AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declaration of Members' Interests

   In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Members are asked to declare any interest they may have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting.

3. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 30 April 2013 (Pages 1 - 6)

School Lunches

4. Food For Life Gold Mark Standard (Pages 7 - 8)

5. Impact of the Saturation Point Policy on the take-up of school meals (Pages 9 - 16)

   This Report is for information only.
Student Voice Scrutiny Review

6. **Draft Recommendations (Pages 17 - 20)**

7. **Date of Next Meeting**

   Wednesday 24 July 2013
   6.00pm
   Committee room 2, Town Hall, Barking

8. **Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent**

9. **To consider whether it would be appropriate to pass a resolution to exclude the public and press from the remainder of the meeting due to the nature of the business to be transacted.**

    **Private Business**

    The public and press have a legal right to attend Council meetings such as the Children’s Services Select Committee, except where business is confidential or certain other sensitive information is to be discussed. The list below shows why items are in the private part of the agenda, with reference to the relevant legislation (the relevant paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended). **There are no such items at the time of preparing this agenda.**

10. **Any other confidential or exempt items which the Chair decides are urgent**
MINUTES OF
CHILDREN'S SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 April 2013
(6:00 - 8:00 pm)

Present: Councillor G Letchford (Chair), Councillor T Perry (Deputy Chair), Councillor L Butt, Councillor R Douglas, Councillor A S Jamu, Councillor E Kangethe, Councillor B Poulton and Councillor A Salam; Paul Cox

Apologies: Councillor P Burgon

49. Declaration of Members' Interests

None.

50. Minutes - 20 March 2013

Agreed.

51. Reverend Rodger Gayler

The Lead Member announced that Reverend Gayler had resigned from his position as the co-opted member representing the Church of England diocese. The Scrutiny Officer stated that once a nomination was received, it would be ratified by Assembly and the Committee would be updated. In the meantime the position would be shown as vacant.

52. The Local Picture: Update on Evidence Gathering in Schools- Student Voice Review

The Corporate Director, Children's Services (CDCS) provided the following summary of the findings of the evidence gathering from schools for the scrutiny review on Student Voice:

- 50 out of 58 schools had been visited. Of these, 9 were secondary schools, 39 were primary, one, a special school and finally a specialist alternative provision.
- Each visited school subsequently received a report which they were encouraged to discuss at their school council, governing body and head teacher.

Secondary schools
- All but one school had an established school council.
- With the exception of one school, none had received specific training around school councils.
- Some had established links to the BAD Youth Forum but only one had BAD Youth Forum issues as a standing item on its agendas.
- Most school councils met fortnightly or monthly during the school day.
- One met for 20 minutes which was clearly not long enough.
- One school council had an allocated budget of £500.
In most schools, students contribute to the agenda. Feedback was given in the form of minutes (written by a student clerk), via Assembly and newsletters.

Most schools had developed strategies to address problems raised in their meetings. For example, one school faced an issue around the school bus and contacted the CDCS requesting that she write a letter to help address the issue, which she had done.

In most schools students do feel that they receive explanations from school leaders for decisions and outcomes.

Very few school councils had direct contact with their governors.

Some schools additionally empowered the student voice by involving them with staff interviews, allowing them to observe lessons, and via surveys and questionnaires.

Most schools demonstrated that they valued diversity.

**Primary schools**

- The ratings for seven schools were currently being finalised.
- The majority appointed students to their school councils on the basis of elections with secret ballots by their peers.
- Some school councils met during the school day and some met after school; however, those doing the latter usually saw a drop in attendance.
- Generally, students recognise that decision making lies with the head teacher.
- Feedback on action was given in classrooms and through notice boards.
- The kind of issues being considered by school councils was promoting healthy food, bullying and religious diversity.
- Schools had benefitted from visits to the Council's Town Hall chamber where Democratic Services gave presentations on local democracy last year.
- School councils promoted values such as kindness, support and challenge.
- They focussed on both the positive and negative things happening in their school and importantly, looked at how to improve the negative aspects.
- They understood the role of teachers; for example, in relation to controlling behaviour, so everybody could learn.

**Main achievements**

- The main achievements of primary schools were around improving play facilities, consideration of the environment, school lunches, fund raising for charity, school transport, gardening and recycling.
- Some highlights for secondary schools were participating in the teacher appointment process and evaluating teaching.

The full report on this work would be shared with members soon. All schools would receive their individual report and the really positive thing about this work was that there were areas for improvement for all schools. The few schools who had not participated yet were being followed up. Three of these had requested to do conduct the visit after the Easter holidays, one had cancelled after the relevant member of staff went off sick and one stated that it was too busy to participate. The CSCD stated that she may raise this at the next meeting with head teachers if felt appropriate.

The Lead Member stressed the need for the Committee to be provided the report
and the CDCS stated that this would be done as soon as possible.

The CDCS stated that this review was an example of really good scrutiny practice as it was an issue highlighted by a young person (Paul Cox) which local councillors listened to, resulting in recommendations which could practically be implemented to improve student voice, based on thorough evidence. The Committee commended officers and the schools that took part for their efforts in doing this review and looked forward to shaping the draft Student Voice Report in due course.

53. Education Standards

The Divisional Director, Education (DDE) presented the report, 'Summary of the Borough’s Performance in the summer 2012 Public Examinations and National Tests – Primary and Secondary Schools' and the Committee noted the achievements as well as the areas for improvement. As part of this she emphasised the national problems this year around the changes made to grade boundaries in GCSE English between January and June 2012, which have been well publicised. In Barking and Dagenham this affected around 170 young people (8% of the cohort) who achieved a grade D in English rather than the grade C forecast, which has meant great disappointment for a number of students.

In response to questions and comments from the Committee, the DDE stated the rationale behind the grade boundary change was aimed at keeping up with international standards; however, she agreed that it was morally wrong to do this in the way that it was done, which could have meant students sitting the exam in January were more likely to get a higher grade than those sitting it in the summer.

A discussion took place regarding the relationship between budgets and pupil place numbers. The DDE stated that schools' budgets were protected and primary schools had a seen a better injection into their finances. Schools' finances were in reasonably good positions. This helped to ensure that schools had enough places. The most common reason why some parents were refused their first choice was because they applied late. 75 percent of schools had expanded to meet local needs; however, the DDE accepted that there would be increasing challenges with regards to the number of places going forward.

The CDCS added that there had been an increase in the birth rate over the years but due to good pupil place management by governing bodies and head teachers schools were able to deal with the increase. However, in future, if there were constraints on budgets, this would present a problem. She stated that it would be essential to look at all sources of revenue to support infrastructure, particularly where new homes were being built. Furthermore, there was likely to be less impact on families who are refused their first choices next year due to there being school places available in Barking, Dagenham and in areas in the middle of both parts of the Borough. However, parents should be encouraged to name, in order, what their six preferences are. Naming only their first or second school choice may cause difficulties further down the line.

In summary, a high proportion of good and outstanding practice was seen. Urgent recommendations were made to four schools, which were already being addressed. The recommendations made by the Committee had been collated and would be reflected in its scrutiny report on student voice.
The Lead Member thanked the DDE for her briefing and attendance.

54. **Children in Care Council (Skittlz)**

The Group Manager, Engagement & External Services (GMEES), delivered a presentation to compliment the report for this item and welcomed the Lead Member to add to the presentation if he wished, due his involvement with the Children in Care Council (CiCC), Skittlz. Of note:

**Context**
The premise behind establishing a CiCC comes from a number of places including the Children’s Act 1989, the Care Matters agenda, the Children and Young Person’s Act 2008 and the Munro review.

**Our Children in Care Council**
The Borough’s CiCC was established in 2007, and is made up of ten members (including care leavers), aged 9-21. It meets at least once a month, and has links to the Members’ Corporate Parenting Group and the 7-11 and 12-16 Looked After Children (LAC) groups. One of the ways they obtain the views of non CiCC members was through an annual questionnaire.

**Local achievements**
Achievements of the CiCC include the ‘CiC pledge’ or ‘promise’ which outlined how the Council would try to ensure the best support for children in care (CiC). After consultation the CiCC developed and promoted a ‘menu of choice’, which allows children and young people more choice over how their review should take place. It also reviewed the Children in Care Guide, that is given to all children and young people that come into care and provided consultation support for the development of the CiC website ([www.careweb.tv](http://www.careweb.tv)) with regards to colour, layout and content. The new website was launched in 2012, and work is nearly complete to allow CiC to input into reviews electronically, via the website. Finally, the Children’s Rights and Participation Team have recently reintroduced out of borough ‘have your say’ days entitled across four locations regionally.

**National achievements**
Members of our CICC have been proactive in a number of national initiatives, outlined in the report.

**National comparators**
Comparisons to the national picture leads to the following positive conclusions about this Borough’s CiCC:
- The CiCC is well established and fully functioning
- It has a budget to promote its work and influence service improvement.
- Both the Lead Member and Director regularly attend and contribute to the CiCC meetings.

**Key challenges and priorities**
- Supporting a young person to take on the role of Chair of the Borough’s CiCC over the coming year.
- Skittlz falls just short of the Child’s Right Director for England's
recommendation that CICCs should comprise 12 young people- we must make a concerted effort to meet this recommendation and exceed it.

- Some common challenges nationally include ensuring that the CICC reached out of borough looked after children, measuring success and impact of the work undertaken and ensuring clear messages were fed back to Social Care and the borough's CICC has encountered some similar difficulties- this will be an area for development over the next six months.
- Strengthen systems for social care to take the messages back to front line practitioners so that practice can be improved.

A short discussion followed during which the GMEES stated, in response to a question, that he would check whether the Annual Review included an analysis for children cared for within and out of the borough and bring a detailed breakdown of this to a future meeting.

55. **Children's Social Care Reviews**

The Corporate Director, Children's Services (CDCS) presented the Report, which provided a review of significant operational service developments and inspections over the past 18 months within the Complex Needs and Social Care teams. The report provided a summary of what was a huge area. This area of work was very complex and was known to be very challenging. Last year saw a large increase in the number of children referred to these Services and recent years saw a rise in the child population, putting significant pressure on case loads.

The CDCS outlined both the strengths and areas for improvement in these services and a discussion then took place around these. Of note:

- It was difficult to promote positive aspects of the Council's work with regards to these services in the press; however, the work was promoted to partners and the public in other ways where possible.
- There were a number of areas where performance was under 100 percent including the timeliness of looked after children reviews, the recording of ethnicity at the referral stage, and a backlog of unauthorised assessments in 2012/13 and these were being urgently addressed.
- With regards to timescales around the adoption process, legal proceedings were the main issue as officers often had to go back to court three or four times. There was the view that if the child is going to be adopted, the sooner they are living with their adoptive family, the better.
- One common factor behind time lags was parents not being able to continue the level of effort they put in initially in order to keep their children. The statistics showed that the life chances of those taken into care were worse than those who were not. The balance was very difficult to achieve.
- The cost associated with taking a child into care depended on the circumstances of each case but the average cost may be approximately £20,000 per case on legal fees, making the process of going back to court repeatedly all the more frustrating.
- The CDCS was certainly not aware of untrained staff working on visits on their own unless it was in accordance with good practice in terms of personal development and the member of staff was ready. She urged members to report anything of concern to her directly.
The CDCS then took the Committee through the Safeguarding and Looked After Children Multi-agency Action Plan. She explained that actions were Red Amber Green (RAG) rated, which meant that actions would not be rated 'green' until a difference could be seen in outcomes. She added that the Services were in the middle of implementing some of the actions at the moment, which was monitored by the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). A report would be drafted at the end of May and any issue not rated 'green' would be raised at the LSCB, Health and Wellbeing Board and Children's Trust.

In response to a question the CDCS stated that young people were supported to become independent for as long as they needed. Many foster carers supported the children they looked after long after the child had left their care, which was not always easy as foster carers managed budgets for children up until they were 18 years of age. Fostering was a key strength in this borough and had been rated ‘outstanding’.

The Select Committee agreed that the CDCS would report progress in relation to the SLAC at some point in the new municipal and the Scrutiny Officer agreed to place this on the Work Programme.

Members suggested that the Committee's work programme for next year include inviting a foster carer to discuss their experiences with the Committee, which the Lead Member said would be considered.

56. **Any other business**

The Lead Member asked the Scrutiny Officer to look into the issue of low attendance of statutory co-opted members of the Committee.

Annual Assembly would appoint the members of this Committee on 15 May 2013, with the exception of his position of Lead Member, which was a two year appointment. He asked members to note that it was likely that the Committee’s work programme for the next municipal year would require more commitment than last year.

He thanked members for their contributions over the past municipal year.

57. **Date of Next Meeting**

Noted.
Gold Food For Life Catering Mark

Report of Catering Services

Open Report For Information

Report Author: Maureen Lowes Catering Services Manager

Contact Details:
Tel: 020 8227 5505
E-mail: maureen.lowes@lbld.gov.uk

Accountable Divisional Director: Meena Kishinani

Accountable Director: Helen Jenner

Summary:

The Food for Life (FFL) Partnership award scheme is a framework to help schools and their communities transform their food culture. FFL Partnership catering teams are committed to serving freshly prepared well sourced food. The scheme works best where there is a good relationship between the school and the catering team.

FFL catering teams demonstrate to parents that we can deliver menus using fresh, seasonal local ingredients, including high welfare meat and sustainable fish.

Barking and Dagenham Catering Services have started on this journey and currently hold the Bronze Food For Life Catering Mark Standard, which is the first step in transforming food culture. The award has many benefits such as a whole school approach to health and sustainability.

We are currently working to ensure that our food and menus are able to achieve the Gold Food For Life Catering Mark Standard.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to support the Catering Service’s plan to work towards The Gold Food For Life Catering Mark Standard.

(i) Support from the CSSC is key to Catering Services achieving success. The Committee’s endorsement sends a strong message to schools that increased involvement would contribute to improved meal uptake and an improved dining experience as well as contributing to Ofsted outcomes and the creative curriculum (outdoor classroom).

(ii) Furthermore, it shows that parents can feel confident that their children are getting a choice of food from a wide range of healthy, fresh meals.
### Reasons

Achieving the Gold Food for Life Catering Mark Standard has a positive impact for the following reasons:

- Makes a significant contribution towards a healthy lifestyle making healthy eating easy
- Encourages good decision making resulting in more fruit and vegetables being chosen
- Schools with FFL Gold report awarded Ofsted outstanding
- Improves attainment levels
- Helps close the gap for disadvantaged children
- Good for the local economy utilising local businesses
- Menus are fresh, local, seasonal, taking into account animal welfare
- Commitment to ethical and sustainable sources

### 1. Introduction and Background

1.1 In achieving the Bronze Food For Life Catering Mark Standard the Catering Service has made significant progress to improve the health and sustainability of our Borough’s food system.

The Gold Food For Life Catering Mark Standard would provide a visible measure of our commitment to improve good practice whilst retaining value for money and would confirm our intention to build on a long term programme to create a healthy and sustainable food legacy.

Now that we have achieved the Bronze Standard, much of the work has already been done and our aim is to apply for gold accreditation during the 2013 autumn term. The main differences between bronze and gold criteria come under the following headings;

- Food leadership and school food culture i.e. setting targets to increase take up of school meals
- Food quality and provenance i.e. introducing organic and additional vegetarian items
- Food Education introducing pupils to growing schemes
- Community and partnerships i.e. parents and the community become actively involved in growing and cooking activities in schools.

1.2 We are committed to working both with our schools and in partnership on menu development with other London boroughs to jointly meet the Gold Food For Life Catering Mark criteria.
# Impact of the Saturation Point Policy on the take up of school meals

## Report of the Corporate Director of Children's Services

### Open Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Author: Tony Sargeant, Group Manager Traded Services, Commissioning, Performance and Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: 020 227 3390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:tony.sargeant@lbld.gov.uk">tony.sargeant@lbld.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accountable Divisional Director: Meena Kishinani

### Accountable Director: Helen Jenner

### Summary:

This report provides a summary analysis of the change in take up of school meals since the introduction of the Saturation Point Policy in 2010.

In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Policy, some increase in meal uptake might be expected. However, although the overall number of meals provided has increased since 2009 (pre Saturation Point Policy implementation) the percentage of pupils taking a school meal appears to have reduced slightly* when compared to the increase in school age population. This is not uniform across the borough with some wards experiencing an increase in uptake while others experience a decrease and there is no clear correlation with the number of take away food outlets in a particular area.

It is unlikely that this drop in meal uptake is directly related to the implementation of the Policy. There are many other potential factors to be taken into account that and it would be safest to say that, on the basis of data currently available, there is no clear causal link between the implementation of the Saturation Point Policy and the take up of school meals.

*Meal uptake data prior to the introduction of the cashless catering system was calculated rather than counted and, as a result, was generally a little overstated. This should be taken into account when comparing with more recent data.

### Recommendation

The Committee is recommended to conclude its investigation into school meal provision.

### Reason

The impact of the Saturation Point Policy on school meal uptake is the final element in the investigation.
1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Barking and Dagenham has one of the highest levels of childhood obesity in the country. It is generally accepted that a key contributory factor is access to unhealthy food and, in particular, the proliferation and poor nutritional standards of takeaway food.

This has been recognised for some time and in 2010 the Borough adopted a Saturation Point Policy which aimed to reduce the risk of obesity amongst the population, particularly among children, by:

- Reducing prevalence and clustering of hot food takeaways, especially those in close proximity to schools (both primary and secondary)
- Seeking contributions from developers of new hot food takeaways towards initiatives to tackle obesity
- Working with outlets to improve the nutritional value of the food they sell
- Improving opportunities to access healthy food in new developments

The Policy forms part of a strategic approach to tackling the Borough’s obesity problem.

The impact of the Saturation Point Policy on the take up of school meals and obesity in the Borough forms the basis of this report.

2. Data and Analysis

2.1 School Meal uptake

In order to see what impact the Policy has had on the uptake of school meals a comparison was made between data for 2009-10\(^1\) – i.e. before the Policy was implemented – and the most recent data for 2012-13.

Overall, there has been a small reduction in the take up of meals since 2009, but this is not consistent across wards. There is significant variation in the changes between wards ranging from reductions of nearly 27% in Chadwell Heath to gains of almost 43% in Gascoigne. None of the changes appear to have any direct correlation with the number of hot food takeaway shops in the ward.

There is a general trend of increasing meal uptake to the West of the Borough and decreasing towards the East, although this may have more to do with changing demographics than other factors.

The map below shows these changes on a ward basis.

\(^1\) Meal uptake data prior to the introduction of the cashless catering system was calculated rather than counted and, as a result, was generally a little overstated. As a result comparisons with more recent data tend to show a level of reduction which should be taken into account.
As stated above, there is no direct correlation, either positive or negative, between school meal uptake and the number of takeaway food shops in a particular ward (and hence to the Saturation Point Policy) and so it should be concluded that the Policy has not had any measurable effect on meal uptake.

It should be noted that with any analysis of data without a control group (one that is kept separate from the changes made), it is not possible to say if the final result would have been different if the change had not been made – i.e. if the Saturation Point Policy had not been implemented would the meal uptake figures have been worse (or better) than the data shows.

2.2 Obesity

For completeness, the data relating to childhood obesity have also been analysed on a ward basis and over a similar timescale.

Children are measured at primary school in Reception (age 4-5) and Year 6 (age 10-11) as part of the Child Measurement Programme. The table below shows a
breakdown by ward of obesity for both age groups based on the 2011-12 survey data (the most recent available).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obesity among school pupils 2011-12</th>
<th>% obesity (aged 4-5)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% obesity (aged 10-11)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alibon</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becontree</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbury</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longbridge</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsloes</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalebone</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barking and Dagenham</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.9</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>23.9</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>19.0</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obesity at aged 4-5 (reception) was highest in Thames (17% were measured as obese) followed by River (15.6%). The highest prevalence of obesity among year 6 pupils aged 10-11 was in Village (29.5% obese) and River (28.3%). Abbey has one of the highest percentage levels of reception age pupils measured as obese (15.4%) while also having the lowest (local) level of obesity among 10-11 year olds (21.5%).

In November 2012 there were 167 retail outlets in Barking and Dagenham that could be described as hot food takeaways

The maps below show these data by ward / area layered with additional information showing where hot food takeaways are located.

---

2 There were a further temporary 20 mobile units not included in the analysis
Again, analysis of the data suggests that there is no significant correlation between the prevalence of hot food takeaways and obesity at ward level.\textsuperscript{3}

The chart below shows obesity data and prevalence of hot food takeaways at ward level further demonstrating the lack of correlation between the data sets. The ward data has been ordered by prevalence of take away outlets, Abbey having the highest number and Longbridge the least.

![Obesity by ward 2009-10 to 2011-12 showing little correlation with prevalence of fast food outlets](chart.png)

In order to assess the impact of the SPP, it is necessary to look at the change in obesity since the Policy was introduced. The maps below show this change for Reception pupils (age 4-5) and Year 6 pupils (age 10-11).

\textsuperscript{3} Statistical analysis has been carried out on both sets of data to examine the possible correlation between the prevalence of hot food takeaways and obesity at ward level to ascertain if there is a link. At reception age these figures produce a Pearson’s correlation\textsuperscript{*} of 0.06 and should therefore be considered as having no correlation.

\textsuperscript{*} Pearson’s correlation is a mathematical calculation to show if there is a link between data sets. Results vary from +1, (a positive correlation), through 0, (no correlation), to -1, (a negative correlation).

Obesity at aged 10-11 and hot food takeaways data shows a Pearson’s correlation of -0.13 which is a very weak negative correlation (a negative correlation would suggest pupils living in areas with more takeaways are less likely to be obese). Again, this should not be considered as a true correlation.
It should be noted that these maps show the general trend of changes within the population of each ward, they do not show the specific changes within each cohort of children that have been measured, i.e. the groups of children measured in 2009 are not the same children measured in 2012 – the year groups remain the same, but not the individuals.

Again, although the data shows some elements of interest, there is no clear correlation between the change in obesity levels at Reception and Year 6 and the implementation of the Saturation Point Policy in 2010.

2.3 Conclusions

Analysis of the available data suggests that the Saturation Point Policy has had no direct impact on the take up of school meals or the level of obesity in primary age children.

It is, however, not possible to say definitively that the Policy has had no impact, as it is not known how these changes would have developed if the Policy had not been implemented and proliferation of hot food takeaway shops had been allowed to continue.

3.0 Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report:

Case Study: Barking and Dagenham, Supplementary Planning Document (2010)
Saturation Point: Addressing the health impacts of hot food takeaways, Naomi Pomfret.

Fast food and childhood obesity: exploring possible correlations. Andrew Meehan
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Draft Recommendations of the Student Voice Scrutiny Review 2013/14

Report of the Corporate Director, Children Services

Open Report | For Decision
---|---
**Report Author:** Masuma Ahmed, Democratic Services & Scrutiny Officer | **Contact Details:**
Tel: 020 8227 2756
Email: masuma.ahmed@lbld.gov.uk

**Accountable Director:** Helen Jenner, Corporate Director, Children's Services

**Summary:**

On 29 May 2012 the Children's Services Select Committee (CSSC) agreed to undertake an in-depth scrutiny review on Student Voice on the recommendation of representatives of the Barking and Dagenham (BAD) Youth Forum, one of whom was Paul Cox, a co-opted member of the Committee. The reasons behind why they felt a review into this area was needed were as follows:

- **Students’ voices are not as fully empowered as they should be.** Drawing on personal and the wider experiences of their peers, they did not feel the student voice had made a significant contribution to school life. This could be attributed to there being no real opportunities to make a difference which made students feel frustrated.
- **A school council is meant to be one of the students' primary channels of communication to a school's senior management team and is also their method of voicing what they are unhappy about or, to make recommendations for the school to make school life better.**
- **These principles are the tenets on which student voices are meant to run by; however, their experiences did not find that this was the case.** They felt this was down to students’ views not properly being listened to by various levels of management in the school.
- **A student voice does not exist to make a school's pupil participation records look good, it exists to improve the experience of pupils who study at the school, and both students and staff need grasp and implement this concept within schools for things to change and improve.**
- **They wished for the Committee to determine whether the experiences of students across the borough were similar in this regard and depending on its findings, make recommendations to strengthen the student voice in borough schools.**

Since this meeting, the CSSC has commissioned reports and considered evidence to establish how school councils can be better supported to strengthen student voice. As part of this, the Committee invited a consultant from School Councils UK to a meeting to discuss the national picture and also commissioned a review of all borough schools to obtain an overview of how well school councils are supported to understand the local...
The CSSC used this information to make recommendations to strengthen student voice in borough schools, which officers have collated. A draft list of recommendations is provided as Appendix 1 to this Report.

Members are asked to note that the full Student Voice Scrutiny Report (which will incorporate the recommendations once they are agreed), is currently being drafted. The CSSC will be given full opportunity to shape the report, and ensure the final version reflects the scrutiny process and its findings.

**Recommendations**

- That the CSSC review the list of draft recommendations arising from the Student Voice Scrutiny Review and comment on whether this reflects the evidence the Committee considered and, whether there are any gaps.
- Good practice dictates that recommendations arising from scrutiny should be specific, measurable, accurate, realistic and timely (SMART) and the CSSC is asked to comment on whether the recommendations meet these principles.

**Reasons**

The CSSC seeks to work with the Council and other partners to secure the continuous improvement of services for children and young people and assist in improving outcomes for the borough's young people.

This reasons behind why this review was undertaken, and the recommendations arising from it, relate to a number of priorities stated in the Council's 'Policy House':

- A borough where people get involved – and feel included – in the decisions that affect them.
- A borough with a range of positive activities for young people.
- A borough which meets the needs of disabled children, young people and adults.
- A borough with excellent schools, constantly improving and which are growing to meet the demands for pupil places.

Furthermore, evidence heard by the CSSC suggests that an empowered and more dynamic student voice may have positive impacts upon the behaviour and attainment levels of young people. This aspect of this review may relate to other priorities in the Policy House overtime, for example:

- A borough with excellent – and improving – attainment through education and training.
- A clean borough, with low levels of litter and graffiti and where residents look after their own homes and gardens.
- A borough where people's health and fitness are improving, with fewer smokers, with more people taking exercise and where people take better care of their diet.

Appendix 1: Draft Recommendations of the Children's Services Select Committee's Student Voice Scrutiny Review 2013/14
### Draft Recommendations of the Children's Services Select Committee's Student Voice Scrutiny Review 2012/13

#### Extending the Voice of School Councils

The Committee recommends that all schools:

1. Allocate a slot for school council representative(s) to address staff during staff meetings or on staff training days, where this is likely to add momentum to a school council initiative or improve communication between the school council and staff.

2. Dedicate at least one school assembly every year to receiving a talk or presentation from their school council on a matter that is important to students.

3. Create clear and active links between their governing body and school council to ensure students are routinely consulted and involved in decisions about school policy and given an opportunity to report to governors on the impact of Student Voice on wider aspects of the curriculum.

#### Mechanisms for providing Meaningful Feedback

The Committee recommends that:

4. The BAD Youth Forum put in place a system for the borough's UK Youth Parliament representatives to feedback relevant matters to school councils.

5. All schools ensure that all teachers recognise the importance of enabling school councillors to provide good feedback to their class by supporting them to hold regular meetings which are held in school time, in a recognised venue, and with sufficient time to discuss matters.

6. All schools ensure young people representing their school in the Youth Parliament also sit on their school council, or have a system in place to feedback relevant matters that have been raised in Youth Parliament sessions.

7. All schools support their school council to establish good links with the Barking & Dagenham (BAD) Youth Forum and ensure mechanisms are in place to feedback and share information, for example, by including BAD Youth Forum matters as a standing item on the school council's agendas, and recommending items from school council's minutes to go forward to be discussed at the BAD Youth Forum.

8. Ensure a member of the Senior Management Team attends a school council
meeting on a termly basis to provide meaningful feedback to the school council on decisions affecting students and to create an opportunity for a two way dialogue to take place.

Supporting School Councils to be more Dynamic and Raising their Profiles

The Committee recommends that all schools:

9. Arrange staff training to ensure teachers and students are clearer on how opportunities to include debate and discussion, and spiritual, moral, social and cultural aspects of the curriculum, in their school council's activities, impact upon attainment and behaviour.

10. Raise the profile of their school council by promoting its activities and celebrating its successes through authorised social media tools such as Facebook and Twitter, the school handbook or prospectus, the school website, notice boards in prominent areas, official school publications that are shared with parents, and by including school council meetings in the school diary.

11. Ask their governing body to consider whether it would be appropriate to allocate a small amount of funding to their school council.

Recommendations for the Local Authority to help develop Student Voice

The Committee recommends that:

12. The Council's Democratic Services team shares its local democracy presentation for children and young people with schools and the BAD Youth Forum to help students understand how local democracy works and how they can use these principles to strengthen student voice.

13. Children's Services officers ensure best practice and areas for development from the School Councils Review are widely disseminated to schools.

14. Ward councillors ensure that each school council in their ward receives an offer from them to attend a school council meeting and information about their surgery times with an invitation to raise any items they would like with them. This information is to be provided annually.

15. Children’s Services officers produce a list of upcoming Student Voice activities which is published on the 'Youth 4 us' website.