Executive Decision Report
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1. **Summary**

1.1. This report has been presented as an interim report based on the progress made since inspections undertaken by Ofsted and a brief description and overview of the performance management of the City’s Children’s Centres over the period January 1st 2013 to July 2014. It will be followed by a more detailed report to Scrutiny in May 2015 based on the performance management process.

1.2. The normal annual report for Children’s Centres 2013-14 was not completed due to the review concluding in July 2014. Now that the review is completed, we will revert to the normal reporting cycle, with a full report about the work of the Children’s Centres for consideration at Scrutiny in May 2015.

1.3. The report also details the outcome of Ofsted inspections conducted under the revised Ofsted inspection framework since April 2013 with action taken by the service to improve aspects of delivery as identified in the inspection reports.

1.4. A cyclical annual performance management process has been embedded across the children’s centre service over a number of years to promote self-evaluation, ensure accountability and service improvement (SEF). The cycle is reviewed annually to take account of feedback and lessons learnt by those involved in the process and changes to the inspection framework.

1.5. Under the previous Ofsted framework, thirteen children centres were inspected between June 2010 and November 2012. Of the thirteen centres inspected, seven were graded “Good” with some outstanding elements and six were graded “Satisfactory” (see table below)

1.6. **Children Centre Ofsted Inspection Gradings – Old Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children Centre</th>
<th>Grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highfields</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrave</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthews</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherhall</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfields</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurnby Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyres Monsell</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunstone</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowley Fields</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parks</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under the new Ofsted framework from April 2013, the grading for ‘Satisfactory’ was changed to ‘Requires Improvement’. Since the changes, five children centres and one cluster were inspected and received gradings as follows:

**Children Centre Ofsted Inspection Gradings – New Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children Centre</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Evington and Rowlatts Hill</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge* (see below)</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunstone Frith</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewcastle</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfields and West Humberstone Cluster which includes: Woodbridge* Belgrave and Rushey Mead St Saviours</td>
<td>Requires Improvement</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These inspections were carried out prior to the reorganisation of Early Help Services in July 2014.

This inspection was carried out after the reorganisation of Early Help Services in July 2014.

1.7. The areas for improvement can be summarised under the following headings:

   a) Improved case recording and supervision

   b) Identify the impact and track the progress of both children and adults.

   c) Improve health outcomes; e.g. working with health colleagues to reduce obesity and increase breastfeeding.

   d) Increase the rigour of performance management.

   e) Increase access and engagement of target families and demonstrate impact.

   f) Increase the number of children achieving a good level of development and close the gap between the lowest achieving children and the rest.

   g) Increase access to services and the range of services for adults that improve parenting and employability.

1.6 Action has been undertaken with progress made in all of the areas identified above through the annual ‘Cluster Delivery Plans’. Work is also ongoing as part of the development of the early help offer and processes with its partners which includes the five key actions:
a) Reviewing existing processes and mainstreaming them to achieve maximum effectiveness and value for money.

b) Developing a robust partnership approach to early help which will include a shared performance framework and 0 – 19 Early Help Locality Boards.

c) Undertake a ‘Health Check’ six month post the reorganisation of Children centres and Family Support in February 2015 with a report coming to DMT in March 2015.

d) Development of outcome tools measuring the impact of early help interventions.

e) Evaluation and evidence the impact Early Help has having in particular with reducing the need for statutory interventions.

2. Recommendations

2.1 For the Commission to receive the report and note the contents of the report and the progress made to date.

2.2 For the Executive to receive the report and note the contents of the report and the progress made to date.

3. Supporting information including options considered:

3.1 The public sector equality duty requires public services to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations for their service users.

3.2 The areas identified by Ofsted for improvement should ensure a focus upon those with protected characteristics, as defined by the Equality Act 2010. Children and families with protected characteristics may include: those for whom English is an additional language; those from minority ethnic groups; those from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller families; those from lesbian, gay and transgender families.

4. Details of Scrutiny

4.1 Previous reports of this subject were taken to Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission, see dates below:

- 11 March 2013
- 23 July 2013
- 18 September 2013 (redesign of centres and call-in of that decision)
- 26 November 2013
- 25 June 2014
5. Financial, legal and other implications

5.1 Financial Implications

There are no significant financial implications arising from this report.
*Martin Judson, Head of Finance, 374 101*

5.2 Legal implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from the report.
*Caroline Woodhouse, Supervisory Solicitor 371 429*

5.3 Climate Change and Carbon Reduction implications

‘There are no climate change implications associated with this report
*Louise Buckley, Graduate Project Officer (Climate Change), 372 293’*

5.4 Other Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal Opportunities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Whole report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Whole report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable and Environmental</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Disorder</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Act</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Whole report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/People on Low Income</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Parenting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Inequalities Impact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Whole report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Background information and other papers:

Children Centres Quality Assurance and Performance Cycle process.

7. Summary of appendices:

A summary of the quality assurance and performance cycle for Children Centres demonstrates the processes undertaken to ensure services are delivered to a good standard, achieving best outcomes.

8. Is this a private report (If so, please indicated the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No
9. Is this a “key decision”?
   No

10. If a key decision please explain reason
Appendix One

Quality Assurance and Performance Cycle Process

1.1.1 A cyclical annual performance management process has been embedded across the children’s centre service over a number of years to promote self-evaluation, ensure accountability and service improvement (SEF). The cycle is reviewed annually to take account of feedback and lessons learnt by those involved in the process and changes to the inspection framework.

1.1.2 Ofsted have previously reported on the robustness of the children’s centre performance management process and agreed with the actions identified to achieve improvement. However, concerns were raised during the inspection at Woodbridge children’s centre, which took place in September 2013. At this time Inspectors were not convinced that senior managers could demonstrate sufficient monitoring of actions to improve performance, following the annual conversation (SEF validation visit).

1.1.3 The performance management process along with the documentation used were reviewed following this inspection and used for the reporting period January 2013 to December 31st 2013. The cycle (refer to cycle on page 3) required each individual centre to self-evaluate their performance for the previous 12 months with the documentation used updated to reflect the revised inspection framework.

1.1.4 Once SEF’s were submitted the operational senior management team undertook a day long visit to each of the 23 children’s centre to look at the evidence available to support self-reporting in the SEF. The information is validated through discussion with managers, staff, parents, advisory board members, and volunteers, observation of practice and audits of case and supervision files.

1.1.5 The performance management cycle for January to December 2013 required SEF’s to be submitted by the end of January 2014 and validation visits in the main were carried out during February and /March. Children’s centres would normally then develop an improvement plan for the beginning of April which would include actions identified during the SEF validation visit and self-evaluation process.

1.1.6 SEF validation visits were made to all 23 children’s centres at the beginning of 2014. It is normal practice to produce a report on the findings of these visits and for a senior manager to attend the respective advisory board to present the report in person. However, due to the prioritisation of other work required, some reports were not completed and presented to the Advisory Boards. In addition, due to the impending changes to the organisation of children’s centres a decision was made to postpone the production of delivery plans until the end of September 2014.
1.1.7 The report format for the SEF validation visits was also revised to match the inspection framework and the children’s centres graded accordingly. Feedback at subsequent Ofsted inspections has been positive, with inspectors saying they consider this robust and aspirational. The cycle below identifies responsibilities of the Management team, Children Centres and Advisory Boards undertaking a series of quality assurance processes and performance reporting over a 12 month period.

**Annual Performance Cycle – Children Centre**

1.1.8 A cyclical annual performance management process has been embedded across the children’s centre service over a number of years to promote self-evaluation, ensure accountability and service improvement (SEF). The cycle is reviewed annually to take account of feedback and lessons learnt by those involved in the process and changes to the inspection framework.