

Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q1 2025

Education & Training programme

August 2025



If you would like a translated copy of this document please contact futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

আপনি যদি এই নথির একটি অনুবাদিত অনুলিপি চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

የተተረጎመውን የዚህ መረጃ ይዘት ከፈለጉ እባክዎ በ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة مترجمة من هذه المعلومات، فيرجى الاتصال بـ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk أو

«اگر یک نسخه‌ی ترجمه شده از این اطلاعات را می‌خواهید، لطفاً با ایمیل futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk

Se desejar uma versão traduzida desta informação, por favor entre em contato com futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Haddii aad rabto nuqul dukumeenti ah oo la turjumay fadlan la xidhiidh futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Si desea una versión traducida de esta información, póngase en contacto con futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

ናይዚ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተረጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk ርኽቡና።

Purpose

What is this: This document is the first Independent Scrutiny Function update on the Education & Training programme. It provides an assessment on the implementation of the Education & Training programme from January – June 2025.

Please note, in the future we expect that scrutiny assessments on the Education & Training programme will be separated out for bereaved and survivors, and community members.

Overview

What is the Independent Scrutiny Function?

The Grenfell Support programme is being delivered by the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) and overseen by an Independent Scrutiny Function (ISF). The job of the ISF is to provide scrutiny (external review, challenge and advice) to help ensure the Grenfell Support programme is being delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors. Further information about the ISF and its appointment can be found [here](#).

What is the purpose of this document?

This document provides a summary of our scrutiny assessment on the implementation of the Education and Training programme from January to June 2025 and monitoring plans for the programme. At this early stage, our assessment is based on a review of programme updates and monitoring plans from the GPT provided in late June 2025, supported by follow up conversations in July.

What are the contents of this document?

This document presents our scrutiny assessment according to our scrutiny framework (which you can see on slide 6).

Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 6
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 7-11
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 12-13

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment – slides 17-27

Scrutiny framework

To make our scrutiny assessment we review the GPT's monitoring data against the following questions:

Delivery, reach and impact	Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? Who is accessing the programme and who is it not reaching? Is the programme having an impact and being adapted as required to improve impact?
Complaints	Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What learning/actions have been taken as a result?
Expenditure	Is expenditure for the programme as intended? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?
Reporting and transparency	Is reporting/planned reporting providing people with clear, honest, and timely information about the programme and decisions?
Restorative practice	Are the GPT ensuring that the process of delivery and monitoring centres the perspectives and experiences of people accessing the programme? Is the delivery and monitoring of the programme informed by restorative practice?
Monitoring	Is the monitoring providing the necessary insight for the GPT to deliver and improve the programme?

Because the Education & Training programme is not yet fully up and running, for this round of scrutiny we used these questions to look at the GPT's proposed monitoring plans for the programme.

Scrutiny assessment overview

Based on the evidence we have reviewed, as the ISF we are satisfied that the GPT is effectively delivering the Education and Training programme in line with the model agreed through consultation.

Summary of overall progress (You can find out more in the GPT's update [here](#).)

After the consultation, the Education & Training programme committed to a longer implementation time frame to ensure that all stakeholders had the opportunity to participate. In particular, this meant spending more time setting up the Education Hub. This means that only the bursaries for children and young people who are bereaved and/or survivors are currently being delivered. Monitoring plans have been developed for the programme, reflecting the aims and principles of the Education & Training programme.

Key milestones and decisions: As planned, all key decisions since January 2025 have been made by the Education Hub Steering Group, which is leading on implementation of the Education Hub. The Group inputted to decisions on the make-up of the team of Education Hub professionals, allocations of time for the clinical posts, types of support that the Hub will offer, recruitment processes for Hub roles, aims of the Hub and ways of measuring if these have been reached, principles of the Hub, and the accessibility of referral forms. In the programme update provided by the GPT, the process by which the Group has come to these decisions could be outlined more clearly. We have asked the GPT to outline this more fully in the next round of scrutiny.

Strengths: Implementation progress to date is in line with expectations. The GPT's proposed monitoring measures are well thought through.

Key risks/issues: Key risks/issues included confirming a permanent location for the Education Hub and recruitment (as this impacts the ability to deliver a tangible offer by September 2025). The GPT are managing these risks carefully, as evidenced by the steps they are taking to resolve the issues i.e., by finding a suitable temporary location and running an extensive recruitment process. The GPT have also recently confirmed that a permanent location for the Education Hub has been found.

Q1 2025 summary scrutiny assessment

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Delivery, reach and impact	<p>Implementation and delivery progress is in line with agreed plans. The key areas of success and challenge have been well documented.</p> <p>We will be working with the GPT to find the best way for them to report on reach, since they do not always have permission from people to hold and share this data. We understand that the GPT is taking several measures to increase reach, and in the next round of scrutiny we would like these to be covered in detail.</p> <p>It is too early for the GPT to measure impact as most of the programme is not yet fully up and running. The measures the GPT have proposed to assess whether the support is making a difference to people are well thought through. We would like to see more detail about how measures will be applied and implemented next quarter, as well as insights about delivery from staff.</p>
Complaints	GPT report that no complaints have been received.
Expenditure	We are working with the GPT to find the best way for them to report on expenditure of the programme. In the next round of scrutiny we would like to see a detailed expenditure breakdown by programme, programme strand and an explanation for variances in expenditure against budget.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Reporting and transparency	The GPT has sent out a range of dedicated communications and also included information about the Education and Training programme in wider Bereaved and Survivors and Community updates. We will review communications and reporting in more detail in the next quarter.
Restorative practice	The GPT have evidenced how a restorative approach has informed their delivery, including a commitment to co-design and facilitation of the Education Hub Steering Group by an external restorative practitioner. We encourage the GPT to share the Group's decision-making process and opportunities for people not involved to input and shape the programme.
Monitoring	As the Education and Training programme is not yet fully up and running we did not expect the GPT to report on the effectiveness of monitoring. We expect this to be included from the next quarterly cycle.

Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

Information we want to see immediately from the GPT (i.e., before the next round of scrutiny)

We do not want to see any information from the GPT before the next round of scrutiny. We think enough information has been provided to come to a scrutiny assessment (slide 8-11).

Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- Detail on the process used by the Education & Training programme Steering Groups to come to decisions
- Detail on what internal systems the GPT will be using to track when and how people access the programme, and how they are ensuring the accuracy of these systems
- Detail on how the GPT are increasing awareness of the programme
- Detail on how satisfaction with the programme will be understood and measured
- Detail on the analysis the GPT will be doing to understand impact
- Reflections from people involved in the delivery of the programme on how well it is being delivered and whether it is having an impact
- More explicit records of operational decisions and programme developments that are based on the team's experience and day-to-day interactions with key stakeholders
- Detail on what communications have gone out about the programme, their frequency, and examples

Sharing your views and staying in touch

Sharing your views and staying in touch

The monitoring and scrutiny arrangements aim to ensure the Grenfell Support programme is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and community members.

The ISF's monitoring and scrutiny updates will be shared with you via the GPT every quarter, but your voice is also crucial. To share your views on the programme's delivery and get involved in its scrutiny, you can:

- Provide direct feedback to the GPT by contacting FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk.
- Provide direct feedback to the ISF by emailing isf@involve.org.uk or calling 020 3745 4334.
- Participate in the collective scrutiny & reflection sessions. These are a dedicated sessions with the Council to help understand programme delivery so far, and identify changes needed to the programme (and beyond). There will be one collective scrutiny & reflection session a year on the Education and Training programme, facilitated by the ISF. The ISF will be in touch prior to this with details about how to take part.

You can be involved as much or as little as you would like, and your involvement can vary at different points in the programme depending on your interest and capacity. There is **no** obligation to get involved in these scrutiny processes and your choice to participate or not will not affect your ability to access support.

Appendix: Q1 2025 Detailed scrutiny assessment

If you'd like more detail than provided in the above summary, please see the following slides for a more detailed assessment against each part of the scrutiny framework

Q1 2025 scrutiny: delivery

Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? What have been key areas of success and challenge?

The GPT report that the Education & Training programme is being delivered in line with agreed plans. They outline that key areas of success include: agreeing on a set of guiding principles for the steering groups leading on implementation of the programme, the establishment of the Education Hub Steering Group, the co-design of the Education Hub, recruitment of certain personnel for the Education Hub and delivery of the bursaries for children & young people, including those who have special educational needs and disabilities, who are bereaved and survivors. They also outline that key areas of challenge include: securing a location for the Education Hub that meets the needs of bereaved, survivors and immediate community members, and recruiting suitable candidates for certain Education Hub roles .

Implementation and delivery progress is in line with agreed plans. The key areas of success and challenge have been well documented.

Have challenges been addressed? How?

The GPT report that they had not yet secured agreement for the proposed location of the Education Hub, so before September 2025, initial services will be offered at alternative locations. They are running an extensive recruitment process with recruitment consultants to ensure they can hire suitable people to people to run the Hub. Finally, they report that they are actively looking for ways to increase capacity in their own team to run the hub well. Given the GPT have outlined in detail how they are managing risks so that any potential harm to bereaved, survivors and community members is limited, we think these challenges are being managed well.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: delivery

Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are impacting delivery (positively or negatively)? If so, what are they? How are these being recorded? Is anything being done to address these?

The GPT do not report that there are any factors beyond the programme's remit impacting delivery. This makes sense given that the programme is not yet fully up and running.

Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for delivery:

In the next round of scrutiny, we have asked the GPT to consider how else they might be able to identify challenges in delivery. This might include asking people working in the Education Hub, Dedicated Service or Advocacy Team to reflect on how well they think it is running.

We would also like the GPT to explain in more detail what internal systems they will use to monitor delivery of the programme.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: reach

What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme?

Bursaries for children and young people, including those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), who are bereaved and/or survivors are on offer. The GPT reports that 71% of eligible children aged 0–4 have accessed the children and young people bursaries for bereaved and survivors and 56% of children and young people aged 5–24 have accessed them. Only 20% of the budget available for SEND bursaries has been used by people who are eligible to access it.

We understand that the GPT may not always have permission from people accessing the bursaries to hold this data, making it difficult for them to accurately report on reach. We will work with the GPT to find the best way to report on this data.

Are there specific groups of people the programme isn't reaching? What work is being done to understand this?

The GPT do not report on any analysis they have done to understand whether any specific groups of people are not accessing bursaries they are eligible to receive. In the next round of scrutiny we would like to see this analysis from the GPT.

What (if any) measures are being taken to improve reach? Why were these measures chosen? What has been the impact of these measures on reach?

The GPT report that they have done extensive communications to increase reach of the bursaries. In the next round of scrutiny, we would like to see examples of these communications.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: reach

Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for reach:

In the next round of scrutiny, we think the GPT needs to put more thought into how they will understand whether there are specific groups of people who the programme isn't reaching. This should include thinking about what analysis they can do to understand why people are not accessing the programme, and how they might use specific engagement activities to address this. This will be particularly important once the Education Hub is up and running.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: impact

It is too early for the GPT to measure impact, since most of the programme is not yet fully up and running.

Areas of improvement on the monitoring plans for impact:

The measures the GPT have proposed to assess whether the support is making a difference to people are well thought out.

Part of their plans includes assessing how 'satisfied' people are (in the annual survey, for example). We would like to see more detail on what the GPT mean by 'satisfied' and how they plan to measure this.

We also think that the GPT and other delivery partners should consider documenting their own reflections on the difference the support is making to people. We think delivery colleagues will have useful additional insight into the impact of the programme.

Finally, the measures proposed to assess the difference in impact across the programme strands are also well thought out. However, they rely a lot on the GPT's approach to analysis, which we would like to understand in more depth. We suggest this analysis includes where impact is different across demographic groups accessing the programme, which is not currently made explicit.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: complaints

How many complaints have been received? What proportion of these have been resolved (and in what timeframe)? What proportion of them have been escalated?

The GPT did not report on whether they had received complaints.

In the next round of scrutiny, we would like the GPT to confirm whether any complaints have been made. The lack of reported complaints is not unexpected however, given the programme is not yet fully up and running.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: expenditure

Is expenditure and predicted spend for the programme as intended? What variances are there? Have any decisions been made to reallocate budget?

We are working with the GPT to find the best way for them to report on expenditure of the programme. We have asked that in the next round of scrutiny, they provide a detailed expenditure breakdown by programme, programme strand and outline variances in expenditure against budget. Any variances should be explained in detail, noting how decisions to reallocate budget were made.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

What reporting and wider communications have been shared in the last quarter? What was shared (e.g. programme updates, invitations to engage in the programme, updates on decisions/opportunity to be involved in decisions)? How frequently?

The GPT report that they have sent out communications asking for people to participate in the implementation process, and inviting children and young people to workshops. They have also provided brief updates on the Education and Training programme through wider communications that have gone out to both Bereaved and Survivors and the Community.

We did not specifically request information about type and frequency of information shares and examples of communications for this quarterly scrutiny review, but we will next quarter.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: restorative practice

How is the process of implementation and delivery (including reporting and complaints) centering the perspectives and experiences of people eligible to access the programme?

The GPT provided in-depth reflection on what applying the principles of the Education and Training programme mean practically for programme delivery, as well as how their proposed monitoring plans reflect the principles. For example, it includes building relationships with those who access the programme, responding to requests as quickly as possible and actively listening to the experiences of service users. They have stressed that their promotional strategy for the Hub will be co-designed with the community to ensure accessibility, cultural sensitivity, and clarity of purpose.

As a result, we think the GPT's plans for centring the perspectives of those accessing the programme across its implementation, delivery and monitoring, is clear.

How has restorative practice informed the delivery (including reporting and complaints) and monitoring approach?

The GPT have provided detail on how a restorative approach has informed their delivery, noting that the Education & Training Steering Groups have helped develop the monitoring plans for the programme. The Education Hub Steering Group is facilitated by an external restorative practitioner.

We think that the involvement of people who will access the programme in the development of these plans is an example of restorative practice. However, we also think it's important for the GPT to reflect on the fact that these views will not represent those of everyone accessing the programme. It will be important for the GPT to remain transparent on what the Steering Groups are involved in and how they make decisions, as well as how people can join the groups if they want to or input in other ways.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: monitoring

Is the monitoring information and process giving the necessary insight to deliver and improve the programme? What areas require more focus/improvement?

As the Education and Training programme is not yet fully up and running we did not expect the GPT to report on whether the monitoring process is helpful, and how it is working well or not well. We expect this to be included from the next quarterly cycle.