

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

- Date:** Tuesday 13 March 2018
- Time:** 2.00pm – 4.15pm
- Venue:** Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge
- Present:** Councillors S Bywater (Chairman), A Bradnam, A Costello, P Downes (until 4.10pm), L Every, A Hay, M Howell, S Taylor, D Wells and J Whitehead
- Apologies:** Councillor S Hoy (Vice Chairman) (substituted by Councillor A Costello) and J Wisson (substituted by Councillor M Howell)
- Co-opted Members: A Read and F Vettese

CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

92. CHANGE TO THE PUBLISHED AGENDA

The Chairman stated that unfortunately the appendix to Item 8: A New Syllabus for the Teaching of Religious Education did not contain full details of the syllabus which the Committee was being asked to approve. In order to ensure that both Committee Members and members of the public had sufficient time to consider the proposed syllabus the item would be deferred to a later meeting. Officers had confirmed that this would not delay the introduction of the new syllabus if the proposal was agreed.

93. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor S Hoy, substituted by Councillor A Costello, Councillor J Wisson, substituted by Councillor M Howell and from co-opted members A Read and F Vettese.

A declaration of a personal interest was made by Councillor L Every in relation to Item 5: Review of the Behaviour, Attendance and Improvement Partnership Service Level Agreement and the Devolved Funding Formula as an Academy Councillor at Ely College, a member of the Cambridge Meridian Academies Trust.

The Chairman reminded Members that they could make a declaration of interest at any point in the meeting.

94. MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 9 JANUARY 2018

The minutes of the meeting on 9 January 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

95. ACTION LOG

The Action Log was reviewed and the following verbal updates noted:

Minute 66: Capital Investment for Sawtry Village Academy

At the request of the Executive Director for People and Communities the LGSS Internal Audit team was carrying out an investigation of the circumstances at Sawtry Village Academy. A report describing the lessons learned would be brought to the Committee in May 2018.

Minute 82: Contracts for Delivery of Home to School/ College Transport

The discretionary elements of the home to school/ college transport policy were currently under review. The work was expected to be completed in May 2018 and an update would be circulated to members of the Committee for information.

Minute 87. Agenda Plan, Appointments and Training Plan

It was proposed to arrange a visit to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub for all members of the Children and Young People Committee and Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee on 10 April 2018.

Minute 88: Legal Support Plan – Six Month Update

An update report would be circulated to Committee members by the end of March 2018 for information.

96. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

DECISION

97. REVIEW OF THE BEHAVIOUR, ATTENDANCE AND IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT AND THE DEVOLVED FUNDING FORMULA

The Lead Education Officer stated that the Committee had initially considered this issue at its meeting on 9 January 2018 and had requested a further report containing more detailed information on the impact of the implementation of the proposed new funding formula on individual schools. The revised report provided this additional information and officers were satisfied that the proposed 10% cap on increases and decreases in funding during the period 1 September 2018 to 31 August 2019 would provide sufficient protection to those schools most affected by the proposed changes.

The Chairman stated that two requests to speak on this item had been received from members of the public. He welcomed Jonathan Digby, Chief Executive of the Aspire Learning Trust and Chair of the Cambridgeshire Secondary Heads (CSH) Group to the meeting and invited him to address the Committee.

Mr Digby stated that he had been appointed as the Principal of Sir Harry Smith Community College in 2008 and in this capacity he had been involved in the original process of devolving funding for alternative provision to schools. All headteachers had been in favour of this change and he believed it had worked extremely well. About two years ago it had been acknowledged that the funding formula was out of date and a working group had been set up with the Local Authority to review the position. Those discussions became increasingly subjective, focusing on the impact on individual schools and no consensus was reached. A new working group was established in 2017 with a view to producing clear proposals to submit to headteachers in December 2017. This Working Group included the Behaviour, Attendance and Improvement Partnership

(BAIP) headteachers for each area, Local Authority representation and Mr Digby in his capacity as the Chair of CSH. The turning point in discussions had been a suggestion by Robert Campbell, Chief Executive of the Morris Education Trust, to use the National Funding Formula as an objective basis for the allocation of future devolved funding. The proposals were submitted to the CSH Group for consultation. Due to the disparity between current and proposed funding levels for some schools it was proposed to set a 10% cap on increases and decreases in funding during the new formula's first year of operation to reduce the impact on these schools. These proposals were agreed by the CSH Group in December 2017. The delay in revising the original arrangements had led to the cliff-edge in funding which would initially occur. Going forward, the allocations would be reviewed annually so changes would be less dramatic in future years.

The Chairman thanked Mr Digby for his comments and invited Members of the Committee to ask any questions of clarification on the points made.

- A Member asked if there had been unanimous support for the proposals amongst headteachers. Mr Digby stated that each area was represented on the working group by its BAIP Lead headteacher and the working group's recommendation had been unanimous. The former Director of Education and Robert Campbell presented the recommendations to CSH in December 2017 and there was an appreciation then that there would be both winners and losers under the proposed new arrangements. CSH's comments were taken into account in reaching the final recommendations;
- A Member expressed concern that the impact on smaller schools could be disproportionate and asked whether the impact of the proposed changes on individual schools had been taken into account as well as the sums involved. Mr Digby stated that as soon as adjustments were made to the outcome of the formula the decisions became subjective. A collective view had been reached that following the National Funding Formula provided the fairest and most objective way of allocating funds, but inherent in this was the acceptance that some schools would see their funding increase whilst others would see it decrease. The 10% transition cap provided protection to those schools who would see a decrease in their funding. Officers confirmed that they had modelled different percentages of transitional support and different lengths of time for the introduction of the arrangements;
- A Member asked whether Mr Digby felt that all Trusts would sign up to the new arrangements and whether the proposed sanctions for those who did not meet their responsibilities under the new arrangements were sufficient. Mr Digby stated that he did feel that all Trusts would sign up as devolved funding allowed schools the opportunity to be more creative in the ways they supported individual students. Under the new arrangements each school would sign up to a Service Level Agreement which made clear that responsibility rested with the school rather than with the local BAIP Lead. No funding would be available to Trusts which chose not to sign up to the new arrangements.

The Chairman thanked Mr Digby for taking the time to attend the meeting and share his views with the Committee. He invited Robert Campbell, Chief Executive of the Morris Education Trust to address the Committee.

Mr Campbell stated that like Mr Digby, he had been one of the signatories to the original BAIP agreement and had first-hand experience of how it had worked in practice. He

acknowledged that there would be winners and losers if the new arrangements were agreed and had been comfortable recommending this objective approach to CSH. However, as the Chief Executive of a school in East Cambridgeshire with no access to a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) he also wanted to look at the separate issue of how to support schools in the Fenland and East Cambridgeshire Opportunity Areas which faced significant and singular additional challenges.

The Chairman thanked Mr Campbell for his comments and invited Members of the Committee to ask any questions of clarification on the points made.

- A Member asked about the cost to schools of delivering BAIP activities. Mr Campbell said that expenditure on inclusion in his schools was much greater than the funding received through the BAIP and that he thought this would be the case for most schools. The Member commented that they supported the policy of devolving funding to schools, but wished that it was better funded. They felt that it would be helpful if headteachers were able to produce details of the actual cost to schools of delivering this policy as it would provide useful evidence in future discussions with the Department for Education (DfE).

The Chairman thanked Mr Campbell for attending and sharing his views with the Committee and invited Members to discuss the report.

- A Member asked about the impact on alternative provision for Ernulf Academy. Officers stated that there was recognition of the genuine concerns which existed in relation to securing Ernulf's access to Prospect House going forward and that officers would be discussing this with the Regional Schools Commissioner;
- A Member thanked the County Alternative Education Provision Manager for the further work she had done in response to the questions raised by the Committee in January. However, whilst they understood the rationale for the proposals they remained concerned that money would be top-sliced to fund the two pupil referral units (PRUs) in Cambridge and Wisbech, but that schools within the Opportunity Areas in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland would be unable to access this provision because of the significant distances involved. They did not believe that it could have been intended that schools should pay for provision which their pupils were unable to access and emphasised the need for equality of access to support.

Officers stated that BAIP funding was not used solely in support of PRUs and that this issue was being considered as a separate piece of work.

- A Member commented that they supported the proposed use of the national funding formula to provide an objective basis for the allocation of funding. However, they were concerned that this would lead to four schools in the East Cambridgeshire and Fenland areas losing funding given the particular difficulties experienced in those areas. The DfE social mobility index placed East Cambridgeshire as 311 and Fenland as 319 out of 324 districts. Both of these districts had been classified as Opportunity Areas, but the additional funding and support which this would deliver would take time to feed through. On this issue:

It was proposed by Councillor Hay, seconded by Councillor Costello, that:

'in recognition of the challenges faced in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, that officers work with the four secondary schools in the East Cambridgeshire and

Fenland Opportunity Area that will lose funding through the Behaviour, Attendance and Improvement Partnership (BAIP) formula changes to ensure an effective level of support continues for vulnerable pupils whilst the wider support in the Opportunity Area is mobilised.'

The nature of the support provided would be for officers to determine and might if necessary include financial support, but this would be separate to the introduction of the proposed BAIP funding formula and would be designed to offer short-term support until the Opportunity Area funding came through. To make this clear Councillor Hay was content for the wording of her resolution to be revised to state that any additional support would be delivered within the financial year. The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that Opportunity Area plans had now been agreed so schools in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland could begin to submit bids. The Service Director for Education stated that an initial request for BAIP funding from the Opportunity Area fund had been rejected, but that bids for specific programmes of support could be submitted which would address the same needs. Officers were confident that these revised bids stood a good chance of success, but some short-term additional interim support for the schools within the East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Opportunity Areas would support their transition to the new funding arrangements. Officers confirmed that a small sum of money was retained centrally for alternative provision. A Member questioned whether all schools should not have the opportunity to benefit from this centrally retained sum, even if it was small. Officers confirmed that this would be possible, but stated that by diluting such a small sum across all schools it would deliver minimal impact.

A Member commented that schools in Huntingdonshire were also without a PRU in their district. Officers acknowledged this, but stated that Huntingdonshire had not been identified as an Opportunity Area;

A Member questioned whether the need to provide additional support to schools in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland suggested that the proposed funding formula was flawed.

Summing up, the Chairman stated that no funding formula would deliver an ideal solution for all schools and that there would always be winners and losers. He had visited North Cambridge Academy at the invitation of the Principal together with Councillors Downes and Every and recognised the genuine concerns which existed amongst schools which would lose funding under the proposals. It was a tough decision, and councillors were acutely aware of this.

It was resolved by a majority of those present:

- a) to note the additional information provided, in particular the detailed Community Impact Assessment setting out how each secondary school would be affected by the implementation of the new Funding Formula, and the impact of adopting the proposed transitional cap for one year;

It was resolved unanimously:

- b) to give approval to officers to proceed with the implementation of the new Funding Formula effective from 1 September 2018, and the proposed one year transitional arrangement which is aimed at minimising the impact on those schools which will receive a lower level of funding than currently;

It was resolved by a majority of those present:

- c) in recognition of the challenges faced in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, that officers work with the four secondary schools in the East Cambridgeshire and Fenland Opportunity Area that will lose funding through the Behaviour, Attendance and Improvement Partnership (BAIP) formula changes to ensure an effective level of support continues for vulnerable pupils whilst the wider support in the Opportunity Area is mobilised within the financial year.

INFORMATION ITEM

98. CHILD AND FAMILY CENTRES UPDATE

The Chairman noted that a representative of the 'Fund the Fields' campaign was present in the public seating with a poster relating to funding for the Fields Children's Centre and welcomed them to the meeting.

The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that proposals to redesign the Child and Family Centre offer in Cambridgeshire had been agreed by Council on 17 October 2017 following extensive consultation. The new offer was designed to deliver more responsive and flexible support to families across the county whilst meeting an agreed savings target of £900k. The Implementation Board had worked tirelessly since October and was on track to deliver the agreed service changes on time and on budget. There had been no compulsory redundancies as a result of the changes and detailed 'What's On' guides were being produced for each district and city council area setting out the full range of provision which would be available. Health partners had been fully involved in and were supportive of the changes made and 325 new Early Years places had been made available by re-using County Council buildings. A number of concerns had been raised in relation to specific aspects of the proposals and the Executive Director and officers would continue to respond to these direct.

The following comments arose in discussion of the report and in response to questions from Members:

- Paragraph 3.1: The reference to staff eligible for transfer under TUPE referred to those staff being transferred from external providers to the County Council to deliver services in a different way;
- Officers clarified that sites described as Child and Family Centres were generally open from 9.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday whereas Zones tended to be open for less hours and were often within shared use buildings. Opening hours would be communicated clearly with service users. Officers acknowledged that some names used in the Committee report did not match the names used in the Appendices and confirmed that the correct usage would be checked before the 'What's On' guides were issued;
(**Action:** Children's Commissioner: Children's Centres)
- A Member noted that residents from their Division made use of the services offered by the Fields Children's Centre and that they were pleased to see most sessions would still be offered under the new arrangements. They were however concerned about the potential impact on the nursery provision offered at the Fields.

The Service Director for Education stated that under the new arrangements there was a clear division between the Field's Child and Family Centre offer and its nursery provision. It was no longer possible to share the leadership costs and the Centre had been subsidising its Early Years offer from its Reserves which was no longer sustainable. Officers would be happy to help with modelling alternative operating models, but the challenge which the Field's faced to deliver a financially sustainable offer was one which had already been faced by other settings across the county. The Council had not provided additional financial support to help other settings to help them meet this challenge. The Service Director for Education had been pleased to have the opportunity to meet some parents the previous week and acknowledged their strength of feeling. Nursery settings had a vital role to play in the county's educational provision going forward and their future sustainability would form part of his wider review of educational provision across the county. The Chairman thanked the Service Director for Education for engaging with the families using the Field's nursery provision and for offering continued support to the Centre's management team and welcomed his offer to keep the Committee informed of developments.

(Action: Service Director for Education)

- A Member commented that the provision of an extended entitlement to additional free childcare for eligible families had not been sufficiently funded by central government. The Cambridgeshire Schools Forum had highlighted this as an area of concern and had discussed sharing learning across settings about managing within the funding available;
- A Member commented that they would concede there was scope for rationalisation of the Children's Centre offer, but not on the scale which had occurred;
- The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that as a result of the service re-design 22 posts at various levels had been removed, building use reviewed and some leases changed. When completed this would deliver the £900k savings target. At present there was a £23k shortfall against this target, but officers remained confident it would be achieved;
- The Children's Commissioner: Children's Centres acknowledged that managers had faced a difficult period and commended their work to minimise the impact of vacancies on provision to families by drawing on support from wider district teams and from volunteers. They were now in a position to bring new staff in on permanent rather than fixed term contracts which would provide greater long-term stability;
- A Member commented that one of the arguments in favour of the revised Children's Centre Offer had been that it would provide more and better provision and asked whether this had been achieved. The Executive Director for People and Communities confirmed that this was the case, highlighting in particular the increased outreach work and the benefits to service users of closer working arrangements with health service providers. She undertook to provide a performance report in 12 months' time to provide further detail;
(Action: Executive Director, People and Communities)
- A Member commented that they had been totally opposed to the redesign of the Children's Centre offer, but that looking now at the content of the new offer they thought it was marvellous. They welcomed the inclusion of an adult learning offer and planned to visit their local Centre to see delivery of the new offer first hand;

- Officers stated that staff were now employed to deliver outcomes rather than a fixed service, making the offer more flexible and responsive to service users' needs. A lot of the provision would be delivered by outreach staff which would mean increased travel time and travel costs for those staff, but this would be offset by the savings made by liquidising some fixed assets such as buildings. The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that taking services out to clients was the right thing to do;
- A Member commented that those areas which had not previously had the benefit of a Children's Centre and were now receiving outreach support were extremely grateful that their residents now had access to the same type of support;
- A Member commented that it had previously been difficult for some of those living in rural areas to access the support offered by Children's Centres due to the distances they would need to travel. That support was now being taken to them.

Summing up, the Chairman stated that he had visited lots of Children's Centres during the past months and met many incredible members of staff who had worked above and beyond what was required of them to maintain services to residents whilst changes to service delivery were implemented. He offered them his public thanks on behalf of the Committee for everything they had done. He also commended the Head of Commissioning: Child Health and Wellbeing and the Children's Commissioner: Children's Centres for delivering such a wide-ranging programme of change.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the work done to date and details of the new service offer from April 2018.

DECISIONS

99. FREE SCHOOL PROPOSALS

Standing item. No business to discuss.

100. A NEW SYLLABUS FOR THE TEACHING OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The appendix to the report did not contain full details of the syllabus which the Committee was being asked to approve. In order to ensure that both Committee Members and members of the public had sufficient time to consider the proposed syllabus the item had been deferred to a later meeting.

101. EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE IN THE 2016/17 ACADEMIC YEAR

The Lead Education Officer stated that the Committee received a report each year setting out the performance of state funded schools and colleges in Cambridgeshire. The report before the Committee related to performance at Key Stage 4, Post 16 and for Looked After Children. The results for Key Stage 5 remained provisional whilst the Post 16 results included both Technical and Vocational certificates. The performance of the county's Looked After Children was notable given that most of them had moved school at least once during their school careers. Due to major changes in the measurement of educational performance the results were not directly comparable with previous years. Key areas to be prioritised for future focus included performance at Key

Stage 4, for those students eligible for Free School Meals and those experiencing disadvantage.

The following comments arose in discussion of the report and in response to questions from Members:

- The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee stated that the Sub-Committee was doing a lot of work with officers in relation to the role of the Virtual School in supporting the county's Looked After Children. This would remain a focus of its work going forward;
- Paragraph 2.1 - Key Stage 4 School Progress: Officers stated that the use of the word 'significant' in this section was a comment rather than an indication of statistical significance. They acknowledged the need to be clear about use of this term in future reports;
- A Member welcomed the encouraging progress indicated in many mainstream schools at Key Stage 4, but noted that progress in seven schools was below the national average and commented that this should be considered further, including with the Regional Schools Commissioner.
- A Member suggested that it would be more informative to look at where Cambridgeshire was placed in comparison to the highest and lowest performing local authorities at Key Stage 4 rather than at its ranking. Officers offered to recast the data to provide this information and to circulate it to the Committee for information;
(**Action:** Lead Education Officer)
- A Member commented that in future they would like to see the detailed supporting data on which the report was based, perhaps via a web link. The Service Director for Education stated that the comprehensive data provided by the Department for Education was very detailed, but officers would reflect on how elements of this might be included in future.
(**Action:** Lead Education Officer)

It was resolved:

- a) note and comment on the findings from the analysis undertaken of educational performance in Cambridgeshire compared to that nationally and to that of Cambridgeshire's statistical neighbours.

102. DELIVERING THE EXTENDED ENTITLEMENT TO AN ADDITIONAL 15 HOURS FREE CHILDCARE FOR ELIGIBLE 3-4 YEAR OLDS

The Committee received a report setting out the progress made in delivering the extended entitlement to an additional 15 hours free childcare for eligible three and four year olds. The new entitlement had now been available for almost two terms and reports from the Early Years sector in Cambridgeshire were positive. As previously agreed by the Committee, an officer had been appointed via the National Day Nurseries Association to provide settings with business planning support and in the previous term 71% of providers offering funded placements were involved in delivering the extended entitlement. Analysis of the headcount data from the autumn term of 2017 showed that

2612 eligible families had successfully applied to take up their entitlement and that 12% of claimants were taking up the full 30 hour entitlement. The take-up of hours per individual family had been slightly less than predicted, although some demand hotspots existed where there were insufficient 30 hour places to meet demand. Childminders were playing a key role in delivering the extended entitlement. In Whittlesey a number of partnerships had been established across the sector which had been shortlisted for a national award in the Partnership Award category. Graham Arnold in the Early Years Service had developed a modelling tool in preparation for the introduction of the Extended Entitlement which had been adopted by a number of local authorities and which had been shortlisted in the Authority Practice Sharing category. The county had also made a successful bid to the Department for Education's Delivery Support Fund to support work with providers on sufficiency through a programme of workshops and webinars.

The following comments arose in discussion of the report and in response to questions from Members:

- A Member asked how best local Members might broach the subject of the extended entitlement with families who might be eligible without causing offence and whether it would be ethically acceptable to seek to enlist the help of local GPs. Officers suggested that raising awareness of the extended entitlement with local community groups as well as individual families was helpful so that they could be signposted to those able to provide them with detailed information. Information on the extended entitlement was already provided to GP surgeries and to health visitors as part of partnership working with health professionals. In response to Members' suggestions, officers agreed to explore running a pilot project with a group of GP surgeries to explore this further and to provide information on the extended entitlement to town and parish councils to enable them to signpost their residents; (**Action:** Strategic Policy and Early Years Operations Manager)
- Officers stated that families within the Traveller community would be made aware of the extended entitlement through the outreach services provided via the new Child and Family Centres offer as well as by an Early Years adviser working with the Travelling Families and Traveller Liaison Service. Officers were working with District and City Council colleagues in relation to the wider delivery of the extended entitlement, but confirmed that they could pick up the need to make Traveller families aware of the extended entitlement as part of these conversations; (**Action:** Strategic Policy and Early Years Operations Manager)
- A Member noted that there were surplus places in some parts of the county whilst in others demand for places exceeded supply and questioned what could be done to balance supply with demand. Officers offered to bring a further update report to the Committee in November 2018 providing more detailed information on the areas experiencing pressure on demand and those with surplus places and the work being done to balance these. (**Action:** Democratic Services Officer)

The Chairman thanked officers for providing an informative update on progress in delivering the extended entitlement and for all of their hard work on this.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the progress made in implementing the extended early years and childcare entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds since its launch in September 2017;
- b) request a further report in November 2018 when analysis of the first year of the extended entitlement will be available.

103. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT: JANUARY 2018

The Group Accountant reported that at the end of January 2018 the People and Communities Directorate was forecasting a pressure of £6,774k. This represented a worsening position from the previous report to the Committee when the forecast pressure had been £6,259k. The main changes in those areas within the responsibility of the Children and Young People Committee related to the Children in Care budget, the Looked After Children Placement budget, the Special Educational Needs (SEN) Placement budget and the Children and Safeguarding Strategic Management Budget.

The following comments were offered in discussion of the report and in response to questions from Members:

- The Chairman noted that due to current reporting arrangements the finance and performance information brought to the Committee reflected the position one or two months previously. Whilst acknowledging the work involved in producing such a detailed report it was important that Members had a clear understanding of the current position. The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that she was working with officers in the Finance team to include more up to date information in future reports.
(Action: Executive Director for People and Communities/ Strategic Finance Business Partner)

A Member commented that they would find it helpful to have a shorter, but more up to date report which provided a snapshot of the current position against budget and highlighted any issues or problems.

- The Service Director for Children's Services and Safeguarding stated that the Council received a fixed amount per year from central government for each unaccompanied asylum seeking child (UASC) in its care. The sum varied depending on the age of the child and broadly covered the cost of an average placement. The position in relation to UASC aged 18+ was particularly complicated. There were peaks and troughs in arrivals, but he confirmed that Cambridgeshire was providing right and proper provision for those UASC within its care;
- Officers stated that the number of Court ordered contact sessions varied from month to month, but that higher numbers of children in care led to increased numbers of contact sessions.

It was resolved to:

- a) review and comment of the report.

104. AGENDA PLAN, APPOINTMENTS AND TRAINING PLAN

The Committee reviewed the agenda plan, appointments and the training plan. The Service Director for Education stated that a date was being arranged for the next meeting of the Educational Achievement Board and that he would contact the relevant Members direct.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the following changes to the published agenda plan:
 - i. 13 March 2018: A New Syllabus for the Teaching of Religious Education: Deferred to 22 May 2018;
 - ii. 22 May 2018: School Admissions and Transport Outcome Focused Review: Deferred to 10 July 2018;
 - iii. 11 September 2018: New item – Annual Complaints and Customer Care Report 2017/18
- b) to review the Committee's appointments;
- c) to review the Committee training plan and note that the Reserve Committee meeting date of 10 April 2018 might be used for training and a visit to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub at Chord Park, Godmanchester.

INFORMATION ITEM

105. OUTCOME FOCUSED REVIEWS: UPDATE

The Transformation Manager introduced a report setting out progress to date on the current Outcome Focused Reviews (OFRs) relating to children and young people. Over the next eighteen months the Council would be looking at how each of its functions contributed to its corporate outcomes. Each OFR consisted of three phases: Phase One - a baseline assessment looking at what services were currently provided and the outcomes sought; Phase Two - a Member-led discovery phase gathering further information from internal and external sources about service potential and proposing either an action plan or moving on to Phase Three: a design phase providing a complete and detailed service review. Learning from the initial round of OFRs was being used to refine the approach to future reviews and there was a move towards looking at a range of services with similar functions rather than at individual services in isolation.

There were currently three OFRs relating to services for children and young people. The Cambridgeshire Music OFR had established a Member Reference Group comprising members of the Commercial and Investment Committee (C&I) and Children and Young People Committee which would make recommendations to the Commercial and Investment Committee. The Education ICT OFR was being re-scoped to include wider digital and IT functions within the Council and the Outdoor Education OFR had progressed to the Phase Three design phase. Final recommendations would be submitted to the Commercial and Investment Committee.

The following comments were offered in discussion of the report and in response to questions from Members:

- A Member suggested that Phase Four of the OFRs should be an outcome evaluation to review what they had delivered;

- A Member asked whether the decision for the Outdoor Education OFR to proceed to Phase Three meant that the need for future provision of outdoor education had been accepted. In his capacity as the Lead Member for the Outdoor Education OFR the Chairman stated that Phase Three was focusing on governance, leadership, location and capacity of sites, investment required, usage and core services. This would include exploring ways of maximising income and looking at alternative delivery models. In reviewing the options Members were very mindful that not all children excelled in the classroom and the value offered by alternative pathways offered to them through outdoor education and the arts;
- A Member commented that there was a debate as to whether the Children and Young People Committee should be offered the opportunity to reshape services if the Commercial and Investment Committee deemed them to be unviable.

Summing up, the Chairman noted the evolving position regarding the decision-making process surrounding the OFRs. He was conscious of the need for members of the Children and Young People Committee to contribute to the discussion, but as things stood currently the final decision would rest with the Commercial and Investment Committee.

It was resolved to:

- a) note and comments on the progress of the Outcome Focused Reviews;
- b) note the recommendations made by the Commercial and Investment Committee.

106. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee would meet next on Tuesday 22 May 2018 at 2.00pm in the Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge.

Chairman
(date)