



Changes to Haringey's Children's Centres

Statutory Public Consultation: Summary Report of Responses

Document length: 296 pages



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Analysis of Responses	7
Questionnaires	7
Outreach Meetings.....	14
Parents’ Meeting	15
Meetings with Staff.....	16
Meetings with Governors and Governing Bodies’/Advisory Boards’ Responses	18
Public Meetings	19
Other Feedback	19
Section A	20
Analysis of questionnaire responses	20
Section B.....	68
Narrative responses.....	68



Section C.....	228
Other written submissions.....	228
Section C (A).....	289
Response to other written submissions.....	289



Introduction

The Council undertook a statutory consultation exercise as part of plans to make significant changes **Haringey's children's centre delivery** model; fulfilling the duty set out in Section 5D of the Apprenticeship, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009.

The statutory consultation sought the views of Haringey residents and affected groups on the following proposals:

- To reduce the number of designated children's centres from 16 to 9
- To close seven designated children's centres but to support these sites to become Community Access Points (CAPs) offering some support to children and families to access services
- To establish five children's centre planning areas
- **Widen the focus of children's centre services from families with children 0-5 years of age to 0-19 years of age, and up to 25 years for children and young people with special educational needs**
- Increase current service availability to include evenings, weekends and across 48 weeks of the year
- Establish new Children's Centre Advisory Boards(CCAB)
- Develop Parent Engagement Forums for each children's centre planning area.

The Statutory Consultation on **Haringey's Children's Centres** closed on **Monday 21st September 2015**.

The Consultation launched on 22nd June 2015 following Cabinet Approval to proceed. Haringey residents were informed of the consultation on line via the Haringey website and through **social media**. Other methods of communication used included the children's centres and other



community organisations such as libraries and health Centres. Residents were also able to obtain paper copies of the consultation booklet, questionnaire and a **freepost envelope from the children's centres.**

A total of 398 questionnaire responses were received, 166 were posted and 232 were completed on line.

A series of evening and weekend public meetings were organised in a variety of sites, covering the whole of the borough from July, 6th to September, 14th – with a break during the summer school holidays. In addition to this, targeted outreach activities were organised at some **children's** centres with officers meeting with parents attending Stay & Play sessions and parents meetings in July. Residents could also submit email or letter responses using the following mailbox: childrenscentreconsulatation@haringey.gov.uk or using a postage free envelope.

Two meetings with all affected staff took place during the consultation period. A number of meetings with school governors were also set up as part of the process on 1st July 2015 and between 3rd September and the 11th September 2015. Haringey officers were invited to two Governing Body meetings – **at Rokesly Children's centre on the 15th September 2015 and at Broadwaters Children's centre on the 21st September 2015** to respond to the consultation directly to officers. The majority of Governing Bodies of school-run **Children's Centres submitted formal responses** to the statutory consultation.

Executive Summary

- The overwhelming feedback from all stakeholders consulted was **that children's** centres are an essential service for local children and families. The proposal of closing Centres was opposed by the greatest majority of the respondents.
- Most respondents did not totally understand the concept and practical use of Key Community Access Points (KCAPs) as described in the proposal. Governors and some staff members raised concerns about the management and accountability for the staff and the work happening in the KCAPs.



- The services that respondents most valued **were Stay & Play, health services, adult learning and parents' support.**
- Generally, respondents would want out of hours opening with a significant number preferring health services and family activities on Saturdays and health appointments for working families in the evenings.
- Respondents generally agreed with the idea to extend services to families with children over 5 years; although some respondents expressed concerns about mixing older children with younger ones.
- Respondents also agreed that having an Advisory Board to oversee the operation of Children Centres was a good idea. The introduction of Parental Engagement Forums was also perceived as a good idea.



Analysis of Responses

Questionnaires

Profile of respondents

The greatest majority (76%) of the respondents were parents of children under 5 years of age. 24% were parents of a child over 5 years of age.

26% of respondents stated they live in the N17 postcode area and 24% in N15. 19% live in the N8 postal code area with 14% and 13% of respondents stating respectively N4 and N22 postcodes. Half of the respondents were Tottenham residents.

28% of the respondents were users of The Ladder Children's Centre, 21% used Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre and 15% South Grove Children's Centre.

By far the largest proportion of parents walked to their local centre (83%). 24% used a bus and 11% drove.

Equality Considerations

Age: 66% of respondents were aged 30 – 44 years. This is by far the most represented age range.

Disability: 64% of respondents stated they did not have a disability and 28% did not reply.

Ethnicity: 41% of respondents declared to be White and 11% stated they were of mixed heritage. 29% did not state their ethnicity.



Gender: The largest group of respondents were women – this was 70% of all respondents. 67% stated that their current gender did not differ from their birth sex and 27% did not reply.

Sexuality: 64% stated they were heterosexual, 22% did not reply and 12% preferred not to say.

Religion: 33% of respondents stated they had no religion and 29% stated they were Christian. 19% did not reply.

Pregnant/had a baby: 72% stated they were not pregnant at the time of responding and 21% did not reply. 17% of respondents had had a baby in the previous 12 months, 60% hadn't and 23% did not reply.

Status: 51% of respondents were married, 18% did not reply, 13% stated to be co-habiting and 13% were single. 90% of respondent did not reply when asked about their citizen status

Language: 59% of respondents declared to be English speakers and 29% did not reply.

A The model

74% of respondents stated they “strongly do not agree” with the proposal to reduce the number of children’s centres; 12% replied “do not agree”.

Of the responses received:

1. 52% of the respondents strongly oppose the closure of any of the proposed centre listed;



2. 17% did not support it, and
3. 26% had no opinion.

The 3 centres that had the highest percentage of support to stay open were respectively: The Ladder, Bounds Green & Stonecroft.

There was an almost even split between respondents that strongly did not support using the buildings proposed for closure as Key Community Access Points (20%) and those strongly supporting this (18%). However 36% of respondents had no opinion, which further confirmed statements made by some respondents that the concept of Community Access Points has not been well explained.

In response to the question about alternative sites to access services, 44% of the respondents listed a specific site with The Ladder having the highest percentage (13%). However 28% of the respondent also stated they did not have any alternative site and 12% stated that they want all the centres to stay open.

The majority of respondents also stated that they would use none of the Key Community Access Points (37%); however a similar percentage stated they would use The Ladder (32%) and 13% responded they would use Noel Park and South Grove respectively.

When asked which additional services they felt it was important to deliver in the key community access points; Breastfeeding support was mentioned by 17% of respondents, whereas 15% stated that there were no additional services and another 15% stated that they opposed having key community access points. 10% of the respondents mentioned ESOL and adult learning.

34% (136) of all respondents completed the question about where else they would like to access children's centres services in their community. 40% (46) of those listed a specific site with The Ladder having the most consensus. A further 32% mentioned a variety of sites including schools, Children's Centres, GP Surgeries, Community Centres and Civic Centre/Town Hall. Finally 26% stated there they had none.



When asked which services would people like to see in a Key Community Access Point; Stay & Play sessions, Health Appointments and Advice sessions had almost an equal share of consensus from respondents, with an overall 71% of respondents rating them all extremely important with a further 13% rating them important. 7% of respondents had no opinion.

When asked if there were any additional service that would be important to deliver in Key Community Access Points, 16% of respondents mentioned breastfeeding support, 14% stated there were no other services, 13% stated they opposed the model of Key Community Access Points and 10% mentioned English Spoken as Other Language (ESOL), training and adult learning.

50% of the respondents stated they strongly agreed to keep the 9 proposed designated centres open – each centre has a very similar percentage share of consensus. 19% had no opinion and 15% did not reply.

When asked to provide comments on the centres that are proposed to stay open, 39% of the respondents who completed this question stated that all centres should be kept open. This is consistent with the overwhelming lack of support for closing any centre. However 38% of respondents also listed individual centres with The Ladder receiving 53% of the consensus and by far being the most popular choice. Park Lane followed at 14%, Campsbourne at 13%, South Grove at 12% and Noel Park at 11%.

35% of respondents stated that they had no opinion about establishing 5 planning areas. An almost equal percentage of respondents stated either they supported the proposal (17%) or they did not support (22%).

B The Offer

79% of respondents stated that they used Stay & Play sessions, 40% breastfeeding support and 35% antenatal services.



28% (112) of respondents supported the proposal to widen the scope of centres to 0-19 year olds. 19% (77) strongly supported the proposal. . However 20% (79) did not support this proposal.

When asked how important it was to have a range of services delivered in the centres, 58% respondents that it was extremely important to have all of them, 19% stated it was important to have all of them and 7% stated it was moderately important. However 3 services received most preferences: Support for first time parents, support for young parents and more generally parent support.

When asked which additional services people would like to see delivered in centres but were not included in the previous questions, 26% of respondents that completed the question mentioned a wide range of services such as outreach, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities support, libraries and physical activities to mention but a few. 24% did not state any other services, 22% mentioned support and advice for families including for families on low income, support for fathers, home support for new mothers and social care contacts; 12% mentioned breastfeeding and health services including midwifery and health visiting and finally 10% mentioned mental health services.

When people were asked about charging for services 41% of respondents stated they would pay for Stay & Play session, 39% for training courses and 32% for Adult learning. 20% of respondents also chose to provide an alternative reply, of those 70% stated that services should be free and they would not be willing to pay.

C Opening hours

When asked about extending the opening hours of centres, 61% of the respondents stated they supported or strongly supported extending the hours to evening opening and (60%) supported or strongly supported the proposal to extend opening hours at weekends. In both cases 16% declared that they had no opinion. Most people stated they preferred attending during weekdays with a slight preference for morning



attendance (24%) compared to afternoon attendance (19%). Saturday morning (11%) attendance was slightly more favoured than Sunday morning(8%); whereas the same percentage (6%) indicated Saturday or Sunday afternoon as their preferred times.

When asked which services they wanted to see delivered in the evenings and/or at the weekend; 30% of respondents mentioned Stay & Play sessions including families activities – with 7% of the respondents mentioning support for working parents and 6% mentioned activities to include fathers. 15% mentioned health services including health visitors appointments, midwifery and breastfeeding for working parents so that they would not need to take time off work. 11% mentioned services to support families and parenting, including advice. However 18% opposed weekend and evening opening and 2 stated that weekend and evening closure were not realistic in a climate of cutting services.

D Governance

When asked to state whether they supported **establishing new Children’s Centres Advisory Boards** for each planning areas, 43% of respondents supported or strongly supported the proposal. 37% of respondents had no opinion.

When asked about establishing Parents Engagement Forums 67% of respondents supported or strongly supported the proposal, whereas 22% had no opinion. This suggests substantial support for parental engagement.

When asked to comment on establishing the Parents Engagement Forums, 38% of respondents stated they could not see the benefits of parental engagement forum. One stated that resources would be best employed in providing services; 19% welcomed the initial proposal but would welcome more details. They also felt the parents should receive proper briefing on the objectives of the forum. 19% made suggestions such as trying to avoid lip service, listen to parental voices and having forums that are representative of the community. However 10% stated there was not enough explanation to make a comment/choice. .



When people were asked whether they would consider being involved in participating actively in the centre, 51% had no opinion. 29% stated they would like to be involved in the Parents Engagement Forums and 24% in volunteering.

Additional Comments

The last question asked to provide any further comment on the proposal in general. 33% of all respondents completed this question. 60% of the respondents that completed this question were opposed to the proposal. This was by far the largest group consistent with the general lack of support for the model. 31% of respondents raised a range of specific issues that relate to the proposal, in particular pointing out the issues around missing vulnerable children, downsizing of essential services and lack of clarity on the functioning of the community access points. 15% also expressed issues with the consultation process particularly around the timing and lack of information and clarity. 12% provided a range of suggestions, some of which oppose the proposal, other seems more positive although all acknowledge the size of the scaling back of services. 9% also expressed concerns about the proposal particularly at having over 5s in the centres and the impact of these cuts on young people and the most vulnerable. Replies are summarised in Section A.



Outreach Meetings

Stay & Play Sessions

38 people were spoken to at the 3 Stay & Play sessions.

They were asked 3 questions:

- **Have you got any ideas on how we can spend less on children's centres?**
- Are there any services in your local community that you would like to be able to access more easily?
- If you have children aged 5 -19 years old (25 years in the case of those with special educational needs or disabilities), what services do you need? Where would you like to be able to access these services?

100% stated that closing the centres was a mistake and that the centres have had a vital role for their families. Participants also worried about overcrowding and distance that families will have to travel.

97% stated they were happy with the current offer. However 3% (1 parent) stated that a neighbouring LA had a fuller calendar of activities for **their children's centres**

The following services were most valued by the parents:

- 11% stated childcare
- 8% mentioned both adult learning and Stay & play sessions
- 5% mentioned both advice sessions and midwifery services



Participants stated they would like:

- 8% wanted Saturday play session
- 5% stated they wanted more outings

One participant was worried about older children in the centres

One stated that childcare should cost less

No participants had children between 5-19 years of age.

Parents' Meeting

3 parents took part in the meeting. One of them was a single father. The same 3 questions were posed to the parents attending this group:

- **Have you got any ideas on how we can spend less on children's centres?**
- Are there any services in your local community that you would like to be able to access more easily?
- If you have children aged 5 -19 years old (25 years in the case of those with special educational needs or disabilities), what services do you need? Where would you like to be able to access these services?

All parents stated that children's centres were an investment for the future. One parent suggested that if changes are implemented, officers should come back to the parents to report on what is going well and consult with them.

The two services that the parents valued the most were: English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) provision and baby groups



100% of the parents agreed that having a baby group was paramount. They also highlighted that groups work at their best when they are smaller and allow staff to properly support parents. Groups are also a mechanism for bringing communities together.

Parents also stated that the front desk function is essential and that receiving good timely information makes a difference. All the parents stated that they should have information ahead of time allowing parents to understand what they need to know when they have a young child and who they need to speak to. The information that they value the most were: relationships/parenting support; housing; nursery and what services/activities they can access. All the parents only had children under 5.

Meetings with Staff

2 meetings with staff took place during the statutory consultation period. A total of 40 staff member attended the June meeting and 37 attended the September meeting.

At the June meeting Staff were asked to comment on the following elements of the proposal:

- Staffing & roles
- The offer
- Costs
- Management & Accountability

At the September meeting staff had an opportunity to comment on the specific job descriptions.

Roles and Job descriptions:



The staff had concerns with not having enough members of staff to continue the work started with families locally. There were also concerns to do with data and monitoring roles and Information role. Staff wanted to also know about the Family Support Workers role and how will they be managed.

When the job descriptions were shared staff were most concerned about the lack of specific data input functions in all front line jobs, the lack of a specific information role and also the need to have some tasks specified for some of the jobs. It was also felt that the Assistant Manager post was not clear and possibly misleading.

Offer:

Concerns were raised that the offer could be compromised by lack of partnerships. They wanted clarity around the work with the vulnerable families and responsibilities for attending meeting when engaging with families on plans.

Costs

Staff made suggestions around increasing income via hiring premises, fundraising, donations and selling venues. It was also suggested that **children's centres operate fully as part of Early Help so that budgets can be streamlined.** In terms of cost staff also felt that there was not enough equity in commissioning services that do not deliver.

Management & Accountability:

Staff expressed their concern with the lack of clarity in the lines of management and accountability. They also raised the issue that Service Level Agreements need to be extremely well defined for such a model to work. Moreover they raised the issue of governance for delivery sites (aka Key Community Access Points) particularly in terms of safeguarding and support. Training and staff development was also an issue raised by staff who were keen to have proper training and development opportunities as part of the process.



Meetings with Governors and Governing Bodies'/Advisory Boards' Responses

14 Governors attended the 1st July meeting. A total of 11 governors and one staff member attended the meetings in September. The Governing **bodies' committee meetings attended by officers had respectively 8 and 7 participants**. We had 7 written responses from Governing Bodies and one from Cluster 3 Advisory Board.

- All Governing Bodies and Advisory Board Members **were opposed to the changes in Children's Centres**.
- The main concerns were in relation to their accountability particularly in relation to the Key Community Access Points and many felt that little consideration had been given to safeguarding and health and safety.
- Governors stated that in order to successfully manage key community access points there needs to be a good partnership with the other schools and buy in from senior managers.
- Governors also expressed concerns in relation to the lack of financial resources for the centres to continue the work with families
- The size of the reach also concerned respondents particularly in relation to building meaningful relationships with vulnerable families and the Advisory Board Members worried about staff capacity in relation to number of children.
- Another concern was also the prospect of staff being displaced and centres remaining losing continuity of care for the local community.
- Not having Monitoring & Evaluation Officer was perceived as putting more strain on managers
- Some governors expressed concerns about sharing a site with older children and having out of hours services
- Governors stated that only by having a really integrated team with health, social care and family support, the proposed model could work
- Some Governing Bodies were willing to work with the Local Authority to discuss possible role of some site in the new model.
- It was also felt that each designated centre would need a dedicated manager and that assistant managers were not a viable alternative.
- Advisory board Members were also concerned about the lack of specific responsibilities and accountabilities in the job description and wondered whether staff had been involved in shaping them.



Public Meetings

In total 10 meetings with the public took place in July and September. (11 were scheduled but one had to be cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances). The meeting were attended by a total of 6 members of the public including 2 ward counsellors.

Generally the feedback was that attendants understood the pressure on the Local Authority however they felt that closing centres was the wrong choice.

Other Feedback

The Ladder Community Safety Partnership submitted a written response to the consultation highlighting their opposition to the proposal to close The Ladder Children's Centre. It was felt that The Ladder is at the very centre of the local community and that access for the local families at Woodlands park Children's centre will be limited.



Section A

Analysis of questionnaire responses

This section reports the raw data analysis of 398 questionnaires returned both on line and on paper. The data is based on respondents completing the given fields.

In some occasions more than one box could be ticked or more than one answer could be listed and this may result in the overall total being greater or smaller than 398. In all cases the percentages are taken over the total of selected options.

Profile

Q1. Which of the following best describe you:

	Total responses	%
Haringey resident and Parent of child 0 - 4 years	301	76%
Haringey resident and Parent of child 5+ years	99	25%
Resident (non- parent)	24	6%
Non-Haringey resident	3	1%
Children's Centre staff member	13	5%
Children's Centre Advisory Board Member	-	0%
School staff member of Governor	13	3%



Professional partner or service provider (eg. health visitor, crèche worker or other early year delivery)	14	4%
Ward Councillor	-	-
No reply	-	-
Total	398	100%



Postcodes or respondents	Non-Haringey	N/A	N10	N11	N15	N17	N22	N4	N8	
Number	8	7	2	5	95	102	50	54	75	398
Percentage	2%	2%	1%	1%	24%	26%	13%	14%	19%	100%

Q3. Which children's centres do you use?

	Responses	Total of questionnaires returned	%
Bounds Green	32	398	8%
Broadwaters	56	398	14%
Campsbourne	27	398	7%
Earlsmead	14	398	4%
Noel Park	24	398	6%
Park Lane	50	398	13%
Pembury	27	398	7%
Rokesly	32	398	8%
Rowland Hill	38	398	10%



Stonecroft	33	398	8%
South Grove	59	398	15%
The Ladder	112	398	28%
Triangle	46	398	12%
Welbourne	31	398	8%
Woodlands Park	85	398	21%
Woodside	15	398	4%
None	31	398	8%
No reply	-		-
			100%



Q4. What method of transport do you use to get to a Children's Centre?

Bus	Car	Walk	Cycle	Tube/ Train	Other	None	Total responses
97	43	329	21	6	-	26	398
24%	11%	83%	5%	2%	-	7%	100%

A The Model

Q5. To what extent do you support our proposal to reduce the number of Children's Centres from 16-9?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
15	15	48	296	24	-	398
4%	4%	12%	74%	6%	-	100%

Q6. To what extent do you support our proposals to close the following centres:

	Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No opinion	No reply	Total responses
Bounds Green	7	6	84	207	94	-	398
Campbourne	3	11	70	200	95	19	398
Earlsmead	3	12	70	186	109	18	398
Noel Park	5	7	75	200	93	18	398

South Grove	4	12	66	199	98	19	398
Stonecroft	3	15	68	203	90	19	398
The Ladder	5	12	42	247	75	14	398
Total	30	75	475	1442	654	110	2786
	1%	3%	17%	52%	23%	4%	

Q7. If the proposals means that the following centres are closed, to what extent do you support the following buildings being used as key community access points:

	Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No opinion	No reply	Total responses
Bounds Green	73	61	35	82	147	-	398
Campsbourne	68	55	34	77	143	21	398
Earlsmead	67	48	30	75	156	22	398
Noel Park	70	52	34	76	145	21	398
South Grove	70	50	29	79	148	22	398
Stonecroft	68	52	31	77	146	24	398
The Ladder	82	54	29	81	131	21	398
Total	498	372	222	547	1016	131	2786
	18%	13%	8%	20%	36%	5%	



Q8. Please indicate which of the following key community access points you are most likely to use:

Bounds Green	Campsbourne	Earlsmead	Noel Park	South Grove	Stonecroft	The Ladder	None
49	35	23	53	53	39	128	146
12%	9%	6%	13%	13%	10%	32%	37%

Q9. Are there any other community buildings within your local area **where you would like to be able to access children’s centre services?**

136 respondents completed the field out of 398 questionnaire return in total (34%)

➤ 46 respondents listed a site (40% of those who responded):

7% indicated North Haringay Primary school; 7% indicated South Grove Children’s Centre, 7% CARIS, 7% Bounds Green Children’s Centre, 7% Pembury House Nursery School & Children’s Centre, 7% Park Lane Children’s



Centre and another 7% Isle Amlot Centre

9% indicated Chestnuts Community centre;

8% indicated The Hub@ Lordship Rec, Woodlands Park, Broadwaters and local Libraries

13% indicated The Ladder **Children's Centre**

17% indicated a variety of other sites (Parks, Shropshire Hall, Woodlands Park CC, The Laurels, Stonecroft, Campsbourne, Private nurseries; Queenswood Medical, Laurels, Muswell Hill Library, Muswell Hill Police station, South **Haringey Primary School, St Ann's Library, Burghley road, Chestnuts Primary School, Crouch End Town Hall, Downhills Link, Noel Park CC both sites, Local Primary Schools, Local libraries, Tottenham Community Sports Centre, Stonecroft & South Grove)**

- 25% have said no or none
- 12% want all centres to remain open
- 0.8% has no opinion



- 2% needs further explanation on what KCAP are
- 2% stated there is no need for them
- 0.8% said they did not know
- 0.8% pointed out spelling errors
- 0.8% mentioned the importance of Breastfeeding support
- 0.8% mentioned childcare
- 0.8% expressed concerns about having only one centre for the whole of the west

Q10. How important is it to you that the following services are available at a key community access point?

	Extremely important	Important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not very important	No opinion	Total
--	---------------------	-----------	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	------------	-------

							ected options
Stay and Play	309	40	7	5	3	34	398
Health appointments e.g. health visitor appointments	273	46	14	7	24	20	384
Advice Sessions	244	60	16	12	26	23	381
Total	826	146	37	24	53	77	1163
	71%	13%	3%	2%	5%	7%	100%

Q11. Are there any additional services that you feel it is important to deliver from key community access points?

157 respondents completed the field out of 398 returned questionnaires (39%); of those:



16% declared that breastfeeding is an important service
7% parenting and parents support and advice
7% midwives and
10% ESOL/English classes and adult learning
7% Parents/Infants Psychology Services & mental health support/therapies
6% early learning, Nursery and childcare
4% Special Education Needs & Disabilities,
6 % Health services including HV and weaning
5% weighing clinics
4% Music and baby sessions
1% Cooking, 3% baby massage, 2% SLT and 2% benefit advice
4% Toy library – healthy eating, behaviour support First aid – wellness, DV,
Housing, JCplus Swimming, Adult learning Knitting Outdoor activities messy



play gardening Supamums volunteering EdPsy Childminder training Art clubs
learning languages safeguarding Breaking isolation, staff training, signposting,
all services provide in the centres now, holiday activities, exercise/keep fit,
hands on activities, groups for new mothers, general advice

14% stated that there are no additional services

One respondent raised an issue about the ability to safeguard children

One respondent stated that fewer services would mean longer term costs
because of cases having to be dealt with by social care.

Opposition:

13% opposed the model of key Community Access Points and closure of
centres

3% asked for an explanation

Q12. To what extent do you support our proposal to keep the following children's centres open:

	Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No opinion	No reply	Total responses
Rokesly	196	43	10	18	71	60	398
Woodside	193	44	4	16	81	60	398
Broadwaters	206	41	5	17	76	53	398
Woodland Park	219	33	5	18	70	53	398
Rowland Hill	201	38	9	16	76	58	398
Pembury	189	41	4	16	82	66	398
Park Lane	193	34	3	15	77	76	398
Total selected options	1397	274	40	116	533	426	2786
	50%	10%	1%	4%	19%	15%	-

Q13. Do you have any comments on our proposal of which children's centres to keep open?

198 respondents made a comment out of 398 questionnaires returned (50%).
Of these:



39% (77) responded that they do not want any centre to be closed and all should stay open

38% (76) stated that individual centres should stay open – 53% (40) named The Ladder, 14% (11) named Park Lane, 13% (10) named Campsbourne, 12% (9) named South Grove, 11% (8) Noel Park, 7% (5) mentioned Rowland Hill, 5% (4) named Stonecroft and Broadwaters, 4% (3) named Pembury House, 5% (4) Woodlands Park and 3% (2) named Triangle and 1% (1) Bounds Green and Rokesly

4% (8) were sceptical about the proposal and consultation process quoting lack of clarity of questions, need for reasons why centres are closed or open, impossibility to choose which centres have to close or stay open, lack of feedback on previous consultations, that the model was only money saving and that the questionnaire was design to minimise impact of the No response.

5% (9) responded that the services should have a geographical and deprivation driven focus

3% (5) had no comments to make

2% (4) made suggestion in relation to use of space and accessibility quoting



proximity to centre as a key element for accessibility and need for larger centres to be open to give wider access

4% (7) expressed concerns with the model mostly to do with possible overcrowding, access by older children and longer opening hours not suiting young children

2 respondents were non users (both of them did not know what centres were or where they were located) and 2 were professionals

1 respondent asked for further explanation

1 stated they welcomed charges

2 respondents were concerned about the workload for Rokesly and the fact that the West had been forgotten

1 respondent suggested closure either of Park lane or Pembury since they are very near

1 respondent suggested that centres should diversify their offer and have a wider range of service even for over 5s

2 respondents raised concerns that closure of centres will affect the most



vulnerable

1 respondent was concerned that Woodside is too small to accommodate the other two centres.

2 respondents stated that geographical spread was even and that centres seemed to remain where needed most

1 asked for the rationale behind the closure

Q14. To what extent do you support our proposal to establish five children's centre planning areas?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
41	69	43	88	139	18	398
10%	17%	11%	22%	35%	5%	100%

B The Offer

Q15. Which Children's Centre services do you use?

Childcare	135
	34%
Stay and play sessions	313
	79%
Speech and language support	69
	17%
Parenting support e.g. parenting programmes	127
	32%
One-to-one family support	74
	19%
Adult education/training	62
	16%
Jobcentre Plus	27
	7%
Benefits or other advice	57
	14%
Ante natal support	141
	35%



Breastfeeding support	161
	40%
Health and nutrition advice	137
	34%
Information services	106
	27%
ESOL classes	39
	10%
Other	42
	11%
None	44
	11%
No reply	-
	-
Total	398
	100%

Q15. Which children's centre services do you use, apart from those listed?

Other _____



6 respondents completed the field out of 149 paper questionnaires (3%). Of these 5:

1 stated that they use the toy library 20%

2 baby weighing (40%)

1 Citizen Advice Bureau advice service (20%)

1 early learning services (20%)

1 postnatal (20%)

Q16. To what extent do you support our proposal to widen the focus of children's centre services from 0-5 years of age to 0-19 years?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
77	112	66	79	54	14	398
19%	28%	17%	20%	14%	4%	100%

Q17. How important is it to you that the following services are available at children's centres:

	Extremely important	Important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not very important
Access to Health Visitors	261	85	16	6	11
Support to help expectant parents prepare for birth of a child	247	87	25	6	7
Visits to all new births in the first 6-8 weeks	261	69	18	9	8
A one year health check	194	56	24	6	12
A 2 -2.5 year integrated health and development check	231	80	33	9	11
Postnatal and antenatal services	264	80	18	3	6
Healthy vitamins for your child and during pregnancy and breastfeeding	226	77	34	20	14
Breastfeeding support and groups	279	58	21	4	7
Oral health information and support	200	101	39	16	10
Stay and play sessions that promote positive attachment, healthy brain development and good communication and language	331	40	5	2	3
Support to find work, training and apprenticeship opportunities	168	80	54	24	30
Support to find volunteering and peer mentoring opportunities	151	84	55	31	28

Access to information, advice and guidance e.g benefits advice or parenting	195	98	38	12	20
Support for fathers and fathers to be one to one breast feeding support	214	93	28	11	14
Support for first time mums	168	52	17	5	8
Support for young parents	290	59	15	9	1
Healthy eating advice	270	61	19	11	3
Parent support	209	94	39	12	10
ESOL (English language lessons)	242	83	27	10	4
TOTAL	179	78	48	22	15
	4580	1515	573	228	222
	58%	19%	7%	3%	3%

Q19. In future, if we did have to charge for some children's centre services in order to be able to maintain a good level of service, which services would you be willing to pay for?

Parent Support groups	Stay and Play sessions	Family learning activities	Adult learning	Training courses	Other	No reply	Total responses
47	162	77	126	154	48	91	398
12%	41%	19%	32%	39%	12%	23%	100%



Q18. Are there any additional services that you feel are important that have not been identified above?

94 respondents made a comment out of 398 questionnaires returned (24%).

26% (23) of the respondents mentioned a wide range of individual activities such as:

- Safeguarding and outreach
- Libraries
- Special Education Needs & Disabilities support
- Knitting
- Gardening
- Singing and music
- Arts and crafts
- Cooking
- Swimming
- Drama
- Knitting
- Budgeting
- Physical activities

24% (20) of the respondents mentioned support and advice for families including for families on low income, fathers, home support for new mothers and social care contacts



22% (20) of the respondents said No/None/Not applicable and that it was a badly designed question (1 respondent)

12% (11) of the respondents mentioned health services including weaning, baby weighing, ante and post natal care and breastfeeding

10% (9) of the respondents mentioned mental health support

8% (7 respectively) of the respondent mentioned respectively:

- Baby activities such as massage and groups
- Childcare and early learning

3% (3) of the respondents mentioned Stay& Play sessions

3% (3 respectively) of the respondent mentioned respectively:

- Activities for older children such as after school clubs
- Childminders drop in & training
- Adult learning

Up to 1% of the respondents have left comments such as:

- **Don't close CC (2 respondents)**
- **Children's centre are vital for networking**
- Closure of centres may lead to depression



- All services should be available
- Staff need support
- Fear of duplication with schools for services 5-19
- **Children's centre should have** better integration with associated schools

Q19. Are there any other services other than those listed that you would consider paying for?

80 respondents completed the field out of 398 questionnaires (20%). Of these:

56 said NO/should be free at point of delivery (70%)

22 respondents (26%) were in favour of some form of charging either on a means tested basis (7) or only small charges or for specific services:

- Wellbeing
- Afterschool services
- Physical activity
- walk and exercise



- Toy and book library
- Mental Health Support
- CAB
- Singing groups

The remaining 2% of respondents did not have an opinion/did not know

C Opening Hours

Q20. To what extent do you support our proposal that Children's centre opening times should be extended to some evenings?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No Opinion	No reply	Total respondents
91	152	52	40	63	-	398
23%	38%	13%	10%	16%	-	100%

Q21. To what extent do you support our proposal that Children's Centre opening times should be extended to some weekends?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
85	157	52	40	64	-	398
21%	39%	13%	10%	16%	-	100%

Q22. What are your preferred times to attend Children's centre?

	Mornings	Afternoons	Evenings	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
Weekdays	298	224	61	34	-	398
	25%	19%	5%	3%	-	33%
Saturday	135	77	21	147	64	398
	11%	6%	2%	12%	5%	33%



Sunday	100	71	15	172	76	398
	8%	6%	1%	14%	6%	33%
Total	533	372	97	353	140	1194
	45%	31%	8%	30%	12%	

Q23. What services would you like to see delivered at weekends, and in evenings?

169 respondents completed the field out of 398 questionnaires (42%). Of these:

The majority of respondents that were in favour of out of hours opening preferred weekends to evening – this was 9% of the respondents against 2% that also mentioned evenings.

30% (51) of respondent chose stay & play or any kind of family fun days, activities and creative clubs as the main services to provide mainly at weekend.

18% (30) were opposed to any weekend or evening opening, of this 12 respondents made also comments mainly to state that extending hours whilst cutting number of centres seemed contradictory and not sustainable.

6% (10) specifically mentioned activities for fathers



9% (16) mentioned adult learning and or training

11% (19) mentioned services to support families and parenting, including advice

15% (25) mentioned health as a service that should be provided mostly at weekend or in the evenings. Midwifery appointments, health visiting services and breastfeeding support were all equally mentioned particularly for working families so that they would not have to take time off work.

7% (12) specifically mentioned support and /or services for working parents

5% (8) quoted childcare

4% (7) wanted the same level of services as those delivered during the week

4% (6) also wanted to see advice sessions mainly for working families

3% (6) stated that out of hours opening ought to be for older children and youth services including after school provision

0.6% mentioned services for young parents

0.6% mentioned sports activities for children

0.6% mentioned Phone help lines



0.6% stated YES

0.6% stated that it should be left to individual centres to decide on evening & weekend opening according to the needs of the community

0.6% mentioned emergency services such as doctor's surgery

D Governance

Q24. To what extent do you support the proposal to establish new Children's Centre Advisory Boards (CCAB) for each children centre planning area?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
45	126	42	38	147	-	398
11%	32%	11%	10%	37%	-	100%

Q25. To what extent do you support the proposal to establish parent engagement forums?

Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not	No Opinion	No reply	Total responses
------------------	---------	----------------	-----------------	------------	----------	-----------------



			support			
92	175	20	22	89	-	398
23%	44%	5%	6%	22%	-	100%

Q26. Do you have any comments on our proposal to establish parent engagement forums?

76 respondents completed the field out of 398 questionnaires (19%)

38% (29) objected to the establishment of forum and to the proposal in general, one stated that resources would be best spent in providing services

19% (14) stated that they would welcome the proposal, would need proper advice, not a tick box and would be interested in



being involved

19% (13) made some suggestions including giving parents a real voice and not just being a tick box, being based on relationship building, running in the evening or weekends to involve working parents, listening to parents ideas, being representative of the community, making them meaningful and focus on improving **services for children's future.**

6% (4) wanted centres to remain open particularly The Ladder

10% (7) stated there was not enough explanation to make a comment/choice

1% stated that it was difficult to maintain parental engagement

1% shared their personal experience

1% stated that the forums can be tokenistic

4% (3) stated that the centre should already involve parents

Q27. Would you be interested in being involved in any of the



following?

Parent Engagement Forum	116
	29%
Children's Centre Advisory Boards	75
	19%
Volunteering at a centre	94
	24%
Volunteering in the community	76
	19%
No Opinion	203
	51%
Running a group or service in the local community	41
	10%
No reply	-
	-
Total	398
	100%

If interested in being involved in running a group, please specify:



23 respondents completed the field out of 149 questionnaires (15%). Of these:

22% - 5 respondents are not interested; of these two think that centres should only be run by paid staff that support parents

13% - 3 respondents stated they cannot because of work and family commitments

4% - 1 respondent is already a volunteer

4% - 1 respondent stated that it would need token payment or certificate

52% - 12 respondents stated that they would support a service:

- Committee to oversee wasteful expenditure by the LBH
- Gardening club
- new parenting club
- stay and messy play,
- story time
- Support for parents from Roma, Gypsy, Traveller communities
- Nutrition Advice
- Breastfeeding Peer Support
- Music
- Baby Clinic
- volunteering



- running a group –
- ESOL
- Music production

Additional Comments

28. Should you have any further comments around any of the proposals, please attach them on the separate sheet of paper provided.

132 respondents completed this question on 398 overall respondents (33%)

60% (80) of the people that completed this question were opposed to the proposal. Some of the reasons quoted are:

- Centres are a vital place for families with young children
- Services are already stretched and cannot do more with less
- Centres have given people confidence and a social circle and have been a life line for many respondents
- Possible over crowding
- Safeguarding children will become more difficult
- Being fed up with cut backs to essential services
- Closing centres is mindless
- They are essential for our society
- Do not reduce funding for children
- Short sighted since savings in the early years will mean costs later
- 4 specifically stated that they did not want South Grove to close



- The proposal is a mess
- Parents are outraged by the proposal
- Why spend money of the 50 anniversary celebration?
- **9 stated SAVE OUR CHILDREN'S CENTRES**
- Save our children
- No centre should be closed in a borough like Haringey
- 6 respondents mentioned being against the closure of The Ladder
- 3 mentioned Park Lane
- 1 mentioned the value of South Grove
- 1 mentioned Bounds Green
- 1 respectively Pembury and Rowland Hill
- Services are local
- **Don't waste money in council's magazine but save the centres**
- Could not have managed with a child with SEND without the help of the centre
- Reason for closing centres to create extra CCAB – nonsense
- Unsure at how 19 year old fit in with early learning.
- **Children's centre are invaluable** and there have already been large cuts.

31% (42) of the respondents who completed this question had specific issues to raise in relation to the proposal:

- Superficial health services at the moment
- Governance of school based centres should be separated from school governance
- Haringey Council potential missing to identify vulnerable children
- Community Access points are an unclear entity, possibly not as good value as centres and easy to cut in another budget cut
- Why change what is good?

- Since Marcus Garvey library is downsized, we need more children's centres in Tottenham
- There are currently no services for children with SEND in children's centres
- Those that will be most affected by the proposal do not have a voice
- Little sense in extending the scope of children's centres for older children
- Services have to be local
- Increase council tax to keep all the centres
- Listen to your own scrutiny decision to keep all the centres open
- Relatively low cost but effective
- Did not understand Q7 so put no option but it depends on what they are
- The LA opened as children's centres leave them such
- Staff should not be replaced by volunteers
- Support for special needs is needed
- Staff working in centre are praised
- Charges for service were considered despicable
- Asset to community particularly for the 0-5 age range
- Fees should cover costs
- They are part of early intervention but perhaps mean test them
- No change to opening hours
- I love Tottenham – please look after it
- Need them to build a new generation
- Extra costs for weekend use is at odds with savings
- Proposal does not consider population trends
- Not enough funding for this proposal
- Centre managers job will be impossible with less staff and resources



- Listen to what this consultation says
- There is money in the system as we saw in the “latest thinking” document
- Children’s centres should be called : Family Support & Early Intervention Centres
- Centres are at capacity
- Responsibility, accountability and resource issues
- Space used for teenagers and infants
- How are the places staffed?
- Closure=barrier to accessibility
- 5-19 better served in schools
- No statistics or indicators about the proposal to understand it properly.

15% (20) of respondents that have completed this question expressed issues with the consultation process:

- Drop in meetings were scheduled too late in the evening could not attend with young children
- The consultation run mostly in the summer when people and schools are on holiday
- Feels like a fait accompli
- Not enough was done to engage parents
- The form is only for parents
- It is a flawed consultation because only 2 questions are on the closure of centre and the rest is about what we want to see
- It is a rigged consultation – in favour of your intentions
- No space to record what I have used with my son. It assumes everybody has young children
- Bad timing
- Unable to comment because there is lack of information and explanation about many elements of the proposal (particularly planning area CCAB and Community key Access Points)
- Not parent friendly



9% (12) of respondents that have completed this question expressed concerns about the proposed model:

- Not clear on what having older children in centres means
- Unmanageable centre leader job
- The locality lead in seven sisters area is a person with no early years background, but youth
- Worries about older children mixing with the under 5s
- Budget cuts that directly affect young people
- Space
- Relied on services provided by the centre such as stay & play, breastfeeding, advice
- Disgusted that vulnerable children will be the victims of cuts
- Child protection issue caused by increased number of children per centre
- Concerns about the functioning and purpose of Advisory Boards
- Concerns about lack of parental attendance and engagement in forums
- Considering the large population there would be extra pressures on the remaining centres
- Key Community Access point – unclear proposal not sure how it would work
- Engagements forums only used by the most able and will create further barriers.
- Concerns about safeguarding in the key community access points

12% (16) of respondents that have completed this question gave us suggestions:

- Larger centres with good transport links have to be retained
- Residents to be given priority over childminders
- Focus on children below high school age
- Focus on closing centres that need to make improvement
- The proposed scheme seems to be well considered but lacks details



- Since the reduction in services centres have not been as effective therefore we need to ensure they are effective
- Keep Campsbourne open
- It makes sense to reduce numbers but perhaps revise the list to take account of vulnerable parents in distress and unable to travel
- One more centre in the area between wood green and the west
- **Don't waste money on training school leavers**
- Work with campaigner and take into account their alternative proposals
- Vital to have access to good and free activities
- **Go and explore how Islington is protecting the children's centres**
- Importance of welcoming staff therefore staff training and reliability are imperatives.
- Look at raising funds either than using government or council funding
- Nursery feeds should be means tested
- Increase nursery places
- Think out of the box and not just reduce services

1 respondent was very critical of current children's centres – they quoted shocking bad standards of care covered up by staff in nursery at WPCC and The ladder. Stay & play should not be government funded people should be able to entertain their own children. Centres should never have been opened.

1 response was an official Governing Body response which has been submitted on email and considered separately.



Equality Considerations

Age

Total	No reply	Under 20	21- 24	25- 29	30- 44	45- 59	60- 64	65- 74	75- 84	85- 89	90 and over
398	41	5	7	34	262	39	1	8	1	-	-
100%	10%	1%	2%	9%	66%	10%	0%	2%	0%	-	-

Disability

Do you have any of the following conditions which have la...

Total	398
	100%
No reply	110
	28%
Deafness or partial loss of hearing	4
	1%
Blindness or partial loss of sight	2
	1%



learning disability	5
	1%
Developmental disorder	-
	-
Mental ill health	8
	2%
Long term illness or condition	7
	2%
Physical disability	6
	2%
Other disability	5
	1%
No disability	254
	64%

Ethnicity

White:



Total	No reply	British	Irish
398	222	163	13
100%	56%	41%	3%

Mixed:

Total	No reply	White and Black African	White and Black Caribbean	White and Asian	Other
398	356	11	10	5	16
100%	89%	3%	3%	1%	4%

Asian:

Total	No reply	Indian	Bangladeshi	East African Asian	Pakistani	Other
398	381	4	5	1	-	7
100%	96%	1%	1%	0%	-	2%

Black or Black British:



Total	No reply	African	Caribbean	Other
398	363	19	11	5
100%	91%	5%	3%	1%

Chinese or other ethnic group:

Total	No reply	Chinese	Any other ethnic background
398	387	7	4
100%	97%	2%	1%

Gender

What is your gender?

Total	No reply	Male	Female
-------	----------	------	--------



398	77	43	278
100%	19%	11%	70%

Does your gender differ from your birth sex?

Total	No reply	Yes	No	Prefer not to say
398	109	3	268	18
100%	27%	1%	67%	5%

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Total	No reply	Heterosexual	Bisexual	Gay	Lesbian	Prefer not to say
398	88	256	5	1	2	46
100%	22%	64%	1%	0%	1%	12%

Religion

Total	No reply	Christian	Muslim	Jewish	Buddhist	Hindu	Sikh	Rastafarian	No religion	Prefer not to say	Other



398	76	117	21	6	3	2	-	1	132	28	12
100%	19%	29%	5%	2%	1%	1%	-	0%	33%	7%	3%

Are you pregnant?

Total	No reply	Yes	No
398	85	28	285
100%	21%	7%	72%

Have you had a baby in the last 12 months?

Total	No reply	Yes	No
398	90	68	240
100%	23%	17%	60%

Status

Total	No reply	Single	Married	Co-habiting	In a same sex civil partnership	Separated	Divorced	Widowed
398	70	51	201	53	3	10	8	2
100%	18%	13%	51%	13%	1%	3%	2%	1%

Are you?



Total	No reply	A Refugee	An Asylum Seeker	prefer not to say
398	360	6	1	31
100%	90%	2%	0%	8%

Please tick the box that best describes your language

Total	No reply	Albanian	Arabic	English	French	Lingala	Somali	Turkish	Other
398	114	1	3	236	3	1	1	6	33
100%	29%	0%	1%	59%	1%	0%	0%	2%	8%



Section B

Narrative responses

On line and paper questionnaire narrative responses

9) Are there any other community buildings within **your local area where you would like to be able to access children's centre services?**

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online 07.07.15	Nth Haringay Primary School Hall
	No x9
	As a social worker, I am aware that families value the safe space which the children's centre buildings provide. It would not work to meet with families in more public places, as there are issues with confidentiality and data protection and making positive progress with families will be stilted. We use children's centres for core group meetings and if these centres are closed, this will reduce our ability to take our services to the families. I feel strongly against these cuts.

	Queenswood medical practice Centrally in Crouch End
	none
	Children's centres are doing a fantastic job. It would be illogical to move services to a different location
	The Laurels Health Centre
	I prefer South Grove Children's Centre.
	Muswell Hill
	Yes. Muswell Hill library or the old Muswell Hill Police station. Just because Muswell Hill is an affluent area does not mean it should not have children centre services

	Ideally yes, but I think it is more important to focus on the existing facilities.
	No I like south grove
	St Ann's Library on Cissbury Road.
	Libraries
	We think the Ladder is fantastic, is lively and HUGELY popular and if that is closed, will be a huge loss to the community and local parents/grandparents who rely on it.
	In the Childrens Centre!!!
	This question is disingenuous

	Stop preventing that you are increasing the service, when in fact you are reducing it and reducing the support to families.
	No. Keep the Ladder open.
	You have missed out the word 'able' in between 'to' and 'access' - honestly!! no proof readers?
	The Ladder is an excellent resource...there is no need for further access just keep what we currently have.

	No, the existing children's centres are the most appropriate place to access children's centres services
	What are "key community access points"?
	I would like LBH to implement the scrutiny committee's decision to keep them open into account instead of ignoring it and listen and work with campaigners who have worked out alternatives that can be funded
	The Ladder. Anything else would be too far for my little child to walk!
	At the Children's Centre

	No, certainly not places like supermarkets! Childrens centres are still the best option. They offer safe and secure, fully staffed and resourced options for all sections of the community.
	don not close centres dd
	DON'T CLOSE CENTRES x5
	I have no desire to move in order to access a children's centre, and the current one on the Ladder works just fine for myself, and I think the majority of parents in the Ladder community
	No. Services should be at Children's Centres
	'Key community access points needs explanation

	<p>No, for me the ones we have work perfectly well. It is already incredibly competitive to achieve a place.</p>
	<p>no - Children's centres are a waste of money used by either people who are sponging or middle class yummy mummies who can afford to go to cafes.</p>
	<p>I would like the actual children's centres to remain open and to open more children's centres- not to close any of the ones that exist currently. They are all used and offer absolutely crucial support to mothers as people and to their children. It will be a grave mistake to close any of them under the pretence that 'services will be extended' and key access points can carry out the function of a children's centre. More work for less staff and no actual permanent dedicated physical space for mothers to go to is utterly disregarding and disrespectful the importance of women as people and as mothers and of their children, who are the future.</p>



	Breast feeding support vital, but not sure where this would be appropriate
	Not if the children's centres stay open.
Online 16.07.15	No
	Woodside
	LOCAL LIBRARIES, EG. Stroud Green and Haringey Library
	North or South Haringay Primary School
	Only if I pay.

	<p>Consultations with front line professionals might identify new areas where such facilities might be a positive addition to the benefit of children and parents of these localities.</p>
	<p>St Ann's Library, Burghley Road Playspace, The HUB at Lordship Recreation ground, Woodlands Park Children's Centre, Chestnuts Park Primary School, Chestnuts Park Community Centre</p>
	<p>My local area is bounds green. The children's centre has been valuable to me, and close when heavily pregnant. So upset it will be closed for my next children.</p>
<p>Online 03.08.15</p>	<p>The current level of services are barely sufficient to meet the growing needs of children and families, especially those that are most vulnerable and most in need of services (Roma, Gypsy and Traveller children, migrants, disadvantaged children with learning difficulties) and to this extent, the need is for additional children's centre services, not reduced or relocated.</p>

	<p>The Ladder Childrens centre is the only one that immediately supports my area (Harringay Ladder). I know at least 10 people actively using the services at the moment that all live on the ladder and that is just my immediate social circle; the others are a long way away so if anything we need MORE support in the vicinity of the ladder. Closing The Ladder Children's Centre would leave many many families a bus journey away from a children's centre and with a 0-6 week old baby with no immunity this is not a good idea.</p>
	Woodlands Park
	None.
	CARIS.
	Do not support.
	Potentially more the Tottenham Hale area as it continues to be redeveloped
	no



	Bounds Green Primary School was perfect.
Hard copies, week ending 03.07.15	CARIS (N15 area)
Hard copies, week ending 10.07.15	None
Online -13.07.15	Downhills CC and Chestnuts Community Hall
	Crouch End Town Hall
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.15	Broadwaters
	I like broadwaters children's centre so much
	The existing children's centres
	Lordship Hub
	Pembury, Broadwater Farm, Park Lane
	No x4



Hard copies, week ending 31.07.15	No
	Broadwaters Farm Children's Centre
	Ilse Amlot Centre
	Noel Park Children's centre - Gladstone avenue and Maurice avenue
	Not that I know of
	Don't Know



Hard copies, week ending 07.08.15	No x2
	No opinion
	Local library x2
	Woodlands Park
	Stonecroft
	Stroud Green School and The Ladder
Hard copies, week ending 14.08.15	The hub at Lordship rec



	Local schools, particularly primary, could provide access to children's centres' services. E.g Coleridge
Hard copies, week ending 21.08.15	No x3
	Ilse Amlot Centre
	Tottenham Community Sports Centre
	Irish Centre
	Not what I know of at the moment
	Only Park Lane.
Online 03.08.15	The current level of services are barely sufficient to meet the growing needs of children and families, especially those that are most vulnerable and most in need of services (Roma, Gypsy and Traveller children, migrants, disadvantaged children with learning difficulties) and to this extent, the need is for additional children's centre services, not reduced

	<p>or relocated.</p> <p>The Ladder Childrens centre is the only one that immediately supports my area (Harringay Ladder). I know at least 10 people actively using the services at the moment that all live on the ladder and that is just my immediate social circle; the others are a long way away so if anything we need MORE support in the vicinity of the ladder. Closing The Ladder Children's Centre would leave many many families a bus journey away from a children's centre and with a 0-6 week old baby with no immunity this is not a good idea.</p>
	Woodlands Park
	None.
	CARIS.
	<p>Do not support.</p> <p>Potentially more the Tottenham Hale area as it continues to be redeveloped</p> <p>no</p>

	Bounds Green Primary School was perfect.
On line 07.09.2015	Need seems to have been determined here based on income rather than where there is a great concentration of children and parents who need a wide range of services. You are simply not reaching out to parents who may need support at some times by being inaccessible. It is astonishing that there is only one centre -Rokesly- which is to serve the whole of the west of the borough. This Centre is already small and I do not believe it can cope. What will happen is that you fail to offer support to parents and babies/ children when they need it, particularly when some needs are on an ad hoc basis.
	Local libraries
	No
	In local libraries; parks; private nursery provisions can support midwife appointments and advice sessions, parenting courses.
	Woodlands Childrens centre and Chestnuts Community Centre
	No. Children's centres play a vital role in not only supporting me but enabling me to support other families in need that I meet through my

	access to the centre.
On line 16.09.15	To be frank I can access most of these services at my GP or library. I am interested in Childrens Centres for Childcare. I am a working parent with a baby and a reception age school child. I need childcare for during the day and before and after school, preferably in the same place and affordable.
	No x 3
	Shropshire Hall
	Stroud Green Library; The Laurels Health Centre
	I want to be able to access children's centre services at my local children's centres - Campsbourne and Stonecroft.
	Not Applicable
On line 22.09.15	Libraries Bounds Green Children's Centre is so valuable. If NONE

	Commerce Road
	I would like there to be 1 year checks as other boroughs provide - this means any potential problems can be identified early. Not only is this better for the child's health but it saves money and complexity for the NHS and other services. These could be done from GP or health centres.
	No, the children's centres are adequate, just don't shut what we by!
	There are plenty of church halls that could be utilised for community services.
	Downhills Park children centre is local to me too but could not find it on the proposal.

Q11. Are there any additional services that you feel it is important to deliver from key community access points?

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online-07.07.15	Parenting classes, ESOL courses, toy libraries, early learning for 2, 3 and 4 year olds.
	Support for parents having someone to talk to when we need it
	It will not be possible to deliver the intensive level of family focussed work, at all levels of the Haringey threshold triangle, that is currently being undertaken by the highly experienced and trained staff in our children's centres, in 'community access points'. Families require consistency, certainty and reliability and the pure fact that this is being taken away from them by moving the buildings they know will reduce the children's centres effectiveness as part of the council's focus on early intervention and prevention. Families know they can walk into a children's centre and access help. They are not able to do this with us at River Park House, and therefore we are becoming more and more corporate, rather than more and more family and community based.
	Breastfeeding, weaning, healthy eating, behavioural advise, parenting advise

	Breast feeding support Early mother and baby sessions ie first aid, baby massage
	wellness centres (wellbeing)
	support for the most vulnerable families who need to build a close relationship with a key person
	Breast feeding support groups
	Child care places are short are they are now. If centres close then it would even be more demand and it would not be suitable for full time working parents
	Domestic violence support, housing advice, parenting classes
	Job Centre Plus, midwife appointments, pips...all of which are available at South Grove Children Centre.

	Those of a Children's Centre!
	Help, advice and support for parents of children with special needs. Marksfield and The Challenge Group (at St James Church) are great sources of support thy should be extended further
	Parenting courses and ESOL courses seem to have been very successful in the past.
	Everything south Grove do
	Breastfeeding support
	What the hell is a key community access point? This is JARGON
	I just said I didn't want one!!
	Again this question is disingenuous as it offers a false dichotomy. Yes having access to services at key areas would be good but you are closing down buildings that the people need.
	Yes.

	Midwife Appointments
	Breastfeeding help. This is so important in terms of keeping children healthier and increasing the likelihood of good life outcomes (ie. it will save local authorities and the NHS money down the track!!) but for some women it is incredibly difficult and they need good support.
	No x7
	Keep the same services as at Children's Centre.
	Haringay ladder is seriously underserved for any services, from NHS to children.
	Midwife appointments, all health services, benefits advice
	Again, what are "key community access points"?
	I don't support Community access points. I would like to see the Children's Centres being retained. These were built as Children Centres

	and should be kept as sc'
	Playgroup, nursery, swimming, music-play,
	I'm not really clear what a community access point is/for - are they just for children or the wider community?
	Not in favour of these at all.
	KEEP ALL CHILDREN CENTRE SERVICES AS THEY ARE x6
	Sure start early learning services
	Cab, parenting training, English classes, knitting classes, cooking classes, anything that make vulnerable mothers in contact with other mothers and children centres staffs
	Breast Feeding clinics
	ESOL classes are a lifeline for mothers who do not yet speak English.
	Breastfeeding support; music sessions for under 5s; outdoor activities e.g. gardening clubs

	<p>In my experience breast feeding advice sessions are a vital device that should not be reduced.</p>
	<p>At the ladders there is a volunteer-run group every Wednesday. I think that if you could get a few more of these going then people wouldn't mind so much. Also, I cannot understand why there is a childminders group - seems like a group of people who really don't need an extra service. If there was one for teenage mums or whatever, that would be a much better use of money. Also, I do think that you need to tell people how much it costs to run these places. Otherwise there is no perspective - just people shouting that they don't want things closed down.</p>
	<p>I don't understand the KCA concept, and I don't like the idea of rebranding and restructuring when the only real driver is plainly to save money (there is no suggestion that what children's centres do is not working/valuable). Why create something new that will require a whole framework of governance and management likely to be only marginally cheaper than the existing shoestring on which children's centres operate? If you want to scale back service availability, you should transfer whatever funding is available together with the management and governance to the related school/nursery (where relevant). That way, appropriate judgments about local needs can be made on the ground by the people with the greatest</p>

	<p>stake, the best knowledge and the simplest accountability to the local community. Extending opening hours and providing services to older children (the only suggestion in your consultation paper of enhanced provision) are things I am sure children's centres would love to do - but they cost money, don't they? Again, all you need to do is integrate management and governance, provide the appropriate funding, and let the existing centres decide what makes sense for their local communities. Restructuring services for the sake of it (or to save money) is what central government does, usually, badly. Don't make the same mistake.</p>
	<p>I think there are serious problems with staff safety and lone working. The thought of opening up the Children's Centres I know to adults off the street is appalling</p>
	<p>POST-NATAL MIDWIFE SERVICES MUSICAL CLASSES</p>
Online16.07.15	<p>Midwifery appointments and breastfeeding support.</p>
	<p>it's not so much about additional services but about NOT reducing the hours offered for stay and play etc</p>
	<p>Breastfeeding support, new parent support, support for parents who are</p>

	<p>struggling. Haringey needs to ensure that those parents don't slip through the cracks in the system and end up as more tragedies. I am lucky to not really need much support from the children's services, but it needs to be accessible for those people who do, and Haringey needs to ensure that someone is responsible for looking after/out for those families. That responsibility can't rest with the health visitors as there aren't enough of them!</p>
	<p>All the services you currently supply in the children's centres, which have proved invaluable.</p>
	<p>It's extremely important to the community to have a place where free child play and support for parents can be accessed close to home. Not all families can afford to pay to go to children's groups or travel to them, it's also hard to do that in the first few months after having a baby so having them close is very important.</p>
	<p>Existing services available from the Ladder children's centre.</p>
	<p>Specific facilities for the disabled parents or disabled children, including the above services but additionally for the special educational needs of such children.</p>

	Breastfeeding support groups, PIPS, midwife. Health visitors once a week.
	ESOL support, parent and toddler groups, breast-feeding support, messy play, cook and eat and gardening sessions. Access to safe and accessible outdoor space.
	HEATH CHECKS AND PRENATAL AND POSTNATAL ADVICE AND SUPPORT, ONE-ON-ONE
Online-03.08.15	The children's centres that currently exist are already key community access points for services to the most vulnerable and needy members of the community in Haringey, i.e. children. Adding services to those children's centres, to include parent support programmes (such as Triple P, Parenting With Confidence or Getting Ready for School) would be a very good addition but not at the cost of existing services. Increasing the number of key community access points by reducing expenditure on unnecessary council activities (such as the Haringey 50th Anniversary activities) would be the best approach to meeting council statutory obligations to children.
	I don't know what a key community access point is - why can't they stay as children's centres?

	None.
	All these services should be delivered from proper children's centres.
	Breastfeeding support sessions; info about local ESOL support for parents for whom English is a second language; support in meeting and being connected with other local parents
	Baby groups 0-12 months, I found these essential for new parents to get information and meet other parents.
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.15	Sensory group,
	baby group
	weighing clinic
	ESOL
	Supamums
	Pips
	Yes, anything that brings up children more friendly and improves their

	language to have a better communication in the future. Child self belief
	Nurseries within the centre
	Mental health support
	baby massage
	baby groups
	breastfeeding support x2
Hard copies, week ending 03.07.15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baby weigh-in 2. English classes 3. General health and well being 4. Generally people commented that all services should be available as they should all be kept as children's centres
Online, 07.07.15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General theme that people don't support community access points, and that all should remain as full children's centres, offering all services. Some constructive comments: 2. Parenting Classes 3. ESOL 4. PIPS

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Toy libraries 6. Breastfeeding, weaning, healthy eating, behavioural advise, parenting advise 7. Help advice and support for parents of children with special needs. Marksfield and The Challenge Group (at St James Church) are great sources of support thy should be extended further 8. Cab, parenting training, English classes, knitting classes, cooking classes, anything that make vulnerable mothers in contact with other mothers and children centres staffs 9. At the ladders there is a volunteer-run group every Wednesday. I think that if you could get a few more of these going then people wouldn't mind so much. Also, I cannot understand why there is a childminders group - seems like a group of people who really don't need an extra service.
Hard copies, week ending 10.07.15	Psychological service, speech & language, education Psychology service - Baby weighting and baby massage
Hard copies, week ending 17.07.15	Childminders training sessions
	No key points all stay
	All to stay
	keep all of them

	Baby weigh-in
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.15	Access to information about health, local community activities and resources. Crucially somewhere to go and see a friendly face- spending all day alone with a baby can be hard.
	Midwife appointments
	Weighing clinics
	Health visitors
	Speech and languagex2
	Activities for older children such as music, art clubs, learning languages
	Don't know
	childcare
	mental health service for parents
	None

	Access to information on housing, benefits
	Ante-natal
Hard copies week ending 07.08.15	No x2
	No, The Ladder has everything already.
	Ante-natal/postnatal care by midwives.
	Safeguarding, relationships, safety, trust and routine.
	Lots of parents have no families in London and are isolated. Providing a place for them to take their children is vital for them and the wellbeing of the children. It gives them the opportunity to meet with key worker and other parents. It is unbearable that Haringey does not support their youth.
Hard copies, week ending 14.08.15	Breastfeeding support group
	N/A
Hard copies week ending 21.08.15	No I can't think of any
	No x3

	Not really.
	Family support
	Disability advice and support
	Play sessions
Online 07.09.15	<p>Breast feeding support, which basically doesn't exist currently. In your proposal you mention one year and two year checks ups- these simply don't happen. How are you going to spot possible vulnerable children or indeed children who may have a learning issue if you don't actually know who they are?</p> <p>Family support and adult learning</p> <p>The reduction of services at any of the centres will be devastating for the community and create greater pressure on external services. The removal of early intervention and preventative work will increase the number of vulnerable children and therefore increase the number of referrals to children's services. The cost savings of the closure of part closure will be have to be taken up by frontline children's services. The recruitment and cost of temporary social workers will mean that the overspend of 5 million</p>

	<p>this year will be even higher after April 2016.</p> <p>Adult learning Baby weighing/weaning workshops Therapy services Parenting courses Baby massage classes</p> <p>Adult learning e.g. ESOL/Helping in Schools; parenting courses e.g. Triple P/SFSC/HENRY; staff training; baby workshops e.g. baby weaning/weighing/breastfeeding/baby massage/baby wonder weeks; Therapy services e.g. IAPT/PIPS.</p> <p>Music classes eg Woodlands Singing for under 5's Keep fit/exercise classes for adults Activities for children over the holidays eg crafts and sports sessions</p>
	Breastfeeding and parental support
	Groups enabling new mother to meet and socialise in an open and secure space. This men's more than stay and plays but more hands on sessions, such as cooking, craft and new skills groups.
	They should stay as full children's centres for children 0-5
	Breast feeding sessions - these are essential not only for the newborn but

	also to prevent mothers from developing post natal depression.
Online 16.09.15	Help and guidance or thoughtful sign posting for the more vulnerable parents i.e. access to help with childcare, other stay and play centres, where they can do courses etc
	It is much nicer to go to a childrens centre to access health visitor appointments and advice sessions. If these services in anyway help the Childrens Centres remain open then I support them.
	Full suite of children's centre services.
	Antenatal services (essential); baby weigh-ins (essential); breastfeeding support (essential); stay and play sessions that promote positive attachment, healthy brain development and good communication and language; access to support for the most vulnerable parents of young children, particularly women at risk of domestic abuse and those living on low incomes
	no
Online 22.09.15	More child-development focussed carer/child drop-in sessions, such as age-appropriate music, gardening, baby massage, cooking, gym/yoga etc.
	Breastfeeding clinics/support groups, CAB advice, ESOL classes, parenting classes
	Babysitter resource
	Baby groups for new mum's. I found that being able to meet other mum's with very young children was essential to share experience and keep our



	mental sanity!
	ESOL, Counselling, Domestic Violence support, Speech and Language Sessions, Psychology Support
	Food nutrition courses (Henry), IAPT for children and families, dental appointments / advice, GP
	Childcare suitable for working parents, links to local schools, child health promotion and promoting positive mental health.
	Outreach workers and family support workers
	All of these and many more currently on offer.
	Activities and health support for parents and to provide networking opportunities

Q13. Do you have any comments on our proposals of which children's centres to keep open?

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online-7.07.15	There should be an even distribution of child centres across the borough, and then the largest ones, closest to public transport should remain open. This will ensure accessibility to the largest group of residents. Woodlands Park provides lovely facilities but space is always limited, limiting the number of residents that can use their services. The Ladders Children Centre has a lot more space.
	Local residents are in favour of particular Children's Centres staying open. These are not featured in the list above. Tottenham is high in deprivation and reducing centres in this area seems a step backward.
	you should keep all of them open and youth centres as this is the most important part of the community
	I have worked particularly close with South Grove and the Ladder and cannot emphasise enough the value the professionals who work there have added to the lives of the children and families in need that they have supported. They have gone above and beyond their duty to provide support, guidance and advice to parents, which has prevented many families coming to the

	<p>notice of social care and has also allowed us (social care), to step down to their capable hands. Families have told me that they feel safe in these centres. The workers always make time for them and they can walk in when they need to, rather than having to make an appointment, which doesn't fit into family life - which can be unpredictable. South Grove, particularly, has become a 'hub' for the local community and losing this site and the staff who work there will be a tragic loss to the children and families of Tottenham, and Haringey will be worse off. Saving money at this vital level of children's service will only increase the level of funding needed at higher levels, such as social care. I implore you to reconsider the closing of South Grove, and if those making the decisions have not already done so, I strongly recommend you read their recent Ofsted report!</p>
	<p>All of them! This area is densely populated with an ever growing population of babies and children, meaning most services are over subscribed as it is. For the mental health of parents I definitely feel having these easy accessible outlets when you are with your child all day are in valuable.</p>
	<p>Park lane</p>

	Essential to keep Rokesley since the closure of red gables to enable services to be accessed centrally in crouch end. Midwife appointments at Rokesley were useful.
	All of them
	Why South Grove not include here?
	all of them needed and more.
	No x 5
	You could charge for stay and play at the children's centres. Many parents would pay for this as it's the social setting of meeting people that families want.
	Campsbourne and Stonecroft should be kept open. They provide an excellent support to the community in many areas and it will be a great loss if they are closed or the level of services that currently provide are reduced

	<p>Stonecroft is an excellent children's centre with a strong community feel. The staff are experienced and knowledgeable. As a Haringey resident paying council tax in this borough I would be outraged if this centre closed.</p>
	<p>Those attached to childcare should take priority. Centres should be in places where parents can easily access Centres that already have high Registration and Reach figures should take priority.</p>
	<p>None of the options are the centres which I access and use. They are not local.</p>
	<p>I think it is shocking that hard working parents are being effectively penalised for being so. Services in our area have been cut further and further back while we continue to lay more and more council tax. This is shocking. Whoever has proposed and supported this should be ashamed.</p>
	<p>All of them. They are a vital part of the community</p>
	<p>Not much analysis has been given on why those centres have been chosen. Personally I have always found Campsbourne to be more of a community hub than Rokesely.</p>
	<p>Why you shut my children centre? I have disability. I need this centre close to</p>

	my house
	I don't think you should be closing any of them - they are all such an integral part of the community
	Yes, how were they selected? The Triangle is due to cover the St Ann's area but it is actually a bit of a walk to get to
	Woodlands offer the best range social activities - it's very important for the area (stay & play, singing, gardening etc) The triangle have an absolutely fantastic nursery & are a focal point for the local community
	You should not be closing any. There are alternatives which you refused to acknowledge and you ignored the scrutiny committee. You will destroy this service
	I don't understand why the council would close the Ladder centre. It's run brilliantly, is consistently in demand (there are queues to get in) and the children love it. It is senseless and heartbreaking.
	ALL! Cut Cllrs Allowances, Cut your 50 year celebration. Cut your Consultants, Cut the idea of changing logo. Cut your £1m renovation of offices. Cut the Comms budget.



	Keep them all open
	You are not defending the exiting provision and simply want to legally cover your pre-decided plan to cut services.
	Keep the ladder open.
	Instead of squandering huge amounts of money on 'nothing' why don't you ensure they all stay open - are you aware of how this will affect families with little else for their children. You are merely adding to the hideous cuts these families already have to deal with and now the children will suffer. Well done!
	I have only ever used The Ladder...I don't actually know where any of these are located but, since we don't own a vehicle, public transport links from our area would be quite critical. Although the 2 pram rules on the buses may create problems for multiple Moms to get to activities at the same time from the same area.

Woodlands Park in particular is a jewel in the crown of children's services in Haringey and it would be complete MADNESS to close it. Are you aware that people *move to the area* in order to get their kids into Woodlands? That's standard behaviour for schools, yes, but not very many nurseries. Walk down Avondale Rd around 8am-9am and you'll see pretty much every house contains nursery-age kids. Woodlands has exceptional staff and management - they win awards, and they have given my two children outstanding care - and under no circumstances should it be closed. Sit inside it and see the number of parents who are from non-Anglo backgrounds and without necessarily a great grasp of English - and you will realise what an incredibly valuable service it performs for the community in putting more vulnerable people in touch with the services they need, and helping the most vulnerable members of society - children whose parents may not have the educational or cultural or linguistic capital to help them have the best possible quality of life.

	You should not be reducing the service at all. These Centres are fantastic and provide essential services in this area.
	I moved to the Harringay ladder for the support and pay taxes for this. If you want people who pay taxes and spends money to move to an area you have to have childcare! Otherwise they'll go somewhere else and you'll be stuck with council flats and retirees.
	All children's centres should be kept open
	ALL children's centres should remain open, not just those listed above.
	I would like mothers to have access to the facilities in close proximity to their homes and benefit from the wonderful support I received from LBH's Children's Centre
	The Ladder serves a large community and is excellent. Please keep it open!!!!
	Please please keep the Ladder open! All the others are too far away and we do not have a car. Little and local, decentralised and devolved beats centralised, remote emperors any day.
	I don't think you should be thinking of closing any of the children's centres. They provide a valuable resource that works best because it is local. I

	<p>understand that your own committee recommended that you keep the centres open and I urge you to reconsider this short-sighted proposal that will short change a generation of children in Haringey.</p>
	<p>They're all important. It can be very difficult, stressful, lonely and isolating being at home with small children and no support. These centres are life-saving in many ways and The Ladder Children's Centre helped keep me sane in difficult times. They need to be easily accessible, as travelling distances with small children can be stressful and meeting other parents in the very local area is important for mutual support.</p>
	<p>KEEP ALL OF THEM x 6</p>
	<p>Yes, don't close any of them</p>
	<p>Keep them all open</p>
	<p>No children centres should be closed. This proposal is damaging to women in vulnerable positions and their children. Less children centres will mean vulnerable women and their children will have less access to essential help they need. Scrap this proposal. Its not workable, harmful, counterproductive and every one knows it.</p>

	All of them
	All children centres across the borough should be kept open as a LOCAL resource.
	I will have 2 children of different ages and it is hugely important to me that I can access a Children's centre with a link to a primary school. My daughter will start South Haringay Primary school in September and I am hoping for a place at the Ladder when my son is 3. I am beyond upset at these plans.
	All of the 16 children's centres should be kept open. No ifs or buts.
	I just think there are some halfway measures: volunteer groups/small payment to offset cost etc. For me it's really just the loss of a stay and play once a week, but for some others there's a much bigger danger. You're making it more likely that there will be another baby p etc, because the staff in these centres and mums who use them are the ones looking out for that kind of thing.
	The question pre supposes that children's centres WILL close. If this is a done deal why are you asking us? No one is going to WANT the centre they use to close. Also, the next question pre supposes we know what you mean and what it is.

	<p>They are all important.</p>
	<p>You should be keeping them *all* open, both these and those you propose closing. The evidence shows that early years and family based support at the community level has a high impact, and can help avoid higher human, community and financial costs later on. Reducing funding for early intervention and support for the most vulnerable, in particular, is a false saving for which you (and we as the local community and as taxpayers) will have to pay later. The consultation paper provides no evidence of any kind and no financial analysis to support the proposals. There is no indication of how the proposals will deliver cost savings, nor do you explain what services you propose sacrificing in the interests of balancing the books next year. It is an inadequate and unacceptable way to make determinations about the future of frontline services.</p>
	<p>I believe the council's knowledge of the work of the existing children's centres is limited. The officers handling this extremely important, and delicate, matter do not have the skills to oversee the service or operate strategically. Elected members affected, most of them Labour councillors, are seemingly unaware of the importance of Sure start and have not got the</p>

	<p>skills or, in this case, bravery, to challenge to proposal for closure. The leader and the cabinet member for CYPS have, again made this a personal rather than strategic or policy issue. Other boroughs are not cutting their Children's Centres. If there are problems with how some centres work, why hasn't the council tackled these? It's not about saving money, it's clearly about something else.</p>
	<p>Instead of the 6% pay rise the council have awarded themselves, children's centres MUST be kept open. They are vital!</p>
Online-16.07.15	<p>Woodlands park is already oversubscribed. The ladder will need to be open too</p>
	<p>Why is Campsbourne being considered for closing when it is situated amongst an area of high deprivation? Why are the other centres not equally considered since the whole of Haringey is being gentrified?</p>
	<p>I strongly believe that none of the 16 children's centres should be closed, let alone the ones above. Children's centres are a vital part of the community offering precious support to parents and families. Going to my local children's centre, at the Ladder, has helped me make friends and not feel isolated (I do not have any family here in the UK). I also got very useful advice from staff and from talking to mothers that I couldn't have got in any other</p>

	<p>way. PLEASE keep as many children's centres open as you can. They are the 'oxygen' of our communities. Closing down so many children's centres would have a hugely detrimental social impact.</p>
	<p>Prediction of implications. The cuts proposed have been given to staff as a 'scenario' and then the resulting work on making effective use of what little is left has been taken as a plan for restructure. It is no such thing. The whole premise of this so called 'proposal' is wrong and ill thought out, made with no regard to impact on increased workload and reduced staff and access to services. It is criminal that a labour council should be following this through..</p>
	<p>I think it makes sense to focus on the areas with most deprivation/reliance on the services at the centres.</p>
	<p>I don't understand why you are decimating the centres to the west of the borough and leaving so many to the east. Closing Noel Park and South Groves leaves the residents in the Wood Green outer areas without anything. That will be crushing to many new Mum's.</p>
	<p>I think it is a crime to shut any of the children's centres.</p>
	<p>Harringay and St Anne's has an enormous and growing community of young families. One facility will simply not be enough, I already have to be</p>

	<p>turned away some mornings from stay and play because it is full at the ladder Children's centre. This will happen a lot more and it's unacceptable to add to this issue by closing a local centre.</p>
	<p>The rationale for which to retain and which to close is not explained in the proposal. I understand that the scrutiny committee did not support these proposals and therefore don't understand why Haringey intends to go ahead. In addition, the demographic makeup of the Ladder is changing at the moment with many more young families moving in at the moment. Demand for these services will increase over the next 3-5 years. Closing the Ladder centre now is short-sighted.</p>
	<p>Would the Council consider making available buildings for volunteers to provide children's centres so that services can continue to be delivered in areas where the Council proposes to close such centres.</p>
	<p>Campsbourne. My child attends the school. How will my child get to another after school club location without impacting on my working hours and causing additional financial implications on me paying for my child to be transported from Campsbourne to another venue?</p>
	<p>There is no point keeping 3 centres open in Crouch End but then have nothing in the Bounds Green area. It means some parents would have to</p>

	take up to 3 different buses to get to a children centre, which massively adds to costs.
	Please keep the Ladder Children's Centre open, the staff provision is outstanding, the support and provision of basic parenting skills training in a safe and accessible space is second to none. This would be a massive loss to the local community.
	There would be a gulf in services from Highgate to Bounds green, and from the north circular to horsey. The area needs one more centre to stay open at least. I and disgusted that it is in these areas the government is making cuts, but given they are happening please don't waste the money you do have on job training for school leavers - that should not be a role of the children' centres at all
Online 03.08.15	All children's centres that are currently open should be maintained and those areas where services have been reduced previously, such as Ferry Lane and Finsbury Park, should be reopened.
	As commented above, the Ladder Childrens centre is the only one that immediately supports my area (Harringay Ladder). I know at least 10 people actively using the services at the moment that all live on the ladder and that is just my immediate social circle; the others are a long way away so if

	<p>anything we need MORE support in the vicinity of the ladder. Closing The Ladder Children's Centre would leave many many families a bus journey away from a children's centre and with a 0-6 week old baby with no immunity this is not a good idea. The Ladder provided my antenatal support - was convenient and a walk away - and I expect it to provide the core services I need for my 4 week old daughter. As stated there is nothing else serving the Haringay Ladder which has a very high proportion of new mums.</p>
	<p>Keep them all opened.</p>
	<p>You should keep all of them open as proper children's centres, not some half baked "Community Access Points".</p>
	<p>Considering the high population and varied demographic of Haringey, I feel it is extremely important to have as many centres remain open as possible with more focus on ensuring that the people that need their support the most are able to access them (perhaps the proposed parent engagement forums can take on some of this work)</p>
	<p>There are so many parents who struggle or need help, often they don't even know that they need support. Support services for young parents are really</p>

	<p>not very well publicised anywhere and ALL Children's centres are important as the professionals are experts in identifying and signposting to the services required.</p>
	<p>Have not used them (too far for walking, and for some it would take too long by public transport)</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 03.07.15</p>	<p>both very busy</p> <p>families with babies and school age children</p> <p>bring older children in the evenings it would change the experience for under 5s</p> <p>All should be kept open Concern that WLP and Ladder are</p> <p>Felt longer hours wouldn't work for</p> <p>Concern that even if parents did</p>
<p>Online, 07.07.15</p>	<p>All should be kept open</p> <p>The Ladder, Stonecroft, Southgrove and Campsbourne all praised</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 10.07.15</p>	<p>If Noel Park were to close I could only access a CC by driving. I cannot drive so I would rely on lifts which means I would lose a vital community resource</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 17.07.15</p>	<p>All</p>

	Please keep open all the centres
	As a childminder I need to have easy access to children's centres that I can regularly visit to enhance my children's learning and development
	I have trusted the staffs of SGCC and very comfortable with the centre than any other centre. I will extremely happy and my children if it's not closed
	Good for our children
	I think all the CCs should be kept open and more activity should be run for under 5s
	All children's centres should be kept open they provide a critical resource for children in their early years and are vital to ensuring children from lower income backgrounds get a decent start in life
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.15	Think it be very helpful to first time parents like myself as it helps in many ways like stimulating your child, access to seek advice from professionals
	Priority are the ones in the most deprived areas
	I think it is vitally important to keep all children's centres open. I use them several times each week and they are always busy.

	Broadwaters is a very safe children's centre
	Big mistake. All children's centre should be kept open needed by the community
	Is not enough. Has taken a long time to establish all centres and how you're closing them. Shame. Will regret this decision in the future.
	I wouldn't close any. Children's centres are crucial to mums in the UK. All are important. Keep all open.
	I cannot see any benefit to closing children's centres.
	They all should be open, including Broadwaters so the kids can socialise.
	No, because less children's centres it means more children in the centres. More children in the centres will be more difficult for better services.
	In general, the more children's centres open the better. These are the main points in child development in early years. All of them should stay open.
	All of them
	All should stay open

	Keep them all open
	Broadwaters children's centres
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.15	All the children should be open especially park lane children's centre
	None
	Don't shut any of them. Don't take from children. Take more tax from the rich for them to stay open.
	Is it a place where our children benefit from and as well as the parents. This children's centre gave alot of training to parents
	The activities at Noel Park children's centre are currently very limited, but the stay and play is the one thing in the area that's free for parents with babies. Without it we'd be very isolated.
	Park lane should stay open. There is a high need in this area for children's centre services.
	Park lane children's centre because I use this.

	It is appalling to see how the current government's policies are hitting families, especially those who are less likely to afford privately owned centres. Boroughs should focus on providing the best service to majority of their constituents.
Hard copies week ending 07.08.15	Keep the ladder open.
	Yes. The Ladder's Stay and Messy Play is outstanding. The large space along with the fact it is attached to a school, makes it a particularly suitable location. Woodlands Park is not as suitable a location, space-wise, nor in terms of the quality of provision. So I don't understand why The Ladder will close and Woodlands Park will remain open?
	I don't even know where they are, and not close to me.
	The Ladder , Noels Park ✓
	As a service provider (North Middlesex Hospital) Midwives. We've seen at least 10 women a week and possibly more in The Ladder Children Centre. I strongly felt that this centre should remain open.

	It disgusts me that Stroud Green (my local) and The Ladder is going. Haringey Council, you make me sick, your disgraceful. The community you are ruining. Shove your budget up your arse!
	Only that Campsbourne school's a local + diverse community and the children's centre, pre-school and school are the central part of the community here, and it would be shocking if the centre were to close.
	All. Future generations of utmost importance.
	It is purely important to keep the children's centres in the economically neediest areas open?
	The Ladder not listed above.
	The Ladder is not on this list. The Ladder is the centre I want open the most.
	The Ladder to keep open as I the feel facilities and staff are welcoming and are better than the others I have visited.
	Yes, because it's very important to reduce loneliness. I make many friends

	and it helps me to reduce depression.
	Campsbourne.
Hard copies, week ending 14.08.15	Strongly needed support system that is local.
	I am concerned, that the Rokesly will be overwhelmed by the number of families. It will have to serve. It is already a busy centre and under the proposals it will serve nine wards that are currently covered by three centres. How will quality and access be preserved?
Hard copies week ending 21.08.15	I think it's a brilliant idea to keep Children Centres. It's a good place for other families to meet and for children to have fun. I strongly support it.
	Park Lane
	I think none of them has to be closed

	Park Lane, Pembury and Rowland Hill
	Park Lane is an excellent service, helping parents in training, family support.
	Park Lane and Pembury House
Online 07.09.15	The west of the borough, currently hugely over subscribed for primary schools, is basically being forgotten here. Do you think that children and parents in the west don't need help?
	This survey is appalling - the questions do not cover the fundamental proposal of cutting cc services rather it is designed to divide and conquer by making consultees choose between children centres and asking the very infantile question of rating support for closures and support for keeping open the chosen ccS - very crass and unintelligent. Designed not to show the overwhelming negative response that the proposals have had.
	Please keep the Ladder open. It has been a lifeline to me and my daughter.

	Please keep South Grove open
	No. I am concerned at the *overall* reduction in services for young people.
	I am a social worker in Haringey and I am relying on the work of children's centres a lot to support me to safeguard children. It is important that the children's centre remain locally to the families I am working with as a longer travel would put them off attending the groups offered. The reduction of children's centre will affect the most vulnerable people in the borough.
	It is not possible to discriminate who should remain open as they are all providing essential services.
	I think between Pembury and Park Lane I feel that they're close to each other and one of them should have been considered to close and kept on Noel Park instead as to my knowledge Noel Park has the highest deprivation of vulnerable families in cluster 4 and in terms of location, Noel Park CC is a great location for families from around the Wood Green high street and Lordship Lane area. Woodside and Rowland Hill and Bounds Green cover wide area's and have no centre's close enough for families to have an easy signposting experience and as a mum myself I would find this process really difficult to deal with if I was to live near Noel Park and would have to travel to

	<p>either the end of white hart lane to access either Woodside or Rowland Hill.</p>
	<p>I think they should all be kept open as they all have served a purpose to their community by offering the services they currently offer. Case studies will prove their aims and outcomes have been met and how those families have benefitted from the support and guidance they received from the children's centre. I think the stories of individual families will be a great attribute to the evidence already collated to why other centre's have stayed open and why the decision was made for some centre's to close.</p>
	<p>I'm afraid I haven't used all of the above centres. I do feel that they should diversify and offer a wider range of services, for a wider group of people, not just under 5's. Of the centres I have used Woodlands is great (love the stay and play, singing and gardening activities, baby weighing) so it would be a great shame if they shut down. Triangle was also good for baby massage, play sessions etc.</p>
	<p>I would prefer no centres to be closed as I think this is a real loss for the local community. I use woodlands park and the ladder predominantly. Woodlands park has been a complete lifeline for me since I became a parent. I have some year old and I have regularly used the centre and I am expecting my second baby and intend to do so again. I attended the breastfeeding support there and I think I would have given up had I not been provided with this assistance. We go at least once or twice a week. The staff are incredible and the facilities are fantastic. There are always great activities for a range of</p>

	<p>ages of children and they learn a lot and love being there. They have a fantastic outdoors space and we often go on the organised trips. I have met a huge number of friends there and seen a large number of vulnerable parents being supported over the years. Whilst I would prefer no centres to close and we have always enjoyed going to the ladder if I had to choose between the two I would support the decision to close the ladder and keep woodlands open as the support I have been provided with at woodlands and the activities we have been able to attend have been incredible.</p>
	<p>Vulnerable families identified by health visitors and family health visitors will be reluctant to travel and ensuring that the services are on their doorstep is vital. There is very little success in getting to the root of family issues without getting to know the family well. This can only be done by regular contact with a family. Staff at local centres to families do get to know the issues facing their vulnerable families and can therefore be in a better position to support.</p>
	<p>I am opposed to all closures.</p>
	<p>Given the stated commitment to keep centres open in the most disadvantaged parts of the borough I'm particularly surprised at the proposed closure of South Grove</p>
	<p>I cannot stress enough how important the Ladder Children's Centre has been for me and my daughter during maternity leave and how important it continues to be for her carer. We live on the Haringay ladder, where there is a high concentration of families and therefore children (requiring two primary</p>

	<p>schools to service the area). The Ladder Children's Centre is a vital resource for families in the area - there is no nowhere else close by - Woodlands could not accommodate us all, the stay and play there would be vastly oversubscribed and crowded, meaning mothers and children looking for interaction with others would be turned away. In addition, as Stay and Play services are generally offered once a week, the closure of the Ladder would mean halving the number of stay and play sessions available in the area. These are a vital service, my daughter thrives at them, she is at home and the removal of half the stay and play sessions in the area would mean that her opportunities to interact with other children would be halved. The only alternative to increase her interaction with other children would be a nursery. However, take for example, mothers who choose to spend an extended maternity leave at home, or who choose to stay at home with their children - this option would mean sacrificing opportunities to socialise with other children if the Ladder centre, and others like it, close. It cannot be part of this government's policy to discourage mothers from being able to take maternity leave or to stay at home with their children. Please reconsider the closure of the Ladder Centre - the removal of services given the high number of families in this area would have a disproportionate impact.</p>
<p>Online 16.09.15</p>	<p>All of them as they are already bursting at the seams</p>

	<p>I really do think you need to keep all the centres open. They are invaluable and closing them is detrimental to our community. I appreciate costs must be cut but all Children's Centres remaining open must be a priority. Costs can be saved elsewhere.</p>
	<p>Of course I support the childrens centres close to my home, however I believe that closing any of them would lead to others being over subscribed. It wouldn't benefit me to use any childrens centres that are not very close to my home as I need to walk to them. I used stay and play sessions in my maternity year and wouldn't have travelled to these. Now I am only interested in the childrens centre which is attached to my daughters school which is The Ladder. I don't really understand the point below so am saying no opinion.</p>
	<p>the ladder is very important for our community</p>
	<p>Keep them all open, they're all vital to ensure the best start for our children.</p>
	<p>Keep all of them open. Regarding Noel Park, this is an area that needs to stay together and Shropshire Hall is a great aggregation centre, unfortunately the only one! Closing it or reducing its services will be highly detrimental for the community.</p>

	<p>I'm particularly surprised that Noel Park is not to be kept open as this is a very deprived area</p>
	<p>I see no sign that the Local Authority has heeded the feedback received in response to its previous consultation on this subject. This is disappointing and frustrating. I am not going to reiterate the detailed comments I submitted on that occasion, but overwhelmingly they remain valid.</p>
	<p>Are you publishing the reasons behind the decisions as to which particular centres close and which are kept open?</p>
	<p>Yes- it is a short-sighted idea to close any of them. Woodlands Park is already hugely over-subscribed and must stay open and expand to accomodate the spill-over from local closures. The sensory room and breastfeeding sessions at Woodlands Park should be replicated elsewhere!</p>
	<p>You have chosen to close my two local children's centres! I don't know why you have chosen to close both of them when the next nearest centre is a 15 minute walk for an adult, how are children expected to walk this distance?! This decision has been made only to save money and not to improve services.</p>
	<p>The closure of The Ladder Centre in Harringay will have an adverse affect on local residents. The nearest centre to remain open is Woodland Park and historically this centre has been very popular and over subscribed - my concern is that vulnerable families will be left with little/less or no support locally.</p>

	I find it worrying that Rokesly is supposed to serve a huge area, according to your proposal. If the age range for children accessing the services is also lifted to 19, how will there be any room for existing under-5s' services?
Online 22.09.15	
	All of them as they are already bursting at the seams
	I really do think you need to keep all the centres open. They are invaluable and closing them is detrimental to our community. I appreciate costs must be cut but all Children's Centres remaining open must be a priority. Costs can be saved elsewhere.
	Of course I support the childrens centres close to my home, however I believe that closing any of them would lead to others being over subscribed. It wouldn't benefit me to use any childrens centres that are not very close to my home as I need to walk to them. I used stay and play sessions in my maternity year and wouldn't have travelled to these. Now I am only interested in the childrens centre which is attached to my daughters school which is The Ladder. I don't really understand the point below so am saying no opinion.
	the ladder is very important for our community

	Keep them all open, they're all vital to ensure the best start for our children.
	Keep all of them open. Regarding Noel Park, this is an area that needs to stay together and Shropshire Hall is a great aggregation centre, unfortunately the only one! Closing it or reducing its services will be highly detrimental for the community.
	I'm particularly surprised that Noel Park is not to be kept open as this is a very deprived area
	I see no sign that the Local Authority has heeded the feedback received in response to its previous consultation on this subject. This is disappointing and frustrating. I am not going to reiterate the detailed comments I submitted on that occasion, but overwhelmingly they remain valid.
	Are you publishing the reasons behind the decisions as to which particular centres close and which are kept open?
	Yes- it is a short-sighted idea to close any of them. Woodlands Park is already hugely over-subscribed and must stay open and expand to accomodate the spill-over from local closures. The sensory room and breastfeeding sessions at Woodlands Park should be replicated elsewhere!

	<p>You have chosen to close my two local children's centres! I don't know why you have chosen to close both of them when the next nearest centre is a 15 minute walk for an adult, how are children expected to walk this distance?! This decision has been made only to save money and not to improve services.</p>
	<p>The closure of The Ladder Centre in Haringay will have an adverse affect on local residents. The nearest centre to remain open is Woodland Park and historically this centre has been very popular and over subscribed - my concern is that vulnerable families will be left with little/less or no support locally.</p>
	<p>I find it worrying that Rokesly is supposed to serve a huge area, according to your proposal. If the age range for children accessing the services is also lifted to 19, how will there be any room for existing under-5s' services?</p>
	<p>Woodlands Park is an exemplary Children's Centre and invaluable public service. Its community drop-in sessions are heavily oversubscribed. It should be providing the model for all Sure Start services in the borough, and these require expansion, not closure.</p>
	<p>Bounds Green Children's Centre - leaves families in Bounds Green without a valuable space to go to, it pushes them into</p>
	<p>Woodlands Park is already a very busy centre with lots of demand - if more funding/support was given to other local centres nearby such as Triangle and the Ladder, some burden could be lifted from it.</p>

	As a new parent being able to walk to sessions is key.
	putting cuts in services affects vulnerable families who may no have enough funds to pay for bus fare travelling to further centres, people with different abilities cannot access centre. Families who may have ill health or other related health issues with be affect travelling(long journeys to other centres.Others find the centres a place to socialise and network with other families where they can receive some support they might need.
	It leaves the affluent west with less but gives support where it's really needed in n15
	Keep them all open. Closing south grove would be a great shame. This is a particularly good one serving a particularly needy community.
	All of them, as they really help mums, dads and kids in more ways than you would expect.
	It seems very unbalanced to have so few remaining in the west of the borough!

	<p>The best would be to keep a maximum of centre open as the easy accessibility and proximity is very important to reach out to people. Also because otherwise services will be overbooked and overwhelmed by demand.</p>
	<p>The case for closure has not been made. Comments made by members included claims that 50% of the cost of Children's Centres was due to running the buildings. I cannot see how that is the case. Early intervention will be much more difficult to arrange. Some reorganisation may be needed but the case has not been made, This questionnaire is poorly constructed unless those who designed it were trying to prejudge the outcome. It does not allow for the views of staff or governors.</p>
	<p>If it's too far to travel, bearing in mind many users will be pregnant or transporting young children, people will feel unable to use the services on offer - parents and children will suffer as a result.</p>
	<p>They'll be faced with exceptional demand. Will you define who can access which centre? Will there be limitation on where and when you can access depending on location and residential boundaries? Will they be delivering the same volume of services, with less resource with increased demand? It's unacceptable to heap this amount of demand onto fewer centres and fewer numbers of staff who are already under pressure.</p>
	<p>The Ladder has one of the highest levels of registration and usage in the borough and is very effectively managed and resourced. It seems crazy to close it</p>

	<p>You have not provided enough detail on actual delivery but I can see that you have attempted to provide relatively even geographical coverage in the more deprived east of the borough. Whether that will actually provide the right balance of support is impossible to tell especially as they will be responsible for providing support/staffing for the community access points.</p>
	<p>All children's centre's need to be kept open as they are vital to the community and vulnerable families.</p>
	<p>What is the rationale behind proposals to close some of the Centres? The families to be 'reached' by those centres will completely change and the relationships which are so vital and have been built up over many years will be lost.</p>
	<p>I feel very strongly that the Ladder Children's centre should remain open as Woodlands is so over-subscribed that you can never get into any of the sessions. There needs to be more centres not less</p>



15) Please specify any other children's centre services that you use

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Hard copies, week ending 03.07.15	Borrowing toys Baby weigh in
Hard copies, week ending 10.07.15	Citizen Advice -
Hard copies, week ending 17.07.15	Early Learning
Hard copies week ending 07.08.15	Weighing

18) Are there any additional services that you feel are important that have not been identified above?

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online 7.07.15	
	weigh in clinics
	Two year old free early learning to help parents get back into work or training.
	no they do a good job as they are
	Advice from family support workers and social workers.
	Family support and parenting
	Antenatal / Postnatal meeting groups for people with similar aged children.
	Activities such as singing/music sessions, baby yoga, baby massage etc.

	there should be opportunities to link with social workers so that barriers can be broken down and social care can be seen as a support network
	Childcare it is vital. All the above can be find in many different ways, internet, family members even though it is important that it is supporting within the services provided by the council. However, trustworthy childcare can only be obtain from true professionals working on regulated centres
	No but I note that the response options aren't aligned in the questionnaire and I assume that 'support for fathers and fathers to be one to one breast feeding support' should be two options not one?
	Play, craft, music.
	Yes proper support for all
	No
	Swimming, music-play, drama, mathematics
	A hundred tiny moments of support and help that the staff offer on a daily basis. Moral support for isolated / struggling parents. The forging of a community. A place that is a hub for the neighbourhood and a place that

	roots parents and children in their area. The building of relationships between children before they start school. Things that aren't necessarily simply defined "services" but a huge positive contribution of the well-being of the neighbourhood's children and parents.
	Probably, but I can't think of any right now.
	Class for mothers with or without their children as provided at Bruce grove/ Pembury: cooking on a budget, knitting, budgeting. All very important for women to have time for themselves especially when experiencing pnd.
	Support for women and children who have been subjected to male violence, especially during pregnancy and after childbirth.
	Sessions for under 5s which cover things they might not get at home e.g. music and gardening
	The children's centres offer much more than what has been listed above. The staff offer warm and friendly ears to new parents, they are places where you meet other parents and build support networks, they have a unique atmosphere of openness, welcome and they are positive and joyful about parenting. It would be awful for young children and parents

	<p>of young children if they were closed and lost all of this. It would also take away from some of the most vulnerable in our society, our very youngest.</p>
	<p>Room for there to be volunteer-run stay and play sessions. Also, it should be possible to hire out these places for parties etc as an extra funding stream.</p>

Is this consultation about expanding services, about saving money across the borough, or about taking stock of what is working well and what is working less well at existing children's services? It is muddled and confused. The answers to your questions will obviously differ in different areas and for different people. Why don't you allow local communities to determine what is working well and what isn't? Haringey handled the first round of cuts to children's centres and the clustering arrangements very poorly a few years ago. You seem determined to bungle this round of cuts too, not least by pretending that it is somehow about extending services.

	No
	The Children's Centres I know deliver many of this services already and you are planning to close them!
Online 16.07.15	No
	Baby weighing sessions
	I feel that the first contact of a new mother, especially one who is also a young mother, should be held at the home of the new mother and is personally visited by an appropriate professional, to iron out any misconceptions about the service - either from over or under expectations. This will waste less professional time and effort re all subsequent use of the services.
	Psychological support (PIPS)
	weighing clinics and mental health advice and support

<p>Online - 03.08.2015</p>	<p>Support for families with young children who have learning difficulties and disabilities should be identified as a priority. Outreach services that identify families from mobile and migrant communities (such as Roma, Gypsies and Travellers, refugees and asylum-seekers) are absent from the list.</p>
	<p>I've found it difficult to get my baby weighed due to the ridiculous rotation of the 'drop in' sessions. I don't think it is a good think that my baby hasn't been weighed for two weeks when her feeding involves top ups (which very little advice is given about). We've had to try and estimate her weight using scales at home. I should be able to get her weighed at any children's centre by request it only take 5 minutes.</p>
	<p>Safeguarding.</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 03.07.2015</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Physical activity / walk and exercise 2. Toy and book library 3. Mental Health Support 4. CAB 5. A safe space to meet others 6. Safeguarding
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Many responses talk about the safe place centre provide. 8. Weigh-in clinics 9. Advice from family support workers and social workers

	<p>10. Activities such as singing/music sessions, baby yoga, baby massage etc.</p> <p>11. there should be opportunities to link with social workers so that barriers can be broken down and social care can be seen as a support network</p> <p>12. Room for there to be volunteer-run stay and play sessions. Also, it should be possible to hire out these places for parties etc as an extra funding stream.</p>
Hard copies, week ending 10.07.2015	Any services that promote children's development
Hard copies, week ending 17.07.2015	training for childminders and group meetings
	All
	None x2
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.2015	Children's centres are a great meeting point for local parents, esp. Mums. If you reduce this, you will have more mums suffering from PND etc.
	Child contact sessions

	Mental health
	nursery within the centre
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.2015	No
	For me, it has been the general contact, a place to go, incidental conversations, feeling part of the community of local parents
	Kids from 19-21 have to pay £9,000 for the university fund. It should be between £300-£500 or people who are on benefits for a good reason should have it free.
	Activities for 5-19 year olds and training
	Childcare
	Not really
Hard copies week ending 07.08.2015	No.

	No. The above services are really important to provide.
Hard copies, week ending 14.08.2015	Early learning development practitioners to support stroke and courage play in young children.
	N/A
Hard copies week ending 21.08.2015	No x5
	No really
	Disability support
	Not at the moment
Online 07.07.2015	Another badly designed question above - how are you going to analyse priorities when the majority will answer extremely important for all.
	Properly organised support for staff
	The 5 to 19 age group receive services at school and it may duplicate services already provided at school at the cost of reducing services for 0 to 5.

	Baby massage classes Weaning workshops Henry programmes Baby weighing Positive parenting courses Coffee mornings Chatter Matters workshops Helping in schools courses Baby wonder weeks
	Adult learning e.g.Helping in Schools; parenting courses e.g. Triple P/SFSC; staff training; baby workshops e.g. baby weaning/weighing/baby massage/baby wonder weeks; Therapy services e.g. IAPT/PIPS.
	art/ music opportunities for children as countless studies show that music helps with early years development on all levels.
	Childcare. Without having full time childcare facilities available vulnerable families can not get the support that they need, you as the service provider have no way of capturing and identifying their needs or supporting their children through the vital early years.
Online 16.09.2015	These services are great though most can be accessed at a GP Surgery. I'd like to see before and afterschool clubs for adjoining schools so that siblings could start and end the day in the same place.
	Integration with associated infants/primary schools.
	Drop in sessions for childminders looking after young children; baby weigh-in sessions; access to mental health support and advice, and support for families on a low income (many people don't recognise they are on a low income even when family income has halved with the arrival of a new baby).
Online 22.09.2015	Childcare resource or babysitting



	First aid for babies
	Parent-Infant Psychology Service (PIPS)
	Psychological therapies and counselling
	Support for working parents.

19) (a) Are there any other services other than those listed that you would consider paying for? identified above?

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online 03.07.2015	wellbeing
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it is not appropriate for families to pay for the services 2. ad hoc crèche 3. Only for families earning over £15k pa 4. I can no afford service 5. But I strongly feel that payment for services should be on an affordability basis, not mandatory 6. I already pay via taxes 7. Use the money you have now wisely and do not charge for child services. 8. This is a disgraceful question to ask as part of survey 9. None. Charging for some services will deepen the gap between haves & have-nots. A shameful proposal. 10. No idea 11. TAXES X6 12. I would be willing to pay because I can afford it. Means testing is one way of maintaining funding. 13. This is awful. It's not about money. You know fine well that Haringey can afford this. 14. To combat child poverty they MUST remain

	<p>free</p> <p>15. All these services MUST remain free</p> <p>16. After school club</p> <p>17. I currently pay for all of these services, via my PAYE and Council Tax contributions.</p> <p>18. We already pay for them with taxes.</p> <p>19. Any services that are charged for should be assessed on the basis of ability to pay.</p> <p>20. NONE - core baby and children's services should be FREE they're so essential</p> <p>21. Strongly do not support.</p> <p>22. Strongly do not support.</p> <p>23. No pay.</p> <p>24. No x2</p> <p>25. None X14</p> <p>26. The families I am supporting are mainly on benefits and would not be able to pay for these services</p> <p>27. I think it is acceptable to ask parents for a contribution for any of the above services.</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 03.07.2015</p>	<p>1. Physical activity / walk and exercise</p> <p>2. Toy and book library</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Mental Health Support 4. CAB 5. A safe space to meet others 6. Safeguarding <p>7. Where people ticked other - generally wrote 'none'</p>
Hard copies, week ending 17.07.2015	Nox2
	No pay
	None x4
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.2015	I don't feel any one should have to pay
	None x 2
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.2015	Small charge

	None x 2
	I strongly feel that those unable to pay shouldn't have to and I'd be happy to pay as I can afford to.
Hard copies week ending 07.08.2015	Can't afford to pay.
	Charge? You take the biscuit! (For Q.20 - Where is the funding coming from??!)
	Providing parents on certain benefits don't have to pay. This results in introducing means-testing which is not a good thing. Personally would be prepared to pay.
Hard copies week ending 21.08.2015	Small amount
	Low cost
	Small charges
	No I cannot afford to pay
Online 22.09.2015	All services that would benefit my child & support me in being a better

	parent.
	Costs should be means tested.
	Baby massage, and things like that.
	I would pay a couple of pounds
	Any on a means-tested basis.
	None
	stay and play
	Babysitting service
	None I'm afraid
	As long pricing doesn't create a barrier to less well off users.
	Not relevant for a governor but do not support this proposal.

23) What services would you like to see delivered at weekends, and in evenings?

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online-07.07.2015	Daddy's play and stay, daddy's child bonding sessions, daddy courses
	Training courses, parenting classes, and stay and plays.
	Events for dads and young parents
	Stay and play sessions on the weekend to promote the involvement of fathers and allow contact sessions to take place. Ante-natal sessions in the evenings to prevent having to take time out of work.
	Maybe more support for dad's as there is a definite lack of groups and activities that they can attend especially as they are at work full time in the week.
	Could have pay for services and limited universal services
	Antenatal groups and certain educational / informational sessions.

	Range of services but only if properly resourced.
	stay and play Parenting support
	services for working parents
	I use the nursery at the Children's Centre I use and do not need any other evening activities. Weekend activities would be good and I would be happy to pay for them.
	To be able to access to services outside normal working hours for a full time worker will be very beneficial
	Where will you find the staff to mann Centres at these times?
	Breastfeeding support
	do not need weekend and evening services. I would rather spend some time at home with my children. I would rather use weekdays during the day whilst my older children are at school.

	<p>It is not very clear to me way the proposals are in this respect. I have put do not "support" above for that reason.</p>
	<p>Stay and play with advice</p>
	<p>None, most parents at home with children have additional support at the weekends anyway and in the evenings he children are in bed!</p>
	<p>I would not like to see services delivered in the evenings at the expense of existing services in the day, when people are involved in active childcare. It isn't a solution to close some centres and open others for longer hours - most parents, especially those in one-parent families, will struggle to access services in the evenings.</p>
	<p>I would be strongly opposed to existing youth services being provided at Children's Centres. Also, my support is conditional on what services would be provided.</p>

	Weekends - stay & play, especially for dads
	All of them?
	I don't. But had to answer to move on
	stay & play sessions
	Support for first time parents or parents of toddlers and fathers would be helpful at weekends to coordinate with work schedules.
	[NB Q22 has an error: there are tick-boxes (multi-choice) for 'Weekdays' but radio buttons (single choice) for the weekend days. That is going to screw up your results (I run academic surveys as part of my job; errors like this are evidence of poor piloting). Also lots of spelling errors.]
	A bit of everything.
	Support for working parents
	Access to wider health services, training courses,
	None

	Advice
	Weekdays are far more important
	Weekend family activities would be positive. Otherwise it seems this is not the best use of money.
	Childcare facility to support working parents, health advice
	stay and play
	None
	Evening are not practical for single parents who physically cannot attend any session bc bedtime and no support so quite a pointless idea.
	I think the whole idea of them is a waste of money
	None I would rather have a local centre with young children how would I use a children's centre in the evening?
	Playgroups and health services
	Breast feeding support and anything to do with health or welfare.

	<p>This is fantasy land. You have less money to go around and are proposing to close centres. Evenings and weekends are most important to working families - only some of which will also be those most in need. Why are you pretending this is about extending services when what you are really trying to do is save money? If the centres being closed are converted to KCAs and the opening hours of remaining centres are extended, what is the amount you expect to save? Where will the savings actually come from? In other words, what this consultation document should be emphasising is not what would we like, but what we are most prepared to lose.</p>
	<p>Same as during the week</p>

	<p>I do not agree that Sure start provision should be made available to anybody other than children. I refer you to my earlier expressed concerns about lone working and staff safety. The community hub model certainly wouldn't work in the centres I am familiar with.</p>
	<p>None-children are in bed then</p>
	<p>Same as week day</p>
<p>Online -16.07.2015</p>	<p>None x2</p>
	<p>Midwifery appointments would be useful at this time also services for working parents who may struggle to access services in working hours eg advice services. Some breastfeeding support may also be valued at weekends.</p>

	this would not be cost effective so don't see why this should be open
	Stay and Play sessions Workshop and Advice sessions
	Stay and play on weekends so working parents can attend and meet other parents; advice sessions, ESOL etc in the evenings so people who work can use them.
	I can see the benefit of evenings and weekends for training for those in work but otherwise I am not sure. Perhaps weekend emergency midwife/health visitor drop ins and drop in breastfeeding support would be helpful at the larger centres such as Woodlands Park
	Activities for older children and young adults.
	Where the services can only be delivered at that time, eg when the parent is available.

	After school club
	Breastfeeding support (weekends) Health visitor (Saturday) so I don't have to take a day off to get my child weighed!
	More activities in general
	health visitor appointments for those in full time work
Online- 03.08.2015	Haringey Council should go back to the drawing board, take their own scrutiny committee's decision to keep children's centres open into account, instead of ignoring this recommendation. Listening to and working with campaigners who have worked out alternatives that can be funded, would also be a very good step in the right direction!

	<p>I am shocked and saddened to hear that the Ladder Children's centre is under threat as I am certain that if you looked at the density of new and expectant parents there would be a hotspot on the ladder. There are other centres that I am sure would be better options to close. Every time I go to the Ladder it is vibrant, filled with parents and children. When I first went there for an antenatal appointment I remember how friendly and welcoming it was. DO NOT CLOSE THE LADDER CHILDRENS CENTRE. It is much cleaner and better kept than the other's that I have been to as well. The state of the toilets at the Triangle (no soap ANYWHERE TO BE FOUND, no toilet paper and a puddle of dirty water on the toilet floor) are downright disgusting and a health hazard.</p>
	<p>I strongly oppose the closure of any children centre. My view is that , the closure of any centre would adversely affect the lives of families. It would also damage many lives.</p>
	<p>The Early Years are the most critical stage of a child's life. All the evidence suggests that should a child fall behind in terms of their personal and academic development at this point, it is hard for them to catch up with their peers. This is particularly the case for children from low-income communities, which are heavily represented in Haringey. Proposed cuts need to bear the evidence in mind and other areas</p>

	<p>should be considered from a money-saving point of view, not Early Years. I believe the Children's Centres in Haringey offer critical services and support to the families that need them the most. They need to stay open and remain focused on the important 0-5 period, not diluted in terms of what they offer so that a greater number of people (potentially up to the age of 25) receive lower quality services. This is so important to the future of Haringey and its residents as so much stems from being able to offer the right support to different groups of people at the right times - a healthy and resilient community, community cohesion and individuals who can effectively contribute to the future of this borough.</p>
Hard copies, week ending 03.07.2015	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training 2. Same services as in the week - childcare will be important
Hard copies, week ending 10.07.2015	<p>Stay & Play - Childcare - Playgroup - For fathers - Stay & Play at weekends would enable more working parents to establish positive playing with children plus meet other parents</p>
Hard copies, week ending 17.07.2015	None x2
	childcare
	Childcare and adult courses in the evening

	Childcare training - first aid and food hygiene
	Children's group activities
	Stay & Play
	parents' support group
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.2015	Family support
	Support for fathers
	family events
	parenting programmes
	None x3
	Stay and Play x 7
	Music group
	Family learning activities
	Social interaction for pre-school children

	Children's centre to be open in the evening all the time
	Family activities
	mental health
	Childcare
	Advice sessions
	Parenting classes
	The most important for children to play with their friends at any time. Is more important than sitting at home
	Sports - exercise activity
	Stay and play with special features like outdoor activities, special guests, new topics, games etc
	Weekends - stay and play, breastfeeding support
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.2015	None

	fun days
	water play
	picnics
	opportunities to meet local parents
	ante-natal
	support for fathers (who often work day times)
	childcare service
	ante-natal and health visiting services would be useful on Saturdays
	childcare
	Adult training
	The curriculum activities for older children
	activities/training for adults
Hard copies week ending 07.08.2015	Stay & Play x3, Parent support groups.

	Clubs, (art, etc.)
	Services for parents who work on weekends. Soft play for dads on weekends.
	Nutrition/meal time support.
	Antenatal sessions for working expectant mothers. Other than this , not really sure.
	None, if you can't afford to deliver your current weekday provision
	Family events
Hard copies, week ending 14.08.2015	Adult's classes/Parental support.
	If proposal to expand services to 0 - 19 years old are implemented then services for 5-19 years old should be offered at the evening and at the weekend.
	No x2
Hard copies, week ending 21.08.2015	Not really

	Stay and play and advice
	Family support
Online 07.09.2015	How are you going to deliver services over a longer week with less staff?
	Stay and plays. Information and advice
	Family Activities, there could be a small charge to cover costs or contribution to maintaining other groups or pay for services where people cant may a contribution.
	Parenting Programmes Stay and Plays to be able to socialise with other families who work during current operational hours.
	Stay and Plays as I work during the week and would like to access these activities and meet families with similar aged children. Parenting programmes too as during the week I cannot access such courses.
	Yes definitely!
	It would be incredibly beneficial to provide breastfeeding support outside of hours for mothers who are desperate for assistance. I also think it would be useful to provide parental support outside of hours. Stay and play on the weekends would be fantastic as it would mean fathers would be able to attend with their children as well when they often do not have the opportunity to do so.

	None at the cost of a poorer weekday service.
	Family activities.
	Health visitor appointments; antenatal care
	All those directed to parents particularly those in work
	The only service that I can think of is an emergency telephone helpline and breastfeeding sessions since waiting the weekend to breastfeed can sometimes make a significant difference.
Online 16.09.2015	I think it is great to give working parents the option to access children centre's after work should they need too. Children centre's should be accessible for parents who work full time too and on their days off (weekends) there should be options to attend a stay and play especially in winter months.
	Stay and play so that my husband can participate.
	Adult Courses and advice sessions could easily happen here.
	For weekends, the same services as during weekdays. This is because working parents have to concentrate time on weekends
	None - the kids are asleep in the evenings and at weekends my husband is around to help

	This should be a matter for individual children's centres/clusters to determine having regard to their local communities.
	Parent information and support groups
	Evenings are the time when I put my child to bed. Isn't that the case with most parents?
	I don't see the point in opening on weekends or evenings. No one needs this. Just keep the current children's centres open.
	At weekends, stay & play sessions particularly for fathers. In evenings, training and Health Visitor checks.
Online 22.09.2015	None at the expense of already-overstretched services. Most children are in bed in the evenings and their carers are at home with them. Given the financial challenges you are citing as the reason for the proposed closures, paying staff overtime to work on weekends doesn't seem sensible.
	Stay and Play for weekends, parenting classes and support groups for weekends and evenings
	antenatal and postnatal
	5-19 y/o activities. Music etc as they are out of school and need a focus.
	Stay and play
	A similar range of services as the rest of the week ... stay and play, baby weighing, breastfeeding support, nutritional advice, etc. Priority for

	accessing weekend services/appointments to be given to WORKING parents
	Stay and play or baby groups for people who feel isolated and cannot attend weekday sessions.
	Information services, training courses and stay and play (weekend only).
	Stay and play sessions or advice for parents
	These questions are for parents and will depend on their needs. It does not seem realistic to offer extended open times while at the same time proposing to close a number of Children's Centres. Staffing will clearly be an issue and additional cost.
	Stay and play or learning programmes

26) Do you have any comments on our proposal to establish parent engagement forums?

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online-7.07.2015	Whilst I support parental engagement in the running of centres, this already exists. I'm not sure how well they are attended ' how much engagement there is. The establishment of any additional bodies should not divert resources from the activities provided within the centres.
	It's difficult to maintain parents' engagement as there are many other commitments.
	I met thee outreach worker in the local park who encouraged me to attend the children centre
	Need good relationship building in the centres
	Only useful if you listen to their ideas and proposals and take action on them, not just lip service.
	As long as it does not created an added complication on the normal running on the centre, parents input it can be very beneficial. However the more governing bodies and complicated hierarchy it could be contra

	productive.
	These forums need to be parent friendly - CAB Meetings are not
	The money going to fund this could well remain in effectively run children's centres.
	Children's centres should be run by staff who have experience in running them my by parents!
	Make them meaningful. Listen to parents.
	Yes stop wasting money
	Only if they have real powers and are not just there to give ok to your service reduction plans
	No x2
	Rather than adding a layer of bureaucracy, to which precious funds will be diverted, give the funds to the centres, which - at least in the case of

	Woodlands, I can't speak for the other centres - already have robust parent engagement mechanisms such as a board of governors - in place.
	Not a lot of faith in LBH - another level of bureaucracy. Will Officers attend meetings and if they do will they be punctual and have the necessary work done. Seen this happen too often.
	Can we join?
	What on earth is a parent engagement forum and how is it proposed to be run. Explain your jargon and acronyms please
	Yes - yet more taxpayers' money wasted. People should be able to manage to find things to do with their children themselves its not for the taxpayer to fund these things. Enough has been wasted on these pointless initiatives.
	Some of the children's centres already have parent forums e.g. woodlands park parent fundraising group, parents groups etc.
	You can't just ask questions like this. You need to explain what the existing governance and parental/family engagement mechanisms are;

	<p>what the evidence is as to whether they are working and where improvements might most be needed; how your proposals would address weaknesses; and the cost implications of your proposed changes. Advisory boards and engagement forums sound positive, but these phrases cannot be sensibly judged without the appropriate context and detail. Which your consultation paper does not provide.</p>
	<p>Would be useful ensure the right services are being supported</p>
	<p>This is a piece of nonsense and it will never happen. It's the only thing in the consultation document that passes for an idea and yet knowing the terrain and the staff, and the political will, I just know it won't ever take place. Isn't that sad?</p>
	<p>You've put questions on this survey without explaining what they are, therefore it's impossible to have an opinion. What are parent engagement forums? What is CCAB?</p>
<p>Online -16.07.2015</p>	<p>Properly advertise and engage with parents. this consultation has been very poorly advertised</p>

	there isn't enough info on this to comment
	These could helpful but they should not be a substitute for the work that professionals do
	These should have been established year ago before the proposals set out in this consultation. It's ridiculous that Haringey are only now proposing this 'establishment' when all Haringey children's centres are already engaging with stakeholders in many forums and CABs are doing the partnership work effectively with negligible support from the local authority.
Online – 03.08.2015	Haringey Council should go back to the drawing board, take their own scrutiny committee's decision to keep children's centres open into account, instead of ignoring this recommendation. Listening to and working with campaigners who have worked out alternatives that can be funded, would also be a very good step in the right direction!

I am shocked and saddened to hear that the Ladder Children's centre is under threat as I am certain that if you looked at the density of new and expectant parents there would be a hotspot on the ladder. There are other centres that I am sure would be better options to close. Every time I go to the Ladder it is vibrant, filled with parents and children. When I first went there for an antenatal appointment I remember how friendly and welcoming it was. DO NOT CLOSE THE LADDER CHILDRENS CENTRE. It is much cleaner and better kept than the other's that I have been to as well. The state of the toilets at the Triangle (no soap ANYWHERE TO BE FOUND, no toilet paper and a puddle of dirty water on the toilet floor) are downright disgusting and a health hazard.

	<p>I am shocked and saddened to hear that the Ladder Children's centre is under threat as I am certain that if you looked at the density of new and expectant parents there would be a hotspot on the ladder. There are other centres that I am sure would be better options to close. Every time I go to the Ladder it is vibrant, filled with parents and children. When I first went there for an antenatal appointment I remember how friendly and welcoming it was. DO NOT CLOSE THE LADDER CHILDRENS CENTRE. It is much cleaner and better kept than the other's that I have been to as well. The state of the toilets at the Triangle (no soap ANYWHERE TO BE FOUND, no toilet paper and a puddle of dirty water on the toilet floor) are downright disgusting and a health hazard.</p>
	<p>I strongly oppose the closure of any children centre. My view is that, the closure of any centre would adversely affect the lives of families. It would also damage many lives.</p>
	<p>The Early Years are the most critical stage of a child's life. All the evidence suggests that should a child fall behind in terms of their personal and academic development at this point, it is hard for them to catch up with their peers. This is particularly the case for children from low-income communities, which are heavily represented in Haringey. Proposed cuts need to bear the evidence in mind and other areas</p>

	<p>should be considered from a money-saving point of view, not Early Years. I believe the Children's Centres in Haringey offer critical services and support to the families that need them the most. They need to stay open and remain focused on the important 0-5 period, not diluted in terms of what they offer so that a greater number of people (potentially up to the age of 25) receive lower quality services. This is so important to the future of Haringey and its residents as so much stems from being able to offer the right support to different groups of people at the right times - a healthy and resilient community, community cohesion and individuals who can effectively contribute to the future of this borough.</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 03.07.2015</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not going to work with bust lifestyles 2. Need to be paid 3. A token payment / certificate 4. They could support first line of engagement to 1st time parents, and introductory sessions for mothers and fathers from abroad
<p>Hard copies, week ending 17.07.2015</p>	<p>No x2</p>
	<p>None</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 24.07.2015</p>	<p>Not in evenings but in the daytime and flexibility to bring young children</p>

	I hope you will find that they want to keep all the centres open.
	No x2
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.2015	I think it is a good idea.
	None
	I think parent forum is important to have in each centre.
	I would like to be involved
Hard copies, week ending 07.08.2015	?
	That you need to explain what they are before asking this question.
	No.
	I think it's good but we promote and intensify isolation.

Hard copies, week ending 14.08.2015	Encourage old parents (in all abilities)
	This should include broad spectrum of parents with children of varying ages.
Hard copies, week ending 21.08.2015	No x5
	To help parents understand the services and what they are setting
	I think it is a good idea.
	Not really
Online 07.09.2015	Both selection and self-selection can be difficult; good in theory, but in practice can be divisive, Needs good advice and ongoing support.
	I would be interested in becoming involved. It is difficult to comment on these proposals without knowing exactly what is proposed.
	You should be already engaging parents in bettering your services. It's tokenism to offer a voice to people who will have very little positive services to support.
	Need to ensure as far as possible they are representative of all communities

Online 16.09.2015	There should absolutely be a parents panel and it should be held at convenient locations and times so parents can attend these meetings. You should have them on weekends and evenings if necessary so that working parents can attend also.
	I think the resources spent on this and CCABs, which will be bureaucratic, could be better spent keeping front line services open
	I'd like to be convinced that these will actually use the parents' advice rather than them being a 'tick box' exercise in democracy; they should be accountable to children via their parents.
Online 22.09.2015	I see no point in funding new ventures when existing, worthwhile ones are at risk and overstretched.
	Great idea to bring community together.
	Sounds like a waste of money!
	I am not quite clear about what the CCAB involves and the role and role limitations linked to it...
	They're not proved to be beneficial. It will be the same people getting involved - those from middle earning families not representative of the wider community and be a talking shop for the most advantaged in the community who will make decisions in their own interests. This the problem with engagement - tokenistic and marginalised communities are not involved. This won't lead to any power but mere involvement, with no autonomy

	<p>What is the reason for establishing new advisory boards when four already exist. There are currently parent forums in most if not all Centre - and these should be maintained.</p>
--	---

27) If interested in being involved in running a group, please specify:

Time period and source	Summary of comments
Online 03.07.2015	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NA 2. I would like to start a committee to oversee wasteful expenditure by the LBH 3. you only want volunteers to cut staff 4. I already do some volunteering at my children's centre 5. I would do any of the above if I didn't work full time with 2 young children 6. NO 7. Gardening club, new parenting club, stay and messy play, story time 8. Support for parents from Roma, Gypsy, Traveller communities 9. None - the centres should be run to support parents not run by them 10. Nutrition Advice 11. Breastfeeding Peer Support 12. Music + Baby Clinic
Hard copies, week ending 03.07.2015	Not going to work with bust lifestyles

	<p>Need to be paid</p> <p>A token payment / certificate</p> <p>They could support first line of engagement to 1st time parents, and introductory sessions for mothers and fathers from abroad</p>
Hard copies, week ending 10.07.2015	None
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.2015	maybe interested in volunteering in the community or running a group or service in the community
	breastfeeding peer support
	running a group - nutrition advice
Hard copies, week ending 31.07.2015	ESOL
	Music production
Hard copies week ending 07.08.2015	Maybe once my baby will be bigger.
Online 22.09.2015	music group early years



	single mothers networking
	I already run a mutual support network for local parents
	we used to run a French speaking group (but not in a children centre)
	You must engage those who desperately need the service, not those who want to get into a good school

Q28. Should you have any further comments around any of the proposals please attach them on the separate sheet of paper provided.

Time and source	Summary of comments
Online-07.07.2015	I also attended activities at Stroud Green Primary School, which does not appear to be listed - unless it has an alternative name. Again, I re-iterate that the larger centres with good public transport should be retain to ensure the maximum number of residents can attend. If the space taken up by centres on primary schools is required for more school places, this should be made clear. Residents should be given priority before childminders, especially where activities are over prescribed. If the number of children centres are to be reduced, then the facilities should focus on children, below high school ages (especially if sites are located on primary school sites). Other services can be provided at other Council facilities including libraries and Council offices. Some of the services listed as being possibly provided are provided by the GP. The save resources they should be provided by one or the other, not both.
	no
	I feel that these proposals are short sighted and do not take into account the needs of the children and families within the Tottenham

	<p>area. Despite saying that investment in early help is happening this is a clear sign to the opposite. From my perspective, child in need and child protection plans will not progress as smoothly as they currently do without the current level of children's centre staff - they are the people who do the day-to-day ground work with our families, which we as social work practitioners are not able to do. Further, there is going to be an emphasis on the mental health of mothers during pregnancy and post-birth, as per the recent NICE guidance. Children's centres provide the perfect opportunity and place for many of these signs and symptoms to be identified and early intervention put in place. This is but one example of the fundamental work our children's centres do. Please re-consider these proposals as a matter of urgency, as they are taking away from the people who most need them. There are staff in the children's centres due to be closed that have knowledge and experience that you cannot train and losing them would be sad and detrimental to the services Haringey are trying to deliver.</p>
	<p>As I said, these services were invaluable to me when I first had my daughter and I have since meet and maintained friendships with many other mum's and children using these services. I cannot praise the staff at these centres highly enough they were so amazing and supportive whilst I was on maternity leave and I would recommend them to any</p>

	new mum in the area!
	I am concerned about the proposal that the lead person is the seven sisters network does not have early years experience but is a youth person. I think this will lead to a move away from an early years focus in that network area.
	I appreciate that there needs to be cuts, however closing centres than run very well (i.e. Stonecroft) and provide an extended number of services and supports the community in many aspects because there are other centres that need to be enhance and improve it does not sound like a solution to me. Stop using agency staff (temps) that cost a fortune, employ and train the staff as relevant for each centre. And do not close the centres or reduce services when it provides excellent results. Focus on the ones that need improvement and on the root of the problem. No because you have you have less centres open the result is going to be a reduce cost if they are not run effectively.
	The new proposals will mean that less staff and resources will be available to support more families. The role of the Centre managers will be unmanageable unless the expectations of what Centres can offer is lowered drastically. This consultation form was not suitable for staff

	(just parents)
	<p>Please do not close down children centres mindlessly and without any thought for the community. In a council building you do not see 'our local' needs and do not really qualify to determine what services and centres are needed by us as parents and users. Even David Cameron's speech for today has stressed the importance of putting together a much more coherent support for parents and children in the early years. How is closing these much needed centres and stopping these services conducive to the vision of the prime minister or providing us with the 'coherent' support that we need? I hope this survey will be taken into consideration and not ignored like previous surveys and consultations when the opinions and thoughts have not coincided with the wants of the council.</p>
	<p>As commented earlier I am fed up with services in our area being cut back. My young child should be able to attend a nursery or Children's Centre within walking distance. Young people can get careers advice at the Job a Centre and many of the other services can be accessed in other places too. Stop penalising hard working parents. Look into the causes of why these areas have higher need rather than trying to deal with the results. First all our stay and play sessions vanished now we</p>

	<p>face the closures of our centres altogether with the argument that others apparently need them more. We all need them, all our children need them and deserve them.</p>
	<p>Children with special needs require positive role models. It is vital that children's centre cater for all children from all backgrounds so that all children have positive role models from the community they live in to learn from. Focusing children's centres around only children who meet a children type or threshold will not assist the wider community</p>
	<p>I do not feel that much has been done to communicate the consultation. Although staff have done their best to engage parents, more needs to be done to ensure that a representative number of parents/users are aware of what is happening and can meaningfully respond. In addition, the timing of the consultation, principally over the school holidays, is unfortunate (some might say cynical). Overall I think the proposals seem to be a reasonably considered way of dealing with the cuts that Haringey is facing, but there is a lack of detail. Children's centres are key to having an integrated community and providing vital support to parents. It is not clear how the extended use proposals (to older children) is intended to work, or what will be on offer.</p>

	Please do not close South Grove. They support and know so much. I am disabled and live close. I need them and my kid needs them.
	This consultation process is completely flawed as this questionnaire only asks a couple of questions about the closing of centres and the rest is about what we would like to see in the proposed centres.
	I wouldn't support volunteering at a centre to replace paid staff.
	This whole proposal is an unmitigated mess. Go back to the drawing board. Don't close basic services and then spend money on nonsense like Haringey 50th celebrations.
	My whole family and other local parents are outraged by the short-sited and heartbreaking decision to close these children's centres that are so valuable for children and families.
	Yes I find you have wasted a lot of money celebrating the 50 year anniversary of LBH.
	I am a grandmother of an autistic and severely delayed granddaughter, I also worked for 45 years in the NHS with babies and children with brain pathologies; it is essential for our society that every help is given to mothers and fathers so that the next generation reaches their potential.

	Do not cut these vital services.
	It is very bad that the council are reducing support to people. I agree that money is short, but you are making wrong decisions with the money there is. You need to put support to people first I hear from the newspaper that you are giving a chicken restaurant hundreds of thousands of pounds. That could be better spent on children's centres.
	I understand cuts need to be made but of all the things to cut, children's services seem like the most short-sighted proposals imaginable. For every pound invested in early education, the state saves multiple pounds later on in the child's life. Take funds away from daft self-promotion initiatives like the absurd Haringey People magazine (gah) and the 50th Anniversary of Haringey celebrations (how can those things *possibly* be more important than children's welfare? Seriously?!) Children's centres are one of the key ways - if not the only way, for many families - that people connect with important services, which is all the more important when they are from immigrant backgrounds / have low educational attainment / don't have a great grasp of English. Cutting these services will hurt more than just children.

	<p>Children are our future and something as simple as stay and play is incredibly important for child's development and mother. Without it women can descend into depression and who knows the long term affects on babies without. Plus its relatively low cost compared to your other services.</p>
	<p>Typical survey by Haringey rigged to favour your obvious intentions. In a borough like Haringey, no children's centres should ever be closed.</p>
	<p>BH opened these as Children Centres and should be retained as such.</p>
	<p>Don't understand what the community centres would be, so ticked no opinion on Q7, as it depends on what they'd be!</p>
	<p>I found it really frustrating that there is no way of recording what services I used when my son was younger - your questionnaire assumes that everyone who is answering has young children.</p>
	<p>It is disgraceful that children's centres in areas that really need them are being closed down. I am against all the closures, but I cannot imagine there is an area that needs a children's centre much more than the area The Ladder Children's Centre serves. It has been vital in forging a community in Harringay - before it opened there was very little for</p>

	<p>parents of small children in the area - and I have witnessed remarkable examples of people accessing services there who otherwise might not have been able to. It is a vital community resource and I strongly wish that the council would listen to their own scrutiny commission's decision to keep children centres open and rethink their decision for the good of the community. The community whose lives they are supposed to make better, not worse...</p>
	<p>Childrens centres are still the best option. They offer safe and secure, fully staffed and resourced options for all sections of the community. Stand up for them, and if necessary increase council tax - lots would support that move.</p>
	<p>Save our Children's Centres x5</p>
	<p>Save our children</p>
	<p>I am not a parent but I am appalled that some of these vital services might be lost whilst the Council prioritise spending on non-essentials such as the 50th anniversary events. It would make sense to take your own scrutiny committee's decision to keep them open into account instead of ignoring it and listen and work with campaigners who have</p>

	worked out alternatives that can be funded.
	I already volunteer in the local community. Instead of wasting money on a half centenary anniversary, LBH have very little to celebrate (Victoria Climbe, Baby P to mention a couple of instances, 2 race riots, and on it goes...) use the money to keep all the present children's centres open.
	Do not close any children centres. Less centres cannot accommodate more parents and children however cleverly you spin things round. Parents need services to be close to them. Travelling long distance because children centres have closed is not practical for mothers of young children who need nearby support and for whom this immediate support can make a significant difference. This whole proposal is damaging our communities.
	services for young people with SEND need to be provided in an age appropriate way. I am not sure many young people with SEND in their 20's would be very impressed at going to get careers advice/housing advice etc from a children's centre.
	Please don't waste money on things like the council magazine and 50th anniversary celebrations - please divert it to keep these centres open. They will only be used if they are local to the people that need them. It

	<p>is difficult for new parents to travel far in order to get help with things like breastfeeding.</p>
	<p>Haringey has a well documented recent history of child care gone wrong. The only way to turn that around is to make sure that those who have less of an online voice (poorer families, families that have ESOL, young mums etc), less of an education and less community awareness are actually bought *too* the centres so that all 9 are used at capacity and that those most in need get the support so that the chances of horrific incidences of abuse are drastically reduced. Sadly the majority of people who will be most affected by these closures are the very people who aren't aware of them or who simply won't be capable of filling out surveys like these or be part of parent advocacy groups, they are indeed the silent majority. I say this as someone who's worked closely with Government Digital Services and has seen first hand how the very people we're supposed to be supporting, miss out because their backgrounds or circumstances mean they don't have a voice. I also recently witnessed this at the Whittington Labour ward where there was a large percentage of new families/mums that clearly would need strong postnatal community support. To be blunt, if Haringay is taking the longer term view on the health of its constituency, it should be putting more into looking after families from an early age, that's the best</p>

	<p>chance you have of breaking bad cycles.</p>
	<p>Haringey desperately needs to stop messing with things that are working well - The Ladder centre is good for local residents, works well for children and is easily accessed by foot - why change something that works?</p>
	<p>Children Centres are an integral part of any neighbourhood. They are key to create a sense of community and let children interact with each other. Easy and quick access is key esp for parents that don't have cars or don't want to spend long time on public transport for a 1 h play session. Closing any of those centres should be the absolute last resort and at the very bottom of any cost reduction programme. I cannot believe that the Council is unable to find the necessary savings in other areas. Therefore I strongly oppose your intention to close the centres.</p>
	<p>My children are now at school but it cannot be underestimated how important the Ladder Children's Centre was to my family in the early years. Stay and Play sessions, and the various advice programmes, were absolutely crucial for us, and since these were expensive in the private sector - and largely focused on the wealthier areas nearby (Crouch End & Stoke Newington) hard to access for those without their own transport. Crucially, it was also the only place where the various</p>

strands of the community - in terms of class and ethnic background - came together. I know that for my family - reasonably middle class - it was a hugely rewarding experience, and in terms of social cohesion in the borough, and fostering a sense of community, the Ladder Children's Centre did a huge amount. The staff and outreach workers clearly had great access to families who might have been trapped at home (stay and play, etc, provision is/was expensive - and the closure of Jamboree in Finsbury Park was a huge blow in that sense too) and you could see the superb work being done by the local authority in spreading information, and dealing with families' problems early and effectively. My fear is that the closure of ANY of these centres will cost infinitely more down along the line. Parents of babies and small children NEED somewhere to go; middle class, moderately well off parents, who can afford to hang out in cafes all day are very visible but do NOT represent a majority of the population in the Ladder area. In an area where many children are raised in fairly parlous circumstances in terms of housing, having a safe place to go to with children - and a place where advice is given and services offered - is huge. With so many people in the area also speaking English as a second language - if at all - it is also a massive help in bringing communities together, and fostering an inclusive atmosphere in the borough. I remember me and my wife

	<p>having an extraordinary three way conversation (English-Turkish-Urdu) about dental care in the Ladder Centre (where the staff were always superb, friendly, and well set up to speak in all community languages) which was for us symbolic of everything good about the Children's Centre. People in the early years are incredibly vulnerable, and with a lot of single-parent families, and economic deprivation, I am sure the centre massively enriched people's lives and - more importantly - gave parents from all backgrounds a sense that someone, somewhere, was looking out for them. Once more - don't let house prices on the Ladder and pushy parents blind you to the fact there are plenty of people in need - Children Centres are hugely important, and I am convinced that they save money in the long run. The people who need these centres most are also not the ones who tend to fill in forms like these.</p>
	<p>I have used two Children's centres in the past. Woodlands park and the Ladder. The standard of care of the children was shocking with injuries and neglect being covered up by nursery staff. the other 'softer' services such as stay and pay etc should not be government funded. if people have children they should be able to find ways to to entertain them etc themselves. Also there is plenty of private childcare available if people show initiative to go and find jobs to pay for it! but its all too easy for some people to sit around all day at tax payers expense!! these</p>

	centres should Never have been opened at all. Shocking ! I say this as a mother of two children under 7.
	It is despicable that you may be even considering charging for children centre services. It is the government's duty to provide community services such as this that are vital for women and children. Everyone, including yourselves- will pay the price for your ego centred actions that put money above all. The council and all its members always have another choice- that it to resist the cuts and object to central government which I and many many others can see Haringey not doing.
	Other than what I have stated in previous answers, please reconsider closing the children's centres, they are there to serve the youngest in society and I believe that their role really matters and makes a difference. In the early few months of new motherhood they were the first places I went for support and I am very thankful for them. As it is not clear what the alternatives are and whether the services will be as thorough I cannot comment.
	I did not understand what you meant by children's centres planning areas so could not answer this question

	<p>A scandalously poor consultation. Deeply dishonest, more concerned to spin cuts as improvements than to help people understand what the choices are as a result of reduced funding. No financial information about the implications of proposals that will inevitably cost money (as restructuring always does), demoralise and confuse overstretched staff (as restructuring always does) and disappoint anyone naive enough to be distracted by questions about what more we want, when your focus seems to be to make cuts. My local centre is the Ladder, I used to be a school governor at South Haringay Infants so I know the buildings and staff and think it would be a great shame to lose it. But that isn't really the point. The point is that you are putting forward proposals without disclosing the analysis behind them (I hope you've at least done that analysis and are just not disclosing it), and without highlighting that the real issue is WHAT WILL BE LOST, not what might be gained.</p>
	<p>Six weeks of the 12 week statutory consultation will take place in the school holidays. Well done Haringey. The money spent on fighting and losing High Court challenges would keep a few Children's Centres open!</p>
	<p>I'm disgusted that venerable children will be the victim of cuts.</p>

Online-16.07.2015	Closing the centres and increasing the amount of people serviced by the centres will create further child protection issues and the centres are not equipped or trained to work with any children above five years old
	I feel it is likely that many Childrens' centres have become less heavily used in recent years, as the number of services they provide has been significantly reduced. When I had my first child in 2009 I relied heavily on the services provided by local centres - largely stay and play groups, breastfeeding support and advice groups - and found them to be a lifeline. Since then I have not been able to use them as much as there were not as many services to use, nor have I felt as confident recommending them to other parents. This is a waste of a resource and of possibilities to improve the health and wellbeing of families and children in Haringey. I hope any future proposals will see all these centres being used in some productive way for the health and wellbeing of Haringey families.

	<p>keep Campsbourne open - it is much needed and I have used for my last two children and want to use for my latest addition</p>
	<p>There is not sufficient funding to support the proposals. The consultation on making centres more effective should have happened before cuts were made. The timing of this consultation is particularly cynical as it falls at the end of term and during times when many centres and all school-based centres are closed. This is a pattern in Haringey - the previous 'consultation' was poorly promoted and fell during the Christmas holidays to ensure as little consultation as possible.</p>
	<p>I do not support the closure of children's centres in Haringey. Please stop targeting children.</p>
	<p>What do you mean by a key community access point? This is a vague term that could mean anything so it is impossible to have an opinion on. More consultation and explanation is required.</p>

	<p>This planned redistribution flies in the face of population trends. Although the last census was some time ago, casual observation suggests an increasing number of children frequent facilities such as parks. Moreover, night and weekend will likely to incur extra costs which defeat the purpose of closures in the first place. i.e. to make savings.</p>
	<p>Vulnerable parents and children can't be expected to travel through half the borough when they are in situations of distress to access support. It makes sense to reduce the number of centres but the list should be reviewed to get a better geographical spread.</p>
	<p>There would be a gulf in services from highgate to bounds green, and from the north circular to horsey. The area needs one more centre to stay open at least. I am disgusted that it is in these areas the government is making cuts, but given they are happening please don't waste the money you do have on job training for school leavers - that should not be a role of the children' centres at all</p>
<p>Online-03.08.2015</p>	<p>Haringey Council should go back to the drawing board, take their own scrutiny committee's decision to keep children's centres open into account, instead of ignoring this recommendation. Listening to and working with campaigners who have worked out alternatives that can</p>

	<p>be funded, would also be a very good step in the right direction!</p>
	<p>am shocked and saddened to hear that the Ladder Children's centre is under threat as I am certain that if you looked at the density of new and expectant parents there would be a hotspot on the ladder. There are other centres that I am sure would be better options to close. Every time I go to the Ladder it is vibrant, filled with parents and children. When I first went there for an antenatal appointment I remember how friendly and welcoming it was. DO NOT CLOSE THE LADDER CHILDRENS CENTRE. It is much cleaner and better kept than the other's that I have been to as well. The state of the toilets at the Triangle (no soap ANYWHERE TO BE FOUND, no toilet paper and a puddle of dirty water on the toilet floor) are downright disgusting and a health hazard.</p>
	<p>I strongly oppose the closure of any children centre. My view is that , the closure of any centre would adversely affect the lives of families. It would also damage many lives.</p>
	<p>The Early Years are the most critical stage of a child's life. All the evidence suggests that should a child fall behind in terms of their personal and academic development at this point, it is hard for them to catch up with their peers. This is particularly the case for children from</p>

	<p>low-income communities, which are heavily represented in Haringey. Proposed cuts need to bear the evidence in mind and other areas should be considered from a money-saving point of view, not Early Years. I believe the Children's Centres in Haringey offer critical services and support to the families that need them the most. They need to stay open and remain focused on the important 0-5 period, not diluted in terms of what they offer so that a greater number of people (potentially up to the age of 25) receive lower quality services. This is so important to the future of Haringey and its residents as so much stems from being able to offer the right support to different groups of people at the right times - a healthy and resilient community, community cohesion and individuals who can effectively contribute to the future of this borough.</p>
Hard copies	<p>Don't close</p> <p>Concern around space</p>
Hard copies, week ending 03.07.2015	To save our children centre.
	Save our children's centre. Please think about the children
	Save our children's centre. Don't turn out the lights on our children's future.



Hard copies, week ending 10.07.2015	It is vital for parents to have access to free and good quality activities
Hard copies, week ending 17.07.2015	Keep All
	Please do not close SGCC I don't know much about other centres
	Don't close the CCs
	Save our children's centre
	Save all centres
	Please keep our children's centres open XX
	I am sorry to say that this is a severely flawed consultation document. Its is essential that consultation are accompanied by information that enables respondents to make informed decision. There is no information contained here about what's key community access points are what children's centres planning areas are. the implication of extending children's centres to young people up to 19 potential charges for children's centres there is also no information about current usage and demand for services in Haringey. Please can somebody respond to

	this concern.
	To save our children's centre.
Hard copies, week ending 24.07.2015	I am very strongly opposed to the closure of any children's centres. They are vital to so many parents, carers and children in the community. Maybe consider making cuts elsewhere.
	It would be nice as well, if at every stay and play, there should be a health that can advise parents on several health issues
	I love Tottenham. Please look after it.
	Sad that you don't realise how this is going to affect so many parents. Please don't close any children's centres.
	Children's centres should remain open because they provide valuable resources for the community.
	I understand that the Tories will continue to attack public services for the next five years but cutting children's services are just as bad as bedroom tax or cutting disability services. How so they expect to build a new generation of hard-working consumers if all the children have

	inadequate brain development and socialisation.
	No.
	Where I have said no opinion is because I do not fully understand the proposal. I think I can see the benefit of having the main areas but I still struggle to understand why the centre will be closed in the first place. Is it that actually they will still be providing the same service under a different umbrella?
	Closed children's centres, will be delivering 2YO, stay and play, health appointments and advice sessions. How is this possible? Which staff will be covering these centres? Sure start and children's centres has been prevention on the last ten years. the impact of closing some centres will be noticed soon and the realisation of what a bit mistake this is. Sounds to me that you think you can do as much as before with half iof the centres and half of the staff. Impossible. All stretch to the max as it is, it won't work and lots of families will miss out.
	CCs are a vital part of the prevention and early intervention strategy. As research shows, the money invested will prevent future spending. I support the idea of parents paying for certain services as they have to

	<p>in other London boroughs. Nevertheless, I believe they should be means tested: there are CCs which are predominantly used by affluent parents who could afford even privately run services. This should obviously not result in segregation between parents who are on a good income and low income parents; it is just about how much parents/carers can contribute to enable services. Once registered with a CC, charging could be done discretely e.g. by using a member card to identify whether a parent or care can afford to pay. this will enable CCs to remain open and therefore remain in walking distance and services vital for children and their carers. another way to generate income is to bring in partners/services to utilise space and maybe even generate income through rent.</p>
<p>Hard copies, week ending 31.07.2015</p>	<p>Changing opening hours - I think it is ok as it is. Changing opening hours - with children under 3 (or single parents) this might be hard for parents for attend.</p>
	<p>Personally I think it's really sad what's going on here. As a person who has paid taxes here for some years, I am outraged at such proposals. Maybe cut the salary of the person who came up with the idea, maybe we can keep the centres open. Don't take from poor families and children, it's disgusting and morally wrong. so me and my family are</p>

	strongly against the proposals and strongly do not support gentrification.
Hard copies, week ending 7th August	No.
	Safeguarding children, splitting up community base. Horrid people!
	Please do not close our children's centre!
	I do not support closing The Ladder as I have been refused entry in other centres as they were full, and is important for stay + play for my child, as she has got no brothers or sisters
	I feel bad and not happy about The Ladder Children's Centre closing. I will miss the staff. The staff understand me; help look for jobs, advice.
Hard copies, week ending 14th August	Children centres are an asset to the community. Especially 0-5, which is a significant time in young children's development. These age parents need the most support before they are at school, also it is so important for the children to socialise and have supported quality play.
	If fees are introduced for some services these should be to cover costs and should be at a level that allows the service to still be accessible to

	<p>all. For example, stay and play sessions should be low cost as these are a great way for parents to entertain their children in an educational and social environment - often providing an alternative to expensive children's classes, without which the children may not get to socialise with other children easily. They also provide access to the other advice and service offerings, e.g. oral health kits.</p>
Hard copies weekending 21st August	None
	I would like Park Lane to stay open, because my child has been coming here to stay and play
	Please keep Park Lane open as they have been very helpful to me and my problems
	Park Lane, Pembury and Rowland Hill to stay open
Online 07.09.15	<p>Post natal care is far too superficial and more targeted, regular post natal visits should be happening in the first 3 months and particularly in the first 3 weeks. All women should be given breast feeding training. There is no current health checks for 1 and 2 year olds which I find astonishing – identify issues early on rather than wait for parents to be desperate of wait for schools to identify issues.</p>

	<p>Children Centres that are currently part of schools should be separated off so that governance and strategic planning is focussed on the children centre rather than being an addition to school governance but ccs and affiliated schools should liaise closely and where appropriate co-ordinate mutually beneficial events, campaigns etc. The council is being extremely short sighted about the significant cuts to the early years budget as the the negative consequences will be reaped for years to come.</p>
	<p>My children and I will be very upset if you close South Grove. Please rethink your proposals.</p>
	<p>I am mostly concerned at the effect of budgetary cuts, particularly as it affects young people.</p>
	<p>Haringey will loose vulnerable children without childcare centres such as Campsbourne. Local community knowledge of families and how to support them will be lost with the closure of centres such as Campsbourne. The already skeletal service provided by the local centres and the lack of support for the enthusiasm of local families who wish to do more doesn't leave much goodwill for wanting to be involved in supporting a thinly revamped service.</p>
Online 16.09.15	<p>I'd love to be in a position to volunteer but I need the Children Centres for childcare as I go to work. At the weekend I spend time with my children and don't have spare time to do so.</p>
	<p>What you do already is good - it doesn't need changing. As you're downsizing the children's library at marcus garvey it makes the children's centres in tottenham even more important</p>

	<p>You appear to have ignored the feedback to the previous consultation on this subject. There is barely reference to it. I for one submitted detailed comments and questions which remain, overwhelmingly, in point in relation to the present proposals. This is disappointing and frustrating. I would encourage you to take another look at that feedback. These proposals are not impressive and do not inspire confidence.</p>
	<p>I'm not exactly sure what is meant by a key access point. I think this needs to be explained a lot more specifically if it is being set out as an alternative to our local children's centre being open. It is very hard to know whether to agree with this or not when the description is so vague, and I fear it could turn out to be nowhere near as valuable a resource. When you have young children it is often the case that you need facilities to be within close walking distance. I think it is a real shame that the one centre that I would easily walk to (the ladder) faces closure, and within an area that is full of young children that can and do benefit from it.</p>
	<p>These centres currently provide an extremely important community service for families with babies and little children, as well as support for vulnerable parents with nowhere else to go. By extending the already over subscribed centres to cover a much wider area and offer services for 0-19 year olds, rather than specialist support for 0-5 year olds and their families, many parents and children will lose out on much needed support. Children's Centre have been a lifeline for me and my young daughter particularly for breastfeeding support & parent courses like</p>

	<p>baby massage where I have met other parents and babies</p>
	<p>The consultation period was over summer when many parents and families are away and schools are shut; drop-in sessions were entirely at inconvenient locations (we don't have a car) and / or at children's bedtimes. The consultation document is unclear on what services will be provided for children over 2.5, although it is proposed that the centres accommodate children up to 19 or 25. Early intervention is proven to give children a better start in life: it is short sighted to close the children's centres. There is nowhere else for families with pre-school aged children to go for the free services, support and advice offered by the Children's Centres. The first year as a new mother can be isolating, frightening and confusing. Without the children's centres the most vulnerable families will be hardest hit by these proposals, and women who have previously found support for domestic problems here incidentally whilst using other services will have nowhere else to go. Existing children's centre at Woodlands is already massively over-subscribed. I have often been turned away from stay and play sessions. Less confident families will be put off from returning if they know they can't get in. The proposed venues of community access points have no obligation to provide services once these changes have been made. 15 hours of services at the venue each week is not enough of an incentive. Free services are incredibly important for parents of new babies and mothers on maternity pay or no job. If you had to charge, only those who could afford it would go to sessions, and those too embarrassed to</p>

	<p>admit poverty would miss out. The consultation document seems to contradict Haringey Council's commissioned 2013 review on children's centres (point 2.1 in particular). There are already other venues for young people under 18 to access services including schools. Parents of 0-5 year olds don't have that option open to them. Haringey's Children's Centres are extremely valuable for the long-term health, resilience and development of Haringey's babies, and for the support they provide for families with young children. Don't close them.</p>
	<p>Keep the children's centres open. You are destroying our community and taking services away from children by closing them.</p>
	<p>I worry that if children's centres are opened up to all under 19yo, there will not be room for stay & play and other services. Also, bigger kids mixing with little ones brings some risks. The "community access points" seem very easy to cut down in the next wave of council saving needs, then - so if we close all those CCs now, I don't believe they will remain open with any services at all for very long.</p>
<p>Online 22.09.15</p>	<p>Regarding the proposal to extend services to 0-19s, my impression is: over 5s are, or should be, well served by their schools and colleges and it is 0-5s and their carers who are most in need of the invaluable support and services currently offered by the best centres, such as Woodlands Park. There are also significant differences in the needs of these age groups. Health services can and should easily continue to be provided by health centres and GP surgeries. There is nothing to be gained by providing a broader range of unnecessary services while axing essential ones.</p>

	<p>Please find a way to keep providing a free service to parents and children in the Bounds Green area.</p>
	<p>Considering there have already been cuts to health visitors and home visits in the borough (compared to neighbouring boroughs like Islington) I do not support these proposals in any way. Woodlands Park is already oversubscribed when you try to attend a session there - in fact workers there ask people living nearer the Ladder centre to try and use that instead, which suggests we need more staff and sessions for parents in this area, not less. I have travelled to other centres in the borough to access breastfeeding support when I need it - when you start breastfeeding you need that support ASAP - you can't wait a week until the session is closer to you. I would not have been able to continue breastfeeding without the support I received at the children's centres. Children's centres are invaluable for me and other parents in Haringey in accessing peer support and advice and staying sane. I've met many local parents through attending sessions at children's centres. I understand the council has a limited budget, but considering the high profile problems this borough has had with child protection in the last few years such as Peter Connelly and Victoria Climbié I think this proposal to reduce the amount of children's services and contact with parents is shocking. The initial idea behind children's centres was that they were for the whole community - I believe this is the best way for people needing support to access help without stigmatisation and encouraging people to meet others in their community. We are also losing out in terms of health care for children in this borough - Islington</p>

	<p>children receive a 1 year developmental check that picks up on any early potential issues - not only is this beneficial for the child but it saves money and complex work further down the line for the NHS and other agencies. Something like 50% of Tottenham children live in poverty. If any borough should be investing more in its children, not less, Haringey should be. This is an extremely short sighted proposal and I and many other parents I've spoken too are firmly against it.</p>
	<p>You have made what could have been a negative situation of closure of children's centres into a positive one. There will be longer opening hours, more activities on offer and to a much broader age range. The forums, if set up, are a cheap but great way to generate a feeling of community. And all for less money.</p>
	<p>South Grove is a particularly good children's centre. It serves a particularly difficult community and the staff have a good relationship with the community. To close this centre would lead to a lack of engagement with the most deprived children in the borough and their parents.</p>
	<p>Closing that many children centres is going to put a massive strain on the ones that will stay open. The groups and activities I have been to are usually overbooked and it is very difficult for people who turn up to be told that they cannot come in. Therefore, the way the few children centre remaining will deal with the demand is going to be very important. In that prospective, I cannot see how the centre can extend their help to 5 to 19 years old? is there any extra budget for that?</p>

	Major concerns about how the Community Access Points should work. Proposals seem unclear.
	The engagement forum will again be used by those parents and family with most agency, social capital and vested interests. You'll create further boundaries as parents will seek involvement to support their own interests i.e getting into a good school catchment area. It will facilitate the middle classes and those more inclined to get involved to be involved. The seldom heard groups will continue to be disengaged and be kept out by parents who have least need for using the services. It creates further social isolation, disparity and hierarchy of need
	You have not provided any statistics for current service delivery for us to understand the impact of the proposed changes. Further you haven't given any indication of the impact on the remaining centre's in providing staffing/support for the new community access points. Also how will they provide support for users outside of pre-school when this has never been their specialism? I am not happy that potential school leavers (16-19) are being rolled into this existing structure as they will not have access to the right support.
	These have been stated many times - there are huge concerns around safeguarding issues, loss of expertise, larger 'reach' areas, lack of face to face time, increase in responsibility for Governing Bodies in relation to sites they do not manage, huge expectations which cannot be met realistically.
	Having considered the proposals put forward in this consultation, Rokesly Infant Governing Body wish to put on record that we do not

support them for a number of reasons. In our view the restructure of staffing and services will not address the inadequacies of the Local Authority (LA) highlighted in the July 2015 Ofsted inspection carried out at Rokesly Children’s Centre. **Many of the issues raised in the inspection have been longstanding and have not been adequately addressed by the Local Authority since the Centre opened. The staffing restructure (as we understand at this point in time) excludes our entire current Children’s Centre staff from being considered for posts , resulting in a loss of local knowledge and expertise that it will take considerable time and effort to replace. Similarly the proposed resourcing will go no way to addressing the issue identified by Ofsted that “the centre is not financially well resourced by the Local Authority”.** In a climate of greater austerity at the LA and with the reduced budget for Children’s Centres, our view is that the proposals are not viable and will not improve outcomes for children or future Ofsted judgements about provision at the centre. We do not believe that we will be able to deliver an effective service or provide effective governance in these circumstances and are concerned about the further increase in already difficult burdens on school staff and resources. This decision we have made as a governing body to request de-designation of Rokesly as a Children’s Centre has been made with regret as we all believe strongly in the importance of Early Help and recognise the importance of Children’s Centres as a resource within our community. We remain committed to exploring the options for how the Children’s Centre building’s available rooms and amenities could be utilised to continue



	<p>to provide services to this end under a different model to the one proposed. We are interested in investigating alternative models of centre management and governance proposed by the Local Authority, not least the possibilities afforded by the LA taking on health commissioning that could be explored as well as commissioning external providers. We look forward to discussing the way forward with you.</p>
	<p>Please, please re-consider the impact the closures will have on families with young children</p>

Section C

Other written submissions

Submission 1:

Pembury House Nursery School & Children's Centre

Lansdowne Road, Tottenham, N17 9XE

Tel: 020 8801 9914 Fax: 020 8885 3714

Email: admin@pemburyhouse.haringey.sch.uk



Headteacher – [REDACTED]

21st September 2015

Dear [REDACTED],

We are writing to confirm that the Governing Body of Pembury House Nursery School **and Children's Centre** emphatically want to remain a nursery school and designated children's centre.

We do not accept the proposals for children's centres as set out in the consultation.

As a governing body, we cannot be responsible for safeguarding across the key sites as well as the designated centre.

Based on the work that we have been doing here for many years, we know that each **Children's Centre needs its own manager. It will be an impossible task for a manager to manage several sites effectively and safely** - cf Rokesly Children's Centre recent OfSTED report.

Among a long list of issues, we are concerned about:

- The introduction of Assistant Centre Managers - as they will end up doing the same jobs as Centre Managers and for less pay.



-The MEO role. This role is essential in order to provide evidence for Ofsted and yet has been removed. The role currently takes up 1 day per week per centre for someone who is just focused on this job and nothing else. Therefore, a Centre Manager who is managing several sites would need to spend several days per week doing this to the exclusion of all else including safeguarding work and supervision of staff. It will be impossible for anyone else in the proposed staffing structure, particularly the Centre Manager, to do this work.

-Safeguarding is not being given a high enough profile. Not enough consideration has been given to any aspect including the amount of time spent making referrals to social care and other related services and in attending safeguarding meetings e.g. case conferences and core groups. Surprisingly it has been suggested by Haringey Council that this is not the role of Children's Centre Staff and that only Family Support Workers need to attend these meetings. Family Support Workers do specialist work with small numbers of families, whereas Children's Centre staff work with a huge reach group and come across many vulnerable families who already have, or are in great need of, social care involvement.

- Children's Centres are a front line service and a vital part of Early Help. Children Centre staff are required to meet national expectations to work in partnership with key agencies and attend meetings for many of these families. Staff spend a lot of time working with families who walk in through the door. Face to face work is of paramount importance to both staff and families. This work will not be possible if a manager is responsible for more than one building. This will also impact adversely on safeguarding.

-Flexibility. Staff and the manager would be expected to move from one building to another as and when needed. This means that relationships with families and communication within a staff team will inevitably suffer - which will also impact on safeguarding.

We will submit a formal reply on the proposed staff restructure process by 9th October 2015.

Yours sincerely,

██████████ (Headteacher) and ██████████ (Chair of Governors) on behalf of the Pembury House Nursery School and Children's Centre Governing Body.



Submission 2: (By email 19th October 2015)

RESPONSE FROM PEMBURY HOUSE NURSERY SCHOOL AND GOVERNING BODY TO CHILDREN'S CENTRE PROPOSALS

The Governing Body confirms that Pembury wishes to remain a designated Children's Centre but does not agree with the proposals as set out in the Local Authority documents.

We do want the staff at Pembury Children's Centre to be considered for the posts available but are concerned that the staff have not been given sufficient information, have not had union or legal advice and do not fully understand what the outcomes will be for them.

We have responded, through the North East Tottenham Cluster, to the job descriptions for the posts and regard them to be inadequate.

We strongly disagree with the structure provided in the latest consultation document. We do not consider it to be safe for one manager to be responsible for more than one Centre. We recommend from our experience that each Centre needs its own Manager (PO3) who would also be the Early Intervention Officer - as is the case currently, in which case there would be no need in our view for Assistant Managers.

The Admin post has to include the ability to provide information and so should be an Admin/Information Officer (Sc 5) and each Centre should have this post. We are not clear about the roles of the Learning/Volunteering co-ordinator and Early Years Play Worker. Far more important is the Early Intervention Outreach Worker post which has been evaluated as SO1, and we should have more of these rather than Learning/Volunteering co-ordinators and Early Years Play Workers. Also Early Years Play Workers should be a scale 6 NOT a scale 4. As we have been saying from the beginning it is the face to face work with parents which is essential.

Each Centre needs to recruit and manage its own staff, including a Family Support Worker, and can work in clusters, as we have until now, to agree service delivery and build relationships with other agencies (and these already exist) in order to meet local needs effectively.



We question the need for Locality Managers. One person to co-ordinate the work of all the Centres across the Borough would be sufficient. Monitoring and Evaluation Officers are also missing from the structure. There could be two working across the borough and reporting to each of the groups of Children's Centres.

There is no mention in any document about Bruce Grove which is currently a link site with Pembury. What is the intention? Triangle CC has been identified as a member of the South East Tottenham group but it is far more realistic for Park Lane to be in this group as it is very close to Pembury and Triangle is not. Pembury and Park Lane have also been working well together.

Woodlands Park CC's point that CC teams should be integrated with Health visitors and Social Care should be explored further by the LA too.


The NLCs may be a convenient way to propose a structure but in practice it does not work. Thought needs also to be given to the number of families in each Children's Centre area. We also need a clear indication at this stage of what will be expected from each Children's Centre through an SLA.

Thank you for noting our concerns.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Submission 3:



Making life better for children, parents
and communities by bringing together:
▶ early education
▶ childcare
▶ health and family support

Rowland Hill Nursery School & Children's Centre

315, White Hart Lane, Tottenham, LONDON N17 7LT

[REDACTED]

21/09/2015

[REDACTED]

Haringey Council

River Park House

222 High Road

London N22 8HQ

Dear [REDACTED]

Re: Response to Statutory Consultation – Children's Centres

This letter sets out the formal response from Rowland Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre to the Council's proposals regarding children's centre provision in Haringey.

It is fortunate for Rowland Hill that the recommendation is that we become a designated children's centre, and that we will be able continue providing service to families in our locality, and will not be spread across multiple sites. We have already written to you confirming our agreement to become such a centre.



We do, though, have some general comments to make regarding the proposed changes.

The proposal to have centre managers responsible for multiple sites is one which we **believe should be reconsidered. Children's' centres** are complex places, providing a mix of services to families, many of whom are vulnerable and in need. The local centre based team provide continuity, consistency and strong support for families, which is invaluable all the time, but especially when they are in crisis.

The centre manager leads this and we know from our own experience that each **Children's Centre needs its own manager. It is the key role within the centre, ensuring** continuity for families and sound links to partner services. Handing centre management and all that entails regarding vulnerable families to peripatetic managers will not provide the early help and prevention of further problems. Who will be responsible for supporting families and ensuring they do not get lost in the new arrangements? What impact will this have on safeguarding?

There are also serious issues to consider in relation to the demands being placed on staff in this new structure which could be intensely stressful. We would urge councillors to think very hard indeed before approving this model.

It is regrettable that there seems to be a view that the centres' main role is to provide stay and play sessions. This is a gross misunderstanding, and we believe it will be a very demanding and stressful task for a designated centre and the manager to be responsible for several sites effectively and safely. Many things can happen on just one site as we know, which can take hours to resolve. There are particular issues such as record keeping, tracking vulnerable children and families, supervision meetings and other tasks allied to dealing with complex family support. How will this be managed in the new system?

The recent Ofsted inspection of Rokesley Children's Centre (14 – 15 July 2015) made an explicit reference to this problem of managing multiple sites. The inspectors commented:

The centre manager has a very good understanding of the centre's strengths and areas for development. Under her leadership, the centre is significantly improving access to services for families. However, the centre is not financially well resourced by the local authority. The situation is compounded because the manager is also responsible for another two centres in the locality and her time and effort are spread too thinly.



We would urge you to reconsider the plans, and provide at least the funding for a centre manager on each site to enable Early Help to work. This would go some way to reassure **people about the new model, and respond to the inspectors' clear concerns.** At the very least, the LA should consult governing bodies about the possibility of a shared funding arrangement or partnership approach to retain the centres under threat.

Early intervention and early help

It is widely acknowledged that children's centres are at the forefront of early help and early intervention, and you have told us that there will be a 'dotted line' link to school-based centres and a direct operational link to the LA centres. We cannot see how early help will work effectively in the proposed model. Who will ensure vulnerable families are **not lost or missed at the 'community access points'?** We do not believe the designated centre manager or the team he/she will lead can do this across multiple sites, and for the sake of a relatively small saving, early intervention with vulnerable families will be lost. How will work with the health visitors and other partners who support and know families be integrated into these centres? We would reiterate again that having a dedicated centre manager on each site would provide continuity, consistency and engagement with families. It is a false economy to make these cuts.

Safeguarding

The proposed model will bring additional pressures with regard to safeguarding on both **staff and governing bodies of designated children's centres and community access points.** Problems can arise anywhere, and the centre will need to follow up, record actions, attend meetings etc. Who will do all this work in the new structures and who will actually be accountable and to whom? We are concerned that the division of roles and responsibilities between governing bodies of different sites could cause friction especially should things go wrong. Are the systems robust enough to deal with this eventuality?

Partnership Working

Children's centres have built strong partnerships and relationships with other services. How will the LA work to ensure these will be sustained in the new model, especially where centres are losing their centre based staff. How will they be integrated into the new structures? Spending time building these relationships is vital, yet without it centres will not be effective. What we do know from our own experience is that someone needs to drive it and take responsibility for making the partnerships happen. This of course brings us back to the vital issue of centre leadership and clear, accountable governance. Having



centre based staff is vital for this, and we are urging the Council to think again and invest additional funds to ensure each centre has, at minimum, a dedicated manager on site. Cutting these will, we believe, prove to be a false economy and really impact adversely on the families we work to support.

Finally, Rowland Hill operates as an integrated and inclusive centre, combining high quality early education, care, family support, social inclusion, health and family learning. We hope Haringey will appreciate the impact the work has on children and families as much as they do.

██████████ and ██████████

Chair of Governors and Head Teacher, Rowland Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre



Submission 4:

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 21 September 2015 08:27

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Draft reply to [REDACTED] re Children's Centres Consultation

Dear [REDACTED]

I write as chair of Rowland Hill Governing Body. Our Governing Body is meeting in October and we will do our best to comply with the consultation deadline for the staff restructure. This is October 9. Regarding the deadline of September 21, we understood this to be regarding the statutory consultation alone and would register our concern that undue pressure is being brought to bear on governing bodies. None of the paperwork sent to governors over the summer or subsequently asks for this decision by September 21.

However, since Rowland Hill is fortunate in remaining a standalone centre in the proposed new structure, we can give you an indicative confirmation that, subject to full GB approval Rowland Hill is ready to accept becoming a designated children's centre for its locality.

Rowland Hill is in the position of not having to provide services to other children's centres which would of course make our decision more difficult, as it would raise very serious concerns about our staffing capacity. We do have concerns about retaining our staff team which we will raise in due course in our formal response to the restructuring proposals as set out in the Children's Centre Redesign 2015 paper. We will also respond to the formal consultation separately.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Email: [REDACTED]

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mob [REDACTED]



Submission 5:

[REDACTED]

16/10/2015

[REDACTED]

Haringey Council
River Park House
High Road
Wood Green N222

Dear [REDACTED]

RESPONSE FROM ROWLAND HILL GOVERNING BODY TO LOCAL AUTHORITY REGARDING COUNCIL CHILDREN'S CENTRE RE-DESIGN 2015

Our Governing Body met on October 12 to discuss the key issues facing us with regard to **the Council's proposed redesign of children's centres. The Council's amended timeline** for the formal response from governing bodies was extended until October 16, and I am writing now on behalf of the Governing Body to set out our formal response and position. You will already know from my letter of September 21 that Rowland Hill **accepts** the proposal set out in the **Children's Centre Re-design 2015** document *'for your school children's centre as set out in the consultation, either as a designated centre or as a key access point.'*

The Governing Body **confirmed** that on Monday October 12.

We also discussed the other matter posed by the Local Authority to which we needed to respond. We have confirmed with your officers that the two questions you put to us in the document are separate and we therefore discussed them individually.

This other matter for our consideration is in the **Children's Centre Re-design 2015** document as set out below:



The proposal is for the Council to manage the restructure process as a single service restructure, working in collaboration with each of the governing bodies of the school based children's centres. This would mean they would be able to apply for jobs within the restructuring process established and managed by the Local Authority.

Our governing body is concerned that our staff are not disadvantaged in the restructure process and we believe it is important that they have the widest range of options open to them in these very difficult circumstances. We therefore **agreed** that our existing **children's centre staff would go into the borough wide recruitment pool. We would add a** strong caveat that staff local knowledge and experience is essential in sustaining services and we would expect this to be a key factor in any recruitment process. We would also urge that governing bodies are involved in selection and recruitment of staff who will be working from their centres.

A key issue for Rowland Hill relates to running costs. Our centre needs a secure running **costs budget in order to deliver children's centre services effectively and to a sustained** high standard. We are ready to discuss this with you as we do not believe the current allocation is sufficient. In relation to this is the broader issue of local need. The re-design is essentially a top-down model of service delivery with a fixed staffing and service model imposed on areas. This top-down approach does not seem to take full account of levels of deprivation and needs in different areas. Northeast Tottenham remains firmly in the 5% of poorest SOAs in Haringey despite the fact that Haringey is no longer in the top twenty deprived authorities in England.

We recognise that the children's centre budget is limited, but given local needs and the enormous regeneration focus on north east Tottenham we are asking for additional funding to underpin our running costs. We believe this would be a sound investment in local social regeneration which is a vital element in community sustainability.

Our letter of September 21 commented on wider issues related to this re-design, including safeguarding, accountability, early intervention and partnership working and we trust you have taken close account of our views and recorded them in your consultation



report. We remain concerned that lines of accountability within the proposed staffing structure are unclear, especially for managers who have significant responsibilities to deliver services on different school sites.

The final area of discussion at our meeting related to the proposed job descriptions. Our governing body was told these had been drafted and evaluated by the Local Authority. We are concerned that in several cases the grades are lower than currently. We believe the Administrator post has to incorporate the skills and ability to provide information and should be redesignated and re-evaluated as an Admin/Information Officer. In all our discussions with you and your team over several months there has been consensus that Outreach Worker posts are vital. We believe the grading for these posts should reflect the current grade of Scale 6. The overall funding gap to retain centres is not that large and we ask that the Council adds some funding to ensure staff are properly remunerated so centres can run effectively.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Chair of Governors, Rowland Hill Nursery School and Children's Centre

Cc Rowland Hill Governing Body

[REDACTED], Lead Member for Children

White Hart Lane Ward Councillors

[REDACTED], Chair, Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel

[REDACTED] Director Haringey Children's Services

[REDACTED], Early Years Commissioning Manager

[REDACTED], Interim Children's Centres & Early Years Service

Co-ordinator



Submission 6:

LADDER COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

c/o [REDACTED]

14 September 2015

Formal Response to the Consultation on the Future of LBH Children's Centres

Dear [REDACTED]

The Ladder Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) aims to represent the views and concerns of residents who live in the nineteen >Ladder= roads and their immediate vicinity. Our principal aim is to improve the quality of life for all who live and work in the >Ladder= community area.

I am writing to you in my capacity as Chair of the LCSP to express the serious concern, and strong **opposition, of local residents at the probable closure of the Ladder Children's Centre (TLCC)**. Along with other members of the LCSP Committee, I have been contacted **by numerous Haringay residents about the Council's proposals, which were also** discussed at our monthly meetings on 9 July and 10 September.

There was unanimous agreement that TLCC has been outstandingly successful in providing young infants with a welcoming , safe and educational environment at the heart of our community. Given its unique location, the Centre also facilitates a seamless relationship with South Haringay Infants and Juniors, providing continuity of educational care and well-being across the entire 0-11 age range. It also looks after the wider needs of our local community by providing additional services to parents and carers, for example classes in ESL, Maths and ICT. Such is the level of commitment among the



Centre's parents and volunteers that there is even a gardening group, which grows vegetables on site for fresh soup!

It is difficult to see how this level of devotion and loyalty can be replicated by sending **parents and infants to alternative locations, such as Woodlands Park Children's Centre (WPCC)** or even further afield. Indeed, is it really possible for WPCC to provide all of the services offered by The Ladder for nearly 1,000 infants and their parents/carers?

We understand that The Ladder will remain available for 'around 15 hours of provision a week', but this is a drop in the ocean in comparison to the full-time 48 weeks of the year which is currently on offer. The consultation also suggests that the **surviving Children's Centres** will provide support for children and young people up to the age of 19 (or 25 for those with SENs).

It is not easy to accept the feasibility of such a massive leap in provision at Woodlands Park, and we are concerned that the best part of 1,000 Ladder infants (and their parents/carers) will not receive anything like the same level of service from over-stretched and over-worked colleagues who are likely to find themselves placed in a very difficult and invidious position.

The suggested use by Ladder residents of Woodlands Park (or another alternative venue) also raises the question of access. It will inevitably trigger hundreds of extra journeys every week, perhaps by car or bus, or maybe on foot across a busy and dangerous main road (Green Lanes) with its high level of traffic pollution – all as a result of this proposal.

None of this is very sensible, especially at a time when the Leader of the Council has stressed her desire for the local community to be given a greater stake in their own destiny. As [REDACTED] wrote in the June-July edition of 'Haringey People', **'We want to ensure that local people are at the heart of driving forward improvements in their neighbourhoods and that you feel able to play a part in your community'**.

It is precisely for these reasons that the LCSP strongly supports local residents who want **to keep The Ladder Children's Centre open, at the heart of their community.**

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Chair LCSP



Submission 7:

North East Tottenham Children Centre Cluster

30th September 2015

Dear [REDACTED],

Re: Response to the latest CC re-structure proposals and proposed job description drafts

The North East Tottenham Children Centre Cluster met today and have agreed this joint response to the latest CC restructure proposals and evaluated job description drafts.

The North East Tottenham Children Centre Cluster is **not** in agreement with the proposed **Children's Centre** structure. We believe the structure lacks sustainability; will create a loss of services and will create a range of possible safeguarding issues. It is difficult to assess the job descriptions in the light of this but here are some of the key issues we have picked out:

The job descriptions show a lack of understanding. When constructing the JDs, what consultation took place with the people who operationally do this role?

The basic structure of the new CC proposals does not work – each cluster cannot be given the same structure and be expected to work effectively. Each cluster has different needs.

In the proposed South East Tottenham cluster there will be around 5,000 under 5s, nearly double that of the other clusters. However, they are not being given double the amount of staff and the expectation that they will deliver similar successful results to the other clusters remains. It is an impossible task.



The manageability of the JDs are a huge concern and safeguarding is very vague throughout

Have you taken account of how much operational time needs to be allocated to each part of the job description?

The JDs share much of the same text which makes us question what the differences are between each job role?

In the manager's role, nowhere does it mention 'lead'. Does this reflect a lack of expectation of the Centre Manager to lead the service? Is the Centre Manager expected to manage rather than develop the service? In other words, will the manager manage what is there, and is it ok not to develop what is not there?

Re supervision. It states that the Centre Manager will manage 5 staff. What if there are more than 5 staff? Is there time for this built in? Supervision is crucial to the Centre Manager role and the safety of the service and those it is providing for.

If there is a concern around safeguarding in the centre, who is accountable? Who will the Centre Managers be accountable to? If on school premises, are they accountable to the Headteacher? Or the governing body? What if the safeguarding issue takes place on a key link site where an assistant manager is sited, and the Centre Manager is on a different site? Who then is accountable? Is it still the Centre Manager? Or the Headteacher? Or the governing body? It would be irresponsible of a Headteacher or a governing body to agree to accept this type of chain responsibility, and impossible for the Centre Manager to keep everyone safe in different places.

Has there been a thorough risk assessment? If so, please can we see the evidence that this will work and be safe?

What support is being given for the stressful process of restructure, who is involved in the interview process and what consideration is being given to the loss of expertise?

Re Centre Manager / Assistant CM posts: PO1, PO3, PO6 the areas relating to safeguarding should be expanded and worded differently to show the differentiation of responsibility in the posts. PO3 point 16 and PO6 point 18 around day to day safeguarding are exactly the same statement with expectations that safeguarding issues will be dealt with without expanding how this will happen.



The sections on evaluating and monitoring are very general and are the same statement **across the job descriptions. To ensure there are 'robust systems in place' implies** delegation. In reality, the Centre Manager will spend at least 20% of dedicated Centre Manager time on this aspect of the role. It needs to be stated in the job description because it will impact on the reasonableness of the rest of the role – particularly managing safeguarding needs.

Early Intervention Outreach Workers need to have safeguarding meetings as part of their role. There is a lack of understanding in the LA of just how many safeguarding meetings take place and how it is the responsibility of Children Centre staff to attend. In addition, the number of meetings currently attended will be multiplied by three settings and so would become an unwieldy task, creating real safeguarding dangers. Is there a risk assessment to identify safeguarding risks in this scenario?

The information officer is an important role that has been downgraded to an administrator role which has less pay and less time allocated to it. However, they will still need to input data for e-start. The new JD is similar to the current one but has less pay attached to it. We know from the Rokesly CC inspection that data is crucial to the success of an Ofsted inspection and so are surprised at this decision to minimise and downgrade the role. In addition, there will be an increase in data input as the number of two and three year olds in PVI settings grows, and the 30 hours entitlement is introduced across all under 5s settings.

Early Learning Practitioners will be leading on stay and play but it will be difficult to find staff with the right skills. We know that because of the current difficulty in finding good staff at a level 6. Again, have practitioners who operationally recruit and manage staff been consulted? Will school scale 4 staff work differently to PVI scale 4 staff? Will there be different weighting and will it operate more like a scale 6 post?

Can this be reflected in the JD?

Services in the children's centres will have to change as there is less money and less staff. The funding for crèches is tiny e.g. approx. £2000 for the cluster. Who will be responsible for deciding which services run? Who will be responsible for deciding if there are more targeted rather than universal services?

The funding will not cover universal services as they are currently run eg ESOL classes will have to be cut despite huge demand. Crèches will not be available for adult learning,



thereby restricting the numbers who could attend. If volunteers are used to run crèches, how has that been quality controlled e.g. qualifications and safeguarding

Buildings are expected to accommodate different services . Every building will be a community access point. What does that mean? How will groups be staffed? What is meant to take place where? Who makes these decisions? Where is that identified in the JDs?

Therefore, we believe that unless a proper risk assessment is provided, along with the evidence that this system will work, it is irresponsible for Headteachers and Governing Bodies to accept the proposed CC restructure and proposed job descriptions.



Submission 8:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

20/09/2015

CYPS

Haringey Council

Dear [REDACTED],

**Re – Seven Sisters Primary School/South Grove Children’s Centre
Statutory Consultation Response, Children’s Centres**

This letter sets out the formal response from Seven Sisters Primary School to the **statutory consultation regarding children’s centres**.

As you know from the governing body meeting you attended before the end of the summer term, and as I have reiterated to you, [REDACTED] and your other colleagues, we are **realistic and are considering options available to us given the council’s proposals for our centre**. We will be confirming our position by the deadline set out in your **Children’s Centre Redesign 2015 document**. We will also respond to the proposed staff restructure process as requested by 9th October 2015.

You will know that we have serious reservations about your proposals, in particular with regard to:

Safeguarding

Governance and accountability

Centre management

Relationships with families, especially those who are vulnerable



Practical day to day centre management

Early intervention and early help

Links with the school

Each of these issues is discussed in more detail below and we would ask you to read through them carefully and to respond on each one.

To put our concerns in context, Seven Sisters has the highest level of children on free school meals in Haringey, which you will know is a proxy indicator for poverty and **deprivation. The children's centre has a high level of vulnerable children including 5 on the child protection register, 10 Child in Need & 2 Looked after Children.** Our recent Ofsted inspection (March 2015) also highlighted the specific areas of mental health, **safeguarding and domestic violence where the centre's work was praised. The** inspectors wrote:

Many parents who speak English as an additional language, who are known to social care, are subject to domestic abuse, have mental ill-health or have low incomes sustain their contact with the centre and various specialist services until their needs are met. The impact of this contact is notable in the changes families say it makes to their lives, and the way in which children are kept safe.

Safeguarding children and the promotion of their well-being is central to the centre's work. Policies, practices and procedures are very effective. Representatives from the key partners meet regularly to share information. This ensures that children subject to child protection plans, assessed under the Common Assessment Framework, looked after children and those identified as being in need receive support designed to meet their precise needs.

Staff at the centre provide high quality care, guidance and support, including for those experiencing domestic abuse. Parents hold staff in high regard and trust their advice. Staff are good role models showing parents how to build positive relationships with their children.

The report also commented on the effective governance, and role of the manager and her team, complimenting them on their *'in-depth local knowledge to identify new vulnerable groups who are in significant need. As a result of their effective work, registrations have increased rapidly'*.



Our serious concern is that the proposal for South Grove to become a 'community access point' will seriously undermine this work, with a potential detrimental impact on the families.

Safeguarding

This is of major concern to our school team and to governors. This is both in relation to the service and also in relation to governance and accountability.

Our centre team spend many hours safeguarding children and their vulnerable adults. **This often 'invisible' work includes making referrals to social care and other related** services, chasing up referrals and partners, and in attending safeguarding meetings e.g. case conferences, team around the child and core groups. The centre staff know families well and are able to manage difficult conversations. They also know what to do when issues arise and emerge from the Stay and Play sessions, workshops, other community activities and during 1:1 sessions. These proposals do not appear to take account of the fact that the community activities can result in additional serious casework. How will this extra work be managed in the new arrangements you are proposing, which seem to suggest that most of this work is around stay and play sessions?

The importance of stable staff who know the families cannot be over estimated, yet this is at risk in the new proposals. Our governing body needs to be certain about the changes, and assured by the LA that its plans are robust and reliable and would deliver to the required standards. The partnership working document ascribes responsibilities to different parties on and off site. We are concerned that this could also cause friction, confusion and great stress, especially should things go wrong, and that the centre **manager from the designated children's centre will be carrying a huge workload and** responsibilities across different sites.

In addition, although the designated children's centre governing body may be responsible for their staff member's actions, the fact is that the problem would be on our site and in our setting. We would ask you to provide us with background documents setting out the



risks and strategies for dealing with all these issues. We are sure that you would have conducted such an assessment as elected Members will be deciding on these vital and sensitive issues and will ultimately be held to account for their decisions.

Our concern about safeguarding is not confined to Seven Sisters. We are equally concerned that the governing body of Woodlands Park and the staff team there would also be placed in a difficult situation were there to be a safeguarding issue on our site.

Governance and Accountability

As governors we have a statutory role in ensuring the safe delivery of services on our site. Currently the lines of accountability are clear, as the staff are employed to work at Seven Sisters/South Grove. The Head Teacher and her SLT have day to day operational management responsibility and are accountable to the Governing Body. Staff in the **children's centre are** managed in this way, and have a clear line to the Head Teacher. **The Governing body consider the children's centre to be an integral part of the school; we** receive regular reports, and it is accountable through the committee structure.

In the proposed new arrangement, where South Grove is a 'community access point' governance and accountability is less clear. Work will be undertaken on our site but the governance **for this will rest ultimately with the designated children's centre's governing** body. Our role will be purely advisory. Yet we will be responsible for health and safety on our site, with complicated arrangements set out (page 6 of the partnership document) for risk assessments, and site safety. We could be held to account for accidents; and, **in your document, should the service 'not meet their (i.e our) organisational standards we** would need to report this to a senior manager within the organisation who will have the duty to discuss this with the organisation that **employs staff and/or the LA'. This system** is bureaucratic, insensitive and is likely to cause friction. We have repeatedly asked how you think this might actually work, and we feel it is your professional responsibility to tell us and to reassure the governing body that it will not leave us exposed and liable should things go wrong.



Centre Management

Based on our experience of running a children's centre, and from working in the cluster, we know that each Children's Centre needs its own manager. This is the key role within the centre, ensuring continuity for families and sound links to partner services. Handing centre management and all that entails regarding vulnerable families to a peripatetic manager places us all in invidious positions, and we would urge councillors to think very hard indeed before approving this model.

We believe it will be a very demanding and stressful task for one designated centre and the manager to be responsible for several sites effectively and safely, given the number of things which can arise on just one site in the course of one or two days. There are particular issues such as record keeping, tracking vulnerable children and families, supervision meetings and other tasks allied to dealing with complex family support. This **also 'invisible' work is currently carried out in each children's centre** – how do you propose this will work in the new structure? The reference to this in the partnership working document (page 4) is a bureaucratic response, giving no indication of the complexity or importance of such work in safeguarding.

This has already been described in detail in the paper submitted by the Haringey Children's Centre Alliance, **A Day in the Life of a Children's Centre**. The recent Ofsted inspection of Rokesley Children's Centre (14 – 15 July 2015) made an explicit reference to this problem of managing multiple sites. The inspectors commented:

The centre manager has a very good understanding of the centre's strengths and areas for development. Under her leadership, the centre is significantly improving access to services for families. However, the centre is not financially well resourced by the local authority. The situation is compounded because the manager is also responsible for another two centres in the locality and her time and effort are spread too thinly.

We would urge you to reconsider the plans, and provide at least the funding for a centre manager on each site to enable Early Help to work. This would go some way to



reassuring us about the new model, and respond to the inspectors' clear concerns. Should you wish to discuss this with us, we are open to negotiation about partnership arrangement.

Relationships with families, especially those who are vulnerable

The strength of children's centre work is built on strong and trusting relationships between families and centre staff. The introduction of peripatetic teams will impact on those relationships and we believe this will have an adverse impact on the vulnerable families who use and rely on South Grove Children's Centre. Who will be responsible for supporting these families and ensuring they do not get lost in the new arrangements? What impact will this have on safeguarding?

Practical day to day centre management

Delivering services in the children's centre requires a great deal of organisation and, as previously mentioned, 'invisible work'. Much of that work has already been discussed. In addition there are practical tasks which take someone's time and effort. For example, washing toys after group activities, washing towels, clothing, mats, rugs etc. Ensuring refreshments are available for families and children and that the centre is resourced. Knowing there are emergency supplies should families need them. We know these are important things for parents as they give a practical signal to parents that the centre cares and has high standards. These may seem small jobs, but they have to be done and done regularly. The question is by whom?

Early intervention and early help

It is widely acknowledged that children's centres are at the forefront of early help and early intervention, and you have told us that there will be a 'dotted line' link to school-based centres and a direct operational link to the LA centres. We cannot see how the early help link to South Grove will work effectively in the proposed model where the sole activities provided at our site would seem to be stay and play sessions. Apart from the fact that this shows little understanding of the complexity of work with families at the centre, exactly who will ensure vulnerable families are not lost or missed? We do not



believe the designated centre manager or the team he/she will lead can do this across multiple sites, and for the sake of a relatively small saving, early intervention with vulnerable families will be lost. Who will work with the health visitors and other partners to support families in delivering early help? We would reiterate again that having a dedicated centre manager on each site would provide continuity, consistency and engagement with families. It is a false economy to make these cuts.

Links with the school

Many of the families who access services at South Grove either attend Seven Sisters Primary School already or go on to do so. Due to the close working relationships with the staff in both settings, parents do not see them working separately but as one. They know that they will not have to tell their story over and over again, (one of the core aspirations of Local Authorities Children & Young Peoples services) and that the support they receive will be seamless. This will be lost to the detriment of the families. This applies to a slightly lesser degree with the other schools in South Grove's current reach area.

In summary

The preferred position of Seven Sisters is that we remain a designated children's centre with our current staff team. However, we recognise that the government has imposed very large cuts on local government and that this has put great pressure on the local authority. **We would remind you that children's centre budgets were cut by 50% in 2011** and would ask, in the light of those previous extensive reductions, that the Council reconsider its current proposals to find additional funding, prioritising the centre manager's role.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Seven Sisters Primary School and South Grove Children's Centre



Submission 9: (By email 21st September 2015)

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 21 September 2015 22:38

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre - Response to Consultation on Changes to Children's Centre Services

Dear [REDACTED]

I write on behalf of the governors of Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre in response to Haringey Council's Consultation on Changes to Children's Centre Services and to your email of 17th September asking us for a written response to the Consultation from our governing body and specifically an answer to the following question:

Whether you accept the proposal for your school children's centre as set out in the consultation, either as a designated centre or as a key access point.

I would first like to note that your email of 17 September was the first time that governors had been asked to provide a written response to the consultation or to answer that specific question as part of the response. Until your email, it was our understanding that the meetings with governors convened by the local authority before the summer holiday and at the beginning of this term for the purpose of this consultation were the appropriate channel for the views of governing bodies to be fed back to the local authority. We do not consider it reasonable or realistic to require the written responses you are now seeking at this short notice.

Having said that, by chance we had a governors' meeting scheduled for this evening and, as a centre which it is proposed will retain children's centre status, we are able to give



you a formal response to the question posed in your email. We do accept the proposal for Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre to continue as a designated children's centre.

By way of a response to the consultation in more general terms, we would make the following points:

Whilst we understand the pressures on the local authority's budget, we continue to consider it a false economy to reduce the number and total budget for children's centres as proposed. Children's centres and their staff are a trusted, non-stigmatizing resource widely used by the community that reach and help many of our vulnerable families and improve outcomes for their children. They are also relatively inexpensive compared to resources needed for those at higher levels of need. It is impossible that the risk of some families falling through the net and thereby moving up the levels of need will not be increased by removing staff and services from 7 of the existing children's centres, even if they were all to remain as community access points.

As governors of a hub children's centre, we recognise and are concerned about the additional pressures that the proposed model will bring with regard to safeguarding – both across the wider reach area, and on community access point and link sites.

We have said throughout the informal and formal periods of consultation since December 2014 that the only way to make the reduced model of children's centres work will be to include health visitors/health visitor assistants, family support workers and link social workers as part of the core children's centre teams. These staff need to be an integrated part of the children's centre team and roles may well need to be remodelled to ensure a coherent offer of universal and targeted early help in accordance with the values of the children's centre.

In a similar way it will be crucial to improve the communication and way of working with the early help team. This is potentially being addressed by moving the management of **the relationship between the local authority of children's centres in maintained schools** from the commissioning team to the early help team but it will be important to ensure that this opportunity is not missed.

The recent Ofsted report on Rokesly Children's Centre highlighted the current failings at local authority level and between partner agencies (in particular health services and children's social care) in terms of partnership working and information sharing, which appear to have been central to the decision to award a judgement of Requires



Improvement. It will be important to develop a plan of action to improve this area as a **matter of urgency if the changes to children's centres are to be implemented in April 2016** without a severe impact on families.

At Woodlands Park, we have experience of delivering **children's centre services from a link site (Downhills/Harris)**. We have had experience of good partnership working, where there is good engagement by senior management on both sides and good communication and **cross-referral between the school and children's centre teams**. We **have also had a different experience, where children's centre services are located on the link site but due to poor engagement at senior leadership or any other level between the school and the children's centre teams, there is little to no communication or cross-referral**. It is essential that the partnership working between Woodlands Park and the host schools of community access points (and link sites) in the reach area follow the former model.

In order to achieve good partnership working, it will be essential that there is good engagement at senior leadership and day-to-day level. How this is best achieved may vary from one community access point to another but it is more than likely that it will require some additional funding beyond the **allocated "hourly rate" for use of a community access point for 15 hour a week**. If such additional funding can be kept to a minimum, for example by being match-funded by the host school in a sustainable manner, we believe that it would be money very well spent. It may be difficult for **host schools of community access points to justify providing space for children's centre services for 15 hours a week**. We strongly recommend that proposals from host schools for other models be considered and that every effort is made to include them in the model going forward. Examples may include match-funding a **full-time children's centre services manager post at a community access point, or working in a different way with the hub children's centres such that the host school independently runs children's centre services rather than simply providing space**.

We believe that the integrated nature of Woodlands Park as a nursery school, childcare **provider and children's centre is absolutely key to our ability to perform as an effective hub children's centre**. It will be important to bear this in mind in the context of reviewing **Haringey's nursery schools and childcare provision in the coming months**.

We also ask that the points raised during the consultation meetings attended by Woodlands Park governors be taken as part of our response to consultation.



Best regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Submission 10: (12th October 2015)

Response to consultation on the restructuring of Children's Centres in Haringey by governors of South Haringay Infants School and The Ladder Children's Centre

Governors discussed the proposals at their meeting on 23 September 2015. We concluded that there were two major questions that needed a response from us:

Did we support the proposal that The Ladder should become a delivery centre in support of the main centre to be housed at Woodlands Park?

Did we support the proposals around the new staffing structure that would be put in place?

Given decisions about the budget that have already been made and to avoid creating uncertainty which would not be in the interests of the children, the community and staff, we reluctantly accept both proposals.

But we have major concerns about accountability for safeguarding and about the responsibilities that will remain with governors and with the staff that will be employed on our premises.

The consultation document is vague about a number of key issues that should be clarified before we are asked to sign off detailed proposals. Not least there is a lack of clarity about where the budget for delivering services at The Ladder will lie. There is some concern that South Haringay Infants School may end up subsidising Children's Centre provision from funds that are already stretched and which are set to become tighter under policies announced by the government. Over recent years The Ladder has built up an impressive array of partner agencies and other support mechanisms which have provided a level of service to our community that is second to none. We wish to ensure, so far as is



possible, the maintenance of those relationships, but it is not clear how monies that will be needed in support of this will be distributed.

We have a good working relationship already with Woodlands Park but there can be little doubt that, aside from outside play areas where they are well provided for, the space at their disposal for activities and services that are to continue is significantly less than that available at The Ladder. We expect to be fully consulted on the range of activities and services that will be run from The Ladder and that the staffing available here will reflect the work involved.

We will work hard to continue to provide an excellent level of service and commitment - our engagement with the community has been exemplary and we will strive to maintain that so far as it is possible under the circumstances. Our primary responsibility is to the children and to their parents/carers and we must be satisfied that their safety and interests will be protected.

This response has been approved by all members of our Governing Body.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

South Haringay Infants School and The Ladder Children's Centre



Submission 11: (By email 24th June 2015)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 June 2015 10:29
To: Childrenscentreconsultation
Subject: Closing children's centres

Please could you answer the questions below.

- 1-What children's services are you proposing still operate from the centres you are going to close?
- 2- How have you ascertained where the 'greatest need' is ?
- 3- What is a 'key community access point' ? What other services operate out of these centres?
- 4- Are the areas where you are proposing the greatest concentration of children's centres also in areas of high crime/ Asb when compared with where they are now?
- 5- And may be a cynical question but how far will you take parents views into account? All very well having a consultation but I would like some assurance and an idea of how this is actually going to acted upon , if it is (and not assuming that councillors have already made up their mind and this is just a tick box, lazy exercise in democracy)

Look forward to your response

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Response to submission (by email)

Dear [REDACTED],

Many thanks for your questions relating to the children's centre consultation. More information on our proposals can be found in our consultation document, which can be found here:

http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/1145.8_children_centres_consultation_document_a4_12pp_final_web.pdf

1-What children's services are you proposing still operate from the centres you are going to close?

Please see page 7/8 of the consultation document. Where children's centres are closed, they will be supported to become part of a network of 'Community Access Points'.

We are proposing that these key community access points are used to deliver some services, which may include:

- Stay and Play sessions
- Health appointments
- Advice sessions.

2- How have you ascertained where the 'greatest need' is ?

In developing our proposals we considered a number of factors, including child poverty indices.

Please see page 4 of the consultation document for more information.



3- What is a 'key community access point' ? What other services operate out of these centres?

See page 6/7 of the consultation document.

Of the 7 centres that are proposed to close, 5 of the buildings are managed by schools, providing education for primary aged children. 2 are managed by the Local Authority, Noel Park and Stonecroft, which offers childcare.

4- Are the areas where you are proposing the greatest concentration of children's centres also in areas of high crime/ Asb when compared with where they are now?

All the children's centres that we are proposing in the new model are existing children's centres. Crime rates were not a factor that we considered when proposing which centres should remain open.

5- And may be a cynical question but how far will you take parents views into account? All very well having a consultation but I would like some assurance and an idea of how this is actually going to acted upon , if it is (and not assuming that councillors have already made up their mind and this is just a tick box, lazy exercise in democracy)

We have undergone extensive engagement work to develop our proposals (details can be found in the June Cabinet Paper -

http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s79041/Childrens%20Centre%20Release%20Consultation%20Paper_Final.pdf).

During this period of consultation, we have scheduled 11 Public Events (details can be found here - <http://www.haringey.gov.uk/CCC2015>) and will visit stay and play sessions and other daytime activities to speak to parents. We are meeting separately with governors, partners and staff. This extensive consultation activity is underway because we genuinely want to gather as many views as possible. All the responses from the



consultation will be taken into account and councillors will consider the responses when making a decision at the November Cabinet.

I hope this helps - please come back to us with any queries,

Best wishes,

[Redacted signature]

Early Years



Submission 12: (by email 21st September 2015)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 September 2015 19:08
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Children's Centre consultation

Dear [REDACTED]

Having considered the proposals put forward in this consultation, Rokesly Infant Governing Body wish to put on record that we do not support them for a number of reasons.

In our view the restructure of staffing and services will not address the inadequacies of the Local Authority (LA) highlighted in the July 2015 Ofsted inspection carried out at **Rokesly Children's Centre**. Many of the issues raised in the inspection have been longstanding and have not been adequately addressed by the Local Authority since the Centre opened.

The staffing restructure (as we understand at this point in time) excludes our entire **current Children's Centre staff from being considered for posts, resulting in a loss of local knowledge and expertise that it will take considerable time and effort to replace**. Similarly the proposed resourcing will go no way to addressing the issue identified by Ofsted that **"the centre is not financially well resourced by the Local Authority"**.

In a climate of **greater austerity at the LA and with the reduced budget for Children's Centres**, our view is that the proposals are not viable and will not improve outcomes for children or future Ofsted judgements about provision at the centre. We do not believe that we will be able to deliver an effective service or provide effective governance in these circumstances and are concerned about the further increase in already difficult burdens on school staff and resources.

This decision we have made as a governing body to request de-designation of Rokesly as **a Children's Centre has been made with regret as we all believe strongly in the importance of Early Help and recognise the importance of Children's Centres as a resource within our community**. We remain committed to exploring the options for how the Children's Centre building's available rooms and amenities could be utilised to



continue to provide services to this end under a different model to the one proposed. We are interested in investigating alternative models of centre management and governance proposed by the Local Authority, not least the possibilities afforded by the LA taking on health commissioning that could be explored as well as commissioning external providers.

We look forward to discussing the way forward with you.

██████████

██████████, Rokesly Infant Governing Body

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Submission 13:

■■■■ Meeting with Bounds Green Children's Centre 3.07.15

This meeting was arranged to help ward councillors understand some of the questions and concerns that the centre has around the consultations proposal to reduce the number of children's centre in Haringey which would include the closure of Bounds Green Children's Centre.

In addition to the S&P and Baby groups at BGN site the Centre currently operates a baby group and a stay and play session from the community centre at Commerce Road. Staff feel that these are of great value and help the service reach some of the families in greatest need in the ward. Staff would like to ensure that these sessions continue. ■■■■

■■■■
■■■■.

There are some questions about the future of the community centre. At the moment they are not charged for using the centre but they are concerned that this may not continue given that the centres lease is up soon. ■■■■

■■■■.

Currently the Centre spends around 12k on crèche workers partly to provide support for the S&Ps and esp to groups at Commerce Rd where lone working is not appropriate, but also to allow parents to take part in EASL classes which is an important access route for families often in need of other services. These crèche staff are skilled and valued members of staff and their work facilitates important engagement work. The team are concerned that only 9k is identified with this across the area (Woodside, Noel Park and Bounds Green). The team are concerned that this isn't enough. ■■■■

■■■■

The team are concerned that the wording in the consultation could be misleading for families. Saying that the centres that are earmarked for closure will remain open as delivery sites is confusing. We must be clear about what that means. Families may think



that it's a rebranding exercise and the team are keen that families understand what the change will mean in terms of service delivery. [REDACTED].

The team feel that the budget for admin in the new model is quite low. On a scale 4 it cannot be expected that staff will fulfil and information roll as they currently do. The current member of staff who does this is on a scale 5 and does great work sharing information with families visiting services at Bounds Green about the support that the centre offers. [REDACTED]

There are lots of unknowns about data and what the new 0-19 database will consist of. **It's important that the data that is collected helps practitioners to track families** effectively and measures the impact of early help. With the proposed much reduced levels of admin and data support, levels of activity in CCs are likely to APPEAR to plummet due to lack of **consistent data capture and input ... which affects capacity to meet current LA targets.**

There are lots of families living on Cline Road and Ringway N11. Until very recently their data has not showed up on the numbers the Council was using to calculate need. Many of these families use the BGCC and for them Woodside is a long distance away from their homes. The team would like to explore sites in that area that could be used to deliver services and have made some progress towards developing a partnership with Bounds Green Group Practice. This is in very early stages and at this stage of the consultation the team are not sure that it will be progressed.

The team feel the Consultation process has been much better than last time around and staff feel well informed and that they had an impact on the proposed model. However, there has been less communication and consultation with partner organisations including the midwifery team from The Whittington and Workers Education Association who deliver the EASL classes in Bounds Green. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].



The Centre seemed particularly protective of the work down with new parents (babies rather than toddlers and up), how is this important work maintained? Is it realistic to assume that parents of newborns would access Woodside.

Finally, the commitment that BGCC will stay open as a delivery site is problematic. The school nursery has very little space and the school is expanding. Will the rooms be **safeguarded for use by the cluster of children's centre? The team are unclear about this** and are concerned that the School would find it difficult to prioritise keeping the space for a lower level of CC activities). [REDACTED].



Submission 14: (By email 5th October 2015)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 October 2015 17:16
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Children's Centre Consultation Response

Dear [REDACTED]

*I write on behalf of the governors for **Broadwaters Children's Centre** in response to Haringey Council's Consultation on changes to Children's Centre Services.*

We give this response knowing that a great deal of work and consultation has already taken place and that our Headteacher was part of the process and has put forward views on our behalf. We continue to stand by the value of Children centres as we believe they provide a very valuable service to the communities which they service. We understand that there are budget pressures and some very difficult decisions have had to be made by the council in terms of which services to keep open, and which to close. We believe that it is not only detrimental to the life chances of children (particularly in the East of the borough) to close children centres but also false economy, as preventing the escalation of problems is far less costly than trying to fix issues once they have spiralled, ie, the early help provided by having children centres more accessible in the East of the borough will support the aspirations of the LA. We are concerned that vulnerable families will not only lose out, but be made even more vulnerable due to the lack of immediate services in their area.

We are also concerned about the additional stress that will be placed on the children centre hubs in trying to cover such a large reach area (in some cases more than double). It would be extremely difficult to have an intimate knowledge of those families and therefore a risk to safeguarding.



*We know our Headteacher was keen to increase the access and line management of other key service providers, ie, health visitor, social worker and family support workers – we very much echo this view. Going through the restructure without increasing the team is a lost opportunity for services to work more closely together in order to have a bigger impact on outcomes. It is not only a lost opportunity but potentially a dangerous one when safeguarding is considered. **Families could potentially get ‘lost’ between services.** It is essential that information sharing between these services is not inhibited by false boundaries which sometimes come with unnecessary or even hindering line management structures.*

Lastly, Broadwaters works because it offers a fully integrated service. We cannot emphasise enough the synergy and development opportunities which come from providing childcare alongside community services. Our families can move seamlessly from conception, through pregnancy and birth, to stay and plays, then to childcare and eventually through to the school nursery and lastly to school. The importance of the relationship that is built up with these families (especially the most vulnerable), cannot be underestimated. In addition the professional development, and therefore, quality of all workers within our setting is enhanced due to this shared working. There is no doubt in our minds that we offer a high quality service because of our integrated nature.

In terms of the questions posed:

- 1. Yes we wish to remain as a designated Children Centre*
- 2. Yes we wish to opt in to the staff restructure process.*

In terms of the latter, having local knowledge is the key to our success and therefore without question, we wish to maintain our team who have worked tirelessly to offer an outstanding service. We understand that there are a limited number of jobs available, however, if members of our team are successful in gaining posts, it is our expectation that they will remain with us.



We also ask that staff are given the opportunity to go 2 points up in the restructure as we have, over the years, grown our staff in order that they offer a much higher service than which they are currently paid. It is essential for us that these members of staff have the opportunity to apply for posts to which they aspire. It will then be up to the panel to decide if they are actually ready for that promotion.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Broadwaters Children's Centre

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Submission 15: (By email 05th October 2015)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 October 2015 15:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Children's Centre consolation

Dear [REDACTED]

My apologies I thought the consultation closed end of September and only realised my mistake when I tried to respond to the consultation on the Haringey website last week.

[REDACTED] said I should email you directly with my comments so please could you include my submission below?

Many thanks

■

Haringey's 16 children's centres offer a vital service to families across Haringey. The centres have very small staff teams but work with many partners and have become extremely cost effective following the children's centre re structure several years ago. The children's centre campaign group estimated that it costs less than £4.30 per week per family using children's centre services.

The key to the success of Haringey's children's centres is that they are in easily accessible locations and in pram pushing distance for most families in the borough. And they provide a universal service which is non-stigmatising so parents are more likely to visit and use the centre services. This universal approach has the advantage that, while it may provide services to less vulnerable children, it reaches many who are more



vulnerable. This reduces risk significantly as it does not depend upon successfully identifying vulnerable families before offering help to them. Also because a lot of the work involves individual support in delicate and complex situations, the work is often invisible and not measured but that doesn't mean that vital family support isn't happening.

Closing 7 children's centres and moving to a locality model, which is being proposed, poses greater risks because it will be difficult to identify vulnerable families, especially those who you really need to reach. Childrens centres build relationships with families and that is often how vulnerable families are identified. A wrap around support package is organised by staff at the centre and much of this support takes places in the secure setting of the centre itself. Losing 7 centres means that families lose somewhere safe to come to with their young children (many families need an escape ramped living conditions and difficult family environments) which means a further strain on these families which is likely to increase the risk to children.

In summary I do not support the closure of children's centres and I believe the new locality model will put children at risk in Haringey.

[REDACTED]

Councillor

Highgate Ward Liberal Democrat Party

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Twitter: [REDACTED]



Submission 16: (By email 21st September 2015)

Hello

I have filled in the questionnaire but forgot to mention that one of the useful things about having a greater variety of locations offering services is that services are offered on different days. This can help working mothers ie I work part-time, Mon-Wed, so am looking for services, mainly stay and play, on Thu-Fri. The closure of Bounds Green would mean it is harder to combine caring for children and working, as we would have fewer options of things to do on the days I'm not working.

Plus stay and play is brilliant for the children - a great mix of activities and people, and a lifesaver for parents.

Many thanks



N22

Car Free Walks: take your boots, leave the car

Switch to Ecotricity. British Gas are bastards.

Delayed Gratification: last to breaking news

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Submission 17: (By email 14th July 2015)

Dear Haringey Council,

With regards to your proposals to reduce the number of Children's Centres, can you please share with me the source data on which you made your decisions.

Your consultations document states that you considered the number of children under 5 in each area, as well as the levels of need.

The former item (number of under 5s) is a fairly straightforward, objective and egalitarian measure. The latter aspect (the 'levels of need') is far more complicated. Can you therefore please advise exactly how this need is quantified. Please include all variables considered, the weighting that each receives and the calculation used to pull all of these together.

It appears from the map that the west side of the borough will be significantly under-resourced, when compared to the central area and east side. I am looking for confidence that this is not the case, and that the population density in the central and eastern areas of the borough merit the additional resources over the western side.

Note that I will make this request through an FoI request if necessary, so please include all information at first request.

Regards,



This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Response to submission 17: (By email 28th July 2015)

On 28 Jul 2015, at 09:06, Childrenscentreconsultation
<Childrenscentreconsultation@haringey.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear [REDACTED],

Please accept my apologies for the slight delay in providing you with a response to your **request for information. In your email you asked how 'levels of need' has been considered** as part of informing the proposals set out in the consultation.

A number of data sets were considered and used to provide a picture of need alongside the population of children and the proposal to retain more centres in some parts of the borough than others has been informed by this data. I have attached summaries for your information and can tell you that these were compiled with the support of colleagues working in the business intelligence team within the council.

You will see from the information that population density is far from insignificant in the western side of the borough, however, the combination of both size of population and levels of needs identified in other areas within the borough do suggest that any proposed **changes to the current model for delivering children's centres will need to focus higher** levels of resources in those areas.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Children and Young People's Service

Haringey Council

River Park House, 225 High Road, London N22 8HQ



T. [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

www.haringey.gov.uk

twitter@haringeycouncil

facebook.com/haringeycouncil



Submission 17a: (By email on 31st July)

Dear [REDACTED],

Many thanks for providing this summary of source data. To fully address my original request, can you please provide the following:

- 1) Definitions of all acronyms and abbreviations used in the Excel spreadsheet.
- 2) The specific formula which provides the result for 'weighted reach' (which will explain the weighting that each variable receives).
- 3) The formula (or qualitative rationale) which combines 'weighted reach' and geographical area, to produce the results of which centres to close.

I look forward to receiving your reply, to help me understand the decision making process.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]



Response to submission 17a: (By email on 31st July 2015)

Dear [REDACTED],

Regarding your queries contained in email of 31st July, please find below my responses;

Acronyms and abbreviations and their meanings are as follows;

YCP – Young Citizens Panel

SEN – Special Education Needs

LAC – Looked After Children

CPP – Child Protection Plans

YOS – Youth Offending Service

NEET – A NEET is a young person who is "Not in Education, Employment, or Training"

PRU – Pupil Referral Unit

CIN – Children in Need

ASB – Anti-Social Behaviour

ASBAT – Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team

DV – Domestic Violence

I have attached working sheets that provides information on how the weighted reach for individual wards and / or children's centres have been arrived at.

NB.

(a) IMD - Index of Multiple Deprivation – this shows relative levels of social and economic deprivation across England;



(b) IDACI - Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index – this shows the proportion of children in specific geographical areas (or local super output area (LSOA)) that live in families that are

income deprived.

Proposals on which centres remain open and which are proposed to close have been informed by levels of need and population (as shown by the weighted reach). It was also important to consider the location of the existing centres and discussions with centre representatives as part of the process of identifying the options.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Children and Young People's Service

Haringey Council

River Park House, 225 High Road, London N22 8HQ

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

www.haringey.gov.uk

[twitter@haringeycouncil](https://twitter.com/haringeycouncil)



[facebook.com/haringeycouncil](https://www.facebook.com/haringeycouncil)



Submission 18: (by email 21st September 2015)

Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 21 September 2015 17:26

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Meeting last week re Children's Centres.

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for meeting [REDACTED] and me on Wednesday 16th September.

Following that meeting I am writing to ask for the full details of the risk assessment that you have undertaken regarding the proposals that you are making for Children's Centres. None of us can be confident about the validity of proposals until we see not only this but also the exact evidence on which you are basing the proposals. There are far too many concerns expressed in all the consultation meetings which have taken place for anyone to agree to support what is being suggested. The recent Rokesley Children's Centres OfSTED report confirms some of these concerns.

We have not seen minutes of any meetings which have been held during the summer and request that they are all sent to us.

We are in the process of arranging a meeting for Headteachers of all the Centres, Chairs of Governing Bodies and EICs and we would want to see both the risk assessment and evidence as well as the results of the consultations.



Since we met on Wednesday Governing Bodies have been asked to make a decision by Monday (today) as to whether we agree with the proposals for our Centre. The email for this only went out last Thursday (17th). It is completely impossible for Governing Bodies to meet and make such a major decision in such a short timescale and would be irresponsible to do so without the information I have requested.

With best wishes,

██████████

██████████, Pembury Nursery School and Children's Centre Governing Body.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Campsbourne School & Extended Services

Acting Head Teachers: Karen Edgar & John Sharman

Sent by post and email

Freepost RTS4-BLSX-SHYC
4th Floor Early Years Service
Children's Centres Consultation
Haringey Council
River Park House
225 High Road
LONDON
N22 8HQ

18 September 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Early years Consultation - Changes to Haringey's Children Centres

As Campsbourne's Governing Body we felt that it was appropriate for us to write a response to your Consultation in relation to the proposed changes to Haringey's Children Centre and more specifically on the direct impact on the proposal in relation to Campsbourne Children Centre.

Closing Campsbourne as a Children Centre: As you no doubt remember we wrote to you in 2014 in relation to de-designating Campsbourne Children's Centre and making it a link centre, under the management of another local centre. This request was a pragmatic suggestion to ensure the available money was focussed on service delivery and not on stretching the management's resource too thinly. We therefore do not object to Campsbourne not remaining a Children's Centre. We do however have grave concerns about the ability of the service to build on the important work it currently does in early intervention and support on a vastly reduced budget. In fact on reading the last Ofsted report on Roksey Children Centre, Ofsted agree and stated 'the centre is not financially well resourced by the local authority. The situation is compounded because the manager is also responsible for another two centres in the locality and her time and effort are spread too thinly.' So how you can continue to consider slashing the budget and adding in extra Youth Services can only be considered ill advised.

Extension of age range supported in Children Centre: Your consultation mentions the desire to widen the focus of children's centre services from families with children 0-5 years of age to 0-19 years of age, and up to 25 years for children and young people with

Nightingale Lane
Hornsey,
London,
N8 7AF



Tel: 0208 340 2064
Fax: 0208 341 2658

Campsbourne School & Extended Services

Acting Head Teachers: Karen Edgar & John Sherman

special educational needs. Our concerns are how this will be managed on a site which is shared with a Nursery, Infant and Junior School? The entrance to our Children Centre is shared with our Nursery and that of our After School Club, open until 6:30pm Monday to Friday?

Impact on School Budget: You also mention you would like to 'increase current service availability to include evenings, weekends and across 48 weeks of the year'. We have concerns around the unmentioned support that may be necessary from the school to maintain a service that operates at different times to the school. How do you plan to facilitate this change in operating hours, surely there is not an expectation on our school to fund this?

Doing More for Less: The drive for the change seems to be borne out my the 'need' to cut £1.44m from the budget. In the early days of this consultation there was also an implication that the service was falling in it's current state, thankfully that was challenged and there seems to be a recognition for the work that is currently. All of us have been involved in cost cutting exercises and normally it is easy to see how a change in service can lead to a reduction in costs. You are reducing the number of children centres but on the whole those you are closing actively become Key Access Points. You are proposing to extend the open range and opening hours of the centres, more not less. It is hard to see it in this case and in fact the proposal seem to be we will doing more for less.

We hope that are points are fully considered and addressed as part of your review of the consultation.

Yours faithfully

Jude Pow
Chair of Extended Services Committee



Submission 20:

See attached PDF document

Response to submission: (by email on 23rd July 2015)

Request for information

The questionnaire was compounded by the Consultation booklet which had explanations concerning the new proposed model. Questionnaire and booklet go hand in hand.

1. Community Key Access Points

On page 7 of the booklet the last two paragraphs define the Community Key Access Points and particularly paragraph 2:

“Where children’s centres are closed, they will be supported to become part of the network of ‘Community Key Access Points’ – providing some services found at children’s centres, and signposting people to other forms of support where necessary. Services provide at ‘Community Key Access Points’ will be coordinated by a nearby children’s centre and may be delivered by children’s centre’s staff, partners, or parents themselves. Our intention is to retain around 15 hours of provision per week from these closed children’s centre buildings.”

2. Planning areas

On page 8 of the booklet there is a colour coded map to highlight the 5 planning areas and a paragraph above aims to explain what they are and how centres will operate within each area:

“We are proposing that the children’s centres remaining open will be grouped in 5 geographical areas, which will be called children’s centres planning areas. In each children’s centre planning area, children’s centres will work together with partners and schools to ensure that the services offered meet the needs of children and families living in the area. These groupings align to the areas that schools use to plan and organise services.”

3. Extending services to young people up to 19

The opening paragraph on page 9 of the booklet aims to explain what the role of centres will be in supporting families with children who are older than 5.

“[...] To do this, children’s centres will work across their planning area with partners, including schools, health services, social services, Job Centre Plus and private and voluntary sector”. The concept is for centres to be a hub of information, signposting and link to a variety of support services for families with older children. There is no expectation that centre’s staff would deliver specific services for older children. However if a centre is open after school hours, then there might be other professionals delivering services for the older groups of children. Services should be planned according to local needs and may vary from centre to centre.

4. Potential Charges for services

As part of the consultation we are asking families whether they would be prepared to pay and if so for what type of services. We are aware that in some areas in Haringey families can afford to pay for services and we need to test whether some families would be prepared to do so. As part of the proposed model we are not suggesting that all centres charge for services. Currently some centres do charge for some services and this has proved successful in supporting income generation in those areas.

In terms of usage and demand for services in Haringey children’s centres, the data and information on this was part of reviewing the current offer and developing the model we are consulting on. This model was arrived to by working with a children’s centres representative group and parents from a variety of settings in the period February to May 2015.

Section C (A)

Response to other written submissions

A range of written submissions were made as part of the consultation process. The majority were submitted by respondents to the questionnaire as part of the comments section. In addition to this, some written responses were submitted by individuals and the Governing Bodies of school-based children's centres. A number of issues were raised that were of concern to respondents and a response to each of the key issues is set out below.

	ISSUE RAISED	RESPONSE
	SAFEGUARDING	
	Governing bodies for centres proposed as designated sites did not feel that they could be responsible for safeguarding at key sites in addition to their own.	All staff, managers and governing bodies have a role to play in safeguarding children, young people and adults accessing provision on their site. We have considered how designated centres, working with partner agencies, services and other sites in the community might work within clear accountability framework. An initial draft of this framework was shared with the governing bodies of school-based children's centres during the consultation period. The intention is that the accountability framework is reflected in the service levels agreements issued as part of the future commissioning arrangements.
	Has there been a thorough risk assessment to identify safeguarding risks? Can we see evidence that this will work and be safe?	Risk assessments to identify specific safeguarding risks have not been carried out as these would be implemented as specific risks

		<p>were identified and in line with agreed Haringey safeguarding processes and protocols. These proposals do not change the thresholds in place in the borough for responding to social care concerns and specifically safeguarding and do not amend individual organisational responsibilities for responding to these thresholds.</p> <p>A more general consideration of how safeguarding will work in the context of designated centres working in partnership with other sites or partner services has been undertaken in order to mitigate any risks and to ensure roles, responsibilities and accountabilities are clear across partners. This is reflected in the roles and responsibilities set out in the draft accountability framework.</p>
	<p>JOB ROLES</p>	
	<p>Each Centre needs its own Manager</p>	<p>The concern about the capacity to manage a number of sites whilst fulfilling the centre manager role is acknowledged. The proposals have been amended to include a Centre Manager at each proposed designated site.</p>
	<p>Early Year Play Worker posts should be a Scale 6 grade and not a Scale 4.</p>	<p>These posts have been developed as Early Learning Practitioner posts. The changes to the proposed job descriptions suggested by staff and Children’s Centre Managers have been made and when re-evaluated, the grades have been returned as a Scale 4.</p>
	<p>We urge that governing bodies are involved in selection and</p>	<p>Governing Bodies will be involved from the earliest opportunity,</p>

	<p>recruitment of staff who will be working from their centres in order to maintain local knowledge and experience in sustaining services.</p>	<p>beginning with being asked to feedback on the proposed job roles and the process for restructuring staff teams. It is anticipated that Governing Bodies will, working with their Head teachers, be represented on selection panels.</p>
	<p>Lines of accountability within proposed staffing structure are unclear, especially for managers who have significant responsibilities to deliver services on different school sites</p>	<p>Work undertaken during the consultation period has included developing the job descriptions associated with each of the proposed job roles. We believe that the lines of accountability are clear and the proposed staffing structures set out the line management arrangements and the responsibilities of each job role.</p>
	<p>When constructing JDs, what consultation took place with people who operationally do this role?</p>	<p>Three meetings have been held for staff working across the children’s centre, before and during the consultation period (3rd June 2015, 29th June 2015 and 7th September 2015). In each of the meetings, the thinking to date was shared as well as proposals for job roles. All staff in attendance were asked for views and feedback on the proposed job descriptions and encouraged to share the information provided at the meeting with those unable to attend. Where possible, changes were made to job descriptions based on feedback from staff.</p>
	<p>JDs share much of the same text which makes us question what the differences are between each job role?</p>	<p>There are similarities in some of the job descriptions reflecting some of the common functions for all job roles working as part of a children’s centre team. There are clear differences in each of the job roles.</p>
	<p>Will the Centre Manager manage what is there, and is it ok not to develop what is not there? What happens if they have to manage more than 5 staff?</p>	<p>The Centre Manager will manage what happens as part of the children’s centre direct service delivery. It is not envisaged in the proposed model that the centre manager will be managing more</p>

		than 5 staff, however, the post is evaluated at a grade that does not preclude a centre manager from managing more than 5 people.
	Who is involved in the interview process and what consideration is being given to loss of expertise?	The interview process is likely to involve representatives from the local authority and schools, as appropriate. We are aware that the proposed reduction in the number of posts across children's centres will place some staff at risk of redundancy and subsequently contribute to a loss of knowledge and expertise
	Will school Sc 4 staff work differently to Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Sc 4 staff? Will there be different weighting and will it operate like a Sc6 post? Can this be reflected in the JD?	The role profile for the proposed staff roles reflects the functions and responsibilities that the post holder is expected to fulfil as part of a children's centre team in Haringey. Those evaluated at a Scale 4, have been assessed based on the functions of the role as required within a children's centre service. This may be different to how a member of staff, with the same pay grade, within a private, voluntary or independent sector provision may be required to work.
	We ask that staff are given the opportunity to go 2 points up in the restructure as we have, over the years, grown out staff in order that they offer a much higher service than which they are currently paid.	The policy that covers the staff restructure process dictates that staff can only be ring-fenced for posts that are one grade above or below the grade for their current job.
	Admin post should be re-designated and re-evaluated as an Admin/Information Officer	The newly proposed admin/reception roles differ from the current admin/information officer and admin/information assistant roles but it is expected that the new role will, alongside other roles within the proposed children's centre staff teams, have a key role to play in the provision of information to parents and other service users.
	Currently admin is graded as Sc 5 so degrading it to Sc4 means they cannot fulfil the information role as they currently do.	
	Children's Centre Teams should be integrated with Health Visitors and Social care	At this time, the proposals do not fully integrate the children's centre teams with health visitors and social care. The proposals do,

		however, include a named Health Visitor and Social Worker for each designated children’s Centre which will strengthen the partnership working between these important service areas and facilitate the integration of early help services in and around children’s centres.
Where will you find staff to work in centres on weekends and evenings?		We would expect all designated centres to consider how they organise staff working patterns to facilitate access to services for residents in their community. The proposal to extend to weekends and evenings will be evaluated in terms of cost and reflecting the staffing hours required to enable this. Final proposals around the extension of opening hours will be informed by the feedback from the consultation and the anticipated costs.
CHILDREN CENTRE PLANNING AREAS		
There is no mention of Bruce Grove, the link site to Pembury		It is not proposed to continue with Bruce Grove and Downhills (link site to Woodlands Park) as link sites in the new arrangements due to the need to reduce expenditure across the model.
In the proposal, South East (SE) Tottenham cluster will have around 5,000 under 5s, nearly double that of other clusters. However, they are not being given double the amount of staff, and the expectation that they will deliver similar successful results to other clusters remains.		The approach set out in the model reflects the different levels of deprivation, size of population and needs through the differing allocations of outreach capacity across centres. The alignment of other services with children’s centres will also differ from centre to centre based on these factors.
Top-down approach in model does not seem to take full account of levels of deprivation and needs in different areas.		
COMISSIONING CHILDREN CENTRES		
We need a clear indication of what will be expected from each children’s centres through a Service Level Agreement		The service level agreement s will set out explicitly what will be expected from each centre.

	<p>What will the changes from a centre to a delivery site mean in terms of service delivery?</p>	<p>The proposed change from a designated centre to a delivery site will mean that there will be a reduced volume of services offered from that site and those services will be coordinated by the designated centre linked to that delivery site. The change from designated centre to delivery site will also mean that the centre will no longer be formally designated as children’s centre with an Ofsted registration number. The centre will no longer be subject to an Ofsted children’s centre inspection but will contribute to an inspection of the designated centre, along with a number of other services that play a part in facilitating children and families to access services.</p>
	<p>How do you plan to facilitate the change in operating hours, surely there is not an expectation on our school to fund this?</p>	<p>There is no expectation on schools to fund any change in operating hours. The proposed changes in operating hours are being appraised in terms of cost and this, as well as the feedback from the consultation, will inform final proposals for opening hours.</p>
	<p>EARLY HELP</p>	
	<p>We cannot see how early help will work effectively in the proposed model</p>	<p>Children’s Centres offer a significant contribution to the wider implementation of a successful partnership early help model in the borough. It is recognised that they are often the first port of call for parents with young children and their interventions support an effective early help approach. The proposals are for each of the designated centres to be linked to the relevant early help locality team for their planning area. This will include a link to a named Family Support Worker for each Centre. There will also be</p>

		additional family support work time to offer early intervention capacity and to support children’s centre workers to intervene earlier to prevent needs escalating and to access appropriate support
	Who will ensure that vulnerable families are not lost or missed at the ‘Community Access Points’?	Each centre will be required to hold regular vulnerable children meetings, involving key professionals, and participate in other safeguarding and care planning forums. We will improve the information given to centres about vulnerable children in their area and also developing agreed information – sharing protocols with other key agencies.
	PARTNERSHIP WORKING	
	How will the Local Authority ensure that strongly built partnerships and relationships with other services are sustained in the new model?	Where services are commissioned by the Council, the requirement to work collaboratively with children’s centres will be reflected on the service level agreements and service specifications, as appropriate.
	COSTS	
	We do not believe the current allocation of running costs is sufficient. This should reflect local needs.	The amounts allocated to meet running costs have been reviewed and have been revised.
	If centres being closed will become CAPS and opening hours of remaining centres are extended, where will the savings come from?	The proposal to retain de- designated children’s centres as community access points and extending the opening hours of remaining centres will have to be accounted for in the financial modelling for the new design of children’s centres. The savings will largely come from reducing the numbers of staff and also the costs of running the current number of designated children’s centres.
	GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY	

	<p>What are the governance and accountability position for 'community access points'?</p>	<p>The designated centre will be responsible for coordinating the services that may be delivered from a community access point. If services are delivered by a third party, then the accountability for the service being delivered will rest with the third party organisation. The relationship between children's centre, community access point and any third party service provider will need to be clearly articulated in appropriate service specifications and service level agreements. In addition, we are developing an accountability framework which will outline accountability and responsibilities.</p>
<p>COMMUNICATION</p>		
	<p>Are you publishing the reasons behind the decisions as to which centres will close?</p>	<p>The reasons for the decisions made will be published as part of the decision –making process.</p>
	<p>Is this consultation about expanding services, saving money across the borough or taking stock of what is working well and what is isn't?</p>	<p>This consultation is about gathering views on a set of proposals for the future delivery of children's centre services in Haringey. The proposals are seeking to save money but have also been informed by what is believed to work well. It is challenging to expand services when there is a need to reduce expenditure and therefore the approach has been to ensure that the future model builds greater collaboration between children's centres and other services; providing improved access to a wider range of services for children and families.</p>

