

## THE EXECUTIVE

9 SEPTEMBER 2008

### REPORT OF THE CHILDREN'S TRUST SCRUTINY PANEL

CHILDREN'S TRUST SCRUTINY PANEL - FINAL REPORT	FOR DECISION
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The Panel began its work in January 2008 and conducted a very thorough analysis of the current work and operations of the Trust as well as taking advice from the Head of Commissioning Children's Services in Tower Hamlets, which is a pathfinder Borough on integrated joint commissioning. Interviews were also held with Trust partners across the spectrum and these helped the Panel reach a balanced view on the Trust's strengths, weaknesses and potential areas for future development.</p> <p>The Panel recognised the notable achievements of the Trust since its inception in April 2006 and has made a total of 20 recommendations that are intended to help build on this platform. These recommendations cover issues such as the need for the Trust to have a greater focus on performance management and monitoring, improved forward planning based on the key priorities within the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) and the Local Area Agreement (LAA), strengthening of the role of the voluntary sector and proposals to help develop the new integrated joint planning and commissioning culture across the Partnership. It is also proposed that scrutiny of the Trust is formalised through regular reporting to the Scrutiny Management Board on performance and progress issues and the creation of ad hoc Panels to examine, in detail, specific problems or underachieving areas.</p> <p>The specific recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel, in light of its investigations and representations received, are as follows:</p> <p><b>Children's Trust meetings</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) The Children's Trust institute a Forward Plan and work programme for Trust meetings that clearly relate to Partnership priorities set out in the Children and Young People's Plan which informs the Local Area Agreement</li><li>(2) There is a standing item on performance management at each meeting of the Children's Trust that focuses on a number of key areas relating to Local Area Agreement priorities and the Children's Trust work programme, and draws on up-to-date performance information, clearly analysed and compared to local and national targets</li><li>(3) The Children's Trust look to reduce the size of the agenda for their meetings and the amount of paperwork sent to Trust members; possibly through greater use of electronic access to background documents</li><li>(4) The Children's Trust should facilitate additional in-depth work on problem areas through, for example, ad hoc planning days and/or preparatory work by sub-groups</li></ol>	

## **Role of the Voluntary Sector**

- (5) The management processes of the Children's Trust to be reviewed, including the timing and location of meetings and the provision of dedicated support to enable the voluntary sector's participation as equal partners
- (6) The Children's Trust ensures that the strengths of the voluntary sector are fully utilised, particularly in analysing need and providing valuable information from the grass-roots level

## **Integrated Joint Planning and Commissioning**

- (7) Staff capacity to deliver the new integrated joint planning and commissioning culture across the Partnership is reviewed and, if necessary, resources are identified across the Partnership to increase staffing in this area
- (8) A vision statement for joint planning and commissioning across the Partnership is developed, recognising the different cultures in the Partnership and the different commissioning styles that may be required
- (9) A realistic work-programme to implement integrated joint planning and commissioning is developed
- (10) The new structure for the Children's Trust and the new focus on performance management is implemented
- (11) The locality structure, including the re-organisation of staff teams, the devolving of budgets and the provision of locality based services, is integrated with the Council's Neighbourhood management structure
- (12) Locality Partnership Commissioning Teams be established, which are made up of local professionals, to assess locality needs and set commissioning priorities for each area
- (13) The Common Assessment Framework be established consistently across all services for children and young people in the Borough, and the electronic sharing of information through Contact Point be fully implemented in accordance with national timescales
- (14) The participation of children, young people and their families in planning and commissioning of services should both continue and increase
- (15) Priority is given to resolving potential funding issues such as realigning budgets to preventative services whilst ensuring that the capacity to respond to acute needs is retained
- (16) A programme of work-force development for Partnership staff is planned and implemented, including the voluntary and private sectors, to support integrated joint planning and commissioning and ensuring that the training is sensitive to the particular needs of different groups and the timetabling requirements of schools

## **Children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities**

(17) Evidence regarding the impact of service improvements on the outcomes for children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, including the transition to adulthood, be collated.

### **Every Child Matters**

(18) The contribution of partners to each of the five outcomes be improved by promoting closer working partnerships (e.g. between schools and the voluntary sector, for instance, in connection with 'make a positive contribution'), and the sharing of information (e.g. to enable the Police to signpost children and young people to services and opportunities)

### **Role of Councillors**

(19) Officers report on a regular basis to the Scrutiny Management Board on the performance and progress of the Children and Young People's Plan and Local Area Agreement priorities

(20) Scrutiny Management Board consider establishing ad hoc Scrutiny Panels to examine, in depth, any problem or underachieving areas within the Children's Trust.

### **Recommendation**

The Executive is asked to consider the Children's Trust Scrutiny Panel's report and action plan and, if appropriate, respond in a separate report or verbally to the Assembly.

### **Reason**

In order to assist the Council achieve its Community Priority in 'Developing Rights and Responsibilities with the local community' and improve the performance management and accountability of the Children's Trust.

<b>Lead Member:</b> Councillor Evelyn Carpenter	Lead Member	Tel: 020 8591 7604
Clair Bantin	Team Manager, Scrutiny and Civic, Democratic Services	Tel: 020 8227 2352 Fax: 020 8227 2171 Minicom: 020 8227 2685 E-mail: <a href="mailto:clair.bantin@lbbd.gov.uk">clair.bantin@lbbd.gov.uk</a>

## **1 Introduction**

1.1 The Joint Area Review (JAR) assessment of Children's Services in 2007 was disappointing. One recommendation was that the Council should ensure that members have sufficient time to effectively scrutinise children's services and the wider Children's Trust.

1.2 Therefore, a Scrutiny Panel was set up in January 2008 by the Scrutiny Management Board to review the work of the Children's Trust.

## **2. Membership**

- 2.1 The membership of the Scrutiny Panel comprised Councillor Evelyn Carpenter (Lead Member), Councillor Mrs Dee Hunt, Councillor Miss Nadine Smith, and Councillor Richard Barnbrook. Councillor Barnbrook was unable to attend, and resigned because of pressure of work. Miss Jill Pullen, Non-Executive Director of Barking and Dagenham Primary Care Trust and Mrs Lynda Rice, Parent Governor representative, were also appointed to the Scrutiny Panel.
- 2.2 The Independent Scrutiny Support Officer was Bruce Morris, Head of Adult Care Services, and the Lead Client Officer was Meena Kishinani, Head of Children's Policy and Trust Commissioning. The Democratic Support Officers were John Dawe and Margaret Sampson.

## **3 Terms of Reference and Objectives**

- 3.1 The terms of reference of the Panel were:
- (i) To review the Children's Trust in its early stages, with particular emphasis on: how the Trust is working; the contributions and views of all partners; and what needs to be done for the Trust to work more effectively.
  - (ii) To review progress in producing an integrated commissioning strategy, leading to the establishment of a commissioning process that provided a better service to children and young people.
  - (iii) To examine the role of councillors in the Children's Trust.
  - (iv) To monitor the Joint Area Review action plan and the Children and Young People's Plan, with particular regard to children with learning difficulties and disabled children.
  - (v) To ensure that the processes operated by the Local Children's Safeguarding Board are effective and reflect best practice.
  - (vi) Like all Scrutiny Panels, to consider any related equalities and diversity and health implications.

## **4 Background**

- 4.1 The Scrutiny Panel agreed a work-programme at its first meeting setting out the methods of scrutiny and types of evidence that Members wished to consider. The methods of scrutiny included:
- presentations by officers and an external expert from another local authority
  - interviews with a representative selection of Children's Trust partners either in Scrutiny Panel meetings, or (because of time constraints) by the Lead Member and Democratic Services Officer outside Panel meetings
  - reports by Children's Services officers and Democratic Services officers on areas being scrutinised
  - research of relevant documents from, for example, Children's Services, OFSTED, and the Department for Children, Schools and Families

- seeking clarification at meetings of the Scrutiny Management Board on 20 February 2008 and 26 March 2008 on reports relevant to the work of the Scrutiny Panel.

4.2 The Scrutiny Panel agreed questions in advance to ask Children's Trust partners (see **Appendix 1**), the external expert on commissioning from another Local Authority (see **Appendix 2**), and in connection with the Joint Area Review Action Plan (see **Appendix 2**). These were emailed to interviewees and officers in advance of meetings.

4.3 To help ensure accuracy, and to identify the key issues:

- full interview notes and notes of presentations were prepared
- draft notes were distributed to interviewees and officers for amendment - most interviewees took advantage of this
- there was the opportunity to glean evidence on the same issue from a variety of sources.

4.4 In line with best practice, the Scrutiny Panel sought external advice about an issue identified by the Corporate Director for particular scrutiny - the integrated joint commissioning of children's services. Karen Badgery, Head of Commissioning Children's Services in Tower Hamlets, gave a presentation to the Scrutiny Panel about progress in one of the Children's Trust national pathfinders.

4.5 In addition, a selection of Children's Trust partners were interviewed and the list of presentations and reports considered by the Scrutiny Panel are set out in **Appendix 3**. A full list of all the documentation presented to the Scrutiny Panel for consideration is set out in **Appendix 4**.

## **5. The Children's Trust**

5.1 The Children's Trust was established in April 2006. The Corporate Director of Children's Services and the Lead Member have a statutory role for the welfare and well-being for all aspects of children's lives and this remit is expressed in structural and governance terms through the Children's Trust which brings together all the relevant partners from schools, Council services, the Police, Primary Care Trust (PCT), Learning Skills Council (LSC), and the voluntary sector.

5.2 The Scrutiny Panel looked at how well the Children's Trust was working and what had been achieved since its inception. The Panel also investigated whether there were areas of weakness.

5.3 There was evidence that the Children's Trust has started to create relationships and break down barriers between individual services. This was felt to be new ground for most of the partners because, previously, contact had been ad hoc. The Children's Trust enabled partners to discuss the same strategic issues, forge relationships in doing so and, thus, lead to a growing understanding of each others' sectors.

5.4 The networking and informal processes have also led to new joint working. For example, the PCT are funding a multi-organisation project involving the voluntary sector and Leisure Services to combat children's obesity.

5.5 Other notable achievements attributed to the Children's Trust even at this early stage include:

- the reduction in number of those Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETS) arising from a new focus on prevention earlier in secondary schools, and the development of a screening model for children in the early years
- stronger links between the Police and secondary schools
- making young people central to decision-making, and finding new ways to engage them in decision-making.

5.6 However, areas of weakness included:

- the lack of a robust focus on clear priorities relating to the outcomes of Every Child Matters and the Local Area Agreement (LAA).
- the lack of up-to-date performance information, clearly analysed and compared to local and national targets on 3 or 4 key areas at each meeting
- the need 'to become operationally nimble' and drive down the good partnership working at the strategic level to the middle management operational level
- meetings with large agendas and copious paper-work delivered at short notice
- insufficient time for in-depth planning

5.7 Work is in hand to resolve these problems and a simpler structure for the Children's Trust is proposed. The strategic body will focus on performance management with operational sub-groups dealing with, for example, school improvement, integrated youth services, and learning difficulties and disabilities to focus on specific areas of service provision.

5.8 At the grass-roots level, services will be organised in 6 localities aimed at helping middle managers focus on intractable problems. Services will use the Common Assessment Framework and share information electronically through Contact Point.

## **6. Financial pressures**

6.1 There was a general impression that financial pressures were not unduly constraining the Children's Trust. It was suggested, in fact, that the Borough was awash with different initiatives and funding streams which were putting additional pressure on partners.

6.2 Moreover, the PCT has been in a good position to support Children's Trust priorities because of an under-spend in 2007/ 2008.

6.3 There was a general view that hard decisions needed to be made to re-allocate resources, particularly to meet the needs of young people and to deal with anti-social behaviour.

## **7. Role of the voluntary sector**

7.1 There was evidence that the Children's Trust needed to do more to facilitate the contribution of the voluntary sector to partnership working. More could be done to empower and improve the contribution of the voluntary sector and make use of valuable data gleaned by them at the local level.

- 7.2 Unlike other Children's Trust partners who were senior managers in their organisations, voluntary sector representatives were usually front-line workers: the Children's Trust needed to take account of this difference.
- 7.3 The voluntary sector representatives did not feel equal partners in the Children's Trust partly because of the formality of meetings held in the Council Chamber at Barking Town Hall where the seating arrangements, for example, are hierarchical. Like other Children Trust partners, they found it hard to cope with large agenda and copious paper-work delivered only a few days before meetings. They were also concerned about the impact of commissioning on their budgets.
- 7.4 This was an area explored with Karen Badgery, Head of Commissioning Children's Services in Tower Hamlets. She spoke about the difficulties of embedding the new commissioning culture in the voluntary sector in Tower Hamlets. Capacity building to enable voluntary sector services to tender for work had been an important priority yet it had remained difficult for the voluntary sector to generate bids of sufficient quality. The voluntary sector was encouraged to join in consortia with both local and national organisations to make bids which could compete with national organisations.
- 7.5 Karen Badgery advised that, whilst the voluntary sector in Tower Hamlets had particular strengths in analysing need, commissioning decisions needed to be transparent to all. She considered that there were no specialist niche services which only the voluntary sector could offer.

## **8. Integrated joint planning and commissioning**

- 8.1 The Scrutiny Panel also investigated, in general, the new arrangements for the joint planning and commissioning of services for children and young people. Arrangements in Barking and Dagenham were compared with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, one of the national Children's Trust Pathfinders.
- 8.2 Joint planning and commissioning is defined in Tower Hamlets as the process of assessing needs, allocating resources, defining priorities and choices and determining how they are best delivered, monitoring implementation and delivery, evaluating impact, and learning from the process. This is similar to the definition used in Barking and Dagenham.
- 8.3 In Tower Hamlets there are three levels of commissioning:
- strategic – the setting and development of services to children and young people
  - operational – the process of procuring and developing services
  - individual – the procurement of individual packages of care and education

Barking and Dagenham are moving in this direction but are currently concentrating on developments at the strategic level. Barking and Dagenham will also operate a locality structure to procure and develop services at the operational level.

- 8.4 The commissioning cycle in both Authorities is similar. In Tower Hamlets there is:
- a Commissioning Principles and Framework document establishing a shared vision for commissioning across the partnership. This was prepared in

consultation with children and young people, statutory partners and third sector groups

- a commissioning unit responsible for the overall strategic direction of commissioning with some posts funded by the PCT
- an Access to Resources Team responsible for the procurement and management of placements. Social workers make referrals to this team who are then responsible for considering whether the future care plans, particularly those that involve residential placement, are necessary. The placement budget of £13 million has been halved as a result of the commissioning approach.

8.5 In Barking and Dagenham, the new Children's Trust structure incorporates a Joint Commissioning Board. There is a head of service post with the lead for joint commissioning, a group manager post and a small team of three commissioning officers. In recognition that the structure needs to be strengthened, grant funds will be sought to increase staff. Possibly, the PCT will assist.

8.6 Although an extensive needs analysis has been undertaken across the partnership and priorities agreed which underpin the Children and Young People's Plan and the LAA, further development is required to ensure the full implementation of the joint planning and commissioning of children's services in Barking and Dagenham. Further progress is needed on:

- preparing a vision statement for joint planning and commissioning across the partnership recognising the different cultures in the partnership, and different commissioning styles in the Council and PCT, for instance;
- implementing the new structure for the Children's Trust and the new focus on performance
- implementing the locality structure including the re-organisation of staff teams, the devolving of budgets, and the provision of services supported by the Council's neighbourhood management structure and others, as appropriate
- establishing Locality Commissioning Teams made up of local professionals who would assess locality needs and set commissioning priorities for each area
- implementing the Common Assessment Framework consistently across all services for children and young people in the Borough and fully implementing the electronic sharing of information through Contact Point
- increasing the participation of children, young people and their families in planning and commissioning services
- resolving funding allocations, such as shifting budgets to preventative services whilst retaining the capacity to respond to acute needs
- the planning and the implementing of work-force and market (private and voluntary sector) development to support all of the above which is sensitive to the particular needs of different groups and the timetable requirements of schools.

8.7 Such a substantial and complex cultural shift across a large partnership necessitating the multi-faceted work-programme outlined above requires sufficient staff resources to make progress. It is not clear that a head of service (with other wide-ranging responsibilities) with a group manager post assisted by a small team of three officers will be sufficient for the task.



## **9. Children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities (LDD)**

- 9.1 The Scrutiny Panel received detailed information on the progress made in responding to the recommendations of the 2007 JAR and the supplementary papers listed in Appendix 4. The Panel paid particular attention to the improvement in services for children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities (LDD). The JAR assessment had been critical, for example, of their employment and education opportunities, the integration of services for this group, consultation with children and young people with LDD, and their representation and participation in the youth forum.
- 9.2 The Divisional Director for Safeguarding and Rights explained to the Scrutiny Panel the role of the new strategic board for children and young people with learning difficulties and disabilities. The remit of the board is to oversee the implementation of the JAR recommendations, improve understanding of LDD across partner agencies, and ensure that the voices of children and their families are reflected in decision making. The strategic board has established a Borough wide parents' board and specific sub-groups for speech and language, autism, behaviour, and a deaf task group. The Scrutiny Panel also learnt how a group of voluntary sector organisations had been commissioned by Children's Services to develop a youth parliament for disabled children and to undertake consultations with them: this was now in place and had proved a successful and popular forum.
- 9.3 The implementation of the JAR recommendations through an action plan is closely monitored. Scrutiny Management Board, for instance, on 26 March 2008 considered a report on 'Achieving Excellence 2007/2008 Quarter 3' which showed that 61% of the JAR actions were on track, 16% were making slower progress, 9% were not due yet, and 13% were completed. The recommendation, however, that specialist facilities are made available to children with LDD who are not pupils of Trinity School had not yet been achieved. This would be addressed by additional resources and building an additional special school through Building Schools for the Future.
- 9.4 Other future developments that have already been addressed include:
- the integration of all services from the Barking Children's Health Centre when opened
  - the Transitions Team based in Adult Services to work with young people aged 14-16 during their transition to adulthood
  - School Action and Action+ assessment would now be through the Common Assessment Framework to help identify all children with LDD
  - the implementation of individual budgets using the Adult Services model
  - a campaign to increase the participation of disabled children in the Every Child Matters agenda.
- 9.5 Nevertheless, the Scrutiny Panel was concerned to see more evidence of the impact of service improvements on the lives of children and young people with LDD, particularly at the transition stage to adulthood.

## **10. Children and Young People's Plan**

- 10.1 The Scrutiny Panel investigated whether, and how, the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) affected the work of partner organisations. Statutory and voluntary sector partners explained how they had contributed to the CYPP priorities and how the relevant sections of the plan were built into their own strategic and operational plans. There was plenty of evidence that this document was well embedded in the work of all the Partners.
- 10.2 The schools' representatives also reported that schools had regard to the CYPP plan: schools were aligned to it because they work to the same agenda.

## **11. Every Child Matters**

- 11.1 The Scrutiny Panel explored whether any of the five outcomes of 'Every Child Matters' (enjoy and achieve, be healthy, stay safe, make a positive contribution, enjoy economic well-being) were more difficult to achieve by the partnership. However, as the Children's Trust was at an early stage in its development, there was no clear evidence one way or the other.
- 11.2 Partners generally felt that they were making a greater or lesser contribution in all areas and had a part to play. The Police thought that the Children's Trust could be more demanding of its partners in this area and suggested that the Police could be involved in sign-posting in connection with the strand 'enjoy economic well-being'.
- 11.3 The primary schools' representative said that schools did not have the capacity to contribute to all strands. The secondary schools' representative felt that the outcome 'make a positive contribution' was more difficult to achieve for schools (though this was a strength of the voluntary sector).
- 11.4 The Corporate Director for Children's Services thought that the Children's Trust could do more to mesh contributions together.

## **12. Local Children Safeguarding Board**

- 12.1 The Scrutiny Panel was asked to consider the relationship between the Children's Trust and the Local Children Safeguarding Board. At the Scrutiny Management Board on 20 February 2008, it was reported that recommendations arising from Serious Case Reviews which had implications for the Children's Trust were communicated and monitored. The Chair of the Independent Local Children Safeguarding Board sits on the Children's Trust as a member and the LCSB is a standing item on the agenda of the Children's Trust for a brief update with a twice yearly formal report.
- 12.2 Responsibility for implementing Serious Case Reviews lies with the Local Children Safeguarding Board.

## **13. Role of Councillors**

- 13.1 To check best practice in other Authorities, a survey was carried out into the role of Councillors in the Children's Trust. Of the fourteen Authorities investigated, all had a framework for delivering children's services located within the Local Strategic

Partnership structure. They had a children's trust or similar body with an operation and membership similar to Barking and Dagenham's. Many of the Authorities had a corresponding scrutiny function; some by operating individual scrutiny reviews of discrete areas, some by establishing standing scrutiny commissions on Children's Services. The portfolio holder was usually the only councillor involved in the children's trust or similar body.

### **Background Papers Used in the Preparation of this Report**

Background papers are listed in Appendix 4 to this report.

**Questions for Children's Trust partners**

1. What is your role in the Children's Trust?
2. Please tell us briefly about what has worked well in the Children's Trust from your perspective, and why? Please give just two examples of this.
3. What has worked less well in the Children's Trust from your perspective, and why? What are the areas that the Children's Trust needs to improve?
4. Supplementary question as necessary: Are financial pressures constraining the development of children and young people's services and, if so, what can be done about this by the Children's Trust?
5. How is data shared across the Children's Trust and how does it inform needs assessment and the commissioning of services?
6. In what ways has the well being of children in Barking and Dagenham been improved by the Children's Trust (recognising that measuring the effect of the Children's Trust at such an early stage presents difficulties)? Nevertheless, can you give us, say, 2 examples of significant developments that have resulted from the work of the Children's Trust?
7. How does the Children and Young People's Plan feed into and affect the work of your organisation? How do the strategic priorities set out in the Plan translate into deliverable operational objectives in your organisation, and how do you ensure that they are delivered?
8. 'Have any of the five outcomes in Every Child Matters (enjoy and achieve; be healthy; stay safe; make a positive contribution; enjoy economic wellbeing) been more difficult to achieve from your organisation's perspective, and what has been the easiest to achieve?'
9. Question for voluntary sector members: How do the voluntary sector representatives on the Children's Trust ensure that they adequately represent other voluntary sector groups?

**Questions for Tower Hamlets on joint commissioning of children and young people's services**

1. Is there agreement on a joint commissioning strategy and how is joint commissioning defined?
2. How is a culture for successful commissioning being developed?
3. What is the commissioning cycle?
4. How does the Children's Trust oversee and co-ordinate planning and commissioning activities and delivery of services, and ensure that they are simple and streamlined?
5. How does the commissioning and development of services take account of the views of young people and families?
6. Is there a Joint Commissioning Unit? Who leads the partnership to commission services; gather information about services; agrees what better services look like; writes contracts; monitors effective delivery of services?
7. Is there any evidence that services are being reviewed and redesigned as a result of the commissioning process?
8. What has been the impact of commissioning on the voluntary sector in Tower Hamlets?
9. What has the Year 1 Review of your Children and Young People's Plan highlighted for you?

**Questions on Joint Area Review (JAR) Action Plan?**

1. Has the Children's Trust addressed immediate action points arising from the JAR? Have there been delays and, if so, why?
2. How far has progress been made with the intermediate and long-term issues raised by the JAR?
3. How far advanced are the plans for children with disabilities? Have the weaknesses identified by the JAR been addressed or are there still areas of concern?

**List of interviews, meetings and presentations**

Children's Trust partners interviewed:

Councillor Jeanne Alexander, Lead Member for Children's Services  
Roger Luxton, Corporate Director of Children's Services  
Hilary Ayerst, Chief Executive Barking & Dagenham Primary Care Trust  
Superintendent Dave Reed, Deputy Borough Commander, Metropolitan Police  
Trevor Cook, Partnership Director for Barking and Dagenham and Havering, Learning and Skills Council  
Karen West-Whyllie, Chief Officer, Barking and Dagenham CIII  
John Wainaina, Project Manager, African Youth League  
Gary Wilder, Primary Headteacher representative  
Roger Leighton, Secondary Headteacher representative

Reports and Minutes of the Scrutiny Panel meetings held on:

14 January 2008  
28 January 2008  
13 February 2008  
4 March 2008  
12 March 2008  
25 March 2008

Presentations to the Scrutiny Panel

Barking & Dagenham Children's Trust by Meena Kishinani, Head of Children's Policy and Commissioning

Barking & Dagenham Children's Trust Commissioning Strategy by Meena Kishinani, Head of Children's Policy and Commissioning

### Background papers used in the preparation of this report

Children's Workforce Development Council	Common Assessment Framework Fact Sheets ( <a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk">www.everychildmatters.gov.uk</a> ) October 2007.
Fox, Claire	Not all birds of a feather ( <a href="http://www.LocalGov.co.uk">www.LocalGov.co.uk</a> ) 21 February 2008
HM Government	Joint Planning and Commissioning framework for children, young people and maternity services. March 2006.
Improvement & Development Agency	Children's Services Scrutiny Toolkit ( <a href="http://www.idea.gov.uk">www.idea.gov.uk</a> )
London Borough Tower Hamlets	Children's Trust Pathfinder: Commissioning Principles and Framework ( <a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk">www.everychildmatters.gov.uk</a> ) March 2005.
London Borough Tower Hamlets	How to Develop and Embed a Framework for Commissioning Principles across Partner Agencies ( <a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk">www.everychildmatters.gov.uk</a> ) February 2007.
Maxwell, Nicolas	Service User Involvement in Tendering (Ch. 3 'Commissioning with Service Users and Carers') ( <a href="http://www.integratedcarenetwork.gov.uk">www.integratedcarenetwork.gov.uk</a> ) May 2006.
National Youth Agency	Hear by Right – Children and Young People's Trusts and Local Authority decision making ( <a href="http://www.hbr.nya.org.uk">www.hbr.nya.org.uk</a> )
OFSTED/ CSCI	2006 Annual performance assessment of services for children and young people in Barking and Dagenham. 1 November 2006
OFSTED	Barking & Dagenham: Joint Area Review of Children's Services. June 2007.
OFSTED	Barking & Dagenham: Joint Area Review of Children's Services. June 2007.
Smyth, Judith	Integrated Commissioning for Children's Services ( <a href="http://www.opm.co.uk/2006_pubs/44comm.htm">www.opm.co.uk/2006_pubs/44comm.htm</a> )
Whyte, David	Partnership: the new challenges for Local Government (Ch.4 'Working with Service Providers') ( <a href="http://www.integratedcarenetwork.gov.uk">www.integratedcarenetwork.gov.uk</a> ) July 2006.

**LB Barking and Dagenham background documents:**

Analysis of 2006/07 Permanent and Fixed Exclusions

Analysis of L2 and L3 qualifications at the age of 19: 2006/07

Barking and Dagenham Inclusion Statement

Children's Trust: agenda and reports. 15 January 2008

Children's Trust: structure

Children and Young People's Plan 2006-2009: a summary

Children and Young People's Plan 2006-2009: one year on

Integrated Services for Young People (ISYP): Governance Structure

Joint Area Review Action Plan 2007

Learning Difficulties and Disabilities: Background and Current Position.  
2 October 2007

Learning Difficulties and Disabilities: Notes/Outline for LDD Board

Learning Difficulties and Disabilities: Board Terms of Reference. August 2007

Learning Difficulties and Disabilities Board: Engagement and Communication.  
31 January 2008

Strategic Review of services for disabled children. 7 August 2006