



## Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Thursday 29 March 2012 at 7.00 pm**

Committee Rooms 1, 2 and 3, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9HD

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Gladbaum (Chair)  
Matthews (Vice-Chair)  
Aden  
Cheese  
Al-Ebadi  
Harrison  
Mitchell Murray  
HM Patel

#### First alternates

Councillors:

S Choudhary  
Clues  
Oladapo  
  
Mashari  
Hirani  
Daly  
Baker

#### Second alternates

Councillors:

Hector  
Lorber  
Krupa Sheth  
  
RS Patel  
Hossain  
Denselow  
Kansagra

#### Statutory Co-optees

Mrs Shabna Abbasi  
Alloysius Frederick  
Dr Nanda Kumar  
Elsie Points

#### Non-statutory Co-optees

Mrs Hawra Imame  
Dr J Levison

#### Observers

Mr A Carter  
Ms J Cooper  
Mrs L Gouldbourne  
Ms C Jolinon  
Mr B Patel  
Brent Youth Parliament  
representatives

**For further information contact:** Bryont Gibbs, Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1355 [bryony.gibbs@brent.gov.uk](mailto:bryony.gibbs@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit: [www.brent.gov.uk/committees](http://www.brent.gov.uk/committees)

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

Item	Page
<b>1 Declaration of personal and prejudicial interests</b>	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting any relevant financial or other interest in the items on the agenda.	
<b>2 Deputations (if any)</b>	
<b>3 Minutes of the last meeting held on 2 February 2012</b>	1 - 8
<b>4 Brent Youth Parliament update</b>	
A verbal update will be presented to the committee by representatives of Brent Youth Parliament.	
<b>5 Education Standards in Brent</b>	9 - 34
This report comments on education standards achieved by Brent schools at the end of the academic year 2010/11.	
<b>6 Inspection on Adoption Services in Brent</b>	35 - 48
The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the outcome of the Adoption inspection which took place between 13 and 17 February 2012.	
<b>7 Safeguarding &amp; Looked After Children (LAC) Action Plan update</b>	49 - 52
The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the outcome of the Safeguarding and Looked After Children (SLAC) inspection which took place between 3 and 14 October 2011.	
<b>8 School Places update</b>	
A verbal update will be presented to the committee by Rik Boxer (Assistant Director, Achievement and Inclusion).	

## 9 Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 53 - 62

The Work Programme is attached.

## 10 Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny meeting will be confirmed following the annual Council meeting scheduled for 16 May 2012.

## 11 Any other urgent business

Notice of items raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 64.



- Please remember to *SWITCH OFF* your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
  - Toilets are available on the second floor.
  - Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near the Paul Daisley Hall.
  - A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank



## MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 2 February 2012 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Gladbaum (Chair), Councillor Matthews (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Aden, Al-Ebadi, Harrison, Mr A Frederick, Ms E Points, Ms J Cooper, Mrs L Gouldbourne, Brent Youth Parliament representatives and Cheese

Also Present: Councillor Arnold

Apologies were received from: Councillors Mitchell Murray, HM Patel and Ms C Jolinon

### 1. Declaration of personal and prejudicial interests

Councillor Cheese stated that he was a member of the Advisory Board for the Kilburn Locality.

### 2. Deputations (if any)

There were no deputations.

### 3. Minutes of the last meeting held on 8 December 2011

The minutes of the meeting of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 8 December 2011 were approved as a correct record.

### 4. Matters Arising

The Chair sought an update regarding the status of the following recommendations made at the last meeting of the committee on 8 December 2011: -

- (i) Review of policy for the provision of early years full time places

RESOLVED: -

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to refer the report on the provision of full time early years places to the Executive and recommended that action be taken to address the two issues of concern to members:

- That a consistent appeals procedure be put in place in schools offering full time early years places for 3 and 4 year olds

- That steps are taken to promote the availability of places to the most vulnerable families, including those who are new arrivals to the UK where language could be a significant barrier to accessing services.
- (ii) Results of Ofsted Safeguarding and Looked After children Services Inspection

RESOLVED: -

That the Ofsted report, presentation and action plan be submitted to a meeting of the Executive for their consideration and to ensure they “own” the council’s response to the Inspection.

Priya Mistry (Policy and Performance Officer) advised that the agenda for the next meeting of the Executive had not yet been published but that this would be followed up.

## 5. **Brent Youth Parliament update**

The committee welcomed Thivya Jeyashanker, the newly elected Chair for Brent Youth Parliament. Thivya Jeyashanker informed the committee that elections for the BYP Executive had been held on 28 January 2012 and the results of the election were as follows: -

- Chair - Thivya Jeyashanker
- Vice Chair - Omar Mohamed
- UK Youth Parliament representative - Chante Joseph
- Deputy UK Youth Parliament representative - Priyesh Patel
- Media representative - Adam Massoud

Thivya Jeyashanker advised that the new executive would now decide on its priorities for the forthcoming year. The next meeting of the BYP would be held on 25 February and Thivya Jeyashanker noted that all councillors would be welcome to attend.

## 6. **Youth Offending Team Inspection**

Anita Dickinson (Head of Service - Brent Youth Offending Service) presented a report to the committee setting out the results of a recent inspection of the Brent Youth Offending Service (YOS). The inspection took place in September 2011 and was conducted by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP). Anita Dickinson explained that Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) in England and Wales had been established under the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act and formed part of the criminal justice system. YOTs worked with young people aged 10 to 18 years old who were referred via court order. YOTs were multi-agency and drew staffing and resources from a range of services including the Local Authority, the Police, the Probation Service and the Health Service.

Anita Dickinson explained that the inspection had examined a representative sample of offender cases to assess whether work had been carried out sufficiently

well against the HMIP criteria. Three key practice areas were assessed; Risk of Harm, Safeguarding and Likelihood of Re-Offending. The judgement scale utilised by HMIP related to the level of improvement required, with possible outcomes encompassing 'Minimum', 'Moderate', 'Substantial' and 'Drastic'. Brent achieved a 'Moderate' award for both Safeguarding and the Likelihood of re-offending with scores of 65% and 62% respectively. For Risk of Harm which related principally to Public Protection, a score of 59% had been awarded and it was judged that substantial improvement was required. Brent's scores were close to the National Average and were greater than the results currently published for other London Youth Offending Services. Five recommendations had been proposed by HMIP for Brent and an improvement Plan to address these recommendations had since been developed and agreed with HMIP.

Anita Dickinson emphasised that the inspection was focused on how well the required processes had been followed for each case rather than outcomes. As a consequence there was some question as to whether this type of inspection provided a full assessment of the quality of the service provided. In addition, immediately prior to the inspection the Brent YOS had been subject to a budget reduction of almost 30%. As many other London YOTs had experienced similar budget reductions a request had been made to delay the inspection for London, however, this had been unsuccessful.

In the subsequent discussion, members raised several issues and queries. Ms Elsie Points sought further information regarding the inspection judgement which stated that there was little evidence of joint working within the YOT. Councillor Mathews queried how well the Brent rates for reoffending compared to other London YOTs and sought further details on whether budget reductions in partner agencies had impacted Joint Working for YOTs. Councillor Cheese queried whether YOTs had any input for young people whilst they were in custody. The Chair sought further details regarding the Triage programme, referred to within the report. The Chair also queried whether there had been any noticeable increase in youth offending rates by Brent young people following the riots of August 2011.

In addressing the committee's queries, Anita Dickinson advised that the sample of cases reviewed during the inspection had unfortunately not evidenced the high level of Joint Working between Social Care and Brent YOT. However, the impact of reductions in budgets and in available funding had created challenges for Brent's YOT. The YOT had recently lost its Mental Health worker post as the funding for this had been withdrawn. This was deemed to be a significant loss to the team given the often complex needs of the young people with whom the service engaged. Efforts were now being made to compensate for the loss of this post by working closely with the Brent Centre for Young People. In addition, the recent inspection of Children's services had identified that cuts had not been coordinated across partner agencies and consequently many similar services had been reduced or removed. The impact of reduced service provision for children and young people, alongside other changes such as those affecting access to higher education, were significant factors influencing the potential for youth offending and reoffending.

Anita Dickinson further advised the committee that YOTs were required to report on reoffending rates as a key performance indicator, to the Youth Justice Board. A new measure of 'reoffending' was in the process of being introduced and consequently, it would prove difficult in future to compare reoffending rates with previous years'.

Brent's YOT had been successful in reducing both the frequency and seriousness of reoffending for many of those cases in which it was involved. However, there were some prolific reoffenders familiar to Brent's YOT. Where young people were placed in custody, YOTs continued to engage with them and their families and would raise any concerns regarding their safety with the prison system and the Youth Justice Board.

Turning to the Chair's question regarding the Triage programme, Anita Dickinson explained that there were many impacts of having a criminal record that could cause difficulties for a young person and which could act to limit their life opportunities. Therefore, in cases relating to low level crime and where the young person had expressed remorse, the police could choose to make a referral to the Triage programme. Following an assessment by the YOT, the police could be requested to take no further action and a plan would be developed to support the young person. This programme had been sustained in a reduced form following budget and funding reductions. With reference to the riots of 2011, Anita Dickinson noted that there had been very few Brent young people involved.

RESOLVED: - that the report be noted.

## **7. Complex Families Review**

Joanna McCormick (Partnerships Co-ordinator) and Fiona Ledden (Director of Legal and Procurement) delivered a presentation to the committee on the Complex Families Project. This project was being developed by the council and partner agencies and aimed to pilot multi-agency early intervention with a cohort of families in the borough. The project would have one management structure, which would facilitate better joint working. Intervention would be co-ordinated via key workers and with reference to individual family plans which would be developed in collaboration with families. Key workers would be required to have specialist knowledge in certain areas which would ensure that there would be a range of knowledge and experience available within the team. This model would bring the necessary professionals around the individual and families as and when needed and would reduce duplication of work.

Fiona Ledden explained that she was sponsoring this project, which entailed providing support to the project in its progress through the one-council programme. This project reflected the amalgamation of several key initiatives being driven forward by central government. It was intended that the positive results of the project would be evident through a reduced impact on the criminal justice system and social care services.

Joanna McCormick further explained that an analysis of child poverty in Brent had indicated that 34.1% of families struggle to meet the basic necessities of life. Parents were disadvantaged by various factors including employability, child care costs and house prices. Changes to benefit entitlement would further disadvantage certain families; in particular lone parents and families with two or more children were at greater risk of this. Central government had estimated that over 1000 families would lose an average of £83 per week in Brent and a further 8,000 would experience reductions just from the cap on Housing Benefit. The project would work with families as a whole and aimed to tackle poverty not 'troubled families'.



Challenges for the project included the national economic context, unemployment and the effective coordination of different central government department initiatives.

Several queries were raised by members in the subsequent discussion. The Chair sought details of how families were identified for this project and Councillor Matthews queried how hard to reach families would be engaged. The Chair and Ms J Cooper (Observer) also sought details regarding the funding arrangements for the project. Councillor Matthews further queried whether support via the project was maintained in the longer term.

In response to members' questions, Joanna McCormick advised that a risk based assessment would be conducted following the receipt of a referral which could be made by a range of services. 150 families were being identified so far with central government seeking a larger number of families to be supported by each authority through its troubled families programme over the next 3 years. Criteria had been established which set the parameters for the cohort of families with whom the project aimed to engage and attempts would be made to identify hard to reach families that might meet this criteria.

With regard to funding and resources, Joanna McCormick advised that existing resources from the council and from across partner agencies would be redirected to support the project's new way of providing multi-agency input to families. In addition, discussions were on-going with central government to clarify its funding approach of payment by results. This approach envisaged the setting of targets and where those targets were met the provision of funds by central government. If targets were exceeded, additional funds would be provided. The means by which results were to be measured was yet to be agreed. The council was particularly interested in measures relating to employment, education, health, deprivation and whether children were subject to Child Protection Plans. Within the current pilot project, work had been conducted with families over the period of a year but final details would be clarified in discussions with central government. Similar pilot projects elsewhere had set timeframes of between 9 and 18 months and had achieved a cost avoidance per family of between £15k and £18k.

Ms Elsie Points enquired whether services offered by voluntary agencies would be included within the multi-agency approach offered by the project. Joanna McCormick confirmed that work was taking place with voluntary agencies such as Addaction and it was intended that this would be expanded.

Councillor Cheese commented on the difficulties faced by lone parent families and particularly noted the barriers to employment and the significance of the impact of the changes to benefit entitlement. Joanna McCormick advised that child care costs were also a significant challenge for lone parent's seeking employment. Councillor Cheese noted that he had presented his concerns to the Children and Families minister regarding the adverse impact that rent capping would have on children, which through families being forced to move out of certain areas would include disruption to children's education.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the report be noted

- (ii) That an update on the project be presented to a future meeting of the committee.

## 8. Special Educational Needs - Additional Resourced Schools

Rik Boxer presented a report to the committee focusing on the provision of school places for young people with high level special educational needs (SEN). Whilst the majority of children with SEN had their needs met within mainstream schools, those with severe and complex needs would have a Statement of SEN drawn up which would set out the special provision required to meet their needs; this might include a specialist placement. Due to factors such as a rising population, the numbers of children requiring SEN statements had increased over the previous 5 years, in contrast to the national trend which had fallen over the same period. As a result of this trend there was a substantial budgetary deficit within the Dedicated Schools Budget which affected the total funds available for schools in Brent. Rik Boxer explained that the report provided to the committee set out what actions were proposed to address this issue.

Rik Boxer advised that a SEN transformation programme was being driven via the One Council Programme Management Board. The aim of the programme was to maintain and improve outcomes for SEN whilst reducing the associated costs and eliminating the dedicated schools budget deficit over a 3 year period. The council was working closely with the Schools' Forum and with schools direct to achieve this aim. All aspects of the council's SEN policy and procedures were being reviewed and a strategy was being developed. All parties would be consulted and the draft strategy document would be issued by March 2012.

Rik Boxer advised that there were several strands to the SEN transformation programme including school expansion projects to increase local specialist provision. It was noted that the single largest factor in overall SEN costs resulted from placing Brent students in day placements outside of the borough and therefore the school expansion projects were a highly significant aspect of the programme. Members' attention was drawn to paragraphs 5.2 and 5.7 of the report which set out several school expansion projects including the development of new co-located provision for secondary aged students with severe learning difficulties via the rebuild of the Village School by September 2013 and the opening of a satellite centre at Queens Park School in September 2011; expanded specialist nursery provision at Granville Plus Children's Centre; planned development of Vernon House Special school to provide 30 places for pupils with autism; and the intention to establish a 20 place Additionally Resourced Provision at Alperton community School, for which agreement in principle had been obtained.

The committee raised several issues in the subsequent discussion. The Chair queried how the school expansion projects were financed. Ms J Cooper queried whether the knowledge and experience of SEN teachers and Head teachers had been made use of by the One Council programme. Ms J Cooper further noted that many of the school expansion projects related to provision for primary aged pupils and queried whether the subsequent demand on secondary places had been addressed. Ms J Cooper also raised a concern regarding the intention to drive down costs of SEN transport, noting that continuity in staff was beneficial to maintaining a good quality service. Ms Elsie Points noted the introduction of the

'Individual Pupil Support Agreement' (IPSA) as an alternative in certain circumstances to the statutory SEN assessment process and expressed concern that this would result in the needs of some pupils not being fully recognised or met. Councillor Cheese queried whether there were many SEN places filled by pupils from outside of the borough.

In response to members' queries, Rik Boxer explained that the provision of local SEN placements removed the cumulative budgetary pressure of those that it was replacing out of the borough. The capital costs of expansion were not always considerable, particularly where existing facilities were adapted. Where the associated costs of expansion were significant the council had an agreement in principle with the Schools' Forum that the cost of borrowing the required funds would be charged to the dedicated schools budget. Rik Boxer emphasised that there was a focus within the SEN transformation programme, on working closely with the Schools' Forum and direct with Brent's schools. The programme, however, drew resources from across the council services.

Turning to the subject of the development of adequate secondary school places to meet future demand, Rik Boxer confirmed that this had been considered within the long term strategy for SEN provision. A detailed piece of work had been completed regarding demand for SEN places in the longer term and it had been projected that a further 200 specialist places would be required by 2020. These places would be required across all phases and the current expansions were part of a longer term strategy.

Addressing some of the specific concerns expressed by the committee, Rik Boxer advised that the focus of the strategy with regard to the SEN transport service was to achieve cost reduction by increasing the availability of local placements, thereby reducing the length of journeys required. With regard to the introduction of the 'Individual Pupil Support Agreement' (IPSA), this was a means of assessing the needs of pupils and securing the required funding to address these needs, without having to engage in the lengthy and costly process of a statutory assessment. There was an emphasis on ensuring that the decision making with regard to the IPSAs was clear, transparent and consistent. Turning to Councillor Cheese's query, Rik Boxer advised that there were approximately 20 pupils in SEN placements in local authority maintained special schools who came from outside of the borough.

RESOLVED: - that the report be noted.

## 9. **School Places Update**

Rik Boxer presented a verbal update to the committee regarding school places within Brent. The shortage of primary school places remained an acute problem and was exacerbated by the continued flow of new arrivals to the borough. At present there were 632 primary aged children in Brent without a school place. Whilst there were currently 306 vacancies across Brent's primary schools, these were not necessarily in the required year groups or geographical areas with the highest shortfall of school places. Consultation on new permanent expansion schemes is being undertaken at Barham Primary School, Fryent Primary School and Mitchell Brook Primary School to provide additional primary provision. Temporary bulge classes would be needed from September 2012 and options for

these were currently being reviewed. The government had awarded £25m to the council to contribute towards the capital costs of expanding primary provision.

Rik Boxer informed the committee that the closing date for Reception year applications had been 15 January 2012 and at present 3,717 had been received. In contrast the number of applications received for 2011 had been 3,642 which further evidenced the continued growth in demand for school places.

With reference to the minutes of the previous meeting, Mr Alloysius Frederick noted that Councillor Arnold had indicated that two schools had submitted expressions of interest in becoming all-through schools and sought an update on this. Rik Boxer advised that no decisions had yet been made.

**10. Items from the Forward Plan and the Work Programme**

The work programme items scheduled for the following meeting were outlined to the committee. The Chair noted that if members' had any ideas for future items for scrutiny they should be forwarded to her or to Priya Mistry (Policy and Performance Officer).

**11. Date of next meeting**


The committee noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on Thursday 29 March 2012.

**12. Any other urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm

H GLADBAUM  
Chair

 The logo of Brent Council, featuring a central coat of arms with a shield, a crown, and two lions, surrounded by the words 'BRENT COUNCIL' in a circular arrangement.	<p><b>Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b> Thursday 29 March 2012</p> <p><b>Report from the Director of Children and Families</b></p>
<p>For Information <span style="float: right;">Wards Affected: ALL</span></p>	
<p><b>Education Standards in Brent 2011</b></p>	

## 1.0 Summary

1.1 This report comments on education standards achieved by Brent schools at the end of the academic year 2010/11.

## 2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are asked to note the continuing improvements in education standards and the contribution made by Services to Schools to these outcomes.

## 3.0 Detail

3.1 The details are set out in the attached report – Appendix A

## 4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications contained within this report.

## 5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 There are no legal implications contained within this report.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

6.1 Diversity issues are highlighted throughout the report. Analyses relating to the achievement of specific groups by gender, ethnicity, free school meals and special educational needs are included for each Key Stage.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)**

7.1 There are no staffing/accommodation issues contained within this report.

### **Background Papers**

- i) Performance data, available electronically, published by the Department for Education, for example, School Performance Tables

### **Contact Officers**

**Faira Ellks, Head of Services to Schools**

[faira.ellks@brent.gov.uk](mailto:faira.ellks@brent.gov.uk) or 020 8937 3378

**Rik Boxer, Assistant Director of Children and Families**

[rik.boxer@brent.gov.uk](mailto:rik.boxer@brent.gov.uk) or 020 8937 3201

**Director of Children & Families**

**Krutika Pau**

### 1.0 Summary of assessments, national performance indicators and expectations

1.1. This chart summarises the assessments for each stage up to Key Stage 5:

<b>Key Stage</b>	<b>Age at end of key stage</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Expectation / Key performance measure</b>
Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)	5	<p>EYFS practitioners carry out observations and assessments of pupils in Nursery and Reception classes across six areas of learning. At the end of Reception, teachers record their judgements on pupils' attainment for the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile. A nine-point scale is used to assess each strand of each area of learning. Children with six or more points in all scales are working securely within the Early Learning Goals.</p> <p>There are 13 assessment areas covering the six areas of learning, namely Personal, Social and Emotional Development (PSED); Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL); Problem-solving, Reasoning and Numeracy; Knowledge and Understanding of the World; Physical Development; Creative Development.</p>	<p>Children should be working securely within the Early Learning Goals.</p> <p>The main indicator of success is the percentage of children achieving 78+ points across all areas of learning with at least 6+ in each strand of Communication, Language and Literacy (CLL) and in Personal, Social and Emotional Development (PSED).</p> <p>The other main indicator relates to the narrowing of the gap between the achievement of the lowest performing 20% of children and the rest.</p>
Key Stage 1	7	Teachers assess pupils' attainment in reading, writing, mathematics and science using National Curriculum levels and sub- levels.	<p>Pupils should achieve at least Level 2.</p> <p>Attainment at Level 2b+ is a key predictor of attainment at Level 4+ at the end of Key Stage 2.</p>
Key Stage 2	11	Tests in English and mathematics using National Curriculum levels.	<p>The key performance measures are based on the proportion of pupils:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• achieving Level 4+ in English <u>and</u> mathematics combined</li> <li>• making at least 2 levels of progress from Key Stage 1 in English and</li> </ul>

Key Stage	Age at end of key stage	Assessment	Expectation / Key performance measure
			in mathematics.
Key Stage 3	14	Teacher assessment only in English, mathematics and science using National Curriculum levels.	Based on teacher assessment, the main performance indicators are achievement at Level 5+ and Level 6+ in each of English, mathematics and science
Key Stage 4	16	GCSE examinations or equivalent.	The key performance measures are based on the percentage of students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• achieving 5+ A*- C grades (including English <u>and</u> mathematics) at GCSE</li> <li>• making the equivalent of 3 levels of progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 in English and in mathematics</li> </ul>
Key Stage 5	19	Students follow courses at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 (qualifications equivalent to five GCSEs D-G)</li> <li>• Level 2 (qualifications equivalent to five GCSEs A*-C)</li> <li>• Level 3 (qualifications equivalent to two A levels A-E)</li> </ul>	Key performance measures relate to achievement at Levels 2 and 3 by age 19, based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average Points Score (APS) per learner</li> <li>• Level 3 APS per entry</li> <li>• The ALPS value-added grade</li> <li>• success rates.</li> </ul>

## 2.0 Summary 2011

2.1. Brent has above average levels of deprivation. However, standards were near or above national averages against many indicators.

## 3.0 Early Years Foundation Stage(EYFS)

3.1. Standards at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage were low in 2010, but in 2011 they rose to just below national averages. In addition, the gap between the lowest performing 20% of children and all other children narrowed, bringing Brent's performance close to the national average.

## 4.0 Primary

4.1. At Key Stage 1, results for Level 2+ improved to near national averages. At Level 3, standards remained below average, but the gaps narrowed between Brent's results and those nationally.



- 4.2. Brent pupils made above average progress from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2, and standards at Level 4+ and Level 5+ were at or above national averages.

## **5.0 Secondary**

- 5.1. Results at Key Stage 3 were above the national averages for Level 6+ but below for Level 5+. As these figures rely on teacher assessment, comparisons are not secure for this key stage. Pupils made above average progress and standards rose at Key Stage 4. Results were above average for 5+ GCSE grades at A\*-C including English and mathematics, as they were for the English Baccalaureate (EBacc). Results were average for 5+ GCSE grades at A\*-C in any subjects.
- 5.2. Improvements continued at A Level (Level 3) and the average points score (APS) per candidate exceeded the national average. The average grade per entry was between B and C. Value added was excellent.

## **6.0 Groups of pupils**

- 6.1. Girls did better than boys at Key Stage 1, although Brent boys' results were above the national averages for boys at Key Stages 1 and 2. At Key Stage 2, girls achieved better results than boys at Level 4+, but differences at Level 5+ were less clear. By the end of Key Stage 4, girls outperformed boys on most indicators. At Key Stage 5, boys' results improved: although girls had a higher APS per candidate, the APS per entry was the same for boys and girls.
- 6.2. Gaps in achievement by the end of Key Stage 2 between pupils entitled to free school meals (FSM) and others remained, but were narrower than those found nationally. At Key Stage 4 the gap widened.
- 6.3. Gaps in performance between different ethnic groups continued and although there were some encouraging improvements, there were also disappointing falls in results. Pupils of Indian and Pakistani origin performed better than the national averages for those groups. Results improved for Somali pupils. However, the performance of Black British/Caribbean pupils remains a cause of concern.
- 6.4. The attainment of pupils with SEND is above the national average for those groups at Key Stage 1, Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4. The progress of pupils with SEN from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 is above the national average for those groups.

## 7.0 Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)

- 7.1. There was a significant improvement in EYFS outcomes in 2011. The percentage of children scoring 78 points or more across all areas of learning, including Communication Language and Literacy (CLL) and Personal Social and Emotional Development (PSED) rose by 14 percentage points (ppts). This result narrowed the gap between Brent and national averages to 2 ppts. In common with the national picture, attainment in CLL was lower than in the other five areas of learning.
- 7.2. In terms of reducing the gap in attainment between the lowest achieving 20% of children and all other children, Brent's performance also improved. The gap narrowed from 35% in 2010 to 32% in 2011. As a result, Brent's performance was closer to the national average of 31%.
- 7.3. With the exception of a dip in 2010, the overall five year trend was one of steady improvement.
- 7.4. The attainment of boys was in line with the national average whilst the attainment of girls was below the national average.
- 7.5. The performance of children entitled to Free School Meals (FSM) improved significantly, and was above the national average for this group.
- 7.6. In terms of the attainment of key ethnic groups, Somali children performed very strongly. There was a 19 ppt improvement, placing this group within 7 ppts of all children nationally. There has been a 39 ppt improvement for this group over the last five years.
- 7.7. For Black Caribbean children, there has been a steady upward trend since 2008, resulting in a narrowing of the gap between this group and all children nationally to 6 ppts.
- 7.8. Key activity undertaken by the Early Years Quality Improvement team which has had a positive impact on standards has included:
  - promoting accurate self-evaluation by settings
  - the provision of robust support and challenge
  - ensuring accurate assessment of children's achievements
  - ensuring aligned working with other local authority professionals within localities
  - providing or signposting opportunities for continuing professional development.
- 7.9. Key priorities for the current year are to:
  - intensify the levels of support and challenge to settings requiring improvement
  - intervene more vigorously in private, voluntary and independent settings causing concern
  - promote the sharing of effective practice.

## 7.10. Attainment EYFS

Table 1

EYFSP	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference		
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011	
% with total 78 points or more in all areas, including 6+ in PSED and CLL (indicator 1)	37	46	41	49	45	52	43	56	57	59	↑	14	-2
Equality Gap: The gap between the lowest achieving 20% and others	40	37	39	36	35	34	35	33	32	31	↓	-3	1
% boys achievement against indicator 1	19	38	34	41	39	43	37	47	50	50	↑	13	0
% girls achievement against indicator 1	28	54	47	58	51	61	50	65	65	68	↑	15	-3
% Black Caribbean children's achievement against indicator 1	22	35	39	40	43	43	45	49	53	54	↑	8	-1
% Somali children's achievement against indicator 1	13	~	28	~	37	~	33	~	52	~	↑	19	~
% of children on FSM: achievement against indicator 1	21	28	44	31	35	34	34	40	49	44	↑	15	5
% of pupils achieving 6+ points in PSED	53	71	63	72	67	74	64	77	77	79	↑	13	-2
% of pupils achieving 6+ points in CLL	32	49	45	53	49	55	60	59	60	62	→	0	-2
% of pupils achieving 6+ points in PSRN	47	66	56	68	63	70	62	72	70	74	↑	8	-4
% of pupils achieving 6+ points in KUW	58	77	67	79	72	81	68	83	79	84	↑	11	-5
% of pupils achieving 6+ points in PHY	80	88	87	89	87	90	86	91	89	91	↑	3	-2
% of pupils achieving 6+ points in CRE	60	78	73	79	77	80	76	82	82	83	↑	6	-1

EYFSP	Early Years Foundation Stage Profile
FSM	Free School Meals
PSED	Personal Social and Emotional Development
CLL	Communication, Language and Literacy
PSRN	Problem solving, reasoning and numeracy
KUW	Knowledge and understanding of the world
PHY	Physical development
CRE	Creative development

## 8.0 Key Stage 1

- 8.1. Attainment at Level 2+ (the key national benchmark) was in line with the national average in reading and writing and just below it in mathematics. Standards rose in reading, writing and mathematics, whereas national figures were static or declining.
- 8.2. Attainment at Level 2B+ is a key predictor of attainment at Level 4+ at the end of Key Stage 2. This remained below the national average, but the gap narrowed because Brent's figures rose in reading by 5 ppts, in writing by 4 ppts and in mathematics by 6 ppts.
- 8.3. Attainment at Level 3+, although still below national averages, remained stable in reading but rose slightly in writing and mathematics, narrowing the gap between Brent and national averages. The widest gap between the Brent and national averages was in reading.
- 8.4. There has been a steadily improving trend in performance at Key Stage 1 over the last five years.
- 8.5. The attainment of girls was higher than that of boys in all three areas and at all levels except at Level 3 in mathematics. Girls did not perform as well as girls nationally across the board but boys' performance was above that of boys nationally at Levels 2+ and 2B+

- in writing and in line with the national average at Level 2+ in reading and mathematics and at Level 3+ in writing.
- 8.6. FSM pupils performed better than FSM pupils nationally in reading, writing and mathematics and at all levels. Non-FSM pupils did not perform as well as non-FSM pupils nationally. However, both groups of pupils improved their performance in all three areas and at all levels compared with 2010 results, except in mathematics at Level 3 for FSM pupils, where performance declined slightly. The gap between the performance of FSM and non-FSM pupils in both English and mathematics was much narrower than the national gap except in writing at Level 3, where it remained the same, and reading at Level 3, where it increased slightly.
- 8.7. In terms of the performance of key ethnic groups, the attainment of pupils of Indian heritage at Level 2+ was broadly in line with national averages for that group, and well above Brent and national averages for all pupils.
- 8.8. The attainment of pupils of Pakistani heritage was just above that of this group nationally, and the performance of Pakistani boys in writing improved by 5 pts.
- 8.9. Results for White Other pupils were broadly in line with the national averages for that group, although there was a slight fall in reading and writing.
- 8.10. The performance of Somali pupils improved significantly in reading, writing and mathematics, with Somali boys improving at a faster rate than girls. Although the attainment of this group was below national averages for all pupils, the gap narrowed in all three areas.
- 8.11. The performance of Black Caribbean pupils has been largely static over the last five years and their attainment was in line with that of Black Caribbean pupils nationally.
- 8.12. In reading, writing and mathematics at Level 2+, the attainment of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) in Brent, with and without statements, was better than the national average for the same group. There was a rise in attainment in all three subjects compared with 2010. There has been an upward trend in the attainment of pupils with SEN over three years.
- 8.13. These outcomes reflect schools' increased focus on raising standards at Key Stage 1, in response to a local authority emphasis on this, starting three years previously. The results for English also showed the impact of the Communication Language and Literacy Development (CLLD) programme, which focused on early literacy and of the Every Child a Reader (ECaR) programme, which aims to increase the impact of the Reading Recovery teacher in a school. The results for mathematics showed the impact of the Every Child Counts (ECC) programme, which aims to improve the chances of children at risk of not achieving Level 2 at the end of Key Stage 1.
- 8.14. Key priorities for the current year for English are to:
- continue to run successful literacy programmes
  - provide support for schools in preparation for the Year 1 phonics check
  - provide support tailored to schools' individual needs.
- 8.15. Key priorities for the current year for mathematics are to:
- secure success at Level 3 for more pupils

- extend opportunities for speaking and listening in mathematics.

8.16. The special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and Ethnic Minority Achievement Services to Schools teams have continued to provide specialist training, advice, support and guidance to schools in order to improve outcomes for these groups of pupils. These teams will continue to provide a similar range of services over the coming year.

## Attainment Key Stage 1

Table 2

KS1 - Level 2+ all pupils	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% of pupils achieving L2+ in reading	80	84	79	84	81	84	83	85	85	85	↑ 2	0
% of pupils achieving L2+ in writing	76	80	73	80	77	81	78	81	81	81	↑ 3	0
% of pupils achieving L2+ in mathematics	86	90	84	90	87	89	86	89	89	90	↑ 3	-1

Table 3

KS1 - Level 2B+ all pupils	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% of pupils achieving L2B+ in reading	65	71	65	71	65	72	66	72	71	74	↑ 5	-3
% of pupils achieving L2B+ in writing	55	59	52	58	54	60	56	60	60	61	↑ 4	-1
% of pupils achieving L2B+ in mathematics	68	74	65	74	66	74	66	73	72	74	↑ 6	-2

Table 4

KS1 - Level 3+ all pupils	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% of pupils achieving L3+ in reading	19	26	20	25	19	26	20	26	20	26	→ 0	-6
% of pupils achieving L3+ in writing	9	13	9	12	9	12	10	12	12	12	↑ 2	0
% of pupils achieving L3+ in mathematics	17	22	18	21	15	21	17	20	18	20	↑ 1	-2

Table 5

KS1 - Level 2+ by gender	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% boys achieving L2+ in reading	76	80	76	80	78	80	80	81	82	82	↑ 2	0
% boys achieving L2+ in writing	72	75	70	75	72	75	74	75	78	76	↑ 4	2
% boys achieving L2+ in mathematics	85	88	82	88	85	88	85	88	88	88	↑ 3	0
% girls achieving L2+ in reading	83	88	81	88	84	88	85	89	88	89	↑ 3	-1
% girls achieving L2+ in writing	81	86	78	86	82	87	83	87	85	87	↑ 2	-2
% girls achieving L2+ in mathematics	87	91	86	91	88	91	87	91	90	91	↑ 3	-1

Table 6

KS1 - Level 2B+ by gender	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% boys achieving L2B+ in reading	60	66	62	66	61	67	62	67	67	68	↑ 5	-1
% boys achieving L2B+ in writing	49	51	47	51	48	52	49	52	54	53	↑ 5	1
% boys achieving L2B+ in mathematics	67	73	65	73	65	72	64	72	70	73	↑ 6	-3
% girls achieving L2B+ in reading	69	77	68	77	69	77	71	78	75	79	↑ 4	-4
% girls achieving L2B+ in writing	61	67	57	67	61	68	63	69	68	70	↑ 5	-2
% girls achieving L2B+ in mathematics	68	75	68	75	67	75	67	75	73	76	↑ 6	-3

Table 7

KS1 - Level 3+ by gender	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% boys achieving L3+ in reading	18	22	17	21	16	22	16	22	18	22	↑ 2	-4
% boys achieving L3+ in writing	8	9	8	8	7	9	8	8	9	9	↑ 1	0
% boys achieving L3+ in mathematics	20	24	20	24	18	23	18	23	20	23	↑ 2	-3
% girls achieving L3+ in reading	20	30	22	29	22	30	23	30	23	30	→ 0	-7
% girls achieving L3+ in writing	11	17	11	16	12	16	13	16	15	17	↑ 2	-2
% girls achieving L3+ in mathematics	14	20	17	19	13	19	15	18	16	18	↑ 1	-2

Table 8

KS1 - Level 2+ by FSM	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L2+ in reading	74	69	72	69	76	71	77	72	81	73	↑ 4	8
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L2+ in writing	70	63	64	64	70	66	70	66	76	68	↑ 6	8
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L2+ in mathematics	81	80	78	79	83	80	81	80	86	80	↑ 5	6

Table 9

KS1 - Level 2B+ by FSM	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L2B+ in reading	57	52	54	51	56	54	59	55	65	57	↑ 6	8
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L2B+ in writing	44	37	40	37	44	40	46	41	52	43	↑ 6	9
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L2B+ in mathematics	58	56	54	56	58	57	56	57	65	58	↑ 9	7

Table 10

KS1 - Level 3+ by FSM	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L3+ in reading	10	11	11	10	14	11	13	12	13	12	→ 0	1
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L3+ in writing	6	4	5	4	6	4	6	4	8	5	↑ 2	3
% pupils on FSM: achievement at L3+ in mathematics	11	9	11	9	10	9	11	9	10	9	↓ -1	1

Table 11

KS1 - Level 2+ by ethnicity	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean pupils achieving L2+ in reading	81	81	77	80	81	80	83	81	81	82	↓ -2	-1
% Black Caribbean pupils achieving L2+ in writing	76	75	67	74	76	75	77	75	77	77	→ 0	0
% Black Caribbean pupils achieving L2+ in mathematics	86	85	81	85	82	84	82	84	85	85	↑ 3	0
% Somali pupils achieving L2+ in reading	65	~	72	~	77	~	76	~	80	~	↑ 4	~
% Somali pupils achieving L2+ in writing	61	~	61	~	67	~	65	~	76	~	↑ 11	~
% Somali pupils achieving L2+ in mathematics	75	~	75	~	80	~	80	~	86	~	↑ 6	~
% White Other pupils achieving L2+ in reading	73	75	66	75	76	76	77	77	75	77	↓ -2	-2
% White Other pupils achieving L2+ in writing	71	72	63	71	71	73	76	74	73	73	↓ -3	0
% White Other pupils achieving L2+ in mathematics	84	86	76	86	88	86	84	86	85	86	↑ 1	-1
% Pakistani pupils achieving L2+ in reading	80	77	75	77	78	80	83	81	85	83	↑ 2	2
% Pakistani pupils achieving L2+ in writing	74	72	72	72	76	75	77	76	80	78	↑ 3	2
% Pakistani pupils achieving L2+ in mathematics	84	83	81	82	82	83	86	84	86	85	→ 0	1
% Asian Indian pupils achieving L2+ in reading	84	88	85	89	89	90	89	91	93	92	↑ 4	1
% Asian Indian pupils achieving L2+ in writing	82	85	82	86	85	88	85	88	89	89	↑ 4	0
% Asian Indian pupils achieving L2+ in mathematics	91	92	91	92	93	93	92	93	96	94	↑ 4	2

Table 12

KS1 - Level 2+ by ethnicity /boys	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference		
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011	
% Black Caribbean boys achieving L2+ in reading	78	75	73	75	76	75	78	76	76	77	↓	-2	-1
% Black Caribbean boys achieving L2+ in writing	72	68	62	67	72	67	72	68	71	70	↓	-1	1
% Black Caribbean boys achieving L2+ in mathematics	86	82	79	82	79	81	79	81	82	82	↑	3	0
% Somali boys achieving L2+ in reading	62	~	74	~	74	~	72	~	79	~	↑	7	~
% Somali boys achieving L2+ in writing	56	~	58	~	63	~	59	~	73	~	↑	14	~
% Somali boys achieving L2+ in mathematics	74	~	77	~	82	~	79	~	88	~	↑	9	~
% White Other boys achieving L2+ in reading	73	71	62	71	72	73	74	73	73	74	↓	-1	-1
% White Other boys achieving L2+ in writing	69	67	59	66	65	68	70	68	70	68	→	0	2
% White Other boys achieving L2+ in mathematics	86	85	76	85	86	85	83	85	85	85	↑	2	0
% Pakistani boys achieving L2+ in reading	70	72	72	73	76	76	81	77	81	79	→	0	2
% Pakistani boys achieving L2+ in writing	63	66	66	66	71	70	72	71	76	72	↑	4	4
% Pakistani boys achieving L2+ in mathematics	78	80	77	80	82	82	85	82	84	83	↓	-1	1
% Asian Indian boys achieving L2+ in reading	81	86	83	87	85	88	86	89	90	90	↑	4	0
% Asian Indian boys achieving L2+ in writing	77	81	80	82	82	84	80	85	85	85	↑	5	0
% Asian Indian boys achieving L2+ in mathematics	91	91	89	91	91	91	91	92	96	93	↑	5	3



Table 13

KS1 - Level 2+ by ethnicity /girls	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference		
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011	
% Black Caribbean girls achieving L2+ in reading	84	86	81	85	85	85	87	86	86	88	↓	-1	-2
% Black Caribbean girls achieving L2+ in writing	80	82	71	80	80	83	82	83	83	84	↑	1	-1
% Black Caribbean girls achieving L2+ in mathematics	86	88	83	87	86	87	85	87	88	88	↑	3	0
% Somali girls achieving L2+ in reading	67	~	72	~	79	~	80	~	81	~	↑	1	~
% Somali girls achieving L2+ in writing	66	~	67	~	71	~	71	~	80	~	↑	9	~
% Somali girls achieving L2+ in mathematics	76	~	77	~	79	~	81	~	85	~	↑	4	~
% White Other girls achieving L2+ in reading	73	78	69	78	80	80	80	81	78	81	↓	-2	-3
% White Other girls achieving L2+ in writing	76	77	66	76	77	79	81	79	77	79	↓	-4	-2
% White Other girls achieving L2+ in mathematics	81	87	77	87	89	88	85	87	84	87	↓	-1	-3
% Pakistani girls achieving L2+ in reading	89	82	78	82	80	83	86	85	90	86	↑	4	4
% Pakistani girls achieving L2+ in writing	83	78	77	79	81	81	83	82	86	84	↑	3	2
% Pakistani girls achieving L2+ in mathematics	89	85	84	85	83	85	88	86	88	87	→	0	1
% Asian Indian girls achieving L2+ in reading	88	92	88	92	92	93	92	94	96	95	↑	4	1
% Asian Indian girls achieving L2+ in writing	86	89	85	90	88	91	89	92	94	93	↑	5	1
% Asian Indian girls achieving L2+ in mathematics	91	93	93	94	94	94	92	94	97	95	↑	5	2

Table 14

KS1 - Level 2+ by SEN	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference		
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011	
% pupils with SEN achieving L2+ in reading	59	48	55	50	58	51	58	52	62	52	↑	4	10
% pupils with SEN achieving L2+ in writing	52	41	47	41	50	43	49	43	53	43	↑	4	10
% pupils with SEN achieving L2+ in mathematics	69	65	63	65	70	64	65	64	71	64	↑	6	7
% pupils without a statement achieving L2+ in reading	58	51	60	52	61	54	61	54	66	55	↑	5	11
% pupils without a statement achieving L2+ in writing	49	43	51	44	52	46	52	46	57	46	↑	5	11
% pupils without a statement achieving L2+ in mathematics	65	68	69	68	74	68	69	67	75	68	↑	6	7
% pupils with a statement achieving L2+ in reading	16	24	13	23	24	23	27	23	35	23	↑	8	12
% pupils with a statement achieving L2+ in writing	16	18	10	17	17	17	26	17	27	16	↑	1	11
% pupils with a statement achieving L2+ in mathematics	19	28	14	27	24	27	26	26	41	26	↑	15	15

## 9.0 Key Stage 2

- 9.1. Attainment at Level 4+ was in line with the national average for English and mathematics combined, despite a fall from the previous year's unusually high results. Attainment at Level 4+ in English was in line with the national average, although there was a 2 ppt fall from the previous year. Attainment at Level 4+ in mathematics was above the national average and results were the same as in the previous year
- 9.2. At Level 5, attainment in English and in English and mathematics combined was above the national average. In mathematics it was well above.
- 9.3. These figures represent a rising trend at all levels over five years except in English at Level 5.
- 9.4. The other key measure of success at Key Stage 2 is the percentage of pupils making at least two levels of progress in English and in mathematics from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2. In Brent, the percentage of pupils making two levels of progress in English and in mathematics was well above the national averages and remained the same as in 2010.
- 9.5. The new higher Key Stage 2 floor standard in 2011 consisted of two key measures. The first required that at least 60% of pupils should achieve Level 4+ in both English and mathematics. Four schools failed to meet this measure. The second measure was based on the expectation that the proportion of pupils making two levels of progress from Key Stage 1 in English and in mathematics would at least be in line with the national median. Four schools failed to meet this measure. Only one school failed to achieve both key measures included in the floor standard.
- 9.6. Boys' attainment at Level 4+ was in line with that of boys nationally in English and in English and mathematics combined, and 3 ppts above the national average for boys in mathematics. At Level 5, their performance was slightly above national averages in English and in English and mathematics combined. Attainment in mathematics was 6 ppts above the national average for boys at Level 5.
- 9.7. Girls' attainment at Level 4+ on all three measures was close to national averages for girls. At Level 5, attainment was close to national averages for girls in English and in English and mathematics combined, and 4 ppts above the national average for girls in mathematics.
- 9.8. FSM pupils performed better than FSM pupils nationally in all subjects at Level 4+ and Level 5+. The performance of FSM pupils declined in comparison to 2010 at Level 4+ across the board, whilst the performance of non-FSM pupils improved. At Level 5+ the performance of both groups improved in mathematics but declined in English and in the two subjects combined. The gap in achievement between FSM and non-FSM pupils increased against all indicators at Level 4+; at Level 5+ the gap decreased in English and remained the same in mathematics and in the two subjects combined.
- 9.9. In terms of the performance of key ethnic groups, pupils of Indian origin outperformed Indian pupils nationally at Level 4+ in English and mathematics combined for the first time in 2010 and, despite a small decline, continued to do so in 2011.

- 9.10. The overall performance of White Other pupils was the same as in 2010 largely as a result of an 8 ppt improvement for boys.
- 9.11. The attainment of key Black and minority ethnic groups was very disappointing, with a drop in performance for Black Caribbean pupils (down 3 ppts), for Pakistani heritage pupils (down 4ppts) and a significant drop for Somali pupils (down 8 ppts). The decline in girls' attainment was greater than that of boys in all key groups, except the Black Caribbean group, where the position was reversed. The most significant falls were for Somali girls (11 ppts) and Pakistani girls (8 ppts).
- 9.12. The percentage of pupils with SEN gaining Level 4+ in both English and mathematics declined slightly, in comparison with 2010. However, performance was well above the national average for this group. The percentage of pupils without a statement of SEN gaining Level 4+ in both English and mathematics declined but was above the national average for this group. The percentage of pupils with a statement of SEN gaining Level 4+ in both English and mathematics improved when compared with 2010 and was above the national average for this group. Though variable, there has been an upward trend for all pupils with SEN over five years.
- 9.13. The percentage of pupils with SEN making two levels of progress in English and the percentage making two levels of progress in mathematics increased over five years. The percentage of pupils making two levels of progress in 2011 was above the national average for the same group.
- 9.14. The Key Stage 2 SEN/non-SEN gap was narrower than the national gap in 2008 and 2009. Although the gap widened a little in 2011, it was still narrower than the national gap for 2009. National data for 2010 and 2011 is not available.
- 9.15. Support for English at Key Stage 2 in 2010-11 included:
- the provision of support and challenge for schools causing concern
  - the provision of central and school-based training
  - action research projects
  - reviews of English in partnership with school leaders
  - advice and training on improving assessment practice.
- 9.16. Priorities for English in the current year are to:
- develop planned talk for learning
  - narrow the gap further between reading and writing
  - promote reading for pleasure.
- These will be addressed through action research projects and targeted support for schools.
- 9.17. Support for mathematics in 2010-11 included:
- the provision of support and challenge for schools causing concern
  - the provision of central and school-based training
  - an action research project
  - reviews of teaching and learning in mathematics with specialist LA staff working in partnership with school leaders
  - advice on improving assessment practice.

9.18. Priorities for mathematics in the current year are to:

- accelerate the progress of underachieving pupils through improving planned talk for learning
- support teachers in increasing the level of challenge for all pupils.

Support will be provided through partnership reviews, school-based support and central training.

9.19. The special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and Ethnic Minority Achievement Services to Schools teams have continued to provide specialist training, advice, support and guidance to schools in order to improve outcomes for these groups of pupils. These teams will continue to provide a similar range of services over the coming year.

Table 15

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 4+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English	80	80	80	81	80	80	83	80	81	81	↓ -2	0
Maths	75	77	78	79	78	79	82	79	82	80	→ 0	2
English and mathematics	70	71	72	73	72	72	77	73	74	74	↓ -3	0

Table 16

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 5+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English	31	33	27	30	28	29	34	33	30	29	↓ -4	1
Maths	36	35	33	31	37	35	39	34	40	35	↑ 1	5
English and mathematics	21	22	19	20	20	20	26	23	23	21	↓ -3	2

Table 17

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 4+ (boys)	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English	75	76	74	77	78	75	79	75	78	77	↓ -1	1
Maths	77	78	77	79	78	79	82	79	83	80	↑ 1	3
English and mathematics	69	70	69	71	70	70	74	71	72	72	↓ -2	0

Table 18

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 5+ (boys)	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English - boys	25	28	21	23	22	23	30	26	24	23	↓ -6	1
Maths - boys	34	35	34	34	38	37	42	36	43	37	↑ 1	6
English and mathematics - boys	20	21	17	18	18	18	25	20	21	19	↓ -4	2

Table 19

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 4+ (girls)	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English	84	85	81	85	82	85	87	85	85	86	↓ -2	-1
Maths	74	76	78	78	78	78	82	79	81	80	↓ -1	1
English and mathematics	71	73	76	75	74	75	79	76	76	77	↓ -3	-1

Table 20

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 5+ (girls)	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English - girls	36	39	34	36	34	36	39	40	35	35	↓ -4	0
Maths - girls	30	29	31	27	35	32	36	32	37	33	↑ 1	4
English and mathematics - girls	23	23	21	21	22	22	27	25	25	24	↓ -2	1

Table 21

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 4+ by FSM / Non FSM	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English - FSM	66	62	68	65	69	64	74	65	73	67	↓ -1	6
English - Non FSM	82	84	83	84	81	83	84	84	85	84	↑ 1	1
Maths - FSM	62	61	68	63	67	64	73	66	72	67	↓ -1	5
Maths - Non FSM	78	80	83	81	80	82	84	83	86	83	↑ 2	3
English and mathematics - FSM	57	51	58	54	59	54	66	56	64	58	↓ -2	6
English and mathematics - Non FSM	75	75	77	76	74	76	79	77	80	78	↑ 1	2

Table 22

KS2 - % pupils achieving Level 5+ by FSM / Non FSM	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010
English - FSM	20	17	18	22	19	↓ -3
English - Non FSM	34	30	32	39	34	↓ -5
Maths - FSM	19	19	24	25	28	↑ 3
Maths - Non FSM	35	36	38	43	46	↑ 3
English and mathematics - FSM	11	10	10	15	13	↓ -2
English and mathematics - Non FSM	25	23	24	29	27	↓ -2

Table 23

KS2 - pupils achieving Level 4+ in both En and ma by ethnicity	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean	64	59	63	63	62	63	71	66	68	67	↓ -3	1
% Somali	51	~	48	~	53	~	66	~	58	~	↓ -8	~
% White other	67	72	63	73	61	74	75	76	75	77	↓ 0	-2
% Pakistani	64	61	69	64	72	64	74	68	70	68	↓ -4	2
% Asian Indian	75	77	74	80	74	79	85	82	83	82	↓ -2	1

Table 24

KS2 - pupils achieving Level 4+ in both En and ma by ethnicity / boys	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean boys	64	57	55	58	58	59	70	63	63	62	↓ -7	1
% Somali boys	50	~	48	~	56	~	61	~	60	~	↓ -1	~
% White other boys	64	72	60	73	65	72	64	74	72	75	↑ 8	-3
% Pakistani boys	71	59	71	64	69	63	65	66	67	66	↑ 2	1
% Asian Indian boys	75	77	71	78	73	77	82	81	82	80	→ 0	2

Table 25

KS2 - pupils achieving Level 4+ in both En and ma by ethnicity / girls	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean girls	65	62	70	68	68	68	72	70	73	72	↑ 1	1
% Somali girls	52	~	50	~	49	~	68	~	57	~	↓ -11	~
% White other girls	72	74	66	76	56	77	83	78	78	78	↓ -5	0
% Pakistani girls	57	62	66	65	75	65	80	69	72	69	↓ -8	3
% Asian Indian girls	74	78	77	82	75	81	85	84	83	83	↓ -2	0

Table 26

KS2 - % pupils with SEN Level 4+ Eng and ma	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
ALL SEN	38	29	40	32	40	31	45	34	43	35	↓ -2	8
Without statement	41	31	43	35	44	35	51	37	48	38	↓ -3	10
With statement	9	13	11	14	8	13	12	13	16	15	↑ 4	1

Table 27

KS2: SEN - 2 levels of progress	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English - All SEN	81	75	81	76	81	74	82	74	86	74	↑ 4	12
Mathematics - All SEN	63	58	64	63	67	62	75	65	78	65	↑ 3	13

Table 28

KS2: SEN/non SEN gap	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	
% attaining L4+ En and ma	39	51	42	51	42	51	42	~	45	~	3

Table 29

KS2 - % pupils making 2 or more levels of progress from KS1 to KS2	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English	88	85	85	83	80	82	90	84	90	84	→ 0	6
Mathematics	78	77	80	78	84	81	88	83	88	83	→ 0	5

## 10.0 Key Stage 3

- 10.1. There are no statutory tests at Key Stage 3. Schools are required to submit teacher assessments in mathematics and English. There is flexibility about when these assessments take place because schools have the freedom to shorten the length of this key stage to suit the needs of their students. Schools can also use a variety of strategies to measure pupil performance. Comparisons with national attainment data for Key Stage 3 should therefore be treated with some caution.
- 10.2. The national expectation is that most pupils will achieve Level 5 or Level 6 in English and mathematics when they reach the end of Key Stage 3. In Brent, performance at Level 5+ rose slightly in mathematics and by 3 pts in English. Mathematics was broadly in line with the national average but English was some way below. There has been an upward trend in performance at Level 5 + over five years in both English and mathematics.
- 10.3. Girls outperformed boys in English at Level 5+ in Brent but there was no difference in performance in mathematics.
- 10.4. The performance of both boys and girls was below the national average in English but Brent boys' attainment was the same as the national average in mathematics.
- 10.5. Performance at Level 6+ improved strongly in English although attainment was slightly below the national average. In mathematics, performance dipped slightly but was broadly in line with the national average. In both subjects there was an upward trend in performance at Level 6+ over five years.
- 10.6. Girls significantly outperformed boys in English at Level 6+ whilst boys slightly outperformed girls at Level 6+ in mathematics.
- 10.7. Over the last year, the Services to Schools secondary team supported school subject leaders in the core subjects to help develop the quality of teacher assessment in the core subjects and to share best practice in teaching.
- 10.8. The main priorities for the coming year are to:
- develop the literacy skills of learners in this key stage in preparation for the future changes to examinations at Key Stage 4.
  - continue to raise attainment between Key Stage 2 and 3 through the development of high quality teaching.

Table 30

KS3 - % of pupils achieving Level 5+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English L5+	72	74	75	74	76	77	75	79	78	82	↑ 3	-4
Mathematics L5+	75	76	77	77	80	79	79	80	80	81	↑ 1	-1

Table 31

KS3 - % of pupils achieving Level 6+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English L6+	32	33	32	35	42	41	42	44	48	47	↑ 6	1
Mathematics L6+	57	56	57	57	57	58	59	58	58	59	↓ -1	-1

Table 32

KS3 - % of boys achieving Level 5+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English L5+ boys	67	68	69	67	70	71	68	73	71	76	↑ 3	-5
Mathematics L5+ boys	75	75	77	76	80	79	79	79	80	80	↑ 1	0

Table 33

KS3 - % of boys achieving Level 6+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English L6+ boys	24	26	26	27	34	33	35	36	40	38	↑ 5	2
Mathematics L6+ boys	56	57	58	58	57	58	61	59	57	59	↓ -4	-2

Table 34

KS3 - % of girls achieving Level 5+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English L5+ boys	78	81	82	81	83	84	82	86	85	88	↑ 3	-3
Mathematics L5+ boys	75	76	76	77	79	80	78	81	80	82	↑ 2	-2

Table 35

KS3 - % of girls achieving Level 6+	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English L6+ girls	39	40	38	42	51	49	49	53	55	56	↑ 6	-1
Mathematics L6+ girls	57	55	57	56	57	57	56	58	59	59	↑ 3	0

## 11.0 Key Stage 4

- 11.1. In 2011, standards rose and remained high at Key Stage 4 against the key indicator of performance: 5 A\*-C including English and mathematics. Performance continued to exceed the national average for the proportion of students achieving five good GCSEs including English and mathematics, a trend that has been sustained over five years.
- 11.2. The percentage of students achieving 5 good A\*-C passes in any subject rose in 2011 and was the same as the national average. The percentage of students achieving 5 passes at GCSE was the same as in 2010 and again the same as the national average. The five year trend for both these key indicators is rising.



- 11.3. Attainment against the new performance measure described as the English Baccalaureate (E. Bacc) again exceeded the national average. This also represented a rise on the previous year's results when the measure was reported for the first time. The E. Bacc consists of GCSE A\*-C passes in English, mathematics, two sciences, a humanities and a modern foreign language.
- 11.4. A gender gap continues to exist, with girls significantly outperforming boys against all the key indicators, although both boys and girls in Brent performed better than their counterparts nationally.
- 11.5. The performance of students on FSM gaining 5 A\*-C grades at GCSE, including English and mathematics, dropped by 2 pts from 2010. The gap between their performance and that of non-FSM students widened to 18 pts in 2011 compared with 14 pts in 2010. The percentage of FSM students in Brent achieving five A\*-C grades at GCSE in any subject and those achieving five A\*-G grades was significantly better for Brent students than the national averages against both those indicators.
- 11.6. For Key Stage 4, the measure of expected progress is that students should make three levels of progress in English and in mathematics, whatever their starting points, from the end of Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4. In Brent, the proportion of students making expected progress remained significantly above national averages in both English and mathematics, a trend that has continued over five years in both subjects.
- 11.7. In terms of performance by ethnicity, no national data is available yet which would enable comparisons to be made between the attainment of specific ethnic groups and the national averages for those groups. However, comparisons can be made between the performance of the five key ethnic groups in Brent and the national averages for all pupils.
- 11.8. A major concern must continue to be the low performance of Black Caribbean pupils. The gap for Black Caribbean pupils, compared to all pupils nationally, widened to 17 pts.
- 11.9. Somali pupils' attainment improved the most against the key measure of 5A\*-C grades including English and mathematics.
- 11.10. The performance of Asian Indian pupils was well above the national average for all students, despite a 6 ppt fall for Asian Indian boys.
- 11.11. The attainment of White Other pupils fell by 3 pts and their performance was well below that of all pupils nationally.
- 11.12. The attainment of Pakistani students was below that of all students nationally. The attainment of Pakistani boys, however, improved significantly.
- 11.13. The attainment of Somali pupils remained well below that of all pupils nationally, but there was a significant improvement in their performance. Over five years, there has been a 22 ppt improvement in the attainment of this group. Girls significantly outperformed boys.
- 11.14. The percentage of students with SEN making three or more levels of progress in English and in mathematics rose in 2011 and in both subjects remained significantly higher than the national average for this group. Progress was consistently above the national average in both subjects for this group over five years.

11.15. Data on the attainment of pupils with SEN achieving five or more A\*-C grades at GCSE, including English and mathematics, is not yet available for 2011. However, up until 2010, there was a rising trend in attainment which was in line with the national average for this group.

11.16. Over 2010/11, the Services to Schools team of link advisers and teaching consultants continued to work closely with schools to support them in identifying students who are at risk of underachievement and putting in place a variety of intervention strategies to accelerate progress.

11.17. The main priorities for the coming year are to:

- narrow the gaps in attainment particularly of students on FSM, Black Caribbean students, pupils with SEND and between boys and girls
- develop the academic literacy skills of all learners in this key stage.

Table 36

KS4 - % of pupils achieving GCSEs	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% pupils achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma	51	47	56	48	57	50	60	55	61	58	↑ 1	3
% pupils achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE	65	61	69	65	72	70	75	75	79	79	↑ 4	0
% pupils achieving 5 A*-G grades at GCSE	94	92	94	92	95	94	95	95	95	95	→ 0	0

Table 37

KS4 - % of boys achieving GCSEs	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% boys achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma	47	42	50	44	51	47	58	52	58	55	→ 0	3
% boys achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE	62	56	62	60	69	66	72	72	78	77	↑ 6	1
% boys achieving 5 A*-G grades at GCSE	92	90	92	91	94	92	94	93	94	94	→ 0	0

Table 38

KS4 - % of girls achieving GCSEs	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% girls achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma	57	50	63	53	62	55	66	60	66	62	→ 0	4
% girls achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE	68	60	75	64	75	70	78	80	82	84	↑ 4	-2
% girls achieving 5 A*-G grades at GCSE	96	92	96	92	96	94	97	95	96	96	↓ -1	0

Table 39

KS4 - % pupils achieving English Baccalaureate	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
All pupils	~	~	~	~	~	~	18.0	15.1	19.6	15.4	↑ 2	4

Table 40

KS4 -% of pupils achieving GCSEs by FSM/Non FSM	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma - FSM	35	22	45	24	40	27	49	31	47	Not yet available	↓ -2	~
% achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma - Non FSM	55	50	59	52	62	54	63	59	65	Not yet available	↑ 2	~
% achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE- FSM	51	36	58	41	61	49	69	58	70	Not yet available	↑ 1	~
% achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE - Non FSM	68	64	72	68	75	73	77	78	82	Not yet available	↑ 5	~
% achieving 5 A*-G grades at GCSE - FSM	88	80	92	82	93	85	93	87	91	Not yet available	↓ -2	~
% achieving 5 A*-G grades at GCSE - Non FSM	95	93	95	94	96	95	95	96	96	Not yet available	↑ 1	~

Table 41

KS4 - % pupils making 3 or more levels of progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
English	72	61	73	64	77	65	79	70	82	73	↑ 3	9
Mathematics	69	55	73	57	75	58	76	63	80	66	↑ 4	14

Table 42

KS4 - SEN	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
SEN/non SEN gap -% attaining 5A*-C GCSE in En and Ma	43	44	50	46	51	47	52	~	51	~	↓ -1	~
% pupils with SEN making 3 or more levels of progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 - English	57	50	53	39	54	42	52	47	57	48	↑ 5	9
% pupils with SEN making 3 or more levels of progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 - mathematics	50	38	48	29	51	32	49	37	50	36	↑ 1	14
% pupils with SEN achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma	16	10	16	13	16	17	21	20	20	22	↓ -1	-2
% pupils with SEN achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE	28	21	29	27	31	36	40	47	45	54	↑ 5	-9

Table 43

KS4 - % pupils achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma by ethnicity	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean	32	34	43	37	41	40	41	44	41	Not yet available	→ 0	~
% Somali	26	25	37	29	28	32	40	40	48	Not yet available	↑ 8	~
% White other	51	46	47	46	53	48	49	51	46	Not yet available	↓ -3	~
% Pakistani	55	37	48	40	50	43	52	49	53	Not yet available	↑ 1	~
% Asian Indian	63	62	67	65	71	67	72	71	71	Not yet available	↓ -1	~

Table 44

KS4 - % pupils achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma by ethnicity / boys	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean boys	45	27	36	30	35	33	31	37	31	Not yet available	↔ 0	~
% Somali boys	26	~	29	~	27	~	27	~	41	Not yet available	↑ 14	~
% White other boys	54	43	31	42	37	44	47	47	40	Not yet available	↓ -7	~
% Pakistani boys	68	33	39	35	48	38	47	45	52	Not yet available	↑ 5	~
% Asian Indian boys	75	57	58	60	63	63	69	68	63	Not yet available	↓ -6	~

Table 45

KS4 - % pupils achieving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE, inc En and ma by ethnicity / girls	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		%Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
% Black Caribbean girls	36	39	49	43	45	46	48	50	49	Not yet available	↑ 1	~
% Somali girls	38	~	43	~	29	~	45	~	56	Not yet available	↑ 11	~
% White other girls	49	50	57	50	46	52	50	54	54	Not yet available	↑ 4	~
% Pakistani girls	55	42	56	45	56	48	57	53	54	Not yet available	↓ -3	~
% Asian Indian girls	69	68	75	70	79	72	76	75	81	Not yet available	↑ 5	~

## 12.0 Key Stage 5

12.1. There was a significant improvement in Level 3 (A Level and equivalent qualifications) results in 2011. This followed a strong focus over the last few years on implementing strategies to improve the average point score per candidate by Brent 14-19 Partnership of local education and training providers.

12.2. Validated data for 2011 is currently available on just two Key Stage 5 indicators: average point score per candidate and average point score per entry.

## 13.0 Average Level 3 point score per candidate

13.1. Brent's Level 3 average point score (APS) per candidate increased rapidly between 2009 and 2011. It improved by the equivalent of two A Level grades per candidate. Brent's rate of improvement was better than the national rate of improvement. The APS per candidate rose to above the national average for the first time in 2011.

13.2. Over four years the APS for boys improved at a faster rate than that of girls. Both the boys' APS per candidate and the girls' APS per candidate rose and exceeded the national averages. The gap between results for Brent boys and girls narrowed to half an A Level grade, compared with one A Level grade nationally.

## 14.0 Average Level 3 point score per entry

14.1. Brent's Level 3 average point score (APS) per entry rose steadily since 2008 and at a faster rate than nationally. The average A Level and equivalent qualifications grade was between grades C and B.

14.2. Between 2008 and 2011 the APS per entry for boys improved at a faster rate than the APS per entry for girls. In 2011 boys' and girls' APS per entry were the same.

### 15.0 Level 3 A Level Value-added

15.1. In 2011, A Level value-added was graded 3 (Excellent) by the Advanced Level Performance System (ALPS). Of the 50 local authorities that subscribe to ALPS nationally, Brent has the highest A Level value-added score for the three year period from 2009 to 2011. Brent is the only local authority to be graded 2 (Outstanding) for this period.

15.2. The value-added for 19 subjects was graded Excellent or Outstanding in 2011 compared 17 in 2010. The outcomes and value-added were particularly strong in the following subjects:

A Level subject	Number of successful candidates	Value-added grade
Government and Politics	143	3 (Excellent)
History	185	3 (Excellent)
Mathematics	516	3 (Excellent)
Sociology	215	3 (Excellent)

### 16.0 Key Stage 5 Priorities

- 16.1. The main Level 3 priorities for the 14-19 Partnership over the coming year are to:
- increase the progression rate from the first year of Level 3 (AS equivalent) courses to the second year of Level 3 (A2 equivalent) courses
  - narrow the gap between girls' APS per candidate and boys' APS per candidate
  - ensure that the value-added in all subjects is graded at least 3 (Excellent).

Table 46

KS5 - APS by students achieving all Level 3 qualifications per candidate	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
All pupils	665.2	711.2	663.4	721.1	675.0	721.1	706.3	726.5	738.0	728.2	↑ 32	10
Girls	689.9	665.2	683.6	741.8	685.7	740.0	717.1	743.1	745.1	743.4	↑ 28	2
Boys	640.3	689.5	642.6	696.9	664.4	699.3	693.5	707.3	730.0	710.8	↑ 37	19

Table 47

KS5 - APS by students achieving all Level 3 qualifications per entry	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		% Difference	
	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	% Brent	% Nat	Brent 2011 vs Brent 2010	Brent 2011 vs National 2011
All pupils	209.4	203.6	206.5	205.8	209.3	208.3	216.7	211.4	219.6	213.1	↑ 3	7
Girls	213.0	207.6	209.7	209.7	211.7	211.9	216.4	214.7	219.4	209.2	↑ 3	10
Boys	205.6	198.6	203.1	201.1	206.8	204.0	217.1	207.0	219.9	216.5	↑ 3	3

This page is intentionally left blank



## Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee 29 March 2012

### Report from the Director of Children and Families

For Information

Wards Affected:  
ALL/

**Adoption Inspection, Outcome and Action Plan. February 2012.**

#### **1.0 Summary**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the outcome of the Adoption inspection which took place between 13 and 17 February 2012. The detail is contained within the attached full inspection report and attached Action Plan.

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Members note the outcome of the Adoption inspection report for Brent. The report was published by Ofsted in March 2012 and is attached as Appendix A.
- 2.2 That Members approve the Action Plan contained in Appendix B which addresses the requirements and improvements needed within the Adoption Service.

#### **3.0 Background**

- 3.1 The Powers and duties to inspect Local Authority Adoption agencies are specified in Section 136 of the Education and Inspection Act 2006. Ofsted also gives consideration to the relevant regulations and

- The Care Standards Act 2000
- The Adoption and Children Act 2002
- Adoption National Minimum Standards 2011

All adoption agencies must have at least one inspection in each three year inspection cycle. Brent's last inspection was 2008.

#### **4.0 Detail**

- 4.1 A judgement is made by inspectors about how the Council achieves outcomes for those who use the Adoption Service. Consideration is given therefore to the following outcomes:

**Staying Safe, Enjoying and Achieving, Making a Positive Contribution** and additionally there is a judgement made regarding **Management and Organisation**. Equality and Diversity runs as a thread throughout the inspection and is judged as such, not as a single judgement

- 4.2 The evidence for the judgement comes from the ability or otherwise of the Adoption Service to meet the National Minimum Standards for Adoption 2011.
- 4.3 The methodology used during Brent's inspection involved
- Interviews with key managers and staff, IRO including the Agency Decision Maker
  - Interview with Adoption Panel Chair
  - Interview with Adoption Panel Advisor
  - Discussion with service users including Adopters
  - Meeting with birth parent
  - Inspection of policies, procedures, and protocols
  - Reading of case files, case tracking
  - Examination of personnel records and HR procedures
  - Inspection of administrative procedures and practice
  - Analysis of survey questionnaires returned from prospective adopters, placing social workers, planning authorities, birth families and specialist advisors
  - Checking recommendations from the last inspection have been implemented
- 4.4 The overall quality rating is judged to be satisfactory. This means that provision is 'sound'. From the individual areas 3 were judged as good and 2 satisfactory. It is reported that 'there is evidence of improvement in most areas with an acknowledgement that all recommendations from the last inspection have been fully addressed and that Senior Managers are aware of the areas which need improvement and have taken steps to rectify these areas..
- 4.5 It was acknowledged that there has been considerable improvement within the service and there is a high level of commitment from all the staff to improve. The key points highlighted by the Inspector were around the service addressing historical issues (especially around the timeliness of placement of children) and the improvements made in terms of recruitment, matching and placing children within timeframes, the involvement of birth parents in the process and the support provided. Children are protected through the service's effective implementation of safeguarding procedures. Adopters find the service accessible and staff easy to talk to. The promotion of equality and diversity is good with the service reflecting the community it serves.
- 4.6 The recent changes to the Adoption Inspection has meant it has become far more difficult for the Adoption Service to achieve a good or outstanding rating. John Golding, Deputy Chief Inspector of Ofsted has been quoted as stating "Inspection of Adoption Services has been too lenient in the past and that people were right to question who so many services had previously been rated good or outstanding". Given this and the historic difficulties around meeting timescales for Brent children, the team has worked exceptionally hard to deliver the improvements required and to achieve good in three areas.
- 4.7 Below are the four recommendations required from the Inspection. Work is already underway to address these areas. These four recommendations form the Action Plan attached.



1. Ensure that the life story book is given to the child and prospective adopters in stages: at the latest by the second statutory review of the child's placement with the prospective adopters and the completed life story book at the latest within ten working days of the adoption ceremony (NMS 2.7)
2. Monitor performance against the timescales outlined in this guidance and make this information available in the six-monthly reports under the National Minimum Standards 25.6 (Adoption and Children Act 2002, Chapter 2, paragraph 3)
3. Provide a children's guide to adoption support including all the information outlined in this standard (NMS18.6)
4. Continue to manage the service efficiently and effectively to ensure delivery of a good quality service which meets the needs of children and other service users. (NMS 25)

## **5.0 Finance**

5.1 There are no financial implications from this report.

## **6.0 Legal**

6.1 This report complies with the legal requirements of the Care Standards Act 2000 and the Adoption National Minimum Standards 2011.

## **7.0 Diversity Implications**

7.1 There are no Diversity Implications arising from this report.

## **8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)**

8.1 There are no staffing/accommodation issues arising from this report.

## **9.0 Background Papers**

- a) Ofsted Adoption Inspection report
- b) Adoption Action Plan

### **Contact Officer –**

Graham Genoni, Assistant Director Children's Social Care  
Tel - 020 8937 4091  
Email – [graham.genoni@brent.gov.uk](mailto:graham.genoni@brent.gov.uk)

**KRUTIKA PAU**

**DIRECTOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES**

This page is intentionally left blank

# London Borough of Brent Council Adoption Service

Inspection report for local authority adoption agency

---

<b>Unique reference number</b>	SC058592
<b>Inspection date</b>	16/02/2012
<b>Inspector</b>	Stella Henderson
<b>Type of inspection</b>	Social Care Inspection

---

<b>Setting address</b>	328/330 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6AZ
------------------------	--

<b>Telephone number</b>	0208 937 4558
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Registered person</b>	London Borough of Brent
<b>Registered manager</b>	Gill Kilbane
<b>Responsible individual</b>	Hilary Brooks
<b>Date of last inspection</b>	10/03/2008

---

© Crown copyright 2012

Website: [www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)

This document may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial educational purposes, provided that the information quoted is reproduced without adaptation and the source and date of publication are stated.

You can obtain copies of The Children Act 2004, Every Child Matters and The National Minimum Standards for Children's Services from: The Stationery Office (TSO) PO Box 29, St Crispins, Duke Street, Norwich, NR3 1GN. Tel: 0870 600 5522. Online ordering: [www.tso.co.uk/bookshop](http://www.tso.co.uk/bookshop)

## About this inspection

The purpose of this inspection is to assure children and young people, parents, the public, local authorities and government of the quality and standard of the service provided. The inspection was carried out under the Care Standards Act 2000.

This report details the main strengths and any areas for improvement identified during the inspection. The judgements included in the report are made in relation to the outcomes for children set out in the Children Act 2004 and the relevant National Minimum Standards for the service.

### The inspection judgements and what they mean

Outstanding: this aspect of the provision is of exceptionally high quality  
Good: this aspect of the provision is strong  
Satisfactory: this aspect of the provision is sound  
Inadequate: this aspect of the provision is not good enough

## Service information

### Brief description of the service

This is a local authority adoption service that undertakes all statutory adoption responsibilities and duties. These are the recruitment, preparation and assessment and approval of prospective adopters, the placement of children and support services to people affected by adoption.

### Summary

The overall quality rating is satisfactory.

This is an overview of what the inspector found during the inspection.

Children enjoy some good outcomes on their journey to adoption and the service meets the needs of birth parents and adopters in several respects. Recruitment of adoptive parents has improved and the majority of children waiting for adoptive placements experience successful matching well within the 12 month timescale. These matches result in nurturing, loving and sustainable 'forever families'.

There are demonstrable improvements for children in terms of their health and educational outcomes and they are safe in placement. Birth parents are involved in the adoption process as far as possible, and there is good adoption support. Access to birth records is managed sensitively, and adopters are unanimous in their praise for preparatory training.

Staff receive suitable support and have the skills and expertise required for the task in hand. Adopters confirm that staff are knowledgeable and helpful. The adoption panel operates as an effective mechanism in quality assuring and scrutinising the cases presented to panel.

The service continues to address historical management and performance difficulties. Senior management are aware of the areas which need improvement and took immediate steps to rectify some of the shortfalls identified at this inspection. Several recommendations are raised however to assist in driving up standards further and so improve outcomes for children who seek permanence through adoption.

### Improvements since the last inspection

At the last inspection recommendations were raised to improve practice in the following areas: the handling and functions of adoption panel, amendment to child protection policies and procedure, co-ordination of life story work, frequency of reporting to the executive and records of staff and panel members. Actions were also raised in respect of criminal records bureau checks on staff and review of the children's guide.

Evidence from this inspection demonstrates that these requirements and

recommendations have been met which has impacted positively on outcomes for children.

### **Helping children to be healthy**

The provision is not judged.

### **Protecting children from harm or neglect and helping them stay safe**

The provision is satisfactory.

Children are supported to address past adverse experiences and make the emotional adjustment to living with their adoptive families. This is achieved because they and their adoptive parents have access to a range of effective interventions, such as play therapy and advice and intervention from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Team (CAMHS) where required.

Children experience demonstrable improvements in their physical health outcomes because their health needs are identified and addressed at an early point in the assessment process. Immunisations, dental health checks and health assessments are up to date and children with complex needs enjoy access to specialist resources.

Prompt referral to the adoption register increases the opportunity to children to be matched with adoptive parents and in the majority of cases the 12 month timescale is achieved. Where this timescale is not met the decision about whether adoption continues to be in the best interests of the child is regularly re-visited.

Children are protected through the service's effective implementation of safeguarding procedures. Systems are in place to address any allegations or concerns, and children's safety in placement is kept under close scrutiny through measures such as unannounced and short-notice visits and statutory reviews.

### **Helping children achieve well and enjoy what they do**

The provision is good.

Children develop positive behaviour and relationships because resources are directed towards enabling them to recover from earlier disadvantage and adversity. This includes interventions from health and educational professionals alongside that of skilled social workers who work directly with the child.

Adoptive parents get the information they need to understand the experiences and history of their adoptive children and, as far as is possible to predict, what the future might hold. Adopters confirm that they receive very useful and relevant information about their adoptive children. One adopter noted that 'all material facts known to social services were disclosed at the outset including the history of physical abuse

and neglect. The birth parent's background was also disclosed. The service made clear that further details of abuse might surface once our child had settled in'.

The service meets the educational needs of children in a manner consistent with the principles and practices of being a 'good parent'. Beginning at the early years foundation stage children receive effective support to enjoy life and achieve to the best of their ability. Their educational needs are identified, addressed and tracked through personal education plans (including those for early years) and special statement of educational needs. Children's self-esteem, confidence and wider learning is also promoted through engagement in a wide range of sporting and leisure activities, such as horse riding, football, dance and swimming.

Children are the beneficiaries of their adoptive parents receiving effective adoption support. All children and their new families receive an adoption support assessment and the plan is regularly reviewed and adjusted according to the needs of the child and family. One adopter commented that 'support has been outstanding. CAMHS have also been very supportive in interpreting my child's behaviour and suggesting practical ways to address their anxieties'.

Post-adoption activity includes an annual event which is well-evaluated by those who attended. A new innovation is the establishment of a post-adoption support group for birth parents. One birth parent explained that attending the group had been very helpful.

Those affected by adoption are also assisted with both letter-box and direct contact arrangements. Adopted children and young people do not always know that they can get support however as there is no children's guide to adoption support.

## **Helping children make a positive contribution**

The provision is good.

Children who in later life return to trace their journey to adoption will find that staff worked hard to include their birth parents and birth families in the adoption process. Child permanence reports give a good account of the circumstances, experiences and progress of their early lives in a way that reflects their unique needs and individuality. Life story work contributes to this process however the life story book is not always given to children and their adoptive parents within the timescales suggested by the national minimum standards.

Children are safeguarded through careful arrangements for contact. This takes a variety of forms and sometimes includes very high levels of direct contact where this is thought to be appropriate. This helps children to develop a positive sense of identity and heritage.

Adopters confirm that the service is clear about the expectations and benefits of



contact. They and birth families are supported by the adoption support team, who assist in helping to write and exchange letters for example.

The service offers an effective service to adults seeking to discover more about their family of origin. This process is undertaken with considerable skill and sensitivity.

### **Achieving economic wellbeing**

The provision is not judged.

### **Organisation**

The organisation is satisfactory.

Children's adoptive placements get off to a good start because they and their adoptive parents are well prepared for the journey ahead. Direct work is undertaken with children in a sensitive and helpful way, and introductions are managed well.

Training for prospective adopters is positively evaluated. One adopter commented 'the preparation group was excellently presented and executed', and another noted that the preparation training was 'well facilitated and organised. It provided a useful opportunity to meet other prospective adopters and get information from social workers about the likely backgrounds of adopted children'.

Adopters find the service to be accessible and staff easy to talk to. They feel the service listens to them and keeps them informed. One adopter noted 'our first language is not English but staff treated us with respect, patience and understanding. Brilliant experience'. Another commented that 'from my initial contact to the preparation group to the panel, I have felt supported, valued and listened to'.

Recruitment of adopters has increased and all sections of the community are represented, with workers seeking to rule applicants in rather than rule them out. Adopters are often linked with children at an early part of the assessment process. This means that once the decision has been made for children to be adopted, they can move quickly to their adoptive placements. Adoption panel exercises close scrutiny of prospective adopters and proposals for adoption and matching. This affords children an additional element of safeguarding and contributes to successful long term outcomes.

Children and their adoptive parents benefit from the support and intervention of staff who are highly experienced and knowledgeable. Resources are not always managed efficiently and effectively however. For example, staff in the adoption team are case-holders for children as well as being responsible for all the tasks associated with the core functions of the adoption service. They often attend panel to provide 'updates' on cases when this is more usually done through the panel adviser. This presents a challenge in terms of the competing priorities of children's needs and consistently

meeting the timescales for the matching of children and approval of adopters.

Monitoring of the operation of the service is satisfactory and panel contributes towards the overview of performance. The report to the Executive does not include an evaluation of all the timescales referred to in the statutory guidance however. This excludes an important element in ensuring that all children move to adoption without delay.

The promotion of equality and diversity is good. The service reflects the community it serves and attracts a wide range of applicants from highly diverse backgrounds. This ensures that the majority of children are matched with adopters who reflect their ethnic, religious and cultural needs. These needs do not take priority however and a number of children have enjoyed stability and security in trans-racial adoptive placements.

## **What must be done to secure future improvement?**

### **Recommendations**

To improve the quality and standards of care further the registered person should take account of the following recommendation(s):

- ensure that the life story book is given to the child and prospective adopters in stages: at the latest by the second statutory review of the child's placement with the prospective adopters and the completed life story book at the latest within ten working days of the adoption ceremony (NMS 2.7)
- monitor performance against the timescales outlined in this guidance and make this information available in the six-monthly reports under the National Minimum Standards 25.6 (Adoption and Children Act 2002, Chapter 2, paragraph 3)
- provide a children's guide to adoption support including all the information outlined in this standard (NMS 18.6)
- continue to manage the service efficiently and effectively to ensure delivery of a good quality service which meets the needs of children and other service users. (NMS 25)

## APPENDIX B

### Brent Adoption Action Plan


This action plan has been formulated in response to the Ofsted recommendations following the inspection of the Adoption Service February 2012.

The action plan encompasses the four recommendations from Ofsted and will be monitored by the Head of Service for Placements alongside the Assistant Director Children Social Care.

#### Adoption Recommendations

Ofsted Recommendation	Actions	Lead	By When
1. Ensure that the life story book is given to the child and prospective adopters in stages: at the latest by the second statutory review of the child's placement with the prospective adopters and the completed life story book at the latest within ten working days of the adoption ceremony (NMS 2.7)	To look at how life story work is currently managed within Brent and also across neighbouring authorities  To work alongside Adoption Managers and Care Planning Managers to ensure books are completed on time	Head of Service Placements	End of March 2012
2. Monitor performance against the timescales outlined in this guidance and make this information available in the six-monthly reports under the National Minimum Standards 25.6 (Adoption and Children Act 2002, Chapter 2, paragraph 3)	To review performance monitoring systems and ensure this is written into the reports to executive every 6 months	Head of Service/Adoption Team Manager	Ongoing 6 month report due June 2012. To be completed by then
3. Provide a children's guide to adoption support including all the information outlined in this standard (NMS18.6)	Write a guide for adoption support	Head of Service/Team Manager	Completed, awaiting print
4. Continue to manage the service efficiently and effectively to ensure delivery of a good quality service which meets the needs of children and other service users. (NMS 25)	Continue improvement programme	Head of Service/Team Manager	Ongoing

This page is intentionally left blank

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee 29 March 2012</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report from the Director of Children and Families</b></p>
<p>For Information <span style="float: right;">Wards Affected: ALL/</span></p>	
<p><b>Safeguarding and Looked After Children Inspection, Outcome and Action Plan. October 2011.</b></p>	

## 1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the outcome of the Safeguarding and Looked After Children (SLAC) inspection which took place between 3-14 October 2011. The detail is contained within the attached full inspection report and the associated Action Plan.

## 2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members note the outcome of the Safeguarding and Looked After Children inspection report for Brent. The report was published by Ofsted in November 2011 and is attached as Appendix A. This report was presented at the December 2011 Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny committee meeting.
- 2.2 That Members note the Action Plan contained in Appendix B which addresses the recommendations identified in the inspection report and articulates the department's ambitions to make significant and far reaching improvements to the service.

## 3.0 Detail

- 3.1 There has been a nationally established programme of inspection for children's social care departments over a number of years, which recently has been divided between annual "no-notice" inspections of contact and referral services and 3 yearly "full" inspections of safeguarding and looked after children's services. Brent has had two successful "no-notice" inspections over the last two years but, prior to this inspection, had not had a full inspection since the Joint Area Review in 2006. The current Safeguarding and Looked After Children inspection (SLAC) was under a different regime to the Joint Area Review, but is also the last in the current format. A new inspection regime (based on some of the recommendations of the Munro review) is currently being piloted with a view to being rolled out from April 2012. This new regime introduces a no-notice approach for the first time.

- 3.2 It is clear that the inspection regimes for children's social care are getting progressively tougher and thresholds are rising. The recent inspection was tougher than the Joint Area Review in 2006 and the next one will be tougher still. The other key differences are that the notice given to authorities has progressively reduced (from several months in 2006, two weeks under the current regime, through to no notice in the future) and that the level of detail on individual cases being examined is increasing.
- 3.3 The inspection provides two separate judgements, one for safeguarding and one for services to looked after children. The judgement scale is Outstanding, Good, Adequate and Inadequate. Brent was judged to be adequate for both which is the grade for 48% of Local Authorities for Safeguarding and 53% of authorities for looked after children.
- 3.4 Children were judged to be safe in Brent and thresholds for child protection intervention were judged to be appropriate. There were however concerns in relation to the health of looked after children which resulted in health being given an "inadequate" rating in that area. NHS Brent are currently addressing these concerns and reporting to both the Care Quality Commission (their inspection body) and ourselves on progress.
- 3.5 The Inspection commended aspects of Early Intervention, Locality Services and in Care Planning, some of which are noted below. Parents who received services as part of a CAF had achieved some positive outcomes and valued the services provided, children's social care services positively engage with and listen to children and young people evidenced through assessments and care plans and the established fora to consult such as the Care in Action group and Brent Youth Parliament. Access to front door social work services was clear and well understood and relationships with partner agencies were good. Many children saw positive outcomes as a result of their child protection plan and services were seen to be highly effective in closing the gap educationally for those children subject to economic deprivation with achievement being particularly pronounced for children who are seeking asylum. Morale and staff motivation were reported to be high and strategic arrangements to improve services to looked after children were commended. The inspectors also praised the commitment of elected members as champions of the needs of all children and young people through engagement with Brent Youth Parliament as members of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the decision to provide permanent accommodation for the Youth Parliament in the new Civic Centre,
- 3.6 The plan covers recommendations which are the responsibility of the local authority, as well as those which need to be followed up by the local authority together with its partners. In order to make a comprehensive response to the inspection and further improve outcomes for children and young people, this plan additionally picks up comments made by Ofsted within the text of the final report, which were not highlighted as recommendations. These additional areas for development follow the recommendations for Safeguarding, or for Looked after Children, respectively. As the plan follows the format of the Ofsted inspections, the recommendations and actions required cover all aspects of the work, from management and leadership to front-line practice.
- 3.7 This plan has been prepared in conjunction with the Health Action Plan which has been developed by Brent Primary Care Trust and is reported (and monitored) on a monthly basis by the Care Quality Commission. The Children and Families Plan complements the actions within that plan.
- 3.8 The plan has benefitted from input and quality assurance from London Safeguarding Advisors and the Local Government Improvement and Development Agency (LGIDA). The department has already secured £20,000 improvement monies from LGIDA to start a range of initiatives aimed at making significant improvements to the supervision of front line staff. It will be implemented alongside individual service improvement plans already in

development, representing the ambition of the council and its partners to make a positive difference for children in need of safeguarding or who are in the care of Brent Council.

3.9 The monitoring arrangements for the plan are as follows:

- 1 The Director of Children's Services will chair a monthly monitoring of the action plan involving Health and Social Care colleagues.
- 2 Corporate Management Team on a monthly basis
- 3 Local Safeguarding Board on a bi-monthly basis.
- 4 Brent Children's Partnership on a quarterly basis
- 5 Multi- agency child protection meeting on a quarterly basis
- 6 Children and Families Departmental Management team on a monthly basis.
- 7 Children and Families Scrutiny Committee and Corporate Parenting and Safeguarding group.
- 8 The Lead Member for Children and Families will have a key role in the monitoring of progress.

3.10 Finally, the Department will seek external challenge of the progress against the plan in June 2012 through the Local Government Improvement and Development Agency and the intention is to arrange a process of peer challenge or review in December 2012 to assess progress against the findings of the SLAC Inspection report

#### **4.0 Finance**

4.1 Currently the funding to cover the proposed £152,000 of growth required for the plan identified in this report has not been identified but the department is confident that it will be able to find the money from within existing resources through restructuring.

4.2 Three additional posts are needed. Two of the posts are Child Protection Advisors to assist with the planning, monitoring and auditing of work on child protection across the department. They would join the existing three postholders whose role is to chair child protection conferences but also to provide professional child protection advice on complex cases to a range of professionals as well as to monitor plans and audit the quality of child protection work across the Borough.

4.3 The other post is within the looked after children service to provide additional resource to work with children and young people who were looked after, but who have now turned 18 years and for whom the Council has a responsibility up until the age of 24 years. The Service view is that the posts are necessary to ensure that the Council fulfils its statutory responsibilities to that age group but also to allow improvements to be made to the quality of the work that is delivered.

#### **5.0 Legal**

5.1 The Council has a statutory duty under the Children Act 1989 to appoint a personal adviser for young people who have left care or are preparing to do so. The personal adviser acts as an intermediary between the young person and the social services department, until the young person turns 21, or 24 if they are still receiving help with education, training or employment.

5.2 The council has a statutory duty under the Children Act 1989 to safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need, in addition to a duty to protect

children in its area from foreseeable risks of significant harm. The Children Act 2004 also introduced a duty for the Council to work together with its Safeguarding Partners, such as Primary Care Trusts and the Police to promote the welfare of children.

## **6.0 Diversity Implications**

6.1 There are no diversity implications contained within this report.

## **7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)**

7.1 There are no accommodation issues contained within this report.

## **Background Papers**

- a) Inspection of safeguarding and looked after children services, London Borough of Brent. Published by Ofsted 18 November 2011
- b) Brent safeguarding and looked after children action plan.

## **Contact Officer –**

Graham Genoni, Assistant Director Children's Social Care  
Tel - 020 8937 4091  
Email – [graham.genoni@brent.gov.uk](mailto:graham.genoni@brent.gov.uk)

**KRUTIKA PAU**

**DIRECTOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES**



Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme – 2011/2

Meeting Date	Item	Issue for committee to consider	Outcome
12 <sup>th</sup> July 2011	Tribute and thanks to retiring head teachers	This has been placed on the agenda at the request of the Chair. Details of the head teachers retiring in Brent at the end of the school year will be provided for the committee.	Report noted. The chair will write to retiring head teachers to express her thanks for their hard work on behalf of the committee.
	Brent Youth Parliament Update	Standing item – BYP members will update the committee on their work and campaigns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribute Mid Year Progress Report</li> <li>• Show Shisha DVD</li> </ul>	Update from the BYP noted.
	Provision of services for children with disabilities	The chair of the committee has asked that a regular item on the provision of services for children with disabilities be included on each agenda. This follows the decision to close the short break service at Crawford Avenue and restructure services for children with disabilities at Clement Close.	It was agreed that this issue would become a standing item for the committee. Rik Boxer was asked to provide information for the next meeting on the range of service provision that parents are using for respite services, as an alternative to Crawford Avenue and Clement Close.
	Impact of the budget on future service delivery (including schools budget)	The committee will receive a report on the impact that the CSR and local government settlement will have on children’s services, including the Brent schools budget, which is listed separately in the council’s forward plan.	Report noted
	The implications of the Government’s policy on academies and Free	The committee will consider a report looking at the impact of Free Schools and academies in Brent and the implications for	The committee agreed the report’s recommendations to:

	Schools in Brent	the council and school pupils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse the council's collaborative and inclusive approach to working with local schools within a mixed economy of provision to meet the needs of local children.</li> <li>• Support the Local Government Association in its lobbying during the committee stage of the Education Bill with regard to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the central importance of local authorities in the strategic planning of school places and the regulation of fair admissions procedures.</li> <li>○ the vital role of elected member as representative on schools governing bodies whatever their status.</li> <li>○ the need for a fair funding allocation for all schools which does not disadvantage maintained schools in favour of academies and free schools.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• note the work of the One Council SEN project to develop a strategic and affordable approach to the provision and commissioning of appropriate SEN places.</li> <li>• note the need to develop a more commercially viable approach to the future provision of school improvement services in the light of the provisions contained within the Education Bill which will significantly increase competition in this market.</li> </ul>
	Youth Offending Task Group	The final report of the task group will be presented to members for approval.	The report was agreed and will be submitted to the Executive for approval in September 2011.

	School places update	Standing item, in the form of a verbal report on school places in the borough.	Report noted.
	Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme	For information and to give members an opportunity to suggest items for the work programme.	Report noted.

Meeting Date	Item	Issue for committee to consider	Outcome
<b>6<sup>th</sup> October 2011</b>	Brent Youth Parliament	The members of the Brent Youth Parliament will be invited to provide an update on their work since the committee last met, as well as to raise any issues of concern they would like the committee to consider.	Report noted
	Review of policy for the provision of early years full time places	The chair of the committee has asked for a report to come to the committee on the plan to reverse the policy agreed in February 2010 regarding the allocation of full time early years places. This is currently in the Forward Plan, with a decision due in October 2011. The chair of the committee would like to consider this issue before the decision is taken.	<p>The committee has asked for a report to their next meeting, which should include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outcome of the consultation with schools on the process for offering full time nursery places to 3 and 4 year olds</li> <li>• The opinion of the Schools Forum on this issue</li> <li>• A projection on how the requirement for 2 year olds will be met, including the role for children's centres in meeting this requirement</li> <li>• Safeguards to ensure the most vulnerable children are able to take up the places for 3 to 4 year olds</li> <li>• Information on the number of disadvantaged children in Brent and the number of full time nursery places available</li> </ul>

			for them
	Strategy to provide primary school places in Brent up to 2014/15	The chair of the committee has asked for this report to be presented to members. It was originally considered by the Executive in August 2011, and sets out the challenges faced by the council in providing adequate numbers of primary school places in the borough up to 2014/15, due to increasing demand in Brent.	Report noted
	2011 Education Standards	Verbal update on 2011 education standards.	Report noted. The full results will be presented at a future meeting, once they have been verified.
	Provision of services for children with disabilities	<p>The chair of the committee has asked that a regular item on the provision of services for children with disabilities be included on each agenda. This follows the decision to close the short break service at Crawford Avenue and restructure services for children with disabilities at Clement Close.</p> <p>For the meeting in October, the committee has specifically asked for information on the range of service provision that parents are using for respite services, as an alternative to Crawford Avenue and Clement Close.</p>	Report noted.
	Items on the Forward Plan in relation to Children and Young People	The committee will receive a summary of the items on the Forward Plan that relate to services for children and young people. The committee should consider whether there are any items they wish to call to scrutiny.	Report noted

Meeting Date	Item	Issue for committee to consider	Outcome
8 <sup>th</sup> December 2011	Brent Youth Parliament Update	BYP will give a verbal update on their work over the previous 2 to 3 months, since the committee last met.	Report Noted
	Results of Safeguarding Inspection	The Council's Safeguarding and Looked After Children Teams have been inspected by Ofsted (October 2011). The results of the inspection, plus the council's response will be presented to the committee.	The committee has requested a further report back in 2012 with the Action Plan arising from the Inspection.  The committee has also recommended the report is passed to the Executive, with the Action Plan, so that they take ownership of its implementation.
	Adoption Services in Brent	The chair of the committee has asked officers to prepare a paper setting out how Brent is working to address the issues relating to adoption services highlighted in figures published by the DoE on the adoption of children in care.	The committee noted the report on adoption services. They have asked for a further paper on ethnicity and adoption at a later date. This will be added to the committee's work programme, but is likely to be a report taken for information rather than scrutiny.
	Review of policy for the provision of early years full time places	The committee has asked for another report on this issue, which should include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outcome of the consultation with schools on the process for offering full time nursery places to 3 and 4 year olds</li> <li>• The opinion of the Schools Forum on this issue</li> <li>• A projection on how the requirement for 2 year olds will be met, including the role for children's centres in meeting this requirement</li> <li>• Safeguards to ensure the most</li> </ul>	The committee considered the report and still had concerns about two issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The admissions procedure and the lack of appeals process. Complaints to the council from unsuccessful applicants are a possibility.</li> <li>• That places won't reach those most in need, or those who need additional help before starting school to reduce underachievement. Brent's Somali community was given as an example of a group that should be informed about the</li> </ul>

		<p>vulnerable children are able to take up the places for 3 to 4 year olds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on the number of disadvantaged children in Brent and the number of full time nursery places available for them</li> </ul>	<p>availability of early-years places.</p> <p>The committee agreed to recommend the report to the Executive, along with their specific concerns so that the Executive can consider a response to these issues.</p>
	School places update	Verbal report on the shortage of school places in the borough, a standing item on the committee's agenda.	Report noted.
	Provision of services for children with learning and physical disabilities	The committee has asked that a standing item on the provision of services for children with learning and physical disabilities is included on each meeting agenda. The results of the Judicial Review hearing into the closure of Crawford Avenue will be reported to members.	Report noted – JR result was in the council's favour, but an appeal is possible. Further information to be provided at the February meeting.
	Items from the Forward Plan and Work Programme	The committee will consider items from the Forward Plan relating to Children and Young People as well as the committee's work programme.	The chair requested that an item on Special Educational Needs is included on the committee's next agenda.

Meeting Date	Item	Issue for committee to consider	Outcome
2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2012	Brent Youth Parliament Update	BYP will give a verbal update on their work over the previous 2 to 3 months, since the committee last met.	
	Youth Offending Team Inspection	The results of the inspection of the Youth Offending Team will be presented to the committee for scrutiny.	Report was noted
	Complex Families Review Update	The chair of the committee has asked for an update on the work that is taking place with	Report was noted. Future update on project to

		complex families in Brent. This will be in the form of a presentation due to short notice.	be presented in around 6 months time.
	Special Educational Needs – Additional Resourced Schools	The chair of the committee has asked that the report on Additional Resourced Schools prepared for the School's Forum is presented to the OSC for discussion.	Report was noted.
	School Places Update	The committee will be given an update on the school places situation in the borough.	Verbal update.
	Items from the Forward Plan and Work Programme	The committee will be presented with a list of items related to children and young people's services on the Forward Plan, to decide whether there are any they wish to scrutinise. The committee's work programme will also be included on the meeting agenda.	

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue for committee to consider</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
29 <sup>th</sup> March 2012	Brent Youth Parliament Update	BYP will give a verbal update on their work over the previous 2 to 3 months, since the committee last met.	
	Education standards in Brent schools – 2011 results.	The committee will receive a report on education standards in Brent schools for 2011. Included within this will be an analysis of areas of underperformance and the steps being taken to address these.	
	Inspection on Adoption Services in Brent	Committee will be presented with a report on what the changes and the likely impact of these changes.	

	<p>Safeguarding and LAC Action Plan</p> <p>School Places Update</p>	<p>The committee has asked to see the Safeguarding and LAC Ofsted Inspection Action Plan to scrutinise progress in its implementation.</p> <p>The committee will be given an update on the school places situation in the borough.</p>	
	Items from the Forward Plan and Work Programme	The committee will be presented with a list of items related to children and young people's services on the Forward Plan, to decide whether there are any they wish to scrutinise. The committee's work programme will also be included on the meeting agenda.	

#### Items to be timetabled

Item	Issue for the committee to consider	
Expansion of Brent Schools	The committee will consider a report on the plans to expand Brent schools following the allocation of £25m capital funding by Government to provide more school places. The report will include information on the pros and cons of all through schools	
Preventing Youth Offending Task Group follow up	The committee will follow up the recommendations from the preventing youth offending task group.	



Children's Centre Nursery restructure and fees increase	This item is in the Forward Plan, with a decision due in February 2012. The chair of the committee would like members to consider this issue and comment on the restructure prior to the Executive taking the decision.
Implications of the Munro Review	The committee will receive a report setting out the implications of the Munro Review on child protection arrangements in Brent.
PE and Sports in Brent Schools	A review has been carried out to look at the quality of PE and sport provided by Brent schools. The committee will consider the outcomes from this and how the recommendations from the review are being taken forward.
Domestic Violence – Children's Partnership Project	The committee will consider the Children's Partnership report on domestic violence in Brent, following up previous presentations to the committee on this issue.
Youth service review update	As requested by the committee in October 2010, the committee will receive an update on the progress of the ongoing youth services review, being carried out by the Children's Trust Sub Group.
Music Service	Observer at the February committee meeting requested that the music service and provision in the borough be looked into.
Complex Families Project	Update required around September 2012

This page is intentionally left blank