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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Ward/Equal Opportunities</th>
<th>Item Not Open</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25* of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded). (* In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, notice of an appeal must be received in writing by the Head of Governance Services at least 24 hours before the meeting).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED</strong> – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No exempt items have been identified.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LATE ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To disclose or draw attention to any disclosable pecuniary interests for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the purposes of Section 31 of the Localism Act 2011 and paragraphs 13-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Members’ Code of Conduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To receive any apologies for absence and notification of substitutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MINUTES - 24TH APRIL 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Scrutiny Board (Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Families) meeting held on 24th April 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO-OPTED MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To receive a report from the Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the appointment of co-opted members to the Scrutiny Board (Children and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCRUTINY BOARD TERMS OF REFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To receive a report from the Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presenting the Scrutiny Board’s terms of reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOURCES OF WORK FOR THE SCRUTINY BOARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To receive a report from the Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential sources of work for the Scrutiny Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE UPDATE</td>
<td>To receive a report from the Director of Children and Families which provides a summary of performance information relating to outcomes for Leeds children and young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SCHOOL ORGANISATION PROPOSALS AND OBJECTIONS PROCEDURE</td>
<td>To receive a report from the Director of Children and Families which sets out the process followed in opening, closing and making prescribed alterations to schools and academies in Leeds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SCRUTINY INQUIRY ‘IS LEEDS A CHILD FRIENDLY CITY?’ - DRAFT REPORT</td>
<td>To receive a report from the Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support presenting the draft report of the Scrutiny Board following its recent inquiry ‘Is Leeds a Child Friendly City?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WORK SCHEDULE</td>
<td>To consider the Scrutiny Board’s work schedule for the 2019/20 municipal year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</td>
<td>Wednesday, 3rd July 2019 at 10.00 am (pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.45 am)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIRD PARTY RECORDING

Recording of this meeting is allowed to enable those not present to see or hear the proceedings either as they take place (or later) and to enable the reporting of those proceedings. A copy of the recording protocol is available from the contacts on the front of this agenda.

Use of Recordings by Third Parties – code of practice

a) Any published recording should be accompanied by a statement of when and where the recording was made, the context of the discussion that took place, and a clear identification of the main speakers and their role or title.

b) Those making recordings must not edit the recording in a way that could lead to misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the proceedings or comments made by attendees. In particular there should be no internal editing of published extracts; recordings may start at any point and end at any point but the material between those points must be complete.
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SCRUTINY BOARD (CHILDREN AND FAMILIES)

WEDNESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 2019

PRESENT: Councillor A Lamb in the Chair

Councillors H Bithell, K Bruce, D Cohen, P Drinkwater, C Gruen, J Illingworth and R. Stephenson

CO-OPTED MEMBERS (VOTING)

Mr E A Britten – Church Representative (Catholic)
Mr A Graham – Church Representative (Church of England)
Mrs K Blacker – Parent Governor Representative (Primary)
Ms J Ward – Parent Governor Representative (Secondary)

CO-OPTED MEMBERS (NON-VOTING)

Ms C Foote – Teacher Representative
Mrs A Kearsley – Early Years Representative

88 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

89 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

90 Late Items

There were no formal late items, however there was some supplementary information circulated prior to the meeting in relation to Item 7 – Annual Standards Report 2017-18 (Minute 94 refers).

91 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

92 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting to be held on 12th June 2019
Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Lennox and K Renshaw, with no substitutes in attendance. Apologies were also received from Co-opted Members Helen Bellamy, Debbie Reilly and Claire Hopkins.

93 Minutes of the previous meeting

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held 6th March 2019 and 8th April 2019 be approved as a correct record of the meetings.

94 Annual Standards Report 2017-18


Members were informed that the supplementary information distributed prior to the meeting was a corrected version of Key Stage 2 data on page 44 of the report, along with an additional data chart in relation to the percentage of Key Stage 2 pupils reaching the expected standard in Reading, Writing and Maths (RMW).

The following were in attendance:

- Councillor Jonathan Pryor, Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment
- Phil Mellen, Deputy Director for Learning
- Sal Tariq, Deputy Director of Children and Families
- Anne Fell, Area Lead Primary Learning Improvement
- Kevin Paynes, Leadership and Management Lead
- Erica Hiorns, School Improvement Adviser

Councillor Jonathon Pryor, Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment, introduced the item. In doing so, he apologised for the errors in earlier versions of the report. Councillor Pryor also highlighted some areas where Leeds was improving at a faster rate than nationally. The Deputy Director for Learning added that much of the work to tackle the 15 priorities set out in the report, would be addressed by the new 3 A’s Strategy.

Members discussed a number of matters, including:

- **Early years performance.** Members commented that Early Years progress was behind national, despite the increasing number of providers with ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ OfSTED judgements, and sought more information as to why this was the case. The Board were informed that this was largely due to the increase in population, along with an increase in the complexity of needs of early year’s children, particularly in relation to SEND and SEMH.
- **Take-up of free early years hours.** Members were informed, in relation to the above point, that around 10% of children eligible for free early
years hours were not accessing the provision. This was reported to be
due to a number of reasons, including disparity in quality of provision
across the city, complexity around mobility, and the need for better
engagement with private providers. Members were assured that the
new 3 A’s Strategy would provide a clear focus for overcoming this
issue. The Chair requested more information on this matter to be
submitted to a future meeting.

- **Increase in children and young people with SEMH needs and SEND.**
  Members sought more information in regards to the effectiveness of
  the current training offer to staff in early years settings, considering the
  higher threshold for EHCPs. In response, the Board was informed that
  SENCOs in each school were responsible for supporting other
  teachers within the school, and that early identification comes as part
  of the generic training package for early years teachers.

- **Presentation of data within the report.** Members requested that maps
  be incorporated into the design of the report for 2018/19, to illustrate
differences in outcomes across the city. Additionally, there were some
  comments about misdirection of the data to show a more positive
  picture.

- **Internal Exclusions.** Members sought clarity about the steps taken to
  address the prevalence of internal inclusions, despite a decrease in
  permanent exclusions, and were informed that work ongoing with the
  Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) was informing new strategies
to focus on making the best use of teaching assistants, and ensuring
that support staff in internal exclusion areas are trained to manage
SEMH and behavioural issues.

**RESOLVED -**

a) That the contents of the report be noted.
b) That arrangements are made for the successor Scrutiny Board to be
   provided with specific information relating to the take-up of free early
   years provision across the city, including mapping of providers and
   families.

*Councillor K Bruce arrived at the meeting at 10:15am during discussion of this
item.*

**95 Scrutiny Inquiry into Children's Centres - recommendation tracking
update**

The Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support and Director of Children and
Families submitted a report presenting an update on the implementation of
the recommendations arising from the previous Scrutiny inquiry into Children’s
Centres.

The following were in attendance:

- Councillor Lisa Mulherin, Executive Member for Children and Families
The status of recommendations were agreed as follows:

- Recommendation 1 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 2 – Not fully implemented (obstacle). Scrutiny Board to determine appropriate action.
- Recommendation 3 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 4 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 5 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 6 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 7 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 8 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)
- Recommendation 9 – Not fully implemented (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring.)

The following key points were also raised during consideration of this item:

- **Cluster Partnership Support to Children’s Centres.** Members expressed some concerns about the consistency of the relationships between the Clusters and the Children’s Centres, particularly in relation to the Children’s Centres participation in formal governance. The Chair noted that there was a lack of representation from the Children’s Centres at the JCC in his ward, and queried whether this was an isolated incident. Members were assured that this would be investigated.

- **Buildings and Facilities.** Members were informed that a few Children’s Centres within the city were currently being refurbished, including Burley Park Children’s Centre that the Board visited as part of the original inquiry. Members requested a visit to be arranged to the Children’s Centre once the refurbishment was complete and prior to the next inquiry tracking session.

- **Financial Sustainability.** The Chair requested evidence of benefits from current funding, and comment from the Director of Resources and Housing regarding the financial sustainability of the budget.

- **GP Services.** Members were advised that various attempts had been made in relation to forming relationships between children’s centres and their local GP practices, however there was still not a consistent approach to working in partnership. GPs had reported that they find it difficult to obtain current information about local communities as they
do not have the time to conduct the research, and in response officers acknowledged that a way of sharing data needed to be established. The Board noted that there was a clear obstacle to progress, and that a further meeting would be facilitated to endeavour to understand the challenges associated with establishing partnership working between local GP services and Children’s Centres. The Chair noted that the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing, the Director of Public Health and the relevant lead from the Leeds CCG would be invited to contribute to the discussion.

RESOLVED –

a) That the contents of the report be noted.
b) That the additional discussion around local GP services, and visit to Burley Park Children’s Centre, be incorporated into the work programme for the 2019/20 municipal year.
c) That the above status of recommendations be approved.

96 Scrutiny Inquiry - Is Leeds a child friendly city?

The Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support submitted a report presenting additional information in response to requests made by the Board during the course of its inquiry this year.

The following was appended to the report:

- Leeds Youth Council Open Spaces Questionnaire Results
- Regional Youth Voice & Bus18 Meeting, Notes and Summary of Actions
- Youth Voice Summit Event Report, March 2019

The following were in attendance:

- Councillor Lisa Mulherin, Executive Member for Children and Families
- Sal Tariq, Deputy Director of Children and Families
- Phil Mellen, Deputy Director for Learning
- Sue Rumbold, Chief Officer, Partnerships and Health
- Jane Walne, Head of Programmes and Projects, City Development
- Hannah Lamplugh, Voice and Influence Lead
- Kathryn Holloway, Team Leader, City Development
- Jenny Fisher, Principal Officer, Planning and Sustainable Development, City Development
- Richard Cracknell, Voice and Influence Coordinator
- Vicki Marsden, Play Strategy Officer

Parental engagement and influence on educational outcomes
• Members were informed that most schools in the city are now keen to engage with parents around strategic plans, but further progress was needed. Members queried how this could be achieved, and were informed that there was an opportunity to share best practice. Members were also advised that the Voice, Influence and Change (VIC) Team had developed a model and guidance for Parent Councils across primary schools in the city.

• Members commented on the likelihood for more engagement in primary schools, but challenges within secondary schools. Members queried whether there were varied approaches taken by Multi Academy Trusts (MATs) depending on whether they were local or national bodies. In response, the Board was informed that despite the type of MAT, all parental engagement activities tend to be devised and delivered locally.

• The need for engagement with parents who do not take-up free pre-school hours that they are entitled to, to understand the barriers to access and how to encourage enrolment.

The voice and influence of young people surrounding the development of child friendly spaces through planning and City Development processes

• There was some discussion surrounding the extent to which young people had been consulted during the recent Core Strategy and Site Allocation Plan examinations. Linked to this, Members were informed that consultation workshops in relation to the initial development stages of the Core Strategy had took place back in 2006 with the Leeds Youth Council.

• Whilst acknowledging that there are clear legislative and external considerations linked to the way in which formal public hearings are undertaken, Members felt that more consideration was needed to enable young people’s voices to be heard, such as use of video links and holding meetings at more convenient times. Whilst it was suggested that the Scrutiny Board may wish to raise such matters directly with the Planning Inspectorate, it was noted that the scope of opportunity to bring in the voice of young people could also be linked to the Council’s own forthcoming review of the Core Strategy, including a refresh of the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.

• In relation to significant planning and development decisions that are more localised, Members were informed that as the Youth Council is not currently recognised as a statutory consultee for planning applications, the choice to carry out any specific consultation with children and young people remained at the discretion of individual planning officers. Whilst it was noted that children and young people would still be able to submit their views in the same way as any other member of the public, the Voice and Influence Lead Officer highlighted that local youth groups and schools in specific areas of planned development would be particularly receptive to greater engagement opportunities and that the VIC Team would be happy to work in partnership to explore this further.
Recent examples of active engagement work with young people by City Development was provided to the Board. Particular reference was made to a successful workshop with housing developers looking at barriers and opportunities when developing environments, which took place in February 2019 involving young ambassadors and could be replicated.

Members requested that children and young people be included in the recruitment process for the new Chief Planning Officer, and that a question be included seeking the candidates ideas and ambitions to embed a child friendly agenda in the planning process.

The voice and influence of young people in identifying and addressing local transport needs

Members were informed that work with the Youth Council and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority was ongoing and progressing well.

Engaging young people in the Scrutiny Board’s Inquiry

The Chair thanked the VIC Team for their support with all of the visits to youth groups, and for the Youth Summit Event.

Members provided feedback on the individual visits and identified some common themes. There was clear evidence of feelings and experiences which threatened safety, specifically prevalence of anti-social behaviour and lack of police presence. There were also reports from female groups of feeling intimidated around groups of boys, and around adult men under the influence of alcohol in the city centre. Cost of travel also emerged as a theme, which children and young people felt acted as a barrier to their access to the city centre and other activities outside of their area. Some of the older groups reported that some activities felt ‘too young’, whereas they were unable to be involved in more adult activities and still felt that they required an element of support. There were concerns raised about mental health, and understanding amongst young people of what constitutes as a mental health problem in contrast to a wellbeing issue.

RESOLVED – That the contents of the report, along with Members comments, be noted.

Co-opted Member Andrew Graham left the meeting at 12:00pm during discussion of this item. Councillors Gruen and Bruce left the meeting at 12:20pm and 12:45pm respectively during discussion of this item.

Work Schedule

The Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support submitted a report regarding the Scrutiny Board’s work schedule for the 2018/19 municipal year and outline proposals for the 2019/20 municipal year.
The Principal Scrutiny Adviser introduced the report and outlined the areas within the report and associated work schedule. In relation to the Scrutiny Board's Inquiry this year, Members were informed that the Board’s draft Inquiry report would be circulated for approval during May, and then presented formally to the successor Board at the first meeting of the 2019/20 municipal year in June 2019. Whilst acknowledging that the Inquiry report will be used as a key reference document to help shape the work programme of the successor Board, the Chair highlighted that the proposed work schedule set out in Appendix 3 will be amended to also reflect the suggested areas of work raised during this meeting. Linked to this, a Board Member put forward a further suggestion that internal exclusions also be added to the proposed work schedule for 2019/20.

The Chair thanked all Board Members and the officers for their contributions and support throughout the year.

RESOLVED –

   a) That the overall work schedule as presented at Appendix 1 be agreed.
   b) That the draft work schedule as presented at Appendix 3 be agreed, subject to the amendments set out above.

98 Date and Time of Next Meeting

The precise time and date of the June 2019 meeting was to be confirmed at a later date.

(The meeting concluded at 1.20 pm)
Report of Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support

Report to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Date: 12th June 2019

Subject: Co-opted Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are specific electoral Wards affected?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the decision eligible for Call-In?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix number:

Summary of main issues

1. For a number of years the Council’s Constitution has made provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards.

2. This report provides guidance to the Scrutiny Board when seeking to appoint co-opted members. There are also some legislative arrangements in place for the appointment of specific co-opted members. Such cases are set out in the Council’s Constitution and are also summarised within this report.

Recommendation

3. In line with the options available and information outlined in this report, Members are asked to:
   a) Consider and appoint non-voting co-opted members to the Scrutiny Board.
   b) Note the nominations of the Roman Catholic Diocese and Church of England Diocese.
   c) Note the appointed parent governor representatives.
1 Purpose of this report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Scrutiny Board’s formal consideration for the appointment of co-opted members to the Board.

2 Background information

2.1 For a number of years the Council’s Constitution has made provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards. For those Scrutiny Boards where co-opted members have previously been appointed, such arrangements have tended to be reviewed on an annual basis, usually at the beginning of a new municipal year.

3 Main issues

General arrangements for appointing co-opted members

3.1 It is widely recognised that in some circumstances, co-opted members can significantly aid the work of Scrutiny Boards. The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules within the Council’s Constitution outlines the options available to Scrutiny Boards in relation to appointing co-opted members.

3.2 In general terms, Scrutiny Boards can appoint:

- Up to five non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council; and/or,

- Up to two non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that relates to the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry.

3.3 In the majority of cases the appointment of co-opted members is optional and is determined by the relevant Scrutiny Board. However, the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules make it clear that co-option would normally only be appropriate where the co-opted member has some specialist skill or knowledge, which would be of assistance to the Scrutiny Board. Particular issues to consider when seeking to appoint a co-opted member are set out later in the report.

3.4 There are also some legislative arrangements in place for the appointment of specific co-opted members. Such cases are also set out in the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules and are summarised below.

Arrangements for appointing specific co-opted members

Education Representatives

3.5 In addition to elected Members appointed by Council, the Local Government Act 2000 states that the relevant Scrutiny Board dealing with education matters shall include in its membership the following voting representatives in accordance with statutory requirements:
• One Church of England diocese representative\(^1\) - Andrew Graham has been nominated
• One Roman Catholic diocese representative\(^1\) - Tony Britten has been nominated
• Parent governor representatives\(^2\)

Parent governor representatives are as follows:

- Jacqueline Ward (Secondary) – 23/04/2019 – 24/04/2023
- Kate Blacker (Primary) – 26/09/2018 – 26/09/2022

3.6 The Parent Governor Regulations (Representatives) England 2001 states that a local education authority shall appoint at least two parent governor representatives to each of their education overview and scrutiny committees and sub-committees. The Board has previously appointed three parent governor representatives. However, there were no expressions of interest made to the Education Governors Service as part of the recent application process for a parent governor (SEN) representative.

3.7 The number and term of office of education representatives is fixed by full Council and set out in Article 6. Representatives of the Church of England and Roman Catholic dioceses are nominated by their diocese and parent governor representatives are elected.

3.8 Where the Scrutiny Board deals with other non-educational matters, the co-opted members may participate in any discussion but shall not be entitled to vote on those matters.

**Issues to consider when seeking to appoint non-voting co-opted members**

3.9 The Constitution makes it clear that ‘co-option would normally only be appropriate where the co-opted member has some specialist skill or knowledge, which would be of assistance to the Scrutiny Board’. In considering the appointment of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards should be satisfied that a co-opted member can use their specialist skill or knowledge to add value to the work of the Scrutiny Board. However, co-opted members should not be seen as a replacement to professional advice from officers.

3.10 Co-opted members should be considered as representatives of wider groups of people. However, when seeking external input into the Scrutiny Board’s work, consideration should always be given to other alternative approaches, such as the role of expert witnesses or use of external research studies, to help achieve a balanced evidence base.

3.11 When considering the appointment of a co-opted member for a term of office, Scrutiny Boards should be mindful of any potential conflicts of interest that may arise during the course of the year in view of the Scrutiny Boards’ wide ranging terms of reference. To help overcome this, Scrutiny Boards may wish to focus on the provision available to appoint up to two non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that relates to the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry.

---

\(^1\) This appointment shall be for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council.

\(^2\) These appointments shall be for a four-year term of office.
3.12 Despite the lack of any national guidance, what is clear is that any process for appointing co-opted members should be carried out in a manner which seeks to strengthen the work of Scrutiny Boards.

Nominations for non-voting co-opted members for 2019/20

3.13 In addition to those voting co-opted member nominations stated in paragraph 3.5 the following non-voting nominations and volunteers have been received:

1) Teacher Representative – Celia Foote
2) Teacher Representative – Helen Bellamy
3) Early Years Representative – Anne Kearsley
4) Young Lives Leeds – awaiting nomination
5) Looked after Children/Care leavers – Debbie Reilly

3.14 Should further nominations be received following agenda publication, the Scrutiny Board will be advised verbally at the meeting on 12th June 2019.

4.0 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 The guidance surrounding co-opted members was previously discussed by the Scrutiny Chairs when it was agreed that individual Scrutiny Boards would consider the appointment of co-optees on an individual basis.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration.

4.2.1 The process for appointing co-opted members should be open, effective and carried out in a manner which seeks to strengthen the work of the Scrutiny Board. In doing so, due regard should also be given to any potential equality issues in line with the Council’s Equality and Diversity Scheme.

4.3 Council Policies and Best Council Plan

4.3.1 The Council’s Scrutiny arrangements are one of the key parts of the Council’s governance arrangements. Within the Council’s Constitution, there is particular provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards, which this report seeks to summarise.

4.4 Resources and Value for Money

4.4.1 Where applicable, any incidental expenses paid to co-optees will be met within existing resources.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 Where additional members are co-opted onto a Scrutiny Board, such members must comply with the provisions set out in the Member’s Code of Conduct as detailed within the Council’s Constitution.
4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 As stated in paragraph 3.11 above, when Scrutiny Boards are considering the appointment of a standing co-opted member for a term of office, they should be mindful of any potential conflicts of interest that may arise during the course of the year in view of the Scrutiny Boards’ wide ranging terms of reference.

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 For a number of years the Council’s Constitution has made provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards. This report therefore sets out the legislative arrangements in place for the appointment of specific co-opted members and also provides further guidance when seeking to appoint co-opted members.

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 In line with the options available and information outlined in this report, Members are asked to:

   a) Consider and appoint non-voting co-opted members to the Scrutiny Board.
   b) Note the nominations of the Roman Catholic Diocese and Church of England Diocese
   c) Note the appointed parent governor representatives

7.0 Background documents

None

---

3 The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council’s website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
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Summary of main issues

1. This report presents the terms of reference for Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) for Members’ information.

Recommendation

2. Members are requested to note the Scrutiny Board’s terms of reference.
1.0 Purpose of this report

1.1 This report presents the terms of reference for Scrutiny Board (Children and Families).

2.0 Background information

Scrutiny Board’s terms of reference

2.1 Whilst the general Terms of Reference applied to all Scrutiny Boards is set out in Appendix 1, the variations in the Scrutiny Boards’ remits, together with their special responsibilities, are captured within Article 6 of the constitution (see Appendix 2).

2.2 However, more detailed information has also been provided to show how each of the five individual Scrutiny Boards this year have been aligned to Officer Delegated Functions and Executive Portfolios (see Appendix 3).

3.0 Corporate Considerations

3.1 Consultation and Engagement

3.1.1 These terms of reference were formally considered and approved by Council on 22nd May 2019.

3.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration.

3.2.1 In line with the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, the Scrutiny Boards will continue to ensure through service review that equality and diversity/cohesion and integration issues are considered in decision making and policy formulation.

3.3 Council Policies and the Best Council Plan

3.3.1 The terms of reference of the Scrutiny Board will continue to promote a strategic and outward looking Scrutiny function that focuses on the Best Council Plan.

3.4 Resources and Value for Money

3.4.1 This report has no specific resource and value for money implications.

3.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

3.5.1 This report has no specific legal implications.

3.6 Risk Management

3.6.1 This report has no risk management implications.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 Members are requested to note the Scrutiny Board’s terms of reference.
5.0 Background documents

5.1 None

---

1 The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council’s website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
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Scrubtiney Board

The Scrutiny Board is authorised to discharge the following overview and scrutiny functions:\(^1\):

1. to review or scrutinise decisions made or other action taken in connection with any council or executive function or any matter which affects the authority’s area or the inhabitants of that area;\(^2\)

2. to receive and consider requests for Scrutiny from any source;

3. to review or scrutinise the performance of such Trust / Partnership Boards as fall within its remit;

4. to act as the appropriate Scrutiny Board in relation to the Executive’s initial proposals for a relevant plan or strategy within the Budget and Policy Framework which falls within its remit;\(^3\)

5. to review or scrutinise executive decisions that have been Called In;

6. to exercise such special functions as are allocated in Annex 3 to Article 6 – Scrutiny Boards; and

7. to make such reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate and to receive and monitor formal responses to any reports or recommendations made.

---

\(^1\) In relation to functions set out in Annex 2 to Article 6 – Scrutiny Boards, whether or not those functions are concurrently delegated to any other committee or officer.

\(^2\) Including matters pertaining to outside bodies and partnerships to which the authority has made appointments.

\(^3\) In accordance with Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules.
6.1 ROLE

The Council will appoint Scrutiny Boards as set out in Annex 2 to this Article to exercise functions conferred by section 9F of the Local Government Act 2000 and in accordance with the National Health Service Act 2006, in accordance with their terms of reference.¹

6.2 VISION FOR SCRUTINY

The Council has adopted a Vision for Scrutiny, which is attached at Annex 1.

6.3 ROLE OF SCRUTINY

Policy development and review

Within their Terms of Reference all Scrutiny Boards may:

- assist the Council and the Executive in the development of the Budget and Policy Framework by in-depth analysis of policy issues;
- conduct research, community and other consultation in the analysis of policy issues and possible options;
- consider and implement mechanisms to encourage and enhance community participation in the development of policy options;
- question Members of the Executive and Directors about their views on issues and proposals affecting the area; and
- liaise with other external organisations operating in the area, whether national, regional or local, to ensure that the interests of local people are enhanced by collaborative working.

Scrutiny

Within their terms of reference all Scrutiny Boards may:

- make recommendations to the Executive and/or appropriate committees and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process;
- review and scrutinise the performance of other public bodies in the area and invite reports from them by requesting them to address the Scrutiny Board and local people about their activities and performance; and
- question and gather evidence.

¹ As set out at Part 3 Section 2A of the Constitution
6.4 SCRUTINY OFFICER

The Council has designated the post of Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support, as Scrutiny Officer².

The functions of the Scrutiny Officer are:
(a) to promote the role of the Scrutiny Boards;
(b) to provide support to the Scrutiny Boards and their members³;
(c) to provide support and guidance to Members (including Executive Members), and officers⁴, in relation to the Scrutiny Boards’ functions;
(d) to report to Council⁵ annually about how the authority has carried out its overview and scrutiny functions.

6.5 PROCEEDINGS

Scrutiny Boards will conduct their proceedings in accordance with the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.

6.6 MEMBERSHIP

Members shall be appointed in accordance with the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules.

Scrutiny Boards shall co-opt members in accordance with the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules.

6.7 SCRUTINY BOARD CHAIRS

The Chair of each of the Scrutiny Boards shall be appointed in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules.

Group spokespersons shall not be appointed to Chair a Scrutiny Board which corresponds to the same portfolio.⁶

- The Scrutiny Board with responsibility for health shall nominate Members to any joint overview and scrutiny committee appointed by the authority.⁷

---

³ The Scrutiny Officer shall exercise overall responsibility for the finances made available to Scrutiny Boards.
⁴ The Scrutiny Officer shall exercise overall responsibility for the work programme of the officers employed to support the work of the Scrutiny Boards.
⁵ After consultation with the relevant Scrutiny Chairs
⁶ This does not apply to those groups who have less than 10% of the membership of the Council
⁷ such nominations to reflect the political balance of the Board.
Vision for Scrutiny at Leeds

“To promote democratic engagement through the provision of an influential scrutiny function which is held in high regard by its many stakeholders and which achieves measurable service improvements which add value for the people of Leeds through a member led process of examination and review”

To achieve this Scrutiny will follow the nationally agreed ‘Four Principles of Good Scrutiny’;

1. Provide ‘critical friend’ challenge to decision makers, through holding them to account for decisions made, engaging in policy review and policy development;
2. Promote Scrutiny as a means by which the voice and concerns of the public can be heard;
3. Ensure Scrutiny is carried out by ‘independent minded’ Board members;
4. Improve public services by ensuring reviews of policy and service performance are focused.

To succeed Council recognises that the following conditions need to be present;

- Parity of esteem between the Executive and Scrutiny
- Co-operation with statutory partners
- Member leadership and engagement
- Genuine non-partisan working
- Evidence based conclusions and recommendations
- Effective dedicated officer support
- Supportive Directors and senior officer culture

Council agrees that it is incumbent upon Scrutiny Boards to recognise that resources to support the Scrutiny function are, (like all other Council functions), under considerable pressure and that requests from Scrutiny Boards cannot always be met. Therefore Council agrees that constructive consultation should take place between the Executive and Scrutiny about the availability of resources prior to any work being undertaken.

Consequently, when establishing their work programmes Scrutiny Boards should

- Seek the advice of the Scrutiny officer, the relevant Director and Executive Member about available resources
- Avoid duplication by having a full appreciation of any existing forums already having oversight of, or monitoring a particular issue (e.g. Plans Panel, Housing Advisory Board, established member working groups, other Scrutiny Boards)
- Ensure any Scrutiny undertaken has clarity and focus of purpose and will add value and can be delivered within an agreed time frame.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scrutiny Board</th>
<th>External oversight</th>
<th>Officer oversight (by reference to the Officer Delegation Scheme)</th>
<th>Council Functions</th>
<th>Executive Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and Resources</strong></td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Chief Executive (1-3)</td>
<td>Chief Executive (1-3)</td>
<td>Chief Executive (1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing</td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing (1-9)</td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing (1-9)</td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing (1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Officer (Financial Services)</td>
<td>City Solicitor (1-3)</td>
<td>City Solicitor (1-3)</td>
<td>City Solicitor (1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Solicitor</td>
<td>Chief Officer (Financial Services)(1)</td>
<td>Chief Officer (Financial Services)(1)</td>
<td>Chief Officer (Financial Services)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Communities and Environment</td>
<td>Director of Communities and Environment (2, 15 – 17, 19)</td>
<td>Director of Communities and Environment (2, 15 – 17, 19)</td>
<td>Director of Communities and Environment (2, 15 – 17, 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure, Investment and Inclusive Growth</strong></td>
<td>Risk management authorities (defined by S6 Flood and Water Management Act 2010)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (a-w)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (a-w)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (a-w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Planning Officer</td>
<td>Chief Planning Officer</td>
<td>Chief Planning Officer</td>
<td>Chief Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment, Housing and Communities</strong></td>
<td>Responsible authorities (defined by S5 Crime and Disorder Act 1998)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Director of Communities and Environment (1, 3-8, 10-14, 18)</td>
<td>Director of Communities and Environment (1, 3-8, 10-14, 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing (10-12)</td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing (10-12)</td>
<td>Director of Resources and Housing (10-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of City Development</td>
<td>Director of City Development (1a, 2)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (1a, 2)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (1a, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children and Families</strong></td>
<td>Director of Children and Families</td>
<td>Director of Children and Families (1, 2a-d &amp; f, 3)</td>
<td>Director of Children and Families (1, 2a-d &amp; f, 3)</td>
<td>Director of Children and Families (1, 2a-d &amp; f, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adults, Health and Active Lifestyles</strong></td>
<td>Relevant NHS bodies or health service providers including:- NHS England NHS Leeds Clinical Commissioning Group Local NHS Trusts and other NHS service providers Healthwatch Leeds</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Director of Adults and Health (1 - 8)</td>
<td>Director of Adults and Health (1 - 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Director of Public Health (1-6)</td>
<td>Director of Public Health (1-6)</td>
<td>Director of Public Health (1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Director of City Development (10)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (10)</td>
<td>Director of City Development (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Relating to provision of frontline services only
SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCRUTINY BOARDS

1 – Flood risk Management

The Scrutiny Board (Infrastructure, Investment and Inclusive Growth) is allocated special responsibility for flood risk management namely:

- To review and scrutinise the exercise by risk management authorities\(^9\) of flood risk management functions\(^10\) which may affect the Leeds City Council area\(^11\).

2 – Crime and Disorder

The Scrutiny Board (Environment, Housing and Communities) is allocated special responsibility for crime and disorder namely:

- To exercise the functions of a crime and disorder committee\(^12\), including the following:
  a) To review or scrutinise the exercise of crime and disorder functions\(^13\) by responsible authorities\(^14\); and
  b) To review or scrutinise any local crime or disorder matter\(^15\) raised by a Member.

3 – Health

The Scrutiny Board (Adults, Health and Active Lifestyles) is allocated special responsibility for health namely:

- to review and scrutinise any matter relating to the planning, provision and operation of the health service in its area and to make reports and recommendations on any such matter it has reviewed or scrutinised;
- to comment on, make recommendations about, or report to the Secretary of State in writing about such proposals as are referred to the authority by a relevant NHS body or a relevant health service provider;
- to respond to consultation by any relevant NHS body or health service provider; and

---

\(^9\) As defined by Section 6 Flood and Water Management Act 2010
\(^10\) As defined by Section 4 Flood and Water Management Act 2010
\(^11\) In accordance with Section 9FH Local Government Act 2000
\(^12\) In accordance with Section 19 Police and Justic Act 2006
\(^13\) As defined by Section 6 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (formulating and implementing crime and disorder strategies)
\(^14\) These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies set out in Section 5 Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
\(^15\) Any matter concerning –
  a) crime and disorder (including in particular forms of crime and disorder that involve anti-social behaviour or other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment); or
  b) the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in that area.
Matters which fall within the terms of reference of this Scrutiny Board include:

- arrangements made by local NHS bodies to secure hospital and community health services to the inhabitants of the authority’s area and the quality and safety of such services;
- the provision of family health services, personal medical services, personal dental services, pharmacy and NHS ophthalmic services;
- arrangements made by the authority for public health, health promotion, health improvement and for addressing health inequalities;
- the planning of health services by NHS bodies, including plans made in co-operation with local authority’s Health and Wellbeing Board for improving both the health of the local population and the provision of health care to that population;
- any matter referred by Healthwatch Leeds; and
- the arrangements made by relevant NHS bodies and health service providers for consulting and involving patients and the public.

The Scrutiny Board may make recommendations to the authority, relevant NHS bodies, or relevant health service providers arising from the scrutiny process.

4– Residual Responsibility

The Scrutiny Board (Strategy and Resources) is allocated residual responsibility for any function not otherwise allocated to a Scrutiny Board.
## Scrutiny Board (Children & Families)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Executive Delegations</th>
<th>Executive Portfolio(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Children and Families</strong></td>
<td>Executive Member for Children and Families Cllr Fiona Venner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Children’s Social Work including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Preventative Services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Safeguarding and Child Protection;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Assessment and Care Management;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Residential and Respite Care;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Support For Carers; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Youth Offending Services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Learning including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Early Years Provision; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Development of active citizens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Child friendly City including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Child Poverty; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Voice and Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Influencing Climate Change And Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Children and Families</strong></td>
<td>Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment - Cllr Jonathan Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Learning including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Sustainable access to education;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Special Educational Needs and Disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Promotion of attendance, attainment and achievement;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scrutiny Board Strategy & Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Executive Delegations</th>
<th>Executive Portfolio(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Chief Executive**  
  1) Functions in relation to elections; and  
  2) Civic and ceremonial functions of the Council.  
  3) Devolution and local freedoms. | Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis  
Leader of Council and Executive Member for Inclusive Growth and Culture - Cllr Judith Blake |
| **Director of Resources and Housing**  
  1) Setting, supporting and monitoring the council’s financial strategy; | Leader of Council and Executive Member for Inclusive Growth and Culture - Cllr Judith Blake |
|  
**Director of Resources and Housing**  
  2) Managing effective financial management and controls;  
  3) Setting, supporting and monitoring the council’s policies and procedures  
  4) Corporate communications services;  
  5) The council’s corporate planning and policy development services, including coordination of the Best Council Plan.  
  6) The council’s city-wide resilience and emergency planning functions.  
  7) Shared Services  
  8) Civic Enterprise Leeds services;  
  9) Community Infrastructure Levy spending relating to Strategic Fund; | Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis |
| **Director of City Development**  
  6) International and Domestic inward economic investment; (includes international relations)  
  9) Culture | Leader of Council and Executive Member for Inclusive Growth and Culture - Cllr Judith Blake |
| **Director of Communities and Environment**  
  2) Equalities.  
  15) Registrars functions;  
  16) Licensing functions;  
  17) Local Land Charges functions; and  
  19) Council tax processing and billing arrangements. | Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment - Cllr Jonathan Pryor  
Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis |
| **Chief Officer (Financial Services)**  
  1) Ensuring effective financial management and controls (has responsibility for these arrangements as Section 151 Officer) | Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis |
| **City Solicitor**  
  1) Legal Services;  
  2) Democratic Services including support to elected members in their responsibilities; and  
  3) Supporting the corporate governance of the council. | Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis |
### Scrutiny Board (Environment, Housing & Communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Officer Executive Delegations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Executive Portfolio(s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Resources and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Climate Change</td>
<td>Executive Member for Climate Change, Transport and Sustainable Development - Cllr Lisa Mulherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Sustainable energy and carbon reduction</td>
<td>Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Clean Air</td>
<td>Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Communities - Cllr Debra Coupar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Landlord Functions (funded by the Housing Revenue Account); and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Housing Functions (funded by the General Fund).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Communities and Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Integrated locality working and its associated citywide support and delivery functions;</td>
<td>Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Communities - Cllr Debra Coupar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The council’s corporate customer services functions;</td>
<td>5c) Executive Member Health, Wellbeing and Adults - Cllr Rebecca Charlwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Library and information service.</td>
<td>Executive Member for Environment and Active Lifestyles - Cllr Mohammed Rafique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Community Safety including</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) CCTV;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Reduction of crime and disorder;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Drugs and alcohol treatment and offender management (Reports to EHC as nominated Crime &amp; disorder committee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Tackling antisocial behaviour;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Tackling domestic violence; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Welfare and benefits services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Public Health Protection and Control of Statutory Nuisance;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Environmental Health and Consumer Protection;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Environmental Management;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Car Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Waste;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Cemeteries, crematoria, burial grounds and mortuaries;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Parks and countryside;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Countryside management; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Ecological Sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of City Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Functions relating to the Council’s register of Assets of Community Value.</td>
<td>Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Communities - Cllr Debra Coupar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Executive Delegations</td>
<td>Executive Portfolio(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) City Region Functions</td>
<td>Leader of Council and Executive Member for Inclusive Growth and Culture - Cllr Judith Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of City Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Inclusive growth</td>
<td>Leader of Council and Executive Member for Inclusive Growth and Culture - Cllr Judith Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Asset Management; (This is all of asset management (including assets needed for communities &amp; regeneration functions)</td>
<td>Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Resources - Cllr James Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sustainable development;</td>
<td>Executive Member for Climate Change, Transport and Sustainable Development - Cllr Lisa Mulherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Highways and Transportation; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Planning Services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Sustainable Economic Development (including city centre management, markets service, BID, business support &amp; productivity)</td>
<td>Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment - Cllr Jonathan Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Employment and skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of City Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Flood and water management</td>
<td>Executive Member for Environment and Active Lifestyles - Cllr Mohammed Rafique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of City Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Sustainable Housing Growth</td>
<td>Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Communities - Cllr Debra Coupar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Children and Families</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Learning, Skills and Universal Services including:-</td>
<td>Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment - Cllr Jonathan Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 14-16 Skills Development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Planning Officer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Development Plan functions;</td>
<td>Executive Member for Climate Change, Transport and Sustainable Development - Cllr Lisa Mulherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Planning Policy and Guidance functions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Neighbourhood Planning functions; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Conservation Area functions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scrutiny Board (Adults, Health & Active Lifestyles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Executive Delegations</th>
<th>Executive Portfolio(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Adults and Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Promotion of well-being;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Information, advice and advocacy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Prevention and Recovery;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Safeguarding;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Assessment and eligibility;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Diverse and High Quality Services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Charging and financial assessments; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Public Health.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Health improvement functions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Health protection functions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Functions relating to the commissioning of public health services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Provision of statutory and mandated functions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Functions of Responsible Authority; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Publication of the annual report on the health of the local population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of City Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Sport and Active Leeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of City Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Active travel (relating to the promotion and championing of active travel – with responsibilities for infrastructure remaining within the highways and transport and planning functions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Member Health. Wellbeing and Adults - Cllr Rebecca Charlwood

Executive Member Health. Wellbeing and Adults - Cllr Mohammed Rafique

Executive Member Health. Wellbeing and Adults - Cllr Rebecca Charlwood
Report of Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support

Report to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Date: 12th June 2019

Subject: Sources of work for the Scrutiny Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are specific electoral Wards affected?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☑ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the decision eligible for Call-In?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of main issues

1. Scrutiny Boards are responsible for ensuring that items of scrutiny work come from a strategic approach as well as a need to challenge service performance and respond to issues of high public interest.

2. The Vision for Scrutiny\(^1\), attached at Appendix 1, recognises that like all other Council functions, resources to support the Scrutiny function are under considerable pressure and that requests from Scrutiny Boards cannot always be met. Consequently, when establishing their work programmes Scrutiny Boards should:

   - Ensure any Scrutiny undertaken has clarity and focus of purpose and will add value and can be delivered within an agreed time frame;
   - Avoid pure “information items” except where that information is being received as part of a policy/scrutiny review;
   - Seek the advice of the Scrutiny officer, the relevant Director and Executive Member about available resources;
   - Avoid duplication by having a full appreciation of any existing forums already having oversight of, or monitoring a particular issue;
   - Balanced in terms of the workload across the Scrutiny Boards and as to the type of Scrutiny taking place;

\(^1\) This forms part of Article 6 within the Council Constitution.
- Sufficiently flexible to enable the consideration of urgent matters that may arise during the year.

3. This report provides information and guidance on potential sources of work and areas of priority within the Board’s terms of reference. In consultation with the relevant Directors and Executive Board Members, the Scrutiny Board is requested to consider priority areas of Scrutiny for the forthcoming municipal year.

**Recommendations**

4. Members are requested to consider the information and guidance provided within this report when determining priority areas of Scrutiny work for the forthcoming municipal year.
1.0 Purpose of this report

1.1 To assist the Scrutiny Board in effectively managing its workload for the forthcoming municipal year, this report provides information and guidance on potential sources of work and areas of priority within the Board’s terms of reference.

2.0 Background information

2.1 Scrutiny Boards are responsible for ensuring that items of scrutiny work come from a strategic approach as well as a need to challenge service performance and respond to issues of high public interest. Scrutiny is also a valuable sounding board for new policy initiatives and therefore such pre-decision work continues to be encouraged.

3.0 Main issues

Key sources of information

➢ Best Council Plan

3.1 The Best Council Plan is a significant source of information in terms of highlighting the Council’s key areas of priority over the coming months and years.

3.2 A refresh of the Best Council Plan was agreed by Council in February 2019 to reflect the significant changes to the context in which the council is working. This is therefore attached for Members information (see Appendix 2).

➢ Strategic Partnership Board

3.3 As set out within its terms of reference, this Scrutiny Board may review or scrutinise the performance of the Children and Families Trust Board acting as ‘critical friend’.

3.4 The Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP) is the shared vision for everyone working with children and young people in Leeds. The latest CYPP covers the period 2018 to 2023 and takes account of the current national picture and evolving local challenges. The CYPP plan on a page is presented in Appendix 3 for information.

3.5 In determining items of scrutiny work this year, the Scrutiny Board is encouraged to explore how it can add value to the work of the Partnership in delivering on the city priorities, and the obsessions and outcomes detailed in the Children and Young Peoples Plan.

➢ Performance Data

3.6 Performance monitoring remains a key element of the Scrutiny Boards’ work and is also a valuable source of information to help identify potential areas that may warrant further scrutiny. The most recent performance data is therefore included as a separate agenda item for today’s meeting (Agenda Item 10). This provides the Board with a summary of performance against the strategic priorities that are relevant to the Board’s remit.
3.7 All Scrutiny Boards are consulted annually on the Council’s initial budget proposals in accordance with the Council’s Budget and Policy Framework. This is undertaken in conjunction with a review of the in-year financial health of the authority.

3.8 The 2019/20 budget proposals were agreed by Full Council on 27th February 2019. The Scrutiny Board may wish to consider progress against the delivery of these and therefore a summary of the budget proposals relevant to the remit of the Children and Families Scrutiny Board is provided in Appendix 4.

3.9 Maintaining an overview of the Council’s financial health is also a key element of the Scrutiny Board’s work and therefore the Board may wish to receive further financial health updates during the municipal year.

**Recommended areas of work**

3.10 Last year, the Children and Families Scrutiny Board undertook an inquiry that reviewed overall progress made since the launch of the Child Friendly Leeds initiative and asked the question ‘Is Leeds a child friendly city?’ The Board’s draft inquiry report forms part of today’s agenda (Agenda Item 12) and identifies common themes and suggested key areas of further scrutiny work for the Board to consider this year.

3.11 During its final meeting, the former Children and Families Scrutiny Board was also invited to recommend any matters for the successor Board to consider. In response, it was suggested that particular attention be given to the prevalence and impact of internal exclusions within school.

**Other sources of Scrutiny work**

3.12 Other common sources of work include requests for scrutiny, Call In requests and other corporate referrals. The Board is also required to be formally consulted during the development of key policies which form part of the council’s Budget and Policy Framework.

**Methods of working**

3.13 This year, each Scrutiny Board has eight formal meetings scheduled throughout the municipal year. These meetings are generally held within the Civic Hall and are open to the public.

3.14 Whilst the decision to hold any additional formal meetings is left to the discretion of each Board, historically Scrutiny Boards have also adopted other methods of evidence gathering outside of the formal meeting settings, such as site visits and working group meetings.

3.15 Working groups comprise of a number of Members from a particular Scrutiny Board who may be appointed to carry out specific tasks on behalf of the Board. Suitable tasks for a working group may involve Members meeting on their own (for example for the purposes of developing reports and recommendations in connection with an ongoing Inquiry or terms of reference for a future Inquiry). Alternatively they may
entail activities which cannot realistically be undertaken within the confines of a formally convened Scrutiny Board meeting.

3.16 In all cases, the primary purpose of a working group is to obtain and/or develop information and to report back to a formally convened meeting of the Scrutiny Board. A working group cannot discharge the primary purpose of a Scrutiny Board i.e. it cannot undertake Inquiries independently from its parent Scrutiny Board, conduct Inquiries, issue reports/recommendations (other than to its parent Scrutiny Board) or in any way present itself to a third party as representing the views of the parent Scrutiny Board.

3.17 However, as set out within the Vision for Scrutiny, the Board must also remain mindful of the resource implications associated with the use of site visits and working group meetings when determining its work programme.

4.0 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 It is recognised that in order to enable Scrutiny to focus on strategic areas of priority, each Scrutiny Board needs to establish an early dialogue with the Directors and Executive Board Members holding the relevant portfolios. The Vision for Scrutiny also states that Scrutiny Boards should seek the advice of the Scrutiny officer, the relevant Director and Executive Member about available resources prior to agreeing items of work.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.1 The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules state that, where appropriate, all terms of reference for work undertaken by Scrutiny Boards will include ‘to review how and to what effect consideration has been given to the impact of a service or policy on all equality areas, as set out in the Council’s Equality and Diversity Scheme’.

4.3 Council Policies and the Best Council Plan

4.3.1 The terms of reference of the Scrutiny Boards promote a strategic and outward looking Scrutiny function that focuses on the best council objectives.

4.4 Resources and Value for Money

4.4.1 Experience has shown that the Scrutiny process is more effective and adds greater value if the Board seeks to minimise the number of substantial inquiries running at one time and focus its resources on one key issue at a time.

4.4.2 The Vision for Scrutiny, agreed by full Council also recognises that like all other Council functions, resources to support the Scrutiny function are under considerable pressure and that requests from Scrutiny Boards cannot always be met. Consequently, when establishing their work programmes Scrutiny Boards should:

- Seek the advice of the Scrutiny officer, the relevant Director and Executive Member about available resources;
Avoid duplication by having a full appreciation of any existing forums already having oversight of, or monitoring a particular issue;

Ensure any Scrutiny undertaken has clarity and focus of purpose and will add value and can be delivered within an agreed time frame.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 This report has no specific legal implications.

4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 There are no risk management implications relevant to this report.

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 Scrutiny Boards are responsible for ensuring that items of scrutiny work come from a strategic approach as well as a need to challenge service performance and respond to issues of high public interest. This report provides information and guidance on potential sources of work and areas of priority within the Board’s terms of reference. In consultation with the relevant Directors, Executive Board Members and Scrutiny Officer, the Scrutiny Board is requested to consider areas of Scrutiny for the forthcoming municipal year.

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 Members are requested to consider the information and guidance provided within this report when determining priority areas of Scrutiny work for the forthcoming municipal year.

7.0 Background papers²

7.1 None

² The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council’s website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
Vision for Scrutiny at Leeds

“To promote democratic engagement through the provision of an influential scrutiny function which is held in high regard by its many stakeholders and which achieves measurable service improvements which add value for the people of Leeds through a member led process of examination and review”

To achieve this Scrutiny will follow the nationally agreed ‘Four Principles of Good Scrutiny’;

1. Provide ‘critical friend’ challenge to decision makers, through holding them to account for decisions made, engaging in policy review and policy development;
2. Promote Scrutiny as a means by which the voice and concerns of the public can be heard;
3. Ensure Scrutiny is carried out by ‘independent minded’ Board members;
4. Improve public services by ensuring reviews of policy and service performance are focused.

To succeed Council recognises that the following conditions need to be present;
- Parity of esteem between the Executive and Scrutiny
- Co-operation with statutory partners
- Member leadership and engagement
- Genuine non-partisan working
- Evidence based conclusions and recommendations
- Effective dedicated officer support
- Supportive Directors and senior officer culture

Council agrees that it is incumbent upon Scrutiny Boards to recognise that resources to support the Scrutiny function are, (like all other Council functions), under considerable pressure and that requests from Scrutiny Boards cannot always be met. Therefore Council agrees that constructive consultation should take place between the Executive and Scrutiny about the availability of resources prior to any work being undertaken. Consequently, when establishing their work programmes Scrutiny Boards should

- Seek the advice of the Scrutiny officer, the relevant Director and Executive Member about available resources
- Avoid duplication by having a full appreciation of any existing forums already having oversight of, or monitoring a particular issue (e.g. Plans Panel, Housing Advisory Board, established member working groups, other Scrutiny Boards)
- Ensure any Scrutiny undertaken has clarity and focus of purpose and will add value and can be delivered within an agreed time frame.
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BEST COUNCIL PLAN
2019/20 – 2020/21
Tackling poverty and reducing inequalities
– with the city’s Inclusive Growth and Health & Wellbeing Strategies as key drivers
2. LEEDS IS YOUNG AND GETTING YOUNGER

Our region is one of the youngest in the UK, providing a talent pool that is digitally skilled and enterprising and helping create a vibrant, youthful environment that gives Leeds a crucial competitive edge. Ambitious investment plans for Leeds Station and the South Bank will double the size and economy of the city centre, boosting economic participation across the North and in our local communities.

3. PEOPLE ENJOY LIVING AND WORKING IN LEEDS

We enjoy the advantages of being a big city, with five universities, a thriving job market and access to culture, sport, food and retail at the heart of a clean and walkable city centre. Our city has fantastic green spaces, including award-winning parks, with the Yorkshire countryside and two national parks right on its doorstep. With so much to offer, Leeds continues to attract:

TOURISM – a record high of 29 million visits in 2017 (the most recent figures);
GRADUATES – year-on-year we have more undergraduates and graduates moving into the city than leaving, a ‘brain gain’;
INVESTMENT – with a standout success in October 2018 being the decision by Channel 4 to choose Leeds for its new national headquarters.

4. POWERED BY INNOVATORS, ENTREPRENEURS AND SOCIAL PIONEERS

Leeds has a pioneering social model that harnesses the energy of our communities and of a strong charity sector.

5. IN LEEDS WE PUT PEOPLE FIRST,

with a proud record of working together to deliver for everyone. Leeds is now ranked highest among the largest cities outside London for health and wellbeing with more adults active, fewer people smoking and fewer obese children than before. Our innovative work on healthcare and technology is helping more people worldwide live healthier, more productive lives.

However, not everyone is benefiting fully from these successes. There are still significant issues of poverty and deprivation in Leeds with more than 170,000 people living in areas ranked amongst the most deprived 10% nationally and a growth in in-work poverty affecting more than 70,000 working-aged adults across the city. Despite high employment rates, low pay is an increasing problem, with people caught in a trap of low pay and low skills. Childhood poverty is a particular concern with lifelong implications: one in five of our city’s under 16-year-olds – 28,000 children – are estimated to live in poverty, compared to 17% nationally, with a sharp rise in the number living in our most deprived communities.

Levels of health and wellbeing are inextricably linked with deprivation within the city, leading to targeted interventions.

Leeds is a resilient city with a diversity of people, opinions and cultures and it is these very strengths that will see us through.
Best City

The Best Council Plan 2019/20 to 2020/21 maintains our long-term ‘Best City’ strategic focus on tackling poverty and inequalities through a combination of strengthening the economy and doing this in a way that is compassionate and caring, allowing us to support our most vulnerable children and adults.

Building on the key council and partnership strategies in place and in development, this Best Council Plan update sets out a number of interconnected priority areas of work that flow in particular from our two main cross-cutting strategies: Inclusive Growth and Health and Wellbeing. This year, we have added a new ‘Age-Friendly Leeds’ priority: based on our well-developed ambition for Leeds to be the best city to grow old in, the priority centres on the great work we are doing to make this a place where older people are valued, feel respected and appreciated and are seen as the assets they are, and also prioritises their needs. We have also revised the previous ‘21st-Century Infrastructure’ priority to ‘Sustainable Infrastructure’, better reflecting and helping to promote and progress the environmental ambitions of the council and the city.

Taken together, a focus on these eight ‘Best City’ priorities will deliver improved outcomes for everyone in Leeds:

- Inclusive Growth
- Health and Wellbeing
- Sustainable Infrastructure
- Child-Friendly City
- Age-Friendly Leeds
- Culture
- Housing
- Safe, Strong Communities

Best Council

At a time of unprecedented financial challenges and demographic pressures, we are continuing to work hard for the people of Leeds: maintaining high performance on key city-wide services such as bin collections and street cleanliness; using our capital programme to maintain and improve vital infrastructure such as roads and bridges; further progressing locality working through our targeted investment in neighbourhood priority areas; and supporting our most vulnerable residents through preventative interventions and restorative approaches. This people-centred way of working underpins the eight-year improvement journey we have been on in the services we provide for children in need of help and protection, children in care and care leavers: in December 2018, Ofsted rated these as ‘outstanding’, making Leeds the only ‘core city’ to achieve such a high rating under the inspectorate’s new framework.

We are justifiably proud of our progress but we are not complacent: we recognise the complex challenges facing the city, as outlined above, and that the council has a major place-shaping and leadership role to play to help address them through strong partnership working and engagement with organisations across all sectors and our diverse communities. We also appreciate the impact on our workforce of ever increasing demands on public services alongside reducing resources: whilst continuing our ongoing programme of organisational development and cultural change and further exploiting the opportunities the digitisation agenda can bring to streamline our systems and processes, this year therefore sees us strengthening our health and wellbeing offer to staff. To highlight its importance, this update of the Best Council Plan extends our Best Council ambition to be a more ‘Efficient, Enterprising and Healthy Organisation’, with our values remaining at the heart of what we do and how we work.

The vision, ambitions and priorities set out here would not be achievable without close partnership working, effective community engagement and the dedication of councillors and staff: the elected members who serve the city, our partners and everyone who works for the council play a vital role in delivering the Best Council Plan. We thank you all.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD
THE BEST COUNCIL PLAN ON A PAGE
BEST CITY PRIORITIES:
INCLUSIVE GROWTH
HEALTH & WELLBEING
SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE
CHILD-FRIENDLY CITY
AGE-FRIENDLY LEEDS
CULTURE
HOUSING
SAFE, STRONG COMMUNITIES
BEST COUNCIL
BEST COUNCIL PLAN
2019/20 – 2020/21

Tackling poverty and reducing inequalities

Inclusive Growth
- Supporting growth and investment, helping everyone benefit from the economy to their full potential
- Supporting businesses and residents to improve skills, helping people into work and into better jobs
- Targeting interventions to tackle poverty in priority neighbourhoods
- Tackling low pay

Safe, Strong Communities
- Keeping people safe from harm, protecting the most vulnerable
- Helping people out of financial hardship
- Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour
- Being responsive to local needs, building thriving, resilient communities
- Promoting community respect and resilience

House
- Housing of the right quality, type, tenure and affordability in the right places
- Minimising homelessness through a greater focus on prevention
- Providing the right housing options to support older and vulnerable residents to remain active and independent
- Improving energy performance in homes, reducing fuel poverty

Best City Priorities
What we and our partners are focusing on in 2019/20 to improve outcomes
with the city’s Inclusive Growth and Health & Wellbeing Strategies as key drivers

Health & Wellbeing
- Reducing health inequalities and improving the health of the poorest the fastest
- Supporting healthy, physically active lifestyles
- Supporting self-care, with more people managing their own health conditions in the community
- Enabling people with care and support needs to have choice and control

Sustainable Infrastructure
- Improving transport connections, safety, reliability and affordability
- Improving air quality, reducing pollution and noise
- Improving the resilience of the city’s infrastructure and the natural environment, reducing flooding and other risks from future climate change
- Promoting a more competitive, less wasteful, more resource-efficient, low carbon economy
- Strengthening digital and data ‘Smart City’ infrastructure and increasing digital inclusion

Child-Friendly City
- Supporting families to give children the best start in life
- Improving educational attainment and closing achievement gaps for children and young people vulnerable to poor learning outcomes
- Improving social, emotional and mental health and wellbeing
- Helping young people into adulthood, to develop life skills and be ready for work
- Enhancing the city now and for future generations

Age-Friendly Leeds
- Developing accessible and affordable transport options which help older people get around
- Making Leeds’ public spaces and buildings accessible, safe, clean and welcoming
- Promoting opportunities for older people to be healthy, active, included and respected
- Helping older people participate in the city through fulfilling employment and learning

Culture
- Growing the cultural and creative sector
- Ensuring that culture can be created and experienced by anyone
- Enhancing the image of Leeds through major events and attractions

Outcome
We want everyone in Leeds to...
- Be safe and feel safe
- Enjoy happy, healthy, active lives
- Live in good quality, affordable homes in clean and well cared for places
- Do well at all levels of learning and have the skills they need for life
- Enjoy greater access to green spaces, leisure and the arts
- Earn enough to support themselves and their families
- Move around a well-planned city easily
- Live with dignity and stay independent for as long as possible

Leeds
Best City Ambition
A Strong Economy and a Compassionate City

Leeds
Best Council Ambition
An Efficient, Enterprising and Healthy Organisation
Inclusive Growth

- Supporting growth and investment, helping everyone benefit from the economy to their full potential
- Supporting businesses and residents to improve skills, helping people into work and into better jobs
- Targeting interventions to tackle poverty in priority neighbourhoods
- Tackling low pay

To ensure a strong economy in the longer term, Leeds needs to continue to support and attract good-quality jobs and investment. Our diverse economy has helped us to recover from the economic downturn better than many of our neighbours, and we continue to be a good place to invest and do business, with a strong performance in new business creation and expansion.

663,000 sqft
city centre office take-up in 2018, out of town take-up up 24% from 2017 (Source: LOAF Jan ’19)

However our ambition is for a compassionate city as well as a strong economy. Therefore we are pursuing inclusive growth, to enable all people and places to realise their full potential in contributing to and benefiting from economic growth.

36.4%
of people in Leeds qualified to NVQ LEVEL 4 and above – above regional but below national (Source: ONS APS, Jan to Dec ’17)

75.5%
employment rate higher than regional and national rates (Source: ONS APS, Oct ’17 to Sep ’18)

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:
- Leeds Inclusive Growth Strategy
- Leeds Talent and Skills Plan
- Leeds City Region Strategic Economic Plan

Education and skills are essential parts of our economic prosperity

The people of Leeds will be at the heart of everything we do, from equipping our young people with the right skills and careers advice, to enabling in-work progression, retraining and lifelong learning in our ever-changing labour market. As the UK navigates its way through Brexit, we will continue to offer support to our firms and our communities, and further strengthen the city’s international profile and its attractiveness as a location for investment.

Leeds is, and always will be, open for business and talent.

4.3% (18,000)
unemployment rate
21.5% (111,200) economically inactive – below regional rates (Source: ONS APS, Jan to Dec ’17)

The economic and social impact can be maximised by investing in the right skills: these are the skills which achieve business success and create opportunities for individuals. A continuing challenge is clearly identifying the future skill requirements of the economy, and ensuring more equitable access to education and skills for individuals.

Education and skills are key routes out of poverty and worklessness.

Education and skills of economic value to individuals as workers, to the businesses that employ them and to the wider economy through greater productivity and competitiveness. They also bring considerable social benefits to individuals and communities which foster more equitable communities, in turn supporting economic growth.

Our focus has three main elements: continuing to improve educational attainment across the city whilst closing the achievement gap for disadvantaged learners – one focus of our Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan; encouraging greater collaboration between schools and businesses; and supporting businesses and individuals in improving skills to boost competitiveness and aid career progression.

KPIs

How we will measure progress and achievements

- Private sector employment in Leeds
- GVA (Gross Value Added) per head (balanced approach)
- Number of new business start-ups and scale-ups
- Business survival rate
- Change in business rates payable since 2017 revaluation
- Visitor economic impact for Leeds
- Percentage of working-age Leeds residents with at least a Level 4 qualification
- Number of people supported to improve their skills
- Percentages of Leeds residents and Leeds workers earning below the Real Living Wage
- Number of people supported into work
- Number of adults of working age affected by in-work poverty

The Leeds economy continues to perform well,

GENERATING
£23.3bn
GVA in 2017, an increase of 21% over the last 10 years.

11.2%
of 16-64 yr olds in Leeds have no qualifications, higher than regional and national rates (Source: ONS APS, Jan to Dec ’17)

教育和技能是经济增长的关键途径。教育和技能不仅对个人经济价值，而且对企业和更广泛的社会经济有重大影响。教育和技能有助于个人和社会的福祉，促进更具包容性的社区，从而支持经济增长。

更多关于问题的详细信息，规划的活动和工作进展:
- 利兹包容性增长战略
- 利兹人才和技能计划
- 利兹城市区域战略经济计划

65,000
FTE Leeds residents
earned below the 2017 Living Wage Foundation’s LIVING WAGE (Estimate based on ONS ASHE, Nov ’17)

作为我们包容性增长战略的一部分，我们已经确保了企业与其它利益相关方提供我们的城市所需的支持。一些主要机构已经设想到他们会做更多或不同，这些承诺是我们的关键策略要素。战略识别了十二个大想法来塑造我们的城市，通过提高我们长期的生产力、竞争力和包容性，提高我们的生产力。

6,172
million
visitors to Leeds in 2017, worth £1.7 billion to the local economy

记录高
29 million
Visitors to Leeds in 2017, worth £1.7 billion to the local economy

教育和技能是关键途径。

那些进入职场的人以及在职场工作的人，包括工人、企业家和其它利益相关方，都是我们要支持的。
Our ambition is for Leeds to be the best city for health and wellbeing, underpinned by a strong commitment to partnership working across health and care services to the shared vision in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy:

Leeds will be a healthy and caring city for all ages, where people who are the poorest improve their health the fastest.

80%+ of CQC-registered care services in Leeds are rated as ‘good’ or ‘OUTSTANDING’ (December 2018)

62.4% of people receiving adult social care services were satisfied overall with their care and support, below the national average of 65% but up from the previous year’s 60.9% (Source: DoH ASCOF 3a 2017/18, published Oct ’18).


Leeds is a pioneer in the use of information and technology. We have a thriving third sector and inspiring community assets. We have established strong relationships with health and care partners to continue to pursue improvement and integration aimed at making care services more person-centred, joined-up and preventative, whilst also responding to the financial challenges across the whole system.

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:

- Leeds Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan
- Leeds Better Lives Strategy
- Leeds Health and Care Plan
- West Yorkshire and Harrogate Sustainability and Transformation Plan

So many factors contribute to our health and wellbeing, meaning our challenge is to reflect the breadth of the agenda whilst being specific about the areas we need to focus on to make the biggest difference. In Leeds we believe that our greatest strength and our most important asset is our people.

63.6% of adults in Leeds are physically active (402,200 people) and the number of inactive adults continues to fall. (Source: Active Lives Survey 12 months to May 2018, published Oct ‘18)

There are significant health and wellbeing inequalities across Leeds, with a gap in LIFE EXPECTANCY between the most and least deprived areas of the city of 10+ years.

2x as many women from deprived areas of Leeds are admitted to hospital for alcohol-specific reasons (men women in non-deprived)

2-3x more likely to die from an alcohol-related disease if you live in a deprived area (than those in least deprived)

1 in 4 children say they often feel STRESSED OR ANXIOUS (Source: Leeds My Health, My School Survey 2017/18 – 1:4.14)

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:

- Leeds Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan
- Leeds Better Lives Strategy
- Leeds Health and Care Plan
- West Yorkshire and Harrogate Sustainability and Transformation Plan

KPIs

How we will measure progress and achievements

- Infant mortality rate
- Percentage/proportion of children maintaining a healthy weight at age 11
- Percentage of physically active adults
- Percentage of adults who smoke
- Avoidable years of life lost
- Suicide rate
- Percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage
- Percentage of CQC-registered care services in Leeds rated as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’
- Number of permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes: (a) for people aged 18-64 including 12 week disregards; (b) for people aged 65+ including 12 week disregards
- Proportion of people who use social care services who have control over their daily life

After an increase in 2014-16, INFANT MORTALITY RATES FELL 2015-17

4.2 PER 1,000 live births, slightly higher than the England average rate of 3.9.

Leeds ranked highest among the UK’s largest cities outside London as the BEST CITY FOR HEALTH AND WELLBEING (Source: What Works Centre for Wellbeing, March 2018)
Like other growing cities, Leeds faces a number of challenges, including improving air quality, adapting to climate change, linking people to services and employment, and increasing the number of people choosing active travel and public transport. Congestion is an issue on busy junctions causing journey time delays and contributing to air quality issues. Traffic on major roads in Leeds increased by around 18% between 2000 and 2016 (Source: Department for Transport).

We require sustainable, modern infrastructure. A resource efficient and climate resilient city will not only be a better place to live, it will also be more competitive and better placed to ride out future economic shocks. This means further integration in planning, funding and delivering improved infrastructure for Leeds that will help us support growth and improve connectivity, bringing new markets within reach for business, new jobs within reach for people, and a wider workforce within reach for employers.

City centre district heating will pipe lower cost and lower carbon heat from the perimeter of the city to businesses and residents in dense urban areas.

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:
- Leeds Transport Strategy
- Leeds Inclusive Growth Strategy
- Leeds Local Flood Risk Management Strategy
- West Yorkshire Low Emissions Strategy
- West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan
- Transport for the North Strategic Transport Plan

Our approach needs to go beyond a narrow pursuit of growth, ensuring Leeds is liveable and healthy, as well as prosperous.

A step change in the level of public transport use is needed; employment and housing growth areas in the city need to be advanced and problems such as poor air quality need to be tackled. The renewed commitment to HS2, the Northern Powerhouse agenda, the potential of further devolution deals and the West Yorkshire Transport Strategy create the appropriate context to set a new strategic transport approach for the city.

The approval of the £174m Leeds Public Transport Investment Programme marked a new era in public transport investment across the city. The council is also leading on major schemes within the £1bn West Yorkshire Transport Fund to promote housing and employment growth.

INITIATIVES INCLUDE:
- Investing in a new Leeds High Frequency Bus Network, aiming for 90%+ of core bus services running every 10 minutes 7am–8pm.
- Reduced bus delays through signal technology and bus priority measures, reduced waiting times and improving stop facilities.
- New buses that meet Euro 6 air quality standards and offer a better passenger experience.

We want Leeds to be a healthy city in which to live, work and visit. Working with partners to reduce carbon emissions will bring about health and wellbeing benefits. We are introducing a Clean Air Zone that will charge buses, HGVs, taxis and private hire vehicles that fail to meet the latest emissions standards for entering a defined area within the city centre and we are providing assistance and advice to help local organisations prepare.

Leeds’ digital infrastructure is vital to our future success.

This connectivity underpins growth, not only in our flourishing digital sector but across all parts of our economy. Our Smart Cities work is a key priority, working with business, universities and local partners to establish Leeds as a leader in the application of big data, building on assets such as the Open Data Institute, Data Mill North and Leeds Institute for Data Analytics (LIDA).

KPIs
- Satisfaction with a range of transport services
- Number of passengers boarding buses in the Leeds district
- Increase in city centre travel by sustainable transport (bus, train, cycling, walking)
- Percentage of waste recycled
- Potential new KPI on air quality to be developed
- Carbon emissions across the city
- Level of CO2 emissions from council buildings and operations
- Number of residential and commercial properties moved to a lower level of flood risk
- Increase in tenants’ digital skills/confidence, access to equipment and motivation with business, universities and local partners to establish Leeds as a leader in the application of big data, building on assets such as the Open Data Institute, Data Mill North and Leeds Institute for Data Analytics (LIDA).

11,000 people employed in the digital sector (source: ONS 2015)
CHILD-FRIENDLY CITY

• Supporting families to give children the best start in life
• Improving educational attainment and closing achievement gaps for children and young people vulnerable to poor learning outcomes
• Improving social, emotional and mental health and wellbeing
• Helping young people into adulthood, to develop life skills and be ready for work

Our child-friendly city aspiration is visible throughout this Best Council Plan in the work we are doing to improve the homes and places in which children live and play and better their overall health and wellbeing.

We aim to improve outcomes for all our children:

while recognising the need for outcomes to improve faster for children from disadvantaged and vulnerable backgrounds.

25,710 under 16s across the city estimated to be LIVING IN POVERTY...

...that is 17.3% compared to an average of 16.3% in England (November 2017).

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:

• Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan

31% of key stage 2 children live in the 10% MOST DEPRIVED AREAS nationally (2015) up from 25% in 2011. (Indices of Multiple Deprivation)

Research tells us that EDUCATION IS THE KEY to building resilient adults and improving adult outcomes.

However, the educational progress and achievement of children and young people who could be classed as DISADVANTAGED OR VULNERABLE LEARNERS is below national levels.

Realising this aspiration will require progress across all the Best Council Plan priorities, with renewed action to integrate policy initiatives, for example: through the Health and Wellbeing Strategy we will promote healthy, physically active lifestyles for our young people; our pursuit of safe, strong communities will endeavour to keep young people safe from harm, protecting the most vulnerable; our approach to transport will aim to address the specific requirements of young people; and, improving the skills and education of our young people as they enter the world of work is central to our approach to inclusive growth.

1,271 CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER (2017/18) down from 1,450 (March 2011) a 12.3% reduction compared to a rise of 15.1% nationally.

The Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan explains our child-friendly approach.

The Plan sets out eleven priority areas of work:

1. Help children and parents to live in safe and supportive families
2. Ensure that the most vulnerable are protected
3. Support families to give children the best start in life
4. Increase the number of children and young people participating and engaging in learning
5. Improve achievement and attainment for all
6. Improve at a faster rate educational outcomes for vulnerable children and young people
7. Improve social, emotional, and mental health and wellbeing
8. Encourage physical activity and healthy eating
9. Support young people to make good choices and minimise risk-taking behaviours
10. Help young people into adulthood, to develop life skills, and be ready for work

The skills and education of our young people; and, improving the specific requirements of young people; and, improving the skills and education of our young people as they enter the world of work is central to our approach to inclusive growth.

Realising this aspiration will require progress across all the Best Council Plan priorities, with renewed action to integrate policy initiatives, for example: through the Health and Wellbeing Strategy we will promote healthy, physically active lifestyles for our young people; our pursuit of safe, strong communities will endeavour to keep young people safe from harm, protecting the most vulnerable; our approach to transport will aim to address the specific requirements of young people; and, improving the skills and education of our young people as they enter the world of work is central to our approach to inclusive growth.

KPIs
How we will measure progress and achievements

• Number of children who need to be looked after
• Number of children and young people subject to a child protection plan
• Attendance at primary and secondary schools
• Percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing and maths at the end of Key Stage 2 (end of year 6)
• Progress 8 score for Leeds at the end of Key Stage 4 (end of year 11)
• Percentage and number of young people who are not in education, employment or training or whose status is ‘not known’

7% of 16 and 17 year olds (1,020 young people) NOT IN EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT OR TRAINING (NEET) or whose activity is not known (2.7% NEET, 4.3% not known), above regional and national. (DfE average of Dec ‘17, Jan ‘18 and Feb ‘18)

11. Improve access to affordable, safe, and reliable connected transport for young people

Early Years Foundation Stage:

65.7% of pupils achieved a GOOD LEVEL of development, up from 51% in 2012/3 but below regional (69.4%) and national (71.5%) levels (DfE 2017/18 academic year)
The 2011 Census indicated that:

- 232,000 people in Leeds were aged 50+
- 110,000 people were aged 65+
- 15,000 were aged 85+

The most recent 2017 mid-year estimates (785,000 people) highlight the increase in these figures in line with the city’s population growth. These numbers will continue to rise; looking forward to 2021, the ONS projects the total Leeds population will increase to more than 803,000.

Leeds wants to be a place where people age well: where older people are valued, feel respected and appreciated, and are seen as the assets they are.

The opportunities and challenges presented by an ageing population are well-rehearsed. Older people contribute in countless ways to Leeds’ rich and vibrant communities – through the skills and knowledge that they bring to their local communities, high levels of volunteering, acting formally and informally as community connectors, intergenerational interactions, unpaid caring roles, and through the skills and experience they bring to their workplaces. However, we also know that many older people are also more likely to have multiple long-term health conditions with inequalities disproportionately affecting the poorest in our city. Inequalities in older age are cumulative and have a significant impact on a person’s health, wellbeing and independence. As the baby-boomer generation grows older, there will be a range of implications for public sector service provision.

Our approach to making Leeds the best city to grow old is one of citizenship and applies to the whole population. The approach:

- Ensures there is a strong focus on social networks within neighbourhoods and the city
- Promotes social capital and participation
- Age-proofs and develops universal services
- Tackles inequalities and reduces social exclusion
- Aims to change social structures and attitudes

A lot of good work already takes place in Leeds but we recognise there is an opportunity for this to have a clearer strategic context. We have therefore developed an Age-Friendly Strategy and action plan which cut across all our Best Council Plan priorities. This focuses our work around six areas adapted for Leeds from the World Health Organisation’s Age-Friendly City domains:

- Housing
- Public and civic spaces
- Travel and road safety
- Active, included and respected
- Healthy, independent ageing
- Employment and learning

CROSS-CUTTING THEMES:

- Engagement with older people – involving and consulting with older people on the development, delivery, management and evaluation of those services and projects which affect them
- Access to digital technology – help and support for people who want to use digital technology to make their lives better
- Effective communications – promoting ageing positively and providing information about services and activities in a format that older people can easily access and which suits their needs

KPIs

How we will measure progress and achievements

KPIs will be added during 2019 to help monitor progress against this new priority including the number of people who:

- Are identified as isolated or lonely
- Live independently in a place of their choice
- Feel that public spaces are safe and accessible
- Can travel around the city to the places they want to go
- Feel valued and a part of their community
- Have good health and wellbeing
- Have a job which is meaningful and rewarding

• At national and international levels, Leeds is a member of: the UK Network of Age-Friendly Communities – a group of communities from across the UK collaborating to bring about change in the way we respond to population ageing; the Eurocities Urban Ageing Forum, a forum dedicated to raising awareness and improving strategies for age-friendly environments in cities; and the World Health Organisation (WHO) Age-Friendly Cities, which was established to foster the exchange of experience and mutual learning between cities and communities worldwide.
We believe culture has a vital role to play in realising our Best City ambition.

Our approach is rooted in our communities and takes a wide definition of culture.

We aim to embed it across such diverse areas as urban regeneration, education and health and wellbeing.

Our objectives are:

- For the city to value and prioritise cultural activity, using it as a means of improving the quality of life of every person and every community in Leeds;
- For culture to build respect, cohesion and coexistence between and within communities and individuals;
- For people, whatever their background, to be supported to be creative through school, informal learning, training, volunteering and employment, ensuring that culture can be created and experienced by anyone;
- For Leeds to be nationally and internationally recognised as a liveable city, and a thriving, internationally connected cultural hub open to collaboration;
- For Leeds to be at the forefront of cultural innovation, making the most of new and emerging technologies;
- For Leeds Culture Strategy to grow and increase its contribution to Leeds’ economy, by placing culture at the heart of the city’s narrative; and
- For established cultural organisations to be resilient, and to create an environment where new cultural organisations can flourish.

Leeds selected as location for CHANNEL 4’S NEW NATIONAL HQ, including a new Digital Creative Unit and News Hub

Leeds has been selected to be part of the prestigious ‘Pilot Cities’ European project, a peer-learning programme which will help us benchmark key elements of our Culture Strategy with other cities, learning from each other.

Our approach set out in the Leeds Culture Strategy is to promote a positive attitude towards culture, focussing on the contribution it can make to the city’s confidence, profile and economy and to wider community cohesion.

CULTURE

Growing the cultural and creative sector
Ensuring that culture can be created and experienced by anyone
Enhancing the image of Leeds through major events and attractions

We aim to embed it across such diverse areas as urban regeneration, education and health and wellbeing.

Leeds West Indian Carnival started in 1967, Europe’s Longest RUNNING authentic Caribbean carnival parade

Our approach is rooted in our communities and takes a wide definition of culture.

Leeds has 3 SPECIALIST COLLEGES CREATING FUTURE ARTISTS who will help deliver the city’s cultural ambitions – it is the only city outside London to offer three fine art degrees

KPIs

How we will measure progress and achievements

- Number of visitors at a range of venues and events
- Number of employees in the creative industries in Leeds
- For the culture sector to grow and increase its contribution to Leeds’ economy, by placing culture at the heart of the city’s narrative; and
- For established cultural organisations to be resilient, and to create an environment where new cultural organisations can flourish.

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:

- Leeds Culture Strategy
- Leeds Culture Strategy
**HOUSING**

- Housing of the right quality, type, tenure and affordability in the right places
- Minimising homelessness through a greater focus on prevention
- Providing the right housing options to support older and vulnerable residents to remain active and independent
- Improving energy performance in homes and reducing fuel poverty

One of the biggest challenges Leeds faces is to provide enough quality and accessible homes to meet the city’s growing population, whilst protecting the quality of the environment and respecting community identity. The need for affordable housing and affordable warmth are key issues in meeting this challenge.

The Leeds Housing Strategy sets out our ambitions for effectively meeting housing need to make Leeds the best place to live.

We continue to work to deliver six priorities:
- Affordable housing growth;
- Improving housing quality;
- Promoting independent living;
- Creating sustainable communities;
- Improving health through housing;
- Meeting the needs of older residents.

Working with developers and housing associations, we identify opportunities to build new homes – including affordable homes – and bring empty homes back into use.

**FUEL POVERTY**

- 13.1% (42,829) of Leeds households live in fuel poverty meaning their energy costs are high relative to their incomes.

The average house price is **5.94** x higher than the average workplace earnings.

**Leeds faces is to provide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>349,350</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the **349,350** properties in Leeds, there are **55,390 council homes** including **4,275 sheltered homes** and 63 extra care properties.

**40** households owed a housing duty in emergency temporary accommodation compared to Birmingham (2,058 placements) and Manchester (1,484 placements) (end Nov 2018).

Vulnerable young people, adults and families are helped further through our Housing Related Support Programme, providing support and emergency accommodation. We carry out adaptations to housing to help disabled people live independently and prevent admission to hospital or residential care. Our Accessible Housing Register makes it easier for disabled applicants and housing officers to match properties to people’s needs.

Vulnerable young people, adults and families are helped further through our Housing Related Support Programme, providing support and emergency accommodation. We carry out adaptations to housing to help disabled people live independently and prevent admission to hospital or residential care. Our Accessible Housing Register makes it easier for disabled applicants and housing officers to match properties to people’s needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth in new homes in Leeds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of affordable homes delivered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of new units of extra care housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved energy and thermal efficiency performance of houses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of households in fuel poverty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of homeless preventions and number of rough sleepers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of housing adaptations completed within target timescale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of council housing repairs completed within target timescales.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the **349,350** properties in Leeds, there are **55,390 council homes** including **4,275 sheltered homes** and 63 extra care properties.

Through a mixture of self-regulation and enforcement we encourage landlords to sign up to the Leeds Rental Standard: an accreditation scheme aimed at driving improvements in quality across the private rented sector. These initiatives also provide employment opportunities in construction and increase the energy-efficiency of homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth in new homes in Leeds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of affordable homes delivered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of new units of extra care housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved energy and thermal efficiency performance of houses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of households in fuel poverty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of homeless preventions and number of rough sleepers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of housing adaptations completed within target timescale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of council housing repairs completed within target timescales.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vulnerable young people, adults and families are helped further through our Housing Related Support Programme, providing support and emergency accommodation. We carry out adaptations to housing to help disabled people live independently and prevent admission to hospital or residential care. Our Accessible Housing Register makes it easier for disabled applicants and housing officers to match properties to people’s needs.
SAFE, STRONG COMMUNITIES

- Keeping people safe from harm, protecting the most vulnerable
- Helping people out of financial hardship
- Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour
- Being responsive to local needs, building thriving, resilient communities
- Promoting community respect and resilience

Leeds is a growing and richly diverse city, with people of different ages and from many different backgrounds, cultures and beliefs living and working alongside each other. As a City of Sanctuary, we celebrate this diversity and want Leeds to be a welcoming city for all, where people get on with each other and feel they are part of their local neighbourhood. To achieve this, we need strong local leadership, to increase community conversations to local leadership, to increase this diversity and want Leeds City of Sanctuary, we celebrate alongside each other. As a place to live, people get on with each other so that their strengths and assets to make a difference and help them to do more for themselves and others so that their communities can thrive, making sure that:

- Residents, communities, businesses and organisations are equal partners;
- Local people are engaged to achieve things that we cannot achieve alone and we add value to their activities;
- The city’s strategic priorities are aligned to local communities to meet the needs and demands of communities, regardless of responsibility for resources.

We will continue to work to make all our communities safe for everyone:

- Residents, communities, businesses and organisations are equal partners;
- Local people are engaged to achieve things that we cannot achieve alone and we add value to their activities;
- The city’s strategic priorities are aligned to local communities to meet the needs and demands of communities, regardless of responsibility for resources.

More detail on the issues, planned activity and work in progress:

- Safer Leeds Plan
- Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan
- Leeds Better Lives Strategy
- Citizens@Leeds – Supporting communities and tackling poverty
- Leeds City Council Equality Improvement Priorities
Our ‘Best Council’ ambition has for many years been aimed at becoming a more efficient and enterprising organisation, centred on an ongoing programme of cultural change. This has enabled us to manage significant financial pressures and increased demand for our services whilst minimising as far as possible the impact on the citizens of Leeds. This 2019/20 update explains our organisational priorities for the future with a particular focus on the health and wellbeing of our staff, without whom the outcomes and priorities set out in the Best Council Plan could not be delivered.

Improving staff health and wellbeing

The health and wellbeing of staff has always been important to Leeds City Council; the impact this can have on productivity, engagement and sickness absence is well understood. The challenge now is to ensure that wellbeing is consistently embedded, particularly at a time of ever-reducing time and capacity.

Leeds has introduced a range of initiatives over the years which have been recognised nationally and compare well against other large organisations. Supports such as flexible working, special leave and time off for volunteering and to attend staff networks, are also hugely beneficial to both mental and physical health and wellbeing.

But more can be done to strengthen the health and wellbeing offer, and to ensure that all staff know and understand what support is available and how to access it. To highlight its importance, this 2019/20 update of the Best Council Plan therefore extends the Best Council ambition to be a more ‘Efficient, Enterprising and Healthy Organisation.’

A range of further practical activities are now planned, including:

- Improved communication with guidance made more accessible, current and evidence-based
- Closer collaboration with partners such as the Health and Social Care Partnership and the Business Disability Forum
- Continuing work on low pay and financial wellbeing – we are proud to continue paying our staff at the Real Living Wage level
- Targeted activity with services experiencing the highest sickness absence related to mental health and musculo-skeletal disorders
- Wellbeing conversations linked to staff appraisals
- Health and wellbeing champions at a senior management level across the organisation.

Our Values – underpinning everything we do and how we work

- Being open, honest and trusted
  - I can be my best

- Treating people fairly
  - It feels like I count.

- Spending money wisely
  - I make every pound go further

- Working as a team for Leeds
  - I am part of a team with a ‘can do’ attitude

- Working with people, engaging all communities
  - I am proud to make a difference
Our emphasis on inclusion and diversity aims to eliminate barriers, celebrate differences and create a workforce more representative of our communities. Significant progress was made in 2018 in particular thanks to our 7 staff networks:

- Disability & Wellbeing Network (DAWN), relaunched in 2018
- Early Careers Network
- Healthy Minds
- Women’s Voice
- Carers’ Staff Network
- Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME)
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Trans+ (LGBT+)

Coordinators meet together on a monthly basis to discuss their projects, and provide a ‘first stop’ engagement forum for the organisation to consult with on changes in service delivery or staffing matters before potentially reaching out across the wider groups of colleagues. Whilst each of the seven networks has set out its aims for 2019, three cross-cutting priorities have been collectively agreed across the network partnership:

- Career progression and equity of opportunity;
- Inclusive workplaces, where individuality is acknowledged and respected; and
- Challenging the digital divide and increasing engagement with frontline colleagues.

Work against these priorities will be delivered across the partnership and in conjunction with council staff, including the wider senior management teams. The partnership is also supporting work to increase levels of disclosure: with an improved understanding of the workforce makeup, we can better identify and tackle issues such as barriers to career progression for certain staff groups.

Our ‘Team Leeds – Can Do’ theme remains central to the OD approach, helping staff to feel more confident and empowered. In the coming year, we will build on the set of improvement tools we already use, such as outcomes-based accountability and restorative and strengths-based working which have proved so successful in our work with vulnerable adults and children. And we will further develop our skills and practice around people-centred design so that this approach becomes more regular, widespread and routine practice. We will also review the skills and capacity for delivering change and improvement.

With the investment we are making in our graduates and first time managers, and the strong take-up of leadership and management apprenticeships, our organisational change resource will grow.

Scenario planning around future workforce levels and skills requirements remains a top consideration in light of shifts in demand, external factors such as Brexit, ongoing budget pressures and changes in the way we work. Our comprehensive staffing information and data will provide a good basis but additional work will be carried out during 2019/20 to better understand the medium- to longer-term requirements to enable the right balance between succession/capacity planning and workforce redesign. This will incorporate the impact of digital transformation which is shaping all workplaces and sectors, with the automation of basic tasks sitting alongside different ways of delivering products and services. New job and skill mixes will continue to be explored which could impact on job numbers and role design and so a range of responses will be used to help manage these changes:

- natural turnover
- the council’s Early Leavers Initiative
- redesigning more administrative roles
- reskilling and flexibly deploying staff

Our organisational culture

We strengthened our Organisational Development (OD) approach in 2018 which helped to articulate the focus of the next phase of our culture change work. Keeping the Best City / Best Council ambitions as key drivers for further improvement with our Values underpinning everything we do and how we work, to continue concentrating on staff wellbeing and inclusion and getting the basics of good people and change management right. Investing in training and skills for all staff will remain a key part of this, and our push on Management Development will continue.

KPIs

How we will measure progress and achievements

- Workforce more representative of our communities
- Number / percentage of apprentices employed by the council
- Score out of ten given by staff for working for Leeds City Council [part of staff survey]
- Average staff sickness levels
- Reduction in workplace accident and incident reports
- Increase in collaboration between the council and Health & Care providers across the city around Mental Health First Aid
- Number of employees who believe that their immediate manager/supervisor looks out for their general health and wellbeing
- Percentage of staff appraisals and mid-year reviews completed
- Gender pay gap across council staff

The use of apprenticeships to develop new skills and talent is an increasingly important part of our workforce strategy.

We will introduce a more efficient, streamlined and inclusive recruitment process, including a new e-recruitment system and fresh options around high volume recruitment areas. We will also develop an Employer Brand for the council to aid attraction and retention.
Managing our finances

Between 2010/11 and 2019/20 our core ‘settlement funding’ from government was reduced by around £266m, nearly 60%.

At the same time, we have seen increasing costs and demand for services, particularly due to a growing and ageing population.

We have so far met these challenges by stimulating economic growth, finding ways to increase our traded and commercial income, growing council tax from new properties and a significant programme of organisational efficiencies.

For example, in 2017/18 we spent £700k on 61 HOUSEHOLDS registered in temporary accommodation compared to Birmingham’s £23m (15,481 households) and Manchester’s £21m (3,948 households).

Similarly, thanks to a concerted effort to improve outcomes for all children and families, since 2010 the rate per 10,000 of children looked after has decreased in Leeds by 18.3% whilst the national average has gone up by 12.7%.

In line with our vision to tackle poverty and inequalities, we will continue to target our resources towards the MOST VULNERABLE in our society with nearly TWO THIRDS of our 2019/20 budget funding adult social care and children’s services.

Our medium-term financial strategy approved in July 2018 estimated a funding gap between 2019/20 and 2021/22 of £97m with 53% (£52m) of this projected to hit in 2020/21 and 32% (£31m) in 2021/22. The Strategy indicates the range and scale of challenge and a direction of travel rather than a precise forecast of resources and will be updated again in summer 2019 but there remain a number of risks and uncertainties, particularly within the national and economic environment, not least against the backdrop of Brexit. The results of government’s Fair Funding Review of local government finances are anticipated this autumn, informing the level of resources available to support budgets from 2020/21 onwards. Whilst transitional arrangements are anticipated to be put in place, the Review could result in significant changes to the funding baselines of local authorities compared to the current methodology. During 2019 the government will also carry out a spending review across all departments and the long-awaited Green Paper setting out proposals to make the social care and support system more sustainable is, at the time of writing, due to be released for public consultation. The issuing of a Section 114 notice by Northamptonshire Council in February 2018 imposing emergency spending controls and the subsequently commissioned Best Value inspection, has increased the focus on local authorities’ financial resilience.

In the context of these uncertainties and financial challenges, the council will need to continue to make difficult decisions around the level and quality of services to ensure we keep delivering our ambitions and priorities for the city and the organisation set out in the Best Council Plan.

We will also continue our locality working model with a specific focus on a small number of ‘priority neighbourhoods’ (those defined as being in the most deprived 1% of neighbourhoods nationally), engaging with communities and with partner organisations to better understand and tackle issues relating to poverty and inequality in more co-ordinated, joined-up ways. Linking in with our Community Committees, Neighbourhood Improvement Board and a strategic delivery team, core teams consisting of residents, elected members, local partners and service managers are helping to develop and deliver very localised action plans that increasingly offer opportunities for innovative ways of working and support different models of service delivery.

At an organisational level, we will continue to review services to identify opportunities for greater efficiencies (both financial and staff time), making better use of available financial and performance benchmarking information. This will result in a prioritised number of cross-cutting, major programmes and projects.

These include the next phase of an ongoing ‘Changing the Workplace’ review of our buildings, disposing of those that are no longer fit for purpose and reducing vacant capacity, and exploiting a range of digital solutions.

Over the last 8 years, we have reduced staff numbers by over 3,200 FULL TIME equivalent posts and also significantly reduced the number of buildings we use.

The chart shows the decrease in settlement funding and savings that we have made to balance the budget year on year.

Through targeting resources into preventative services, we have ensured that the implications of demand and demographic pressures have resulted in significant cost pressures in other local authorities have so far been contained.

Decrease in Settlement Fund and Cumulative Savings in Budget
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Our government settlement for this year has REDUCED AGAIN BY AROUND £15m and, with continued cost pressures, the council anticipates needing to deliver more than £24m of savings by March 2020.

Between 2010/11 and 2019/20 our core ‘settlement funding’ from government was reduced by around £266m, nearly 60%.

At the same time, we have seen increasing costs and demand for services, particularly due to a growing and ageing population.

We have so far met these challenges by stimulating economic growth, finding ways to increase our traded and commercial income, growing council tax from new properties and a significant programme of organisational efficiencies.

For example, in 2017/18 we spent £700k on 61 HOUSEHOLDS registered in temporary accommodation compared to Birmingham’s £23m (15,481 households) and Manchester’s £21m (3,948 households).

Similarly, thanks to a concerted effort to improve outcomes for all children and families, since 2010 the rate per 10,000 of children looked after has decreased in Leeds by 18.3% whilst the national average has gone up by 12.7%.

In line with our vision to tackle poverty and inequalities, we will continue to target our resources towards the MOST VULNERABLE in our society with nearly TWO THIRDS of our 2019/20 budget funding adult social care and children’s services.

Our medium-term financial strategy approved in July 2018 estimated a funding gap between 2019/20 and 2021/22 of £97m with 53% (£52m) of this projected to hit in 2020/21 and 32% (£31m) in 2021/22. The Strategy indicates the range and scale of challenge and a direction of travel rather than a precise forecast of resources and will be updated again in summer 2019 but there remain a number of risks and uncertainties, particularly within the national and economic environment, not least against the backdrop of Brexit. The results of government’s Fair Funding Review of local government finances are anticipated this autumn, informing the level of resources available to support budgets from 2020/21 onwards. Whilst transitional arrangements are anticipated to be put in place, the Review could result in significant changes to the funding baselines of local authorities compared to the current methodology. During 2019 the government will also carry out a spending review across all departments and the long-awaited Green Paper setting out proposals to make the social care and support system more sustainable is, at the time of writing, due to be released for public consultation. The issuing of a Section 114 notice by Northamptonshire Council in February 2018 imposing emergency spending controls and the subsequently commissioned Best Value inspection, has increased the focus on local authorities’ financial resilience.

In the context of these uncertainties and financial challenges, the council will need to continue to make difficult decisions around the level and quality of services to ensure we keep delivering our ambitions and priorities for the city and the organisation set out in the Best Council Plan.

We will also continue our locality working model with a specific focus on a small number of ‘priority neighbourhoods’ (those defined as being in the most deprived 1% of neighbourhoods nationally), engaging with communities and with partner organisations to better understand and tackle issues relating to poverty and inequality in more co-ordinated, joined-up ways. Linking in with our Community Committees, Neighbourhood Improvement Board and a strategic delivery team, core teams consisting of residents, elected members, local partners and service managers are helping to develop and deliver very localised action plans that increasingly offer opportunities for innovative ways of working and support different models of service delivery.

At an organisational level, we will continue to review services to identify opportunities for greater efficiencies (both financial and staff time), making better use of available financial and performance benchmarking information. This will result in a prioritised number of cross-cutting, major programmes and projects.

These include the next phase of an ongoing ‘Changing the Workplace’ review of our buildings, disposing of those that are no longer fit for purpose and reducing vacant capacity, and exploiting a range of digital solutions.

Over the last 8 years, we have reduced staff numbers by over 3,200 FULL TIME equivalent posts and also significantly reduced the number of buildings we use.

The chart shows the decrease in settlement funding and savings that we have made to balance the budget year on year.

Through targeting resources into preventative services, we have ensured that the implications of demand and demographic pressures have resulted in significant cost pressures in other local authorities have so far been contained.
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Our government settlement for this year has REDUCED AGAIN BY AROUND £15m and, with continued cost pressures, the council anticipates needing to deliver more than £24m of savings by March 2020.
Delivering digital solutions

In July 2018, Leeds City Council, alongside other local authorities, sector bodies, the Government Digital Service (GDS) and the UK Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), was a co-publisher and signatory to The Local Digital Declaration. This document affirms a collective ambition to maximise the use of digital tools and technology for housing, communities and local government digital service authorities, sector bodies, the council, alongside other local authorities. In July 2018, Leeds City Council, alongside other local authorities, sector bodies, the Government Digital Service (GDS) and the UK Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), was a co-publisher and signatory to The Local Digital Declaration. This document affirms a collective ambition to maximise the use of digital tools and technology for housing, communities and local government digital service authorities, sector bodies, the council, alongside other local authorities.

These principles articulate the approach we are taking in Leeds: that in order to deliver improved public services, ‘digital’ is an essential tool but it cannot be considered in isolation.

We are working particularly in collaboration with NHS colleagues to develop a shared, connected digital infrastructure for the city to enable professionals to work together more seamlessly and people to manage their own health and care needs.

We remain committed to ‘open data’ where possible in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulations and privacy standards: ensuring that confidential information remains secure whilst enabling better analysis to prioritise interventions and resources to where they are most needed.

To use OPEN DATA standards and incorporate modular IT solutions that are more FLEXIBLE, BETTER VALUE FOR MONEY and can be JOINED UP more effectively.

To redesign services around THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE USING THEM prioritising those needs above any organisational, technological or professional silos.

To demonstrate DIGITAL LEADERSHIP helping create the environment for organisational transformation and also challenging the people and organisations we work with to EMBRACE THE DECLARATION too.

To embed an OPEN CULTURE that supports, values and expects digital ways of working across all members of staff and that facilitates CROSS-ORGANISATIONAL COLLABORATION

It must be integrated within the council’s overarching approach to improving services and delivering efficiencies, through organisational development and cultural change and also close partnership working.

We are working particularly in collaboration with NHS colleagues to develop a shared, connected digital infrastructure for the city to enable professionals to work together more seamlessly and people to manage their own health and care needs.

The Leeds bid relates to collecting damp monitoring data in social housing, helping us proactively maintain our property portfolio and ensure homes, particularly for more vulnerable members of society, remain healthy environments.

We will focus on a number of priority service areas to challenge how services are provided and their underlying processes and systems. Incorporating user-centred design to ensure the ‘customer experience’ is the starting point, we will identify opportunities to streamline and redesign processes, using digital solutions where appropriate.

For example, through widening the rollout of a single health and care record that can be continually updated by both professionals and individuals. Not only does this create more opportunities for joined-up care, but also modern technologies such as artificial intelligence can be used to analyse the data and provide new insights to inform decisions around prevention, treatment and future research. The council has access to an Innovation Lab which has successfully aided the delivery of a number of new digital products and services, such as the bin app and council housing matching facility (the ‘Social Housing Picker’), through bringing together users and experts to co-create solutions.

We will further promote this work in 2019/20 and beyond, exploiting opportunities for grant funded bids:

- such as DIGITISING incoming mail, replacing outgoing mail with digital alternatives and replacing IT software and hardware in the medium- to long-term — as part of a wider consideration of the whole function. The council is also undertaking a significant programme to upgrade, replace and possibly consolidate a number of applications through rethinking what we do and how we can improve the service, rather than merely replacing legacy IT systems. A ‘Core Systems Review’ is underway, assessing options across several cross-cutting functions. Digital also has a key role to play in our focus on improving staff health and wellbeing: better automation will create time-saving opportunities and digital assistive technology can both prevent and support musculo-skeletal injuries.

To support our staff on the digital journey, we will establish a digital coaching initiative to help managers understand more about how technology could help them deliver their services in more innovative and cost effective ways, and develop a ‘Directory of Digital Innovation’, enabling decision-makers to easily access information about technology advances that could aid service modernisation. Over time, we want all our staff to understand the opportunities that digital can provide in service delivery, with it being as much a part of decision-making as, for example, finance, staffing, consultation or equality considerations. We will also continue to promote tools such as the ‘Learn My Way’ platform to help staff develop their digital skills, part of our broader 100% digital literacy ambition for the whole city. There will be opportunities to learn and share with others too: for example, the Government Digital Service (GDS) is developing learning offers on digital leadership skills and service/user-led design, and the Greater London Authority is piloting a digital leadership programme which, when completed, will make all content freely available to other public sector bodies.

Underpinning the digital agenda is our ongoing work to improve the quality and availability of information provided to customers, staff and elected members.

The Leeds bid relates to collecting damp monitoring data in social housing, helping us proactively maintain our property portfolio and ensure homes, particularly for more vulnerable members of society, remain healthy environments.

We will focus on a number of priority service areas to challenge how services are provided and their underlying processes and systems. Incorporating user-centred design to ensure the ‘customer experience’ is the starting point, we will identify opportunities to streamline and redesign processes, using digital solutions where appropriate.

For example, through widening the rollout of a single health and care record that can be continually updated by both professionals and individuals. Not only does this create more opportunities for joined-up care, but also modern technologies such as artificial intelligence can be used to analyse the data and provide new insights to inform decisions around prevention, treatment and future research. The council has access to an Innovation Lab which has successfully aided the delivery of a number of new digital products and services, such as the bin app and council housing matching facility (the ‘Social Housing Picker’), through bringing together users and experts to co-create solutions.

We will further promote this work in 2019/20 and beyond, exploiting opportunities for grant funded bids:

- such as DIGITISING incoming mail, replacing outgoing mail with digital alternatives and replacing IT software and hardware in the medium- to long-term — as part of a wider consideration of the whole function. The council is also undertaking a significant programme to upgrade, replace and possibly consolidate a number of applications through rethinking what we do and how we can improve the service, rather than merely replacing legacy IT systems. A ‘Core Systems Review’ is underway, assessing options across several cross-cutting functions. Digital also has a key role to play in our focus on improving staff health and wellbeing: better automation will create time-saving opportunities and digital assistive technology can both prevent and support musculo-skeletal injuries.

To support our staff on the digital journey, we will establish a digital coaching initiative to help managers understand more about how technology could help them deliver their services in more innovative and cost effective ways, and develop a ‘Directory of Digital Innovation’, enabling decision-makers to easily access information about technology advances that could aid service modernisation. Over time, we want all our staff to understand the opportunities that digital can provide in service delivery, with it being as much a part of decision-making as, for example, finance, staffing, consultation or equality considerations. We will also continue to promote tools such as the ‘Learn My Way’ platform to help staff develop their digital skills, part of our broader 100% digital literacy ambition for the whole city. There will be opportunities to learn and share with others too: for example, the Government Digital Service (GDS) is developing learning offers on digital leadership skills and service/user-led design, and the Greater London Authority is piloting a digital leadership programme which, when completed, will make all content freely available to other public sector bodies.

Underpinning the digital agenda is our ongoing work to improve the quality and availability of information provided to customers, staff and elected members.

We remain committed to 'open data' where possible in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulations and privacy standards: ensuring that confidential information remains secure whilst enabling better analysis to prioritise interventions and resources to where they are most needed.
You can stay up to date with all our news and services throughout the year.

🌐 www.leeds.gov.uk
🐦 LeedsCC_News
👉 Leedscouncil
This page is intentionally left blank
Leeds 2018-23 Children and Young People’s Plan
Helping deliver the Best Council Plan and our Best City ambition of a strong economy in a compassionate city

One vision
Our vision is for Leeds to be the best city in the UK and the best city for children and young people to grow up in. We want Leeds to be a child-friendly city.

Through our vision and obsessions we invest in children and young people to help build an increasingly prosperous and successful city. We aim to improve outcomes for all our children whilst recognising the need for outcomes to improve faster for children and young people from vulnerable and deprived backgrounds.

Three obsessions
Safely and appropriately reduce the number of children looked after
Reduce the number of young people not in education, employment and training
Improve achievement, attainment, and attendance at school

Five outcomes
Conditions of wellbeing we want for all our children and young people

1. All children and young people:
   - are safe from harm
   - do well at all levels of learning and have skills for life
   - enjoy healthy lifestyles
   - have fun growing up
   - are active citizens who feel they have a voice and influence

Eleven priorities
1. Help children and parents to live in safe, supportive and loving families
2. Ensure that the most vulnerable are protected
3. Support families to give children the best start in life
4. Increase the number of children and young people participating and engaging in learning
5. Improve achievement and attainment for all
6. Improve at a faster rate educational progress for children and young people vulnerable to poor learning outcomes
7. Improve social, emotional, and mental health and wellbeing
8. Encourage physical activity and healthy eating
9. Support young people to make good choices and minimise risk-taking behaviours
10. Help young people into adulthood, to develop life skills, and be ready for work
11. Improve access to affordable, safe, and reliable connected transport for young people

How we’ll do it

The best start in life for all children
Before and after birth, we will support parents and babies to create the conditions where stress is reduced, positive bonds and attachments can form, and language and communications skills develop.

Attaining and achieving
Learning underpins wellbeing; we will place a disproportionate focus on learning, and readiness for learning, so we narrow the gap, and enable all children and young people - particularly those who are vulnerable learners - to realise their potential.

Think Family Work Family
When working with a child or young person, we will consider their family relationships, the role of adult behaviour, and the wider context such as their friends and the local community, and how these impact on outcomes for children and young people.

Challenging child poverty
In acknowledging the scale and impact of poverty on families, we will work with communities and families to mitigate the impact of poverty on children’s outcomes and support children’s journeys into secure adulthood in a prosperous city.

Outstanding social work and support for vulnerable children and young people
Continuing our journey to outstanding following the 2015 Ofsted inspection, our Families First programme, and our investment in social work (for example, the RES teams), we will ensure consistent quality across all our work with vulnerable children and young people.

A stronger offer to improve SEMH and well-being
We will redesign the whole system of SEMH and wellbeing support, and create simple pathways with clear points of entry to an integrated offer from education, health and social care services, which is personalised to individual needs.

Early help - the right conversations in the right place at the right time
Building on what works well, and reorganising more of our services around the Restorative Early Start (RES) approach, we will focus help to where it is needed earlier.

Behaviours that underpin everything we do

Use Outcome Based Accountability, and ask the question: is anyone better off?
Use restorative practice to work and do with people, not for or to them
We listen and respond to the voice of the child
We support and prioritise children and young people to have fun growing up

How we’ll know if we’ve made a difference

1. Number of children looked after
2. Number of children and young people subject to a child protection plan
3. Number of parents experiencing a second or subsequent instance of having a child or children enter care
4. Number of children and young people with a child in need plan
5. Percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage
6. Infant mortality rates
7. Percentage of new school places in good and outstanding schools
8. Attendance at primary and secondary schools
9. Number of fixed-term exclusions from primary and secondary schools
10. Percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing, and maths at the end of Key Stage 2
11. Progress 8 score for Leeds at the end of Key Stage 4
12. Destinations of young people with special educational needs and/or a disability when they leave school
13. Progress against measures in the Future in Mind dashboard
14. Prevalence of children at age 11 who are a healthy weight
15. Proportion of young offenders who re-offend
16. Under-18 conception rates
17. Admission episodes for alcohol-specific conditions: under-18s
18. Percentage of students achieving a level 3 qualification at age 19
19. Number of young people who are not in employment, education, or training, or whose status is ‘not known’
20. Transport for young people indicator to be developed after further discussions with young people
LEEDS CITY COUNCIL
2019/20 BUDGET REPORT

Directorate: Children and Families

1. Introduction

1.1 This report has been produced in order to inform members of the main variations and factors influencing the Directorate’s budget for the 2019/20 financial year.

2. Service Context

2.1 The Council has a statutory duty and responsibility to safeguard and promote the welfare of over 175k children and young people (aged 0–18) across Leeds. The Children and Families Directorate has produced the Leeds Children and Families Improvement Plan 2018-2020 which sets out the aims and priorities for the next three years and how the Directorate will continue to work to make Leeds the Best City for Children and Families in the UK. This budget reaffirms the Council’s commitment to the plan and once again protects the vital services provided by the Directorate.

2.2 The Children and Families Directorate has come a long way in recent years. It is still less than a decade ago that OFSTED found that services to children in Leeds were ‘inadequate’ and vulnerable children were being left at risk. The most recent OFSTED inspection report, published in December 2018, has rated the services that Leeds provides for children and families as ‘outstanding’. Leeds is the first major city to achieve this standard. This national recognition has led to Leeds being awarded significant additional grant funding from the Department for Education (DfE) under the Partner in Practice (PiP) programme with a total of £9.6m invested in Leeds between 2016/17 and 2018/19. In addition, Leeds has been undertaking ongoing improvement work with Kirklees Council and this arrangement has secured an additional £1.6m of funding from the DfE between 2017/18 and 2018/19. This budget ensures that the additional investment in services funded by the DfE PiP can be continued beyond the period of the grant funding.

2.3 Recent budgets have provided additional resources for the Directorate to fund the significant budget pressures on demand-led budgets, notably around transport, Children Looked After (CLA) and financially supported non-CLA. In terms of CLA the Directorate has had considerable success in implementing the ‘turning the curve strategy’ and has made substantial and invaluable progress in reducing demand for care at a time when elsewhere demand has been rising. The CLA rate per 10,000 in Leeds has continued to reduce year on year and is now below the core city average and on a par with our statistical neighbours. The reductions in CLA have been achieved in the context of significant demographic growth in Leeds, particularly in the more deprived areas of the city. As well as demographic pressures there has also been a notable increase in costs, especially in externally commissioned residential placements. However, in 2018/19 there is a projected overspend of £2.1m on CLA and financially supported non-CLA and whilst this is significantly less than in previous years the actual number of children being supported is still higher than budgeted. This budget provides for an increase in the demand led budgets of £2.6m.

2.4 The 2019/20 budget proposals ensure ongoing provision to support the Children and Young People’s Plan, continue the investment previously funded through the DfE funded Partner in Practice grant, protect frontline services and provide a realistic and appropriate level of budget provision for demand-led services to meet current and anticipated demands. The
detailed proposals are outlined below but these proposals also include additional resources to address key budget pressures including the demand-led pressures and loss of specific grant funding. The 2019/20 budget proposals for Children and Families also reflect the position that the changes to the education transport offer for post-16 learners, to introduce personal travel allowances (PTA’s) instead of providing transport which were approved by Executive Board in July 2017 are now not proposed to go ahead. This is outlined in section 3.14.

3  **Budget Proposals**

3.1 This 2019/20 budget has been set at £121,749k representing a net increase of £852k (0.7%) when compared to the adjusted budget for 2018/19. This net increase comprises a number of pressures totalling £2,652k offset by savings of £1,800k which are explained below.

3.2  **Budget Adjustments and Transfers £630k Cr**

3.2.1 There have been a number of service transfers and other budget adjustments which are reflected in the 2019/20 budget.

3.2.2 There has been a net reduction of £287k for the transfer of various budgets to other directorates. The transfers are mainly to Resources and Housing and include the transfer of the Public Access Service.

3.2.3 Budget adjustments include a reduction of £505k for the continued budgeted use of section 106 balances to support the 2019/20 budget. A budget of £92k has been transferred from Civic Enterprise Leeds (CEL) for the additional costs of the living wage in 2018/19 in relation to the transport service provided by CEL. Budget provision of £150k has been transferred from Adults Social Care, Public Health, for the commissioning of a bereavement service which will be managed by Children and Families. There are a number of small adjustments which result in a reduction of £80k.

3.3  **Changes in prices – pressure of £3,235k**

3.3.1 The budget includes provision of £2,390k reflecting the National Employers’ two year pay offer made in December 2017. For 2019/20 this offer increased above 2% for spinal column points (SCP) 1 to 22 and 2% increases for SCP 23 and above and for the impact of the teachers’ pay award for staff in the Directorate employed on teaching grades. As a result of this pay offer, the minimum hourly rate paid to current Leeds City Council employees will rise to £9.18 per hour which is 18p above the Real Living Wage rate. Apprentices and new starters on the A1 spinal point will be paid £9 per hour for the first year only.

3.3.2 No provision has been made for inflation on running cost budgets other than where there are specific contractual commitments and on utilities. Specifically in respect of energy, £66k provides for a 24.4% increase in electricity and a 14.8% increase in gas. The main provision for price inflation is £550k and provides £300k for CLA external placement costs and £250k for children’s transport costs. An additional £115k is provided for an increase in the cost of insurance, a reduction of £93k for National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR) following the revaluation and £207k for an increase in the pay award element of the costs of transport services provided by Civic Enterprise Leeds.
3.4 **Actuarial Review – pressure of £192k**

3.5 A review of the West Yorkshire Pension Fund has been undertaken in the autumn of 2017. The actuary has confirmed that the figures advised to the Council in the last triennial review. As a result of this the rate provided for will increase from the current 15.9% to 16.2% in 2019/20. This increase is estimated to cost £192k.

3.6 **Capitalised Pension Costs £173k Cr**

3.6.1 It is proposed to reduce the capitalised pension budget by £173k to reflect projected savings on this budget in 2019/20.

3.7 **National Living Wage Commissioned Services £590k.**

3.7.1 Provision of £590k has been included for the estimated cost of the increase in the national living wage for external residential placements.

3.8 **Demand and Demography £1,500k**

3.8.1 In recognition of the ongoing pressures on the Children and Families budget from increases in the child population and the resulting increase in CLA and children requiring transport, the CLA and financially supported non-CLA budgets have been increased by an additional £1,100k and the transport budget by £400k.

3.9 **Specific Grant Funding Changes £3,350 Cr**

3.9.1 The 2019/20 budget allows for a number of changes to grants in the Children and Families Directorate. The provisional Local Government finance settlement confirmed additional national funding of £410m for Adult’s and Children’s social care. The Leeds allocation of this is £5,600k and it is proposed that this is used to help fund the budget pressures in Children and Families including the fall out of other grant funding and increases to the demand led budgets.

3.9.2 The grant funding of £9.6m was awarded to the Council following a successful bid to the DfE PiP programme. This funding has now been fully committed. In order to secure the continuation of this significant additional investment, the budget has been increased by £3,050k so that the early intervention services funded through the programme can be continued. During 2018/19 the Council agreed to a request from the DfE to reschedule the final grant payment for the PiP programme from 2018/19 to 2019/20. In order to fund the 2018/19 spend the Directorate received a £1,700k contribution from reserves. The 2019/20 budget includes additional income of £1,700k as a result of the slippage in the payment. This income will be used to repay General Fund reserves.

3.9.3 Two smaller grants received by Children and Families are the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering grant and the Special Education Needs (SEN) grant. In both cases allocations for 2019/20 have not been announced and for the budget it is assumed that for the School Improvement, Monitoring and Brokering grant only the previously notified sum up to August 2019 will be received, a reduction of £400k on the grant received in 2018/19. If the grant is extended then the funding will be used to enhance the school improvement service. For the SEN grant it is assumed that the full £500k will fall out or an extension of the grant will come with new responsibilities which will require additional expenditure.
3.9.4 As part of the autumn budget in October 2018 the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced an additional £84m grant would be made available over 5 years for up to 20 local authorities to help children stay at home safely. The Chancellor specifically stated that this grant is intended to build on existing innovation in Leeds, Hertfordshire and North Yorkshire programmes. As referred to in paragraph 3.9.2 Leeds has been successful in receiving significant additional funding for innovation in Children’s Services from the PiP programme. These budget proposals do not specifically assume any additional funding from this grant as the Directorate is still working on a potential bid. However, the budget proposals do assume an additional £150k in income, see paragraph 3.16.3, which could include this new grant if the bid was successful. It is anticipated though that the majority of any additional funding received under this programme would result in additional responsibilities and hence would incur additional expenditure so would not result in direct savings for the Directorate.

3.10 Other budget pressures – £2,656k

3.10.1 There is in place within both Children and Families Directorate and Legal Services a strict approval mechanism to control external legal spend but recognising the pressure in 2018/19, the budget for external legal costs in 2019/20 provides for an additional £500k which reflects the increase in external legal costs associated with some of the more complex children cases being dealt with by the Council.

3.10.2 As an improvement partner working with the DfE, the Directorate has an income budget for income earned through working and supporting other LAs. This budget was increased in 2018/19 following the partnership agreement with Kirklees MBC. As this agreement will largely come to an end after 2018/19 the income budget is being reduced by £400k in 2019/20. Whilst further partnership work may be undertaken it is unlikely to be of the extent of the Kirklees MBC arrangement and any further agreements may also result in additional costs to the Directorate.

3.10.3 An increase in the fees for inter-agency placements during 2018/19 has meant that the local authority contributions that fund One Adoption West Yorkshire (OAWY) have been increased. The budget for the Leeds contribution for 2019/20 been increased by £350k.

3.10.4 Other funded pressures include £300k to reverse savings included in the 2018/19 budget that were achieved from the use of non-recurring income.

3.10.5 The 2019/20 budget includes a provision of £1,000k to make a one off contribution to schools funding to increase the PFI Factor in the schools funding formula for 2019/20. This follows discussions with the DfE about options to address the projected increase in the unitary charge costs for PFI schools in 2019/20 and future years. This proposal has a neutral impact on the Children and Families budget as the additional funding from reserves in year will be transferred to the schools DSG budget to be distributed to PFI schools as part of their PFI affordability gap funding. The DfE has confirmed that this increase to the PFI Factor will be baselined in future DSG settlements so a one off contribution of £1,000k funded by the Council in 2019/20 will lead to an equivalent increase in total schools funding for the PFI Factor for each subsequent year whilst the PFI contracts are still operating. This proposal protects non-PFI schools from contributing to the increased costs of the PFI contracts and provides more certainty over meeting future cost pressures for PFI schools. More details on this proposal are included in the schools budget report.

3.11 Reserves - £2,000k Cr

3.11. These proposals include the use of £1,000k of reserves to support the 2019/20 budget.
3.12 In addition, it is proposed that £1,000k of reserves in Children and Families will be used to make a one off contribution to schools funding as outlined in paragraph 3.10.5.

3.12 Savings

3.13 Efficiencies – £600k.

3.13.1 Savings of £300k have been included in the transport budget in relation to the mainstream school transport services commissioned through the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA). These are savings that have already been partly achieved and have been delivered through route rationalisation of routes.

3.13.2 As part of moving the services funded through the PiP programme DfE grant to baseline Children and Families base budget the service will review the current spend with a view to identifying non-staffing savings. A saving of £150k has been assumed for this.

3.13.3 Other running cost savings of £150k include £50k savings on prudential borrowing costs, £50k savings on Independent Support Workers reflecting current savings and £50k general running cost savings.

3.14 Service Changes - £0k

3.14.1 As referred to in paragraph 2.4, the report to the July 2017 Executive Board on ‘Transport assistance for Post-16 students with SEND’ had sought approval to implement a new transport offer for young people with SEND (special educational needs) in post-16 education. The proposal was approved by Executive Board. The changes had been subject to rigorous consultation, a strong communications strategy was conducted and a long phasing-in period included an extended period of no-change for existing students. During the implementation period additional feedback was received from a small number of affected families. The phasing-in period was therefore paused pending further consideration and the effect of cancelling the policy changes in line with the new feedback was considered, with alternative options explored.

3.14.2 A pilot scheme to offer PTA’s on a voluntary basis to both post-16 and statutory age children has proven very successful with a high level of take-up delivering £360k of savings to date. The scheme continues to be promoted and further take up of the offer is expected. There are now more families in receipt of voluntary PTA’s across all year groups than had been expected from across the post-16 cohort. These savings have helped offset the impact of the increase in children requiring transport arrangements and a reduced need for demand and demography funding. In addition, as outlined in paragraph 3.13.1 reviews of mainstream school services commissioned through WYCA have secured efficiencies.

3.14.3 It is now proposed that the changes to the post-16 offer approved in 2017 are not implemented and that the Children’s Transport service reverts to the November 2015 transport policy. In common with other local authority transport policies, the Leeds policy will continue to be reviewed. The 2019/20 budget therefore provides for an increase in the overall transport budget reflecting an anticipated overall increase in demand for transport services although the overall additional costs has been partly offset by the savings made through the take up of voluntary PTAs. No savings have therefore been assumed from the original proposed changes to the post-16 offer.

3.15 Income – Fees and Charges £200k
3.15.1 Maintaining current trading levels with schools continues to be challenging and therefore no increases in traded income have been assumed except for income from Adel Beck where there will be an increase in charges estimated at an additional £200k.

3.16 **Income – Traded Services and Other £1,000k**

3.16.1 An additional £600k of grant income is anticipated from the High Needs Block (HNB) of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in relation to the additional costs incurred by the Directorate for the education costs of children and young people in external residential placements and from recovery of the costs of the voluntary Passenger Transport Agreements for SEN pupils. These additional costs have been taken account of in the High Needs Block five year financial plan.

3.16.2 Income of £200k is expected from the capitalisation of some of the staff of the Children and Health and Disabilities team around the work of the occupational therapists team on adaptations.

3.16.3 As referenced in paragraph 3.9.4 an additional £150k in income has been included on the basis of a number of bids for external funding that the Directorate are currently working on.

4 **Risk Assessment**

4.1 In determining the 2019/20 budget, consideration has been given to all the risks which are managed within the directorate’s overall risk management framework. Within this framework, a register of those items considered carrying the highest risk and therefore requiring careful and regular monitoring has been prepared. The key risks in the 2019/20 budget for Children and Families are:

4.2 Leeds is growing as a city and as well as rising birth rates more families are choosing to live and work here. It is projected that the number of children & young people will continue to increase in Leeds over the next few years.

4.3 This increasing demographic brings with it an increasing number of children with special and very complex needs. This impacts in particular on the Children and Families placements budget for Children Looked After, financially supported Non-CLA and on the transport budget. As already mentioned in the report these budget proposals provide for an increase of £2.6m for the budgets for supported children and transport costs. There is a risk that this additional funding is not sufficient to meet the growing demands. To mitigate this risk the budget proposals also provide funding to continue the additional investment in services previously funded by the DfE PiP grant and the budget also protects all the vital services that the Directorate provides.

4.4 These pressures have also impacted on the High Needs budget in recent years which is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant. Although this budget sits outside the Children and Families budget, decisions on spend are made by the Council. Schools and School Forum have been consulted on options to balance the High Needs budget in 2018/19 and 2019/20 and to reduce the deficit balance from previous years. On the 17th December 2018 the Secretary of State for Education announced that there would nationally be an additional £250m of high needs funding on top of existing allocations, in recognition of the cost pressures that Local Authorities (LAs) are experiencing on the High Needs Block. The national announcement provides £125m for 2018/19 and £125m for 2019/20. For Leeds this results in an additional £1.76m in funding each year. It should be noted that the additional
grant is for two years only and funding beyond 2019/20 is subject to the outcome of the spending review. Full details are included in the Schools funding budget report. There is still a risk that ultimately a deficit on the DSG could become a liability to the Council.

4.5 The Directorate’s proposed budget includes additional income from grants and from other sources. There is a risk that not all the additional income will be secured, although the budget proposals do include reductions to some income targets and funds the loss of known reductions in grant income.

Briefing note prepared by:  Simon Criddle (Head of Finance)

Telephone: 07891274578
### Directorate - Children’s and Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2019/20 FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net managed budget 2018/19</strong></td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers of function</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjustments</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted net managed budget</strong></td>
<td>120.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Pressures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers Pension</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalised Pensions</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Living Wage - commissioned services</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic and demand pressures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA and financially supported non-CLA</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Fallout</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallout of DfE Partner in Practice Grant</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant - anticipated reduction</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE Special Educational Needs Grant - reduction/new responsibilities</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE Partner in Practice Grant - final payment</td>
<td>(1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grant funding - Adult's and Children's social care</td>
<td>(5.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of earmarked reserves</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to PFI Factor in the School Funding Formula</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal disbursements</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in partnership income following ending of Kirklees partnership work</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Adoption West Yorkshire - increase in contribution</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pressures</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pressures</strong></td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings Proposals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport savings - WYCA commissioned services</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running cost savings from former PiP funded activities</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other running cost savings</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income - Fees &amp; Charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased charges Adel Beck</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income - Traded Services, Partner Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and Other Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Dedicated Schools Grant (High Needs Block) for external placement costs and personal transport budgets</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional income from Housing for the capitalisation of 50% of the costs of the Children Health and Disabilities team (occupational therapists)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grant income (following local government settlement)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Savings</strong></td>
<td>(1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Managed Budget 2019/20</strong></td>
<td>121.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Schools Budget 2019/20

1. The schools budget is funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The DSG is a ring-fenced grant and may only be applied to meet costs that fall within the schools budget. Any under or over spend of grant from one year must be carried forward and applied to the schools budget in future years.

2. The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2019/20 is funded in four separate blocks for early years, high needs, schools and central schools services.

3. A new National Funding Formula (NFF) was implemented in April 2018 for high needs, schools and central schools services. However, local authorities will continue to set local formulae for schools as a transitional arrangement until full implementation of the NFF. This has been delayed until at least 2021/2022.

4. The early years block will fund 15 hours per week of free early education for 3 and 4 year olds and the early education of eligible vulnerable 2 year olds. From September 2017, there is an additional 15 hours per week provision for working families of 3 and 4 year old children. The per-pupil units of funding have remained the same at £4,659.50 per full time equivalent for 3 and 4 year olds and £4,940.00 per full time equivalent for 2 year olds. The grant received will continue to be based on participation. The actual grant received during 2019/20 depends on pupil numbers in the 2019 and 2020 January censuses. The early years pupil premium is included in the early years block and is payable to providers for eligible 3 and 4 year olds at the rate of £0.53 per child per hour. The grant value shown below is based on the projected pupil numbers in January 2019.

5. The high needs block will support places and top-up funding in special schools, resourced provision in mainstream schools and alternative provision; top-up funding for early years, primary, secondary, post-16 and out of authority provision; central SEN support and hospital & home education. A grant allocation was issued in December 2018, though adjustments to this figure are expected up until May 2019. On the 17th December 2018 the Secretary of State for Education announced an additional £250m of high needs revenue funding on top of existing allocations over 2 years. For Leeds this resulted in £1.76m additional funding in 2018/19 and 2019/20. However, the high needs block is facing a number of financial pressures and Schools Forum had previously agreed a transfer of £2.5m from the schools block to help fund these pressures. The additional high needs revenue funding was announced with an expectation that any transfers from the schools block would be re-examined and as a result it is proposed that the transfer from the schools block is reduced to £1.5m. Some of the additional funding would also be used to increase the Funding for Inclusion (FFI) rate for mainstream schools for eligible pupils from £600 to £650. Based on current numbers the annual cost of this is estimated at £1.05m. The remaining additional funding would be used to make a contribution to the DSG deficit. In addition,
there is a proposed transfer of £0.8m from the central schools services block to the high needs block. These proposals were all fully supported by Schools Forum members in the January 2019 meeting.

6. The schools block funds the delegated budgets of primary and secondary schools for pupils in reception to year 11. The grant for 2019/20 is based on pupil numbers (including those in academies and free schools) as at October 2018. Schools have been consulted on options for the local formula in 2019/20. The results of the consultation have been reported to Schools Forum to enable further discussion with a final decision being made by the Director of Children and Families in early 2019.

7. The central school services block (CSSB) includes the funding which was previously delivered through the retained duties element of the ESG along with previously reported ongoing responsibilities and historic commitments. The allocation for 2019/20 was issued in December 2018 at £5.33m.

8. The guidance for 2019/20 allows for funding to be moved within these blocks. Several movements to transfer funding to meet need have been agreed or supported by Schools Forum as detailed below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>CSSB</th>
<th>High Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Funding for post-16 provision is allocated by the ESFA. For 2019/20, funding for post 16 high needs pupils will remain in the high needs block and the post 16 grant will reduce correspondingly. Funding for 2019/20 will be based on 2018/19 lagged student numbers.

10. Pupil Premium grant is paid to schools and academies based on the number of eligible Reception to year 11 pupils on the school’s roll in January each year. The rates for 2019/20 are expected to remain at: primary £1,320 and secondary £935 for each pupil registered as eligible for free school meals (FSM) at any point in the last 6 years, and £300 for children of service families. The pupil premium plus rate for children looked after and children who have ceased to be looked after by a local authority because of adoption, a special guardianship order, a child arrangements order or a residence order is expected to remain at £2,300.

11. The Primary PE grant will be paid in the 2018/19 academic year to all primary schools at a rate of £16,000 plus £10 per pupil.

12. For the year 7 catch up grant in 2018/19, funding is allocated to schools on the basis that they receive the same overall amount of year 7 catch-up premium funding received in 2017/18. It will be adjusted to reflect the percentage change
in the size of their year 7 cohort, based on the October 2018 census. It is assumed that the 2019/20 grant will be on the same basis and so dependent on the October 2019 census information.

13. A grant for the universal provision of free school meals for all pupils in reception, year 1 and year 2 was introduced in September 2014. Funding for the 2018/19 academic year is based on a rate of £2.30 per meal taken by eligible pupils, giving an annual value of £437. Data from the October and January censuses will be used to calculate the allocations for the academic year.

14. A further grant has been announced in relation to additional teacher’s pay costs from 1st September 2018. The values below are a part year impact on 2018/19 and the estimated full year grant in 2019/20.

15. PFI schools have different arrangements around a number of cost elements including premises costs and various facilities costs. The funding arrangements for such schools are also slightly different to other schools.

16. A number of financial issues have recently arisen specifically around PFI schools which the Council has been looking to address and has had discussions with the DfE over options to manage these. The main issue is around how the projected increasing costs of the contracts will be funded in the future. The Council has sought a solution which avoids having to take more funding from the Schools Block and provides some financial certainty over the next few years.

17. Leeds has a high number of PFI funded schools with 29 PFI maintained schools and academies across five PFI schemes representing around 11% of schools in Leeds. The PFI contracts are between the council and the PFI contractors and the council is responsible for contract management. The contracts are for 25 years and the schemes will end at various stages up to 2036/37. The budgeted total unitary charge for 2018/19 is £52.1m. The cost of the unitary charge is met through a combination of income received from PFI credits grant from the DfE and contributions from schools through a school budget contribution and a school affordability gap contribution. The affordability gap is the difference between the full cost of the contract and the combined income from the PFI grant and school budget contributions. In order for PFI schools to pay the affordability gap contribution they receive additional PFI Factor funding through the Schools Block of DSG.

18. There are significant differences between the original assumptions in the PFI financial models and what has actually been experienced for variables such as the rate of inflation, the rate of overall increase of the unitary charge payments, lettings income and the available funding to meet the payments. Re-modelling of the financial position for each of the PFI schemes shows increasing and significant funding issues over the remaining lifetime of the schemes, particularly as inflation has increased over the last few years. The options to meet this growing funding gap are limited as most of the funding is fixed or based on previous year spend with an annual uplift for RPIX. In future years it is projected that the uplift will not be sufficient to meet the overall increase in the unitary charge.

19. Following discussions with the DfE it is proposed to increase the PFI factor in the formula through an additional contribution from the Council. The DfE have
confirmed that this would then be baselined in future years. This option protects non-PFI schools from contributing to an increase in the PFI Factor and provides more certainty over meeting the projected increase in costs for the PFI schools. The Council is therefore proposing to make a contribution of £1m from Council reserves to the PFI Factor in the school funding formula in 2019/20. This will then be baselined by the DfE in future years’ Schools Block DSG settlements. The additional £1m will be distributed to PFI schools through an increase in their PFI Factor funding.

**Schools Funding Summary**

20. The grants before ESFA deductions (e.g. for payments to academies) and transfers between blocks for 2018/19 (latest estimate) and 2019/20 are shown in the following table along with the additional contribution to be made by the council to the Schools Block in relation to PFI. Some of the amounts for 2019/20 are subject to final confirmation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG - Schools Block</td>
<td>498.97</td>
<td>516.32</td>
<td>17.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Block – additional council contribution</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG - Central Schools Services Block</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG - High Needs Block</td>
<td>68.72</td>
<td>72.55</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG - Early Years Block</td>
<td>57.15</td>
<td>59.07</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA Post 16 Funding</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Premium Grant</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE &amp; Sports Grant</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 Catch-up Grant</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Infant Free School Meals Grant</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Pay Grant</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>720.28</td>
<td>744.06</td>
<td>23.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefing note prepared by: Louise Hornsey, Principal Financial Manager
Telephone: 0113 3788689
## Children and Families/Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Options considered and justification for proposal</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Consultation undertaken</th>
<th>Summary of equality impact assessment</th>
<th>Expected decision date</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget Amount £</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families</td>
<td>Revert to the original November 2015 transport policy</td>
<td>Original proposal to implement changes to the policy have been reconsidered following additional feedback and consultation. Savings on the transport budget now realised through Personal Travel Allowances.</td>
<td>There are no particular risks with this proposal</td>
<td>Extensive consultation on original proposals and follow up consultation.</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Children’s and Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Schools Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Options considered and justification for proposal</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Consultation undertaken</th>
<th>Summary of equality impact assessment</th>
<th>Expected decision date</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget Amount £</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools Funding</td>
<td>Transfer of £800k from the Central Schools Services Block to the High Needs Block</td>
<td>There is surplus funding in the CSSB as some costs have now fallen out. The HNB has a number of financial pressure and the additional resources will</td>
<td>There are no particular risks with this proposal</td>
<td>Consultation with all schools and Schools Forum in October and November 2018 with overwhelming for the proposal.</td>
<td>The proposed transfer will provide additional funding to support the most vulnerable pupils.</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Options considered and justification for proposal</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Consultation undertaken</td>
<td>Summary of equality impact assessment</td>
<td>Expected decision date</td>
<td>2019/20 Budget Amount £</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the schools funding formula for 2019/20</td>
<td>Two options for the 2019/20 schools funding formula were consulted on in October. The additional HNB funding has meant that the options have been reviewed with a lower transfer from the SB to the HNB now proposed.</td>
<td>There are no specific risks but the Council has a statutory responsibility to approve a schools funding formula</td>
<td>All schools and schools forum were consulted on two options. The responses were equally split between the two options. Schools Forum requested the Council’s preferred option was amended to reflect the concerns of some schools. The proposed formula is an amended formula that takes account of this.</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>Over £500,000,000 to be distributed to schools</td>
<td>Director of Children and Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of Director of Children and Families

Report to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Date: 12 June 2019

Subject: Performance update for October 2018 to March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are specific electoral wards affected?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If relevant, name(s) of ward(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the decision eligible for Call-In?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:

Appendix number:

1. **Summary of main issues**

1.1. This report provides a summary of performance information relating to outcomes for Leeds children and young people. It provides Scrutiny with an update on the 2018-23 Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP).

2. **Recommendations**

2.1. Members are recommended to:

- Consider and comment on the most recent performance information.
- Use the data and comments in this report as additional, contextual information to inform the Scrutiny Board’s discussions on its work programme for the year.
- Request an additional update at the December or January meeting.
3. **Purpose of this report**

3.1. Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) receives a biannual performance update that provides a broad and succinct summary in terms of what difference is being made in the delivery of the CYPP and the Best Council Plan (BCP). The CYPP is a partnership plan that supports the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Leeds Inclusive Growth Strategy. The report summarises data and progress from a number of reports and dashboards used within Leeds City Council and in Leeds Children and Families Trust arrangements.

3.2. The CYPP was refreshed in 2017 to maintain momentum and commitment to improving outcomes for Leeds children and young people, integral to our best city aspirations. Central to this is that we remain focused on the children, young people, and families who most require support, on the impact of child poverty, and on ensuring all children make good progress in their learning.

3.3. This report is the first update of the 2019/20 financial year. It provides the latest performance data - both strategic, and operational, to offer assurances around the health of the social care system in Leeds - and a position statement for the end of the 2018/19 financial year on our progress against our CYPP ambitions for the Council and for the wider children’s partnership in Leeds.

4. **Background information**

4.1. The CYPP is the strategic document that guides the work of Children and Families. The current iteration covers the period 2018 to 2023 and takes account of the current national picture, and evolving local challenges, placing challenging child poverty at the heart of our work. It is part of the family of strategies that focus on delivering the ‘best city’ ambition. Work has been undertaken to ensure that the CYPP and BCP reference each other, and that key measures from the CYPP appear in the BCP.

4.2. Selected comparator information is mentioned throughout this report. Greater detail is found in a range of online sources, including the DfE LAIT\(^1\), school performance tables\(^2\), the Annual Standards report\(^3\), and the Leeds Observatory\(^4\).

4.3. Over the last 12 months, a Scrutiny inquiry has considered if Leeds is a child friendly city through a series of themed meetings and reports. This report focuses on performance information and provides an up-to-date position that will complement the information presented to Scrutiny as part of its inquiry.

4.4. Ofsted provide external validation through their inspection programme of local authorities’ children’s services. The November 2018 inspection awarded Leeds an outstanding rating\(^5\).

---

2. [https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/](https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/)
5. [https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50045174](https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50045174)
4.5. Children and Families remains committed to the Outcomes Based Accountability model of reporting, asking at city and partnership level what impact are we having, are we ‘turning the curve’, and at a service context how much did we do, how well did we do it, and what difference did it make? This is reflected in the design of the CYPP and the reporting approach (as seen in the summary table in appendix one). More in-depth, operational information is provided to services through weekly and monthly reports, ensuring that children and young people are safeguarded and receive appropriate support in a timely manner.

5. Main issues

The 2018-23 Children and Young People’s Plan (supporting data in appendices one, two, and three)

5.1. Appendix one provides the latest data for all measures in the 2018-23 CYPP, as well as contextual comments, key insights, and messages for the children’s partnership in the city. The summary table is presented biannually to Children and Families Trust Board, the strategic board where CYPP performance is discussed and challenged. Further contextual information is provided in appendix two, showing change over time, comparator data, and - where possible - cluster-level performance data.

5.2. Outcomes in the CYPP include:

5.2.1. All children and young people are safe from harm. The number of children looked after in Leeds has safely and appropriately reduced over the last eight years. The charts, below, show the change in Leeds against comparators between 2011 and 2018 (the latest available national data). Leeds’ rate per ten thousand figure is now below core cities and statistical neighbours, and has significantly closed the gap to the regional and national figures.

Data source: SSDA903 return (DfE)⁶

5.2.2. At the end of March 2019, 1,284 children and young people were looked after in Leeds. This is a one per cent rise in the last 12 months, broadly in line with the

---

rising under-18 population in Leeds (0.9 per cent higher in the latest Office for National Statistics population estimates). This figure remains provisional until the DfE publish the outturns from the SSDA903 return on children looked after for 2018/19, in the autumn.

5.2.3. Fewer children are subject to a child protection plan, and fewer have an open child in need case at the end of March 2019 than March 2018. Increasingly, the range of early help options available suggest that appropriate alternatives to social care intervention are being taken up, such as early help assessments and the developing Restorative Early Start (RES) teams.

5.2.4. All local authorities submit social care data to the DfE through statutory data returns each June and July (covering the 2018/19 financial year). The DfE publish these datasets in the autumn, which will provide us with the opportunity to place Leeds’ data in the context of the national picture.

5.2.5. All children and young people do well at all levels of learning and have skills for life. The Annual Standards report summarises the performance of Leeds pupils at all key stages in the 2017/18 academic year. It highlights the successes and challenges, identifying where the gaps are between groups of Leeds pupils and their national peers. Children who grow up in poverty face a range of disadvantages throughout childhood and their entire life course. Experiencing childhood poverty has severe short and long-term consequences across all indicators for success. There are statistically significant relationships evidenced in gaps for educational attainment, physical and mental health, social integration, longevity, wellbeing, housing, economic and employment outcomes.

5.2.6. The attainment data within this report are for the 2017/18 academic year. Ward and children’s cluster data for 2017/18 by pupil’s home address is being processed and will be made available on the Leeds data observatory. Headline performance includes:

- 65.7 per cent of pupils achieved a good level of development at the Early Years Foundation Stage (5.8 percentage points behind national).
- 61 per cent of pupils achieved the expected standard in reading, writing and maths at Key Stage 2 (four points behind national).
- 40.9 per cent of pupils achieved a strong pass (grade five and above) at Key Stage 4 (2.6 points behind national).
- The Leeds Progress 8 score (which demonstrates institutional effectiveness by showing progress made by pupils between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4) is -0.02 (this is the same as the national figure).

5.2.7. Pupils will be sitting SATs, and GCSE and A-Level examinations between May and June, with the first (provisional) results available towards the end of the summer. The DfE will release final (confirmed) results by January 2020.

5.2.8. The latest national data show that authorised absence in Leeds schools is amongst the lowest in the country, with results for both primary (eighth) and secondary (19th) being in the top quartile nationally. These results reflect the
seriousness with which the children’s partnership and the city view school attendance. Unauthorised absence, however, remains a challenge, particularly in a small number of secondary schools. Unauthorised absences can lead to higher levels of persistent absence, culminating in pupils disengaging from learning, which negatively affects their chance of achieving good exam results. The ‘triple A’ obsession - improve attainment, achievement, and attendance at school - acknowledges this and attempts to redress the challenge of unauthorised and persistent absence.

5.2.9. **All children and young people enjoy healthy lifestyles.** The reduction in childhood obesity in Leeds recently received coverage in the national media. The Guardian\(^7\) reported that “Leeds has become the first city in the UK to report a drop in childhood obesity after introducing a programme to help parents set boundaries for their children and say no to sweets and junk food.” A possible reason for this reduction is the HENRY programme\(^8\), introduced in 2009 as part of the city’s obesity strategy.

5.2.10. Janice Burberry, a head of public health at Leeds City Council, was quoted in The Guardian article as saying “we understand that there is no magic bullet here. Parents are experts in their own lives and they know what they can and can’t achieve. The strategy of HENRY is about sitting alongside parents and thinking through what’s right for them”. In other words, working with families, not doing to, or for them.

5.2.11. **All children and young people are active citizens who feel they have a voice and influence.** Updates on NEET figures have not been provided in this report as we are not sure that the current figures for NEET are accurate. The change in the cohort in September 2018 resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of young people reported as ‘not known’. As a result of inaccuracies in the cohort the number of not knowns have not reduced at the rate expected or to the level expected. It is anticipated that some of the young people reported as ‘not known’ will actually be:

- In an educational provision in the city;
- Have started an apprenticeship;
- Commenced employment;
- Have moved out of the local authority;

Attempts are being made to match data across a number of systems but this is proving a complex task. Due to the high number of young people reported as ‘not known’ from the cohort the Pathways Team which contacts individuals to follow up ‘not known’ is struggling with capacity. The Director of Children and Families has offered additional support from across the Directorate to support them with this process. We are reviewing our arrangements to enable the production of an accurate list of ‘not knowns’. Through the 3A’s strategy and plan the Directorate

---

\(^7\) [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/may/01/leeds-becomes-first-uk-city-to-lower-its-childhood-obesity-rate](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/may/01/leeds-becomes-first-uk-city-to-lower-its-childhood-obesity-rate)

\(^8\) [https://www.henry.org.uk/](https://www.henry.org.uk/)
are strengthening arrangement to follow up ‘not knowns’ to support the work of the Pathways Team.

5.2.12. As part of a regional consortium bid, Leeds has been successful in applying to the European Structural and Investment bid for work with NEET young people. Two ESIF-funded programmes commenced delivery this month, with a further £3.8m available over three years to enable the Council to strengthen its targeted work to support vulnerable young people that are NEET and the wider group of young people up to 25 years that have yet to find work. The programmes aim to support up to 3,000 young people to better connect to opportunities.

6. Population changes

6.1. There are approximately 10,000 births each year in Leeds. Between 2012 and 2017, the under-18 population in Leeds rose by six per cent, compared to a 3.9 per cent rise across England. The year-on-year growth in Leeds is higher than the England growth for each of the last five years, and has been concentrated, although not exclusively, in Leeds’ poorer communities, especially in areas considered in the most deprived nationally. Leeds had the greatest rate of child population growth in areas considered in the three per cent most deprived nationally. This growth is now affecting secondary school provision and will in the coming decade impact on all young people focused services.

6.2. Children living in the ten per cent most deprived areas are ten times more likely to be in care or subject to a child protection plan than their peers living in the ten per cent most affluent areas. The rising diversity impact will be complicated, but some of the largest population rises are in ethnicities over-represented in the care cohort.

6.3. Changes are also apparent in the school population. 34 per cent of the school population is from Black, Asian, or Minority Ethnic groups; 16.5 per cent of children are eligible for free school meals; and 13.8 per cent of children have special educational needs and disability.

7. Supporting children and families, strengthening social care (supporting data in appendix four)

7.1. Appendix four provides an overview of operational performance measures for the Children’s Social Work Service. We continue to monitor closely that the simple things, such as timeliness and contact, are being done well. The report in appendix four is an extract from a monthly performance report that is provided to senior leaders within the Children’s Social Work Service.

7.2. The report contains information for the safeguarding journey on a monthly basis, providing a snapshot into the system. From contact at the Front Door, to decision-making by social work professionals, to assessments that identify the level of intervention required to the monitoring of open cases, the report provides senior leaders with the latest data, but also includes performance data for the preceding 12 months to contextualise and address changes in performance.
7.3. Providing this report to Scrutiny supports our culture of being open and honest with the information. The report is part of suite of tools used by managers to support their practice and to be accountable for performance. Any dips in performance are quickly identified and action is undertaken to fix the issue.

7.4. In line with Outcomes Based Accountability principles, the report identifies the main indicators that together signify the health of the system that supports children and young people currently experiencing vulnerabilities. More detailed, weekly operational information is scrutinised within social work teams and at management and leadership levels to make sure that small divergences from the norm are quickly identified and efficiently and effectively addressed.

7.5. Much of the data in the report shows improvement over time, supported by national comparator information through DfE statistical first releases. The strong and continued improvement in timeliness and process measures, as well as the headline measures such as children looked after, and children subject to a child protection plan - all of which indicate an improvement in children and young people’s outcomes - have contributed, alongside service improvement initiatives, to the outstanding rating from the November Ofsted inspection.

**Children in Need**

7.5.1. The number of both contacts and referrals has risen since the turn of the year. A greater number of both were received in March 2019 than in March 2018, although proportionally fewer contacts were accepted as referrals (46.3 per cent in March 2019 compared to 48.8 per cent in March 2018). This is likely due to the increasing ranges of early help alternatives available to children and families before statutory social care involvement.

7.5.2. 389 more children have an open case at the end of March than at the end of October 2018; however, the number of open cases at March 2019 is 7.5 per cent lower (413 lower) than the number at March 2018.

**Child protection**

7.5.3. The number of children subject to a child protection plan continues to safely and appropriately reduced, with the March 2019 figure of 414 lower by 113 than the March 2018 figure. Fewer children are becoming subject to a child protection plan due to the increasing range of early help options, and throughout the year, a number of large sibling groups have ceased to be subject to a plan, which has contributed to the reducing numbers.

7.5.4. Timeliness of ICPCs is 75 per cent - higher than March 2018 and October 2018. Previous reports have shown this measure can be subject to short-term variation and have provided assurance that this is identified and addressed.
Children looked after and moving on

7.5.5. Children looked after numbers have remained stable in the first three months of the 2019 calendar year, approximately ten higher than the figure reported at the end of September. The modest increase reflects the rising under-18 population in Leeds over recent years, with the most recent population estimates showing a 0.9 percentage point increase.

7.5.6. In the previous update it was reported that the percentage of initial child looked after reviews carried out within timescales in the month was 84.2 per cent, a reduction from the last report. In March, 94.7 per cent of initial child looked after reviews were carried out within timescales, an increase of more than ten percentage points.

8. Mitigating the impact of child poverty

8.1. Some young people are statistically more likely to have relatively poor outcomes, for example those with learning difficulties and disabilities; those from some ethnic minority backgrounds; those with English as an additional language; those living in deprived areas; those with poor school attendance; and those in the social care system.

8.2. The purpose of all the strategic and operational activity relating to this this area of work is to keep all children and young people safe from harm and to enable them to achieve their full potential. A central element of this is to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children, young people, and families who experience inequality of opportunity or outcomes are identified and responded to at the earliest possible opportunity.

8.3. A national measure of child poverty indicates that 20.0 per cent of children, (33,485) in Leeds live in poverty, which is above the 17.0 per cent seen nationally (HMRC children in low income families measure, August 2016 snapshot, published in December 2018). Whilst the impact of poverty can be found in all areas of the city, there are specific concentrations of poverty within the inner city. The city strives to mitigate both the causes and impact of poverty and this is integral to all work with children and families.

8.4. The development of the triple A strategy for the city, focusing on attendance, achievement and attainment, is intended to ensure that all children including those affected by child poverty and disadvantages have the opportunity to reach their potential. This will be a key strategy for Leeds as it strives to improve educational outcomes across the board.

8.5. The Annual Standards report provides headline information about attainment across the city. It also provides details about the performance of distinct cohorts of pupils, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds, those eligible for free
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school meals, and pupil premium pupils. The 2017/18 academic year report was presented at the 24 April Scrutiny meeting.  

9. Corporate considerations

9.1. Consultation and engagement

9.1.1. This is an information report and as such does not need to be consulted on with the public. However, all performance information is available to the public.

9.2. Equality and diversity/cohesion and integration

9.2.1. This is an information report, rather than a decision report and so due regard is not relevant. However, this report does include an update on equality issues as they relate to the various priorities. Mitigating the impact of child poverty is covered in section eight.

9.3. Council policies and city priorities

9.3.1. This report provides an update on progress in delivering the council and city priorities in line with the council’s performance management framework. The CYPP supports, reflects, and complements the outcomes, priorities and indicators set out in the Best Council Plan 2015-20 and the Joint Health and Well Being Plan 2013-15 (which is currently being updated).

9.4. Resources and value for money

9.4.1. There are no specific resource implications from this report.

9.5. Legal implications, access to information and call in

9.5.1. All performance information is publicly available. This report is an information update providing Scrutiny with a summary of performance for the strategic priorities within its remit and as such is not subject to call in.

9.6. Risk management

9.6.1. The six-monthly summary of CYPP report cards provided to Scrutiny includes an update of the key risks and challenges for each of the priorities. A comprehensive risk management process to monitor and manage key risks in the council supports this.

10. Conclusions

10.1. This report provides a summary of performance against the strategic priorities for the council relevant to Scrutiny Board (Children’s Services). It also formally

10 http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/mgChooseDocPack.aspx?ID=8546 (pp13-100)
introduces the 2018-23 CYPP, which will be monitored through six-monthly reports to Children and Families Trust Board, and Scrutiny (Children and Families).

11. Recommendations

11.1. Members are recommended to:

- Consider and comment on the most recent performance information.
- Use the data and comments in this report as additional, contextual information to inform the Scrutiny Boards discussions on its work programme for the year.
- Request an additional update at the December or January meeting.

Background documents

11.2. Other regular sources of information about performance in relation to children’s services are contained in: community committee reports; the annual standards report to Executive Board each February/March about education attainment; annual reports to Executive Board of the fostering and adoption services each summer; and regular updates to Executive Board on proposals to increase school places as part of the basic need programme.

11 The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council’s website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
## Appendix one: indicator performance for the 2018-23 CYPP indicators as at the end of March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obsession</strong>&lt;br&gt;Number of children looked after</td>
<td><em>Story behind the numbers:</em> There has been a one per cent rise in the number of children looked after in Leeds in the last 12 months, which is broadly in line with the rising under-18 population (0.9 per cent higher in the latest ONS population estimates).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>Key insight:</em> The number of children looked after in Leeds decreased by 11.4 per cent between 2011 and 2019. The latest (to 2018) national figures show a 15.1 per cent rise in children looked after in England, demonstrating the impact in Leeds of safely and appropriately reducing the need for children to be looked after. The latest national data show that Leeds’ children looked after numbers rose by 1.5 per cent in the 12 months between April 2017 and March 2018. Over the same period national looked after numbers rose by 3.9 per cent. At the end of September 2018 there were 1,275 children looked after stable since March.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>Achievements/next steps:</em> A range of initiatives and practice developments have contributed to Leeds success including the development and implementation of the Leeds Practice Model, Rethink Formulation, Restorative Early Support Teams, family group conferencing, restorative practice, MST (multi-systemic therapy) standard, CAN (Child Abuse and Neglect team) and FIT (Family Integrated Transitions), targeted placement support for reunification and the Futures service. Leeds is leading a team across West Yorkshire to review policies and guidance in relation to special guardianship orders. The residential service has been reviewed and is being re-purposed, existing services are being enhanced and expanded through Earned Autonomy to provide greater support for adolescents on the edge of care so that they can remain living within a family setting. An Early Help Board has been established that reports into the Children and Families Trust Board, a number of work streams have been set up to drive the multi-agency Early Help strategy aimed at reducing the need for children to become looked after.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:</em> Recognising and supporting the council’s responsibilities as corporate parents.</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.4 per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children and young people subject to a</strong></td>
<td><em>Story behind the numbers:</em> The number of children subject to a child protection plan in Leeds reduced by nearly 47 per cent between 2011 and 2018. The England figure rose by 26 per cent between 2011 and 2018 (the latest available national data).</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0 per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child protection plan</td>
<td>Key insight: Fewer children are starting to be subject to a child protection plan, as more early help alternatives are identified. A focus on family group conferencing (FGC) and the introduction of the FGC/ICPC pathway, which offers families an FGC as an alternative to an initial child protection case conference, and the fact that FGCs are now an entitlement for families has contributed to a reduced number of children/young people being the subject of a child protection plan. Furthermore, a number of large sibling groups have ceased to be subject to a child protection plan in recent months, contributing to the sustained safe and appropriate reduction. Achievements/next steps: An independent review of the FGC service has taken place and the findings will influence the ongoing development of the service, ensuring that it is effective in engaging families and supporting them to find family solutions to identified concerns. Regular audit activity and dip-sampling takes place led by the area social work heads of service. The restorative early support teams continue to support the safe and appropriate de-escalation of child protection plans. The chief officer of Social Work is undertaking observations of child protection conferences. The service continues to monitor process measures to ensure that children subject to a plan have statutory reviews within timescales, that review meetings are attended, and that multi-agency work ensures the best outcome for those children. Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership: Encourage agencies to continue to participate in reviews, and to support children’s plans, to provide appropriate and sustainable outcomes.</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parents that have had more than one child enter care at different times</td>
<td>Story behind the numbers: Of the 222 mothers who have had a child start to be looked after in the last 12 months, 51 (23 per cent) have had at least one further child removed at a previous point. This is a small improvement on the previously reported figure. This is a new measure, introduced to the Children and Young People’s Plan 2018-23. It is a local measure so no comparator data are available. It is being reported for the second time in this report card, so it is not yet possible to provide a trend analysis.</td>
<td>New measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key insight: There is an increasing focus on restorative ways of safely reducing the number of children in care, and making use of targeted interventions to educate and prevent the need for care in as many cases as possible. <strong>Achievements/next steps:</strong> A new service, 'Futures', has been established as part of phase two of the Innovation Programme. It provides intensive support to mothers and fathers who are under 25, who are care experienced, and have had a previous child removed. It is evidencing positive outcomes and receiving positive feedback from the young parents that it seeks to support. It is providing rich learning that is shaping and influencing ongoing practice improvement. Rethink Formulation provides an opportunity for multi-agency professionals to work with parents/carers who have had a previous child removed to identify the presenting concerns and develop outcome-focused plans aimed at reducing the need for children to become looked after. Understanding the patterns of children entering care, their siblings' experience of care, and their mother's background, helps highlight the scale of 'repeat removals', and can help identify mothers who may in the future be at risk of having further children taken into care. This allows for a proactive outcome focussed approach from the professionals involved. The FCC service continues to work proactively with parents/carers who have had previous children removed in order to engage the wider family network in identifying solutions to the identified concerns. <strong>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:</strong> Help to identify and provide support for mothers who may be at risk of having further children taken into care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of children and young people with a child in need plan | Story behind the numbers: Despite a rise in the number of child in need plans since September, there has been a 10 per cent reduction across the 2018/19 financial year. **Key insight:** Increasingly, the range of early help options available suggest that appropriate alternatives to social care intervention are being taken up, such as early help assessments. These alternatives mean that children and families receive appropriate support to help them achieve sustainable outcomes. **Achievements/next steps:** Continue to have the right conversations at the right time to ensure that children and families receive the support most appropriate to their individual circumstances. A new head of service for Early Help has been appointed and is working with key strategic partners to drive and embed the preventative agenda to ensure that children and families get the help that they need at the earliest opportunity. The Think Family protocol has been revised to ensure that it |

<p>| | | Performance |
| | | Q4 2017/18 | Q2 2018/19 | Q4 2018/19 |
| | | New measure 2,838 170.7 per 10,000 Sept 2018 | | 3,120 187.6 per 10,000 March 2019 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development at the end of the EYFS</td>
<td><strong>Story behind the numbers:</strong> There has been a considerable increase in the proportion of Leeds children achieving a good level of development, from 58 per cent in 2014, to 65.7 per cent in 2018. Leeds remains below the national average by a gap of 5.8 percentage points, which is broadly the same as the gap in 2017, and below core cities by just over two percentage points. Leeds is 148/151 authorities. Against the average points score measure Leeds is 77th.</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key insight:</strong> Targeted support to schools is informed by data analysis focusing on key vulnerable groups.</td>
<td>64.8% 2016/17 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Achievements/next steps:</strong> Continued targeted support following data analysis, but broadening this approach to identify and share best practice examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:</strong> Continue to make appropriate use of early help assessments and other early help options so that children and families who most need social work support are identified and supported through child in need plans and other social work options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rates</td>
<td><strong>Story behind the numbers:</strong> The rate has improved for the latest reporting period (2015-17) driven by a low number of infant deaths reported in 2017 (32). The Leeds rate was 4.24 down from 4.45 in 2014-16; for Leeds deprived the rate was 5.42 down from 6.01 in 2014-16, with a slight narrowing of the deprivation gap. Leeds remains slightly higher than England (3.9) but not significantly so.</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key insight:</strong> Infant mortality is the headline indicator for the Leeds Best Start programme, a partnership programme jointly led by Public Health and the Children and Families directorate, which aims to give every child the best start in life from conception to age two. The Best Start</td>
<td>4.1 per 1,000 2013-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan was refreshed during 2019 encompassing a wide range of partnership actions across the five outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements/next steps: A multi-agency practitioners’ group has been established to promote speech, communication and language development and increase best practice locally. An Early Years Peer review is due to take place in June 2019, which will help to assess how advanced Leeds, as a local system, is in helping children in their early years to thrive and to guide planning to make the Leeds system more effective. It has a particular focus on speech, language and communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly created school places in good and outstanding schools</td>
<td>Story behind the numbers: The Council has responsibility for delivering new school places where needed. The Children and Families Learning Places programme delivers on key strategic outcomes for the city and must continue its success against the background of Council budget saving targets, the pace and scale of the Learning Places programme and the complex risks on projects.</td>
<td>71% Sept 2017 - reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key insight: The need for additional primary school places has reduced due to the birth rate levelling out, although in-year pressures continue within inner city areas. The demand for secondary school places continues to increase with pressure in particular within the south and east of the city currently. Plans to address these pressures include expansion of existing schools as well as new free schools in both these areas of the city. Strong cross-council partnerships are in place to respond to these challenges, and adequate controls in place to provide appropriate levels of governance and oversight of the programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievements/next steps: Consultations continue across the city, in areas where additional school places are needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsession Attendance at primary and secondary schools</td>
<td>Story behind the numbers: Reflecting national trends, there has been a very marginal decline in attendance since a peak in 2014. Primary attendance remains good, with Leeds slightly above national. Secondary attendance remains in line with statistical neighbours and marginally below national, Leeds rates of authorised absence are low.</td>
<td>96.0% Primary 2016/17 HT 1-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator: Key insight: Attendance for those who have low attendance is a particular concern for some vulnerable groups; those who were free school meal eligible and those recorded as having special education need support have the lowest attendance. In 2017/18, one quarter of all of primary-age, children in need were persistently absent, and almost half of all secondary-age children in need were persistently absent.

#### Achievements/next steps: Plans are being developed to allow live information to flow from schools to the local authority, which will enable the attendance team to provide better support to schools.

#### Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership: To support safeguarding and to help ensure all children and in learning there is intention of creating a live Leeds school roll. School leadership and governor support is welcomed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of fixed-term exclusions from primary and secondary schools</th>
<th>Story behind the numbers: The rate of exclusions in Leeds primary schools is lower than comparators, and places Leeds in the first quartile, with a ranking of 30 out of 152 local authorities. The secondary rate is higher than comparators, and places Leeds in the fourth quartile, with a ranking of 132 out of 152 local authorities.</th>
<th>Key insight: The average number of days lost per pupil for secondary schools is 6.17; this is the second highest in the Yorkshire and the Humber region, and higher than all comparator averages.</th>
<th>Achievements/next steps: A regional meeting in February 2019, looked at the issue of exclusions, off-rolling, and elective home education. Local authorities shared good practice and are developing actions to work together to address the issue of off-rolling.</th>
<th>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership: Consider requesting a report on the outputs from the February 2019 meeting, and determining the appropriate support and challenge the Board can offer to improve the Leeds picture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
<td>Q2 2018/19</td>
<td>Q4 2018/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 2016/17 HT 1-6</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 2015/16</td>
<td>608 (0.86%)</td>
<td>(2017/18 academic year figures will be published by the DfE in July)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 2015/16</td>
<td>5,734 (12.89%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 2016/17</td>
<td>6,601 (14.52%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading.</td>
<td>Story behind the numbers: Gaps to national performance narrowed in the combined reading, writing and maths measure as a result of both the writing and maths gap to national narrowing in 2018. Leeds is 128/148 local authorities. If an additional 364 pupils in Leeds had achieved the expected standard in the combined measure, Leeds’s overall result would have been in line with national.</td>
<td>Key insight: 56% of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading.</td>
<td>Achievements/next steps:</td>
<td>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership: Consider requesting a report on the outputs from the February 2019 meeting, and determining the appropriate support and challenge the Board can offer to improve the Leeds picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18</td>
<td>Q2 2018/19</td>
<td>Q4 2018/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 academic year</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 academic year</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing, and maths at the end of Key Stage 2</td>
<td><strong>Key insight:</strong> Establishing an enquiry-based school-to-school support with the adviser tightly focussed on impact on outcomes has helped shape improvement activities within schools. <strong>Achievements/next steps:</strong> Further develop the learning alliance approach, which supports peer challenges that are focused on raising outcomes. <strong>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:</strong> Support direction of travel and continue to support a school facing improvement service.</td>
<td>Q4 2017/18 Q2 2018/19 Q4 2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress 8 score for Leeds at the end of Key Stage 4</td>
<td><strong>Story behind the numbers:</strong> Young people in Leeds are making progress in line with their peers nationally. Progress 8 in Leeds matches national and the region, and is better than statistical neighbours and core cities. Whilst Leeds remains behind national on the pupils achieving a strong pass in English and maths measure, Leeds is above core cities, and saw a faster improvement rate than all comparators on the strong pass measure in 2018. Leeds is 66/151 authorities. <strong>Key insight:</strong> Successful funding bids to the Strategic School Improvement Fund, produced in partnership between the local authority and teaching schools, will allow the implementation of strategies to improve English and maths outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. <strong>Achievements/next steps:</strong> Two conferences in 2019 will focus on improving progress for disadvantaged pupils and on what makes an effective curriculum, to prepare leaders for Ofsted’s new framework in September 2019. <strong>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:</strong> Consider how we can support disadvantaged pupils when they are not in school, for example, in providing a quiet place to study, creating cultural opportunities and helping them to stay safe.</td>
<td>+0.07 2016/17 academic year -0.02 2017/18 academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations of young people with special educational needs and/or disability when</td>
<td><strong>Story behind the numbers:</strong> The rate of progression to sustained education has improved, but the gap between Leeds and national widened for young people in receipt of on EHCP. <strong>Key insight:</strong> A higher proportion of pupils with an Education and Health Care Plan (86 per cent) are going on to a sustained destinations compared to pupils with SEN support (83 per cent). However, the gap to national EHCP sustained destinations widened in 2017 from two to four percentage points.</td>
<td>82% 2015/16 83% 2016/17 (Published October 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| they leave school                             | Achievements/next steps: The development of a new strategy, *Making a Difference: Improving the attendance, achievement and attainment of children and young people in Leeds*. This will help young people engage positively with education, and create opportunities that lead to positive, lifelong pathways.  
  
  Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership: Help support preparation for adulthood work including having effective careers guidance in all settings for pupils in year nine and above. | Q4 2017/18 | Q2 2018/19 | Q4 2018/19 |
| Progress against measures in the Future in Mind dashboard | Story behind the numbers: The Future in Mind Leeds dashboard has been created to provide a high-level report to the members of the programme board of progress in delivering the city’s strategy and Local Transformation Plan for children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing. 13 key indicators are reported on a quarterly basis, with a more comprehensive report produced annually, which will include some of the critical qualitative elements, such as children and young people’s experiences.  
  
  Key insight: There has been an increase in the number of young people accessing services. When young people access services, the majority of services are delivering within the sector standard. The partnership would like to observe an increase in the numbers receiving autism assessments within 12 weeks, and those accessing the routine community eating disorder service within four weeks.  
  
  Achievements/next steps: Over the next quarter, developments across the Future in Mind programme of work include the launch of the newly procured young person’s SEMH service; further development of the children and young people’s mental health crisis service, including procurement of a safer space service; and the launch of the CAMHS community crisis service. A review and redesign of the cluster SEMH offer and the review of the MindMate Single Point of Access (SPA) model is also planned. | New measure to be developed |
| Children that are a healthy weight at age 11 | Story behind the numbers: The proportion of obese children at age 11 in Leeds shows a small long-term reduction accepting a slight rise in 2015/16. The percentage of obese children of reception age has fallen from 9.4 per cent to 8.8 per cent, while levels remain unchanged in similar cities and for England as a whole. | New measure | 64.6% | 2016/17 academic year |
### Indicator: Key insight

**Summary**: The Leeds Child Healthy Weight Plan prioritises action to support families during pregnancy and during the first five years of life, with early identification and targeted support for those children and families most at risk at the earliest opportunity. 60 Henry Healthy families group programmes delivered at children’s centres across the city. Parents attending these reported making positive changes in fruit and vegetable consumption, screen time; sugary drinks consumption, physical activity and parenting confidence. Leeds City Council Health and Wellbeing team offer a traded service to schools to enable them to achieve Healthy School Status. This includes training and resources to help schools to provide an environment and curriculum supportive of child healthy weight.

**Next steps**: Continue to support the excellent wider work being delivered by other partners to make it easier for families to choose a healthy lifestyle and to make Leeds a less obesogenic environment, for example the Leeds City Council Sustainable Travel Team, Planning and Design, Active Leeds, Leeds Food Network, Catering Leeds, and Adult Healthy Living Services.

### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q4 2017/18</th>
<th>Q2 2018/19</th>
<th>Q4 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015 to June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>(1,150)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016 - June 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>(999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Young offenders who re-offend

**Story behind the numbers**: This is a new measure in the refreshed CYPP, which reports the proportion of young offenders who commit further offences. Reoffending data comes from the Ministry of Justice Geographical Data tool. The latest data was published on 25 April 2019. An update report on the latest reoffending data is provided to the Youth Justice Partnership on a quarterly basis. Included in this report comparative information on other core city and West Yorkshire YOTS performance.

**Key insight**: Fewer young people in Leeds are committing an offence. However, proportionally more of those young people who commit an offence re-offend. This has led to a higher reoffending percentage in the latest figures compared to the previous figure.

**Next steps**: Continue to review and refine the approach to reduce reoffending, including the development of a new remand strategy, and implementing a review around education to try and reduce the number of NEET young people.

### Under-18 conception rates

**Story behind the numbers**: Leeds’ rate of 27.9 is 6.3 points above the statistical neighbours’ average of 21.6. The gap has increased in the most recent statistical release.

**Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rate per thousand 2014</th>
<th>Rate per thousand 2015</th>
<th>Rate per thousand 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator**  
**Summary**

- Key insight: Between 1998 and 2016, the conception rate in Leeds has fallen by 22.5 points, from 50.4 to 27.9. This reduction mirrors a similar reduction seen in the England rate over the same period.

- Next steps: a detailed report card will be provided to Trust Board with the next performance update.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Under-18 alcohol-related hospital admissions | **Key insight:** There has been a slight increase on the previous year, in under-18 alcohol-specific hospital admissions. Figures for Leeds show that female rates for alcohol-specific admissions tend to run about a third higher than male rates, which reflects the national picture.  

**Story behind the numbers:** There has been a slight increase on the previous year, in under-18 alcohol-specific hospital admissions. Figures for Leeds show that female rates for alcohol-specific admissions tend to run about a third higher than male rates, which reflects the national picture.

**Key insight:** The My Health My School survey for 2017/18 shows 51 per cent of Leeds secondary school young people report never having consumed an alcoholic drink, this has steadily increased from 30 per cent in 2011/12. Data show that under-18 alcohol-specific admissions are lower in the most deprived decile. Evidence indicates that young people in the least deprived areas are more likely to drink and more likely to drink regularly.

**Next steps:** Create and promote an educational intervention for young people/young adults that will simulate the effects of alcohol as well as provide information on the unseen effects using an effective online tool. Continue the rollout of alcohol awareness training to the children’s workforce, providing them with the skills to give brief advice to young people using the locally developed under 18s Pocket Guide to Alcohol tool. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 2017/18</th>
<th>Q2 2018/19</th>
<th>Q4 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate per 100,000 2014/15 - 2016/17</td>
<td>Rate per 100,000 2015/16 - 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students achieving a Level 3 qualification at age 19</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Story behind the numbers:** The number of pupils achieving a Level 3 qualification has marginally increased since 2017. Although Leeds remains below national, Leeds ranking improved from 120/151 in 2017, to 115/151 in 2018.  

**Key insight:** Whilst there is an increase in the percentage of pupils achieving a Level 3 qualification, too many pupils are starting Level 3 courses but are failing to complete them.

**Achievements/next steps:** Monitor the retention of pupils on Level 3 courses, identify the reasons why many pupils do not complete them, and resolve this issue.

**Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:** Support young people’s retention on Level 3 courses; help produce a shared understanding of why many pupils do not complete them. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Obsession**  
Young people who are NEET, or whose employment status is ‘not known’ | *Story behind the numbers:* We are not sure that the current and recently reported figures for NEET are accurate. The change in the cohort in September 2018 resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of young people reported as ‘not known’. As a result of inaccuracies in the cohort the number of not knows have not reduced at the rate expected or to the level expected. It is anticipated that some of the young people reported as ‘not known’ will actually be:  
- In an educational provision in the city;  
- Have started an apprenticeship;  
- Commenced employment;  
- Have moved out of the local authority;  
Attempts are being made to match data across a number of systems but this is proving a complex task.  
Due to the high number of young people reported as ‘not known’ from the cohort the Pathways Team which contacts individuals to follow up ‘not known’ is struggling with capacity. The Director of Children and Families has offered additional support from across the Directorate to support them with this process. However, as yet we have been unable to provide the Directorate with an accurate list of ‘not knowns’.  
We are reviewing our arrangements to enable the production of an accurate list of ‘not knowns’. Through the 3A’s strategy and plan the Directorate are strengthening arrangement to follow up ‘not knowns’ to support the work of the Pathways Team.  
*Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:* Consider how agencies from across the partnership can support with the tracking duty and the capture of data this helps facilitate the entitlement to targeted information, advice and guidance. | Q4 2017/18 | Q2 2018/19 | Q4 2018/19 |
<p>| | | 6.0% (870) (Dec 16 to Feb 17) | 7.0% (1,020) (Dec 17 to Feb 18) | (Next national figures published in October 2019) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport for young people indicator to be developed after further</td>
<td>Story behind the numbers: Youth Council members have set up a campaign group to work on the transport issue, after improved public transports was the top issue in the 2017 Make Your Mark ballot.</td>
<td>New measure to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions with young people</td>
<td><strong>Key insight:</strong> A ‘My Day’ ticket type has been introduced, for young people aged 18 and under, enabling young people to take unlimited bus travel, on any operator across the whole of West Yorkshire at a low and more affordable price of £2.60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Achievements/next steps:</strong> ‘Bus 18’ has now become ‘Bus Alliance’, and bus companies said to be keen to work with young people. A work stream plan has been developed regarding ticket affordability for young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key message to the Children and Families Trust partnership:</strong> Continue to support the efforts of the Leeds Youth Council and ensure transport issue for young people remain a central focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix two (a): CYPP key indicator dashboard - city level: March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Stat neighbour</th>
<th>Result for same period last year</th>
<th>Result December 2018</th>
<th>Result January 2019</th>
<th>Result February 2019</th>
<th>Result March 2019</th>
<th>DOT</th>
<th>Data last updated</th>
<th>Timespan covered by month result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children looked after</td>
<td></td>
<td>64/10,000</td>
<td>81/10,000</td>
<td>1275 (75.4/10,000)</td>
<td>1278 (75.8/10,000)</td>
<td>1286 (77.3/10,000)</td>
<td>1282 (77.1/10,000)</td>
<td>1284 (77.2/10,000)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>Snapshot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children subject to a child protection plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3/10,000</td>
<td>47.6/10,000</td>
<td>527 (32.4/10,000)</td>
<td>436 (26.2/10,000)</td>
<td>428 (25.7/10,000)</td>
<td>431 (25.9/10,000)</td>
<td>414 (24.9/10,000)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>Snapshot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children and young people with a Child in Need (CIN) plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local indicator</td>
<td>Local Indicator</td>
<td>3499 (215.2/10,000)</td>
<td>2984 (179.5/10,000)</td>
<td>2984 (174.1/10,000)</td>
<td>2939 (176.6/10,000)</td>
<td>3120 (187.6/10,000)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>Snapshot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of parents that have had more than one child enter care at different times</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local indicator</td>
<td>Local Indicator</td>
<td>New Indicator</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>Rolling 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>84.6% (2017/18 AY)</td>
<td>65.7% (2017/18 AY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Oct 18 SFR</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9/1,000</td>
<td>4.0/1,000</td>
<td>4.4/1,000</td>
<td>4.2/1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Mar-19 SFR</td>
<td>Calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>96.0% (HT 1-6 2017/18)</td>
<td>95.9% (HT 1-6 2017/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Mar-10 SFR</td>
<td>HT 1-6 AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>94.3% (HT 1-6 2017/18)</td>
<td>94.2% (HT 1-6 2017/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Mar-10 SFR</td>
<td>HT 1-6 AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of fixed-term school exclusions: primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37 per 100 pupils (2018/17)</td>
<td>1.26 per 100 pupils (2016/17)</td>
<td>0.6 per 100 pupils (2015/16)</td>
<td>0.8 per 100 pupils (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Aug-18 SFR</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of fixed-term school exclusions: secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 per 100 pupils (2018/17)</td>
<td>12.9 per 100 pupils (2016/17)</td>
<td>14.5 per 100 pupils (2015/16)</td>
<td>14.5 per 100 pupils (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Aug-18 SFR</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing, and maths at the end of Key Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>65% (2017/18)</td>
<td>55% (2017/18)</td>
<td>56% (2016/17)</td>
<td>61% (2017/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Dec 16 SFR</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress 8 score for Leeds at the end of Key Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02 (2017/18)</td>
<td>.02 (2017/18)</td>
<td>.07 (2016/17)</td>
<td>-.02 (2017/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Oct 18 SFR</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations of children and young people with special educational needs - remaining in education, or employment or training¹</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>89% (2016/17 AY)</td>
<td>Stat neighbour</td>
<td>88.3% (2016/17 AY)</td>
<td>Result for same period last year</td>
<td>82% (2015/16)</td>
<td>Result December 2018</td>
<td>83% (2016/17 AY)</td>
<td>Result January 2019</td>
<td>Result February 2019</td>
<td>Result March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of children at age 11 who are a healthy weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of young offenders who re-offend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-related hospital admissions for under-18s (rate per 100,000)</td>
<td>34.2 (2016/17)</td>
<td>39.2 (2016/17)</td>
<td>33.6 (2015/16)</td>
<td>36.7 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 qualifications at 19</td>
<td>57.2% (2017/18)</td>
<td>55.7% (2017/18)</td>
<td>52.9% (2016/17)</td>
<td>51.9% (2017/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- AY - academic year
- DOT - direction of travel
- FY - financial year
- HT - half term
- SFR - statistical first release (Department for Education / Department of Health data publication)

Comparative national data for academic attainment indicators are the result for all state-maintained schools

¹ Includes all pupils with a statement/EHC plan or on SEN Support
## Appendix two (b): CYPP key indicator dashboard - cluster level: March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>As at 30/03/2019</th>
<th>As at 30/03/2019</th>
<th>As at 30/03/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>RPTT</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEO</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airmyn</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adsett</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield, Cottingham and Middleton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgnorth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadhembury</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley, Bankhead, school partnership (Wakefield North West)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Lane</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>144.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherwood, North East, school partnership (Wakefield North West)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgivethorpe, school partnership (Wakefield North West)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roefer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealwood, school partnership (Wakefield North West)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempest, school partnership (Wakefield North West)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upthorpe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**<br>
- **AY:** academic year<br>
- **PSM:** no school meals<br>
- **PY:** full-time attendance<br>
- **RPTT:** rate per thousand of children in the cluster<br>
- **RPTT:** rate per thousand children not in the cluster<br>

**Notes:**

1. CYPP indicators are reported on a cluster-by-cluster basis and not on a school-by-school basis.
2. CYPP indicators are based on a cluster-by-cluster basis.
3. CYPP indicators are based on a cluster-by-cluster basis.
4. CYPP indicators are based on a cluster-by-cluster basis.
5. CYPP indicators are based on a cluster-by-cluster basis.
6. CYPP indicators are based on a cluster-by-cluster basis.
7. CYPP indicators are based on a cluster-by-cluster basis.
### Appendix three: 2017/18 attainment summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Future SFR Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EYFS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage achieving a Good Level of Development</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>Equal 149/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achievers Gap</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>Equal 105/152</td>
<td>Band C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Stage 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Future SFR Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonics - Year 1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Equal 137/130</td>
<td>Band D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics - Year 2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Equal 124/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading - percentage reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Equal 146/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing - percentage reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Equal 138/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths - percentage reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Equal 145/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading - percentage reaching greater depth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Equal 122/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing - percentage reaching greater depth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Equal 138/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths - percentage reaching greater depth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Equal 138/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Stage 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Future SFR Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading - percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Equal 120/152</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing - percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Equal 142/152</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths - percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Equal 119/150</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Writing and Maths - percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Equal 125/152</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar, punctuation and spelling test - percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Equal 120/152</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading - percentage of pupils reaching the higher standard</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Equal 88/152</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing - percentage working at a greater depth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Equal 112/152</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths - percentage working at a greater depth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Equal 85/152</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Writing and Maths - percentage reaching the higher standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Equal 79/152</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar, punctuation and spelling test - reaching the higher standard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Equal 81/152</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools not meeting floor standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Equal 110/152</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools meeting the coasting definition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Equal 45/152</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Academic Year 2014</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Comparators 2018</td>
<td>Future SFR Publication Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Progress 8 Score</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Equal 55/151</td>
<td>Band B</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Attainment 8 Score per pupil</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>Equal 104/151</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils achieving a strong pass (grade 9-5) in English and mathematics</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Equal 88/151</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pupils achieving a standard pass (grade 9-4) in English and mathematics</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Equal 93/151</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Baccalaureate Average Point Score</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Equal 99/151</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools below the floor standards&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Equal 45/151</td>
<td>Band B</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of schools meeting the coasting definition&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Equal 1/151</td>
<td>Band A</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 5 covers all state-funded mainstream schools, academies, free schools &amp; maintained special schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point score per A level entry</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>30.16</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>85/150</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>32.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average points score for a student’s best three A levels</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>100/148</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>33.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students achieving grades AAB or higher (in at least two facilitating subjects)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>79/147</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point score per entry for Applied General students</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>SFR KS5 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point score per entry for Tech level students</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>49/142</td>
<td>Band B</td>
<td>31.49</td>
<td>31.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 5 covers all state-funded mainstream schools, academies, free schools, maintained special schools &amp; FE sector colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point score per A level entry</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>90/150</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>32.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average points score for a student’s best three A levels</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>99/149</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>32.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students achieving grades AAB or higher (in at least two facilitating subjects)&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85/149</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point score per entry for Applied General students</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29/148</td>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>27.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point score per entry for Tech level students</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29/140</td>
<td>Band A</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>27.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment at 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 qualification</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 qualification</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 qualification with English and maths</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix four: Safeguarding specialist and targeted services March 2019 monthly practice improvement report

(October 2018 figures - last data reported to Scrutiny - in brackets, where available.)

Performance summary: Child in need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much did we do this month?</th>
<th>How well did we do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 2560 (2246) contacts were received, of which 1184 (1003) became referrals to Children’s Social Work Service.</td>
<td>• 27.9% (27%) of referrals within a 12-month period (rolling 12 months) were re-referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 350 (287) referrals this month were re-referrals within 12 months; this is 29.6% (28.6%) of all referrals this month.</td>
<td>• 79.6% (82%) Child and Family Assessments undertaken in the month were carried out within 45 working days. The year-to-date from performance is 79.2% (76%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 731 (772) Child and Family Assessments were completed.</td>
<td>• 76 (80) days is the average time taken to complete Child and Family Assessments that took longer than 45 working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5067 (4678) open cases.</td>
<td>• Of Child and Family Assessments completed outside 45 working days (% of assessments outside 45 working days):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality issues:</td>
<td>46-49 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 147 (72) open cases had no ethnicity recorded.</td>
<td>14 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9% (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What difference did we make and what we want to improve

• Volume of work has increased across all indicators this month.
• The recording of children’s ethnicity.
• Improve CFA timeliness.
• Reduce the percentage of re-referrals.
Performance trends: Children in need

**Commentary**

This graph shows total contacts received by the Children’s Duty and Advice Team and the number of referrals accepted by the Children’s Social Work Service.

**Commentary**

This graph shows what percentage of referrals in the month were re-referrals within 12 months of previous referral.
Commentary

This graph shows the total number of assessments completed in month and percentage completed within 45 days.

Performance trends: Private fostering

Commentary

This graph shows for each month the number of new notifications, initial visit within appropriate timescales and became private fostering arrangement.

A private fostering arrangement is where a child or young person under the age of 16 (or under 18 if disabled) is cared for, for 28 days or more, by someone who is not their parent or ‘close relative’. This is snapshot of data and previously there have been delays in recording. However delayed recording will be included within the end of year report.
## Performance summary: Child protection

### How much did we do this month? (October 2018 in brackets)
- **414** (478) children and young people (CYP) subject to a child protection plan (CPP).
- **427** strategy discussions were held.
- **139** (136) section 47 enquiries were completed.
- **52** (54) CYP had an initial child protection conference (ICPC).
- **65** (64) CYP had a child protection review.
- **336** (446) CYP received a visit in the last 20 working days, as of the last day of the month.

### How well did we do it?
- **98.3%** (99.4%) of CYP subject to CPP were allocated to a qualified social worker. Those cases recorded as without a qualified social worker are reviewed and followed up with the service.
- **14 CYP from 10 families** (17 CYP from 7 families) were subject to a CPP for more than two years.
- **8%** (9.3%) of CYP becoming subject to CPP in the last 12 months were for a second or a subsequent time and within 2 years of their previous plan ending.
- **75%** (83.3%) of ICPCs this month were held within statutory timescales.
- **92.3%** (95.3%) of all child protection reviews this month were held within statutory timescale.
- **91.3%** (93.3%) of CYP who have been subject to a CPP for at least 20 working days received their statutory visit, as of last day of the recording month.

### What difference did we make and what we want to improve
- Improved ICPC timeliness.
- Improved timeliness of child protection reviews.
- Improve timeliness of CPP statutory visits.
- Timeliness of allocation of children on CPP to qualified social worker.
Performance trends: Child protection

Commentary

The graph shows the number of children subject to CPPs at the month end. This month the rate per 10,000 is **24.9** (28.9), compared to **32.0** (39.7) at the same time last year.

* Rate per 10,000 uses 166,268 child population (0-17) from the mid-2017 population estimates released in June 2018 by ONS.

Commentary

This graph shows the number of children who have been on a CPP for 2 years or more at the month end and the number of sibling groups these children belong to.
Performance trends: Child protection

The graph shows the number of children for whom ICPCs were held, together with the percentage held within 15 working days of the strategy discussion meeting.

Commentary

The graph shows the number of children for whom child protection reviews were completed in month, together with the percentage held within statutory timescales.
Performance trends: Child protection

**Commentary**

This graph shows children becoming subject to a CPP within 2 years of their previous plan ending ("re-registrations") and as a percentage of all children coming onto plan in the last 12 months.

This month the rate per 10,000 is **3.3** (2.5).

* Rate per 10,000 uses 166,268 child population (0-17) from the mid-2017 population estimates released in June 2018 by ONS.
## Performance summary: Children looked after and moving on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much did we do this month? (Last month in brackets)</th>
<th>How well did we do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1284 (1266) children are looked after, 58 (54) children are UASC.</td>
<td>• 99.5% (99.1%) of children looked after were allocated to a qualified social worker (QSW). These cases are reviewed and followed up with the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 360 (273) children looked after had a looked after child review.</td>
<td>• 94.3% (95.1%) of children looked after, who have been in care for at least 12-month continuously, have an up to date HNA recording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 33 (37) CYP became looked after.</td>
<td>• 88.5% (88.2%) of children looked after, who have been in care for at least 12-month continuously, have an up-to-date dental checks (rolling 12 months).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 27 (42) CYP ceased to be looked after.</td>
<td>• 91.2% (91%) of children looked after have had a statutory visit within timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 73.8% (78.1%) of children looked after aged 4-16 years, who have been looked after continuously for over a year had a “Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire” (SDQ) completed for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 82.8% (83.8%), 759 (758) of school aged looked after children had an up to date PEP, 23 (21) has a PEP due. This indicator is inclusive of all PEPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 114 (98) children looked after have experienced three or more placements in the last 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 66.7% (78.3%) of care leavers were contacted within the previous 8 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 93.3% (91.6%) of all child looked after reviews held in month were within statutory timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 94.7% (82.4%) of initial child looked after reviews held in month were within statutory timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% (51.5%) of children who were adopted <em>ytd</em> were placed for adoption within 12 months of the child entering care. This is 28 of 56 children (17 of 33 children).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What difference did we make and what we want to improve

- The percentage of health needs assessments and dental checks done on time for our looked after children increased.
- Timeliness of looked after children reviews is positive.
- Increase the percentage of school aged looked after children with PEPs.
- Improve the rate of care leaver contact
Performance trends: Children looked after and moving on

Commentary

This graph shows the number of looked after children (excluding any looked after children receiving only S20 short term breaks) alongside the number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC).

Commentary

This graph shows the breakdown by age and gender of the children in care.

The largest age group for boys is 11-15 years with 260 (248) children and the largest age group for girls is 11-15 years with 189 (200) children.

There was 0 (1) child recorded with unknown gender.
Performance trends: Children looked after and moving on

Commentary

This graph shows the ethnic breakdown of the children looked after population over a 13 month period.

This is relatively stable throughout the period.

In total 31.2% (31.5%) of the CLA population was BME, compared to 33.8% of the school roll (school census - Jan 2018).

The line shows the percentage of each ethnicity of the school population.

Commentary

This graph shows the percentage breakdown by ethnicity of children entering care this month.
Performance trends: Children looked after and moving on

Commentary

This graph shows the percentage of children looked after who have an up to date health needs assessment and an up to date dental check.

Commentary

Since June 2008, LA’s have been required to provide information on the emotional and behavioural health of children and young people in their care. This information is collected through the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) and is completed for each child/young person looked after, aged 4-16 years, who has been looked after continuously for over a year.

The Total Difficulties Score:

- 13 and below is considered to be within a healthy range.
**Performance trends: Children looked after and moving on**

### Commentary

This shows the number of children entering care this month broken down by age group.

### Graph: Age of starters in month

- **Less than 1:** 4
- **1 to 4 Years:** 8
- **5 to 10 Years:** 7
- **11 to 15 Years:** 11
- **16 Years & over:** 3

### Commentary

This graph shows the number of reviews held, for looked after children, in the month and the percentage completed within statutory timescales.
Performance trends: Children looked after and moving on

Commentary
This graph shows the percentage of care leavers with:

- Relevant, former relevant and eligible care leavers with an up to date Pathway Plan.

- Relevant and former relevant care leavers, 16-20 years who received their 8 week contact who are in suitable accommodation and EET.

Commentary
This graph shows the percentage of care leavers with:

- Relevant and former relevant care leavers, 16-20 years who received their 8 week contact.

- Relevant and former relevant, 17-21 years (in accordance with the 903 CLA Return), who received their birthday contact within appropriate timescales.

- Birthday contact for November and December is still within timescales.
Report of the Director of Children and Families

Report to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Date: 12th June 2019

Subject: A report on the School Organisation Proposals and Objections Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are specific electoral Wards affected?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the decision eligible for Call-In?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of main issues

1. This report briefly sets out the process followed in opening, closing and making prescribed alterations to schools and academies in Leeds.

2. As requested by Scrutiny Board the report also sets out potential options along with recommendations to ensure an appropriate level of rigour and challenge continue to exist where objections are received following the discontinuance of the School Organisation Advisory Board.

Recommendations

3. Scrutiny Board is requested to:

   - Note the current level of rigour within the existing process;
   - Note the decisions that fall outside of local authority control and the significant discrepancy between local transparency in decision making and that which takes place for Academies and Free Schools; and
   - Advice on the preferred course of action
1 Purpose of this report

1.1 This report sets out the process followed when opening, closing or making prescribed alterations to schools, and academies. It describes the process in Leeds where the local authority is the decision maker and how such changes take place where the local authority are not the decision maker. Within that context it sets out the nature of objections that have been received to proposals that led to the former School Organisation Advisory Board (SOAB) meeting along with options and recommendations for Scrutiny Board to consider in respect of future decisions.

2 Background information

2.1 In October 2007, Executive Board were advised of the decision by the Department for Education (DfE), under Section 29 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006; to abolish the need for School Organisation Committees (SOC) to make decisions on statutory proposals where objections had been received following the publication of statutory notices in relation to:

- Closing schools
- Opening new schools
- Making prescribed alterations to schools.

2.2 Executive Board decided at that time to establish SOAB to consider objections and provide advice. A Scrutiny Board working party was established in 2009 to consider the consultation process in prescribed alterations to schools, using City of Leeds as a case study, publishing their report, with recommendations in April 2010. The Academies Act 2010 introduced further changes whereby all decisions relating to Academies opening, closing or making prescribed alterations sits with the Secretary of State, or delegated to the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC). There was a further legislation change in 2014 relating to school organisation proposals to shorten and streamline the process, and provide more opportunities for maintained schools to make some decisions for themselves.

2.3 Following the legislative changes in 2014 Executive Board were asked to approve some changes to the consultation process to enable a greater level of engagement with stakeholders, providing more openness and transparency. Since 2014 there have been more than 40 proposals brought forward for decisions by Executive Board and SOAB has been called on to meet 6 times following receipt of objections. The first of those occasions was in relation to a consultation that pre-dated the changes and there were numerous objections based on lack of transparency. The remaining 5 are focused on further in this report.

2.4 Discussions with neighbouring local authorities has revealed that only one has an early engagement process similar to SOAB which they are now looking into dissolving. Whilst some, in common with Leeds, take decisions on school organisation matters to the Executive Board, others have the decision taken by the lead member in consultation with the Director of Children Services. One LA has informed us that following the publication of a Statutory Notice but before a final decision by Executive Board that their Children’s Scrutiny Board meets to discuss and give advice to Executive Board.

3 Main issues
3.1 The context of educational provision, both locally and nationally, has continued to change since the abolition of SOCs. The Academies Act 2010 has altered the balance of provision, and continues to do so, with over half of all secondary schools in Leeds now academies, and a growing proportion of primary schools. Decision making for prescribed alterations to Academies sits with the RSC unless they choose to refer that decision to the Secretary of State. If an academy is requesting funding from the local authority, then the Local authority remains the decision maker on the allocation of capital funding. With the legislation for the Free School Presumption, it is very likely that any new school opening in the foreseeable future will be an Academy.

3.2 Before moving on to consider those decisions which are those of the Local Authority, it is useful to note the process Academies and Free Schools are required to follow. Attached, at appendix 1, is the guidance document produced for Academy Trusts to follow. In summary they are required to conduct a ‘fair and open’ consultation on proposed changes, and there is advice provided as to what a ‘listening period’ would be, although this is only advice and not a requirement. Following this single stage of consultation a business case is submitted to the RSC for a decision.

3.3 In Leeds, when we are working in partnership with Academies who wish to expand to meet an identified need for places, we require them to meet the same initial consultation requirements as would be necessary for a maintained school. This is to ensure that there is a consistency for stakeholders in their ability to engage in the consultation, ahead of any decision. Although the final decision on expansion is the RSCs, the Executive Board is asked for permission to commit capital funding to the proposal, and a consultation summary is provided. Where no capital funding is required then the local authority has no decision making process. A flow chart is provided at appendix 2 that sets out the stages of decision making.

3.4 Following the changes to our consultation process approved by Executive Board in 2014, where the local authority believe there is a need to bring forward any prescribed alteration the first stage is a Stakeholder Engagement Event. This event is run on the principles of Outcomes Based Accountability, and a wide range of data is provided to enable participants to be involved in determining the extent of the problem to be solved, offer their suggestions as to who else should be involved that might not already be, and their options for how to address the issue. Stakeholders typically include head teachers, governors, parents, elected members, local interest groups, academy and free school sponsors, Diocesan representatives and others partners who we are already aware have an interest in the area.

3.5 This initial event enables us to allow stakeholders to shape proposals from the outset. We feedback to stakeholders the options not being taken forward, with reasons for not progressing them. When we bring forward consultation on a proposal we are required to be clear, so that interested parties can clearly understand what we are consulting them on, however we do refer them back to the options that have been considered and not brought forward. This stage of ‘informal’ consultation includes plenty of opportunity for meetings with the school council, staff and governing body of the affected school/s, as well as ward member briefings and public meetings where all stakeholders are welcome to attend. In addition to any presentation that may take place officers are on hand to talk individually with people about the proposal and listen to their views. Written responses are also encouraged.

3.6 The first report to Executive Board summarises this consultation phase, and the responses to any concerns that may have been expressed, and following due consideration may seek approval to progress to the formal stage of consultation, where a statutory notice is published. This report is eligible for call-in.
3.7 There are some common themes that emerge in the majority of consultations at this first stage. Highways and traffic concerns frequently exist around schools at start and finish times, and it is understandable that residents, and others, will have concerns about how a proposal may exacerbate this issue. As part of every physical expansion of a building we conduct impact assessments and work closely with colleagues in highways and planning to understand the most appropriate way to mitigate any increases in pupil numbers. This is more comprehensively covered much later in the process during the separate planning application.

3.8 Full details of the building solution are not generally available during the first stages of consultation. Given the costs incurred in working up detailed plans this process generally follows on once we have listened to the initial views of consultees. We understand that people often feel unable to comment positively without understanding the detailed plans, however, there is the full planning application process when all stakeholders are once more able to engage in a consultation phase.

3.9 The other common themes are about the potential impact on a school, their improvement journey, the feel and ethos of a school and how it might be changed, whether the proposal is the right one for the area, the accuracy of the demographic information, and a range of more individual and personal reasons. The first paper to Executive Board summarises and seeks to address any concerns raised before permission is granted to move to the statutory notice phase. This next phase is the legal, or formal, phase of consultation.

3.10 Once a statutory notice is published there is a fixed timeline which must then be met. Within two months of the expiry date of the notice the decision maker must make their decision. Most statutory notices are for four weeks. Looking back now at prescribed alterations over the last 5 years, there have been over 40 proposals, six of which required SOAB to meet due to the receipt of objections during this statutory notice phase. This issue presented to March Executive Board was that any delay to presenting a final recommendation to the earliest possible Executive Board would result in a need to exempt the paper from call-in.

3.11 Referring to appendix 2 you will note that any decision not made within the two month deadline must then be passed to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. School Adjudicators are separate from the DfE and appointed by the Secretary of State for Education. Therefore any alternative to the former SOAB must also be mindful of this timeline.

3.12 In appendix 3, are the actual objections that were received that triggered the meeting of SOAB since the introduction of the improved consultation process. Although at the time when SOAB was held these were publically available, under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) they have been redacted to ensure individual identities are protected.

3.13 The objections received are similar, or identical, to those received in the first consultation phase. It is very rare to receive a new objection that raises points not already considered in the decision to publish the notice. Some points in relation to planning, highways and the proposed physical build are most appropriately considered at the planning application stage where there is, once again, consultation with stakeholders and when the local authority are in a more advanced stage enabling suitably detailed responses to be given, not available at the earlier stage.

3.14 Whilst all concerns are valid they represent individual perspectives, and the focus is naturally drawn to the small number of objections, rather than those who support the
proposal, or those who have chosen not to respond due to lack of concerns. It is therefore important to take a proportionate view of how those concerns are considered and the weight given to them at each stage.

Options:

3.15 For decisions relating to all proposals relating to Free schools and academies, other than in the matter where funding is required from the local authority, there is no decision made locally. The RSC makes the decision in each case, and the same requirements from transparency and scrutiny of those decisions is outside of local authority influence. There is no statutory notice phase and therefore no equivalent opportunity for objections to be expressed.

3.16 Option 1: Scrutiny request that an extraordinary meeting be called on the same basis that SOAB would have been convened, on receipt of any objections. As explained previously the time take to convene the meeting this would be detrimental to the democratic process as all reports of this nature to Executive Board would need to be exempt from call in.

3.17 Option 2: Scrutiny request that an extraordinary meeting be called when an objection is received that would not reasonably be considered at a more appropriate stage in the future, and has not already been considered in a previous decision. Specifically where objections are in relation to planning, highways, or building matters they will be considered more fully and completely at the planning application stage, when the development of the built solution is sufficiently well developed that appropriately detailed answers can actually be given. Additionally this would acknowledge that a respondent may continue to hold a viewpoint that differs from that of the local authority, and that the Executive Board has already given due consideration to their points. The advice from the extraordinary meeting would then exempt the decision from call in, but the consideration of the extraordinary meeting would be included in a paragraph in the Executive Board report.

3.18 Option 3: The Executive Member for Learning discuss with the Chair of Scrutiny any objections received to gauge the level of the objections and identify situations that would benefit from greater scrutiny ahead of a final decision.

3.19 Option 4: Scrutiny note the significant discrepancy between local transparency in decision making, and that which takes place for Academies and Free Schools, and acknowledges that elected members have the opportunity to call-in decisions where they feel there are sufficient reasons for doing so, and that only in exceptional cases is the additional level of scrutiny necessary.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 There is extensive consultation and engagement that takes place when the local authority are considering bringing forward any proposal. At the initial Stakeholder Engagement Event all partners are invited to share the data and in the formation of ideas. From this event either the preferred solution will involve a Free School or Academy partner solution. In these cases the following consultation processes vary from those of the local authority and decision making sits with the RSC. There is no right of appeal or challenge.
4.1.2 Where the preferred solution is with a maintained school then the consultation and decision making process is set out in appendix 2. This includes the right for a final referral to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator by specific parties (Dioceses and governing body of affected school).

4.2 **Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

4.2.1 All proposals are subject to the Council’s Equality and Diversity Scheme, and a screening document is completed for every recommendation made to Executive Board.

4.3 **Council Policies and Best Council Plan**

4.3.1 School Organisation proposals contribute to the city’s aspiration to be the Best Council, the Best City in which to grow up and a child friendly city. The delivery of pupil places through the Learning Places Programme, managed and co-ordinated by Children and Families and City Development, is one of the baseline entitlements of a child friendly city. By creating good quality local school places we can support the priority aim of improving educational attainment closing achievement gaps for children and young people vulnerable to poor learning outcomes. In turn, by helping young people into adulthood, to develop life skills, this proposal provides underlying support for the council’s ambition to produce a strong economy and a compassionate city. A good quality school place also contributes towards delivery of targets within the Children and Young People’s Plan such as our obsession to improve behaviour, attendance and achievement.

4.4 **Resources and Value for Money**

4.4.1 Two of the difficulties with the former SOAB was securing membership and resources to facilitate the meetings. Should an alternative group be established then the proportionate use of resources requires consideration. In the future many decisions will be in respect of Academies, where there are fewer stages of consultation, and decisions taken outside of the local authority. For those decisions which are required to be taken by the local authority, where the process of consultation has been managed in line with legislation and local specification, the value for money of allocating further resources to additional scrutiny of such decisions should be considered.

4.5 **Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.5.1 One of the stated aims of legislation introduced in 2014 was to give schools more authority over decisions about their size and composition without being unduly restricted by local authority process. The process in Leeds complies fully with guidance and has the oversight of two separate Executive Board decisions to approve any proposal.

4.5.2 Creating an alternative advisory group to the former SOAB would lead to all final decision by Executive Board being exempt from call-in due to the legislative timeframes

4.5.3 Appendix 3 has been redacted to protect individual identities, and Scrutiny Board can read all but one of the objections that have been previously received.

4.6 **Risk Management**
4.6.1 This section is not relevant to this report.

5 Recommendations

5.1 Scrutiny Board is requested to:

- Note the current level of rigour within the existing process;
- Note the decisions that fall outside of local authority control and the significant discrepancy between local transparency in decision making and that which takes place for Academies and Free Schools; and
- Advise on the preferred course of action.

6 Background documents

6.1 None

---

1 The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
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Part A: Making significant changes to an open academy

1: Summary

About this departmental advice

This document provides advice to academy trusts on what they need to do to make a significant change to an open academy (which in general has an impact on the number, type and/or location of school places).

Academy trusts should read this advice in full to ensure that they are aware of the circumstances in which their proposal can follow the ‘fast track’ application process or requires a ‘full business case’. Where a local authority (LA) has instigated the change, there is still a requirement for academy trusts to go through the significant change process.

The purpose of this advice is to ensure that additional good quality school places can be provided quickly where they are needed. Academy trusts should work collaboratively with LAs, dioceses and other schools in the area, to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach to place management and the strategic needs of the area.

We expect academy trusts to only propose to create new places in academies that have an overall Ofsted rating of ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’. If, however, there are no other feasible ways to create new places in the area, the academy trust should submit a ‘full business case’ to the department, and set out its justification for expansion and how education will be improved.

Expiry or review date

This advice document will be reviewed in October 2019.

Who is this advice for?

Academy trusts considering a change to the characteristics of open academy schools (as defined in section 1A of the Academies Act 2010). This includes free schools, studio schools and university technical colleges (UTCs).

Separate advice is available on how to make changes to a maintained school.

Please refer to the Further Information section for full website addresses should you be unable to access documents via the hyperlinks provided.
Terminology

Definitions of common terms used in this advice:

Academies - includes free schools, studio schools and UTCs.

Academy trusts - includes single academy trusts (SATs) and multi-academy trusts (MATs). Academy trusts are set up as charitable companies limited by guarantee.

Trustees of the school - the foundation which established the school.

For schools with a religious character this could be the:

- Church of England
- Catholic Church
- other religious authorities.

The term ‘trustees’ is usually used in Department for Education (DfE) documents to refer to those who sit on the board of directors of an academy trust.

In church academies the term trustees refers to the legal trustees, known in law as the 'trustees of the school'. The directors of church academies are always referred to as the directors and not trustees.

Schools with a religious character - all schools designated with a religious character in accordance with the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.

Parent(s) - The Education Act 1996 defines ‘parent’ as including someone who has care of, or legal responsibility for, the child. Therefore, a parent can include, for example, a grandparent, other family member or foster carer if they have care of or responsibility for the child.

Main points

- Academy trusts proposing to make a significant change which will affect clauses in their funding agreement, **MUST** submit a proposal for change, and follow the required process, in advance of the change being made. **Failure to do so could constitute a breach of their funding agreement.** This includes changes requested by the LA.

- Proposals for change must be submitted to the department through either a ‘fast track’ application or a ‘full business case’. A decision on the proposal will be made by the relevant Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), on behalf of the Secretary of State, or by a Minister as appropriate. See [part four](#).
• Some changes can be fast tracked: adding boarding provision; increasing the capacity of an academy (with the exception of satellite expansions and changes to UTCs and studio schools) and age range changes of up to two years (with the exception of age-range changes to UTCs and studio schools, adding or removing a sixth form and any cases of a contentious nature).

• In addition, to be eligible for the fast track route, the academy must: be rated as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ following their last inspection by Ofsted; have a latest Progress 8 score of at least the national average; be in good financial health and have the capacity to make the change without jeopardising the academy’s performance. Academy trusts are also required to provide evidence that the LA, and where a school is designated with a religious character, the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, does not object to the proposed change. The table of changes and the advice in part two set out which changes can be made via this route.

• Changes which do not meet the fast track criteria will require a full business case. The RSC will make a decision based on consideration of the factors and evidence relating to the academy trust(s) as set out in part four.

• Academy trusts proposing to make a significant change to an academy which has been designated with a religious character should engage the trustees of the school, diocese or relevant diocesan board at the earliest opportunity.

• For any proposals for significant change, full consideration should be given to their potential impact on, or the potential impact of, imminent pipeline free schools. These schools may well have been approved to meet the same need as the proposed significant change. A list of pipeline free schools can be found on GOV.UK.

• Academy trusts will need to undertake a fair and open local consultation, ensure the change is aligned with local pupil place plans, that all required funding is in place and that appropriate planning permissions and other consents (e.g. trustees of the school for any dealings with land) have been secured. All unfunded proposals, without exception, will require a full business case.

• Where a proposed change sets a precedent, or is considered contentious a full business case will be required, irrespective of the school’s Ofsted rating. RSCs may choose to escalate such proposals to the Secretary of State for decision.

• All proposed significant changes requiring alterations to admission arrangements must ensure that a fair and open local consultation on the school’s proposed admission arrangements has been completed, in accordance with the School Admissions Code, and a request to vary the admission arrangements must be submitted at the same time as the significant change request. Only those
admission changes necessary to implement the significant change should be made. The significant change process should not be used to request a variation of the admission policy to make wider changes to the policy. Wider changes should be consulted on according to the normal process and timescale for changing admissions set out in paragraphs 1.42 - 1.49 of the School Admissions Code. See part four.

- For cases where a significant change will require admission arrangements to be varied to implement the proposal; if an existing point of entry will be removed, or the published admission number (PAN) reduced, the change must be agreed in advance of the closing date for the application for places (31 October for secondary schools or 15 January for primary schools) unless exceptional circumstances apply. See part four.

- Academy trusts considering any changes that are not listed in this guidance must contact the department at the earliest point via an enquiry form.

- Academy trusts are responsible for updating the school’s details on the department’s Get information about schools (GIAS) database. Further guidance is available on the GIAS website. These changes must be made no later than the date of implementation and can be input in advance, once a decision is made. Ofsted use GIAS as part of its inspection scheduling so it is important that significant changes are recorded accurately and promptly.

2: Types of changes

This section provides details of significant changes which require approval, either through a fast track application or full business case. The academy trust should respond promptly to requests for additional evidence, clarification or further information.

Potentially contentious proposals: full business case required

Where a proposed change sets a precedent or is potentially contentious, a full business case is required, regardless of the school’s Ofsted rating and whether the type of change being proposed is eligible for the fast track process. Examples, which are not exhaustive, include:

- reducing places in an area of basic need;

- where objections have been received (from the LA and/or neighbouring schools; from the trustees of the school where the school is designated with a religious character; from the diocese or relevant diocesan board in the case of Church schools), that the proposed change could potentially undermine the quality of education provided by other ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ schools in the area, by creating additional places where there is surplus capacity;
• seeking to set up a satellite site to the school;
• any changes to UTCs and studio schools.

Where proposals are particularly controversial and could attract public or press attention, RSCs may choose to escalate such proposals to ministers for a decision.

**Governance changes to an academy trust**

Applications to make governance changes, such as a SAT joining or becoming a MAT or a SAT or MAT adding a new free school, are not required to follow the significant change process, and this guidance does not apply.

There are different routes to becoming a MAT; depending on what route a SAT takes, they will need to access the appropriate link and follow the process below. The case will be assessed and the RSC makes a final decision. The change will need to be reflected in funding agreements and articles of association as necessary.

All applications must be submitted to academy.questions@education.gov.uk for:

- SATs thinking about [setting up a MAT to become a sponsor](#);
- SATs/MATs wishing to [add a new free school to their trust](#);
- The [SAT to MAT application form](#) must be used in the following situations:
  - MATs who are taking responsibility for an existing SAT;
  - Two or more SATs coming together to set up a MAT;
  - A SAT working with other schools who want to form a MAT; and
  - SATs becoming MATs where there are no other schools involved at all and where the change does not relate to becoming a sponsor.

Any structural changes to a MAT need to be approved by a RSC. Please speak to your RSC’s office if you are planning any of the following changes:

- A MAT planning to take responsibility for an academy or academies that are transferring from another academy trust;
- Two existing MATs planning to come together to form one MAT;
- A MAT planning to make major changes to its governance, for example removing or adding a principal sponsor.
Table of changes

The following table shows whether changes are eligible for the fast track or full business case process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of proposal</th>
<th>Fast track route possible?</th>
<th>Full business case needed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of physical capacity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly – if the change meets the expansion criteria but does not meet the fast track criteria, or the proposal could be considered contentious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion onto an additional or satellite site</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the number of pupils in a special school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – if the increase is for 10% or more or 20 pupils or more (whichever is the smaller number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of lower or upper age limit of up to 2 years (including adding a nursery but excluding adding or removing a sixth form)</td>
<td>Yes – if the fast track criteria are met</td>
<td>Possibly – if the fast track criteria are not met or where the proposal could be considered contentious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of lower or upper age limit by 3 years or more</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a sixth form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing a sixth form</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of age range of UTCs and studio schools</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamating with another academy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – case should address TUPE and land issues, as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-amalgamating an existing academy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of proposal</td>
<td>Fast track route possible?</td>
<td>Full business case needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining or changing faith designation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing a Church of England academy’s characteristics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to another site</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of gender composition – single sex to co-educational or vice versa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in type of SEN provision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes affecting provision reserved for SEN pupils</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding or increasing boarding provision</td>
<td>Yes – however other legislation applies and will need to be complied with</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in or removal of boarding provision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – if proposal is to remove at least 50% or 50 pupils (whichever is greater) or entire boarding provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expansion of physical capacity**

A significant expansion is defined as an enlargement that increases the overall physical capacity of an academy (as recorded in its funding agreement) so that it can provide places for more than 30 additional pupils. Changing the internal configuration of a building to accommodate more pupils would also be classed as an increase in capacity. **If this threshold is not met, schools do not need to seek approval via the**

---

1 This is primarily to allow for an emergency one off bulge class to be introduced.
significant change process, but will need to seek agreement to amend the capacity\textsuperscript{2} figure in their funding agreements.

Under section 14 of the Education Act 1996, LAs have a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places for primary and secondary education in their area. Both academy trusts and LAs should manage the school estate efficiently and should reduce or find alternative uses for high levels of spare capacity, in order to avoid detriment to schools’ educational offer or financial position. As part of this, we would expect academy trusts and LAs to consider all options for the reutilisation of space, including, for example, increasing the provision of early education and childcare, and reconfiguration, including via remodelling, amalgamations and closure where this is the best course of action.

The department is working with LocatED to look at how academy trusts and LAs can improve the efficient use and management of the school estates. This work is currently being piloted on a small scale, but, subject to the outcomes and lessons learned, LocatED and the department will be looking at how they can potentially support a wider range of schools in future.

The department has a strong expectation that academy trusts should work collaboratively with LAs, and where the school is designated with a religious character the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, on pupil places planning, taking into account the increases or decreases in pupil numbers forecast in the area, especially in areas of basic need. Academy trusts should consider how they can best support their LA in meeting this need. To help achieve this, academy trusts can propose either an expansion of their capacity, increase their PAN\textsuperscript{3} or admit over PAN. In areas with high levels of surplus capacity and where forecasts do not demonstrate a future need for places, schools should not normally be expanded, although the quality and diversity of provision should be taken into account to assess the strategic needs of the area.

We expect academy trusts to have considered a range of performance indicators and financial data, before proposing the expansion of an academy. Where schools are underperforming, we would not expect them to expand unless there is a strong case that such an expansion would help to raise standards. We expect academy trusts to propose to create new places in academies that have an overall Ofsted rating of ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’. If, however, there are no other feasible ways to create new places in the area, the academy trust should submit a full business case application to the department, and set out why the expansion is necessary.

\textsuperscript{2} Capacity - This is the number of pupils that can be taught within the physical space available.

\textsuperscript{3} Published Admission Number (PAN) - as part of determining their admission arrangements, all admission authorities must set an admission number (PAN) for each ‘relevant age group’. So, if a school has an admissions number of 120 pupils for Year 7, that is its PAN. Further details can be found in the School Admissions Code https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-admissions-code--2
Academies that are rated ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ at their last inspection, have a latest Progress 8 score of at least the national average, are in good financial health and are proposing a change that is not contentious or subject to objections from the LA may propose to expand their physical capacity by following the fast track process, with the exception of:

- Proposals to expand onto a satellite site;
- Proposals to expand sixth form provision.

Where the fast track requirements are not met, expansion proposals will require a full business case.

**Part four** explains the steps to making a significant change and the information needed for both a fast track application and full business case.

**Physical expansions onto satellite sites**

Where academy trusts wish to expand onto an additional site they will need to consider whether the new provision is genuinely a change to an existing school or is in effect a new school.

The establishment of new selective maintained schools and academies is prohibited by statute. Expansion of any existing academy onto a satellite site will only be approved if it is a genuine continuance of the same school and the academy has the financial resources to create the satellite site.

When deciding whether to approve an expansion onto a satellite site, the RSC on behalf of the Secretary of State will consider factors including:

**The reasons for the expansion**

- What is the rationale for this approach and this particular site?

**Admission and curriculum arrangements**

- How will the new site be used (e.g. which age groups/pupils will it serve)?
- Are any changes to admission arrangements necessary?
- Will there be movement of pupils between sites?

**Governance and administration**

- How will whole school activities be managed?
- Will staff be employed on contracts to work on both sites? How frequently will they do so?
• What governance, leadership and management arrangements will be put in place to oversee the new site (e.g. will the new site be governed by the same governing body/academy trust board and the same school leadership team)?

Physical characteristics of the school

• How will facilities across the two sites be used (e.g. sharing of the facilities and resources available at the two sites, such as playing fields)?

• Is the new site in an area that is easily accessible to the community that the current school serves?

The purpose of considering these factors is to determine the level of integration between the two sites; the more integration, the more likely the change can be considered to be an expansion.

In relation to Church of England and Catholic schools, the consideration by the RSC will take place in light of the respective Memorandum of Understanding and this guidance should be read alongside those documents.

Academy trusts proposing to expand onto a satellite site will always be required to submit a full business case, to enable the department to ensure the proposal is a genuine expansion and does not in effect constitute a new academy. See part four for more detail.

Changes to the published admission number (PAN) where an enlargement of premises has not taken place

Mainstream schools must set a PAN for each relevant age group for admission in their determined admission arrangements. If an admission authority for a mainstream academy wishes to change its PAN, without increasing the overall physical capacity of the buildings, this is not a significant change. Such changes should be made under the procedures and to the timescale set out in the School Admissions Code, unless an in-year variation of the admission policy needs to be requested at the same time the significant change is requested.

It would be helpful for admission authorities to discuss their plans with the LA, and where the school is designated with a religious character the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, to consider whether there is a need for additional places in the area when considering increasing a school’s PAN. When considering reducing a PAN, again, admission authorities should consider the need for places in the area. An admission authority must carry out a full consultation in accordance with the School Admissions Code when reducing a PAN.
Changes to the number of pupils in a special school

The School Admissions Code does not apply to special schools but the academy trust responsible for special academies may seek to increase the number of places by following the significant change process if the increase is by:

- 10% or more; or
- 20 pupils or more (whichever is the smaller number), with the exception of special boarding schools where the limit is 5 pupils.

The significant change process does not need to be followed where a special school is established in a hospital.

Age range changes

A school's recorded age range should reflect provision at the school correctly. If the change relates to pupils of non-compulsory school age; for example if nursery or sixth form provision is to be added or withdrawn, then a proposal for an age range change must be submitted (as set out below).

Academies that were rated as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ at their last Ofsted inspection, have a latest Progress 8 score of at least the national average, are in good financial health, have the capacity to make the change, and have evidence to show that the LA, and where the school is designated with a religious character, the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, does not object to the proposed change, can propose to change the age range of their school by up to two years (including adding nursery provision but excluding adding or removing a sixth form) by following the fast track process.

Academy trusts proposing to change the age range of their schools by three years or more, those which want to add or remove a sixth form, make any age range change which is contentious, or which will set a precedent for schools in their local area, must submit a full business case.

Where proposals are likely to have a significant impact on other local provision, a full business case will be required to provide evidence that the education of children in the area, as a whole, will not be compromised. Where local provision is organised in three tiers and the aim is to move to two tier age range, the department expects academy trusts, LAs and where the school is designated with a religious character; the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, to work together to ensure an appropriate co-ordinated implementation, and will only approve any individual proposal in that context.

The addition or removal of a relevant age group must be actioned in accordance with the School Admissions Code.
If fast track conditions are not met, a full business case is always required, see part four.

Proposals to add sixth form provision

Proposals to add a sixth form will require a full business case and should only be put forward for existing academies rated as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’.

Applications for the addition of a sixth form will be assessed against the following criteria:

- **Quality:** The quality of pre-16 education must be good or outstanding (as rated by Ofsted) and the school must have a history of positive Progress 8 scores (above 0);

- **Size:** The proposed sixth form will provide places for a minimum of 200 students;

- **Subject Breadth:** The proposed sixth form should - either directly or through partnership - offer a minimum of 15 A level subjects. Academy trusts/LAs may wish to consider the benefits of delivering a broader A level curriculum through partnership arrangements with other school sixth forms. Working with others can offer opportunities to:
  - Improve choice and attainment for pupils;
  - Deliver new, improved or more integrated services;
  - Make efficiency savings through sharing costs;
  - Develop a stronger, more united voice;
  - Share knowledge and information.

Schools proposing a partnership arrangement must include evidence of how this will operate on a day-to-day basis, including timetabling and the deployment of staff;

- **Demand:** There should be a clear need for additional post-16 places in the local area (including evidence of a shortage of post-16 places and a consideration of the quality of Level 3 provision in the area). The proposed sixth form should not create excessive surplus places or have a detrimental effect on other high quality post-16 provision in the local area;

- **Financial viability:** The proposed sixth form should be financially viable (there must be evidence of financial resilience should student numbers fall. The average class size should be at least 15, unless there is a clear educational argument to run smaller classes – for example to build the initial credibility of courses with a view to increasing class size in future.
Not all changes in age range to add a sixth form will necessitate a change to the school’s admission arrangements, for example a school may set up sixth form provision solely for its own pupils. However, if the intention is to also admit external applicants to the sixth form the school will need to adopt a sixth form PAN and, potentially, academic entry requirements on changing its age range. A request for a variation to admission arrangements, in line with the School Admissions Code, must be made at the same time as the school requests the significant change.

**Proposals to remove sixth form provision**

When removing a sixth form, either temporarily or permanently, the significant change process must be followed and a full business case submitted.

When an institution closes or stops ESFA-funded 16-19 provision, either on a temporary or permanent basis, this will have implications for sixth form funding. Further details on this are included in paragraphs 9-13 of the Funding Guidance for Young People 2018 to 2019 which is available on GOV.UK.

**Proposals to change the age range of university technology colleges (UTCs) and studio schools**

As for other academies, UTCs and studio schools may make a proposal to change their age range. Due to the differences associated with UTCs and studio schools, including an atypical age range and a specialist/technical and vocationally related curriculum, a full business case is required, accompanied by an education plan that sets out the overall strategy for KS4 and KS3 where appropriate. The requirements for a full business case are as set out in part 4. These include the requirement to set out the local context, and UTCs and studio schools should ensure that their business case fully addresses how the age range change proposal fits within the local school system and any specific local arrangements for KS4.

A comprehensive education plan is required that looks across the whole of KS4 (and KS3 if appropriate) and fully articulates the approach to a different age range in relation to teaching, learning and resourcing. It should therefore include details on the following:

- **Curriculum** - overall curriculum strategy and how it applies to different year groups (including technical/vocational subjects and enrichment activities);
- **Staffing** – revisions to staffing structure, details of the resourcing of curriculum delivery, and plans for staff support;

---

4 University technical colleges (UTCs) are academies which focus on delivering technical education to meet the needs of businesses. UTCs follow a very specific model developed by the Baker Dearing Educational Trust [https://www.utcolleges.org/].
• **Quality of teaching** - approaches to pedagogy, differentiation for different groups of students, monitoring and improving the quality of teaching;

• **Student attainment and progression** – approaches to setting standards and targets: systems for tracking individual student performance; assessment, recording and reporting.

Before submitting a proposal, UTCs and studio schools considering an age range change should contact their department lead/contact to discuss in further detail what would be expected in the business case and education plan.

All decisions on age range changes for UTCs will be taken by ministers after seeking the view of the RSC (for studio schools the decision maker will be the RSC in line with the process for all other academies).

**Amalgamations**

In **ALL** cases, proposals to amalgamate an academy with another academy/academies will require a full business case. There are two ways to do this:

I. The academy trust may propose to close one (or more) academy and expand the remaining academy to accommodate the displaced pupils. The amalgamated academy will retain its school number, as it is not a new school, even if its age-range has changed.

II. Alternatively, the academy trust may propose to close all the academies involved and replace them with a new school.

An amalgamation may also require an in year variation of the school’s admission policy by the decision maker on the proposal (i.e. the RSC or the Secretary of State if the proposal is contentious).

As these proposals will involve the closure of at least one school, academy trusts should be mindful of TUPE implications. The issue and implications of excess land will be dealt with by the department as part of an amalgamation case.

**De-amalgamations**

In exceptional circumstances, academy trusts may propose to split (“de-amalgamate”) existing provision into two or more separate, distinct schools. This change will require a full business case and should only be put forward by good and outstanding schools\(^5\) where there is a clear education or organisational benefit in doing so.

\(^5\) Any request to de-amalgamate an academy rated as “requires improvement” or “inadequate” will be referred to a minister for a decision.
Where proposals seek to establish provision that is significantly different to the existing provision; for example, offering a significant increase in places or covering a wider range of year groups, the proposer will need to submit a proposal to establish a new school. Legislation prohibits the establishment of new selective schools, so selective academies will not be allowed to establish additional provision through this process.

Academy trusts that seek to propose this change must submit a full business case, clearly demonstrating that the proposal is based on a clear vision to deliver a high-class education that delivers value for money and is supported by strong management and governance structures. Academy trusts proposing such a change would need to demonstrate:

- The original school site will remain open;
- The provision delivered by the existing and additional school, collectively, should not deviate from the provision of the original school (basically the same size, delivering the same curriculum and not looking to add any new special units);
- Splitting the school would represent a good and lawful use of the existing site and any new/additional sites (if applicable);
- The clear educational or organisational benefits that would be delivered/addressed through splitting the school;
- The additional school(s) will meet all of the departmental expectations for new schools;
- Admission policies may require variation where the de-amalgamation involves; setting up two single sex schools from the de-amalgamation of a co-educational school, the de-amalgamation of a primary into an infant and junior school or any demerger of all-through schools;
- It is not possible for a 16-19 academy to be created by a de-amalgamation.

When deciding whether to approve a split in provision the RSC, on behalf of the Secretary of State, will consider the case for the split including:

**Educational vision:**
- Does the proposal deliver a strong educational vision based on the delivery of high standards?
- Will the split in provision meet the needs of all children?
- Does the proposal demonstrate a commitment to excellent teaching and learning?

**The curriculum and teaching:**
- Has the academy trust demonstrated a commitment to an ambitious, broad and balanced curriculum?
- What strategies have been put in place for measuring pupil performance and setting challenging targets?
- Does the proposal detail enrichment and extended services?
Capacity and Capability:

- Has the academy trust correctly identified and secured the resources needed to support the development of the new school?
- Is there clear evidence of the range of skills and abilities needed to set up a new school?
- Does the proposal clearly demonstrate strong school organisation and governance arrangements?

Funding and Costs:

- Does the proposal deliver value for money on all areas of build, site costs and ongoing delivery of provision?
- Have issues surrounding the ownership, control, future/alternative use of the land and transfer of leave been explored?
- All legal, planning and related costs in advance of a decision would need to be funded by the academy trust.

Admissions:

- Where splitting a school would result in a change to the age or gender of pupils that the original school would admit, the application to split provision must be supported by a request to vary the admission arrangements to such an extent as is necessary to implement the proposal, to ensure that both schools have fair and lawful arrangements and remain in line with the Admissions Code. The same applies where the split establishes two schools with different age–ranges.
- Where the proposal is to establish a single sex school or change single sex schools to be co-educational; decision makers should ensure the proposal complies with equalities legislation and does not create a significant imbalance of either girls or boys places in the area.
- Evidence that the bodies in paragraph 1.44 of the Admissions Code have been consulted for 6 weeks must be submitted.

Registering the new school:

As a state funded independent school, any new academy resulting from a de-amalgamation of an existing academy must be registered before it can start to operate. As part of the full business case, academy trusts will also need to provide:

- A plan showing the layout of the premises and accommodation of all buildings;
- Detailed curriculum plans, schemes of work for every subject and year group taught and pupil assessment procedures;
- A copy of the school’s written policies on:
  - The written behaviour policy setting out, amongst other matters, the sanctions to be adopted in the event of pupil misbehaviour;
o Particulars of the school’s arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of pupils at the school and how those arrangements have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
o Particulars of the school’s anti-bullying strategy;
o Health and Safety;
o The school’s complaints procedure.

On receipt of the documents listed above and following all necessary internal checks, the department will forward the application to Ofsted with a request that they arrange a visit to the school. If the school intends to admit boarding pupils, it will also be subject to inspection of the boarding facilities. Ofsted will report to the DfE on their findings and, in order to register the school as a state funded independent school, the Secretary of State must be satisfied it is likely to meet all the Independent School Standards once registered.

If the Secretary of State is not satisfied that the standards are likely to be met on opening, the application to de-amalgamate the school will be rejected.

**Faith-related changes**

Gaining or changing a faith designation requires approval based on a full business case (changing a faith designation would require a new funding agreement). Academies designated with a religious character have specific freedoms which permit them to take faith into account when admitting pupils, appointing staff and in the teaching of religious education and delivery of collective worship. These freedoms differ according to whether the academy was previously a voluntary aided (VA) school, voluntary controlled (VC) school or free school.

Before they may apply to be designated as having a religious character, academy trusts are required, by their funding agreements, to seek the Secretary of State’s consent.

The academy trust must clearly set out, as a minimum, in their business case: their proposed new governance and staffing arrangements; the basis on which they believe the change is needed; and, why it will benefit the academy and the wider community. They must show that there is support for this change from their school and wider local community and have the express consent of the relevant religious body to become a school designated with a religious character. If faith based admission arrangements are proposed these must be consulted upon too, in accordance with the requirements set out in the School Admissions Code. The academy trust should also consider if an Equalities Impact Assessment should be completed, and include this with the business case.

Once approval has been given, the academy trust must then formally apply to have the school designated as having a religious character. A school can only be considered a school with a religious character with a completed religious designation order. A school
will not be permitted any of the freedoms associated with this status until the designation process has been completed. Please approach your project lead for details of the documentation that will need to be provided.

**Process for former VC Church of England schools to gain the same characteristics as VA schools**

It is possible for an academy that was formerly a voluntary controlled school to alter certain characteristics; i.e. their governance structures, approach to employment of staff; teaching of religious education and collective worship, so they are akin to those of a VA school.

This gives the academy greater freedoms in relation to how they maintain and develop their faith ethos. Therefore, the academy trust is required to undertake a local consultation, including with staff and parents, and submit a summary of the results with their application. Once the RSC is satisfied there is sufficient support, changes are made to the funding agreement and articles of association. If the school wishes to have VA style freedoms in relation to employment of staff, an Order will be issued to ensure compliance with legislation.

**Other change proposals**

**Temporary changes:** In the vast majority of cases the significant change process will have to be followed when making a temporary change. Academy trusts wishing to make a temporary significant change must contact the department in the first instance via an enquiry form.

**Changes to deliver a different type of provision:** academy trusts wishing to make changes to the type of provision offered, e.g. from mainstream to special or alternative provision, or providing pre-school childcare, should contact the department at the earliest point via an enquiry form.

**Removal of or changes to early years provision:** is subject to the significant change process.

**Transfer to another site:** can mean an enlargement of the premises, but might also affect the catchment area. If so, the academy trust will need to seek a variation to their admission arrangements. A full business case is required in all cases.

**Change of gender composition:** made via a full business case, allows a move from single sex to co-educational (or vice versa). A change from single sex to co-educational provision in post-16 provision can be made through the normal procedures for changing admissions. Academy trusts should remember that a co-educational school cannot change its nursery or post-16 provision to single sex. Whenever changes to co-educational from single sex provision are made, or vice versa, the decision-maker (i.e.
the RSC or Secretary of State) will consider whether the change complies with equalities legislation.

**Change in the type of SEN provision:** proposals require a full business case and allow special academies to add/remove the designation and categories of SEN provision that they currently provide. The home and neighbouring LAs and affected parents should be consulted.

**Changes affecting provision reserved for pupils with SEN:** proposals require a full business case to add or remove the reserved provision or increase/decrease the number for which the reserved provision caters. The characteristics of the reserved provision may also be changed so as to change the age range or type of SEN for which the reserved provision caters. Academy trusts should note that provision reserved for pupils with SEN includes both "resourced provision" (where pupils spend more than half of their time in mainstream classes with support) and "designated SEN units" (where pupils spend more than half of their time in special classes).

**Proposals for adding or increasing boarding provision:** can be made through a fast track application. In these cases compliance with the boarding schools national minimum standards, health and safety, fire, planning regulations will be required.

When adding new boarding or residential provision, following all necessary internal checks, the department will forward the application to Ofsted with a request that they arrange a visit to the school to inspect the boarding facilities, to ensure the boarding schools national minimum standards and residential special schools national minimum standards are met. The department will commission the inspection to check that the school is likely to meet the standards. Ofsted will normally contact the school two days prior to the inspection.

An inspection is not required where an academy trust is proposing to increase existing boarding provision.

Where an academy makes accommodation arrangements for boarders, for example with host families, the academy must still register as a boarding school. A fast track application will need to be made as well as a material change inspection.

**Decrease in, or removal of boarding provision:** requires a full business case when the proposal is to decrease by 50 pupils or 50% (whichever is the greater), or the entirety of boarding provision.

3: **Funding**

Generally the department does not provide funding for significant changes or any associated legal or administrative costs. Academy trusts will need to consider how to
fund any associated costs in terms of capital funding. The proposal should include indicative costings and an explanation of how these will be met.

Where capital funding for expansion has been sought from the Condition Improvement Fund (CIF), academy trusts must state this in their business case. The decision on capital funding rests with the minister, taking into account the RSC’s view on the proposed significant change. Academies will need to make a separate CIF application to demonstrate their ability to plan and deliver the proposed capital project.

Where an academy agrees to expand in response to a proposal by a LA to meet a local need for places, the LA should meet the capital costs. The department provides capital funding to LAs facing a shortfall of places (basic need), to help support them to meet their statutory duty to secure sufficient school places in their area. Academies should confirm that agreement has been reached with their LA.

It is expected that all academies that were rated as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ at their last Ofsted inspection and are situated in areas of population growth, will actively consider how they can best support LAs in meeting their duty to provide sufficient school places. This can include increasing PAN without expansion of the premises or an expansion of the premises alongside an increase in PAN.

LAs can fund expansion at academies either by allocating funding directly from a growth fund, whose size and criteria have been agreed by the schools forum, or by varying the pupil numbers on which the school is funded from the previous census to the estimated number for the following academic year. In both cases, they must treat academies on the same basis as maintained schools. Where the authority varies pupil numbers, the ESFA will use those figures to fund the academy’s GAG, unless it is already funded on estimates in its funding agreement.

**Selective Schools Expansion Fund**

The selective schools expansion fund (SSEF) is capital funding specifically to support the creation of additional places in existing fully selective or partially selective schools.

Applicants to the SSEF will be required to demonstrate that there is a need for new places, that they will increase accessibility for disadvantaged pupils, and that they will work with local non-selective schools to raise attainment.

Academies applying for the SSEF do not need to complete a separate significant change application, as this has been incorporated into the SSEF application form.

Further details on the latest round of the SSEF, including how to apply, can be accessed [here](#).
4: What are the steps for making changes?

For ALL significant change enquiries and proposals, academy trusts will need to contact the department, via an enquiry form, at least three months prior to the proposed change coming into effect. This is to ensure that there is time for the decision to be made and that the funding agreement and, if necessary, the admission arrangements can be varied BEFORE the change can take effect. Failure to follow the correct procedure could constitute a breach of the funding agreement.

Who should be consulted and how?

For both full business case proposals and fast track applications, the academy trust will need to demonstrate that a fair and open local consultation has been undertaken with all those who could be affected by the proposed change, and that the academy trust has considered all responses received. Comments or objections can be made on any grounds and opportunities for feedback should be given at all public and stakeholder meetings.

The LA will hold important contextual information on the requirement for places locally, and must be consulted in all cases and where the school has been designated with a religious character, the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, must be consulted. The RSC (or the Secretary of State as appropriate) will need evidence that they have been consulted, and will consider any reasonable objections from them.

Conditions of funding for any future capital are that the academy trust has conducted a consultation, that responses have been considered, and that any consents (including planning permission, land transfers, trustees of the school, diocese or relevant diocesan board) required have been given. Changes will not be agreed unless an appropriate consultation has taken place.

If you represent the governing body of a maintained school and are consulting on proposals to make a significant change as soon as it becomes an academy, this must be undertaken as part of your section 5 (conversion) consultation. Decisions about significant changes immediately following conversion are separate to decisions about conversion, and may not be approved when conversion is approved.

The department considers that the stakeholders listed below must be consulted about proposals for change, but others may also be included:

- Each LA which maintains an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) or statement of SEN in respect of a child attending the school;
- Parents of children who attend the school;
• Parents in the area;
• Primary, secondary and special schools and sixth form and FE colleges in the area;
• The Admissions Forum for the academy’s area, where one exists (if admissions are to be affected);
• Affected admission authorities, including those in neighbouring LA areas (if admissions are to be affected);
• Where a school is designated as having a religious character, the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board.

Where a significant change does not require a variation to the school’s admission arrangements, the consultation should run for a minimum of four weeks. Where the significant change also requires a variation to admission arrangements there must be a six week consultation on the admission arrangements, with the parties set out in paragraph 1.44 of the School Admissions Code. If appropriate the significant change and admissions consultations can be combined, so the entire consultation period would not exceed six weeks.

It is important to take timing into account in order to maximise responses to the consultation, including attendance at any public meetings, for example; consulting during term time rather than school holidays. The location of public and stakeholder meetings should also be planned to maximise responses; it is good practice to hold meetings in the academy or in a venue close to it. It is also important when making changes that affect admission arrangements, to ensure consultation is completed and the business case and variation request are submitted in sufficient time to ensure any changes to an admission policy can be implemented before parents submit their applications for school places.

Guidance is available from the Cabinet Office on consultation principles, which are examples of good practice.

**Equality Impact Assessment**

Academy trusts proposing a significant change must undertake an equalities impact assessment in order to consider the expected impact of the proposed change on all individuals with protected characteristics, under the Equality Act 2010. Further guidance on how to conduct equality impact assessments can be found on the Equality and Human Rights Commission’s (EHRC) website.
5: Requesting a change: fast track and full business case

Fast track application

Changes which can be made via the fast track application i.e. do not require a full business case, are academies, rated as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ in their last inspection by Ofsted, have a latest Progress 8 score of at least the national average, are in good financial health, have the capacity to make the change and can provide evidence that the local authority, and where a school is designated with a religious character, the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, does not object to the proposed change. This evidence could be in the form of a letter, email or a formal record of a meeting. The types of changes that can be fast tracked are:

- any increase in the capacity of an academy (with the exception of satellite expansions and changes to UTCs and studio schools);
- an age range change (of up to two years) e.g. to extend existing nursery provision to two year-olds (with the exception of age-range changes to UTCs and studio schools, adding or removing a sixth form and any cases of a contentious nature);
- adding boarding provision.

When assessing a fast track application, the RSC will consider the impact that the proposed change will have on the quality and capacity of the academy. Proposers must provide evidence that:

- a fair and open consultation has taken place, including demonstrating that any consultation relating to admission changes has been undertaken, the number and percentage of people/bodies in favour of the change and against it have been considered, and if there are any objections, how the issues raised will be (or have been) managed;
- funding to cover the capital costs of the proposed change has been secured, and that there are no issues with the school’s current budget and/or finances. In the case of expansions, academies must show they have sufficient funding for additional pupils, until lagged funding is received;
- the change is aligned with local pupil place plans, with supporting evidence from the local authority and it is unlikely to have a negative impact on educational standards at the academy or at other local schools or colleges;
- appropriate planning permissions and other consents required have been secured; and
• the proposal does not displace existing pupils, or where it does, that the LA has been engaged in good time to run a preference exercise to find displaced pupils a place in an alternative mainstream school or post 16 provider.

The department may need to request additional information to that requested above, depending on the complexity of the proposed change and may also request that a full business case is submitted.

**Full business case**

For full [business case proposals](#), the RSC will make a decision based on consideration of all relevant factors and any evidence provided by the academy trust(s). These include:

• educational track record and current performance of the academy;

• the details of the change, including the rationale and impact on the school, any potential issues/risks relating to the proposals (e.g. changes to leadership and governance, any foreseen adaptations, additions, refurbishments or land transfers needed), and evidence of demand;

• when the change is to be implemented, and how (e.g. will it be done in stages?);

• evidence that the LA has been engaged to find places for displaced pupils including proposed arrangements for any pupils part way through their GCSE or post 16 studies where a change in age range or amalgamation will displace them;

• local context including supply of school places data, LA wider position data and the impact on the availability of places, the effect on other schools, academies, colleges and educational institutions within the LA;

• evidence of fair and open local consultation, including an overview of the responses to the consultation;

• evidence of the degree of LA support and what the academy has done in response to any consultation responses from it;

• financial health of the academy and funding arrangements for the proposed change, any indicative costings and an indication of how these might be met, including how the change will be sustained in terms of capacity and value for money;

• a request for a variation of the admission arrangements, where changes are necessary to implement an approved change. The request should flag whether it is proposed that a PAN will be reduced, or a relevant age group for admission will be removed;
• information on the consultation on the proposed change including any admissions consultation, including the number and percentage of persons/bodies in favour of the change and against it, and if there are any objections, how the issues raised will be (or have been) managed;

• when an academy is proposing changes to its SEN provision, the business case must demonstrate that the proposed change will not have a detrimental impact on local SEN provision or pupils with SEN currently in the school;

• details of financial and governance arrangements and if appropriate, confirmation that planning permission has been secured;

• where a school is designated as having a religious character, consent of the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board; and

• any implications for other statutory requirements e.g. under TUPE, childcare (early years), equalities and health and safety legislation.

6: Decision making process

The RSC will consider the proposal and either approve or reject it. The RSC may also defer the approval pending further evidence. Where proposals are particularly controversial and could attract adverse public or press attention; the RSC may choose to escalate such proposals to the Secretary of State for a decision.

The department will notify the academy trust of the RSC’s decision. The responsibility for amending academy trust documentation and registering the change on GIAS lies with the academy trust. GIAS can be updated any time after the decision date but must be done prior to implementation.

7: Admission related changes

Reductions in the PAN or the removal of a relevant age group, must be consulted on in accordance with the School Admissions Code or, if a variation is sought because of a major change in circumstances, the request must be made sufficiently in advance of the closing date for admission applications.

Changes to admission arrangements

• All academies are contractually obliged to comply with the School Admissions Code, including the timescale for changing admissions.

• The normal lead in time between beginning consultation on changing admission arrangements, as set out in the School Admissions Code, and determining those
arrangements as final, is 17 months which includes a six-week statutory consultation on the proposed revision to arrangements. However, this may not always be possible; for example, if the timing for a significant change does not align with the normal admissions consultation timetable.

- Where it is not possible to follow the normal admissions timetable, academies must seek a ‘variation’ of their admission arrangements at the same time as they submit their full business case for the significant change.

- A variation can only be agreed if there is a major change in circumstances necessitating the change to the admission arrangements or the change is otherwise necessary.

- All variation requests should be the minimum necessary to implement the significant change, if the change is approved.

The variation process

- The academy trust must consult the relevant persons or bodies as set out in paragraph 1.44 of the School Admissions Code.

- The consultation must cover the relevant changes to the admission arrangements.

- The consultation on admission arrangements should last six weeks.

- Evidence of the consultation should be submitted with the business case.

- Where a change reduces a PAN or removes a relevant age group, it is essential a decision is made before parents apply for a place. Submissions must be sufficiently in advance of the closing date for applications in order to allow the RSC, on behalf of the Secretary of State, to take a decision. The following deadlines apply:
  
  - Changes reducing a primary PAN or removing a primary relevant age group for admission – submission to the department by 1 November\(^6\) in the year before the change will be implemented;
  
  - Changes reducing a secondary PAN or removing a secondary relevant age group for admission – submission to the department by 31 August\(^7\) in the year before the change will be implemented.

---

\(^6\) The closing date for parents to submit an application for the following September is 15 January

\(^7\) The closing date for parents to submit an application for the following September is 31 October
What changes to admission arrangements are likely to be necessary if the age range is changed?

- Where, for example, a school changes its age range from 11-16 to 4-16, the department would normally expect the current oversubscription criteria to be used. However, a new PAN, to apply to reception as a new point of entry, should be determined and the year seven PAN may need to be reduced or removed depending on whether the change is also an amalgamation.

- Where a school adds boarding provision, a boarding admission number and boarding admission criteria must be adopted.

- Where a school adds a sixth form, there is no need for changes to be made to admission arrangements unless the intention is to admit external pupils, in which case a year 12 PAN must be requested through a variation and the school may also wish to add academic entry criteria for entry into the sixth form, although this is not mandatory. In most cases the existing oversubscription criteria for the school will be appropriate for the sixth form.
Part B: Departmental advice for academy trusts considering school closure by mutual agreement

1: Summary

About this departmental advice

This section provides non-statutory advice for academy trusts considering whether to close an academy by mutual agreement with the Secretary of State. It is not to be taken as providing legal advice and academy trusts should seek their own independent legal advice to ensure they are complying with their legal obligations. This advice sets out an expectation that academy trusts will work collaboratively with Regional Schools Commissioners (RSCs) and local authorities (LAs), and where the academy is designated with a religious character the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board. It emphasises the need for an area-based approach to pupil place planning. Just as it is important that academy trusts and, where relevant, dioceses, support LAs in providing additional places where they are needed, it is equally important that they support the removal of surplus capacity in the system, where there is no forecast increase in the need for school places in the medium or long term.

In some circumstances closure, alongside other changes such as amalgamations or mergers, a reduction in the Published Admission Number (PAN) and/or reorganisation of the school estate more broadly, can be the most appropriate course of action in order to deliver good school places, and support better educational outcomes, as well as long term financial sustainability.

This advice recognises the need for a clear and consistent approach to the consideration of academy closures by mutual agreement, and confirms the processes.

Expiry or review date

This advice document will be reviewed in October 2019.

Who is this advice for?

Academy trusts (including Free Schools, Studio Schools and University Technical Colleges) considering whether to seek agreement from the Secretary of State to terminate the funding agreement and close their academy.
2: Introduction

This advice will support academy trusts to understand when closure of an academy might be an appropriate solution to address standards and/or viability issues, including in areas where there are surplus places and there is no predicted increase in the need for places in the medium or long term. Managing surplus capacity is about considering a range of options for the reutilisation and reconfiguration of space, and in some circumstances, closure. Mutually agreed closure can curtail prolonged decline in standards and viability, and as such support better educational outcomes for pupils.

Academies where there are low pupil numbers with limited prospect of increasing numbers through recruitment, should consider area based solutions for removing surplus capacity; including mergers with other local schools, reduction of PAN, the reutilisation of the school premises for other purposes, such as nursery provision, or, where appropriate, school closure.

LAs have overall responsibility for local place planning and academy trusts play an important role in supporting LAs to effectively manage the school estate. In the case of Church schools the diocese will work in partnership with the LA in place planning. If an academy trust is considering the future viability of their school, they will need to work collaboratively with RSCs, LAs, other academy trusts and academies, dioceses and the governing bodies of other schools in the area to ensure that decisions are made in the best interests of pupils. This guidance sets out the processes academy trusts need to follow, and provides advice as to when academy trusts should talk to other parties.

3: Closure principles and processes

The closure of an academy may be undertaken in the following ways:

- Either party (the Secretary of State or the academy trustees) giving seven years notice of terminating the funding agreement;

- Where the Secretary of State (1) uses statutory powers to terminate the funding agreement on performance grounds or (2) uses termination powers in the funding agreement to intervene and close an academy because the academy trust is otherwise in breach of the terms of the funding agreement. This is referred to as ‘closure directed by the Secretary of State’. The circumstances in which the Secretary of State can use these intervention powers is set out in the Schools Causing Concern guidance.

- By mutual agreement with the Secretary of State. **This advice focuses on this type of closure.** In all circumstances, the Secretary of State must agree to the termination of the funding agreement before an academy can close. If the Secretary of State agrees to terminate the academy trust’s funding agreement and decides not to re-broker the school to another academy trust, the school will close. This decision will be made based on evidence provided to
the Secretary of State setting out the case for closure and evidence that the academy trust has followed this advice.

**Academy closure by mutual agreement**

The circumstances in which an academy trust might ask the Secretary of State to agree to the closure of an academy include:

- Where an academy has low numbers of pupils on roll, and there is no reasonable prospect of attracting additional pupils because there are surplus places in schools elsewhere in the local area, and no predicted increase in the medium and long-term need for places.

- Where an academy in an area with a need for additional school places has been underperforming for some time, and shows no realistic prospect of meeting the required standard. However, in these circumstances, as an alternative to proceeding to closure, the Secretary of State may agree to allow trustees to terminate their agreement early and seek an alternative sponsor or multi academy trust with the skills and capacity to improve standards.

**Process and factors to consider**

**Stage 1: Consideration of closure**

When considering a closure solution, it is important that the academy trust engages early with the relevant RSC and LAs, and quickly establishes an active working relationship, involving them in planning and decision-making right from the outset. Where the academy is designated with a religious character, and in the case of Church schools, these discussions would take place between the RSC and diocese. Early discussions should be handled sensitively with the interests of the pupils at the heart of the consideration.

**Factors to consider in closure discussions**

- Are pupil numbers low? Is this due to a surplus of places in the area?
- Is the surplus of places likely to change in the future? If so, are there steps the academy trust can take in the meantime to improve viability of the school?
- If numbers are low for reasons other than surplus places, does the academy trust have the capacity to drive the necessary improvement to increase viability? If not, is there another academy trust willing and able to take over?
• If the school closes, will there be sufficient places in the area for the pupils affected? If places are in neighbouring LAs have their views been sought? Will any pupils be moved into underperforming schools?
• Are there any alternatives to closure, e.g. a merger.
• Has the academy trust exhausted all other options related to increasing income and achieving efficiencies?

Stage 2: Seeking in principle agreement

If, in consultation with the LA and RSC, the academy trust comes to a preliminary view that closure is the best option, the trust should submit, in writing, a request to terminate the funding agreement by mutual consent and, its proposal for closure together with documentary evidence. Where the academy is designated with a religious character, and in the case of Church schools, consent of the Diocesan Bishop and the trustees is required. The request to terminate the funding agreement must not be conditional upon school closure.

The proposal should include (but should not be limited to) the following:

• The primary reason for seeking agreement to terminate the funding agreement, and the rationale and evidence in support of a closure solution;
• Evidence that reasonable alternatives to closure have been considered;
• Evidence of discussions with and the views of the LA. Is the LA supportive or opposed to the closure of the academy and why?;
• Evidence of the impact the academy closure will have on the local community;
• Evidence to confirm the existence of other available provision for pupils within reasonable travelling distance, with particular attention to those pupils in exam years and finding a curriculum match in a replacement school. Consider whether partial closure is an option, and allow pupils in exam year groups to complete their studies. (It should be noted that a partial closure may result in a reduction in GAG funding);
• Where an academy provides early years provision, evidence of discussions with the LA to avoid a shortfall of nursery provision;
• An indicative closure timeline/calendar. This should evidence that where possible the timing of the proposed final closure date would be communicated as early in the academic year as possible to allow pupils, parents, and employees, to make informed choices about the options available to them in schools elsewhere in the local area. Every effort ought to be taken to minimise the disruption caused to pupils and any future pupils, including those in feeder and neighbouring schools with a reasonable expectation of attending the academy. A best practice example of a timeline can be found in the appendix below.
Stage 3: In principle decision

The RSC will review the evidence and make a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether, in principle, the funding agreement should be terminated, and whether the school should close. Where the academy is designated with a religious character, and in the case of Church schools, the RSC will consider evidence and discussions with the diocese. The department will communicate the Secretary of State’s decision to the academy trust.

Factors considered by the RSC/Secretary of State:

- LA projections for future levels of basic need. These should be bespoke, rather than SCAP data;
- The viability of the school under the current academy trust (including the effectiveness of any previous attempts to improve educational standards and financial performance);
- The availability of other academy trusts to take on the school and their capacity to drive the necessary improvements (where the academy is designated with a religious character, the trustees and in the case of Church schools, the diocese will lead these discussions);
- The impact on those likely to be affected by the closure;
- Cost effectiveness of closure.

Stage 4: Submit closure plan

If there is an agreement in principle, the department will work with the academy trust and the LA, and where the academy is designated with a religious character the trustees, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board, to manage the process to termination of the funding agreement and closure of the academy. The academy trust must first produce a communications and stakeholder plan and share this with the department. The plan must set out how they will undertake ongoing communications with pupils and parents, academy employees and their representatives and the LAs and schools affected by the closure throughout the closure period.

Once the plan is completed, the following actions should be taken:

- Share the news that closure of the academy is under consideration with pupils, parents, staff, unions, relevant LAs and schools elsewhere in the local area at the earliest opportunity;
• Explore availability of alternative provision for pupils in the local area. Evidence that costs and transport arrangements to attend other schools have been considered and are reasonable and viable;

• Financial arrangements. When an academy closes and its funding agreement terminates, its general annual grant ceases immediately. Academy trusts are expected to meet the costs of closure from existing reserves. This includes any redundancy payments, the costs of appointing an independent auditor, of providing financial statements and an accounts return, any legal advice, or penalties incurred by the early termination of contracts or leases. The academy Accounting Officer must agree to provide a written commitment to comply with the checklist at Annex B and provide their final accounts.

This stage concludes with a substantive decision. The RSC will make a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether the funding agreement should be terminated. If the Secretary of State concludes that closure is the preferred option, the academy trust will be instructed to commence the listening period.

Stage 5: A listening period

Following a substantive decision from the Secretary of State to proceed to closure, the academy trust should conduct a time-bound listening period. Academy trusts should take independent legal advice as to how the listening period should be conducted. Details of the listening period should be shared with the department in advance. The listening period is an opportunity for stakeholders and interested parties to submit their views on how the school closure process can be best managed. This will encourage positive levels of engagement with, and provide safeguards for, the local community.

• The academy trust should provide the department with a summary of responses received.
• A summary of the listening period responses will be shared with the Secretary of State. It is following the Secretary of State’s consideration of these that a final closure decision will be made.
• Annex A sets out the expectations of a listening period in more detail.

Stage 6: Implementation

The RSC will write to the academy trust to confirm the final consent to close the academy. The academy trust must then formally announce the closure decision. It is the academy trust’s responsibility (seeking external advice (if required)) to ensure that all closure obligations are met. The Department will provide support to the academy trust throughout this process.
The key actions to be carried out by the academy trust include the following:

**Placement of pupils**
- Detailed work with the LA admissions office should be undertaken to ensure that suitable places are found for all pupils (excluding post-16 students). The LA should take responsibility for running a preference exercise and co-ordinating the process of identifying places and agreeing transfers with local heads. For post-16 students the academy trust should support students to find suitable alternative institutions to allow them to continue their courses;
- The academy trust must plan for the storage of pupil records, including access to coursework, until these can be transferred to the receiving institutions.

**Disposal of Academy Assets** (including its land, buildings, finance, fixtures and fittings)
The memorandum and articles of association of the academy trust and its funding agreement influences how the assets are dealt with. In practical terms, the academy trust will work with the RSC to establish a method of distributing all assets including its land, building fixtures and fittings.

**Redundancies**
The academy trust is responsible for meeting redundancy costs, unless the funding agreement (FA) states otherwise.

**Pension liabilities**
The academy trust is responsible for meeting the costs of pension liabilities associated with closure. The academy trust should engage with the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) fund manager as early as possible. The fund manager will need to know the proposed/actual closure date, which will enable the fund manager to request and provide the academy trust with a ‘cessation report’. Further advice on the LGPS arrangements can be found [here](#).

**Submission of final accounts**
It is important to note that the academy trust **must** submit final accounts after termination of the funding agreement and closure of the academy.

When an academy is closed or its management is transferred to a different academy trust, its trustees must ensure audited financial statements and an accounts return from the start of the reporting period (1 September) up to the date of termination of the funding agreement are prepared and submitted to the department no later than 4 months after termination.

**Deed of Variation**
Once final accounts have been submitted, the academy trust should produce a Deed of Termination for agreement and sign off with the department.
Trustees must then undertake closure action with Companies House and the Charity Commission so that the academy trust can be removed from the register of Charities.

**Closure of rural schools**

There is a presumption against the closure of rural primary schools. In respect of academies, this means that both the Department for Education and the LA need to agree to the closure of a rural academy, and where the school is designated with a religious character the trustees of the school, and in the case of Church schools the diocese or relevant diocesan board.

The presumption does not mean that a rural school will never close, but it does mean that the case for closure should be strong and that the proposals are clearly in the best interests of educational provision in the area.

When considering a closure solution for a rural academy, it is important that due regard is given to the factors below (in addition to those outlined above):

- the likely impact of the closure on the local community, including the loss of the building as a community facility;
- the availability, and likely cost, of transport to other schools;
- any increase in the use of motor vehicles which is likely to result from the closure of the academy, and the likely effects of any such increase;
Annex A: Listening period

This is provided as advice only. Academy trusts should seek independent legal advice to ensure they are fulfilling their legal obligations.

1. The department’s expectation, in all cases, is that academy trusts discuss their closure plans openly and transparently with all individuals and organisations likely to be affected by the closure, once a substantive decision has been given by the department.

2. The listening period should normally take place over a period of no less than four weeks (during term time, and not school holidays). It should set out the rationale for closure and plans the academy trust intends to put in place to transfer pupils to schools elsewhere in the local area. It should also propose a timeline for closure. A period of approximately 6 weeks should usually be allowed for representations to be made by any interested parties affected by these plans.

Information that should normally be provided to interested parties:

a) The name and the contact address of the academy trust considering closure.

b) The likely date of closure or, where it is proposed that the closure be implemented in stages, the dates of and information about each stage.

c) A statement explaining the reason why closure of the school is considered necessary.

d) The numbers (distinguishing between compulsory and non-compulsory school age pupils), age range, sex, and special educational needs of pupils at the school (distinguishing between boarding and day pupils) for whom provision is currently made.

e) A statement and supporting evidence about the need for school places in the area including whether there is sufficient capacity to accommodate displaced pupils.

f) In collaboration with the LA, agree a statement on the process for finding places at other schools or colleges for displaced pupils. Set out the provision that is to be made for pupils with special educational needs.

h) Where closure plans relate to a rural primary school; a statement that the trustees have considered the likely effect of the discontinuance of the academy on the local community, the availability and the likely cost to the LA of transport to other schools, any increase in the use of motor vehicles which is likely to result from the discontinuance of the school, and the likely effects of any such increase; and any alternatives to the discontinuance of the school (such as considerations around mergers/ amalgamations or community use).

i) Where the academy has a religious character, a statement about the impact of closure on the balance of denominational provision in the area and its impact on parental choice.
j) Where the plans for closure relate to an academy that provides sixth form education, what the likely impact of these plans will be on 16 to 19 year olds in the area in respect of their educational or training achievements their participation in education or training and the range of educational or training opportunities available to them.

k) Where existing provision reserved for pupils with special educational needs may be discontinued, a statement as to how the trustees believe their proposals are likely to lead to improvements in the standard, quality and/or range of the educational provision for these children.

l) The proposed arrangements for travel of displaced pupils to other schools including how the proposed arrangements will mitigate against increased car use.

The department considers the following individuals and organisations to be interested parties:

- The LA and any other LA likely to be affected by the closure, in particular any LA that maintains an EHC plan or statement of special needs in respect of a registered pupil at the academy or an academy with a looked after child. Where the LA is a County Council, the local district or parish council where the academy is situated;
- Local Authority County Councillors/Members;
- Pupils and the parents of pupils registered at the academy;
- Teachers and other staff at the academy;
- Parents of any pupils at other schools affected by the closure of the academy; including, for example the families of pupils at feeder schools;
- Any trade unions who represent staff at the academy;
- The MP for the constituency in which the academy is situated.
Annex B: Final account checklist

The Secretary of State will not agree to the early termination of a funding agreement, without an assurance statement from the academy trust’s Accounting Officer (AO) to confirm that funds received to the point of termination have been used for the purposes intended. The AO should also provide a written commitment that they will comply with the following checklist. They must:

- Make provision for the production of audited financial statements and accounts return (i.e. have tasked a member of the academy trust staff to produce the accounts and/or instructed their accountants to do so). This should be completed no later than 4 months after termination.
- Safeguard the academy’s accounting records, evidence and systems to facilitate the production and audit of the financial statements and accounts return.
- Share the forecast costs and cash flows expected to the point of termination and ensure funds are set aside to meet the cost of producing the audited Financial Statements and an accounts return.
- Ensure the academy trust has appointed and instructed an independent auditor, and a member of finance staff (or a trustee) is available to respond to audit queries from the independent auditor and the department who will be available ‘post closure’ in case there are final queries.
- Ensure a representative of the Board of Trustees has committed to sign off the Financial Statements that the Board has approved - as required by the Companies Act 2006.
Further Information

Queries can be submitted via the [online enquiry form](#).

- **Convert to an Academy: guide for schools** [www.gov.uk/guidance/convert-to-an-academy-information-for-schools](http://www.gov.uk/guidance/convert-to-an-academy-information-for-schools)
- **Regional Schools Commissioners** [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/schools-commissioners-group](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/schools-commissioners-group)
- **Charity Commission** [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/charity-commission](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/charity-commission)
• Establishing a new school: free school presumption

• Opening a free school
  www.gov.uk/government/collections/opening-a-free-school

• Sponsor an academy
  www.gov.uk/guidance/sponsor-an-academy

• Academies: funding, payments and compliance
  www.gov.uk/government/collections/academies-funding-payments-and-compliance

• Condition Improvement Fund guidance
  www.gov.uk/guidance/condition-improvement-fund

• Selective Schools Expansion Fund - GOV.UK

• The School Admissions Code
  www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-admissions-code--2

• Governance Handbook
  www.gov.uk/government/publications/governance-handbook

• Change your charity's governing document
  www.gov.uk/change-your-charitys-governing-document

• Boarding schools national minimum standards
  www.gov.uk/government/publications/boardingschools-national-minimum-standards

• Residential special schools national minimum standards

• Ofsted material change inspection

• Get information about schools (GIAS)
  www.get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/

• How to make changes to a maintained school
  www.gov.uk/government/collections/school-organisation
- **Opening and Closing LA maintained schools guidance**

- **Consultation principles guidance**

- **Independent School Standards**

- **Local Government Pension Scheme** [https://lgpsmember.org/](https://lgpsmember.org/)

- **Companies House** [www.gov.uk/topic/company-registration-filing/closing-company](www.gov.uk/topic/company-registration-filing/closing-company)

- **Charity Commission** [www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-close-a-charity](www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-close-a-charity)
This page is intentionally left blank
Appendix 2 – Stages of decision making (where need is identified by the local authority)

1. Stakeholder engagement event identifies need

   - Preferred provider
     - maintained school
     - Academy or Free School

   - Consultation phase

     - Executive Board permission to publish statutory notice – eligible for call in

       - Formal Consultation phase

         - Executive Board final decision – eligible for call in

           - Right of appeal to Schools Adjudicator

             - Design and Cost report to Executive Board – eligible for call in

             - Planning Permission

             - Design and Cost report to Executive Board – eligible for call in
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## School Organisation Advisory Board (SOAB) – history of objections (anonymised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOAB date</th>
<th>Objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 Jan 2019</strong> Benton</td>
<td><strong>Objection 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Please could I take this opportunity to object to the proposed increase in pupil numbers at this school, as it stands there are insufficient facility's, and it will increase the influx of pupils from areas where teaching and standards differ from Benton Park.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Objection 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;I write in regards to the plans to increase numbers at Benton Park. As a parent I feel that the capacity of pupils already on roll at the school is extremely high and feel that this has a detrimental effect on pupils due to the wide range of pupils who attend.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;It was of somewhat an eye opener as a parent of a pupil in Year 7 to the goings on with in the school and the way that issues are dealt with and also feel that there is a lot of goings on un-seen again due to the capacity. Expansions will only add to the already existing problems at the school although this plan if it was to go ahead would not impact on my child currently attending it would make me reconsider my younger child attending.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;To add to this the way that events such as parents evening something that is extremely important is already somewhat stretched and again is something that would to a contribution due to expansion as Well as the safety of parking for parents in the area. The school buses again is something that can become over-subscribed which in turn has a knock on effect.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;With the contributing factors Benton Park would spiral in my opinion in the wrong direction. It would not be a choice of school for us and think already it's a large enough school that needs to focus more on the teacher structure due to the amount of supply teachers in place and also the way that they deal and speak to students. There is a need for a more focused approach to issues that go on within the school before expansion is considered. Make something solid before building on weak blocks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **15 Aug 2018** Moor Allerton Hall | **Note all of these objections were subject to being challenged back by email to clarify some points and check if they really were objections**<br><br>**Objection 1**<br>Objection to the expansion<br><br>I am writing to object to the expansion of Moor Allerton Primary School. I currently have children at Talbot Primary but would now fall in to Moor Allerton catchment. My sister has a three year old who lives and is unlikely to get a place at Talbot next year, and would be most likely to be offered Moor Allerton.<br><br>I would not have wanted or accepted a place at a school which has been unpopular for several years and, whilst improving, has significant challenges to address. The three form entry system is not conducive to a nurturing environment. The issues which have been felt at Roundhay Primary are reflective of this and the impact of shaking up the classes to readdress the balance is detrimental to many pupils throughout their learning journey.<br><br>I think there needs to be a different system for entrance to Talbot for 2/3 years to readdress the issues caused by the bulge years and the impact of the siblings of this cohort. Currently, as you’ll know, the catchment is ludicrously small.<br><br>I feel the council has not fought for what parents actually want in the area, and the proposals provide an easy, but unsatisfactory solution to the problem. <br><br>**Objection 2**<br>Further to your email, I would like to register my **strong objection** to the proposal to expand Moor Allerton Hall Primary School. Though there is clearly a pressing need to provide more places for primary school places for children in Roundhay, this school is in a completely different postcode and is not a viable solution to the problem. My preference would be for an expansion of an existing...
good, desirable school - a school which is already successful and could cope with the extra influx of pupils.

**Objection 3**
Are the scheduled changes going to affect Talbot Avenue - please clarify. Are you affecting the school entrance to be on Talbot Avenue - Please clarify Are you aware that the current situation ALREADY puts pressure on the use of Talbot Avenue as a thoroughfare during school times What plans ARE scheduled for speed bumps on Talbot Avenue and parents NOT parking outside residents front gates - as ALWAYS happens? This is a highly congested avenue during school times - are you FULLY aware of the breach of peace to residents?

**Further email received 3 July 2018**

Little thought is given to the residents of this quiet area on Talbot Avenue and the Bentcliffes through to Lidgett. For example, Talbot Avenue and Lidgett Lane are high congestion areas and drivers zoom along these roads and block residents access - although you have addressed Lidgett Lane with speed bumps, you have failed to consider Talbot Avenue ( on the Moortown, LS17 side). Parents park outside gates, teachers leave cars all day outside our homes so that builders and utility companies working in the area cannot park on Talbot Avenue and generally there is a disrespect for this avenue. I urge you not to devalue this residential area further by totally jamming and congesting these routes and spread the buildings elsewhere. In the meantime, it is HIGH time we had speed bumps from the school entrance on Talbot Avenue to Bentcliffe - the misconception that this route is not abused now needs to be addressed. Speed signs do not work and are a waste of money.

**Objection 4**
As a resident of Brackenwood Drive I object the formally New Highwood pub expansion to another school.

While it is recognised that more child places are needed, there are already quite a few schools in the area and this is causing quite a lot of traffic congestion, especially at 8:45 and at 3:15pm. The Current traffic is already very heavy outside the Highwood Pub, and the surrounding areas. You really struggle to get through if you are turning into Brackenwood Drive from Lidgett Lane, there are vehicles which are parked up on both sides of the road and on the corners. People are also using the unofficial closed High Wood Pub car park as a drop off area, then pulling out of the site with no disregard to other on coming road users. This has to stop as this is also causing great congestion and confusion. I would appreciate if this will be surveyed by the Council at the peak times as described above.

In addition the People who are parking their vehicles on Brackenwood Drive so they can walk their children to school, or for that matter who are already on foot are leaving their litter behind. The amount of crisp packets, chocolate wrappers and cigarette butts that are left behind is unacceptable.

I would like to propose that you consider this application very carefully because I feel it will become more dangerous for family’s/children, and older people walking around this area, more litter and not to mention the congestion that will contribute to the air pollution.

Would you not consider the New Highwood pub being converted in to Extra Care Housing for older people. It would be an ideal location for older people to maintain their independence while receiving some support.

It would be easy for people who would be living there to access the buses as there are two bus stops near by. Also being near to the local shops, close to the community centre that have a lunch club. As well as contributing to the local community, this would also support the local housing problems where there is a shortage, and waiting in list at other extra care housing providers. There is only one nearby, which is a few miles away from this area, where as some of the schools nearby have already been expanded.

**Objections 5 and 6 (two objectors on one email)**
We are writing in response to the statutory proposal to permanently expand Moor Allerton Hall Primary School to 3FE. My wife and I are firmly in objection to this proposal and would ask that it is cancelled and a more appropriate solution considered. We have been involved in the campaign to highlight the lack of school places in Roundhay for over 2 years and have tried to work with the council to come up with good quality solutions; we have also studied all proposals presented and attended the consultations to understand what they would mean for us and future generations of children. I am sorry to say that the plans are not appropriate, these are our key reasons why:

The school is too far from the area of need, we cannot walk there with a child and would have to drive. I cycle to work and my wife drives, we also only have one car. So we either place the full burden on one parent or we buy another car at considerable expense and then contribute to the worsening air quality in Leeds (I note your other consultation on air quality proposals)

We are effectively outside of the catchment for this school, in other words if the families living closest to MAH preferred it then we would not get a place and we’re back to square one. There needs to be a new school north of Street Lane to meet the considerable and ongoing demand

You have not conducted a full traffic assessment and cannot reassure anyone that localised air pollution is not going to get any worse (it certainly won’t improve) and you also cannot say how you will manage that extra traffic. This is already a busy and dangerous road and this proposal puts lives at risk, there have already been accidents near the school involving children, how long before a child is knocked down and killed. What then? How will that sit on your consciences?

LCC has a poor record in early years development (using your own data) and it is shown that 3FE schools perform worse than 2FE. This is also a school that is currently rated RI and you expect it to improve whilst encumbering it with change and greater pupil numbers. What is the chance that this school makes it to where all schools should be, outstanding? I would say zero under your stewardship and that is really depressing

Your modelling data and record on school expansions is flawed, as a consequence you expand in the wrong places and waste public money. There are numerous examples where you have done this across the city, expanded a school and then not filled it, in the worst cases you have expanded a school and not even got the pupil numbers up to the pre-expansion level. This is incredulous. Historically this is not a popular school amongst the local population, expanding here is likely to be a waste of money and the school will not fill. If a parent has to get into a car to take their child to school (as the black hole parents will have to) then they will likely elect to go to a school even further afield but that has a better reputation and better outcomes. Our campaign group is full of parents trying to get their children into something approaching a local school, it also has the stories of many parents who have been allocated MAH (either through auto-allocation or by putting the school down as a backstop to avoid being given Khalsa) and who have tried every means to get their children sent to another school.

We implore you to think again and work with the local community, this is not a desired expansion and will not fix the problem. Don’t be wedded to this solution just because you have come this far down the track, you will gain more respect and engagement from local residents if you stop this and work with us and local academies to deliver good quality places where they are needed.

**Objections 7 and 8 (two objectors on one email)**

**Objection to Moor Allerton Hall Primary School Expansion**

We oppose the proposed expansion of Moor Allerton Primary School on the following grounds.

**NOTE - The reasons for the objection cannot be included in this document all of the points raised relate to a specific property and its location to the school and it would be very easy to identify who the objection came from. However it should be noted that the objection was very detailed and was considered fully by SOAB at the time the objections were made.**

<p>| 20 Feb 2018 | Note all of these objections were subject to being challenged back by email to clarify some points and check if they really were objections |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allerton C of E</th>
<th>Objection 1 (various emails from one objector)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dear [Redacted]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Also for clarification, my formal complaint is against Allerton Primary Schools intention to significantly increase pupil levels.  
I have not seen any plans for the extensions to the building. My thoughts are still that this location is not fit for purpose.  
Regards  |
| **Email 2**  | **I wish to formally object to any planning to extend the size of Allerton Primary School.**  
Regards  |
| **Email 1**  | **Dear [Redacted]**  |
| Please find email sent 27th Sept 2017 airing my concerns re the proposed extension of Allerton Primary School. I remain strongly against this proposal. I feel increasing the school to accommodate and extra 210 pupils will also inevitably increase the volume of traffic. Potentially 210 cars.  
It is clear that this school is badly situated, with it's one small entrance that creates a traffic bottle neck situation. It is fair to say it is no longer fit for purpose and our streets cannot cope with any more congestion.  
Regards  |
| **Objection 2**  | **As a resident on Lingfield Approach I do not think a doubling of the current pupils by 210 is a viable proposal.**  
Unfortunately the parking and traffic situation is extremely congested by cars, owned by both parents and residents parking on both sides of the road during the peak times of drop off and pick up. This has made it impossible to drive through both Lingfield Approach and the parallel road Lingfield View. |
I do believe the possible addition of another 200 or so cars at these peak times will increase the congestion on, Lingfield Approach and Lingfield View and also spread that further out. When I return from work at the peak time of school pick up it is impossible to get through and cars often have to reverse to let oncoming traffic through... Buses have also had to reverse... This with children and parents crossing the road and doors open to get children in their cars is an accident waiting to happen.

Another issue is current parents do not observe the permit parking restrictions in force on either side of the road on approach of the school entrance and this will also get worse. This is particularly hazardous as children frequently run across this particular part of the road without looking and an increase in vehicles in this area is extremely dangerous.

I do not believe that the surrounding roads can support another 200+ cars without posing an increased risk to safety. Parents reluctance to park farther from the school is already evident. Restriction of parking through double yellow lines is possible but it is unlikely to stop parents from parking there..parents do not observe the permit parking in force mainly due to the fact there is no one who patrols the area regularly to enforce it, so parents do not take it seriously.

While it is a great achievement for the school to want to expand/double it's intake... It might be possible if there were a few different entrances as some other schools have... i.e., nursery, reception, Yr 1,Yr 2 and another entrance for Yr 3&4 and a final entrance for Yr 5 & 6. This would spread out the traffic congestion. This however is unlikely to happen as providing different entrances would be expensive.

As the school stands with one entrance I do believe the proposal is not viable on the grounds if safety. I hope Leeds City Council thinks seriously about the safety issue and plan accordingly either way.

I also hope that the Leeds City Council will look at the current parking situation at these peak times. The current situation is at breaking point and desparately requires some attention and planning.

13 Nov 2014
Gledhow

Objection 1

The only two proposals listed are to expand Gledhow or Immaculate Heart, so is it now the case that either one or both will be chosen? Or will other options still be considered?

In September I will have children at Gledhow and also live nearby so have concerns with how expanding Gledhow would affect the school and the increase the traffic (increase in traffic was apparently used as the reason not to expand Allerton High). I expect that people living close to Immaculate Heart have similar views.

Both proposals look like they will just expand the catchment area when other primary schools might be closer. They seem to be the easiest and cheapest options, but not necessarily the best overall.

We have , one of which is already at Gledhow Primary School, and the other is due to start in September. We also live very close to the school. We do not agree with the proposal of expanding Gledhow Primary school due to the negative affect it may have on the school and the children that attend, and the increase in traffic that it would bring. The school has a lovely friendly and close atmosphere, which is commented on by Ofsted, and the children feel cared for. This might be eroded with a larger school. There are also concerns over the disruption and Health and Safety issues from the required construction work. More traffic would mean that the chances of someone being injured or even killed would be increased. It is also likely to increase issues with roads and drives being blocked and confrontation between drivers, such as fighting over parking spaces. Dog fouling on streets and near the school is already an issue, especially as there is a field at the back of the school used predominately by dog walkers. The current plans are to bring this field back into school use, which may mean that there is less dog fouling close to the school. However, it will probably mean that there is more fouling in the streets surrounding the school, as the field will no longer be able to be used. The current plan is to build new classrooms etc on part of the school playground. Although this loss would be compensated by bringing the field back
Objection 2

We have [redacted], one of which is already at Gledhow Primary School, and the other is due to start in September. We also live very close to the school. We do not agree with the proposal of expanding Gledhow Primary school due to the negative affect it may have on the school and the children that attend, and the increase in traffic that it would bring. The school has a lovely friendly and close atmosphere, which is commented on by Ofsted, and the children feel cared for. This might be eroded with a larger school. There are also concerns over the disruption and Health and Safety issues from the required construction work. More traffic would mean that the chances of someone being injured or even killed would be increased. It is also likely to increase issues with roads and drives being blocked and confrontation between drivers, such as fighting over parking spaces. Dog fouling on streets and near the school is already an issue, especially as there is a field at the back of the school used predominately by dog walkers. The current plans are to bring this field back into school use, which may mean that there is less dog fouling close to the school. However, it will probably mean that there is more fouling in the streets surrounding the school, as the field will no longer be able to be used. The current plan is to build new classrooms etc on part of the school playground. Although this loss would be compensated by bringing the field back into school use, this could not be used when wet. I understand there are plans for some of the current field to be converted to an all weather play area. I do not agree with increasing the number of primary school places available in the Roundhay area, if there are then also no plans to increase the number of secondary school places available. If there is a requirement to increase the number of primary school places in the Roundhay area, the demographic data clearly shows that the area of most need is around North Roundhay/Street Lane where Talbot Primary School is the nearest primary school. Proposing Gledhow just seems to be the cheapest and easiest option, but not the best one for the longer term.

15 Oct 2014

Hollybush

Objection

This is a formal note of my objection to the proposed expansion Hollybush primary school. The reason for my objection is that there is no detailed information available as to the nature of the expansion. Without this information it is impossible to tell the impact of the learning experience and the built environment which children will be exposed to as a result of this expansion. I suggest that the proposal for this proposed expansion is withdrawn until detailed plans of the nature of the expansion on site are forwarded.

I currently have one child in [redacted] year and in future years his younger [redacted] will attend Hollybush.

Please note my objection to this proposed expansion.
Report of Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support

Report to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Date: 12th June 2019

Subject: Scrutiny Inquiry ‘Is Leeds a Child Friendly City?’ - draft report

Are specific electoral Wards affected? [ ] Yes [x] No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):

Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration? [ ] Yes [x] No

Is the decision eligible for Call-In? [ ] Yes [x] No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? [ ] Yes [x] No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:
Appendix number:

Summary of main issues

1. At its initial meeting in June 2018, the Scrutiny Board agreed to adopt a thematic approach this year and undertake an inquiry based on the question ‘Is Leeds a child friendly city?’ seven years on from the introduction of Child Friendly Leeds.

2. The Board agreed to theme its inquiry sessions around the five outcomes set out within the Leeds Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP), with particular consideration given to how much the Council and partners have progressed towards delivering each outcome in relation to the following cohorts:
   - All children
   - Vulnerable Children
   - Looked After Children

3. This inquiry has now concluded and the Board is in a position to report on its findings and recommendations resulting from the evidence gathered. The Board’s draft report will therefore be made available in readiness for today’s meeting when Board Members will be asked to formally consider and agree its report.

4. Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 52 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 reported to the Scrutiny Board and considered before the report is finalised”.

Report author: Angela Brogden
Tel: 0113 3788661
5. Once the Board publishes its final report, the appropriate Director(s) will be asked to formally respond to the Scrutiny Board’s recommendations.

**Recommendation**

6. Members are asked to consider and agree the Board’s report following its recent inquiry.

**Background documents**¹

7. None

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council’s website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
Report of Head of Governance and Scrutiny Support

Report to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Date: 12th June 2019

Subject: Work Schedule

Are specific electoral Wards affected?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):

Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

Is the decision eligible for Call-In?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:

Appendix number:

1 Purpose of this report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the Scrutiny Board’s work schedule for the forthcoming municipal year.

2 Main issues

2.1 A draft work schedule is attached for consideration. Already included within the draft work schedule are the traditional items of Scrutiny work. These involve recommendation tracking of work previously undertaken by the Children and Families Scrutiny Board; performance monitoring reports and any Budget and Policy Framework Plans.

2.2 Members are also requested to reflect on all the information presented during today’s meeting and the discussion with those present at the meeting to draw up a list of potential areas for Scrutiny for the forthcoming municipal year.

3 Recommendations

3.1 Members are requested to;

(a) Consider and approve the work items already reflected within the attached draft work schedule.

(b) Reflect on all the information presented during today’s meeting and the discussion with those present at the meeting to draw up a list of potential areas for Scrutiny for the forthcoming municipal year.
(c) Request that the Chair and the Principal Scrutiny Officer consult with the relevant Director and Executive Board Members regarding resources in line with the agreed Vision for Scrutiny and report back to the next meeting with a more detailed work programme.

4. **Background papers**¹

4.1 None used

---

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council’s website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.
## Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)
### Work Schedule for 2019/2020 Municipal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Agenda for 12th June 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting Agenda for 3rd July 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Scrutiny Board meeting scheduled.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny Board Terms of Reference and Sources of Work (DB)</td>
<td>SEND Inquiry (RT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Update (PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Organisation Proposals and Objections Procedure (PRS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Working Group Meetings

### Site Visits

### Scrutiny Work Items Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>Pre-decision Scrutiny</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>Recommendation Tracking</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Development Briefings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Policy/Service Review</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)
## Work Schedule for 2019/2020 Municipal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Agenda for 25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2019</td>
<td>Meeting Agenda for 23&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2019</td>
<td>Meeting Agenda for 27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry into Child Poverty &amp; 3As (RT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 3As Strategy (PSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Working Group Meetings

### Site Visits

### Scrutiny Work Items Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>Policy/Service Review</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>Recommendation Tracking</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>Development Briefings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Pre-decision Scrutiny</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)
### Work Schedule for 2019/2020 Municipal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Scrutiny Board meeting scheduled.</td>
<td>Meeting Agenda for 22nd January 2020</td>
<td>No Scrutiny Board meeting scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance report (PM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Health Monitoring (PSR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020/21 Initial Budget Proposals (PDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best Council Plan Refresh – Initial Proposals (PDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Working Group Meetings

### Site Visits

### Scrutiny Work Items Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>Policy/Service Review</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>Recommendation Tracking</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>Development Briefings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Pre-decision Scrutiny</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)
#### Work Schedule for 2019/2020 Municipal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Agenda for 4th March 2020</td>
<td>Meeting Agenda for 1st April 2020</td>
<td>No Scrutiny Board meeting scheduled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Standards Report (PM)

### Working Group Meetings

### Site Visits

---

**Scrutiny Work Items Key:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>Policy/Service Review</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>Recommendation Tracking</th>
<th>DB</th>
<th>Development Briefings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Pre-decision Scrutiny</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>