

Introduction

1. This paper sets out the engagement process followed at the start of the development of the strategy, as well as details on the 12-week public consultation, including how it was promoted, data on who responded and details of the feedback received.
2. As part of the consultation, a series of questions were asked about various aspects of the plan, and whether respondents agreed with the identified outcomes and priorities.

Strategy Development Engagement

3. To identify the outcomes and focus areas of the Plan, a series of one-to-one engagement sessions were held with key service professionals, both internal and external to the City Corporation, as well as attendance at team staff meetings to gauge a wider opinion. Recently published service area reports were also used to gather information on priorities as well as using one-to-one meetings.
4. Engagement was carried out with professionals from the following service areas
 - Children’s Social Care & Early Help
 - Education
 - SEND
 - Early Years
 - Commissioning
 - City & Hackney Public Health
 - Health Visiting Service
 - City of London Virtual School
 - Northeast London Integrated Care Partnership
 - Northeast London Clinical Commissioning Group
 - Homerton University Hospital Foundation Trust
 - East London NHS Foundation Trust
 - Barbican & Community Libraries
 - London Borough of Hackney
5. As most of the engagement work was completed during the Covid-19 pandemic, it was not possible to conduct direct engagement with our children and young people. Attempts to mitigate this were used such as including published national research, recently conducted engagement work with our young people, such as the Action for Children Survey and engagement work by the City of London’s Youth Service provider, SocietyLinks.
6. Engagement questions put to service professionals on a one-to-one basis was also framed in a way that put the views and priorities of young people at the forefront of their response. This was achieved by asking service professionals to

Appendix 3 – Children and Young People’s Plan 2022-25 Consultation Responses

answer on behalf of young people through their knowledge and experience of working with them on a day-to-day basis.

Public consultation

7. Following the development of the strategy, a twelve-week public consultation period was undertaken to gather feedback from children and young people, parents, Members, City of London residents and service professionals on the design of the Plan and the identified outcomes and priorities.
8. The consultation was hosted on the City of London website and was open for a period of twelve weeks (22 June 2022 – 14 September 2022).
9. Translations of the consultation were made available in different languages upon request by a member of the public.
10. The consultation was promoted to various individuals and groups to provide the widest range of feedback. These included:
 - a. The Aldgate School & Children’s Centre
 - b. City of London Corporation staff
 - c. City & Hackney Public Health
 - d. Community & Children’s Services Departmental Leadership Team
 - e. Barbican & Community Libraries
 - f. City of London Children’s Partnership Board
 - g. City of London Parent and Carers Forum
 - h. City of London Family Information Service
 - i. Partnership for Young London
 - j. City of London Police
 - k. Community Safety Partners
 - l. City & Hackney Emotional Health & Wellbeing Partnership
 - m. City & Hackney Families Sub-Group
 - n. City of London Early Help Sub-Group
 - o. City & Hackney Substance Misuse Service
 - p. City of London Health Visiting Service
 - q. London Borough of Hackney
 - r. City of London Virtual School
 - s. Northeast London Integrated Care Partnership
 - t. Northeast London Clinical Commissioning Group
 - u. Homerton University Hospital Foundation Trust
 - v. East London NHS Foundation Trust
11. As well as promoting the consultation to individual groups, other forms of advertising the consultation was conducted. This included:
 - a. Resident & estate newsletters
 - b. Full page advertisement in print copies of City Matters
 - c. Social media posts
 - d. Advertisements on the City of London Family Information Service website

12. In addition to feedback from the consultation itself, feedback from recently conducted consultation work has also been considered as part of the feedback. This includes recently completed engagement work by SocietyLinks, the City Corporation’s commissioned youth provider, and Action for Children’s survey with Looked After Children and Care Leavers.

Consultation response data

13. Over the course of the consultation period, page visits and the bounce rate of the consultation page were monitored on a weekly basis to provide analysis of the amount of people attempting to complete the survey. This provided evidence that promotion of the survey was having an impact on the number of people completing the survey, and if necessary, adjustments to the level of promotion could be made.

14. Page visits and engagement with the consultation remained high throughout the consultation period. At the end of the consultation period, over 300 unique hits to the consultation web page were registered, with an average user time of 12 minutes being spent on the page.

15. Over the 12-week consultation period, a total of 32 responses were received. Of these...

- a. 9.4% (3) were from children under the age of 18 and live in the City of London
- b. 6.3% (2) were from young people aged 19-25 and live in the City of London
- c. 21.9% (7) were from a parent or carer who live in the City of London
- d. 9.4% (3) were from other interested residents who live in the City of London
- e. 12.5% (4) were from professionals working in the health sector
- f. 3.1% (1) were from professionals working in the education sector
- g. 3.1% (1) were from professionals working in social care
- h. 9.4% (3) were from professionals working in the commissioning of services
- i. 21.9% (7) were from Officers of the City of London Corporation
- j. 3.1% (1) were from an Officer of another local authority
- k. 3.1% (1) were from a City of London tenant in Southwark
- l. 3.1% (1) were from a City of London based teacher
- m. 3.1% (1) were from a PhD student

16. In total, 46% (15) of responses were from individuals who live inside the boundary of the Square Mile, with 53% (17) stating that they live outside the boundary of the Square Mile.

17. Of those who stated that they live in the Square Mile...

- a. 15% (5) live in the Barbican Estate

Appendix 3 – Children and Young People’s Plan 2022-25 Consultation Responses

- b. 6.3% (2) live in the Portsoken Estate
- c. 6.3% (2) live in the Golden Lane Estate
- d. 18.8% (6) live in another area of the City of London

18. Due to the discrepancy between page hits, the average time spent on the web page and the lower number of submitted responses, it can be assumed that most individuals who engaged with the proposed plan had no further comment to make and can be taken as a positive response to the consultation.


Consultation response

19. The below sets out the questions asked during the consultation, as well as responses to each of the questions.

20. Question 1: Did you know anything about the Children & Young People’s Plan (CYPP) before this consultation?

Did you know anything about the Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP) before this consultation?


32 responses



21. Question 2: Is the language used in the Children & Young People’s Plan easy to understand?

Is the language used in the Children & Young People’s Plan easy to understand?


32 responses



22. Question 3: Do you like the design of the Children & Young People’s Plan?


Do you like the design of the Children & Young People’s Plan?

32 responses



23. Question 4: Do you agree with our proposed outcomes and their associated focus areas? (see page 3 of the Plan)

Do you agree with our proposed outcomes and their associated focus areas? (see page 3 of the Plan)



24. Question 5: What do you think is the biggest issue facing children and young people in the City of London?

- a. Having good mental health – 31% (10)
- b. Having somewhere safe to play – 18% (6)
- c. Being successful at school – 9% (3)
- d. Having somewhere safe to live – 9% (3)
- e. Being happy and able to make good friends – 9% (3)
- f. Being protected from online harm – 6% (2)
- g. Exploitation and gangs – 6% (2)
- h. Feeling safe whilst walking the streets at night – 3% (1)
- i. Access to a range of development opportunities within the Square Mile – 3% (1)
- j. Not being an after thought in decision making – 3% (1)

Appendix 3 – Children and Young People’s Plan 2022-25 Consultation Responses

25. Question 6: What would you like to see more of in the City of London (respondents selected their top three)

- a. Measures to support the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people – 62% (20)
- b. Opportunities for young people to be physically active – 47% (15)
- c. Youth services and activities for young people to get involved with – 40% (13)
- d. Measures to protect young people from gangs and exploitation – 32% (10)
- e. Signposting on how to access services and information – 25% (8)
- f. Careers and job support for young people – 19% (6)
- g. Working with children and young people and their families when designing services? – 19% (6)
- h. Green space and better sporting facilities – 6% (2)
- i. A dedicated state secondary school in the City of London – 3% (1)
- j. Looking at the causes of the problems identifies – 3% (1)

26. Question 7: Anything else you would like to tell us about your thoughts on the Children and Young People’s Plan? (this section summarises all additional comments received to the consultation)

- a. Support for young people doing the career they want to do. I would like to be a vet and I want to have the opportunity to have work experience.
- b. I think the design of the plan is very clear, easy concise. I feel like this would relate to a young person.
- c. Specific work around domestic abuse and what a healthy relationship looks like would be beneficial
- d. How would SEND support work if the child goes to school outside say city of London primary Islington. Double so for secondly schools since there are no state maintained schools in the city.
- e. The plan is fine but how its achieved isn't clear and prevention of the causes is never addressed.
- f. With regards to the question about the design of the plan - it is not so much that I don't like it, but more think that it combines two slightly different approaches, one user (particularly child) focused, and one public facing in a strategic sense. Whilst I can understand the desire to make the plan engaging for the different public audiences that are served by the plan, I do think that some of the colour and font choices could actually cause disengagement with the very important content of the document itself.
- g. The format is clear and easy to access. It's important that children's earliest years are fully taken into account in the plan.
- h. Themes in the plan are repetitive and include meaningless tautology. What does “Improve youth services, education, and work experience for all” mean? What does “Support children, young people, and their families to make sure they are prepared for school”? What does “Encourage families with early years children to make the right decisions” mean? I have a 6.5 year old daughter, never received any support or encouragement. These appear empty statements with little substance. What we would like to see is: “the City will create more green spaces and playground facilities for children.” Or “the City will consider

Appendix 3 – Children and Young People’s Plan 2022-25 Consultation Responses

local intake into City run schools”. We need concrete actions, not some blue sky slogans that are frankly hollow. The demographics have changed significantly over the past few years which ought to be reflected in all City plans and endeavours. In addition, the plan should also address concerns of families from less disadvantaged backgrounds in general.

- i. No mention of crafts and arts or team sports. Language was too generic and could apply to ANY place, doesn't take into account the issues in city of London, ie not great access to state secondary schools, competition when it comes to good access to good schools.
- j. There is simply not enough consideration of how to ensure children can live, learn and play safely in the city. Education and access to quality after school care facilities is very much a postcode lottery and there is little being done to ensure children can gradually and safely learn how to become independent. Basic health needs are not being met including accessing GP or a dentist. Provision of holiday/ half term clubs is poor. There is not enough sport activities that children can access.
- k. The design of the Plan is awful. If it's a serious document it should be set out accordingly. A plus cannot be the fifth least deprived borough in London for children. There should be no deprivation. Whilst there is access to pre-school child care, the removal of funding to the Golden Lane Camus Children’s Centre was callous. Whatever Ofsted may say, the fact that City Corporation spends millions on its Independent Schools and academies and nothing on its one state school over and above government grant is shameful. And are there really newly 3,000 under 25s in the City?
- l. The design is good and the graphics are very well done, particularly the blue to red ratios in the statistics. The yellow textboxes make the appearance quite overcrowded and it can be labour some to read all the information because one is darting between various sections of the file.
- m. A healthy sense of belonging and pride in your area is so important and needs to be encouraged. The strategy objectives are solid.
- n. I think that building positive relationships with parents, teachers and peers is extremely important as young people often feel isolated in an increasingly online world. An increase in community involvement and identity would create a better support network, therefore creating a sense of belonging.
- o. To make sure information gets to parents and young people. Often things get organised but we don't know about it.
- p. This is a magnificent poster, something that I myself have been longing to see ever since I was a kid... someone/anyone that genuinely cares about the children and young people. This poster and its initiatives certainly represent that. All I would like to say is that it is apparent that this is not a quick fix/solution to tackle all the challenges but certainly what you have captured is a very good basis to work with. As they are problems I identified when I was a kid and still feel that way (regarding challenges as a C&YP) now that I am older... so it is reassuring to know that you have actively listened and captured their thoughts. It is hard to get C&YP to engage with materials in general but the quality of what you have got... I am confident that if overtime they are actioned it will

Appendix 3 – Children and Young People’s Plan 2022-25 Consultation Responses

certainly spark a change in the lives of C&YP and encourage them to speak out and engage with their peers and elders a lot more... why? because they feel like they are being listened to and more importantly they get a sense of belonging knowing that people do care about them and are not just saying xyz for the sake of good PR. Hope this helps :)... GOOD LUCK!

- q. I believe a safe playground and space to play for children is very important and lacking in the City. If these facilities exist, they should be clearly signposted so others can access. I understand from consultations regarding the public spaces of the Barbican podium restoration that “natural play features” will be built. If this is designed to be a play space for children this should be clearly signposted so that non Barbican residents are aware also. Being up on the Barbican podium would be a safe place for children in the City, with play features this would be excellent to have somewhere safe to play.
- r. Design - I think this is refreshing and vibrant. A lot different from the usual faceless strategies that we see elsewhere. It is eye catching and encourages people to look further into it. It does draw people in. However, would be good to have it more interactive eventually - perhaps clicking on a topic to get more info on a particular topic. Challenges. I am not an expert, but the challenges facing young people in London per se are many. I feel young people get very little central education for living across the board and I worry schools do not prepare them for the wider challenges of life. Expectation for young people is high and this can lead to unhealthy choices on leaving education, there feels like there is a lack of pathway and opportunity especially for more vulnerable children. As experts in many areas of society I think council departments can get involved a little more.
- s. Like the plan- succinct, colourful, engaging, better than a report. The Youth Forum isn't currently meeting the needs of successfully engaging with City young people
- t. Engaging and concise. May not be accessible for all groups, such as people with learning difficulties or English as a second language.