

## Performance report for the financial year 2022/23

Date: Wednesday 08 June 2022

Report of: Director of Children and Families

Report to: Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

Will the decision be open for call in? Yes No

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes No

### What is this report about?

#### Including how it contributes to the city's and Council's ambitions

- This performance report provides an update on progress in delivering the council and city priorities in line with the council's performance management framework, offering assurance around the health of the social care system in Leeds. The Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) is the strategic document that guides the work of Children and Families. It supports, reflects, and complements the outcomes, priorities, and indicators set out in the Best Council Plan 2019-21, and the City's three pillar strategies, including the Health and Well Being Plan. A selection of the CYPP indicators is reported in Best Council Plan updates.
- Selected comparator information is mentioned in the appendices of this report. Further data are available in a range of online sources, including the DfE LAIT<sup>1</sup>, school performance tables<sup>2</sup>, the Annual Standards report<sup>3</sup>, and the Leeds Observatory<sup>4</sup>.
- Ofsted provide external validation through their inspection programme of local authorities' children's services, with the most recent inspection taking place in February 2022. Ofsted rated children's services as outstanding<sup>5</sup>, with this judgement maintaining the Ofsted rating from the November 2018 inspection. The inspection found that all the areas for improvement that were identified during the Focused Visit in July<sup>6</sup> have improved. Two recommendations have been made: one in relation to *clear contingency planning on children's written records*, and the other *for consistent decision-making as regards strategy discussions*. An Ofsted Inspection action plan is being developed to address these recommendations and other areas for ongoing improvement in line with the directorate's existing Covid-19 Transition Plan.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authority-interactive-tool-lait>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/documents/g9974/Public%20reports%20pack%2020th-Jul-2020%2013.00%20Executive%20Board.pdf?T=10> (pp263-302)

<sup>4</sup> <https://observatory.leeds.gov.uk/children-and-young-people/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50182665>

<sup>6</sup> <https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50168423>

- Children and Families remain 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 appendices one and two). More in-depth, operational service information is provided through weekly and monthly reports, ensuring that children and young people are safeguarded and receive appropriate support in a timely manner.

## **Recommendations**

Scrutiny members are asked to consider and comment on the performance information contained in this report, more specifically to:

- a) 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.
- b) Indicate how they would like to be involved in the refresh of the Children and Young People's Plan.

### Why is the proposal being put forward?

- 1 This performance report provides an update on progress in delivering the council and city priorities in line with the council's performance management framework. It is intended to provide assurance to Scrutiny that both strategic and operational objectives are progressing, accepting the ongoing impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. This impact is most prevalent in disruption over the last two years to formal assessment processes towards the end of the academic year, and the regular reporting of school attendance.

### What impact will this proposal have?

Wards Affected: n/a

Have ward members been consulted? Yes No

- 2 The CYPP is the strategic document that guides the work of Children and Families. Any progress referenced within this performance report will have an impact on the priorities and the outcomes within the CYPP.

### What consultation and engagement has taken place?

- 3 This is an information report and as such does not need to be consulted on with the public. However, all performance information included in this report is available to the public. The CYPP was last refreshed in 2017, which included consultation with leaders across the children's partnership in Leeds, young people, and elected members. Plans to refresh the CYPP in the coming months are underway; Scrutiny are asked to consider how they wish to be involved in this process.

### What are the resource implications?

- 4 The report has no direct resource implications. However, the Covid-19 pandemic is unprecedented and, as such, Children and Families has had to redeploy resources to areas of need with the highest priority to safeguard children and mitigate any impact on children's outcomes, both short and longer term. The current need to prioritise resources in response to Covid-19 and the related budget challenges are relevant in considering performance. Appendix one contains the Children and Families Covid-19 Transition Plan 2021/22, which sets out how the directorate will continue to deliver outstanding services that improve the lives of children, young people, and their families whilst ensuring financial sustainability.
- 5 Supporting the workforce to work flexibly, remotely and safely, including mitigating the risk of infection to the workforce has been a priority, particularly with front line staff working with children and families and for vulnerable staff (some of whom were shielding over the last 12 months). This has placed additional pressure on services.

### What are the legal implications?

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

## What are the key risks and how are they being managed?

- 7 Children and Families has eight risks: three corporate, and five directorate. The key corporate risk, which is subject to an annual risk assurance report, is 'safeguarding children' (the risk of harm, accident or death to a child linked to failure of the Council to act appropriately according to safeguarding arrangements).

## Does this proposal support the Council's 3 Key Pillars?

Inclusive Growth       Health and Wellbeing       Climate Emergency

- 8 This performance report provides an update on measures in the CYPP, which focuses on improving the lives and outcomes for children and young people living in Leeds. These measures were included after widespread consultation in 2017. Work on the new Best City Ambition will ensure that appropriate measures relating to children and young people are referenced under the appropriate pillars.
- 9 A response to the climate emergency is not explicitly covered in the CYPP measures. It is a priority for children and young people, reflected in our work with them and in our support for schools and in wider council work such as active travel. Children and Families has responded to the climate emergency through other reports that have been provided to Executive Board and Scrutiny, and through the risk management and Best Council reporting processes

## Options, timescales and measuring success

### a) What other options were considered?

- 10 Not applicable.

### b) How will success be measured?

- 11 The CYPP is the strategic document that guides the work of Children and Families. Any progress referenced within this performance report will have an impact on the priorities and the outcomes within the CYPP.

### c) What is the timetable for implementation?

- 12 The current CYPP covers 2018 to 2023. Plans are being developed to refresh the CYPP, with a consultation exercise planned for September. Views from children and young people will also be sought, with co-ordinated action with the Voice, Influence, and Change Team. A wider consultation exercise for elected members and key partners is also being planned. Scrutiny are asked to consider how and when they would like to be involved with the refresh exercise.

## Appendices

- 13 Appendix one (a) provides the latest city level data for measures in the CYPP. The DOT (direction of travel) column shows current trends. This is best viewed in colour, as improving performance may either be a reduction or an increase in numbers/percentages.

The latest national data are provided for context. There were 1,365 children looked after in Leeds at the end of March 2022 (a rate per ten thousand of 80.0), a rise of 87 from the previous March. This is due to both an increase in the number of children entering care, as referrals return to pre-pandemic levels, and a reduction in the number of children ceasing to be looked after. The attainment information in this appendix remains for the 2018/19 academic year, but will be updated for the next report, as examinations and assessments will take place this summer.

- 14 Appendix one (b) reports on a subset of the indicators contained in appendix one (a), but at cluster level. All information relates to children and young people living in the cluster, rather than schools located within the cluster, and is the most recently-available data for each indicator (note the different time periods for different indicators). The table shows that the most deprived clusters (based on data from the Indices of Multiple Deprivation) often have more open child in need and children looked after cases than those clusters that are less deprived, and that attainment is more likely to be lower in the more deprived clusters.
- 15 Appendix two provides an update on the three CYPP obsessions: children looked after; school attendance; and NEET and Not Known young people. A summary of the obsession updates is below:
  - *Children looked after.* The number of children looked after in Leeds has steadily risen since March 2021, with November's figure being in line with the pre-pandemic figure of March 2020 (1,344; a rate per ten thousand of 79.9). There were 1,365 children looked after in Leeds at the end of March 2022 (a rate per ten thousand of 80.0). The Covid-19 Transition Plan sets out the actions the directorate is taking to improve the lives of children looked after and care leavers.
  - *School attendance.* Leeds' primary schools remained in line with the 2020/21 academic year national attendance rate of 96.4 per cent (ranked 72 of 150 local authorities). Attendance at Leeds' secondary schools was 94.3 per cent, which is just below the national figure of 94.5 per cent (ranked 94 of 150 local authorities).
  - *NEET and Not Known.* The annual performance indicator for NEET and Not Known is based on the average figures for December, January, and February. Leeds' combined figure is 1,356 young people/7.8 per cent (NEET: 429 young people/2.5 per cent, Not Known: 927 young people/5.3 per cent) and is marginally lower than the previous year's figure of 1,302 young people/7.9 per cent. A statistical first release is still awaited, so no national rankings have yet been published.
- 16 The previously-included summary of the latest attainment information has been removed from the appendices of this report as it summarises data from the 2018/19 academic year and is significantly out-of-date. Examinations and assessments will take place towards the end of the 2021/22 academic year and a summary of those results will be provided with the next performance update, due at Scrutiny in January 2023.
- 17 Appendix three contains an update on an area that has previously been reported to Scrutiny: initial child protection conferences (ICPCs). Pressures associated with the

timeliness of ICPCs were seen in November due to uncertainties during the review and subsequent deployment of administrative staff across the Council. Interim safety plans were put in place to ensure that all children were appropriately safeguarded. There has been a marked increase in timeliness performance since the turn of the year.

## **Background papers**

18 None.

## Appendix one (a): CYPP key indicator dashboard - city level, March 2022

| Measure   | National                         | Stat neighbour                   | Result for same period last year  | Result June 2021                 | Result September 2021  | Result December 2021   | Result March 2022      | DOT | Data last updated                           | Timespan covered by month result |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----|---|----------------------------------|
| Number of children looked after   | 67/10,000<br>(2020/21 FY)        | 92/10,000<br>(2020/21 FY)        | 1278 (76.0/10,000)                | 1303<br>(77.5/10,000)            | 1330<br>(79.1/10,000)  | 1336<br>(79.4/10,000)  | 1365<br>(81.2/10,000)  | ▲   | Mar-22                                      | Snapshot                         |
| Number of children subject to a child protection plan   | 41.4/10,000<br>(2020/21 FY)      | 51.3/10,000<br>(2020/21 FY)      | 560<br>(33.3/10,000)              | 541<br>(32.2/10,000)             | 525<br>(31.2/10,000)   | 590<br>(35.1/10,000)   | 619<br>(36.8/10,000)   | ▲   | Mar-22                                      | Snapshot                         |
| Number of children with a child in need (CIN) plan  | Local indicator                  | Local indicator                  | 2754 (163.8/10,000)               | 2915<br>(173.3/10,000)           | 3207<br>(190.7/10,000) | 3556<br>(211.4/10,000) | 3349<br>(199.1/10,000) | ▲   | Mar-22                                      | Snapshot                         |
| Percentage of parents that have had more than one child enter care at different times                     | Local indicator                  | Local indicator                  | 26.7%                             | 27.5%                            | 25.9%                  | 23.8%                  | 25.8%                  | ▼   | Mar-22                                      | Rolling 12 months                |
| Percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage | 71.8%<br>(2018/19 AY)            | 70.8%<br>(2018/19 AY)            | 65.7%<br>(2017/18 AY)             | 66.4%<br>(2018/19 AY)            |                        |                        |                        | ▲   | Oct 19 SFR (no data for 2019/20 or 2020/21) | AY Confirmed                     |
| Infant mortality rates  | 3.8 / 1,000<br>2020              | 4.5 / 1,000 (U)<br>2020          | 5.1 / 1,000<br>2019               | 4.9 / 1,000<br>2020              |                        |                        |                        | ▼   | Mar-22                                      | Calendar year                    |
| Primary attendance  | 96.4%<br>(HT1-6 2020/21)         | 96.3%<br>(HT1-6 2020/21)         | 96.0%<br>(HT1-6 2018/19)          | 96.4%<br>(HT1-6 2020/21)         |                        |                        |                        | ▲   | 24/03/2022 SFR<br>(no data for 2019/20)     | HT 1-6 AY                        |
| Secondary attendance  | 94.5%<br>(HT1-6 2020/21)         | 94.5%<br>(HT1-6 2020/21)         | 94.2%<br>(HT1-6 2018/19)          | 94.3%<br>(HT1-6 2020/21)         |                        |                        |                        | ▲   |   | HT 1-6 AY                        |
| Rate of fixed-term school exclusions: primary   | 1.00 per 100 pupils<br>(2019/20) | 0.99 per 100 pupils<br>(2019/20) | 0.95 per 100 pupils<br>(2018/19)  | 0.63 per 100 pupils<br>(2019/20) |                        |                        |                        | ▼   | Jul-21 SFR                                  | AY                               |
| Rate of fixed-term school exclusions: secondary   | 7.43 per 100 pupils<br>(2019/20) | 9.29 per 100 pupils<br>(2019/20) | 11.91 per 100 pupils<br>(2018/19) | 7.21 per 100 pupils<br>(2019/20) |                        |                        |                        | ▼   | Jul-21 SFR                                  | AY                               |

| Measure  | National                     | Stat neighbour                       | Result for same period last year | Result June 2021      | Result September 2021 | Result December 2021 | Result March 2022 | DOT | Data last updated   | Timespan covered by month result |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----|---|----------------------------------|
| Percentage of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing, and maths at the end of Key Stage 2                 | 65%<br>(2018/19)             | 65%<br>(2018/19)                     | 61%<br>(2017/18)                 | 62%<br>(2018/19)      |                       |                      |                   | ▲   | Jan-20 SFR Confirmed (no data for 2019/20 - 2020/21)      | AY                               |
| Progress 8 score for Leeds at the end of Key Stage 4   | -0.03<br>(2018/19)           | -0.16<br>(2018/19)                   | -0.02<br>(2017/18)               | +0.03<br>(2018/19)    |                       |                      |                   | N/A | Feb-20 SFR Confirmed (no data for 2019/20 - 2020/21)      | AY                               |
| Percentage of young people with special educational needs at KS4 remaining in education, employment or training <sup>1</sup> | 89%<br>(2019/20 AY)          | -                                    | 86%<br>(2017/18 AY)              | 86%<br>(2019/20 AY)   |                       |                      |                   | ↔   | Oct 21 SFR  | AY                               |
| Prevalence of children at age 11 who are a healthy weight  | 57.8%<br>(2020/21)           | 56.6%<br>(2020/21)<br>Yorks & Humber | 63.2%<br>(2018/19)               | 64.4%<br>(2019/20)    |                       |                      |                   | ▲   | Jan 22 SFR (LA data not available for 20/21 due to covid) | AY                               |
| Proportion of young offenders who re-offend  | 34.2%<br>(England and Wales) | 29.8%<br>(Core Cities)               | 40.0%<br>(FY 2018/19)            | 36.6%<br>(FY 2019/20) |                       |                      |                   | ▼   | Jan 22 SFR  | FY                               |
| Teenage conceptions (rate per 1000)  | 15.8<br>(2019)               | 19.3<br>(2019)                       | 23.8<br>(2018)                   | 22.8<br>(2019)        |                       |                      |                   | ▼   | Sep-21  | Calendar Year                    |
| Alcohol-related hospital admissions for under-18s (rate per 100,000)   | 30.7<br>(2019/20)            | -                                    | 34.1<br>(2018/19)                | 27.8<br>(2019/20)     |                       |                      |                   | ▼   | Jun-21  | 3 FY pooled (2017/18-2019/20)    |
| Level 3 qualifications at 19   | 57.4%<br>(2019/20)           | 55.3%<br>(2019/20)                   | 50.1%<br>(2018/19)               | 51.1%<br>(2019/20)    |                       |                      |                   | ▲   | May-21 SFR  | AY                               |
| Young people who are NEET  | 2.8%<br>(2021 SFR)           | 3.0%<br>(2021 SFR)<br>Yorks & Humber | 395<br>(2.4%)                    | 453<br>(2.7%)         | 213<br>(1.3%)         | 332<br>(2.0%)        | 501<br>(3.07%)    | ▲   | Mar-22  | Snapshot                         |
| Young people whose status is 'not known'   | 2.7%<br>(2021 SFR)           | 3.3%<br>(2021 SFR)<br>Yorks & Humber | 854<br>(5.2%)                    | 646<br>(3.9%)         | 2009<br>(12.7%)       | 1007<br>(6.2%)       | 819<br>(5.02%)    | ▼   | Mar-22  | Snapshot                         |

**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

<sup>1</sup> Includes all pupils with a statement/EHC plan or on SEN Support

## Appendix one (b): CYPP key indicator dashboard - cluster level, March 2022



| Deprivation Rank                   | SAFE FROM HARM                                    |                  |  |                  |                                      |                  | PARTICIPATION & WELLBEING                |                  |   |                  |  |            | ATTAINMENT (due to COVID there will be no update for 2019/20 or 2020/21) |               |  |            |  |            |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|------------------|---|------------------|--|------------|--|---------------|--|------------|--|------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--|
|                                    | Number of open child in need cases <sup>1,2</sup> |                  | Number of children subject to a child protection plan <sup>1,2</sup> |                  | Children looked after <sup>1,2</sup> |                  | Young People who are NEET <sup>1,2</sup> |                  | Young People whose status is 'not known' <sup>1,2</sup> |                  | Prevalence of children at age 11 who are a healthy weight <sup>1</sup> |            | Healthy Weight (No update for 20/21)                                     |               | Early Years Foundation Stage: % GLD <sup>3,4</sup> |            | Reaching the expected standard in RWM at the end of KS2 <sup>3</sup> |            | Average Progress 8 Score <sup>3</sup> |            | Level 3 Quals at age 19 <sup>5</sup> |            |           |           |  |
| Time Period                        | IMD 2019  | As at 31/03/2022 |  | As at 31/03/2022 |                                      | As at 31/03/2022 |  | As at 31/03/2022 |   | As at 31/03/2022 |  | 2018/19 AY |  | 2020/21 HT1-6 |  | 2018/19 AY |  | 2018/19 AY |                                       | 2018/19 AY |                                      | 2018/19 AY |           |           |  |
| Leeds                              |   | 3,349 (199.1)    |  | 619 (36.8)       |                                      | 1,365 (81.2)     |  | 501 (3.07%)      |   | 819 (5.02%)      |  | 63.2%      |  | 96.4%         |  | 94.3%      |  | 66.4%      |                                       | 62%        |                                      | +0.03      |           | 49.9%     |  |
| Cluster                            | 1= most deprived; 22= least deprived              | No.              | RPTT   | No.              | RPTT                                 | No.              | RPTT                                     | No.              | %   | No.              | %  | %          | %  | %             | %  | Confirmed  | Confirmed  | Confirmed  | Confirmed                             | Confirmed  | Confirmed                            | Confirmed  | Confirmed | Confirmed |  |
| Aireborough                        | 19  | 89               | 121.4  | 12               | 16.4                                 | 31               | 42.3                                     | 13               | 1.7%  | 24               | 3.2%   | 70.9%      | 96.9%  | 93.7%         | 76.6%  | 70%        | +0.12  | 68.7%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| ARM                                | 17  | 132              | 98.8   | 19               | 14.2                                 | 35               | 26.2                                     | 14               | 1.1%  | 14               | 1.1%   | 67.7%      | 96.3%  | 93.3%         | 72.6%  | 73%        | +0.02  | 60.9%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton  | 4   | 194              | 221.9  | 45               | 51.5                                 | 115              | 131.5                                    | 48               | 5.7%  | 39               | 4.6%   | 58.3%      | 95.5%  | 91.1%         | 56.7%  | 51%        | +0.12  | 33.6%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Bramley                            | 3   | 185              | 252.8  | 9                | 12.3                                 | 73               | 99.8                                     | 50               | 6.5%  | 31               | 4.1%   | 61.1%      | 95.3%  | 90.9%         | 59.5%  | 58%        | -0.05  | 34.4%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Brigshaw                           | 14  | 49               | 96.5   | 11               | 21.7                                 | 16               | 31.5                                     | 7                | 1.4%  | 18               | 3.5%   | 62.8%      | 96.6%  | 93.1%         | 75.9%  | 60%        | -0.10  | 46.2%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| EPOS                               | 22  | 51               | 70.6   | 9                | 12.5                                 | 7                | 9.7                                      | 4                | 0.7%  | 15               | 2.6%   | 72.8%      | 97.4%  | 92.7%         | 78.6%  | 76%        | +0.22  | 55.6%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| ESNW                               | 16  | 69               | 138.4  | 13               | 26.1                                 | 22               | 44.1                                     | 9                | 1.9%  | 10               | 2.1%   | 71.2%      | 96.3%  | 90.9%         | 72.1%  | 68%        | -0.33  | 59.1%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Garforth                           | 18  | 16               | 46.7   | <5               | -                                    | 6                | 17.5                                     | 8                | 2.0%  | 14               | 3.6%   | 69.2%      | 97.0%  | 94.2%         | 78.3%  | 68%        | +0.49  | 51.5%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Headingley - Kirkstall partnership | 10  | 117              | 178.9  | 20               | 30.6                                 | 45               | 68.8                                     | 19               | 3.6%  | 18               | 3.4%   | 60.3%      | 95.7%  | 93.8%         | 66.7%  | 68%        | +0.04  | 59.8%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Horsforth                          | 20  | 46               | 113.3  | <5               | -                                    | <5               | -  | 2                | 0.5%  | 12               | 3.1%   | 75.7%      | 96.6%  | 94.5%         | 77.2%  | 76%        | +0.38  | 67.6%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Inner East                         | 1   | 353              | 243.4  | 70               | 48.3                                 | 220              | 151.7                                    | 47               | 3.7%  | 76               | 5.9%   | 58.1%      | 93.9%  | 90.3%         | 57.8%  | 48%        | -0.09  | 38.3%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Inner North East                   | 7   | 295              | 228.0  | 58               | 44.8                                 | 91               | 70.3                                     | 32               | 2.7%  | 61               | 5.2%   | 61.1%      | 93.6%  | 92.9%         | 59.0%  | 55%        | +0.16  | 48.9%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Inner West (ACES + Farnley)        | 6   | 275              | 309.6  | 70               | 78.8                                 | 87               | 98.0                                     | 43               | 4.7%  | 36               | 3.9%   | 57.6%      | 94.6%  | 91.5%         | 56.0%  | 56%        | +0.33  | 41.6%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| J.E.S.S                            | 2   | 323              | 280.3  | 67               | 58.1                                 | 165              | 143.2                                    | 68               | 6.0%  | 58               | 5.1%   | 52.9%      | 94.6%  | 92.7%         | 56.7%  | 50%        | +0.00  | 31.6%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Lantern Learning Trust             | 8   | 68               | 164.7  | 21               | 50.9                                 | 49               | 118.7                                    | 4                | 1.5%  | 14               | 5.3%   | 55.0%      | 92.9%  | 85.9%         | 60.6%  | 54%        | +0.16  | 36.1%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Leodis                             | 15  | 44               | 134.8  | 5                | 15.3                                 | 15               | 46.0                                     | 5                | 1.4%  | 12               | 3.3%   | 63.2%      | 97.4%  | 94.2%         | 64.1%  | 69%        | +0.32  | 59.9%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Morley                             | 11  | 129              | 154.4  | 19               | 22.7                                 | 51               | 61.0                                     | 17               | 2.1%  | 43               | 5.3%   | 64.9%      | 96.2%  | 93.7%         | 74.5%  | 70%        | +0.59  | 49.3%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Otley/Pool/Bramhope                | 21  | 52               | 129.8  | <5               | -                                    | <5               | -  | 6                | 1.4%  | 12               | 2.7%   | 68.4%      | 96.3%  | 94.4%         | 80.1%  | 72%        | +0.36  | 71.6%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Pudsey                             | 12  | 116              | 110.6  | 6                | 5.7                                  | 23               | 21.9                                     | 19               | 1.9%  | 25               | 2.5%   | 66.6%      | 95.8%  | 91.6%         | 72.1%  | 67%        | -0.10  | 45.9%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Rothwell                           | 13  | 81               | 124.3  | 34               | 52.2                                 | 33               | 50.6                                     | 8                | 1.3%  | 29               | 4.6%   | 68.8%      | 96.5%  | 91.0%         | 68.2%  | 68%        | -0.10  | 47.9%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Seacroft Manston                   | 5   | 319              | 315.0  | 36               | 35.6                                 | 140              | 138.3                                    | 52               | 5.2%  | 48               | 4.8%   | 60.1%      | 95.1%  | 89.3%         | 61.0%  | 62%        | -0.69  | 28.8%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |
| Templenewsam Halton                | 9   | 99               | 184.0  | 28               | 52.0                                 | 36               | 66.9                                     | 23               | 3.8%  | 23               | 3.8%   | 61.1%      | 94.8%  | 88.4%         | 70.1%  | 56%        | +0.12  | 44.3%      |                                       |            |                                      |            |           |           |  |

Key: AY - academic year  
(P) - Provisional data

### Notes

CYPP indicators reported at a cluster level are not comparable with citywide results, as the data used are not always from the same period.

- 1 - Data for this indicator show children and young people living in the cluster area, not attending schools in the cluster
- 2 - Data suppressed for instances of fewer than 5.
- 3 - Data for this indicator are by schools within the cluster, not by pupils living in the cluster area.
- 4 - GLD is Good Level of Development
- 5 - Based on the location of the school the young person attended when they were in Year 11; not where they gained the Level 3 qualification.

## Appendix two: the CYPP obsessions

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <p>Children looked after</p> | <p>1,365 children were looked after in Leeds at the end of March 2022, a rate per ten thousand of 80.0. The number of children looked after in Leeds has steadily risen since March 2021, with November's figure being in line with the pre-pandemic figure of March 2020 (1,344; a rate per ten thousand of 79.9). Our current children looked after numbers include 77 unaccompanied asylum seekers; this number has steadily increased in the last 18 months in line with our strategy to increase the number we have in the city.</p> <p>The number of children looked after has risen as the number of referrals accepted in Leeds have returned to pre-pandemic levels. Provisional year-end figure indicate that 12,606 referrals were accepted by Children's Social Work Service, which is 3,111 (23.7 per cent) more than were received in 2020/21, and 1,690 (15.5 per cent) more than 2019/20 (the last pre-pandemic financial year). This increase in demand has contributed to the rise in children looked after numbers, coupled with a slowdown in the number of children ceasing to be looked after as courts have a backlog of kinship care orders to discharge due to the long-term effects of the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>The Covid-19 Transition Plan sets out the actions the directorate is taking to improve the lives of children looked after and care leavers. This includes increasing the number of local authority foster carers and supporting children to live in stable arrangements; improving access and support for children looked after to mental and emotional health services and sexual health services; and increasing the number of care-experienced students accessing higher education. The Plan also reinforces the continued aim to safely reduced the number of children needing to become looked after.</p> <p>Leeds' position against national comparators will be available in the autumn, when the Department for Education releases data from the SSDA903 return on children looked after<sup>7</sup>. The most recent comparative data, from March 2021, shows the England average at a rate per ten thousand of 67, the core cities average at 94, and the Yorkshire and The Humber average at 78. All of these averages have risen slowly in recent years, and it is likely that rises will be recorded again in the 2021/22 figures due to the increasing demand for social care services across the country.</p> <p>The information in appendix one (b) provides data at cluster level. Included here is a breakdown of the children looked after cohort, which is based on a young person's home address before they enter care. This is a proxy for 'levels of need', showing where young people live before they enter care.</p> |
| <p>School attendance</p>     | <p><i>In-year academic year 2021/22 data</i></p> <p>Note: this information does not cover all schools, as the data return this is extracted from is not mandatory. It is, however, the best source of 'live' school attendance information available to the local authority. Further, the information is calculated</p>  |

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-looked-after-children>

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
|                    | <p>differently to the DfE data referenced above, as this data includes Covid-19 as an absence, which explains why the figures are somewhat lower than the DfE data.</p> <p>Data from a proportion of Leeds schools show that primary school attendance up to April was 92.9 per cent, which is half-a-percentage point higher than the national estimate of 92.5 per cent. Secondary school attendance in Leeds for the same period was 89.8 per cent, 0.2 percentage points higher than the national estimate of 89.7 per cent. Authorised illness, and unauthorised holiday absence were major factors in the Leeds attendance rates dipping slightly just before the Easter break.</p> <p><i>Attendance information for the 2020/21 academic year:</i></p> <p>Note: 2020/21 data is not comparable to previous years as the DfE had to consider sessions recorded as 'not attending in circumstances related to coronavirus'. When calculating attendance rates, the DfE have included sessions missed due to Covid in the number of 'possible sessions' (denominator) but have not counted them as an absence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leeds' primary schools remain in line with the national rate of 96.4 per cent. Of 150 local authorities, Leeds is ranked in equal 72nd position, placing it in quartile band C for performance. Leeds primary schools have a lower rate of authorised absence than all comparators (2.4 per cent), which is reflected in the ranking position of equal 17th out of 150 local authorities, placing it in quartile band A for performance. Persistence absence rates are in line with national with 8.8 per cent of pupil enrolments classed as being persistently absent. Leeds is ranked in equal 80th position, placing it in quartile band C for performance.</li> <li>Attendance rates for 2020/21 for Leeds' secondary schools is 94.3 per cent which is just below the national (94.5 per cent) and statistical neighbours (94.6 per cent). Of 150 local authorities, Leeds is ranked in 94th position, placing it in quartile band C for performance. The secondary authorised absence rate is lower than all comparators with 3.2 per cent of absences classed as authorised. Of 150 local authorities, Leeds is ranked in 15th position, placing it in quartile band A for performance. However, for unauthorised absence, Leeds is above the national and all other comparators except core cities, with 2.5 per cent of pupil absence falling under this category. Leeds is ranked in 132nd position, placing it in quartile band D for performance.</li> </ul> |
| NEET and Not Known | <p>In February, the DfE published figures for the annual performance indicator for NEET/Not Known. This indicator measures how effectively local authorities are tracking their young people and is based on the average figures for December, January, and February. The combined NEET/Not Known figure for Leeds is 1,356 young people/7.8 per cent (NEET: 429 young people/2.5 per cent, Not Known: 927 young people/5.3 per cent) and is marginally lower than the previous year's figure of 7.9 per cent. The gap between Leeds and national has however increased from 2.4 percentage points to 3.1 percentage points in 2022. This is due to national NEET/Not Known figures since November being lower than the corresponding months in the previous year. A statistical first release is still awaited, so no national rankings have yet been published.</p>   |

Figures at the end of March (see appendix one) show a rise in young people who are NEET from the previous month. There is a corresponding reduction, however, in the number of young people whose status is Not Known, suggesting that the status of more young people is being updated on a monthly basis.

The DfE also published in February the data for the September Guarantee; this demonstrates how young people are supported into post-16 education and training. The guarantee is about ensuring every young person of academic age 15 and 16 (Year 11 and Year 12) is entitled to have an appropriate offer in education, employment, and training by the end of September when they are in Year 12 and Year 13. The local authority is required to lead the September Guarantee process for 16-year-olds who are educated in their area, and for 17-year-olds who are resident in their area. The combined data show the proportion of young people in Year 11 and 12 who had an appropriate 'offer' remained broadly in line with last year's performance and equates to 16,058 out of 17,230 young people (93.2 per cent). This is against a backdrop of an increasing cohort, with 2,071 more young people being part of the September Guarantee cohort in 2021 than there were in 2018; in 2021, there were 689 more young people than there were in 2020. Nationally, performance improved by just over one percentage point to 95.5 per cent, increasing the gap between Leeds and national to 2.3 percentage points in 2021. Leeds ranked equal 131 out of 152 local authorities and was in the fifth quintile for performance.

### Appendix three: ICPCs

Pressures associated with ICPCs were recorded in November and December 2021. The Council is in the process of a complex, multi-faceted programme of efficiency reviews, which has included a review and subsequent revised model for the deployment of administrative staff across the whole Council to contribute to challenging corporate savings targets. Uncertainties during the review led to several experienced business support staff leaving their posts in the small Child Protection Team, which in turn resulted in pressures on other staff and a rise in staff absence.

ICPC timelines was directly affected by the reduced business support capacity; the response to this has been a key priority within the Covid-19 Transition Plan. Children's Services leaders worked closely with corporate colleagues to redeploy experienced business support staff from other directorates into the CP Team and to recruit additional business support staff as a matter of urgency as well as an extra agency chair to build capacity back to the necessary levels required to ensure the timeliness of ICPCs. Despite the best efforts of Children's Services and corporate leaders it took time to build the capacity with the CP Team back to the required levels; however, since January, performance has significantly risen and is on a clear and sustained upward trajectory. 145 more ICPCs (a 20 per cent increase) were carried out in 2021/22 than in 2020/21, reflecting the increasing demand across the safeguarding system.

| Month     | Month-only performance |
|-----------|------------------------|
| April     | 91.7%                  |
| May       | 92.5%                  |
| June      | 78.6%                  |
| July      | 70.1%                  |
| August    | 65.9%                  |
| September | 32.9%                  |
| October   | 56.3%                  |
| November  | 11.5%                  |
| December  | 11.4%                  |
| January   | 46.0%                  |
| February  | 74.4%                  |
| March     | 87.5%                  |

This has obviously been a concern for practitioners and managers. With system leaders moving quickly to ensure that children were appropriately safeguarded whilst waiting for a delayed conference, interim safety plans were developed and reviewed by team managers and service delivery managers, additional support services provided where necessary, planned child in need review meetings brought forward, and additional multi-agency meetings held. Service managers monitored this work to ensure that all teams and workers had plans in place where there was a significant delay.