

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

Present

Members:

Councillor Jonathan Chilvers
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 John Whitehouse
Councillor Chris Williams (replacing Councillor Yousef Dahmash for this meeting)

Co-opted members:

John McRoberts, Parent Governor Representative

Other Councillors:

Councillor Wallace Redford
Councillor Bob Stevens, Portfolio Holder, Health
Councillor Heather Timms, Portfolio Holder, Children and Schools

Officers:

Hugh Disley, Head of Early Intervention
Helen King, Deputy Director of Public Health
Chris Lewington, Head of Service, Strategic Commissioning
June Maw, Interim Service Manager, Learning and Achievement
Rachel Leslie, Public Health Registrar
Ann Mawdsley, Senior Democratic Services Officer (Minutes 1 – 6)
Richard Maybey, Performance and Improvement Officer
Jayne Mumford, Interim Service Manager, Special Educational Needs
Sue Ross, Interim Head of Safeguarding
Sharon Shaw, Operations Manager, Adoption
Paul Spencer, Democratic Services officer (Minutes 7 -13)
Pat Tate, Service Manager, School Early Intervention Service
Barbara Wallace, Operations Manager, Children's Centres
Adrian Wells, Interim Service Manager, Integrated Disability Service

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 2 April 2014**

Members of the public:

Ellie Costello, Siblings at the Same School

1. General

The Chair welcomed Richard Maybey, who gave the Committee a demonstration on LG Inform, which provides benchmarking information across a range of Local Authority services. Richard Maybey's contact details were provided for any Member needing further guidance.

(1) Apologies

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Yousef Dahmash (replaced by Councillor Chris Williams for this 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 at St. John's Nursery and Primary School in Kenilworth.

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 at Oakwood Academy which has a nursery; and that she was a trustee for the Nicholas Chamberlaine Schools Foundation; and that she had a relative who had a disability.

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 Parsons declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that he was a governor at Nethersoles Church of England Academy, Polesworth, and that his son was a teacher at The Croft Junior School.

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

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

Councillor Williams declared a non-pecuniary interest; the nature of the interest being that he was a member of the Warwickshire Adoption Panel.

(3) Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2014

The Committee agreed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 22 January 2014 be signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record, with the following corrections:

Page 2 – Item 1 (2), Members’ Disclosures of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

Diana Turner stated that her declaration had been in regard to her grandson.

Page 8 – Item 4, School Admissions Arrangements 2015/16 – point 2

Following a discussion on this point, the minute was agreed.

Page 10 – Item 5, 16-19 Year Old NEETs (Not in Education, Employment or Training) Performance Update

In the seventh line of the fourth paragraph, the minute should read: *“was pregnant or a teenage parent”*.

2. Public Question Time

Ellie Costello put a question to the Portfolio Holder for Children and Schools regarding the written support that had been received from the North Leamington Cluster. Councillor Timms reported that this was referred to in Item 2.10 of the report to Cabinet on 10th April 2014.

In response to a general concern regarding the difficulty for members and the public to access information, Councillor Timms responded that the Cabinet report would be published today and she hoped that this gave sufficient time for all members of the public to engage.

3. Questions to Cabinet and Portfolio Holder

Question 1

Diana Turner stated that she was a governor at Bilton School in Rugby. This school was an academy and therefore had its own admission arrangements, but was currently below the Pupil Allocation Numbers (PAN) and had additional places. Bilton School was a signatory to the In-Year Fair Access Protocol (IYFAP), which ensured that outside of

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

the normal admissions round, unplaced children were offered a place at a suitable school as soon as possible. Diana Turner felt this arrangement was not working in Rugby, which had a number of selective schools, and any school with places was being asked to take more children. Bilton School had been asked to take 35 hard-to-place children, while other schools had no more than four, and this large number had a potential disruptive and deleterious impact on other students.

Councillor Timms noted that the Access to Education Board had agreed that the INFAP should be reviewed and this would be going out to schools shortly for consultation with a view to implementation in September 2014.

Question 2

Diana Turner stated that it seemed there were major shortcomings in the admission arrangements and the funding was therefore not following students in the short-term. She gave the example in Rugby where admissions applications had been placed in August, with children only being placed until the School Census Data was published in October. Schools were therefore losing out as victims of unfair access and admission arrangements not placing students quickly. She asked for remedial action to be taken.

In response to both questions, Councillor Timms noted that the Access to Education Board had agreed that the INFAP should be reviewed and this would be going out to schools shortly for consultation with a view to implementation in September 2014. She added that the Learning and Achievement and Admissions teams took the IYFAP very seriously, and this work had moved to the Special Educational Needs Team within the People Group. In relation to Rugby, Councillor Timms noted that she had spoken to the Head at Bilton School during the week, and that the Head at Avon Valley School was the Early Behaviour Partnership Head, and was aware of the challenges faced by Bilton School. Councillor Timms recorded her gratitude to the school for the work they were doing across the board for young people in Rugby.

Question 3

Councillor Whitehouse noted there was an item on the Forward Plan for Cabinet regarding the provision of additional school places at Milverton Primary School. He asked what the Portfolio Holder's response was to the concerns of the Milverton Primary School's Governing Body, which was challenging the expansion plans and had highlighted the lack of consultation around this decision. Councillor Whitehouse asked what actions were being taken to rectify the systematic problems with school admissions.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

Councillor Timms responded that in the last year Government had invited bids for a one-off Targeted Basic Needs Fund to provide additional funding for school places in areas where they are most needed. She noted that the County Council had a role to champion children and ensure sufficient school places and had put forward 20 bids, and had been successful with ten. The whole of North Leamington had been identified as an area of pressure and work had been done with the respective schools. Work had been undertaken with Milverton Primary School, including an extended consultation time. The Primary Schools had rejected the proposals and the Directorate would continue to have conversations with the school and identify alternative proposals. Councillor Timms added that discussions had also been held with the Head at Paddox School, which had resulted in a solution for that school.

Councillor Whitehouse stated that he believed there was a systematic problem in school planning and asked what was being done about this.

Councillor Timms responded that North Leamington had been identified as an area of pressure in the 2012 School Census, and this was evidenced. She added that the Targeted Basic Needs Fund was a once-off pot of money for Local Authorities to bid for, which Warwickshire had done. This was completely separate to the Basic Need Funding, which supports the capital requirement for providing new pupil places both in new or expanded maintained schools, and in Free Schools or expanded Academies. Within this fund, Warwickshire had identified a gap for 2016, which was being challenged on the basis of the true picture being masked on basic planning areas. She added that while there had been a high staff turnover in the Learning and Achievement Team, which had resulted in learning curves for many officers, she was confident the team could manage this going forward.

June Maw, Interim Service Manager (Learning and Achievement) noted that the District/Borough Councils Local Plans were at different stages of development, which was allowing housing developers to put in opportunistic plans, which the County Council had to deal with quickly, often without warning.

Councillor Timms noted that a Sufficiency Strategy was being developed, with numbers, and would ensure that Area Teams prioritised needs which were fully evidence-based, and this would enable a more co-ordinated approach in the future.

It was agreed that growth and pressure on school places was no longer about birth rates, and that the pressure on Primary School places needed to be resolved quickly, with the understanding that this pressure would quickly move into the secondary school places.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

Councillor Timms stated that schools were being consulted, as their involvement was essential, but it was important to get the right mix between ensuring developers delivered where new schools were required, or that in areas where opportunities to expand existing schools were available, these were maximised.

Councillor Whitehouse asked whether the County Council had been consulted on rumoured proposals for Kenilworth School and College, which potentially had major capital investment requirements from the County.

Councillor Timms noted that the Admissions teams worked closely with planners and that the Infrastructure Delivery Manager had been appointed in this role. She added however that developer contributions were always based on basic needs.

The Chair thanked the Portfolio Holder for her responses.

4. Early Years Commissioning

Chris Lewington, Head of Strategic Commissioning, provided a verbal update on the progress of this work. She noted that it was taking longer than originally anticipated, and was still in the evaluation stage. It was reported that the number and quality of the bids received had been high. The number of voluntary staff redundancies had been determined and this information had been forwarded to the Pension Scheme Actuaries for the determination of pension scheme liabilities. Once this exercise was complete, the information would be shared with potential bidders, to determine whether they would be moving forward with their bids.

With regard to the procurement timetable, members were advised that the notification of successful and unsuccessful bidders would be deferred from 7th April to 12th May 2014. In light of this, the contract would be awarded on 23rd May and subsequently the starting date for the 39 children's centres with their new providers would be staggered with three stages, commencing 1st July, 1st August and 1st September 2014. Full implementation was expected by 1st September 2014.

During the discussion that followed, the following points were noted:

- 1) Members recorded their concern that this had been a verbal report and that many of the delays, particularly the work required around pensions, had been highlighted by the Chair and Spokesperson members at the end of 2013. Chris Lewington reassured members that there was a Project Team for this work, meeting weekly to evaluate progress;

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

- 2) There was a concern in respect of the significant financial impact caused by any delays to the commissioning process, reported to be £40,000 per week. Members queried whether additional savings targets would be required due to the delay. Chris Lewington confirmed that at the point of transfer, expenditure would remain the same. In terms of additional savings targets, this would have to be determined by the Project Board for inclusion in medium-term financial plans. This information would be included in the briefing to members.
- 3) The quality of the bids was good, and no decisions had been made for alternative plans should bidders withdraw. It was agreed however that the Communications Strategy needed to be robust, with the correct information being shared with Children's Centres, staff and parents.

In response to a query regarding the sustainability of Children's Centres if further extensions were put in place, and the potential impact on parents and children, Chris Lewington responded that a letter had been sent to all Children's Centres and the Project Team would be following up with all Centres, considering further extensions and the potential impacts. The staged approach would be used to ensure that those Children's Centres at the highest risk would be included in the first tranche.

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

- 1) Note the update; and
- 2) Request a briefing note on the progress of the Early Years Commissioning exercise, which would include information relating to additional savings targets.

5. Warwick Super Priority Area Consultation

The Chair referred to the two Cabinet reports that had been tabled at the meeting, and were now in the public domain. June Maw outlined the consultation responses and what was being proposed, specifically a change to the timetable from 2015 to 2016.

Members noted their dissatisfaction at receiving both reports on the day of the meeting, and to the fact that the officer report referred to the consultation responses in the group rooms, and this had not yet happened. This meant the Committee would find it difficult to form a reasoned response. The Committee made the following points:

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

- 1) The Committee noted that in response to the O&S report being submitted to Cabinet, the Strategic Director had commented that it was unfortunate that the Committee had not had the opportunity to hear views of other parties. The Committee considered however, that officers had been aware that the debate at the previous Committee meeting would take place and it was their responsibility to ensure that a balanced set of inputs was made available to elected members.
- 2) Members felt the consultation process had been poorly communicated and late in the day, and this may have added to the disappointing response. It was felt that future consultations should include consultation meetings at Children's Centres as well as at schools.
- 3) The standard County Council process following public consultations, where officers provided a valued response to consultation responses, had not been carried out in this case.
- 4) Members felt that Cabinet would have no choice but to agree the recommendation to develop Super Priority Areas for Leamington and Warwick, which would then have to be included as part of the Council's consultation for 2016/17 school admissions. The Cabinet would then have to be clear about what officers would need to do to ameliorate the situation for parents.
- 5) June Maw undertook to check whether a response to the consultation had been received from the Warwick Transport Strategy Group.

The Committee acknowledged that this was no easy solution to this, and it was important to get a good resolution in Warwick to support the roll-out to other areas of the county, which were all distinct in their requirements and needs. It was considered desirable to have local schools for local children and siblings going to the same school; however, it was recognised that this may require increased accommodation in some cases.

Members were advised that it was not clear yet how many appeals would be received as placement notifications would only be sent out on 16th April 2014. Appeals would then have to be lodged and scheduled in to the programme of appeals that had been set.

Chris Smart outlined the independent role of School Admission Panels, which operated under the guidance issued by the Department of Education. He added that there would never be a right answer for everyone involved with school admissions and the County Council would have to be a decision made that would best serve the majority.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

Councillor Heather Timms responded that it had been made clear throughout the process that all proposals were subject to the agreement of schools and further discussions would be held with the relevant schools, and that this would be key to moving forward. She reassured the Committee that the intention to develop Super Priority Areas was not being lost, and the comments received from the Committee would be used to further develop the proposals for Leamington and Warwick.

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

- 1) Note the update; and
- 2) Establish a Task and Finish Group to consider the philosophy and strategy of the Super Priority Areas across the county and submit recommendations to the Committee meeting scheduled for 2nd September 2014. This would enable the Committee to be involved in developing this policy. Any member wishing to participate was asked to contact Democratic Services before 11th April 2014. Councillor Heather Timms supported this proposal, and it was agreed that School Governors needed to be involved in the process, possibly through a briefing at the summer meeting of the Governor's Forum.

6. Adoption Process and Scorecards

Sue Ross, Interim Head of Safeguarding, and Sharon Shaw, Operations Manager (Adoption Services) introduced the report which outlined the priorities for adoption outlined in the 2011 Government paper *"An Action Plan for Adoption: Tackling Delay"*.

A discussion took place regarding the breakdown of adoptions. Sharon Shaw acknowledged that statistics relating to this were vague, but that Warwickshire had had three over the past year, all with older children. It was important to learn lessons from these situations, and to continue to improve training and psychological support for families. She added that some authorities did not carry out adoptions for children over three but she felt that this risk was worth taking.

Members noted that there was a balance to be achieved between trying to move children as quickly as possible without pre-empting court decisions. The Children's Panel did monitor potential children coming through the system, which helped.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

It was noted that children available for adoption most often came from challenging backgrounds, and this meant that the matching process could take some time.

The Committee thanked the Adoption Team for the positive work they were doing.

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

- 1) Note the report; and
- 2) Request a further report in 12 months, with a focus on the impact of the Government's Adoption Action Plan.

7. Primary Support Inclusion Groups

The Committee received a report regarding the evaluation of Primary Support Inclusion Groups (ISGs) and to enable comment on future provision for primary age pupils that were subject to, or at risk of exclusion.

Background was provided on the report to Cabinet in February 2011, regarding the closure of the primary section of the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), following recommendations made by the Children and Young People OSC. The actions taken since that time to comply with statutory education duties, including work with primary school head teachers, to provide support for pupils at risk of exclusion, were also reported.

Funding previously allocated to the primary PRU had been used through two commissions for a pilot period of two years, to fund six professional learning communities and a service level agreement with the County Council's Early Intervention Service (EIS), to establish ISGs. The EIS was also commissioned to provide support to other Warwickshire primary schools not involved in the pilots.

An evaluation was provided of the ISGs, which reminded of the purpose of the programme, its aims and objectives. It also evaluated the capacity of ISGs to meet the needs of primary age pupils and value for money of the pilot scheme.

Six ISGs were established throughout Warwickshire, with funding focussed on staffing, staff training, external support and adapting premises. Criteria were established to determine which cases could be managed within a school setting and those needing to be escalated to ISG level. Tables were included giving data on the numbers of pupils supported through ISGs, attainment and attendance levels. A table compared data on permanent and fixed term exclusions by year from

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

2008/09 to 2012/13. Data was also provided, for emotional wellbeing and resilience, early intervention / integrated working and meeting the learning need.

A section of the report looked at the improved value for money from the pilot scheme and the increased numbers of pupils supported, with earlier intervention. The conclusions were reported, together with data on the support provided by EIS to the schools outside the ISG pilot.

Future need and demand was considered. An audit in January 2013 showed the numbers of primary school pupils with a statement of behaviour, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) and others who required support. The report explained how the majority of these pupils' needs were met. However, there was a gap in provision, for a small number of individuals, where current arrangements were insufficient and the consequences of this were detailed. It was exacerbated where a school fell into crisis. Appended to the report were details of the criteria used for accessing support. A related table showed the numbers of pupils involved, including those in need of specialist ISG support.

Proposals had been approved by the Schools' Forum, a group comprising head teacher representatives and senior officers. The Group was taking forward the planning and guidance of these proposals for supporting primary pupils at risk of exclusion. The elements of these proposals were also reported.

Finally, the implementation plan was considered, with details of the commissioning arrangements, the service level agreement with EIS and the plans to open the first specialist ISG by September 2014.

In presenting the report, Pat Tate, Service Manager for the School Early Intervention Service, referred to the recent member visits to Goodyers End and Stockingford Primary Schools. Several members spoke about the value of the school visits. The Chair asked officers to thank the schools for their hospitality. He commented that from the visits, the experience of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) was at best, mixed. Hugh Disley, Head of Early Intervention, confirmed that a review of CAMHS was being undertaken presently, emphasising that this was at a senior level within the authority and its outcome may affect future commissioning arrangements.

In response to a number of questions raised, the following points were noted:

- 1) Travel costs to alternate school premises would be met by the local authority. Different travel options would be considered in each

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

pupil's case, rather than reliance just on taxis. Further information was also supplied about nurture groups and family support work.

- 2) Proposals to develop ISGs in other geographical areas were comprehensive. Sites would be established that were flexible, with appropriate staffing and advice in place. In some cases, it might be necessary to bring the support to the pupil, in their existing school.
- 3) Successes were benchmarked against other local authorities. Pat Tate referred to the quantitative data available and the underpinning Common Assessment Framework (CAF), which most Warwickshire schools engaged with.
- 4) One of the outcomes from the pilot was the need for a specialist ISG. She talked about the difficulties when schools were in special measures, the extra demands this caused, the need for risk assessments and ensuring appropriate support was provided to pupils needing it at all times.
- 5) Persistent disruptive behaviour was considered the most frequent cause for exclusion. Members were advised that there was no prescribed period for action to be taken and each case was dealt with individually. Councillor Heather Timms stated that there were no PRUs in Warwickshire. She spoke about the revised service delivery, the reducing exclusion statistics and the benefits of the specialist ISG approach, in supporting pupils at an earlier stage.
- 6) Other points were raised about exclusions and supported transfers to other schools, as well as transport difficulties for families with children at different schools.

A discussion took place regarding 'satisfactory academic progress' and members noted that the classification given may have undersold the actual progress achieved. Members sought further information, which was duly provided, about the balancing figures for the data relating to schools outside the ISG pilot. Pat Tate compared the previous support arrangements, which were often provided at a later stage. She spoke also about how an event at home could trigger issues, the expectations of schools and the support provided to them.

Chris Smart, Warwickshire Governors Association, sought further information about the governance arrangements for ISGs. From a parent's perspective there was an impact on pupils having to travel to additional school premises and this also affected their ability to attend after school clubs. On the governance question, Pat Tate confirmed the officer hierarchy, the Ofsted arrangements and that there was a service level agreement in place for the EIS. Hugh Disley added that the pupil's home school commissioned the IDS support and maintained control via its governance structure.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

Diana Turner, Warwickshire Governors Association, stated the need for regular feedback to governors on ISG placements. Pat Tate responded that there were annual reports and a regular dialogue with head teachers. She responded to a supplementary question, confirming the revised wording used under the Children and Family Act for children with emotional, social, or mental health issues, also speaking about the underlying issues, linked to difficult behaviour and the positive outcomes from the CAF approach. There was discussion about the specialist school and the availability of ISG placements for primary school pupils.

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

- 1) Note the report; and
- 2) Request a further update in 12 months, to include the experience gained of transport issues and how these have been resolved.

8. Integrated Disability Service

Adrian Wells, Interim Service Manager (Integrated Disability Service), presented a report on the impact of the savings programme on priorities and service delivery. Members were reminded of the previous decisions by Cabinet regarding the redesign of the Integrated Disability Service (IDS). The service worked with disabled children, young people and their families, providing social care and short breaks. Work was being undertaken to redesign the service in light of forthcoming Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND) legislation, within the Children and Families Bill.

The savings agreed by Council for the current savings plan amounted to £1.76 million. The impact on staffing was reported, it being expected to achieve approximately £883,000 from previously identified staffing reductions. However, given the focus on achieving budget reductions through efficiencies in staffing structures some areas would be revisited.

Development of a matrix of need that made sure resources were allocated in a fair and transparent way was also important. There had been two abortive attempts to do this and it had been agreed to update an earlier version of the matrix to be compliant with legislation.

Families in receipt of social care services would need to be reviewed by 30th September, with packages of support being agreed by a quality audit panel, to ensure consistency of decision making and that the right service is provided.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

A section of the report considered improvements to commissioning processes, with details being provided of the tenders to be sought. Close joint working would also be needed with partners, including clinical commissioning groups and schools. The recently established IDS Reference Group would need to become a formal body and appended to the report were the terms of reference, a meeting schedule and an action plan for this Group.

In presenting the report, Adrian Wells explained that retendering was expected to realise some savings, but there would inevitably be cuts in services. Consultation would take place on a range of options to achieve the required savings.

Councillor Jenny St. John was concerned about the future of the short break centre at Kenilworth. Details were provided of eligibility and usage levels, with a comparison being made to the service delivered by Wiltshire County Council, which was deemed to be similar to Warwickshire. Another point was the mix of provision in the County with the Kenilworth facility being funded by social care and an NHS funded facility in North Warwickshire.

It was noted that this was a holding report, with the focus on staffing aspects, but Councillor Whitehouse wished to ensure that that a focus remained on the service offer to Warwickshire's residents. Confirmation was sought regarding the time line for progress with this review. Adrian Wells outlined plans for a discussion paper by the end of April 2014 for consideration by the Reference Group. Options would then be prepared for public consultation and the aim was to report back to Cabinet by the end of July 2014 with the consultation response. It was suggested that a further report be submitted to the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2014.

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

- 1) Note the report;
- 2) Receive an update to the meeting scheduled for 3rd June 2014, following the consultation exercise but prior to Cabinet's determination.

9. Development of a New School at Manor Park Site

Members considered a report from Jane Mumford, Interim Special Education Needs and Inclusion Service Manager, regarding the development of a new school for children with behavioural, emotional and social disorders. The need for additional places had been well

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

documented. Members were updated on the development plans and recently, the Department for Education had appointed a sponsor to take forward the project. Appended to the report was the detailed position statement, which the Committee reviewed.

An update was provided about potential restrictions for development of the school's current playing field. Furthermore, there was concern about asbestos on the site. The Chair questioned whether the new school would have use for the existing sports hall.

Councillor Whitehouse spoke of the demands for specialist school places in both the Nuneaton and Bedworth and Warwick areas. This demonstrated the need for satellite services in other parts of the County. Other points were raised about the ring fencing of capital receipts, the deadlines for this scheme and the potential for claw back of government funding.

Councillor Mike Perry asked about the potential for pupils from neighbouring counties to be placed at the new school. It was noted that 90% of pupils would come from Warwickshire. Finally, there was discussion about the potential for appointment of a member to the governors or trust board for the new academy school.

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

10. One Year On: The Transition of Public Health into Warwickshire County Council

This item was introduced by Councillor Bob Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Health. A report was presented by Rachel Leslie, Public Health Registrar, with support from Helen King, Deputy Director of Public Health.

The report included a summary and background of the work undertaken in the first year, since the transfer of public health functions from primary care trusts to the Local Authority. The background included a table showing a description of the six key functions of Public Health. A section was included on the Strategic Commissioning Reviews of integrated sexual health, focussed services for children and lifestyle services. Planned and ongoing Public Health programmes had been aligned to the One Organisational Plan and a further table outlined the programme areas and how these related to the broad vision of the Plan.

The report included information on 'Making Every Contact Count', a process to enable all employees to provide guidance which supported behaviour change, to improve residents' health and wellbeing. The

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

public health partnership aspects were also reported. Public Health supported the Health and Wellbeing Board and an independent annual report was produced by the Director of Public Health. Finally, the report looked at financial considerations, with a table showing the 2013/14 and 2014/15 budget for each Public Health function.

Councillor John Whitehouse spoke about the functions delivered by the community and voluntary sector, such as youth services. He declared an interest, due to his involvement in a group in Kenilworth and explained that this group had a strong relationship with young peoples' groups, but not with the County Council. Helen King responded, giving examples of work with pharmacies, that on mental health and wellbeing and work with young peoples' groups, but she accepted the point about engaging with local partnerships.

In response to questioning from the Committee, the following points were noted:

- 1) Public Health services provided in schools included school nurses, those delivered through health visitors and work with very young mothers. Councillor Stevens also commented on the roles of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- 2) Obesity was a complex issue and there were many reasons why statistics could vary significantly, such as those between the North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth areas.

In response to a question raised regarding relationships with former NHS colleagues and whether there were barriers to information sharing since the transfer of the Public Health function, the Committee was advised that there were good links through clinical commissioning groups (CCGs), and a joint commissioning board, through which relationships were maintained, but there were some data sharing restrictions.

Councillor Julie Jackson asked about links with neighbouring CCGs and public health departments. She also referred to mortality statistics and levels of obesity in her division as compared to other parts of the County. A report on spending to target these issues and the related outcomes was suggested. Councillor Stevens provided further information about the CCGs serving Warwickshire, as CCG boundaries weren't coterminous with local authority areas. Helen King added that the next Director of Public Health Annual Report would focus on child health issues.

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to note the report and request that information be provided to on the points raised during the debate.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

11. Work Programme 2013-14

The Chair presented the Committee with the final work programme report for 2013/14. He reminded members of the decision made in the morning session for a Task and Finish Group regarding the implementation of Super Priority Areas. Diana Turner commented that this work could complement that on ISGs referred to earlier in the meeting.

The Chair sought the Committee's input to the Work Programme, commenting on the recent Ofsted report of a school in the Nuneaton and Bedworth area classed as 'outstanding'. The Committee could undertake a review of how to learn from excellence. Councillors Perry and Whitehouse pursued this idea, suggesting that a review could include a school which had significantly improved its performance that the meetings be held at the school.

Chris Smart referred to the rates of staff turnover and the number of senior officer posts that were currently appointed on an interim basis. Councillor Whitehouse noted the recent appointment of the Head of Learning and Achievement and suggested that a report be brought from the officer in September 2014, with their forward plans for the service.

With regard to the appended briefing notes in the work programme, Councillor Whitehouse requested that the date of issue be placed against each one. He also asked if the appendix showing the recommendations and action plan could be considered earlier in the meeting, as he had two questions for the Portfolio Holder and an officer, but they were no longer present at the meeting, so would pursue them himself. The issues concerned the officer response regarding information on youth and community centres on the County Council's website and concerns about the response to the letter submitted by the Chair of Governors at Kenilworth Children's Centre and Nursery.

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

12. Any Urgent Items

None.

**Minutes of the meeting of the
Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
held on 2 April 2014**

13. 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 3rd June 2014. The Chair also publicised a training session on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and asked members to confirm their availability.

The Committee rose at 3.30 p.m.

.....
Chair