

Education Consultation decision

04 July 2024 - Involve & Collaborate CIC

This is an initial summary report to inform the council leadership team's decision on progressing the Grenfell Future Support Programme model for Education. It will be followed by a final report which details our consultation scrutiny process and findings in more detail.

In writing this report we have decided to review the bereaved and survivors and community consultation work from the council under one consultation decision. This is for two reasons:

1. The consultation is about a fixed pot of money for both cohorts and the outcome of consultation with bereaved and survivors are connected more so than for the previous consultations.
2. From our observations of the various consultation sessions and listening to feedback from bereaved and survivors and community members, we feel that reporting separately would be both repetitive and also creating an unnecessary differentiation. A restorative aspect of this consultation has been that it has felt less divisive than previous consultations and we wish to respect this.

In areas of this scrutiny report where we felt that the scrutiny from EST applies more to bereaved and survivors and or community members, we will make this clear. Otherwise, our scrutiny feedback is about the consultation with all people.

What is the required assessment from the External Scrutiny Team (EST)?

In our terms of reference we were asked to scrutinise whether the consultation process, for both the bereaved and survivor and immediate community consultations, were effective, and to pay particular attention to the following:

- The weighting of different voices
- The methods used to reach out to all eligible groups and individuals
- The collection and analysis of data and the use of feedback
- The robustness of analysis and interpretation
- Ensuring the final proposals adequately reflect the feedback
- Assess strengths and weaknesses of the whole consultation
- The allocation of funding across the three budgets (bereaved and survivors, immediate community, education and training)

We have addressed all these areas in our judgement below.

We have used four principles of effective consultation which we set out in our first report: fairness, accountability, transparency, integrity. We also considered how far the consultation has been both trauma-informed and restorative.

The role of EST was not to judge the specific division of funds between different bereaved and survivors and immediate community members, but to ensure that the process of consultation, analysis, and development of the models followed good practice for a consultation, and that the overall consultation process, in particular the design of surveys and facilitation of sessions about

these models was trauma-informed, and created space for a robust and restorative dialogue between the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) and those being consulted; both bereaved and survivors and the immediate community.

As part of our role we have listened to complaints that we have received about both the process of consultation and the outcomes of the models. We have considered these complaints alongside our broader observations and scrutiny. Throughout the consultation process we have requested additional written evidence, from GPT about their approach and decision making, to inform our judgement. We have also done this through questioning and discussion in a series of meetings throughout the consultation process. This has been a thorough approach as the GPT have been required to give comprehensive feedback on all areas of the consultation, on request from us and at our discretion.

There is one area to caveat: we are not able to say definitively whether or not the final proposals adequately reflect *all* the feedback received. It was not within the scope of our role to run the consultation, conduct thorough analysis of all the consultation data or look at all of the information about support services that GPT have collected over the past seven years. We have scrutinised a proportionate sample of the feedback, not every piece of feedback, so we are not able to ascertain how every piece has been used. We have reported based on all the feedback we have seen, both through formal observation and data sampling of analysis.

Overall Assessment

We are satisfied sufficiently in the consultation process to recommend that the council proceeds with developing the support model, into the implementation phase, **based on the final models sent to us on 25th June 2024.**

EST is satisfied that it was an effective and trauma-informed consultation. We can also see that the process of the consultation has also made some important steps in restorative practice.

We confirm that the Education consultation process has so far met our four principles for effective consultation (fairness, accountability, transparency, integrity), with a few areas for improvement. We are recommending some additional steps be taken. We are prepared to sign off the Education consultation with the following additional commitments (see below), which should be actioned during the next phase of preparing for implementation.

We note that some members of the community are concerned about the levels of response to this consultation. Based on the data that we have been provided, we consider the level of response to be adequate, especially given the high rate of response from children and young people. We also note the council's efforts to encourage engagement through a wide range of methods. The level of engagement from adults in the community may be a key indicator of continuing low levels of trust between the community and the council. In order to continue the restorative process between council and community, more engagement is required during the implementation phase, particularly in the delivery of the Centre for Excellence.

Based on our agreed model of observing a proportion of consultation events, sampling the questionnaire analysis, and reviewing all questions and phase reports, the EST agrees that the proposed model adequately reflects the feedback received through the consultation.

Strengths of the consultation process

- 1. The staging of the consultation process took time to be inclusive** -The original timeline was amended and longer was taken to collect and analyse feedback at all phases. GPT also shifted the Education and Training timeline from running in parallel with the other consultations to more sequentially for Phases 3 and 4, to allow for more feedback through both surveys and group and individual meetings.
- 2. A large proportion (approximately 50%) of bereaved and survivor adults and children and young people responded to Phase 1 of this consultation. In addition, a large number of children and young people (approximately 30%) from across the community responded through Phase 1 of the consultation.** A particular strength is that this consultation has put the views of children and young people at the centre, when designing the future models of support.
- 3. Online and in-person meeting options were available for each phase. The Grenfell Partnerships team adapted engagements for different groups.** GPT became progressively more skilled at planning and facilitating engagements. The team engaged through a variety of methods, in schools, in small groups in settings outside of schools, online and in person, on the doorstep, and through 1:1 conversations.
- 4. Workshops for young people were adapted and tailored to be age appropriate and were held in settings familiar to young people.** GPT supported young people to be co-facilitators of these sessions, and centred young people as part of the consultation process.
- 5. Quantitative data was collected and analysed in a professional and systematic manner.** In particular, the GPT took on EST feedback to complete all analysis of the questionnaire data before developing models, go into more detail and increase rigour on coding and theming.
- 6. Voices were weighed accurately during the Phase 1 survey analysis.** The interpretation of the range of views we heard, and the way these were translated into the models, appeared to be reasonable and balanced. Where we advised the need for clarity in some parts of the analysis presentation GPT amended presentations to reflect this clarity.
- 7. Full analysis of the first phase consultation was shared transparently.** Clear and simple summaries of the consultation analysis were shared in advance of workshops. Although the raw data and its analysis was not shared, it was available to see on request. People's own words and phrases were used as much as possible. Final model documents also include a transparent summary of how final decisions have been made.
- 8. GPT additionally drew on other data sources from disaster recovery expertise, and insights from case work, to inform the interpretation of feedback, and to check and refine the development of the models.** We are satisfied that this represented good practice, and saw that it informed the allocation of resources between bereaved and survivors and community members, and the choice to offer all groups of bereaved and survivors the same education and training support.
- 9. In addition to survey and engagement feedback, GPT also drew on feedback from professionals working with children and young people in schools and wider settings** - EST are satisfied that there was a fair balance between taking account of the views of individuals

and specific groups whilst also being informed by the wider response to the consultation throughout phases 1-4, alongside external expertise and evidence from professionals.

- 10. Analysis of feedback and changes made from phase 2-4.** The analysis and the subsequent changes to models between phases 2-4, reflected the range and specificity of the feedback given by adults and children and young people. In particular, where individuals and groups felt that their voices, views or needs were under-represented in the proposed models, additional meetings were added on request and serious consideration was given to the representations and needs, to incorporate this feedback whilst remaining fair in the context of the overall consultation.
- 11. Presentation of potential models came with costings** allowing respondents to see the implications of different choices and to express where they felt money would be best spent. Several changes were made to allocations through the process in response to what was heard.
- 12. The final models take the support to a more restorative place.** From what we have seen, the final model reflects and accommodates a wide range of expressed needs and feedback. From our observations, there has been broad agreement about the ways in which young people's voices and choices have been centred in the shaping of models, and this feels restorative across the community and bereaved and survivors. The final model also feels restorative in the way in which key parts of the model, such as the Centre for Excellence, with its flexible modes of delivery, will be available to all cohorts and all ages - thus bringing different parts of the community together under one umbrella.

Weaknesses of the consultation process

- 1. Response rates, connected to the fact that the consultation was not wholly restorative, (and could not have been).** The timing of the criminal trial, the questions around the future of the tower, the historic injustices that have been experienced by different groups, and existing tensions between some bereaved and survivor groups all made it very difficult for this consultation to be wholly restorative. This wider context, coupled with the existing levels of trust, meant that overall at each phase, responses from adults in the community were proportionately lower than from children and young people or bereaved and survivors.
- 2. Lower engagement through phases 2-4:** Engagement in phases 2-4 was lower than phase 1, from all groups, particularly from community members. This is partly to be expected, as phases 2-4 engagement was more targeted engagement through in-person and online meetings and individual and group conversations. However, this has resulted in some community members and bereaved and survivors feeling that their views are not represented in the final models.
- 3. Weakness in demographic data:** As EST we are satisfied from our observations, the data made available to us, and through questioning GPT members, that the final models reflect a diverse range of views from a range of people who are broadly reflective of the wider community and bereaved and survivors. However, particularly for children and young people, there was a lack of demographic data provided to substantiate this. We recognise that there is an inherent challenge with conducting a consultation and getting demographic data, in a

context where there are low levels of trust¹. Providing demographic data was voluntary throughout the consultation, and currently we have observed that it does not feel safe for all community members and particularly children and young people to give their demographic information to the council. This makes it difficult to ensure directly through the data that a wide range of views are represented. It also means that GPT must rely on their knowledge of the demographics of the area, and their relationships with individuals and groups in order to reach out to those who are most affected and least likely to respond.

- 4. Discussion of education and training in Phase 2** - During phase 2 when the analysis was fed back and people were asked for feedback in workshops, there was a lot of ground to cover and education as a topic often got missed off due to lack of time, so there were missed opportunities for some people to feed back on the education and training findings..
- 5. Accessibility through languages other than English** - GPT made efforts to be accessible, and provided translators and materials in languages other than English. However, we would expect in future GPT will need to revisit their approach to providing translated materials and in particular increase work to ensure that people are able to engage in languages other than English.
- 6. Clarity for education settings about their relationship to the future models:** It is clear to EST that the GPT engaged widely with professionals such as teachers, CYP specialist clinicians, community organisations and therapeutic professionals. However despite this wider engagement, a few schools were unclear around the transition between existing support services and future support services, in particular around the centre for excellence and how this would impact the services that are currently provided in schools.
- 7. Pace:** This challenge was not within the control of GPT, and we felt that GPT managed this challenge well responding rapidly to feedback and adapting models appropriately. However, pace is a barrier overall to a more fully restorative consultation process and therefore we are categorising it as a weakness.
A quick turnaround between consultation data collection and preparing the next phase of models led to some bereaved and survivors and community members feeling that they did not have time to respond to parts of the consultation, especially the later phases.
 - a. The requirement to finish the consultation by the July leadership team deadline, led to phases 3 & 4 of the consultation needing to happen at pace. Although these timelines were longer than for the previous consultations, the timelines in phase 4 in particular meant that some members of the community and wider stakeholders felt that they were not up to date with the changes and the final models, and some felt that their views were not included.
 - b. There was good justification for keeping to time, and EST are satisfied that all the stages of the consultation were carried through with due attention. However, it led to a tension felt both in GPT and in the EST. This was that slowing down might create harm in missing deadlines for support, and also potentially damage relationships with those members of the community and bereaved and survivors who simply wanted the consultation to be over. However, in proceeding at pace GPT was losing some transparency in the consultation data analysis and EST in the scrutiny of the

¹ Literature on participative democracy in spaces of trauma recognises that some “good” social science methodology can break down

consultation. EST judged it most important to allow the models to proceed; we prioritised this above a requirement for the council to slow down to allow even more time for responses at this stage.

- 8. Timing of this consultation in relation to the previous consultations.** This challenge was also not within the control of the GPT, and we felt that GPT managed this challenge as best as possible in the situation.

Closing the previous consultation and then immediately starting Phase 3 and 4 of the Education and Training consultation was tiring and emotionally draining for bereaved and survivors and community members. Extending the timeline over the anniversary added to this load. EST's understanding is that this was a difficult trade off decision for GPT and they needed to balance creating additional time for response, balancing time stress with emotional stress, alongside the deadline for implementation.

Additional commitment required:

The consultation was not wholly restorative, (and could not have been given the context, timing and setting of the consultation). Implementation process will be important and there needs to be a commitment from the Council to carry the restorative aspiration through to the implementation process.

Observation: The GPT now faces the need for a pragmatic and fast period of implementation of services that align with existing provision to prevent unnecessary gaps in service, so that services are ready for the new academic year. They also need to provide clarity on how services will be integrated between schools, the Centre for Excellence and other places where this fund will be spent. During this implementation period, it will be important to pay attention to any stakeholders that are not yet supportive of the new model, especially the Centre for Excellence, and ensure that the model is implemented in ways that continue to build trust and relationships..

Recommendation 1 - A set of principles to guide the implementation of the models such that there can be as much assurance as possible that the ways that the models are implemented are restorative, trauma informed and sufficiently person and community centred.

Recommendation 2 - A transparent plan and process for Implementation for the CfE, a way of transitioning from the current support to the new support. The council has committed to continuing to work alongside children and young people, adults, and also professionals at the implementation stage. EST would like to see plans for implementation, including an implementation group for the Centre for Excellence.

Recommendation 3 - Make sure that as part of the implementation plans, there is a strategy for how to engage with people that GPT feel, or have evidence, are underrepresented.