

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 13 September 2016

Time: 2.00pm – 4.05pm

Present: Councillors Whitehead (Chairwoman), D Brown (Vice Chairman), Sir P Brown, P Clapp, P Downes, G Kenney, M Leeke, S Taylor and A Walsh

Apologies: Councillors D Divine (substituted by Councillor P Clapp), S Frost, D Harty, M Loynes (substituted by Councillor G Kenney), Z Moghadas (substituted by Councillor A Walsh) and J Wisson.

CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

195. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

196. MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 24 MAY 2016 AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

The Chairwoman noted that Councillor Bywater had left the Committee in July and said that she had written to offer him her thanks for his contribution to its work, particularly in relation to childhood poverty. She welcomed his decision to continue with his application to join the Fostering Panel.

197. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

198. THE ROLE OF THE REGIONAL SCHOOLS COMMISSIONER

The Chairwoman welcomed Dr Tim Coulson, the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) for the East of England and North-East London, to the meeting.

Dr Coulson thanked the Chairwoman for the invitation to brief the Committee on the role of the RSC and for providing him with advance notice of a number of questions which members would like to address. He circulated a short note responding to these questions (copy attached at Appendix 1) and offered the following supplementary information:

- The role of the RSC had been established by government in 2014 to support the development of its academies and Free Schools programme. This included addressing under-performance within the sector;
- The National Schools Commissioner played a central role in ensuring consistency across the work of the eight RSCs. Dr Coulson also met with other RSCs on a monthly basis to share information and discuss best practice;
- The RSC was supported by a Headteacher board which acted in an advisory capacity;

- Dr Coulson's team was reorganised in June 2016 and enhanced by the addition of two senior staff members at Deputy Director level;

Dr Coulson said that he was happy for the Committee to write to him with any further questions on the responses contained in his note.

Working Arrangements Between the County Council and the RSC

Dr Coulson said that the political impetus for schools to become academies remained unchanged, although the timescale had become less defined. He felt that there were good mechanisms in place to address any concerns arising about particular schools, both through formal processes and informal working contacts. Dr Coulson said that RSCs were keen to work with councils across the country in relation to the setting up of new schools and free schools and that he wanted to work as closely as possible with Cambridgeshire County Council to get this right. He had a good relationship with Cambridgeshire's officers and their discussions covered both academies and maintained schools.

The Chairwoman said that Cambridgeshire County Council was very open about its plans to open new schools, leading to early expressions of interest by academy trusts. However, where this occurred in advance of the wider development of an area it could have serious knock-on effects on existing schools. The Council felt that it was very important that new schools were opened in a timely manner to avoid these difficulties and would like to see a requirement for better liaison to avoid this happening in the future. Dr Coulson said that applicants were now encouraged to be more open about their plans in relation the timing of school openings and that he was keen that all parties should work together on this to avoid the difficulties described.

The Chairwoman said that the Council remained concerned about the lack of intervention in failing schools and the apparent lack of practical support to help struggling academies improve their performance. There was a concern that the Government had not yet addressed what to do about under-performing academies and that there was a need for this to be looked at very seriously. Dr Coulson said that academies were expected to be able to improve their performance by drawing on the expertise of teaching schools in the same way that maintained schools would do. The Government's view was that academies were autonomous organisations which were able to identify and source the support they required. The RSC was not able to provide specific school improvement activities or support, however he noted that in Cambridgeshire a number of separate academies had begun grouping together to share experience and best practice which he felt would provide some additional support. Dr Coulson said that the Government was aware of these concerns and noted that following the recent White Paper the Government had set up an external advisory board looking at, amongst other things, the issue of school improvement and addressing under-performing schools.

Members expressed concern that their role in supporting local people who were experiencing difficulties with academies could be seriously undermined if academies chose not to engage with them. Dr Coulson said that his view was that all schools and academies would benefit from establishing positive relationships with local councillors and officers and that he actively encouraged them to do so. Should members feel that there were certain academy trusts that were not engaging in this way he would be happy for them to approach him direct or through officers and he would raise the matter

with the trust concerned. However, he had no powers to require academies to engage in this way.

Dr Coulson noted some specific concerns raised by councillors in relation to particular schools and said that he would be happy for these to be raised with him directly by members or by officers. Parents could also contact him direct if they wished.

Darwin Green

Dr Coulson said that a process had been followed in this case, but he accepted that Cambridgeshire County Council had found the outcome frustrating. Although he believed his decision to be reasonable he did feel in hindsight that the potential for disagreement could have been identified earlier on in the process. He emphasised that the National School's Commissioner's letter to Councillor Brown and Adrian Loades on this issue dated 28 July 2016 (copy included at Appendix 1) made clear the wish to try to improve the process going forward, although he could not rule out the possibility of similar differences of opinion occurring again in the future. Whilst accepting that the Council had reached a reasonable and sensible view in this case he said that it had decided that the impact on North Cambridge Academy was not germane to its decision. In contrast, Dr Coulson had taken the view that that the impact on the North Cambridge Academy was an important consideration. In response to questions Dr Coulson said that he did not see the papers relating to the bids until after the Council had concluded its own consideration of the bids and that he had not reached this view in advance of receiving the Council's recommendation.

Looking forward, Dr Coulson suggested that it would be helpful in the future to have more substantial discussions between officers and the RSC when bids were initially invited. He also acknowledged members' significant frustration at what they perceived to be the waste of time and money in the Council reaching a recommendation which was subsequently rejected by the RSC. He confirmed that both the National Schools Commissioner and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools were aware of Cambridgeshire County Council's strength of feeling on this issue, but undertook to raise this again with both individuals. However, this did not alter the requirement that the Local Authority should make its recommendations and the RSC review them, so the possibility remained that they might again in future reach a different view. However, both the Committee and the RSC hoped that this could be avoided as far as possible.

The Chairwoman thanked Dr Coulson for the very helpful information which he had provided and for his constructive response to questions. She welcomed his offer to respond in writing to any additional questions which the Committee might have on the role of the RSC and to pass on to Government any comments which the Committee might wish to offer on the Prime Minister's recent announcement on grammar schools. Members had found his visit most informative and might wish to extend a similar invitation in the future.

DECISIONS

199. UNACCOMPANIED ASYLUM SEEKING CHILDREN

The Committee received a report by the Executive Director for Children, Families and Adults (CFA) Services providing an update on proposed changes in the arrangements for unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC) and proposing the Council's participation in the new arrangements.

At present, UASC became the responsibility of the Local Authority in whose area they first came to notice. This led to wide variations in numbers between authorities and high concentrations in areas with ports or other major transport hubs. The new proposals sought to share this responsibility more equally between local authorities on a regional basis by introducing a cap of 0.07 UASC per 10k of the child and young adult population. In Cambridgeshire this represented an upper limit of 92 UASCs. These arrangements were currently voluntary, but might become mandatory. Government funding levels had been revised and were now closer to the actual costs involved in supporting this group. Although a resilient and resourceful group, UASC were also vulnerable children and young people.

The Chairwoman noted that a member of the public had asked to address the Committee on this item and invited Mr Adrian Matthews, a volunteer with the Cambridge Refugee Resettlement Campaign (CRRC), to share his views.

Mr Matthews said that the CRRC was already working with a variety of local and national organisations in the course of its work. It was providing a wide range of support to UASCs including access to volunteer English teachers, arranging social activities and providing resources such as bikes to enable these children and young people to become more autonomous and active citizens. The CRRC supported Cambridgeshire County Council's proposed participation in the regional transfer scheme for UASCs and he invited the Council to treat the organisation as a resource in supporting this very vulnerable group. The Chairwoman thanked Mr Matthews on behalf of the Committee for his constructive contribution.

During discussion it was noted that:

- Some members had experienced difficulties in obtaining responses from housing authorities in some areas within the county and they would welcome a focus on getting housing authorities to work together;
- Members felt that the reference to repatriation in paragraph 3.4 was unhelpful and asked that it should be revised to convey more positively the Council's wish to ensure that UASC who were not granted leave to remain when they reached the age of 18 were adequately supported to ensure that they did not fall victim to exploitation;
- There was a need to balance the wish to place UASC with suitable foster carers or in supported living accommodation as quickly as possible to avoid them becoming institutionalised with the need to follow proper safeguarding protocols. The limited number of foster carers available to support the number of Looked After Children requiring their care was also a factor;
- Officers would liaise directly with each district council about their participation in the scheme and it would be for each authority to reach its own decision on this matter.

It was resolved:

1. To agree to the Council's participation in the regional transfer scheme for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC);

2. That the Chairwoman would write to the Home Office setting out the Council's concerns about the vulnerability to exploitation of UASC who were not granted leave to remain in the United Kingdom and who were therefore ineligible for benefits.

(Action: The Director for CFA to draft a letter to the Home Office for the Chairwoman's signature).

200. BUSINESS PLANNING

i. Development of Revenue Proposals

The Committee received a report by the Head of Strategy for Children, Families and Adults Services (CFA) on the development of business planning revenue proposals for the financial years 2017/18 to 2022/23.

The current business planning cycle was moving away from an incremental cash limit approach and towards cross cutting programmes looking across a number of directorates. However, each Service Committee would still receive full business planning reports showing how proposed savings would impact on individual service budgets. A business planning seminar had been arranged in early October to give members of the Committee an early opportunity to challenge, steer and suggest proposals in advance of the first round of revenue proposals being presented to the Committee at its October meeting.

During discussion it was noted that:

- Changes had been made to the handling of demographic pressures. It would be expected that each service would absorb demographic growth of 1.4% (the rate at which the general population was increasing) from within its own budget;
- The Chairwoman requested that a proposal for home to school transport being considered by the Total Transport Group should be considered in the business plan.
(Action: Head of Strategy for CFA)
- It would be helpful for officers to signal in future reports where a decision on finance would be irreversible;
(Action: Head of Strategy for CFA)
- Officers were basing their figures on the assumption of a 2% increase in the social care precept and a 0% rise in council tax. Some members felt that it would be helpful to also see figures based on a 2% rise in council tax. The Executive Director for CFA said that this would need to be done council wide rather than just within CFA and undertook raise this question and report back;
(Action: Executive Director for CFA)
- One member had a specific concern on a contract issue and was advised to contact the Head of Passenger Transport Services direct.

It was resolved:

1. To note and comment as recorded above on the plans for the development and presentation of business planning revenue proposals.

ii. Draft 2017-18 Capital Programme

The Committee received a report by the Head of 0-19 Place Planning and Organisation Service providing an overview of the draft business plan capital programme.

The following points arose in discussion:

- Although there was a drop in Basic Need Funding from 2017/18 to 2018/19 (paragraph 5.2 refers) this still represented a higher figure than had been contained in internal planning assumptions. Officers agreed to reflect on how this might be more clearly represented;
- School Condition funding was used principally for repairs to local authority schools. The reduction in the funding allocation for 2017/18 was significant but not unexpected and plans were in place to manage this reduction. Officers confirmed that there was an agreed process for assessing schools' maintenance needs which included considering what reserves were held by schools and alternative sources of funding. School Condition funding remained the provider of last resort;
- The figures in table 4.5 had been re-stated to reflect extended expectations about the useful lifespan of items;
- A meeting had taken place with representatives of Huntingdon District Council (HDC) and Councillor Bates to discuss the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It had not proved possible to pursue the CIL with Huntingdonshire, but alternative arrangements were being considered and additional capacity had been created at Huntingdon Primary School. The Chairwoman expressed the hope that the reason for the County Council being unable to provide a new school because of lack of CIL funding would be made clear to parents;
- Cllr Sir Peter Brown asked for a note about the situation in Huntingdonshire.
(Action: The Head of 0-19 Place Planning and Organisation Service)

It was resolved:

1. To note the overview and context provided for the 2017/18 capital programme for Children and Young People (CYP);
2. To comment on the draft proposals for the CYP 's 2017/18 capital programme as recorded above and to endorse their development;
3. To agree that, following the programme's adoption by Full Council, any new schemes which it was found necessary to add to the capital programme for the reasons identified in section 5.11 of the report would be detailed in the Finance Performance Report for approval initially by CYP Committee and then the General Purposes Committee.

201. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT JULY 2016

The Committee considered a report by the Strategic Finance Manager providing an update on the finance and performance position for Children, Families and Adults Services (CFA) at the end of July 2016.

Members noted:

- An improvement in the forecast overspend for CFA from £1,040k at the end of June 2016 to £693k at the end of July 2016;
- Allocation of an additional £200k to CFA by the General Purposes Committee to partially mitigate reported pressures;
- The position would become more clear in September once home to school transport costs were available for inclusion in the figures.

It was resolved:

1. To review the report and comment as recorded above.

202. FORWARD AGENDA PLAN, APPOINTMENTS TO INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS AND APPOINTMENTS TO PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS

The Committee reviewed the Forward Agenda Plan for the Children and Young People Service Committee which was published on 1 September 2016.

It was resolved to note the following changes to the published Plan for October 2016:

1. The Co-option of new representatives of the Church of England and Roman Catholic Dioceses;
2. Re-tendering of Data Cabling and ICT Installations (Key Decision): Moved from November;
3. Looked After Children (LAC) Strategy Progress Report: Moved from November;
4. Total Transport.

A copy of the amended Forward Agenda Plan is attached at Appendix 2.

203. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee resolved to meet next on Tuesday 11 October 2016 at 2.00pm in the Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge.

Chairwoman

Cambridgeshire Children and Young People's Committee, 13 September 2016

Tim Coulson, Regional Schools Commissioner, East of England and North East London

Role of the Regional Schools Commissioner

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/schools-commissioners-group>

1. What exactly is the RSC's geographical coverage? How many LAs? How many primary, special and secondary schools and how many of those are already academies?
- 2.

The Regional Schools Commissioner for the East of England and North-East London is responsible for making decisions about the academies and free schools in the following 15 local authorities:

- Barking and Dagenham
- Cambridgeshire
- Essex
- Hackney
- Haringey
- Havering
- Newham
- Norfolk
- Peterborough
- Redbridge
- Southend-on-Sea
- Suffolk
- Thurrock
- Tower Hamlets
- Waltham Forest
-

There are 2373 schools in the region, of which 715 are academies. 657 schools have become academies:

- 387 primary - 208 converted, 179 sponsored
- 241 secondary – 167 converted, 74 sponsored
- 22 special - 16 converted, 6 sponsored
- 7 alternative provision - 5 converted, 2 sponsored
-

There are also:

- 60 free schools, nine opened September 2016
- 2 studio schools
- 4 University Technical Colleges
- 1 University Teaching School

3. How does the RSC travel across this area? Train, private car, taxi? How many hours per week does he spend travelling?

I travel mainly by train, but occasionally by private car when journeys by public transport are particularly time consuming. The amount I travel varies considerably but I am generally in the Cambridge office once a week, the London office once a week and travelling around the region the rest of the time.

4. There are 8 RSCs each directly answerable to the DfE via the National Schools Commissioner. They are interpreting for academies the expectations and requirements of the government. What is the process by which the RSCs ensure that their application of directives is consistent across the country?

The National Schools Commissioner is responsible for overseeing the consistent use of the decision making framework that has been published -

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/548540/RSC_Decision_Making_Framework_April_2016.pdf

5. What is the structure of the RSC's staffing team? Deputies, clerical staff and where are they located?

The structure is as attached. This follows the recent merger of what had been the Regional Schools Commissioner's office and the regional team of a DfE Academies Group.

6. What is the annual cost of the RSC and his office (salaries, on-costs, travel expenses, office rental etc)

The annual cost is £2.3m.

7. What is the appraisal process for an RSC? Who carries it out, how often and what are the criteria? Does the RSC receive a fixed salary or is there a performance-related element? If so, what are the criteria? Is the achievement of school to academy conversions one of them?

The appraisal process is as the arrangements for members of the Senior Civil Service. My line manager is the National Schools Commissioner. The process is very similar to when I was senior officer in local government, ie with agreed objectives, half yearly review and annual review. I have a fixed salary. There is an annual performance related element. There has been a debate about the extent to which school to academy conversions are part of the measures and ministers have said that the KPI that we are held to account for will be published.

Working arrangements with the County Council

8. If as Cambridgeshire members we are criticised for having failing schools in the county, how can Academy Trusts get away with having so little contact with members if that is what they choose? How can lines of communication be opened up so that the local County member may know what is happening within his or her trust schools?

Effective communication is based on effective relationships. I encourage but do not tell trusts to have productive relationships with local authorities.

9. The Council is particularly concerned that schools serving new communities are being opened early and before they are needed by the population of the new community. This creates spare capacity unnecessarily, disrupts existing patterns of pupil movement and creates issues for the medium and longer term for both the new and existing communities as spaces intended for newly arriving families are taken up by pupils from existing communities who will then struggle to access future places for siblings. How will the RSC

ensure that the timing of the opening of new schools better supports the needs of the community that they are planned to serve?

I am keen to work with the local authority to ensure that schools open when they are of most help

10. How can the RSC and the Local Authority work together to improve Cambridgeshire schools?

I am keen that we continue to communicate regularly and meet at regular frequencies, in particular to discuss where there are concerns about school quality or school places. We have a meeting tomorrow where we will look at the provisional primary school results of both maintained schools and academies. We are keen to discuss how to get the best school leaders to have a wider impact, to discuss areas of particular concern and how academy trusts can make a difference there, to discuss academies or maintained schools about which we are concerned and actions that will follow.

Darwin Green Decision Making

11. One of the tasks of the RSC is to decide on who will open a new school. Recently in Cambridgeshire we had a process for opening a new secondary school in Cambridge. There were three applicants. Cambs CC staff carried out the full process to the letter and on the day of the interviews in Shire Hall, a representative of the RSC was present throughout. After detailed and exhaustive interviews of the applicants, the panel unanimously agreed to eliminate one applicant. After a long discussion, it was agreed to recommend one of the two remaining applicants and the RSC's representative did not demur. Some weeks later we were informed that the RSC had appointed the applicants who had been unanimously rejected by the panel. What is the point of having a panel and interviews, at considerable public expense, if the RSC is then going to make the decision irrespective of the recommendation?

The framework for deciding on the sponsor for a new school is clear and that the RSC may make a different decision to the one recommended. This decision was reviewed by the National Schools Commissioner and his letter is attached.

12. What had persuaded the RSC that Meridian Trust were the better option to take on the running of the new school as opposed to the CCCs selected option?

It became clear that a difference of view was that the council had decided that the impact of the decision on North Cambridge Academy was not something that should be brought to bear on the decision. I came to the view that it was reasonable to consider the impact on North Cambridge Academy.

13. Did the RSC apply different criteria in reaching a decision, what were the differences or if he disagreed with the findings of the CCC which parts of the process of procurement did the RSC disagree with? Why was objection not raised at the time by his representative, who I understand was present at proceedings?

As in question 11, there was a different view. The RSC's representative observed the interview stage but was not involved in the decision making and about what factors to take into account. Although now retired, his views were sought as part of the review of this decision by the National Schools Commissioner,

14. If this process were to take place again with another new school what lessons, if any, has the RSC learnt from this experience? What does he think could be improved?

Sir David's letter recommends:

- It should be reinforced in the presumption guidance that the LA should not make its preferred sponsor public before the final decision by the HTB, to avoid any issues should a difference of opinion arise.
- In each presumption case, the LA should be invited to meet the RSC to explain the rationale for its recommendation before the recommendation is made to the HTB.
- In the interests of transparency, in each presumption case the RSC should set out the criteria against which his decision has been made and how each of the bidders matches those criteria.

Key issues for the Regional School Commissioner team in Cambridgeshire

- Improving the attainment of disadvantaged pupils
- Bringing together 'standalone academies into multi-academy trusts
- Helping the best primary heads to lead multi-academy trusts locally
- Supporting governance and effectiveness of multi-academy trusts
- New school places going in the right places
- Holding to account where school performance is unacceptable

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN | Published: 1 September 2016 Updated 16.09.16 | <u>Appendix 2</u> |
|---|---|--------------------------|

Notes

Committee dates shown in bold are confirmed.

Committee dates shown in brackets and italics are reserve dates.

The definition of a key decision is set out in the Council's Constitution in Part 2, Article 12.

* indicates items expected to be recommended for determination by full Council.

+ indicates items expected to be confidential, which would exclude the press and public. Additional information about confidential items is given at the foot of this document.

Draft reports are due with the Democratic Services Officer by 10.00 a.m. eight clear working days before the meeting.

The agenda dispatch date is six clear working days before the meeting.

| Committee date | Agenda item | Lead officer | Reference if key decision | Spokes meeting date | Deadline for draft reports | Agenda despatch date |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 11/10/16 | Minutes and Action Log | Democratic Services | Not applicable | 06/09/16 | 28/09/16 | 30/09/16 |
| | Co-option of Diocesan Representatives | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |
| | Re-tendering of Data Cabling and ICT Installations contract | C Nunn | 2016/049 | | | |
| | Children's Change Programme | T Leavy | 2016/062 | | | |

| Committee date | Agenda item | Lead officer | Reference if key decision | Spokes meeting date | Deadline for draft reports | Agenda despatch date |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Business Planning | A Loades | Not applicable | | | |
| | Children's Centres | J Sollars | Not applicable | | | |
| | Cambridgeshire LA's School Improvement Strategy 2016-18 | K Grimwade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Looked After Children (LAC) Strategy Progress Report | M Teasdale | Not applicable | | | |
| | Total Transport | T Parsons | Not applicable | | | |
| | Free School Proposals | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |
| | Finance and Performance Report | C Malyon/ M Wade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |
| 08/11/16 | Minutes and Action Log | Democratic Services | Not applicable | 04/10/16 | 25/10/16 | 28/10/16 |
| | Cambridgeshire Catering and Cleaning Services: Future Options | K Grimwade/ R Imhoof | 2016/048 | | | |
| | Review of Secondary Provision in Cambridge | H Belchamber/ R Lewis | Not applicable | | | |
| | Business Planning | A Loades | Not applicable | | | |
| | Free School Proposals | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |

| Committee date | Agenda item | Lead officer | Reference if key decision | Spokes meeting date | Deadline for draft reports | Agenda despatch date |
|-----------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| | Foster Carer Allowances | A Loades | Not applicable | | | |
| | Youth Offending Peer Review | A Jack | Not applicable | | | |
| | The LA's Role in Education | K Grimwade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Recruitment and Retention Strategy - Update | C Black | Not applicable | | | |
| | Total Transport | T Parsons | Not applicable | | | |
| | Finance and Performance Report | C Malyon/ M Wade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |
| 06/12/16 | Minutes and Action Log | Democratic Services | Not applicable | 19/10/16 | 22/11/16 | 25/11/16 |
| | Business Planning | A Loades | Not applicable | | | |
| | Fenland Secondary School Review – Phase 2 consultation | C Buckingham | 2016/042 | | | |
| | Histon & Impington Primary School Review Stage 2 consultation outcomes | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |
| | Free School Proposals | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |

| Committee date | Agenda item | Lead officer | Reference if key decision | Spokes meeting date | Deadline for draft reports | Agenda despatch date |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Extended Entitlement to an additional 15 hours free childcare for eligible 3 and 4 year olds nationally from September 2017 | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |
| | Finance and Performance Report | C Malyon/ M Wade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |
| 17/01/17 | Minutes and Action Log | Democratic Services | Not applicable | 30/11/16 | 03/01/17 | 06/01/17 |
| | Risk Register | A Loades | Not applicable | | | |
| | Free School Proposals | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |
| | Business Planning | A Loades | Not applicable | | | |
| | Finance and Performance Report | C Malyon/ M Wade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |
| <i>[14/02/17] Provisional Meeting</i> | | | | 10/01/17 | 31/01/17 | 03/02/17 |
| 14/03/17 | Minutes and Action Log | Democratic Services | Not applicable | 07/02/17 | 28/02/17 | 03/03/17 |
| | Looked After Children (LAC) Strategy Progress Report | M Teasdale | Not applicable | | | |
| | Free School Proposals | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |

| Committee date | Agenda item | Lead officer | Reference if key decision | Spokes meeting date | Deadline for draft reports | Agenda despatch date |
|---|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| | Finance and Performance Report | C Malyon/ M Wade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |
| <i>[11/04/17] Provisional Meeting</i> | | | | 28/02/17 | 28/03/17 | 31/03/17 |
| 06/06/17 | Minutes and Action Log | Democratic Services | Not applicable | 27/04/17 | 22/05/17 | 25/05/17 |
| | Free School Proposals | H Belchamber | Not applicable | | | |
| | Finance and Performance Report | C Malyon/ M Wade | Not applicable | | | |
| | Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan | Democratic Services | Not applicable | | | |

To be programmed: Future management and governance of the Oasis Day Nursery, Wisbech (Nov./Dec 2016); New Primary School for NIAB Site/Darwin Green: Approval of Sponsor (H Belchamber/R Lewis) (date to be confirmed); Cambridgeshire; Establishment of New Primary School at Wintringham Park, St Neots (C Buckingham)

Notice made under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 in compliance with Regulation 5(7)

1. At least 28 clear days before a private meeting of a decision-making body, public notice must be given which must include a statement of reasons for the meeting to be held in private.
2. At least 5 clear days before a private meeting of a decision-making body, further public notice must be given which must include a statement of reasons for the meeting to be held in private, details of any representations received by the decision-making body about why the meeting should be open to the public and a statement of the Council's response to such representations.

| Forward plan reference | Intended date of decision | Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made | Decision maker | List of documents to be submitted to the decision maker | Reason for the meeting to be held in private |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| .../... | [Insert Committee date here] | | [Insert Committee name here] | Report of ... Director | The decision is an exempt item within the meaning of paragraph ... of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as it refers to information |

Decisions to be made in private as a matter of urgency in compliance with Regulation 5(6)

3. Where the date by which a meeting must be held makes compliance with the above requirements impracticable, the meeting may only be held in private where the decision-making body has obtained agreement from the Chairman of the Council.
4. Compliance with the requirements for the giving of public notice has been impracticable in relation to the business detailed below.
5. The Chairman of the Council has agreed that the Committee may hold a private meeting to consider the business referred to in paragraph 4 above because the meeting is urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred for the reasons stated below.

| Date of Chairman's agreement | Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made | Reasons why meeting urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | |

For further information, please contact Quentin Baker on 01223 727961 or Quentin.Baker@cambridgeshire.gov.uk