

Minutes of a meeting of the Children’s Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday 27 January 2016 at City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1630
 Adjourned 1800
 Reconvened 1805
 Adjourned 1850
 Concluded 1930

PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	BRADFORD INDEPENDENTS
M Pollard	Engel	J Sunderland	F Khan
Sykes	Peart		
	Shaheen		
	Tait		
	Thirkill		

Voting Co-opted Members:

Church Representatives: Claire Parr (RC), Joyce Simpson (CE)

Parent Governor Representative: Sidiq Ali

Non-Voting Co-opted Members:

Health Representative: Tina Wildy

Teachers Secondary School Representative: Tom Bright

Councillor Sykes in the Chair

91. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Sunderland disclosed an interest in Minute 95 as she was involved in the gifted book scheme.

ACTION: *City Solicitor*



92. MINUTES

Resolved -

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2015 be signed as a correct record.

93. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

94. BETTER START BRADFORD PROGRAMME UPDATE

Previous Reference: Minute 57 (2014/15)

The Strategic Director Children's Services submitted **Document "AT"** which provided an update on setting up of the Better Start Bradford programme, early implementation and sharing of the learning from the programme across the Bradford district.

It was reported that the development of the Better Start Bradford bid and early implementation of the programme had profoundly influenced the district wide approach to early years service delivery and the development of the Integrated Early Years Strategy (IEYS) for children under 7 years 2015-2018. The IEYS 5 workstreams were focused on:

- Children ready for school and schools ready for children.
- Improved health and wellbeing for all children and reduce inequalities.
- Support and increase parents' knowledge and skills.
- Support the development of high quality leadership together with highly skilled and responsive workforce.
- Integrated working and system change.

Members were informed that Better Start Bradford was a "test and learn" programme which was being used as a vehicle for reform across the district in early years. It was being delivered in 3 disadvantaged wards (Bowling and Barkerend, Bradford Moor and Little Horton) but aimed to embed what worked across the district. For example, specific attachment training for the early years workforce (including volunteers) was being rolled out and the Baby Buddy phone app (supporting women during pregnancy) was now being promoted across the district.

The outcomes of the programme was to improve communication and language development, social and emotional development and nutrition in children aged 0-3 years. The programme was entirely focussed on pregnant women and 0-3 year olds.



Members were informed that key features of the Better Start Programme included early interventions which were evidence based and included detailed monitoring of their implementation and effective evaluation led by Born in Bradford.

It was reported that projects from April 2015 included:

- Innovation Hub which provided a robust system for effective monitoring and evaluation, building on the strong academic, practitioner, and community networks already developed by the Born in Bradford research programme. (5 year contract worth £3,928,167)
- Perinatal Support Service which provided emotional support to families during pregnancy and the first year after birth, where a parent is struggling with their emotional health and wellbeing or where they have been diagnosed with a low to moderate level perinatal mental illness. (3 year contract worth £988,969)
- Talking Together, a service to support children in their communication and language development. All 2 year olds to have an initial language assessment in the home which may be followed by a 6 week intervention delivered in the home for those identified as being at risk of language delay. (3 year contract worth £753,356)
- Baby Buddy mobile phone app for parents and parents-to-be with personalised content approved by doctors and midwives that spans from pregnancy right through to the first six months after birth. (agreement for £75,000 for monitoring and development of another community language)
- Personalised midwifery care pilot which ensured that women saw the same midwife for all their community midwifery appointments throughout their pregnancy and the postnatal period. Appointments were longer and women were supported to make informed choices around the birth of their baby. (3 year contract worth £1,626,952)

It was reported that on a national level Warwick University were leading on impact and economic evaluation of the national programme.

Members commented on a number of issues which included:

- Personalised midwifery care pilot would be extremely beneficial to women having the same midwife for all their appointments; were there enough midwives to serve the area?
- What was the level of engagement from people wanting to be volunteers?
- Could the project cater for everyone if there was a high demand for a particular service?
- How was the quality of volunteers monitored?
- Who was consulted? how was the progress of various initiatives monitored and how would the various services be duplicated to other wards?
- What was the timeline for rolling the programme to other areas?
- The Talking Together project included a six week intervention programme, what happened after that?
- Did the service ensure initiatives were being inclusive?
- Were children's centres engaging appropriately?
- How would the project ensure it targeted the most needy?
- How would the £49 million lottery funding drive real change?



- What percentage of the children in the 3 wards were not school ready?
- How many midwives would serve the 3 wards?
- Would the personalised midwifery initiative be rolled out if it was successful?
- Would be useful to have feedback from Warwick University once they had evaluated the programme nationally.
- Request that Members be provided with Early Years contact for their wards.

In response to Members' questions it was reported that:

- It was important that the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) were on board as whatever followed from the programme needed funding; what difference the personalised midwifery pilot would make and its direct impact on birth would need looking at; CCG's were involved in shaping it.
- There was a good number of volunteers recruited onto the programme.
- The service needed to be flexible and look at how many families were eligible for it.
- The innovation team looked at training, supervision etc, there were a set of standards services had to meet; there was no difference between volunteers and paid workers; training was provided to all the workforce.
- Early Years Service, Midwives, Health Visitors, voluntary sector, local community etc were all consulted.
- It would be 2 to 3 years to obtain the initial findings on what was working and to decide whether to continue with a certain piece of work or stop it.
- Roll out of the programme to other areas would be considered but certain initiatives such as the Baby Buddy App was district wide; the midwifery pilot was funded for 3 years.
- There had been an increase in the number of referrals for speech and language delays.
- Consideration would be given to the impact of the Talking Together initiative and how it translated to 2 year olds.
- Children's Centres had a duty to engage.
- Midwives and Children's Centres were well aligned and integrated to ensure people in need were targeted.
- The focus of the project was improving the lives of children.
- 45% of the children in the wards had a good level of development; 55% did not have a good level of development; if the programme succeed it would change the lives of 75% of the children.
- Would be engaging with 30,000 children in the lifetime of the project.
- There would be 6 midwives with 60 cases each in the 3 wards.
- How successful an initiative was and whether it was rolled out to other areas applied to all the projects.
- Work that was being undertaken at district level was detailed in 3.9 of the report.

Resolved -

That the information provided in the report (Document "AT") be welcomed and a further progress report be presented to the Committee in 12 months time.

ACTION: Strategic Director, Children's Services



95. NATIONAL LITERACY TRUST HUB IN BRADFORD

Previous Reference: Minute 56 (2014/15)

The Assistant Director, Education and School Improvement submitted **Document “AU”** which reported on Literacy Hubs. Literacy Hubs aimed to create long-term change in places where low levels of literacy were entrenched, intergenerational and seriously impacting on people’s lives. A Literacy Hub was envisaged as a ten year programme to have maximum impact and permanently embed change. They were a partnership between the National Literacy Trust, the local authority and a wide range of local partners including voluntary and community organisations, businesses, health, education and cultural organisations. Each Hub had a range of specific literacy priorities and activities based on the needs of the local community, as well as authority wide work including a local media campaign.

Bradford District Learning Hub had identified a range of specific literacy priorities and activities based on the needs of the local community. The three target ward areas were closer evaluated focus was needed were Toller, Eccleshill and Keighley Central.

It was reported the hub worked closely with Better Start Bradford who were currently exploring the Early Words Together Programme, their programme of delivery had been finalised already and any new programmes were being explored for future options and did not form part of their current delivery.

Members commented on a number of issues which included:

- How would the hub be funded after December 2016.
- When was the external evaluation taking place?
- It seemed that secondary schools did not show the same level of interest as primary schools.
- Strengthening the bond between child and book was important – could schools be provided with contact details for professional story tellers and published authors/poets who were able to attend schools and speak with pupils.
- Were schools provided with information on the hub and access to its resources?
- How well was the initiative taken up by schools and children’s centres in the three wards?
- Could the Commissioning Board be approached for funding?

In response to Members’ questions it was reported that:

- Officers were looking at ways of sustaining the funding for the hub beyond 2016.
- External evaluation was taking place in March 2016.
- The key stage 3 writing resource called “Great Poetry Through Time” was available to all schools.
- Have already brought in a number of authors to schools; schools did have access to authors.
- Two literature festivals had taken place.
- Further work needed to be undertaken with headteachers; schools had clear priorities to improve writing.



- Work was being undertaken in collaboration with the School Improvement Team.
- There had been a high take up of the initiative in the three wards it covered; literacy campaign was the main target; looked at other ways people could engage such as the Asian and Eastern European community; other initiatives undertaken with partners included visiting neonatal wards in Bradford, targeting premature babies as reading a book soothed a baby's heart rate.
- Other avenues of funding would be explored and conversations with the commissioning boards was taking place.

Resolved -

- (1) That the Committee supports the Hub Senior Steering Group in identifying and Securing continuation funding for a range of initiatives and projects being delivered by the hub to operate beyond December 2016 (when the initial grant from the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation comes to an end).**
- (2) That evidence of community based activity relating to the literacy hub be circulated to Members of the Committee.**
- (3) That the Education and School Improvement Service provides the District's schools with contact details for professional story tellers and published authors/poets who are able to attend schools and speak with the pupils.**

ACTION: Assistant Director, Education and School Improvement

96. UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHILDREN'S TRUST

Previous Reference: Minute 72 (2014/15)

The Assistant Director, Access and Inclusion submitted **Document "AV"** which provided an update following on from the survey of the Children's Trust Board arrangements held in Spring 2015 and subsequent development work of the Board in Autumn 2015 which culminated in a development day for Board Members on 14 December 2015. It also outlined the next steps for the Trust as it moved into its next three year cycle 2016 -2019.

It was reported that the Trust's remit included children and young people in Bradford and District 0-19 years, young people up to the age of 25 leaving care and young people to the age of 25 with disabilities and for learning difficulties.

Members commented on a number of issues which included:

- Who were the Children's Trust?
- How do you ensure representatives attend the Trust Board meetings?
- What was the nature of the Trust Development session?
- Who were the Trust Board accountable to?
- What difference would the Children Trust Board make in helping to raise educational attainment?
- Consultation needed to take place with young people such as children in PRUs, traveller children etc.



- The School Improvement Plan stated that all children would attend a good school by 2018, what would happen if this target was not achieved?
- Who was accountable for failure of schools?
- Hoped that the significant part of the Board would be to do all it can in recruiting good teachers and headteachers.
- What difference had the Children's Trust made in the last 10 years?
- Did the Board have parent representatives, teachers etc on it?
- Were the Board meetings held in public and were the minutes published?

In response to Members' questions it was reported that:

- The Children's Trust Board brought together partner organisations with a shared commitment to improve outcomes for children and young people by working together more effectively and was made up of governors, health representatives etc, a list of membership could be provided to Members.
- The Trust Board was well attended now and had clarity and purpose.
- The Trust Development session held in December 2015 was an opportunity for Members to consider what they would like to see change and agreement of priorities for 2016-19.
- The Trust Board aimed to bring key partners together to improve the outcomes of children.
- The performance framework of the Board had to be robust; the Board met quarterly and now had a clear focus on what it needed to achieve.
- The Board Members were responsible to their individual organisations.
- There was wider representation for young people at the development session and not just young people involved in the Youth Service.
- The Children's Trust minutes were published and available.

Resolved -

- (1) **That it be requested that the final governance structure, responsibility for key performance indicators and the priorities in the Children and Young People Plan, along with the Membership of the Children's Trust be circulated to this Committee in March 2016.**
- (2) **That the Strategic Director Children's Services be requested to consider revising the target in the School Improvement Plan that "all children will attend a good school by 2018", as the view of this Committee is that this target can not be fully realised.**

ACTION: *Strategic Director, Children's Services*



97. CHILDREN'S SERVICES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015-16

The report of the Chair of Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee (**Document "AW"**) presented the Committee's Work Programme 2015-16.

Resolved -

That the Work Programme 2015-16 continues to be regularly reviewed during the year.

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Committee.

