



MINUTES

Executive Partnership

Date: 4 July 2016
 Time: 10.00am – 12.00pm
 Place: Swansley Room A, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne CB

Membership:		Attendance	Apologies
Adrian Loades	Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults Services (CFA), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC)	No	Yes
Mike Hill	Area Partnership – South Cambs & City	Yes	
Susanne Stent	Area Partnership – Huntingdonshire (in the chair)	Yes	
Carin Taylor	Area Partnership – East Cambs & Fenland	Yes	
Councillor J Whitehead	Lead Councillor for Children's Services, Cambridgeshire County Council	Yes	
Substitute Members:			
Meredith Teasdale	Service Director: Strategy and Commissioning (S&C), for Adrian Loades	No	Yes

Officers: G Hanby (Area Partnership Manager) and R Yule (Democratic Services Officer)

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTION

Apologies for absence had been received from the Executive Director, CFA. The Service Director, S&C, had been due to chair but was held up in traffic, so by the decision of those present, Susanne Stent took the chair.

2. MINUTES – 9 December 2015

The minutes of the meeting of 9 December 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

Updating on action points in the minutes, members noted that

Minute 4 – future arrangements for the Children's Trust and the terms of reference:

- the two draft documents agreed on 9 December 2015 could now be made final
- advice from the Management Information and Performance Manager, S&C, was that nothing as formal as a dashboard was required for CTEP; present arrangements were entirely adequate

Minute 5 – Priority 1 Health and Wellbeing Strategy:

- in the unexpected absence of the Service Director, there were no updates on progress with her four actions
- Jenny Swain had now left Voice; the Area Partnership Manager had spoken to Lee Miller, who was happy that existing plans would achieve what was required

Action

RY

MT

- the Head of Localities and Partnerships - East Cambs & Fenland and City had provided information for Primary schools in the City wanting to engage in the Transforming Mental Health Services process; this had also been shared with SCCC Area Partnership members.

Minute 6 - update from Area Partnerships and Cross-Cambridgeshire opportunities

- Mark Freeman of the Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service had joined the South Cambs & City Area Partnership, and Julie Farrow of Hunts Forum was to be invited to attend Hunts Area Partnership, where she was already a member on paper. Hunts Chair to invite Julie Farrow to join East Cambs & Fenland Area Partnership
- permission to share data had now been received; the district councils would be supplying information on Free School Meals (FSM) to the County Council
- because of universal FSM for under-7s, the number required for that age-group was those eligible to receive the pupil premium rather than those receiving FSM
- actions relating to Hunts Area Partnership had been completed
- the South Cambs & City Area Partnership Chair was trying to arrange a meeting with Stella Cockerill (Skills, Careers and Enterprise Manager at the Local Enterprise Partnership [LEP])
- the South Cambs & City Area Partnership Chair had attended the EDGE breakfast event and was now trying to build relationships with the local version of EDGE as part of seeking opportunities for e.g. careers fairs in the area

SS

Minute 8 – update from the County Council

- the Service Director had provided information to the area partnerships but been unable to attend the meetings
- there was a large amount of data on educational performance available, but it was difficult for schools to get a strategic grip on the data, and there was no forum for discussing it
- results for disadvantaged pupils had improved in 2015 compared with 2014, and results for 2016 could well show a further improvement
- Ofsted had not carried out any inspections in Cambridgeshire recently, so was working with out-of-date data
- underperformance of disadvantaged pupils was a Cambridgeshire issue, but much of what influenced their performance was related to families, communities and external support
- the Health and Wellbeing Board had produced a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Vulnerable Children and Families 2015, which included looking at risk factors which made children and young people in Cambridgeshire potentially vulnerable to poor educational outcomes [available online at <http://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/joint-strategic-needs-assessment/current-jsna-reports/vulnerable-children-and-families-2015>].

3. UPDATE FROM THE AREA PARTNERSHIPS

The Area Partnership Chairs provided an update on the key areas of activity of their Area Partnership (reports attached as appendices A, B and C, for South Cambs & City, East Cambs & Fenland, and Huntingdonshire respectively).

Points raised in discussion of the South Cambs & City update included

- an evaluation of approaches to work to support children with mental health needs had been brought to Children and Young People (CYP) Spokes; Democratic Services Officer to seek further information on this paper

RY

- if it was a question of capacity, the Area Partnership's offer of funding a post for 3-6 months to help with data sharing on FSM remained open
- the Area Partnership Manager offered to send out invitations to a one-off opportunity to see Tough Love on 8 November.

GH

Points raised in discussion of the East Cambs & Fenland update included

- information sharing was one of the issues round childcare; a personal pathway package was being put together on a zero budget
- in the context of accelerating achievement, a primary school and a children's centre in Soham were working together on a project to improve children's vocabulary by inviting partners from the Area Partnership to attend sessions, for example fire and police services.

Points raised in discussion of the Huntingdonshire update included

- webinars provided a way of communicating across the county at no cost
- it was important not to lose the EDGE work – there was a need for personalised pathways for young people
- excessively long hours of paid work during the week could lead to young people dropping out of college; this was being raised with employers.

The general point was made that it would be helpful to have the written area partnership updates in advance of the meeting. This would be done in future.

GH

4. FUTURE OF THE AREA PARTNERSHIPS

The Area Partnership Manager introduced a report on future funding and support options for the Area Partnerships. She explained that the County Council, which currently provided £50,000 annual funding to support a full-time Area Partnership Manager post, was proposing to reduce that support to £8,000 from 1 April 2017.

The report identified three possible options:

1. Area Partnerships were disbanded
2. Area Partnerships continued without an Area Partnership Manager
3. Area Partnerships continued using the same model, with a full time Area Partnership Manager.

The report also identified issues or questions in relation to each of the three options, in summary:

1. would there be another forum where issues and projects related to children and young people could be implemented and co-ordinated; would the Children's Trust Executive Partnership (CTEP) continue?
2. partners would need to take on roles currently fulfilled by the Area Partnership Manager; could information and learning be shared across partnerships via CTEP meetings?
3. funding would need to be identified to top up the County Council's contribution, possibly by partners contributing to the funding, and individual partnerships buying the services of the Area Partnership Manager post.

In answer to questions, the Area Partnership Manager said that £8,000 might perhaps pay for about one day a week's support for the area partnerships. The question on which she was currently seeking guidance was what options the Executive Partnership would like her to work on. The Area Partnership Manager left the room for the following discussion.

The three Area Partnership Chairs and the Lead Councillor for Children's Services identified a number of issues and questions, including:

- did the Area Partnership Manager job have to be full-time?
- could the work be covered by others, or at a less senior level?
- it would be difficult to chair an area partnership without the support currently being offered by the Manager
- there was already a further, hidden – and not inconsiderable – cost incurred in supporting the Area Partnerships, in the form of the time of the two CCC Area Managers Localities and Partnerships, the three Area Partnership Chairs, and all their PAs
- how much impact were the area partnerships having in their current form?
- could another way of having the conversations with local partners be found or developed?
- local health partnerships and community safety partnerships might provide an alternative forum
- it was not always easy to engage schools in the present area arrangements
- in general, partnerships needed somebody concentrating on them as their main job in order to run effectively
- the present post holder, with her thorough knowledge of local networks, provided very valuable support to the partnerships
- was it really essential that CCC make this £42,000 saving?

They went on to identify various further avenues to explore:

- the two CCC Area Managers Localities and Partnerships would be able to supply more information about the work and impact of the present Area Partnership Manager
- a mapping of the total actual cost of supporting the area partnerships was required, as was an analysis of the benefits of having the partnerships
- CCC should be challenged as to why it was proposing to withdraw its full support for the Area Partnership Manager post.

The Lead Councillor for Children’s Services, working with the Democratic Services Officer, undertook to seek answers to two questions from the Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults, and the Service Director:

- what was the true costs of supporting the area partnerships?
- what has led to the decision to reduce the support to the area partnerships?

It was also agreed to arrange for CTEP members to meet with the two Area Managers, and to identify a date for an additional meeting of CTEP, should one be required before 15 November.

The Area Partnership Manager returned to the meeting room. She advised that Sarah Ferguson, Area Manager for East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, had been leading on this matter.

5. PRIORITY 1 HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY

In the absence of the Service Director, the Democratic Services Officer reminded the Executive Partnership that the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) had agreed that the Children’s Trust was the primary delivery mechanism for Priority 1 of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy (‘Ensuring a positive start to life for children, young people and their families’) and that regular progress reports outlining performance and achievements be made to the HWB.

JW/RY

GH/RY

In November 2015, the Service Director had made a report to the HWB updating it on progress with delivering Priority 1, but had not had the opportunity to share the draft report with CTEP beforehand. In order to avoid a similar timetabling difficulty in presenting the next report to the HWB, it was necessary to consider when and how to agree the report beforehand, as the CTEP meeting on 15 November 2016 was too close to the HWB meeting on 17 November to use that CTEP meeting for the purpose. Democratic Services would need the final version of the report to the November HWB two weeks beforehand to allow for timely publication.

Executive Partnership members considered the best approach. They agreed that the draft report could be circulated for comment and approval without necessarily requiring a physical meeting, but if one were to take place before 15 November, the draft report could be discussed then.

MT/RV

6. ANNUAL EVENT

The Executive Partnership received a paper on options for the annual event referred to in its terms of reference, when 'all statutory organisations come together once a year to discuss the priorities/key areas to take forward'.

In the course of discussion, various points were made building on those raised in the report, including that

- it could be preferable to spend the money on an Area Partnership Manager, and on work on the ground, rather than on a conference – conferences were expensive and time-consuming both to organise and to attend
- conferences could take many forms, including information exchange on new initiatives, and a gathering of people to look at specific issues
- it might be better to call the event an open meeting rather than a conference
- it was important to keep in touch with key stakeholders to establish what their concerns were
- as an example, the overlap between SEND and disadvantage was a huge area that could be worth exploring, but any event would need to have credibility and make a contribution to ongoing debate
- there was an SEND strategy already in existence, but poorly publicised; the Hunts Area Partnership was pursuing this with the Service Director and the Head of Commissioning Enhanced Services
- in South Cambs, various youth groups had expressed an interest in having an event for youth groups together; the South Cambs & City Area Partnership Chair would be willing to link a CTEP event into that
- a Voice of Youth event would be taking place in Huntingdonshire in October.

The Lead Councillor for Children's Services reported that an individual had left a personal bequest to the Local Authority to be spent on educational issues. She suggested that some of it could be used to fund a half-day workshop, and undertook to explore this further with the Executive Director, the Director of Learning and the East Cambs & Fenland AP Chair.

JW

7. INSPECTION REGIME

The Executive Partnership received a paper from the Service Director giving an overview of the current inspections frameworks covering the system of services for children and young people. It was noted that inspections were expected in Cambridgeshire both of SEND and Child Sexual Exploitation work, and that the multi-agency nature of the inspections frameworks meant that preparation for inspections must be undertaken with all relevant partners, including the Area Partnerships.

8. UPDATE FROM COUNTY COUNCIL

No update, in the absence of the Service Director

9. DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that a meeting had been arranged for 10am – 12pm on Thursday 15 November 2016 in Room 128, Shire Hall.

An additional date in mid to late September was suggested; because of participants' other commitments, it was desirable to avoid 16 – 25 September and avoid Monday and Tuesday afternoons and Thursday mornings. There was a general preference for a morning meeting.

Dates in 2017 were also to be arranged.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

The Area Partnership Manager reported on two possible offers of funding for Area Partnerships. The first was a rather tentative offer of funding to look at arts and mental health, about which she currently had no details.

The second offer had come from Rebecca Avery of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Collaborative Outreach Project. She had been working with the APs and was proposing to host an event round future career opportunities and attending university [see <http://www.cpc.org.uk/news/under-new-management-rebecca-ave> and <http://www.cpc.org.uk/about-us/what-is-the-cambridgeshire-and-p> for further information]. Rebecca Avery was happy to tailor events individually, and was also looking at whether to put money directly into AP budgets, as it had to be spent by 31st December 2016, when the Collaborative Outreach Networks would close in its current form.

RY

Chair