

Southend-on-Sea City Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Executive Director (Children and Public Health)
to

People Scrutiny Committee

on

15th March 2022

Report prepared by Brin Martin, Director of Education
and Early Years

Reference from People Scrutiny Committee 8th February 2022
LGA SEND and CWD Peer Review Implementation Plan progress tracking

People Scrutiny Committee
Cabinet Member: Councillor Laurie Burton
Part 1 (Public Agenda Item)

1. Purpose of Report

This report follows a commitment at the People Scrutiny Committee (8th February 2022) to provide the People Scrutiny meeting on 15th March 2022 a detailed track of progress against the 15 Peer Review recommendations made in the LGA peer review report of December 2001.

The progress tracking sheet indicating both the current status of each action at the time of writing, and commentary on the original actions and subsequent actions that have been undertaken is attached as Appendix 1.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 People Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the progress made against the actions for each of the 15 recommendations in the implementation plan

3. Background

- 3.1 Following the publication of the SEND and CWD LGA Peer Review Report in December 2021, along with the associated implementation plan, the plan was approved by Cabinet on 13th January 2022, and subsequently discussed at People Scrutiny Committee on 8th February 2022. At that meeting the implementation plan was discussed and a commitment given to return to the next scrutiny committee with a detailed update on the delivery of that plan. In addition, as agreed by Cabinet in January 2022, the implementation of the plan, following the LGA review will also be scrutinised at the Children's Services Improvement Board, which is next scheduled to meet on 29th March 2022.
- 3.2 Appendix one contains a high-level summary of the actions taken against each of the recommendations, taken from the original implementation plan. For each action, an indication of the progress (at the time of writing (dated in footer)) is given to indicate whether the action is completed, on track to be delivered by the agreed deadline, or flagging up a possible delay to implementation. In

addition, dated commentary of progress against each of the original actions, and any subsequent actions felt necessary has been included. Where the recommendation has been met in full, this has also been indicated.

4 Summary of progress tracking (appendix one)

4.1 Each of the recommendations made and adopted from the peer review have been broken down into actions, with an indicative timescale against the original timelines added. In addition, a brief commentary against each action has been included.

4.2 Each sub-action is calibrated using professional judgement on the progress made to implement the action. The following key is used:

4.2.1 If the action has been successfully implemented in full by the deadline then it is marked in blue as completed; if the action is on track to be met by the agreed deadline, but that date has not yet been reached it is marked in green as fully on track; if there is delay to the implementation due to slippage, or it is not likely to be met by the deadline it is marked in red. Lastly several actions are left unhighlighted. This could be for a number of reasons: that an agreed implementation date is awaiting confirmation (at the time of writing); or that the action is contingent upon external matters such as the publication of the SEND green paper for example.

4.3 At the time of drafting this report (in preparation for dispatch of papers for scrutiny on 15th March) progress has been made in all areas of the 15 recommendations and a significant number of the actions.

4.3.1 Approximately 38% (32) of the actions have been implemented in full (grey)
46% (39) of the actions are fully on track to be met by the agreed deadline (green)
16% of the actions (15) have yet to be finalised in terms of timelines, but are not considered to be at risk
0% (0) are red

4.4 Further updates will be provided at subsequent scrutiny meetings

5. Other Options

Not relevant

6. Reasons for Recommendations

To allow scrutiny committee to consider the progress against implementing the implementation plan in detail.

7. Corporate Implications

7.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map
Opportunity and Prosperity and Safe and Well

- 7.2 Financial Implications
Due consideration will be given to the report and its recommendations.
- 7.3 Legal Implications
In addition to the scrutiny undertaken as part of the initial OFSTED/CQC revisit, and the particular focus of areas of the peer review, the team were asked to consider any legal implications of this work during the review.
- 7.4 People Implications
None
- 7.5 Property Implications
None
- 7.6 Consultation
N/A
- 7.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications
N/A
- 7.8 Risk Assessment
N/A
- 7.9 Value for Money
N/A
- 7.10 Community Safety Implications
N/A
- 7.11 Environmental Impact
N/A
- 8. Background Papers**
None
- 8. Appendices**
Appendix one, LGA Peer review report (December 2021) recommendations implementation plan progress sheet