

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S TRUST BOARD

5.00pm 18 JULY 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors: Shanks (Chair), Buckley, Marsh and Wealls

NHS Brighton & Hove: Denise Stokoe (Deputy Chair)

Sussex Community NHS Trust: Andy Painton and Simon Turpitt

Non-Voting Co-optees:

Bethan Prosser, Community & Voluntary Sector Forum

Andrew Jeffrey, Parent Forum

Alan Bedford, Local Safeguarding Children's Board

Simone Button, CAHMS

Dr Phil Harland, Further Education & Sixth Form Colleges

Apologies:

Graham Bartlett, Sussex Police Authority

Allan McColgan, Job Centre Plus

Haydn Stride, Longhill Secondary School

PART ONE

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1 (a) Declarations of Substitutes

1.1 There were none.

1 (b) Declarations of Interests

1.2 There were none.

1 (c) Exclusion of Press and Public

1.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act), the Children & Young People's Trust Board considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item,

there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A (3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100I(I) of the Act).

1.4 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 Simon Turpitt mentioned that his name had appeared twice on the list of those present. He represented Sussex Community NHS Trust and his name should be removed from the NHS Brighton and Hove list.

2.2 Alan Bedford referred to the item on the Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) Annual Report (Paragraph 26.4). He had no recollection of saying that more training would be arranged for Member after the May elections. He was not planning to undertake any training.

2.3 Councillor Marsh stressed that elected councillors on the Board had the role of corporate parent. There were new councillors on the Board who would benefit from training. She would also find it useful to receive the latest training on her responsibilities

2.4 The Strategic Director People informed the Board that a corporate parenting update would form part of member development training. Safeguarding would be included.

2.5 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the Children & Young People's Trust Board held on 21 March 2011 be agreed and signed as a correct record, subject to the above amendments.

3. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

Welcome

3.1 The Chair introduced herself as the new Chair of the Board and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair informed members that this was the first time she had chaired a council meeting and that she was a newly elected councillor and Cabinet Member for Children & Young People. She had a background in children's services, youth work and teaching.

4. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S PLAN PERFORMANCE REPORT

4.1 The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, People which provided an update on the priority performance measures for the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) 2009-12 and set out the background context for the discussion of future arrangements for the Children and Young People's Partnership.

4.2 The Senior Manager – Policy & Development presented the report. He referred to the priority indicators. He stated that the rating system had been subjective and that a number of different factors had been taken into consideration. It had not been possible to have standardised figures across the board. The Council had benchmark authorities with a similar profile to deprivation. The indicators looked at performance against targets. They were rated green, amber or red.

- 4.3 Councillor Buckley referred to NI 075 Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English & Maths. She noted that 47% of boys and 51% of girls achieved these grades in the city. Nationally, girls did much better and she asked if any research had been carried out on gender inequality.
- 4.4 The Senior Secondary and Special Schools Adviser explained that this was not a new phenomenon in the city. Individual schools were working on this issue. Work needed to be carried out to make sure each child was doing well. It was possible to see why boys were achieving better results. A great deal of work was carried out 6 or 7 years ago to encourage better results amongst boys. However, it was difficult to find out why the achievement amongst girls locally had widened against national indicators. There had been talk of a lack of aspiration and too much distraction in the city.
- 4.5 The Senior Secondary and Special Schools Adviser confirmed that there were no single gender schools in the City.
- 4.6 The Chair agreed that this issue should be monitored but was pleased that boys were achieving better results.
- 4.7 Councillor Marsh stated that the situation was not the same in Key Stage 2, where she was sure girls were doing well. She referred to NI 056 – Obesity in primary school age children in year 6. It was not clear if this was a national indicator. Meanwhile with regard to the RAG system, she asked how close amber was to green.
- 4.8 The Lead Commissioner Children Youth & Families explained that there were different approaches to RAG rating. For example, the PCT excluded amber. It was difficult to remain consistent in approach. The obesity targets were complicated. Variations could be due to population differences and it was not always possible to compare one year with another. However, the green rating recognised that the figures were improving. The obesity figures were as follows: 2008 – 17.8%. 2009 -16.4% and 2010 – 15.5%. This was an improvement but not a statistically significant one.
- 4.9 Councillor Marsh noted that the trend was decreasing, and that the green rating was not based on a national indicator. She stated that to make sense of the figures there needed to be more information. There needed to be information on how the indicators came to be green, amber or red.
- 4.10 The Strategic Director People referred to Indicators NI102b – Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers achieving the expected level at Key Stage 4 and NI105 – The Special Educational Needs (SEN) non-SEN gap at key Stage 4. He asked if the gaps were getting bigger.
- 4.11 The Senior Manager, Policy & Development explained that the principal method for rating these indicators was to compare the information with statistical neighbours. The deterioration locally was a cause for concern. The rating should be amber.
- 4.12 Councillor Wealls referred to pages 15 and 30 of the agenda. (NI 059 and NI148). Under “What we are doing?” it stated that an improvement action plan had been developed following the inspection of safeguarding and looked after children services

and was being presented to Cabinet on 14 July 2011. Councillor Wealls had been unable to find this report on the Cabinet agenda.

- 4.13 The Chair replied that the report in question had been submitted to the Children & Young People's Overview & Scrutiny Committee, and not to Cabinet. However the City Improvement Plan had been submitted to Cabinet.
- 4.14 The Head of Service Children & Families referred to N1 059, Percentage of initial assessments for children's social care carried out within 10 working days of referral. He confirmed that the actions had been reported to scrutiny. Officers wanted to improve performance. There would be one team and assessments would be carried out more swiftly. Performance had improved since the report had been written.
- 4.15 The Senior Secondary and Special Schools Adviser referred to NI 148 - Care Leavers in education employment or training. She stated that the council now had a post 16 children's worker. Their role would concentrate on the Children's Plan and post 16 education. There was also a pilot for the raised participation age in 2015.
- 4.16 Councillor Buckley noted that the number of care leavers seemed low (11). The Chair stated that compared to national statistics, the figures were very good. The Head of Service Children & Families agreed that nationally the council were doing very well. The council were benchmarking against national outcomes (5%). He mentioned that most young care leavers nationally were asylum seekers, which was not the case in Brighton & Hove.
- 4.17 Denise Stokoe asked for more information on N1 043 – Young People within the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody. The Senior Manager – Policy & Development explained that a 6% target had been set nationally. The council had to maintain a figure below this target. The Council was below the national trend for England. This was not a priority indicator.
- 4.18 The Head of Service, Children and Families informed the Board that locally more children were re-convicted. This was the council's main concern. There were 22 re-convictions last year and 47 convictions overall.
- 4.19 Denise Stokoe stated that it was not easy to draw conclusion from the data. There was a need to look at a more meaningful indicator. The Senior Manager, Policy and Development agreed that questions needed to be asked about the data which would allow new indicators to be developed. There would be opportunities for change with Intelligent Commissioning. Officers were collating data in a different way and trying to gather more detail.
- 4.20 Councillor Buckley asked for assurance that Care Leavers going to university would receive help with their tuition fees. The Head of Service Children & Families explained that the council supported Care Leavers wanting to go on to further education. Nationally there was no guidance regarding fees. However, the council was very supportive to Care Leavers until they were 25 years old.
- 4.21 The Chair remarked that even top universities gave bursaries to Care Leavers. They would have their fees paid and receive a bursary. However, there was an issue over

how they were supported in the holidays. The Senior Secondary and Special Schools Adviser reported that from 16 to 18 years Care Leavers received an additional allowance to support their further education.

- 4.22 Dr Phil Harland referred to the bursaries available for 16-18 year olds. They would receive £1,200. However they would only receive the bursary if the college knew who they were. The Head of Service, Children & Families explained that the council had a good relationship with the further education sector and universities. Officers would meet with them before young people went on to further education. The two universities in Brighton had a Support Worker. However, he acknowledged that he had heard that some Care Leavers had not informed colleges and universities that they have been in care.
- 4.23 Councillor Buckley referred to NI 116 – Proportion of Children in Poverty. She asked if there was a historical poverty level. She also asked if the poverty was considered in terms of monetary value. The Senior Manager – Policy & Development referred Councillor Buckley to the report on the Brighton & Hove Child Poverty Needs Assessment that was submitted to the Board on 21 March 2011. With regard to the indicator, new data was expected in the autumn. This indicator was a monetary indicator and the data was sensitive. Data would be received from the Department of Work and Pensions regarding benefit uptake. This would be monitored as part of the Child Poverty Strategy.
- 4.24 **RESOLVED** - (1) that the information provided on progress with the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) priority performance indicators be noted.

5. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S TRUST PARTNERSHIP - FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS

- 5.1 The Board considered a report of the Strategic Director, People which asked the Board to revisit the role and function of the Children and Young People's Partnership, including the role of the Board itself in light of the anticipated introduction of a local Health and Wellbeing Board.
- 5.2 Members were informed that the Children and Young People's Trust Board is responsible for the production and implementation of the City's Children and Young People's Plan 2009-12. This was no longer a statutory duty.
- 5.3 The Lead Commissioner Children Youth & Families presented the report.
- 5.4 Councillor Marsh remarked that it seemed incongruous that the first recommendation in the report was to suspend further meetings, when the second recommendation was to note that any proposals to implement a Health and Wellbeing Board would be brought for consultation to the CYPT Board. She asked if more information would be received about the Health and Wellbeing Board Development Seminar on 26th July 2011.
- 5.5 Councillor Marsh stressed that the CYPT Board was a dedicated Children & Young Peoples Trust. The Health and Wellbeing Board would encompass all age services. She asked how the focus on children and young people would be retained. She

commented that the CYPT Board had never got to grips with governance and scrutiny. There might be a role in working more closely with the Children & Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Marsh asked for another scheduled meeting of the Board. She was worried that members would leave today not knowing what would replace the Board.

- 5.6 The Strategic Director informed the Board that the reason Children and Young People's Trust Boards were established was to have a greater focus on outcomes and to connect different authorities and agencies in the system. The key issue was how the agencies would meet if this Board did not exist. He acknowledged that the Health and Wellbeing Board would cover all ages. Some local authorities had set up a sub-group for adults, and a sub-group for children which was similar to the Trust Board. The Strategic Director stressed that in discussing the Health and Wellbeing Board, it was necessary to look at all groups involved with children. Meanwhile, the Trust was still a legal entity.
- 5.7 Andy Painton expressed concern that the proposal was premature. There was a need to look at the function of the Health and Wellbeing Board. He considered that the role of the CYPT Board was more important now than at any other time. It was the Trust Board's duty to shape the Health and Wellbeing Board. He was concerned that children's issues could be subsumed in a broad wellbeing agency. If disbanded the functions of the Board would need to be covered by the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- 5.8 Simon Turpitt concurred. He believed that the recommendation to suspend the Board would be the wrong decision at the current time. It might be the right decision once the scrutiny role was known.
- 5.9 Andrew Jeffrey was concerned that there was no mention of young people in the Health and Social Care Bill. He also was concerned that children and young people's issues would be subsumed.
- 5.10 Alan Bedford stressed that there was no requirement for a provider on the Health and Wellbeing Board. The advantage of the CYPT Board was that providers and commissioners were members of the Board. He considered that a body was needed that could be held to account and that focused on children. Meanwhile, the Safeguarding Annual report was due to be submitted to the October meeting. He asked to be kept informed of any changes.
- 5.11 The Chair noted the concerns of the Board. She asked who had been invited to the seminar. The Strategic Director replied that there had been 35 invitations. 8-10 invitations were to elected members. The focus had been on the health sector rather than the representatives around the table.
- 5.12 Denise Stokoe suggested that the next meeting of the Board should focus on discussions on future arrangements and ensuring that the Health & Wellbeing Board would focus on young people in the City.
- 5.13 The Chair suggested that the Board meet on 17 October as scheduled. The Safeguarding Report could be considered at that meeting. Members would then be given more detail about the Health and Wellbeing Board.

.5.14 **RESOLVED** – That it is agreed to hold a further meeting of the Children and Young People's Trust Board on 17 October 2011 as scheduled. The meeting will consider the Annual Report of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board. The Board will also consider further details on proposals to implement a Health and Wellbeing Board in Brighton & Hove.

The meeting concluded at 6.14pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

