



#ambitiousplymouth



Democratic Support

Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
West Hoe Road
Plymouth PL1 3BJ

Please ask for Amelia Boulter
T 01752 304570
E amelia.boulter@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published: 25 February 2016

AMBITIOUS PLYMOUTH

Monday 7 March 2016
10.00 am
Council House, Plymouth

Members:

Councillor Mrs Beer, Chair
Councillor Bowie, Vice Chair
Councillors Dann, Sam Davey, Deacon, Downie, Jordan, Mrs Nicholson, Riley, Singh and Tuohy.

Co-opted Representatives:

Edith Bayley (Statutory Co-opted Representative)
VACANT (Non Statutory Co-opted Representative)

Members are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business overleaf.

For further information on attending Council meetings and how to engage in the democratic process please follow this link - <http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/accesstomeetings>

Tracey Lee
Chief Executive

AMBITIOUS PLYMOUTH

1. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTION

To receive apologies for non-attendance by Ambitious Plymouth members and to note the attendance of substitutes in accordance with the Constitution.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members will be asked to make any declarations of interest in respect of this agenda.

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)

To confirm the minutes of the last meeting held on 1 February 2016.

4. CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS

To receive reports on business which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be brought forward for urgent consideration.

5. CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION (Pages 5 - 20)

The Panel to note the report from the Child Sexual Exploitation Review.

6. SCHOOL STANDARDS REPORT (Pages 21 - 24)

The Panel to receive a report on GCSE and SATs results.

7. REGIONALISING ADOPTION - REGIONAL ADOPTION AGENCIES (Pages 25 - 32)

The Panel to receive a report on changes from the Adoption Bill.

8. HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT SERVICE (Pages 33 - 36)

The Panel to receive a report on the Home to School Transport Service.

9. AMBITIOUS ACHIEVEMENTS 2015 - 16

The Panel to reflect on their achievements for 2015-16 and to submit items for the Annual Scrutiny Report.

10. TRACKING RESOLUTIONS (Pages 37 - 38)

The panel to review and monitor the progress of tracking resolutions and receive any relevant feedback from the Cooperative Scrutiny Board.

II. WORK PROGRAMME

(Pages 39 - 40)

To review the Ambitious Plymouth work programme 2015 – 2016.

This page is intentionally left blank

Ambitious Plymouth**Monday 1 February 2016****PRESENT:**

Councillor Mrs Beer, in the Chair.

Councillor Bowie, Vice Chair.

Councillors Dann, Sam Davey, Deacon, Downie, Jordan, Riley, Singh and Tuohy.

Co-opted Representatives: Edith Bayly (Statutory Co-opted Representative)

Apologies for absence: Councillors Mrs Nicholson

Also in attendance: Wendy Brett - Principal, Sir John Hunt, Heidi Price - Headteacher, Yealmpstone Farm Primary School, Giles Philips - Compton C of E Primary School and Louise Kelly - Sports Development Unit, Jo Siney - Head of Special Educational Needs and Disability, Judith Harwood - Assistant Director for Learning and Communities, Jayne Gorton – Lead Officer, Julie Reed – Principal Admin Officer and Amelia Boulter – Democratic Support Officer,

The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 11.30 am.

Note: At a future meeting, the committee will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.

37. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made in accordance with the code of conduct –

Name	Minute Number	Reason	Interest
Councillor Mrs Beer	Minute 41 – Send Framework 2015 – 18	Chair of Plumtree Children’s Centre	Personal
Councillor Jordan	Minute 40 – Work of the Plymouth School Sports Partnership	Trustee of Plymouth Youth Sailing and involved in various sporting groups	Personal

38. **MINUTES**

Agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2016 are confirmed as a correct record.

39. **CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chair highlighted to the Panel her recent visit to the Cold Truth Exhibition which focuses on child sexual exploitation. The Chair urged members to visit the exhibition at the Radiant Gallery, Derry's Cross which exhibits until 29 April 2016.

40. **WORK OF PLYMOUTH SCHOOL SPORTS PARTNERSHIP**

Wendy Brett, Principal, Sir John Hunt, Heidi Price, Headteacher, Yealmpstone Farm Primary School, Giles Philips, Compton C of E Primary School and Louise Kelly, Sports Development Unit were present for this item. It was reported that -

- (a) following changes to funding 2010 the Plymouth Sports Schools Partnership was established bringing together the two city's sports schools;
- (b) the partnership provides fantastic opportunities for inter school competitions, links to elite coaching, leading lessons in primary schools and improving the standard quality of PE Teaching;
- (c) it encourages responsibility and healthy lifestyles for children and young people;
- (d) they were looking to set up a CIC to generate income and a legacy for Plymouth, tying in with the Thrive agenda and looking at opportunities within the city for young people.

The Panel were shown a very inspirational video and felt that this was a fantastic opportunity for children and young people across the city.

The main areas of questioning from Members related to the following -

- (e) engagement with children with disabilities, including autism;
- (f) obesity in children;
- (g) funding for sports club and lack of engagement with schools;
- (h) funding arrangements and the CIC;
- (i) how do you sell the School Sports Partnership to schools;
- (j) engagement of private schools;
- (k) the cost implication for teacher release;
- (l) definition of an elite athlete and what support provided to an elite athlete.

Agreed that when the Community Interest Company has been set up and in operation the Plymouth School Sports Partnership to comeback to Ambitious Plymouth Panel to provide a progress update in the new municipal year.

41. **SEND FRAMEWORK 2015-2018 - 6 MONTHLY UPDATE**

Jo Siney, Head of Special Educational Needs and Disability and Judith Harwood, Assistant Director for Learning and Communities provided the panel with a 6 month progress report. It was reported that –

- (a) the key areas of work included –
 - improving the quality of data;
 - clear policies and processes were in place that worked for schools and families;
 - good progress made in specialist support centres for children with specific speech impairments and similar support provided for hearing impairments;
 - for the 14 – 25 years provision for young people with SEND active work had taken place over the last year to understand the offer of choice for young people to maximise their independence.
- (b) good progress had been made against the implementation plan;
- (c) by quality assuring the provision this would provide data which would allow them to review the impact the provision was making to improve the outcomes for children and young people.

The main areas of questioning from Members related to the following -

- (d) definition of a support centre;
- (e) provision for children with sight issues;
- (f) who was invited to attend the SENCO Conference;
- (g) the number of children presenting from troubled families;
- (h) training for early years staff;
- (i) provision for 14 – 25 years and the huge gap at the more severe end that fall through the gaps in provision.

Agreed that the Ambitious Plymouth Panel is provided with a further progress report on the SEND Framework 2015 – 2018 in the new municipal year.

42. **TRACKING RESOLUTIONS**

The Panel noted the progress made with regard to the tracking resolutions.

43. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Panel noted the work programme.

44. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

There were no items of exempt business.



PLYMOUTH
CITY COUNCIL



CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

Co-operative Scrutiny Review 2016

Contents	Pages
Chair's Foreword	1
Membership and Methodology	2
What is Child Sexual Exploitation?	3
Prevalence of Child Sexual Exploitation	5
The Plymouth Response	7
Recommendations	11

Chairs' Foreword

The Ambitious Plymouth Scrutiny Panel is pleased to present this report that follows a Co-operative Review on child sexual exploitation (CSE) in Plymouth.

The Jay report on child sexual exploitation in Rotherham has led us to carry out review to understand what is happening in Plymouth and how children and young people are being kept safe.

The OFSTED report of Plymouth City Council in 2015 highlighted how Plymouth had responded to national reports on child sexual exploitation and reported that *“The development of multi-agency arrangements to protect children from sexual exploitation (CSE) is relatively recent and, while there are signs that they are effective, it is too early to see the full impact”*.

Scrutiny continues to hold a specific and important role in the oversight of significant issues affecting the population. Difficult issues are all too easily ignored but in Plymouth committed to addressing the findings of the Robert Francis report on the care in Mid-Staffordshire, and the Jay report, which both flagged scrutiny as too often being absent or inadequate. By undertaking scrutiny into issues such as child sexual exploitation scrutineers are ensuring that all elected members, as representatives of the community and as corporate parents, can be assured that the right policies, processes and actions are in place to protect children.

We would like to thank those people who participated in this review and share openly their views and concerns on this important subject. We were impressed with the dedication and professional commitment of those who came to meet us.

Child sexual exploitation is still a largely hidden and unknown crime. The only way that agencies will tackle this issue is by working together. We were encouraged by the progress that has been made in Plymouth and across the South West Peninsula in this regard.



Councillor Mrs Beer
Chair, Ambitious Plymouth



Councillor Bowie
Vice-Chair, Ambitious Plymouth

Membership

The co-operative review was made up of six elected Members.

- Councillor Mrs Beer
- Councillor Bowie
- Councillor Mrs Bowyer
- Councillor Sam Davey
- Councillor Jordan
- Councillor Singh

Officers co-opted to support the work of the Co-operative Review included –

- Siobhan Wallace
- Charles Pitman

Members were advised that the information that would be shared with them could be distressing and they were directed to the Council's Occupational Health provider for support if required.

Methodology

The support officers undertook a literature search of national and regional policy in this area. The review group agreed that the review be undertaken by inviting written responses through a call for evidence and subsequently invited relevant organisations to meet with the review over a number of sessions.

The following organisations and people agreed to participate:

- Plymouth City Council
- Devon and Cornwall Police
- Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board
- Barnardos
- Plymouth Octopus Project (written response)

Context

Throughout the witness sessions and evidence provided to the review group the following understanding of Child Sexual Exploitation, its victims, perpetrators, impact and prevention was developed.

What is Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE)?

CSE is a form of sexual abuse that involves the manipulation and /or coercion of young people under the age of 18 into sexual activity in exchange for things such as money, gifts, accommodation, affection or status. The “grooming” process involves befriending children, gaining their trust, often encouraging them to drink alcohol and take drugs, sometimes over a long period of time before abuse begins. This abusive relationship involves an imbalance of power which leaves child or young person feeling that they have limited options. This form of abuse has often misunderstood by victims and professionals and historically it has been considered by some professionals to be “consensual”.

CSE can manifest itself in different ways. It can involve an older perpetrator exercising financial, emotional or physical control and violence. It can also involve peers manipulating or forcing victims into sexual activity. As seen in areas such as Rotherham sexual exploitation can also involve organised networks of perpetrators who enable the abuse of young victims in different locations.

Technology is widely used by perpetrators as a method of grooming and coercing victims, often through social networking sites and mobile devices¹ (Jago et al 2011) this form of abuse usually occurs in private or semi-private places such as parks, and areas where young people are known to congregate.

Who is likely to be sexually exploited?

Sexual Exploitation could happen to any young person whether in urban and rural location, a range of ages, male and female, and from any ethnic background. Victims have been identified from heterosexual, gay, lesbian, and bisexual orientations.

Child Sexual Exploitation and Online Protection Centre’s (CEOP) national research and thematic assessment² analysed over 2,000 known victims of CSE. The vast majority were female, although in 31% of cases the gender was unknown. It is recognised that additional difficulties in reporting / recognising sexual exploitation in boys and young men is likely to have led to an under-representation of male victims.

There was inconsistent data with regard to ethnicity, however the report identified that of the cases reviewed 61% of victims were white, 33% were of unknown ethnicity, 3% were classified as Asian, and 1% of victims were recorded as being black. Victims most commonly become known to statutory and non-statutory agencies at the age of 14 and 15, although victims as young as 9 years old were identified.

¹ http://www.beds.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/121873/wgoreport2011-121011.pdf

² https://www.ceop.police.uk/Documents/ceopdocs/ceop_thematic_assessment_executive_summary.pdf

Researchers recognise that children who go missing and/or are in care are at heightened risk of CSE. CEOP's assessment found that in 1,014 cases where this information was recorded, 842 (83%) were also reported missing on at least 1 occasion.

The features of children's background experiences that are likely to make them more vulnerable to the risk of CSE are –

- Living in chaotic and dysfunctional households (with features of parental substance misuse, domestic abuse, parental mental health, and parental criminality)
- History of abuse (sexual, physical, emotional and neglect)
- Recent bereavement or loss
- Attending education settings with children already sexually exploited
- Learning disability
- Unsure of sexual orientation
- Friendships with children being sexually exploited
- Homeless
- Low self esteem
- Young Carer
- Living in care/Hostel/Foyer

What are the signs and symptoms of CSE?

The signs and symptoms of CSE are often mistaken for “normal” teenage behaviour as young people push and test the limits of parental and societal expectations. There are a range of vulnerabilities which can impact on young people and the risk of exploitation increases if young people are subject to more than one vulnerability. Parents, carers, and all agencies delivering services to/for young people need to be alert to the following signs and symptoms

-

- Underage sexual activity
- Visiting hotels or unusual locations
- Going missing from home or care
- Truancy or opting out of education altogether
- Changes in the way they dress, and having unexplained amounts of money
- Having older male and female friends
- Getting in and out of cars driven by unknown adults
- Receiving gifts from unknown sources
- Having multiple mobile phones and worrying about losing contact via mobile
- Mood swings, volatile behaviour, emotional distress, self-harm or thoughts of suicide
- Drug or alcohol misuse
- Criminal Behaviour
- Suffering physical injuries or sexually transmitted infections
- Unwanted pregnancies
- Displaying inappropriate sexualised behaviour
- Associating with or recruiting other young people into sexual exploitation

(Berelowitz et al 2012³)

Who are the perpetrators?

According to the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry, there is a great deal that we do not currently know about the perpetrators of CSE. This is partly because agencies rarely record data on perpetrators, and when they do, it is incomplete and inconsistent. Frequently victims only know their abusers by aliases and nicknames, or they can only provide physical descriptions as children are often heavily intoxicated by drugs and alcohol, and abused by multiple men. For these reasons, many abusers remain unidentified, and the actual number of abusers is likely to be far higher than those reported (Berelowitz et al 2012⁴).

Of the identified perpetrators, the vast majority are men and boys. The Children's Commissioner's study found that 72% were male, 10% female, and 19% gender was undisclosed. Perpetrators often exacerbate their victims' vulnerabilities to gain, and maintain control over their victims and create a distance from the people who may be able to protect them (CEOP 2011⁵).

What is the prevalence of CSE?

It is difficult to assess the numbers of victims of CSE, as a "hidden" form of abuse which leaves victims reluctant to make disclosures. Many young people do not even consider that they are being abused as those perpetrating the abuse manipulate them into believing they are in loving relationships, or they are dependent upon the abuser for protection (CEOP 2011⁶).

There is no Home Office code for the recording of CSE within police databases and as a result the data relating to CSE is therefore partial, concealed in other categories of data, or simply unrecorded. In addition, when perpetrators are convicted for involvement in CSE cases, there is no specific crime of child sexual exploitation.

The Children's Commissioner's Inquiry estimated from the evidence that 16,500 children in the UK were at risk of CSE. Owing to the reasons above, figures of reported victims is likely to be an underestimate of the true prevalence of CSE in the UK.

Information from Devon and Cornwall Police indicated that around three children or young people per thousand living in our area reported sexual offences against them last year, with girls and young women reporting most of the offences. These figures are not a true picture of the extent of child exploitation within the city due to the lack of recording/flagging of CSE as a factor in these crimes. Both the recent OFSTED report on services for Children provided by Plymouth City Council and Local Safeguarding Board⁷, and the HMIC Police

³<http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/1%20thought%201%20was%20the%20only%20one%20in%20the%20world.pdf>

⁴<http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/1%20thought%201%20was%20the%20only%20one%20in%20the%20world.pdf>

⁵ https://www.ceop.police.uk/Documents/ceopdocs/ceop_thematic_assessment_executive_summary.pdf

⁶ https://www.ceop.police.uk/Documents/ceopdocs/ceop_thematic_assessment_executive_summary.pdf

⁷ <http://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/local-authorities/plymouth>

Effectiveness review 2015 (vulnerability)⁸ identified that further work was required by all bodies to understand fully the extent of CSE in the City. The review group noted that both inspection regimes also reported that progress was being made in this area by all of the partner agencies.

What is the impact of CSE?

CSE can have an ongoing and devastating impact on a victim's physical and mental health and development. It can also have profound long-term effects on a young person's social integration, economic well-being, and is likely to adversely affect their long term life chances. Some of the difficulties faced by victims' include:

- Isolation from family members
- Teenage pregnancy/parenthood
- Failing examinations or dropping out of education
- Unemployment
- Mental Health problems extending in adulthood
- Suicide attempts
- Alcohol and drug dependency
- Aggressive behaviour
- Criminal Activity

It is likely that victims may need intensive multi-agency support to mitigate the long term damage inflicted by CSE.

How can we prevent CSE?

Raising awareness amongst young people, parents and carers, the professional networks working with children, and those working with adults living in chaotic households is key to prevention. Campaigns and training for professionals to ensure identification of vulnerabilities and the signs and symptoms of CSE are essential.

⁸ <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmic/wp-content/uploads/police-effectiveness-vulnerability-2015-devon-and-cornwall.pdf>

The Plymouth Response

Do we have a local CSE strategy and action plan?

A South West Peninsula Child Sexual Exploitation currently is in place and adopted by the Safeguarding Children Boards in respective local authority areas.

Its aim is to:

- Inform the strategies and action plans maintained in each local authority taking into account statutory guidance and
- Inspire continuity and common practice across the Peninsula.

The strategy⁹ sets the framework for local action which is led by the South West Peninsula CSE Protocol¹⁰ and sets out the policies and processes to enable local agencies to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation.

Locally in Plymouth there is a strategic and operational CSE group. As a sub group of the PSCB the strategic group is chaired by the police and the operational group is chaired by manager of REACH (Reducing Exploitation and Absence from Care and Home) team. Intelligence is shared on an operational basis amongst relevant and appropriate agencies including Plymouth City Council, Police and Schools.

The NWG risk assessment tool¹¹ is currently in use in the city which allows members of the public and professionals to explore the vulnerabilities and indicators present in a young person who could be at risk of CSE and support a referral to relevant agencies.

CSE was highlighted by both Plymouth City Council and Devon and Cornwall Police as a key priority, the review group held an extensive witness session with representatives of Plymouth City Council, Devon and Cornwall Police and the Chair of the local safeguarding board who provided details of the current system and how it might be improved. The group also received a copy of the Plymouth Safeguarding Board CSE implementation plan.

How effective is the Local Safeguarding Children Board?

The review group met with the chair of the Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board who reported –

- Membership of the Board is wide ranging and representative of the whole community, senior officers from partnership agencies are members of the board
- All members of the Board have important roles as Board members; these roles are often different and additional to their “day jobs”.
- A review of the capability of LSCB staff was currently underway; there was also Proposals under consideration for the creation of a full time CSE coordinator on behalf of the board.

⁹ <http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/pscbpeninsulacsestrategy.pdf>

¹⁰ <http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/pscbpeninsulacseoperatingprotocol.pdf>

¹¹ http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/cse_risk_assessment_tool.pdf

- The Board linked into wider national and regional networks for information sharing and best practice exchange.
- There was strong leadership in respect of CSE and the governance underpinning the work of the Board was in place and further development was being planned.
- A key priority for the board was the CSE profile for the city this was under development and consultation with the Board
- Operations Global, Weevil and Illustrate were three operations which had demonstrated partnership working around CSE.
- More work was required on awareness raising and prevention.
- The Board was implementing learning received from the HMIC report and OFSTED report of 2015.
- A communication plan for the Board was also a priority and would be developed; the Board had a role to stitch together information from across the city and required a higher profile to do so.

The review group was assured that the Board had effective leadership and the developments and priorities as outlined by the chair assured the group that progress to a better understanding of CSE and its impact was clearly being made.

Does the relevant scrutiny panel receive the LSCB's annual report, and use this to challenge local priorities and outcomes?

Currently the Ambitious Plymouth Scrutiny Panel, the relevant panel for Children and Young People does not receive updates from the Local Safeguarding Children Board nor its annual report. Given that the issue of Child Sexual Exploitation is expected to be subject of ongoing review this situation will be rectified in the new municipal year.

What other multi-agency forums exist to facilitate joint working?

The review group was assured that a number of groups and forums existed to facilitate joint working, this included governance surrounding the integrated health and wellbeing programme, children's partnership and the PSCB and sub groups. However the group felt there should be a single group which is seen to lead on this work.

How is CSE incorporated into local training programmes, and who is able to access this training?

The review group were made aware that CSE had been introduced into the programme of training offered by the PSCB.

Local Safeguarding Children Boards are required to ensure the distribution of up-to-date best practice to all agencies and as such the Board is providing –

- Formal, structured higher level learning, including lectures, reading texts, comparative theories, and learning audits
- Facilitated by lead professionals working in the field, specially trained by Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board (PSCB) to deliver informed and detailed learning
- Multi-agency, bringing together core workers from at least six different agencies onto each course to ensure a culture of networking and sharing
- Certificated and accredited, as the lead agency for Safeguarding in Plymouth.

The review group was assured that training opportunities were in place; in particular the group was pleased to see that licensed taxi drivers had undertaken CSE training. The group did however feel that further work was required to drive the take up of training by groups across the city, particularly those in the voluntary and community sector and that the issue of cost may also be a factor to be reviewed.

Is awareness raising programme in place for children, families and the wider community?

The review group was made aware of the “We’re worried about you”¹² leaflet produced by the PSCB and work carried out in the taxi and hospitality trades. However the group remained concerned that the level of awareness of CSE, the signs, symptoms and routes to raise concerns were not clear and a high profile campaign was required to raise awareness of CSE. In particular the group was disappointed at the lack of response to the “Call for Evidence” which they felt was a sign of a lack of awareness amongst partner organisations.

What support is available to current, potential and historic victims of CSE?

The panel met with Kerstin Neason following the submission of evidence from the Barnardos’ BASE project. Kerstin explained that –

- The Barnardos Against Sexual Exploitation (BASE) service had been in place for 5 years and was entirely funded from voluntary funds at around £200K per year. The service employed 3.5 FTE and more staff as required.
- Since the submission of evidence had been provided demand on the service had increased and the service was seeing approximately 50 young people a year.
- Due to the rise in demand higher thresholds had been put into place and young people were being declined the service and signposted elsewhere. 40% of referrals into the service were being declined
- The service worked one to one with young people and helps them to re-engage with other services. The service worked with families or individuals for up to 18 months.
- Exiting the service was a particularly difficult for many young people as there was no “step down” services available to build on the work the BASE service had carried out.
- Multi-agency workforces had received training from Barnardos and were spotting more cases of CSE. In particular workshops had been run to enable the identification of young men that may be at risk of or showing symptoms of being exploited and since those workshops the numbers of referrals had increased.
- There were gaps in the service and Barnardos would be carrying out more work to understand CSE within Black and Minority Ethnic Communities and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender communities.
- There was lack accountability on the BASE service; there was no accountability to the Local Authority and Members as Corporate Parents.
- The service was entirely reactive; there was no capacity for development work with communities and further workforce development was required.

¹² http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/we_are_worried_leaflet.pdf

The review group was made aware of the work of the Targeted Youth Service, the NSPCC and Twelves Company who also support victims of CSE.

Recommendations

1. Agreed that the members were assured that strategies and action plans are in place to tackle child exploitation in Plymouth. It was felt however that the CSE implementation plan required refinement and should return to scrutiny in the future.
2. Agreed that the Plymouth Safeguarding Board should be promoted as the lead body with regards to Child Sexual Exploitation.
3. Agreed that the Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board should promote CSE training more widely and review its pricing structure to allow small community groups with limited resources to undertake this training. This would be subject to a report at a future scrutiny meeting.
4. Agreed to recommend to the Plymouth Safeguarding Children's Board that a comprehensive and wide ranging communications plan should be developed in relation to CSE. In particular this should include a high profile awareness raising campaign in which all partner agencies should play a key part and should be particularly focused at General Practitioners and Schools.
5. Agreed that the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Co-operative Commissioning should explore how more robust and resilient services for victims of CSE should be developed in partnership with other statutory agencies and non-statutory agencies already providing services. This will be subject to scrutiny in the future.
6. Agreed to recommend to the Co-operative Scrutiny Board that the Scrutiny Panel responsible for Children's services will receive regular updates from the Local Safeguarding Children's Board to include the annual report and specific updates on progress in tackling CSE.
7. Agreed to recommend to the Cabinet with responsibility for Co-operative Commissioning that Voluntary and Community Sector organisations delivering support for those subject to Child Sexual Exploitation in the city are invited to join System Design groups supporting the four Integrated Commissioning Strategies.
8. Agreed to recommend to the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Co-operative Commissioning that consideration is given to formally commissioning a Child Sexual Exploitation service which would include and appropriate step-down service.
9. Agreed to recommend to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner that consideration is given to the further development of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre in Plymouth to ensure that young people in Plymouth who have been subject of CSE are able to receive the appropriate support without having to visit Truro or Exeter.

10. Agreed to recommend to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner that they consider how through partnership an advocacy service can be developed to support CSE victims akin to an IDVA used in domestic abuse cases.
11. Agreed that the Scrutiny Panel with responsibility for children and young people will receive the quarterly report written by Barnardos' on their BASE service.

This page is intentionally left blank

School Standards Report to Ambitious Scrutiny 7th March 2016



The Education and Adoption Bill proposes a significant change to the role of the Local Authority (LA) in relation to school standards and pupil achievement. The Bill effectively removes the responsibility from the LA to monitor, challenge, support and intervene in schools in terms of school improvement and attainment. This whole area of work passes to the Regional Schools Commissioner who currently undertakes this function in relation to academies (including Free and Studio Schools and University Technical Colleges). The LA role as champion for all children and young people remains as does the duty to promote the best outcomes for school leavers, safeguard children and young people (including Prevent and extremism), place, shape and provide for Special Educational Need and Disability (SEND).

This report is structured by Key stage and contains a short summary of headlines of school performance across the city.

Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)

(Teacher assessment of five year olds published at the end of Reception Year).

- 1.1 The percentage of 5 year olds reaching a 'good level of development (GLD – having the essential skills, knowledge and understanding to be ready for starting the National Curriculum increased by 5% on last year.
- 1.2 Plymouth's results are 3% below the national average. Last year Plymouth's results were 2% below the national average. This growth in the gap in attainment is because the percentage of children reaching a good level of development increased by a greater degree across the country as a whole.
- 1.3 The percentage of girls reaching a 'good level of development' is 71%. This is 16% higher than the figure for boys.
- 1.4 Children eligible for free school meals (FSM) attain less well than those who do not qualify for free school meals. In 2015 the difference was 18% in terms of the percentage achieving a 'good level of development'. This is in line with the national figure but represents a 2% rise on the figure for Plymouth in 2014.
- 1.5 The percentage of Early Years settings judged to be good or better by Ofsted has increased to 98% in 2015. National figures are not yet available but the figure for Plymouth is likely to exceed the national figure.

Key Stage 1

(Year 1 Phonics Reading Test and Teacher Assessment of 7 year olds, reported at the end of the infant stage).

- 2.1 The Year 1 Phonics Test measures the ability of 6 year olds to decode text using phonic knowledge. In 2015 the percentage of pupils reaching the necessary standard increased by 3% compared to the pass rate for 2014. This figure of 77% is in line with the national result.
- 2.2 The percentage of girls reaching the required standard was 82% and for boys it was 73%. Both results represent an improvement on the position in 2014 and are broadly in line with the national picture.

2.3 Almost all other KSI results covering reading, writing and maths improved when compared to 2014. Most results are below the corresponding national results but the gaps in the majority of cases are closing. In the majority of areas girls outperform boys.

2.4 Pupils eligible for FSM attained less well than Non – FSM pupils in all areas of reading, writing and maths. The gaps in attainment between the two groups both grew and narrowed when compared to figures for 2014. In reading the gaps fell, in writing and maths they grew. The gaps are comparable to those witnessed nationally.

Key Stage 2

(Statutory mainly marked assessments of 11 year olds mainly reported at the end of the junior phase)

3.1 The results for L4+ threshold (expected standard) for reading, writing and maths combined, increased by 3% on the figure for 2014 and now stands at 77% This is 3% below the national figure for 2015 but the gap has narrowed by 2% compared to 2014.

3.1 With regards to individual subjects, there was no improvement in the percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in reading compared to 2014. In writing, the percentage of pupils reaching the required standard increased by 3%, in maths it increased by 3% and in spelling, punctuation and grammar it increased by 6%. In all subjects the results are below the national averages but in many cases the results for the city show the gaps narrowing when compared to the national picture.

3.2 With the exception of maths, girls' results were higher than boys. Such a situation generally mirrors the national picture.

3.3 The percentage of pupils making the two levels of progress in reading, writing and maths increased in 2015 compared to 2014 (expected rate of progress). Again, whilst some of the results are below the national averages the gaps are closing.

3.4. Pupils eligible for FSM attain less well than non- FSM pupils. This is true for all subject areas and mirrors the national picture. However, the gaps in attainment are narrowing in most cases when results are compared to that of 2014. The gaps in attainment for Plymouth are general smaller than those for the country as a whole.

Key Stage 4.

(Statutory external tests taken by pupils at the end of Year 11 – 15/16 Year olds)

4.1. The percentage of pupils achieving 5 GCSE passes grades A*-C including English and maths was 52% in 2015. This represents a fall of 1% on the figure for 2014. The figure for 2015 is below the national average. Part of this decline can be explained by the last minute change in exam boundary grades especially with regards to the D/C grade boarder.

4.2. The percentage of pupils achieving A*-C grades in the English Baccalaureate (Ebacc) subjects was 21%. This represents a 3% fall on 2014 (The Ebacc subjects are English, maths, science, a foreign language and either geography or history. The figure for 2015 is below the national average.

4.3. The percentage of pupils making the expected rates of progress in English fell by 3% compared to 2014. For maths the result for this year represented a 3% increase on the result for 2014. Both figures are below the national averages.

4.4. Pupils eligible for FSM attain less well than non- FSM pupils. In terms of the percentage of pupils achieving 5 GCSE grades A*-C including English and maths, this attainment gap closed by 5% when compared to 2014. The attainment gap is below that for the country as a whole.

Key Stage 5.

5.1. The average points score per student was 719.3 in 2015. This is the accumulation of all the points from L3 qualifications ('A' Levels, BTECs etc). This is an increase on the figure for 2014 and is above the national average.

5.2. The average points score per entry of qualification is 213.1. This represents an increase on the figure for 2014, but is below the national average.

5.3. The percentage of students achieving 3 A levels, grades A*-E, is 68.8%. This is below the national average but the gap has narrowed compared to 2014.

Below floor standards and schools in danger of being classified as 'coasting'.

The floor standards are the minimum standards set by the government for schools. Should a school fall below the floor standard there is an expectation that a rigorous plan for improvement is formulated and implemented as soon as is possible.

The criteria for judging a primary school to be below the floor standards is where fewer than 65% of pupils achieve L4 or above in reading, writing and maths and results are below the median percentage of pupils making expected progress in reading, writing and maths. For secondary schools, a school is judged to be below the floor standards if fewer than 40% of pupils achieve 5 A*-C GCSE grades including English and maths and the school has a below median score for the percentage of pupils making expected progress.

'Coasting schools' are those schools which have, year on year failed to push every pupil to reach their full potential. The government considers a school's performance over three years to decide who is performing below a reasonable level of attainment and progress.

The criteria for a coasting primary school is where less than 85% of pupils achieve L4+ in reading writing and maths and results are below the median percentage of pupils making expected progress in reading, writing and maths. For secondary schools it is where fewer than 60% of pupils achieve 5A*-C including English and maths and the school has a below median score for the percentage of pupils making expected progress.

6.1. There are three primary schools below the floor standards and three schools are in danger of being classified as 'coasting'.

6.2 In the secondary sector there are four schools below the floor standard and four schools in danger of being classified as 'coasting'

Ofsted.

The most up to date figures show:

7.1 Across all our schools, 12.6% are judged as outstanding, 66.3% as good, 15.7% as requiring improvement and 1% as inadequate.

7.2 Of primary schools, 12% are judged to be outstanding, 65.3% as good, 17.3% as requiring improvement and 5.3% as inadequate.

7.3 Of secondary schools, 15% are judged as outstanding, 70% as good, 10% as requiring improvement and 5% as inadequate.

27th January, 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT SCRUTINY BRIEFING**Regionalising Adoption - Regional Adoption Agencies**

February 2016

**Background****1. Adopt South West**

Adopt South West¹ launched in April 2015 as a co-operative regional adoption partnership which is not a legal entity or agency. The adoption agencies in the Adopt South West partnership are Barnardo's, Devon County Council, Families for Children, Plymouth City Council, Torbay Council and Somerset County Council. Cornwall Council were also formally asked to join by Plymouth on behalf of Adopt South West members in Summer 2015. Cornwall have replied formally to say that they do not wish to join.

Agencies in Adopt South West co-operate in marketing and recruitment of adopters and the running of information days and training events for adopters. We are working to develop the support available for adopters and improve the matching of children together. We have also run a conference together, Adoption Activity Days and marketing campaigns.

2. Regional Adoption Agencies

The [Education and Adoption Bill](#), if passed, will give the Secretary of State a new power to direct one or more named local authorities to make arrangements for any or all of their adoption functions to be carried out on their behalf by one of the local authorities named, or by another agency. The bill completed its third reading in the House of Lords on 8th February 2016.

The proposed functions which can be specified are: the recruitment, assessment and approval of prospective adopters; decisions about which prospective adopters a child should be matched with; and the provision of adoption support services.

In Summer 2015 the Department of Education released a paper called [Regionalising Adoption](#) which asked for expressions of interest in moving towards regional adoption agencies. Local authorities were invited to bid for a grant from £4.5million of funding and Plymouth led a successful bid on behalf of Adopt South West.²

Government's stated aim is to reduce the number of adoption agencies from the current national total of 180, as well as improving practice and speeding up adoptions. The Department of Education wants to make sure adoption agencies stop the practice of seeking

¹ and

² Adopt South West is a partnership of adoption agencies from across the region that was formally launched on April 22nd 2015, building on previous co-operation that was already happening. The adoption agencies in Adopt South West are Barnardo's, Devon County Council, Families for Children, Plymouth City Council and Torbay Council. Somerset County Council has just joined Adopt South West. Agencies in Adopt South West co-operate in marketing and recruitment of adopters and the running of information days and training events for adopters. We are working to develop the support available for adopters and improve the matching of children together. We have also run a conference together, Adoption Activity Days and marketing campaigns. This is the Adopt South West website - <http://www.adoptsouthwest.org.uk/>The joint Adopt South West telephone number is 0800 0832227.

to first place an agencies own children with their own adopters because of potential delay for the child.

The D for E intention is that regional adoption agencies will lead to economies of scale, savings, access to a larger pool of adopters willing to take “hard to place” children, faster adoptions and opportunities to share good practice, and supervision. Nationally there are a number of consortia but very few merged services. Examples include Adopt Berkshire (4 Councils) and the Triboroughs (3 London boroughs.)

DfE has stated clearly that Voluntary Adoption Agencies (VAAs) have a central role to play in regional adoption agencies.

Adopt South West Regionalising Adoption Project team - progress

There are now 19 projects up and running nationally. Please see Appendix One for more details. We understand that over 130 local authorities and 20 (out of less than 30) VAAs are involved in one of the 19 Regional Adoption Agency projects.

An Adopt South West project team has started work on the options appraisal to determine what the local Regional Adoption Agency could look like, with the support of a Deloitte’s/Mutual Ventures coach provided by the Department of Education. The project team is currently led/co-ordinated by Plymouth and is working together from the Families for Children head office one day a week. (Families for Children is a local Voluntary Adoption Agency.) Plymouth has also set up a Plymouth focused project team.

In November 2015 the Adopt South West project team went to the Department of Education launch of the regionalising adoption project in London and met the other project teams from the rest of England. In January, February and March 2016 the team are attending DfE learning events about the options appraisal process.

The Department of Education have stated that they are open to different delivery models however they have made the following clear -

- There is an expectation RAAs will be more than a partnership or consortia arrangement.
- By law adoption functions must be carried out by adoption agencies - i.e. a Voluntary Adoption Agency or LA(s) registered with Ofsted.
- There is flexibility around geography and number of partners.
- But there is guidance as to the minimum size expected. The RAA should ideally have the ability to deal with 200+ children per year. (Plymouth currently carry out around 40 adoptions a year.)
- In a recent letter from Edward Timpson Minister’s have emphasised that they would like to see ambition and innovation and want to avoid agencies choosing an option too quickly because it is easiest to implement or agree on quickly, without careful consideration. Rather they would like to see ambitious sustainable change that delivers better outcomes for children.

Independent work is underway on benchmarking the performance of all six adoption agencies in Adopt South West and on stakeholder engagement.

The project is required by the DfE to deliver a transition plan which states the next steps the agencies will take together by the end of March 2015.

The People Children's and Young People's DMT have given the Plymouth staff on the project team a mandate to consider all options for the Plymouth City Council adoption service in the options appraisal. It has been noted that a recommendation could be considered a key decision. If so, then the recommendation would be submitted to Cabinet for approval at that point. The option appraisal is not completed, so it is not yet clear whether an option that involves a key decision will be recommended as yet.

This page is intentionally left blank

Regional Adoption Agency Projects – January 2016

Lead bidder	LAs	VAs	Grouping
North East			
1) Middlesbrough / Tees Valley	Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland, Darlington and Stockton		Develop and Deliver
2) Newcastle	Newcastle City, North Tyneside, Northumberland County, Gateshead	Barnardo's, After Adoption and Arc Adoption NE	Scope and Define
3) West Pennine	Blackburn with Darwen Council, Bolton Council, Bury, Oldham Council, Rochdale Council, Tameside Council	Adoption Matters, Caritas Care	Develop and Deliver
4) Stockport / Greater Manchester and East Cheshire	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council, Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council, Manchester City Council, Salford City Council, Cheshire East Borough Council	Adoption Matters and Caritas Care	Develop and Deliver
5) Liverpool	Liverpool City Council, Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council, Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council, Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Nugent Care and After Adoption	Scope and Define

6) Wigan	Wigan Council, Warrington Borough Council, St Helens Council, Cheshire West and Chester Council, Halton Borough Council	Adoption Matters, Caritas Care	Scope and Define
Yorkshire and Humber			
7) Yorkshire and Humber	All 15 local authorities in the Yorkshire and Humber region	After Adoption, Adoption Matters, PAC UK, Yorkshire Adoption Agency, Barnardo's	Develop and Deliver
South East			
8) PACT	Medway Council, Milton Keynes Council, Brighton & Hove City Council	PACT	Develop and Deliver
9) Adopt Berkshire	Bracknell Forest Borough Council, Reading Borough Council, The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, West Berkshire Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council, Milton Keynes Borough Council, Oxfordshire County Council, Medway Borough Council	Slough children's services Trust	Develop and Deliver
10) London Adoption Board	All 33 London boroughs	Action for Children, Adoption Plus, Barnardo's, Coram, Family Futures, IAC, PACT, PAC UK, SSAFA, TACT	Scope and Define
11) Adopt South Central / Hampshire	Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Southampton, Portsmouth	PACT, Barnardos, Adoption UK	Scope and Define

South West			
12) Adopt South West	Plymouth City Council, Torbay Council, Devon County Council, Somerset	Families for Children and Barnardo's	Scope and Define
13) Adopt Wessex / Families for Children	Bournemouth Borough Council, Dorset County Council, Borough of Poole	Families for Children	Scope and Define
14) Adopt West	South Gloucs, Bath and NE Somerset, Bristol, Gloucestershire, North Somerset, Swindon, Wiltshire	Action for Children, Adoption UK, After Adoption, Barnardo's, CCS, and PAC UK	Scope and Define
West Midlands			
15) Wolverhampton	Walsall Council, Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council, Sandwell Borough Council, Wolverhampton City Council, Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Joint Adoption Service	Adoption Focus	Scope and Define
16) Warwickshire / Adoption Central England	Warwickshire, Coventry, Solihull	After Adoption, Barnardo's	Scope and Define
East Midlands			
17) Lincolnshire	Lincolnshire County Council, Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Peterborough City Council, Derbyshire County Council, Derby	Adopt Together, Coram East Midlands, Family Care	Scope and Define

	City Council, Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council		
18) Central East (Coram)	Cambridgeshire County Council, Northamptonshire County Council, Norfolk County Council, Bedford Borough Council, Central Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire County Council	Coram Cambridgeshire Adoption (CCA), St Francis Children's Society and Adoption Plus	Develop and Deliver
East			
19) Adopt East	Essex County Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council, Luton Borough Council, Suffolk County Council	Adoption Plus	Scope and Define

Ambitious Scrutiny Panel

7th March 2016 Home to School Transport Service



Background

Ambitious Scrutiny have requested that the Home to School Transport service be examined in respect of a recent re-tendering exercise which formed part of the Transformation Programme.

The Transformation portfolio formed is wide-ranging, encompassing programmes for Integrated Health & Well-being, Customer Services Transformation, People and Organisational Development, Corporate Centre of Operations and Growth, Assets and Municipal Enterprise.

The Transformation programmes seek to fundamentally change the way that the Council goes about its business by improving efficiency and thus reducing costs whilst still delivering benefits for the citizens of Plymouth.

Areas of focus were set out within each programme where expected benefits were targeted. Following a previous regime of general cost savings across the Council, the Corporate Management Team led a real desire to seek out new opportunities for improvement and saving whilst encouraging officers to be innovative in their approach.

Last year, the GAME Transformation programme delivered a net benefit of £4.35m for PCC and is forecasting to achieve an additional net benefit of £3.9m this year. The GAME programme is made up of several elements, including Integrated Transport Services, the plan for Growth of new homes in the city and Commercialisation opportunities. The Transport project is council wide to include Passenger Transport, Staff Travel and Fleet Management and has benefits to be realised in excess of £1.5m over a three year period.

Why did we take the action we took

In September 2014, Integrated Transport Services Project Board discussed the extension of the project scope to include Passenger Transport at the request of the Director of People. A project around category management Fleet was already underway, capturing savings and efficiencies from reducing vehicles, plant and machinery across the Council, introducing technology and generating income within the workshop. EDGE conducted an analysis of the Home to School Transport service and reported that the service was well run with route optimisation and management of volatile budgets managed well. They recommended that improvements in procurement could be achieved. They noted that the service had achieved continuous savings since 2011.

In January 2015, a final version of the EDGE report that included a “financial opportunity plan” was published as well as a report on the resource proposal for the delivery of Fleet, Staff Travel & Passenger Transport transformation.

The report highlighted potential financial savings of £175K in 15/16 and a further £175K in 16/17 through the re-tendering of home to school taxi and minibus services, recommending:

- Early termination of the current framework to allow the quickest possible access to savings (early termination is clearly provided for in the framework agreements / contract documentation).

- Re-tendering the provision of contracted transport using electronic tendering (using the current Council e-tender system, Pro Contract) along with the use of 'reverse auctions'.
- Creation of a new Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS); in effect a new, more flexible framework for contracted transport that provides for additional contractors to be added during the term of the framework.
- Improved marketing of the tender opportunity, supported by more pro-active engagement with the taxi and minibus communities in the city, to generate greater interest in and more competition on the new framework. Smaller contractors would also be encouraged to tender and provided with support through the tender process.
- It should be noted that the full contract was a 5 year fixed mileage rate contract with an expiry date of July 2016. The main taxi contract holder was Taxifirst.

EDGE Public Solutions made their recommendation and these were accepted by the Council. Based on their track record of success in other Local Authorities, Edge were initially taken on by the Council to enable savings through fleet rationalisation and commercialisation, which they have successfully achieved.

Benefits and Impacts.

The re-tendering has had a number of benefits;

1. It has increased the number of service providers. Prior to re-tendering there were 2 taxi companies and 2 minibus companies engaged; there are now 12 taxi companies and 7 minibus companies involved in home to school transport. However the overall available capacity has decreased due to Taxifirst, who had the greatest capacity, not bidding for the available work.
2. The exercise has raised awareness of home to school transport demands. It also highlighted potential opportunities for further rationalisation of routes and options around the use of vehicles.
3. It has resulted in fewer routes overall being required. The number of taxi routes required has decreased from 170 to 124, however, the number of minibuses required has increased from 55 to 63 and the number of petrol allowances has increased from 17 to 28. There are still 30 routes which ideally need to be covered by taxis as and when capacity increases.
4. All children continue to have been safeguarded in the journeys to and from school.
5. New forms of tendering have been introduced in the form of E-auctioning
6. A Dynamic Purchasing System has been introduced meaning providers can bid to provide services as routes become available instead of waiting until the end of a contract

Savings

Unfortunately, the savings target for the new tender of £350k over two years has not been realised although there have been savings of approximately £43,500 per year

achieved on renegotiating the prices of student concessionary passes. Other considerations are being considered. For example, further reductions in the Council's own fleet requirement, although this will not have a direct impact immediately.

Officers continue to explore alternative savings. The service is managed very professionally and is pro-active on finding solutions to school travel on a daily basis. The new dynamic purchasing system allows for constant market engagement and this will continue over the

medium term. Longer term, it is fair to say there will continue to be demand and the council will need to continue to operate a robust approach to school transport requests.

Impact of the re-tender

Currently there are 11 parents who are receiving a petrol allowance on a short term basis. These arrangements are short term as the parents have other children to take to different schools and in some instances this means that children are arriving late, or being collected early to one or other of the schools.

Due to amalgamating some taxi routes onto minibuses a number of children are having very early collections from home and journeys of up to 1 hour 30 minutes which is over the recommended guidance of 45 minutes for primary aged children and 1 hr 15 mins for secondary aged children.

The procurement exercise has affected staff within the School Transport Team and the Procurement Unit. Managing the current day to day transport requirements with reduced capacity in drivers and vehicles is challenging. Parents have generally responded well and have been supportive of the situation.

Criteria for qualification for free transport

The Council have a statutory duty to provide travel arrangements to eligible children under the Education Act 1996, and also in accordance with DfE Statutory guidance Home to School travel and transport guidance 2014. PCC provides the statutory minimum required by law and therefore there is no scope to make further savings by changes to qualification criteria. Reviews of existing users and their needs will continue as occasionally circumstances change that mean transport is no longer required. Free transport is provided where a pupil meets the following criteria:

- A pupil is attending the nearest available school to their home where this is more than 2 miles for a child aged under 8, and more than 3 miles for a child aged 8 and over. This is regardless of parent's income.
- A pupil aged 8 or over is attending the nearest available Primary School and the distance is more than 2 miles and the child is eligible for free school meals or the family are in receipt of the maximum award of working tax credit.
- A pupil is attending one of the three nearest secondary schools and the distance from the school attended is more than 2 miles and the child is eligible for free school meals or the family are in receipt of the maximum award of working tax credit.
- The authority must make transport arrangements for all children who cannot reasonably be expected to walk to school because of their mobility problems or because of associated health and safety issues related to their special education needs (SEN) or disability. Eligibility, for such children are assessed on an individual basis to identify their particular transport requirements.

The transport is provided in a range of different ways :

- A free bus pass for pupils able to travel on public transport unaccompanied
- Free bus passes for a pupil and an adult to accompany them on public transport
- Petrol Allowance

- Minibus or taxi transport for pupils unable to travel on public transport or requiring wheelchair accessible vehicles

Since the retendering exercise, due to reduced taxi capacity, the authority has had to put in place other provision for example:

- Using PCC lease cars and Pertemps Agency drivers, however, this option is currently more costly than using taxis.
- Parents paying for taxis (with companies not under contract to PCC) and PCC reimbursing the cost to the parent
- Paying the cost of breakfast club for a primary school pupil to enable the parent to take their SEN child to a different school.
- Four routes have been covered by Social workers booking taxis direct with Taxifirst under the corporate contract. These are routes which do not need passenger assistants. However this arrangement means that the routes are not being managed or monitored by the School Transport Team and effectively increases the workload for Social Workers.

What is being done to cover routes in the long term:

- Continuous procurement exercise: Since the contract commenced on 04th January we have delivered 4 training sessions to the market on the 01/02/16 & 05/02/16 and 8 delegates attended. We now have 26 suppliers on our Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) and a tender was issued on 23rd February in order to cover routes that are currently covered through temporary means. The Strategic Procurement Unit and Passenger Transport Team have been working very closely to engage the market and promote the DPS. Ongoing investment of officer time from the PT team will be necessary to ensure market engagement and positive promotion of the DPS does not lapse. There are concerns about the capacity of the DPS and the registered suppliers' ability to meet the service demand in the short term.
- Investigating social enterprise route to fill gap which market cannot provide.

Simon Dale

Interim Assistant Director, Street Services

Jayne Gorton

Head of Access and Planning, Learning & Communities

25th February 2016

AMBITIOUS PLYMOUTH

Tracking Resolutions and Recommendations
2015 - 2016



Date, agenda item and Minute number	Resolution	Target date, Officer responsible and Progress	
7 December 2015 Minute 32 – Corporate Performance Report	<u>Agreed</u> that the new indicators P27, P28, P31 and P32 are added to the Ambitious Work Programme for further scrutiny when data becomes available.	Date	2016
		Officer	Jayne Gorton/Amelia Boulter
		Progress	Will be added to the 16/17 work programme.
7 December 2015 Minute 33 – Ofsted Improvement Plan	<u>Agreed</u> that the Ofsted Improvement Plan is circulated to Members with the minutes.	Date	January 2016
		Officer	Amelia Boulter
		Progress	Ofsted Improvement Plan to be circulated to all Members before next panel meeting on 1 February 2016.
1 February 2016 Minute 40 – Work of Plymouth School Sports Partnership	<u>Agreed</u> that when the Community Interest Company has been set up and in operation the Plymouth School Sports Partnership to comeback to Ambitious Plymouth Panel to provide a progress update in the new municipal year.	Date	2016
		Officer	Jayne Gorton/Amelia Boulter
		Progress	To add to the work programme for the new municipal year.
1 February 2016 Minute 41 – SEND Framework 2015- 2018 - 6 Monthly Update	<u>Agreed</u> that the Ambitious Plymouth Panel is provided with a further progress report on the SEND Framework 2015 – 2018 in the new municipal year.	Date	2016
		Officer	Jayne Gorton/Amelia Boulter
		Progress	To add to the work programme for the new municipal year.

Recommendations sent to the Cooperative Scrutiny Board.

Date, agenda item and minute number	Ambitious Plymouth Recommendation	Corporate Scrutiny Board Response	Date responded

Recommendation/Resolution status

Grey = Completed item.

Red = Urgent – item not considered at last meeting or requires an urgent response.

AMBITIOUS PLYMOUTH

DRAFT

Work Programme 2015 - 2016



Please note that the work programme is a 'live' document and subject to change at short notice. The information in this work programme is intended to be of strategic relevance and is subject to approval at the Cooperative Scrutiny Board.

For general enquiries relating to the Council's Scrutiny function, including this committee's work programme, please contact Lynn Young, Democratic Support Officer, on 01752 304163.

Date of meeting	Agenda item	Purpose of the agenda item	Reason for consideration	Responsible Officer
6.7.15	SEND framework 2015-2018			Jo Siney
	Children's Social Care Improvement Plan			Alison Botham
7.9.15	Work of Sports Development Unit			Louise Kelley/Pete Aley
	Changes resulting from Adoption Bill			Anne Osborne
19.10.15	Education Paper with Plymouth Learning Partnership			John Searson/David Maddison
	Corporate Performance Report – K14, K15 K19, K45, K27a/b	To monitor progress against KPIs falling within the panel's terms of reference.	Referral from Co-operative Scrutiny Board.	Judith Harwood/Alison Botham
7.12.15	Corporate Performance Report – K14, K15 K19, K45, K27a/b	To monitor progress against KPIs falling within the panel's terms of reference.	Referral from Co-operative Scrutiny Board.	Judith Harwood/Alison Botham
	Children's Social Care Improvement Plan			Alison Botham
	Department Budgets pre Budget Scrutiny			Judith Harwood/Alison Botham
1.2.16	Work of Plymouth School Sports Partnership			
	SEND framework 2015-2018 – 6 Monthly update			Jo Siney
7.3.16	School Transport Contract Award			Julie Roantree
	Update on the changes resulting from Adoption Bill			Anne Osborne
	Validated results SATS/GCSE's			David Bolles
NEW – items not yet allocated a date				
Review of early years childcare provision				
Scrutiny review proposals		Description		
'Be-wise to Child Sexual Exploitation'		New PID re-submitted to Co-operative Scrutiny Board and approved. First meeting scheduled for 11 September 2015.		

This page is intentionally left blank