

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

Present

Members:

Councillor Jonathan Chilvers
Councillor Yousef Dahmash
Councillor Peter Fowler
Councillor Bob Hicks (Chair)
Councillor Julie Jackson (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Danny Kendall
Councillor Dave Parsons
Councillor Mike Perry
Councillor Jenny St. John
Councillor Whitehouse

Co-opted members:

Joseph Cannon, Church Representative
John McRoberts, Parent Governor Representative

Other Councillors:

Councillor Timms, Portfolio Holder, Children and Schools – present from 1.30 p.m. onwards (part-way through Item 4)

Officers:

Georgina Atkinson, Democratic Services Team Leader
Sarah Bradwell, Partnerships Manager, Learning and Achievement
Jenny Butlin-Moran, Service Manager, Safeguarding
Rebecca Davidson, Communications Officer
Hugh Disley, Head of Early Intervention
Philip Edmundson, Service Manager, Learning and Performance
Wendy Fabbro, Strategic Director, People Group
Helen King, Deputy Director of Public Health
Janet Neale, Project Officer, Learning and Achievement
Greta Needham, Head of Law and Governance
Craig Pratt, Lead Officer, Pupil and Student Services
Sue Ross, Interim Head of Safeguarding
Peter Speers, Interim Service Manager, Access and Organisation
Claudia Wade, Interim Head of Learning and Achievement
Barbara Wallace, Operations Manager, Children's Centres

Other representatives:

Diana Turner, Warwickshire Governors Association
Chris Smart, Warwickshire Governors Association

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

Members of the public:

Ellie Costello and Jill Manly, Siblings at the Same School

1. General

(1) Apologies

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Timms, Portfolio Holder for Children and Schools, who would be late attending the meeting.

(2) Members' Disclosures of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interest

Councillor Whitehouse declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that he was a Governor of St. John's Nursery and Primary School in Kenilworth. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest in advance of a question he would raise under Item 3, 'Questions to the Cabinet and Portfolio Holder'; the nature of the interest being that he was a trustee of the Kenilworth Youth Centre.

Councillor Kendall declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that he was a history teacher at Alcester School.

Councillor Jackson declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that she was a governor Oakwood Academy which has a nursery and that she was a trustee for the Nicholas Chamberlaine Schools Foundation.

Councillor Perry declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that he was a trustee at Kind Edward VI School.

Councillor Hicks declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that his daughter was employed at St Michael's School and that this daughter-in-law was employed at Stockingford School.

Councillor Fowler declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that he was a Governor at an academy school and had relatives at two of the schools listed in the Schools Admissions Arrangements 2015/16 consultation document.

Diana Turner declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that she had a grandson who was mentally disabled.

Councillor Timms declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that she was a trustee of the Binley Woods Youth Centre.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

(3) Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2013

The Committee agreed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 November 2013 be signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record.

In response to a request for clarification, Claudia Wade, Interim Head of Learning and Achievement, explained that any school that had been considered by Ofsted to have allocated Pupil Premium funding inappropriately would be subject to Special Measures. This applied to academies, free schools and those schools maintained by the local authority. Confirmation on whether the increase of the Pupil Premium to £1,300 per child applied only to primary schools would be provided.

With regard to the existing vacancy for the Parent Governor representative on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, members were advised that the County Council's Governor Services team would continue to promote the vacancy at Parent Governor Steering Group meetings.

2. Public Question Time

Ellie Costello and Jill Manly were in attendance to represent Siblings at the Same School. Three questions were presented to the Committee, as follows:

Question 1

"I wish to reference Councillor Timms' late submission of consultation papers to Council in December. The impact of her department's actions left Cabinet, as Councillor Whitehouse robustly stated, no opportunity for the decisions she forced Cabinet to act on to be "called-in"; in effect, abandoning Leamington from the Super Priority programme for 2015/16 without explaining why. No rationale was given as to why Leamington was no longer included in her promise to address the dwindling choices available to families and sibling priority within the locations of Warwick and Leamington. We do not accept or understand the explanation behind abandoning Leamington, when there is a clear and pressing need based on catchment figures for Brookhurst, Milverton, Cubbington, Telford and Lillington. Could Councillor Timms elaborate on her reasons for omitting Leamington from proposed changes for 2015, and what assurances will she give that she will not go back on her word again by excluding the areas she originally intended to consult on (which are Bedworth, Leamington, Nuneaton and Rugby) for this November's 2017/18 admissions?"

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

Question 2

“We wish to recommend that this Committee presses the Portfolio Holder to maintain her promise to include the North Leamington Cluster for 2015/16 as delay will certainly result in considerable problems for families with siblings already attending these schools based on current catchment figures. Will the Committee consider recommending to Cabinet the reinstatement of Leamington Super priority areas for 2015/16 admissions?”

Question 3

“It is deeply frustrating that no local press has been issued by the Portfolio Holder informing parents of her change of heart. Many parents who read her September press release in the local papers or heard interviews on the radio are completely ignorant that Leamington’s Super Priority Area has been wiped off the agenda for 2015/16. How are parents expected to engage in consultation when Councillor Timms’ communication with local families is negligible? Peter Speers’ consultation papers regarding the Warwick Super Priority proposal contains a vitally important questionnaire which invites parents to answer three questions regarding sibling priority within the community. Given the specific remit requested by this Committee today to address this very issue, why has Mr Speers or Admissions not promoted the questionnaire more fully? Whilst we are working hard to spread the word and we understand some of our supporters have submitted their responses in time for today’s meeting following our call to them to do so, many parents who undoubtedly have a view are completely ignorant of this unique opportunity to give it. Will Councillor Timms agree to significantly increase publicity about these proposals and reach out to parents via the accepted routes of school letters / press releases, etc. in order to consult fully on this issue; and will Councillor Timms or Mr Speers agree that his three question form be distributed across the county so that parents may fully be afforded the opportunity to engage with this issue and share their views?”

Ellie Costello concluded with a statement which outlined a number of key issues regarding the oversubscription criteria and how it had disadvantaged a number of children through the allocation of school places separate to their siblings.

Wendy Fabbro, Strategic Director for People Group, advised the Committee that the case presented by Siblings at the Same School was only one side of the issue and asked that members did not pass judgement until a full understanding of the issues and implications had been achieved. For example, there may be a case from local families attending local schools.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

In response to the questions raised, Peter Speers, Interim Service Manager (Access and Organisation), advised that paper copies of the consultation document were currently being printed and would be distributed across schools, nurseries, libraries and other community-based venues. A press release had been issued the week commencing 13th January 2014 to publicise the consultation and encourage the public to submit comments and further publicity would be undertaken for the remainder of the consultation period, which would end on 1st March 2014.

3. Questions to Cabinet and Portfolio Holder

Members considered the Forward Plan of decisions by Cabinet and the Portfolio Holder for Children and Schools.

Councillor Whitehouse referred to the 'Youth and Community Centres' page of the County Council's web site and questioned why the page only listed those youth centres that had been retained by the County Council and did not list those that operated within the community sector. Hugh Disley, Head of Early Intervention, agreed that the page would be amended to include the full list of youth and community centres, with web links to the full youth offer in each area.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to note the decisions.

4. School Admissions Arrangements 2015/16

The Committee was advised that an eight-week consultation on School Admissions Arrangements 2015/16 and the proposed changes to the Priority Areas of Primary Schools in Warwick had commenced on 6th January until 1st March 2014. The findings of both consultations and a report detailing proposed future arrangements would be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 10th April 2014.

Peter Speers explained that the oversubscription criteria for Schools Admissions Arrangements 2015/16 had remained the same as in previous years. The additional consultation in respect of the proposed change to admissions arrangements in the Warwick area related to a merge of the five existing priority areas into one combined Super Priority Area (SPA). This would result in the following six schools sharing a priority area: Coten End Primary School, Emscote Infant and All Saints Junior Schools, Newburgh Primary School, Westgate Primary School, and Woodloes Primary School.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

It was proposed that school places would be prioritised to those children living within the SPA who already had a sibling at the particular school. In light of this, it was possible that siblings living further away from an oversubscribed school within the SPA would be given priority over children placed geographically closer to the school. Any remaining school places would be granted on a straight line distance basis to those children who lived geographically closer. He added that the proposal was not to increase capacity and that there was no school capacity issue in Warwick and Leamington last year.

In response to a question raised by Councillor Jackson, Peter Speers explained that there was not a proposal to change the priorities by which places were offered in rural areas. Over 40 per cent of Warwickshire Primary Schools were classed as 'rural' and it was important that the priority for children living in those areas remained. The policy would therefore only be applied in urban areas due to the close proximity of other schools within the SPA.

Following questioning from the Committee, the following points of clarification were noted:

- 1) A 'looked after child' did not need to be a Warwickshire resident in order to get first priority at an oversubscribed Warwickshire school. This priority was a statutory requirement;
- 2) The implementation of a Super Priority Area in Rugby had been a success;
- 3) Children who lived within a SPA but whose parents had requested a place at a school outside of the SPA would face a similar risk as other non-SPA children regarding the siblings at the same school issue;
- 4) The proposed SPA for Warwick was the first phase of a planned roll-out of SPAs in urban areas across Warwickshire from September 2016, subject to consultation outcomes in each of the identified SPAs;
- 5) Although the County Council was legally bound to comply with the approved Schools Admissions Arrangements and oversubscription criteria, the policy was analysed and monitored each year to assess its impact on children and siblings at the same school in order to inform further policy;
- 6) Under the current arrangements, any in-year places that became available would be offered in strict criterion order; for example, the child at the top of the waiting list could live in the school's priority area but not have a sibling at the school. They would be ranked

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

above out of area children with a sibling at the school and would therefore be offered a place first;

- 7) The Department for Education allocation of the Schools Basic Need Capital Allocation had been significantly reduced for the County Council which would impede development opportunities from 2015/16 onwards. Wendy Fabbro was currently assessing the impact of the reduction;
- 8) To assist in the improvement and the enhancement of less subscribed schools, the County Council's School Improvement team offered either direct officer support, or arranged peer support with other schools; and
- 9) The St. Mary Immaculate Catholic Primary School in Warwick had not been included in the SPA as the school was its own Admissions Authority and therefore has its own oversubscription criteria. In addition, the school did not have a priority area for admissions and considered other factors, such as a child's faith, rather than distance of residence to the school.

Members were advised by the Strategic Director that Cabinet would ultimately need to decide which children should get priority in urban areas; either children who lived closest to the school or children that did not live the closest, but had a sibling at the particular school. A concern was raised by Chris Smart, Warwickshire Governors Association, that under the SPA policy, children living closest to the school would not be prioritised and questioned members' views on whether local schools should only be for local children. He believed that the 'siblings at the same school' was an insolvable issue.

Members noted that although the number of children who had been disadvantaged by the oversubscription criteria was low (reported to be 25 children for September 2013 admissions), the impact on the lives of those children and parents was significant. Members were reminded of the statement that had been presented by Ellie Costello that had highlighted the key issues which parents and children experienced on a daily basis due to siblings being placed at separate schools. However, the Committee was mindful that a proposal to change the oversubscription criteria was not an option for consideration and accepted that the implementation of Super Priority Areas across the county was a positive solution to address the current risk of separating siblings. In light of this, the Committee considered that the roll-out of Super Priority Areas in other urban areas be presented for public consultation as a matter of urgency, with a view to wider implementation, subject to consultation responses, from September 2016 in order to prevent further families being disadvantaged.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

The Committee expressed concern at the delay in Cabinet's consideration of the proposed consultation exercise which had restricted elected members' opportunity for challenge and further scrutiny. Councillor Whitehouse reported that this issue had been acknowledged by the Leader of the Council at the Cabinet meeting on 12th December 2013.

Diana Turner, Warwickshire Governors Association, raised a concern in respect of the structure of the consultation questions for the Super Priority Area for Warwick; for example, the first question was: *"Do you agree that a fair and transparent admissions policy should seek to ensure that siblings at the same school can attend the same primary school?"* This was considered to be a leading question as it was unlikely that an individual would reject the proposal for a "fair and transparent" policy. It was requested that future consultation questions were more open; this proposal was accepted by the officer present.

Councillor Timms joined the meeting at this point (1.30 p.m.)

In response to a request made by the Committee in respect of the questions that had been raised under Item 2, 'Public Question Time', Councillor Timms, Portfolio Holder for Children and Schools, agreed that public consultation meetings would be held in the Warwick and Leamington areas in respect of the Super Priority Area (SPA) proposed for Warwick. She explained that the SPA had been designated for Warwick from September 2015 as she had confidence that the County Council had the capacity to implement that SPA successfully and therefore she believed that it would be a positive first phase of a planned roll-out of SPAs from September 2016, subject to the outcome of public consultation. Councillor Timms assured the Committee that public consultation meetings would be held within the proposed SPAs.

In response to a question raised, Councillor Timms explained that Super Priority Areas did not increase capacity in schools; the SPAs would hopefully provide parents with a greater choice of schools and may also address the existing issue of a child not being granted a place at the same school as their sibling.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to:

- 1) Note that there had been no change to the proposed Schools Admission Arrangements 2015/16;
- 2) Respond "yes" to the three questions in the Super Priority Area for Warwick consultation with the following additional comment: *"The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee understands that the Super Priority Area for Warwick is the first phase of an intended roll-out of Super Priority Areas in urban area*

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

across the county. Given the significant impact on families with siblings at separate schools, the Committees stresses that the County Council expedites preparative work to ensure that public consultation for the proposed implementation of Super Priority Areas is carried out in a timely and sufficient manner in order to secure the full roll-out across the county in September 2016, subject to public consultation responses.”;

- 3) To request that Cabinet confirm its statement of intent regarding the roll-out of Super Priority Areas in urban areas from September 2016, subject to public consultation;
- 4) Request that a timetable for the proposed public consultation and roll-out for Super Priority Areas across the county be provided to members;
- 5) Recommend to Cabinet at its meeting on 10th April 2014 that sufficient preparation for Portfolio Holder and Cabinet decisions is always undertaken at an early stage to ensure that elected members have the opportunity to challenge and scrutinise proposed decisions, as part of the County Council's agreed decision-making process.

5. 16-19 Year Old NEETs (Not in Education Employment or Training) Performance Update

Sarah Bradwell, Partnerships Manager (Learning and Achievement) presented the Committee with a performance update in respect of the number of young people 'Not in Education Employment or Training' (NEET). It was reported that the decrease in the number of NEET young people from 6.7 per cent in 2006/07 to 3.6 per cent (660 young people) in 2012/13 had placed Warwickshire as the second lowest proportion of NEET young people within its group of eleven statistical neighbours. Leicestershire had the smallest proportion at 3.5 per cent and the average proportion across the statistical neighbours was 4.9 per cent.

Members noted that the proportion of Warwickshire young people aged 19 who were 'looked after' at age 16 and had since become NEET was currently 34 per cent, which had remained unchanged since 2011. This had placed Warwickshire as fifth amongst its statistical neighbours (whose average was 38 per cent) and ahead of the England figure of 36 per cent. Sarah Bradwell explained that ongoing work with the Virtual School and Care Leavers teams would continue to address this current position. Wendy Fabbro, Strategic Director for People Group, added that there was a guaranteed interview scheme for care leavers applying for apprenticeship positions within the County Council in addition to the mentoring and support service and work of the Tiffin

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

Club. She explained that increasing opportunities in all County Council directorates for care leavers and individuals with learning disabilities would be desirable.

In response to a question raised, Sarah Bradwell confirmed that reducing the level of NEETs in areas of deprivation was a key priority and that data sharing agreements with Job Centre Plus would help to support this; however, this was not yet currently possible and had been raised as an issue at national levels. In addition, the Priority Families Initiative continued to address key issues regarding family support and worklessness that affected young people. Members noted that a review of the impact of the Priority Families Initiative was ongoing at present and a full report would be presented to the Committee on 2nd April 2014.

Members were advised that there was work in progress exploring a data sharing agreement with neighbouring authorities to ensure that Warwickshire young people who attended schools or Further Education in another local authority area were captured and their outcomes tracked.

Sarah Bradwell reported that Coventry and Warwickshire were part of an initial Department for Education (DfE) trial to determine the key characteristics of NEET young people. The information was used to determine the criteria used in the Risk of NEET indicator (RONI). The identified characteristics had included: the young person had less than 85 per cent school attendance; was a looked after child; had experienced one or more fixed term exclusion; was pregnant or a teenage parent; and did not achieve the local authority average score at Key Stage 2.

A discussion took place with regard to the development of employability and vocational skills among young people. Members were informed that the County Council had facilitated a Careers Network for schools, academies and Further Education college middle leaders in November 2013. Jaguar Land Rover and the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (CWLEP) had attended and shared information regarding vocational skills, apprenticeship opportunities. The CWLEP had recently launched a Skills Strategy to address the economic needs of the sub-region and the development of skills for young people. The Strategy had been shared with schools and colleges, who had also received details regarding the new Ofsted framework.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to:

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

- 1) Request that a briefing note on the identified characteristics of young people at risk of becoming NEET be circulated to the Committee;
- 2) Request that a briefing note be circulated to the Committee in respect of the internal audit review of the efficiency and effectiveness of current arrangements for targeted support for young people;
- 3) Note that the progress made in relation to the number of young people aged 16-19 not in education, employment or training had been positive; and
- 4) Note the progress of looked after children, the pupils who were previously on the roll of the Warwickshire Pupil Referral Unit and the work of the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) towards reducing NEETs.

6. Performance of the Independent Reviewing Service in Warwickshire

Members considered a report from Jenny Butlin-Moran, Service Manager (Safeguarding), which outlined the performance of the Independent Reviewing Service in Warwickshire and the steps being taken to address the recruitment difficulties. It was reported that the primary role of the Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) was to ensure that the Care Plan for a looked after child fully reflected the child's needs and due consideration was made to each child's individual wishes and feelings. The IRO also had a duty to monitor the County Council's overall performance as a Corporate Parent and to bring any areas of poor practice in the care and planning for looked after children to the attention of senior managers. In light of this, the IROs were line-managed separately to operational teams in order to maintain independence from the case management decision-making and resource allocation processes.

The Committee was informed that at present there were 9.5 FTE Independent Reviewing Officers which were managed by one Operational Manager. The service had 1.5 FTE staff vacancies which had not been filled, despite three separate recruitment exercises. This had been attributed to the demanding workload of an IRO, the salary offer and the geography of Warwickshire which required IROs to travel significant distances.

Jenny Butlin-Moran reported that in Warwickshire, an IRO managed cases for both children subject to Child Protection Plans and looked after children; therefore, the workload was significant with each IRO responsible for 140 children. Despite these pressures, the Warwickshire IRO had continued to perform above the England

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

average and achieve national Key Performance Indicators. Areas of underperformance related to a decrease in the numbers of Child Protection Conferences held within a 15-date timeframe and a decrease in the numbers of minutes circulated within the required timescales.

A discussion took place with regard to recruitment and whether the successful appointment of the 1.5 FTE staff would alleviate the caseload for the IROs. Members were advised that it would not reduce the case load to the national guidance of 50-70 children per IRO; however, it would lower the caseload overall and further work would be undertaken to address other causes, such as the number of looked after children in Warwickshire, which was higher than other comparable authorities.

In response to a question raised, the Committee was informed that the salary for an IRO in Warwickshire was the second lowest in the region by approximately £5,000 per annum. To address this, the option to apply for a Market Forces Supplement, which would be reviewed every 18 months, was currently being explored. This would be funded from within the IRO service.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to note the report and request a further update in January 2015.

7. Organisational Health – Quarter 3 2013/14

The Committee considered the quarterly performance, finance and risk information in respect of those services within its remit. Following questioning from the Committee, the following points of clarification were noted:

- 1) The Children's Centres savings plan was on track to achieve £2.3 million savings by 2014/15;
- 2) A policy review to explore alternative, more efficient service delivery methods would be undertaken to address the significant overspend of £4.903 million in the Special Education Needs (SEN) budget. Councillor Timms added that a series of member briefings on the impact of the Children and Families Bill and SEN reforms on the Higher Needs Block for funding would be provided for all elected members in due course.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to note the report.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

8. Scrutiny Action Plans

Members were reminded that Scrutiny Action Plans provided an update on the progress and implementation of the Committee's recommendations that had been approved by Cabinet.

Philip Edmundson, Service Manager (Learning and Performance), provided members with an update on the nine recommendations arising from the review of Academies and Free Schools which had been undertaken in July 2012. He explained that the County Council would be realigning and enhancing its support to all schools, including academies and free schools, in order to safeguard the education of Warwickshire children. The County Council was also reviewing its service offer to academies and free schools in order to maximise opportunities for provision, such as HR and Legal services to schools.

Members noted that Recommendation 6, 7b and 7c in the Academies and Free Schools Scrutiny Action Plan referred to specific tasks for the Committee to undertake. Philip Edmundson advised that at present, there was an internal audit review of the School Improvement team in order to assess capacity which was due for completion by the end of February 2014. This would address the Committee's request at Recommendation 6.

In response to a question raised, Philip Edmundson advised that the County Council was forming a positive link to the Department for Education (DfE) academy brokers in order to achieve early dialogue regarding schools that had been identified by the DfE for academy status because of poor performance. He added that at present, there were a small number of schools that the DfE had identified, and that the new Ofsted framework, which had replaced "satisfactory" with "requires improvement" had shifted a number of schools into consideration.

With regard to the positioning of Governor Services, which was currently within the Law and Governance division, members were assured that this was not an issue providing positive links to the School Improvement team continued to be in place.

The item continued with the Committee's consideration of the nine recommendations arising from the Select Committee review of Early Years Commissioning which had been undertaken in August 2013. The Chair raised a concern with the allocation of base funding which had given the impression that the most deprived areas had received a greater reduction; for example, the largest budget reduction had been in Nuneaton (39 per cent) in comparison to a 16 per cent reduction in Stratford-upon-Avon. In response, members were advised that the base funding had been allocated to either a group or collaboration of Children's Centres, with the expectation that the core offer would be provided across the group or collaboration, rather than from each

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

individual Centre. In addition, as the group model significantly reduced management/staff costs, the groups therefore received a reduced base budget. Members were assured that the areas of highest deprivation would receive a higher level of support funding and were advised that a briefing note to outline and explain the allocation of budget across each of the ten groups/collaborations would be shared with members.

A discussion took place with regard to the location of Children's Centres and the possibility that a number may relocate to alternative buildings. Barbara Wallace, Operation Manager (Children's Centres), explained that the relocation of Children's Centres located in buildings that had been designated by the Department for Education was very unlikely, given the claw-back clause; however, for those Centres which currently operated from community buildings, there was a possibility that the providers would seek alternative accommodation within the locality if this was considered to be a cost effective option.

With regard to Recommendation 5 in the Children's Centres Scrutiny Action Plan, members noted the practical challenges in delivering a Birth Registration service from Children's Centres and noted that further work would be undertaken with the Head of Customer Service to explore options.

With regard to Recommendations 6 and 7, members were advised that the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board had been notified of the Committee's recommendations and was yet to provide a response.

With regard to Recommendation 9, members queried the claim that the Chair and Spokespersons of the Committee had been asked to invite parent representatives to informal meetings to discuss the procurement exercise for the Early Years service. Members considered that this was not the intention of the recommendation and that, as the Chair and Spokespersons had been requested to maintain complete confidentiality regarding the procurement information, the involvement of parent representatives at those meetings would not have been possible. Barbara Wallace agreed to gain further clarification from the Council procurement team regarding this suggestion.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to:

- 1) Note the updated Scrutiny Action Plans and request a further update in September 2014;
- 2) Request that the findings of the internal audit review of the School Improvement team be circulated to the Committee;

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

- 3) Request an outline of the base and support funding allocation to each of the Children's Centre groups / collaborations, including the revised procurement timetable;
- 4) Request that the Committee have sight of the County Council's response to the letter that was submitted to the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council by the Chair of Governors at Kenilworth Children's Centre and Nursery; and
- 5) Request that a report on the performance of the service delivery outcomes for each of the Children's Centre groups / collaborations be presented to the Committee in January 2015.

9. Work Programme 2013-14

The Chair presented the Committee with the proposed Work Programme for 2013/14 and invited members to suggest additional items for consideration at future meetings.

Members considered the proposal for a Task and Finish Group review of the transition from children to adult mental health services, following a concern that was raised by the Warwickshire LINK Project Report, 'Giving Young People a Voice in Health and Social Care'. It was proposed that this would be a joint Task and Finish Group of the Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Healthwatch, with two members appointed from each body.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to:

- 1) Schedule the next meeting on 2nd April 2014 as a full day meeting;
- 2) Note the update on the allocation of Children's Health responsibilities and request that a meeting between the Strategic Director for People Group, the Deputy Director of Public Health and the Chairs of the Children and Young People and the Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees be scheduled to discuss and identify the appropriate body for children's health-related topics;
- 3) Appoint Councillor Hicks and Councillor Fowler to a Task and Finish Group which would review the transition of children to adult mental health services;
- 4) Add a review of mental health service provision for children in schools to the Work Programme and request that School Governor representatives be invited to participate in that review;

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 22nd January 2014**

- 5) Include a progress report on Area Behaviour Partnerships as an annual update on the Work Programme; and
- 6) Request that the report on Warwickshire Education Services be provided as soon as possible.

10. Any Urgent Items

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted its congratulations for Chris Smart, Chair of Warwickshire Parent Governors Association, who had been awarded an MBE for education services in Warwickshire. The Committee agreed to request that Chris Smart be invited to the next meeting of Full Council and his award be included as part of the Chair's Announcements.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted that the date of the next meeting had been scheduled for 2nd April 2014.

The Committee rose at 3.30 p.m.

.....
Chair