Adopters schemes. The arrangements for Trust Schools are in the early stages, DfES draft guidance has been consulted on and final guidance is expected by the end of May 2007.
- 2 A Trust School is a state funded foundation school supported by a charitable trust. It is made up of one or more schools and partners working together for the benefit of the school(s). It manages its own assets, employs its own staff and sets its own admission arrangements. Any maintained school will be able to become a Trust School; primary, secondary and special schools.
- 3 There is no government blueprint which sets out an ideal model for a Trust School. The DfES intends this to be a school led initiative, allowing the freedom to choose a model. The most likely types are:-
 - one school and one partner trust, perhaps working on a particular specialism
 - a group of schools creating and sharing one local trust, for example, secondary schools working together on the 14-19 agenda
 - groups of schools working together on a pyramid model
- 4 The DfES tell us that, theoretically, there is nothing to prevent schools working with any partner they choose. Local Authorities, businesses, colleges, universities, PCTs and Community Groups are the most popularly occurring examples from the Pathfinders.
- 5 We feel strongly that the partners that schools agree to work with should be chosen carefully to ensure that all partners share the same aims and vision for the school(s) within the trust.
- 6 Pathfinders have cited several reasons for wishing to become Trust Schools:-
 - greater local community engagement, bringing in key local community partners to put the school at the heart of the local community

Conclusions and Recommendations



- working with other schools to meet the 14-19 provision across a local area
 - working with other schools to deliver extended services locally and meet the requirements of the every child matters agenda
 - autonomy. Some schools want greater control over decision-making, although the DfES told us this was not the main driver in most cases, but it was seen as an added benefit
 - strengthening the governing body to give greater direction and strategic purpose
- 7 We talked to representatives of the Leeds Pathfinder to help assess the impact for Leeds. The Headteacher and Chair of Governors of Garforth Community College told us about their project which aims to make the whole of Garforth a learning zone, offering lifelong learning opportunities. The potential trust partners going to consultation are Garforth Community College, four primary schools in Garforth, Trinity and All Saints Higher Education College, Horsforth, and Leeds PCT. Two other local primary schools, faith schools which already have trusts, will be trust associates. Leeds City Council has been invited to be a partner. The Learning and Skills Council have also shown an interest in being involved.
- 8 The lifelong learning 'cradle to the grave' concept behind the Garforth Pathfinder is a model which we can see the potential in. We expect that future trust proposals, however, will have different visions and not all will have equal merit.
- 9 The range of partners in the Garforth project caused us to consider that if a large number of schools in Leeds wish to move towards Trust status, it might raise capacity issues with potential partners. For example, if the PCT has already committed to the Garforth project, it might be unwilling or unable to partner with any other Trust Schools because of limitations on the time and resources (i.e. match funding, etc) it can offer. This might result in schools who are slower to move towards trust status being unable to secure their first choice of partner(s). There is a finite number of higher and further education institutions in Leeds and we have concerns that the early trusts may cream off the most sought-after partners.
- 10 In view of our concerns about the capacity of strategic partners to contribute to a number of trusts, we would like efforts to be made to try to target their support to the schools and areas most in need. Potential partners may not realise that committing to be a trust partner now might mean they

Conclusions and Recommendations



don't have the resources to partner another trust later, perhaps one sited in a deprived area in greater need. We would like them to be fully aware of that, so that they can plan accordingly.

If a large number of Trust Schools are created, each with their own admissions policies and criteria, there is the potential for large-scale disruption to the Leeds school admission system

11 Apart from the Pathfinder in Garforth, we understand that other Leeds schools have started to consider the possibilities that trust status might offer them. Feedback received by Education Leeds suggests that most governing bodies have decided to postpone taking things any further until more information is available, particularly an evaluation of the Pathfinder projects. We feel this is a wise approach, that governing bodies should be encouraged to reflect on the experiences of the Pathfinder projects before coming to a decision about seeking Trust School status.

12 We have some concerns about Trust Schools setting their own admissions arrangements, despite reassurances from the DfES.

13 Whilst we recognise that Trust Schools must have regard to the Admissions Code of Practice and they will not be able to select pupils on ability, we are concerned that there is still scope for a Trust School to set a divisive admission policy. The creation of just one Trust School could have a substantial effect on neighbouring schools in this way.

14 The Association of Teachers and Lecturers, in its written submission to our inquiry, states that "many of the flexibilities on offer to trusts, under the auspices of raising standards, are already available to schools under the 2002 Education Act." This is a point that we raised during our discussions. Schools have been forming partnerships with local organisations, schools and other education providers for some time and, at first glance, it is difficult to see what can be gained by forming a trust. Now, after hearing the evidence, we accept that formalised partnerships are likely to be more enduring and reliable than informal ones, which often depend on commitments made by personalities, rather than organisations. A trust might mean a higher level of engagement and obligation.

15 We heard from a Leeds secondary school which has been exploring the issues around trust status. The governing body has decided not to rush to become an "early adopter", the name for the second wave of Trust Schools after the Pathfinder projects. The Governors have agreed that, if they decide to consult on Trust

Conclusions and Recommendations



School status further in the future, they would want the Local Authority to be a partner, along with other local schools.

- 16 We feel that there is the potential, with the right partners working together, for a trust in a deprived area to contribute positively to narrowing the gap between the most disadvantaged children and communities and the rest of the city. We would like the City Council to be one of the Local Authorities at the forefront of the Trust Schools agenda, making sure that the potential is maximised for Leeds. We think this might mean helping to instigate trusts for cluster groups of schools in disadvantaged communities.

- **issuing advice to strategic partners about how to target their partnership support to schools and areas most in need**
- **informing our proactive approach to wider planning issues (BSF, 14-19 review, etc).**

- 17 We are particularly interested in the implications of Trust Schools for Leeds as a Children's Services Authority and the ways in which Trust Schools can help deliver the universal and targeted elements of children's services provision.

- 18 We welcome the new statutory duty of governing bodies, set out within the Education and Inspections Act 2006, to promote well-being and community cohesion and to have regard to the Children and Young People's Plan. This should help the Director of Children's Services to hold to account any Trust School that fails to co-operate.

- 19 Trust Schools might make strategic planning around the Every Child Matters agenda more difficult. For example, it won't be possible for every primary school in Leeds to provide the full range of extended schools services and activities on their own sites. The

Recommendation 1

That the Chief Executive of Education Leeds and the Director of Children's Services take a pro-active strategic approach to maximise the potential that Trust Schools might have for improving outcomes for children in deprived communities in Leeds by

- **exploring potential trust models for clusters of schools in deprived areas with a view to instigating trusts**

Conclusions and Recommendations



intention will be for several schools to work together to make sure that children and families have access to the services they need. The planning and implementation of extended schools could be disrupted by a new Trust School forming a trust and causing planners to think again about siting services.

20 Leeds is one of the pilot authorities for Budget Holding Lead Professionals in localities, so locality planning is a key concept in the Leeds approach to Children's Trust arrangements. If the trend is for schools to group together in localities to form trusts, we can see possible opportunities for commissioning those trusts to manage and provide joined up activities at a local level.

21 When a school acquires trust status, its land and assets transfer to the trust. Governors can dispose of or change the use of land and buildings with the agreement of the trust, so again, there is the potential for disruption to strategic planning with pieces of the buildings 'jigsaw' being moved around by individual schools.

22 The long term implications of Trust Schools are hard to predict at this stage. The impact upon Leeds will depend on the numbers of schools opting for Trust School status, the arrangements they put in place, their trust partners and

the level of engagement with the Local Authority. Ideally, we would hope that the Authority will be invited to become a member of any trusts set up for its maintained schools.

23 We are concerned that, if the trust should fail in the long term, it might be difficult for the governing body to remove it.

24 When a Trust School is established, a new governing body is constituted. The outgoing governing body take the decision on whether the new body will have either a majority or a minority of trust Governors. It might be very difficult to remove a trust if the majority of the governors are trust appointed.

25 We understand that there is a safeguard contained in the draft regulations, whereby a vote can be carried by one third of the governing body to remove a trust if the majority of governors are trust appointed. However, the vote can only be taken once every seven years.

26 We have found it quite challenging to assess arrangements which are not fully formed. However, we can see how important it is that the Local Authority takes the opportunity to remain involved, at a strategic level and, wherever possible, as a member of the trust.

Conclusions and Recommendations



27 If the Local Authority is not fully engaged and a number of Trust Schools emerge in Leeds, we anticipate that strategic, city wide planning for Children's Services will prove more difficult. Challenges such as managing school admissions, developing extended schools, children's services workforce reform and wrapping services around the child need a high level of clarity, commitment and participation from all parties and Trust Schools.

28 Although Trust Schools are still within the Local Authority's maintained schools, their relationship within the Children's Services Authority will move to more of an arms length basis, with challenges there for the commissioning role of the Director of Children's Services.

29 To assist the City Council to continue to engage fully with schools seeking to become and becoming Trust Schools, we would like to see a policy adopted requiring the Local Authority to request membership of every school trust in Leeds. We are aware, however, that this might pose capacity and resource issues, and would like these to be fully explored initially.

Recommendation 2

The Chief Executive of Education Leeds and the Director of Children's Services consider the resource and other practical implications of a policy requiring the Authority to request membership of every trust that is established in Leeds.

30 Finally, schools proposing to become Trust Schools must consult with their Local Authority. It is at the consultation stage when we expect schools to be able to address the issues that this report raises.

Recommendation 3

That the Director of Children's Services has regard to this report when responding to any school consulting on becoming a Trust School.

In particular the points raised in this report regarding

- **proposed partner organisations sharing the same vision for the school**
- **any proposed changes to the school's admissions policy**

Conclusions and Recommendations



- potential for the proposals to help or hinder “narrowing the gap”
- balance of trust appointed governors on the governing body

and to consider how the individual proposals will contribute to community cohesion and delivering the Every Child Matters agenda

DRAFT

Sessional Evidence



Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

Trust Schools: a short briefing paper (compiled from information drawn from the DfES and Specialist Schools and Academies Trust websites).

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, 8th February 2007, incorporating a briefing paper from Education Leeds

Report of the Director of Children's Services, 8 March 2007.

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, 8 March 2007, incorporating a briefing paper on LEA experiences of working with Grant Maintained schools.

Witnesses Heard

Keith Burton, Deputy Director, Children's Services
Chris Edwards, Chief Executive, Education Leeds
Paul Edwards, Headteacher, Garforth Community College
Martin Fleetwood, Principal, Temple Moor High School
Ian Garforth, Chair of Governors, Garforth Community College
Dirk Gilleard, Deputy Chief Executive, Education Leeds
Carol Gray, DfES
Jack Jackson, NASUWT
Ros McMullen, Principal, David Young Academy
Patrick Murphy NUT
Tony Sheppard, Chair of Governors, Temple Moor
Richard Smith, Team Leader, Governor Support

Sessional Evidence



Dates of Scrutiny

8 February 2007 Scrutiny Board meeting

8 March 2007 Scrutiny Board meeting

Site Visits

None undertaken.



Originator: Kate Arscott

Tel: 247 4189

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)

Date: 17 May 2007

Subject: Inquiry into Youth Services

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) has now completed its Inquiry into Youth Services. The Board is now in a position to report on its findings and its conclusions and recommendations resulting from the evidence gathered.

1.2 The draft final report is attached for consideration.

2.0 Consultation

2.1 Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 16.3 states that "where a Scrutiny Board is considering making specific recommendations it shall invite advice from the appropriate Director(s) prior to finalising its recommendations. The Director shall consult with the appropriate Executive Member before providing any such advice. The detail of that advice shall be attached to the report".

2.2 The Director of Children's Services has provided advice in the form of a letter. The letter is attached to this report for Members' consideration before the Board finalises its report.

2.3 Once the Board publishes its final report, the appropriate Directors will be asked to formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in the new municipal year.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 The Board is requested to:-

- (i) Agree the Board's final report and recommendations.
- (ii) Request that officers formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in the new municipal year.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cllr John Bale
Elected Members
Civic Hall
4th Floor East

**Director of Children's Services
Unit**

6th Floor East
Merrion House
110 Merrion Centre
Leeds LS2 8DT

Contact: Rosemary Archer
Tel: 0113 39 50925
Fax: 0113 295 0219
Email:
rosemary.archer@leeds.gov.uk

9th May 2007

Dear Councillor Bale,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Children's Services Scrutiny Board's reports on Trust Schools and on Youth Services. The work that the Board and the officers supporting it have done on these reports is both valued and appreciated.

As you are aware, the reports have been shared with Chris Edwards, Chief Executive of Education Leeds and Councillor Richard Brett the Executive Member for Children's Services. Councillor Richard Harker, has also seen both reports. As such, I am pleased to provide the following collective response.

We welcome the report on Trust Schools and its recommendations and have no specific comments to raise on these at this point in time. We look forward to working with the Scrutiny Board as we progress work in this area.


We also welcome the report on Youth Services. You will be aware that an initial response to that report from myself and John Paxton, Head of the Youth Service, was provided when the final report was initially drafted and we appreciate that the comments raised were taken into account. I would however reiterate the point raised about recommendation one on extending the Youth Offer to those aged 11 and 12. This was a point that both Cllr Brett and Cllr Harker drew attention to.

Whilst we recognise and welcome the ambition and motives behind this recommendation and realise that there is a lot of good work already being done with those aged 11 and 12 which can be developed further, at present, resource and financial considerations mean that fully extending the initial Youth Offer in this way would prove problematic. Indeed the wider issue of provision for those aged 8-13 is something we recognise requires more detailed consideration in the future. The recommendation will however prove valuable in helping us to shape our future ambition for this work and we would of course be happy to discuss this issue further at future Scrutiny Board meetings.

Also within the Youth Services report it is worthwhile to note that the review requested in recommendation two around Youth Services funding to Area Committees does form part of the wider work being done around a report on Youth Services that is due to go the Executive Board shortly.

I hope that these comments are helpful and once again thank you for the work that has been done on these important issues.

Yours sincerely.

A handwritten signature in green ink that reads "Rosemary K Archer". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'R'.

Rosemary Archer
Director of Children's Services.

Youth Services

Draft

Scrutiny Inquiry Report

Introduction and Scope

- 1 At the first meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) in June 2006, members agreed that they wished to look at youth services across Leeds as one of their major inquiries for the coming year.
- 2 In order to decide on an appropriate and manageable focus for the inquiry, the Board commissioned a small working group from amongst its membership to scope the inquiry. The working group met with the council's Head of Youth Service on 27th July.
- 3 The group had a wide ranging discussion which included an overview of developments in the council's own youth services over the past few years; the range and variation in services on offer to young people across the city; the many different providers; and the balance between targeted and universal service provision.
- 4 As background to their deliberations members of the working group considered the government publication Youth Matters: The Next Steps.
- 5 In order to provide a clear focus for the board's work, the working group decided to recommend that the inquiry took as its end point the question 'What should Leeds City Council include in the youth offer that it will have to publish next year?'
- 6 In order to answer that question it was felt that the inquiry should look at current provision and how it varied across the city, in order to build a vision for the future. This would include different service providers and partners as well as different types of targeted and universal provision. The inquiry also needed to consider what young people want and expect from youth services as fundamental to mapping future provision.
The board hopes that this inquiry will assist the council in responding successfully to the Youth Matters agenda and ensuring that the 5 outcomes for children and young people are embedded in the youth offer.
- 8 The purpose of the inquiry was to make an assessment of, and where appropriate make recommendations on, the following areas:
 - What should Leeds City Council include in the youth offer that it will have to publish next year?
 - What can be learnt from the existing patterns of provision across the city?
 - What do young people want and expect from youth services in Leeds?
- 9 We were pleased to welcome a wide range of witnesses to our Board meetings, representing a

Introduction and Scope

wide range of agencies from all sectors involved in providing services for young people. This was complemented by our extensive programme of visits to a variety of facilities. We particularly valued the opportunity to talk directly to young people at some of these venues and hear first hand about what they want from a youth offer.

- 10 We would like to thank everyone who took part in our inquiry for giving willingly of their time and for helping us to explore some of the complexities surrounding the provision of youth services today.
- 11 The conclusions and recommendations we have set out below are supplemented by a more comprehensive summary of the evidence we received. This is available as a separate document, from the Scrutiny Unit (see contact details below).

Terminology

- 12 During our inquiry we became aware of some of the confusion that can arise from the use of terminology.
- 13 Throughout this report the term 'youth work' is used to describe professional youth work delivered in accordance with youth work principles. The term 'youth services' is used to describe the broader range of services available

for young people. However the term 'Youth Service' refers to the council's service, which primarily delivers 'youth work'.

- 14 Similarly, the term 'extended services' is currently replacing the concept of 'extended schools'. We have used the former term in this report.

Conclusions and Recommendations



- 1 The requirement to produce a 'youth offer' of sufficient educational leisure time activities and facilities for young people's personal and social development is set out in the Education and Inspections Act 2006.
- 2 The local authority will be required to consult on, prepare, publish and deliver the youth offer on an annual basis. The content of the offer will need to reflect the strap line of the government's Youth Matters programme 'something to do, somewhere to go, someone to talk to'.
- 3 There is an expectation from government that the offer should embrace a very wide range of services including for example, youth work, information, advice, guidance, arts, sports, libraries, environmental initiatives and volunteering.
- 4 The youth offer also needs to be seen within the wider context of the core universal offer for all children and young people, set out by Children Leeds. The youth offer will form an integral element of the core universal offer.
- 5 Our inquiry recognised that 'youth services' cover a far wider range of activities than the predominantly 'youth work' role of the council's own 'Youth Service'. They also include a huge range of activities offered by other partners - ranging from other parts of the council such as leisure services to voluntary, community and faith sector groups. Some of this provision also falls into the category of professional 'youth work', but there is also a great deal of other youth services activity taking place across the city.
- 6 One issue that arose during our discussions was the tension between universal and targeted provision when allocating Youth Service funding. Leeds has consciously focused on targeted work in the past, and this almost certainly contributes to the perception of differing levels of provision across the city that Members highlighted as one of their concerns from the outset of this inquiry.
- 7 Another factor which we had to bear in mind was the separate requirement for an information, advice and guidance service. New guidelines for this service, encompassing the current Connexions services, have recently been published. Connexions and igen contributed to our inquiry, and it was clear from the evidence presented to us that there was a demand from young people for an element of information, advice and guidance to be included within the youth offer.
- 8 The Board is very pleased that the Youth Service already formally recognises the need for

Conclusions and Recommendations



engagement of young people to start well below the statutory youth work age of 13-19, through the allocation of 20% of Youth Service funding for 11 and 12 year olds.

- 9 Nevertheless, probably the strongest message emerging from the evidence presented to us, was the need for far more activity and funding to be targeted towards the 8-12 age group and for the engagement of young people to be well established before the age of 13.
- 10 The Board was also made aware that some groups of young people (for example carers, looked after children and young people with disabilities) may need a different approach or extra assistance to access the types of opportunities available to other young people. In some cases this may mean making specific provision available to meet the access or social needs of these groups; in other cases it may be about ensuring that they are able to overcome any barriers to taking part in universal provision.
- 11 The Board was aware that not all activity that may come under the banner of the youth offer would necessarily be restricted to young people. It is important that inter-generational interaction is retained and developed, particularly in encouraging community cohesion.

Recommendation 1

In light of the evidence presented during our inquiry, we recommend that the youth offer for Leeds needs to address the following key findings:

- **The need for a more equal distribution of universal youth services on offer across the city**
- **That the youth offer in Leeds should extend beyond the statutory 13-19 age group, at least to cover 11 and 12 year olds, but preferably to cover the 8-12 age group**
- **The need to include advice and signposting within universal provision**
- **The need to recognise that some groups of young people (for example carers, looked after children and young people with disabilities) may need a different approach or extra assistance to enable them to access the types of opportunities included in the universal youth offer**
- **The need to recognise young people's expressed desires for venues and spaces to undertake their own (unstructured) activity**
- **The important role of inter-generational/all age activities as well as specific young people's activities**

We ask the Director of Children's Services to report to us within 3 months on how each of these issues will be addressed in the published youth offer.

Conclusions and Recommendations



12 One area that was of particular interest to us was the influence of area management on the Youth Service. When Area Committees were established in 2004, the Youth Service was one of the first services delegated to them to influence and allocate resources for.

13 However, what we also realised was that only about half of the funding for the Youth Service is delegated to Area Committees, and funding for the Youth Service is in itself only a proportion of the funding directed to youth provision city-wide.

14 This was particularly significant in relation to the concerns some of us had about the current formula for allocating Area Committee funding for the Youth Service. This funding is currently allocated in two parts: 50% as a per capita 13-19 head count, and 50% based on the number of children within families that are on benefits (a deprivation factor). This compares to the Area Well-being Funds (also controlled by Area Committees) which are allocated 75% on a population basis and 25% by deprivation factors.

15 We had some debate about whether this was the most appropriate split, and whether other factors should be taken into account such as rural distances

and the availability/proximity or otherwise of alternative facilities. Whilst we could not come to a consensus on the issue, we felt that it needed to be resolved at a political level. However, we also acknowledged that, in the light of what we had learned about funding, it was not as significant an issue in itself as we had at first thought it might be in shaping the overall provision of youth services in Leeds.

Recommendation 2
We recommend that the Executive Board reviews the allocation of Youth Service funding to Area Committees, taking into consideration the issues raised by the Scrutiny Board.

16 We were pleased to hear about the development of the Leeds Youth Work Partnership, and also the emerging work of local networks in some areas of the city, in promoting a stronger partnership approach to working with the voluntary, community and faith sector in providing youth services.

17 Representatives from the voluntary, community and faith sector told us how highly they valued a change in the relationship on the principles of an equal partnership. However for this to be a reality, there needs to be the capacity within the sector to fulfil a strategic role.

Conclusions and Recommendations



- 18 We also noted the value of local networks in assisting smaller organisations, or those for whom youth activity was only a small part of their business, to negotiate the safeguarding and monitoring requirements which were a condition of funding. This nurturing role is an important contribution to the expansion of provision at a local level.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the Director of Children's Services ensures that arrangements for funding and commissioning youth services through the voluntary, community and faith sector includes provision for the strategic capacity of the sector to be an effective partner in service delivery and development.

Recommendation 4

We also recommend that the Director of Children's Services promotes the development of local networks to help smaller organisations to play an effective part in the youth offer and qualify for funding.

- 19 During our inquiry we talked to representatives from Leeds Community Safety, the Youth Offending Service and Youth Inclusion Projects (YIPs), as well as visiting a Junior YIP. Whilst we recognise that it is not the role of

youth services to act as an extension of the law enforcement services, we also see evidence of excellent working between the two services that has a very positive impact for individual young people and for communities.

- 20 In particular, the value of work with the 8-12 age group was again emphasised in engaging young people positively and preventing future anti-social behaviour.

- 21 We feel that this is an area where the Children's trust can promote city-wide good practice based on existing examples in some parts of the city.

- 22 We were pleased to hear that the Youth Service had agreed in principle to provide support to young people leaving the Junior YIPs.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the Director of Children's Services prioritises resources to support the work of the Youth Inclusion Projects (YIPs) and Junior YIPs in the way described to us during our inquiry.

Recommendation 6

That the Director of Children's Services finds ways of promoting positive relationships between the police and youth services more widely, building on the good examples that exist in some parts of the city.

Conclusions and Recommendations



- 23 We valued the opportunity to hear the views of some young people as part of our inquiry, both directly and indirectly.
- 24 However, we were concerned that the Youth Service's survey only involved current users. We feel that it is vitally important that future consultation needs to include young people who do not currently use the service, in order to find out what might attract more young people to access the service.
- 25 We were also interested to hear how young people are more directly involved in shaping services that affect them directly. The best example we heard about was from igen, where young people are formally involved in the management of the service, and also helped decide the decoration scheme for the refurbishment of the Eastgate Connexions centre.

Recommendation 7
We recommend that the Director of Children's Services ensures that, in addition to existing consultation with service users, specific efforts are made to consult with non service users about their views on the Youth Service.

Recommendation 8
We also recommend that the Director of Children's Services considers how the examples of young people's involvement in the management of governance of services can be more widely applied across children's services.

- 26 Overall, we were excited by the range of activities, facilities and services available to young people in Leeds.
- 27 What frustrated us most was the knowledge that the amount and distribution of this provision across the city was limited.
- 28 Whilst in some areas individuals have worked hard to overcome the potential barriers presented by different service infrastructures and priorities, in order to make the most of their combined services, this is not the case everywhere in the city.
- 29 We hope that the combined efforts of the Leeds Youth Work Partnership and Children Leeds will provide greater strategic direction for youth services throughout Leeds, resulting in a more effective and co-ordinated range of provision across the city, and produce an excellent youth offer for our young people to enjoy.

Evidence



Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

- Department for Education and Skills – 'Youth Matters: Next Steps' – March 2006
- Leeds Youth Council Manifesto 2005-08
- Report of the Head of Youth Services – 'Youth Services Inquiry' – 2nd November 2006
- Leeds Youth Services Ofsted Action Plan updated at 17th October 2006
- Leeds Youth Work Partnership information
- Leeds Youth Network (Morley) information
- Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods and Housing – The Impact of Area Management upon the Youth Service – 2nd November 2006
- Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods and Housing – Inquiry into Youth Services: Leeds Community Safety Response – 14th December 2006
- Report of the Chief Social Services Officer – Inquiry into Youth Services: Youth Offending Service response – 14th December 2006
- Igen – Briefing paper – 14th December 2006
- Connexions – Report by Partnership Director Leeds – October 2006
- Learning and Leisure Department - Provision for Children and Young People: Arts and Events – 14th December 2006
- Learning and Leisure 'Reach' Figures for Young People
- Provision for young people 13-19 years in Leeds Museums and Galleries
- Public Private Partnership Unit briefing paper– Use of PFI schools by community groups and third party groups – 14th December 2006
- Report of the Director of Learning and Leisure – Youth Service work with young people with disabilities – 14th December 2006
- A New Universal Offer presentation – Children Leeds
- Local Youth Work Networks
- Local Area Agreement (LAA) Year 9 Project Information
- Youth Service User Survey 2006 - summary of results

Evidence



Reports and Publications Submitted – Evidence from Visits

- Flipchart work in preparation for the Leeds City Council Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) visit to HYPE group
- Connexions/igen information pack 'Moving on in Year Eleven' – June 2006/07
- igen - Scrutiny Board visit presentation and pack of information for young people, including:
 - Connexions West Yorkshire 'Directory of Voluntary and Statutory Agencies 2006 – A guide for referral prepared for Connexions Personal Advisers in Leeds
 - 'Get That Job' – Summer 2006
 - Learning Leeds – Learning Entitlement for 14-19 year olds
 - Leeds Destinations 2005
 - University - Frequently Asked Questions for 2007 entry
 - Routes into..... A Guide to 21 career areas for young people aged 16 – November 2006
 - Where next in Leeds? What can you do at 16? – September 2006
 - Decisions: Information for parents and carers of young people with additional support needs – September 2006

Dates of Scrutiny

- 27th July 2006 – working group meeting
- 2nd November 2006 – Scrutiny Board meeting
- 14th December 2006 – Scrutiny Board meeting

Visits

- 18th November 2006 – Corn Exchange, Leeds City Centre, detached youth work
- 21st November 2006 – Archway
- 22nd November 2006 – igen Leeds Careers, Eastgate
- 27th November 2006 – The Marketplace
- 4th December 2006 – Hyde Park and Burley Junior Youth Inclusion Project (YIP)
- 5th December 2006 – Mobile Youth Provision Service, West Flatts Park, Wortley
- 6th December 2006 – Armley Lazer Centre
- 7th December 2006 – Leeds Sailing and Activity Centre, Yeadon Tarn
- 16th December 2006 – Leeds Youth Council meeting

Evidence



Witnesses Heard

- John Paxton – Head of Youth Service
- Rosemary Archer – Director of Children’s Services
- Dave Ashwell – Voluntary Services Unit, Youth Services
- Mark Law – BARCA / Leeds Youth Work Partnership
- Satbinder Soor – Senior Youth Officer, Youth Services
- Cllr Robert Finnigan – Chair of South (Outer) Area Committee
- Dave Richmond – South Leeds Area Manager
- Louise Megson – St Luke’s Cares }
- Brent Lumley – Willow Young Carers } voluntary, community and faith sector
- Jeni Sawdon – The Marketplace } representatives
- Andy Mills – Head of Community Safety
- Jim Hopkinson – Youth Offending Service Manager
- Peter Hunter – Hyde Park and Burley Junior YIP, Leeds Prevention Programme
- Terry Walsh – Director of igen Leeds Careers
- Shaid Mahmood – Partnership Director Leeds, Connexions West Yorkshire
- Andrew Macgill – Head of Arts and Events,
- Kris Nenadic – Landscape Construction Officer, Parks and Countryside
- Sara Birkinshaw – Senior Sports Development Officer, Sport and Active Recreation
- Britta Heyworth – Arts and Reader Development Manager, Libraries and Heritage
- Mike Kinnaird – Head of Policy and Performance, Learning and Leisure department
- Ken Morton – Director, Learning Communities Team, Education Leeds
- Mark Smith – John Smeaton School
- Dave Outram – Head of the Public Private Partnerships Unit
- Shirley Parks – Deputy Programme Director, Building Schools for the Future, Education Leeds

This page is intentionally left blank