

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

CHILDREN, FAMILIES & EDUCATION - RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Children, Families & Education - Resources and Infrastructure Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 15th April, 2010.

PRESENT: Mr C J Capon (Chairman), Mr T Gates (Vice-Chairman), Mr D L Brazier, Mr R L H Long, TD, Mrs J A Rook, Mr K Smith, Mr M J Vye, Mr M Whiting and Mr R Tolputt

CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES: The Reverend N Genders and
The Reverend Canon J L Smith

PARENT GOVERNORS: Mr B Critchley and Mr P Myers

TEACHER ADVISERS: Miss S Kemsley

PRESENT: Mr G Cooke, Deputy Lead Member, Resources, Capital Programme and Infrastructure

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr K Abbott (Director Resources and Planning Group), Mr G Ward (Director, Capital and Infrastructure Group), Mrs J Wainwright (Director Commissioning (Specialist Services)), Ms A Agyepong (Equalities and Diversity Manager) and Mrs C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

21. Membership (Item A1)

RESOLVED that Mr M J Vye had replaced Mr I S Chittenden as a member of this Committee and that Mr B Critchley had been appointed as a Parent Governor Representative be noted

22. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting (Item A3)

Mr M J Whiting declared an interest in Item B6 as his employer was a sponsor of the Spires Academy, Sturry, Canterbury. Mr Long made a declaration of interest in Item B1 as a Director of the Integrated Services Programme.

23. Minutes - 19 November 2009 (Item A4)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2009 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

24. Financial Monitoring Report

(Item B1)

(Report by Mr K Abbott, Director, Resources and Planning Group and Mr G Ward, Director, Capital and Infrastructure Group)

(1) The Committee considered the fifth report on the forecast outturn against budget for the Children Families and Education (CFE) Directorate for 2009/10 financial year, which was based on the third full quarterly monitoring report that had been presented to the Cabinet on 29 March 2010.

(2) The Chairman asked Mr Abbott and Mr Ward to introduce the report.

(3) Mr Abbott highlighted the key issues in the revenue budget, which included that the Directorate predicted an underspend of £2,001k (excluding Schools and Asylum), which was a movement of £1m since in the last report to the Committee. The two key factors for this was; SEN Transport where a lot of transport runs were cancelled due to the prolonged period of heavy snow, and the impact of the contract negotiations being carried out by the Passenger Transportation Unit. There was an increase in the underspend of over £½m, which reflected the continuing difficulty to recruit Social Workers. Although the Asylum funding was not reflected in the £2m underspend of the Directorate there was the significant change on the position of Asylum funding. The forecast shortfall had been reduced by just over £1m, which was a direct result of the conclusions in the negotiations with the UK Border Agency (UKBA). UKBA had agreed to payback £2.3m, in respect of the additional costs incurred in 2008/9/10, half of that was reflected in the 2009/10 financial year was now reflected in the forecast. He concluded that the final figures for the schools reserves would be submitted to the Committee in the Summer.

(4) Mr Ward then spoke on the key aspects reflected in the capital budget advising that the figures reflected the position statement at the end of December 2009. The figures also reflected the cash limit adjustments that were made as part of the County Council Budget, which left a figure that suggested a £99k overspend on the capital programme, which was covered by the revenue contribution, this did mask the previous levels of slippage which had been adjusted as it moved along the formal approval process for the new capital programme. One of the challenges now until the end of the year was the impact of the adverse weather and what it had done to a significant number of the building schemes, whilst special schools were being rolled out the delay had caused in slippage in expenditure but more challenging the impact it had on planned openings of schools. He advised that colleagues in Corporate Property and some schools had to work through new time lines to ensure the schools could open at the start of the academic new year.

(5) Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments which included the following:

(6) In response to questions by Mr Tolputt, Mr Abbott advised that; the figure of £6m was the forecast of the reserves that schools would be spending for projects etc. If any funding was clawed back from schools it had to be used for the benefit of the schools and not for use by the County Council. In response to the second question, Mr Abbott stated that there had been no Social worker posts held vacant. There had been some success with international recruitment but the reality was that

as fast as there was recruitment; Social Workers were leaving for new posts elsewhere. The County Council had also made a clear decision to put in additional funding to recruit Social Workers but KCC, like other local authorities were having great difficulties in recruiting Social Workers. He added that the restructuring of the Directorate had no impact on this issue as one of the clear positions that had been adopted was that front line posts would be protected. With reference to the Looked After Children figures rising in Kent, Mr Abbott agreed to come back to Members with further information advising that the issue was being pursued with the government and that Mrs Turner, Managing Director, would be speaking to her counterparts in the region to tackle the issue.

(7) In reply to a question by Mr Vye, Mr Abbott advised that in terms of the deficits the report referred to all schools, it was the case that when the accounts closed a few schools tipped into deficit usually because their cash flow calculations were incorrect, those would be dealt with by a telephone call. Mr Abbott said that only once had a school been issued with a notice of concern, where there were concerns regarding their deficit and in the past delegation had been withdrawn from schools but this was very rare. The process was about working closely with the school on an individual basis to agree a recovery plan.

(8) In response to a question by Mr Vye, Mr Abbott said that when preparing the 2010/11 budget he would look to colleagues in the Passenger and Transport Unit and those in Special Educational Needs for an indication of the funding needed for SEN transport. There should be sufficient funding in the budget now but this would be addressed in the first monitoring report of the new financial year on whether the forecasts were genuine.

(9) In reply to a question by Mr Vye regarding the pressures on the Learning Group, Mr Abbott advised that the report reflected the pressures on the Advisory Service. The smaller pressures had been addressed in the budget. He felt that for the future the pressures and demands from schools would not disappear but it was clear there was a national drive for schools to start working collaboratively and looking for solutions. Even with £6m coming out of schools from reserves, their spending plans were just closing; schools would still have £45m in the bank in revenue budgets. There was a need to look at the schools reserves to put in support where schools had been struggling with their spending plans, he suggested this could be carried out through getting the governors and Headteachers to reprioritise and spending their own money on things that in the past the LEA had picked up on occasion. The Governors and Headteachers needed to be aware that there would be less money in the future and the LEA would not be able to carry on funding things it had done in the past.

(10) In reply to a question by Mr Myers, Mr Ward advised that the appointment of the SEN transport contractors was not driven by budget constraints; the Informal Member Group for SEN Transport had been looking at this issue and would be addressed in Item B5 on the agenda. The LEA was aware of its responsibilities and the challenges of being aware of the complete variation of needs for young people that go to special schools.

(11) In response to a question by Mr Smith, Mr Cooke said that it was the role of this Committee to scrutinise the budgets of Children, Families and Education Directorate and that it would not be possible to have individual Informal Member Groups for each of the three Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees (POSCs)

with the Directors. Mrs Rook suggested that Budget IMG that looked at the budget in November 2009 worked well.

(12) The Chairman sought the Committees agreement to a Budget IMG being set up with a membership of 6 (2,2,2) by each of the three POSC Chairmen nominating 2 Members from their Committee. The Committee agreed this without a vote.

(13) In reply to a question by Mr Whiting, Mr Abbott agreed to report back to Mr Whiting and Members of the Committee in writing regarding the graph for the position on SEN Home to School Transport in relation to the underspend.

(14) In response to questions by Miss Kemsley, Mr Cooke advised that the Children's Champions Board and its parent Committee the Vulnerable Children and Partnerships Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee monitored the numbers of children placed in Kent by other local authorities. It was a significant issue. There was a shift that was being seen due to the 25 mile rule [children allowed to be placed no further than 25 miles from their home], with a large number of London Boroughs placing children in Kent and a shift of placements from the Thanet area to the Sittingbourne area. A number of the children were with independent fostering agencies too. Mr Abbott advised that KCC was not able to make money from the placements. This was an historic issue with the London Boroughs in particular as their funding per child was much higher than the shire authorities, they had actively recruited to Thanet but that had now changed because of the mileage limits. He added that the London Authorities were able to pay more than KCC could, which was a contributing factor in KCC's difficulty in recruiting foster carers.

(15) Mr Long made a declaration of interest as a Director of the Integrated Services Programme, which was one of the largest independent fostering providers in Kent. He felt that some social problems did occur by placing children directly or indirectly in Kent he felt that the issues were often overstated. He stated that the cost of the placement of children was borne by the placing authorities they paid fees to independent organisations who then paid foster carers, schools carers, and social workers etc who cared for the children. Children placed with those carers were often less of a burden. Kent social worker only became involved if there were allegations against people involved in the care, which was rare. He concluded that the situation would not change soon as there were experienced people in the present economic climate who were in a position to carry out this type of care.

(16) The Chairman paid tribute to Mr Abbott and Mr Ward and their Teams for the detailed budget reports they produce.

(17) RESOLVED that:

- (a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted,
- (b) the Scrutiny Board be requested to endorse a CFE Budget IMG being set up with a membership of 6 (2,2,2) by each of the three CFE POSC Chairmen nominating 2 Members from their Committee;
- (c) the requests for further information be carried out; and
- (d) the projected outturn figures for the CFE Directorate as at the third full quarterly monitoring report be noted.

25. Deputy Cabinet Member and Service Directors' Update *(Item B2)*

(Verbal report by Mr G Cooke, Deputy Cabinet Member, Resources Capital Programme and Infrastructure, Mr K Abbott, Director, Resources and Planning Group and Mr G Ward, Director, Capital and Infrastructure Group)

(1) The Chairman asked Mr Cooke to give his verbal update. Mr Cooke advised the Committee of the visits he and the other Deputy Cabinet Members had made to various Kent primary and secondary schools, including schools that were part of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF), moving into special measures or struggling. He stated that he had visited primary schools that had a great need but with a limited primary capital programme. He felt that there was a missed opportunity as there seemed to be an unlimited resource in BSF. The work of BSF was understood but the work with children began with early years and at primary school, through the quality of the teachers. He took the opportunity to advise that Ms Andrea Chapman Headteacher of Lydd Primary School had been reinstated. The Committee agreed that a letter being sent to Ms Chapman regarding her reinstatement.

(2) Mr Cooke then spoke on school admissions and advised that 94% of primary and secondary school children had been offered a school of their choice and 80% were going to their first school of choice.

(3) Mr Abbott referred to the three Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) publications that were published in March 2010 for consultation, in particular publication 1 - School Funding and publication 2 - The Distribution of School Funding, which he felt would be tricky to respond to as the closing date for comments was a month after the date of the general election and he felt that the outcome of the general election would effect what was in some of the proposals. He stated that there was more concern with the consultation on the Distribution of School Funding as the DCSF was looking to change the methodology and how it effectively distributed the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) between the English local authorities at the same time looking to no longer allocate specific grants and mainstreaming them by taking the grants and adding them into the DSG so that there was more flexibility in spending the money and less ring fencing. This authority had always pushed for this but there was concern about the national redistribution of schools funding that happened at the same time as mainstream specific grants as Kent schools always lost out on both counts in terms of the national distribution as they tended to move away from the South and South East and if the specific grants were included they would be caught up in this process. This would be closely monitored. Mr Abbott added that the papers set out the five key items that the DCSF wanted to base the distribution on, there was no indication in the proposals as to the proportion that those five elements made up the distribution, so it would be difficult to gauge a response.

(4) Mr Abbott concluded that the third consultation from the DCSF was the Management of Schools Surplus Balances, which seemed to be in line with what KCC was already doing. One issue that may raise concerns with schools was the challenging of school reserves. The guidance now said "...if a school was looking to have reserves bigger than the threshold ie over 5% or 8% the LEA should

challenge the whole reserve". This would be discussed with the Funding Forum in May 2010.

(5) Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

(6) In response to a question by Mrs Rook, Mr Abbott advised that the government had stated that where local authorities were not seen to act on excessive school reserves it would legislate; it currently stood at £2 billion nationally in school reserves. The government gave local authorities more scope to act; KCC was one of the minority authorities to claw back money from school reserves and had made it clear that money was to be spent on children today. The school reserves had been considerably reduced in the past 2 years.

(7) Mr Ward then introduced the Capital Programme and Infrastructure portfolio highlighting key issues that included; that 80% of admission applications were now being made on line as opposed to 15% last year, which had made the process easier. On 30 March 2010 the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) outline business case funding was approved. The funding was estimated at £250m. There had also been recent approval to the outline business case for Skinners' Kent Academy, Tunbridge Wells, allowing the process to begin with approving the contractor and that contractor would then gain access to the next six Academies. Ten schools were already under construction.

(8) Mr Ward advised Members that the Capital Programme was approved on 10 February 2010 but the main uncertainty was that the funding physically stopped on 31 March 2011. The funding for 2011 was not yet known but various scenarios were being worked on i.e. what would happen if we received 40% less. There would also be new challenges as the funding had previously been budgeted over 3 years.

(9) In reply to a question by Mr Vye, Mr Cooke advised that the Kent Test was not a mechanism of pass or fail but a streaming mechanism, where the pass mark varied from year to year. He understood that the pass mark was pitched at streaming 20% of the pupils, but reminded Members that it was critical to note that affecting the overall percentage of children that went to grammar school was the appeals process which included; the schools, parents and secondary Headteachers. He felt that there would be no benefit in having separate pass marks for the Kent Test between the East and West of Kent. Overall there needed to be sufficient grammar school places for the children in Kent. There was an issue of some children from out of county attending grammar school places and there were a number of rulings that needed to be looked at including the Greenwich ruling. The Greenwich ruling would allow the authority to draw parish boundaries around schools. He reminded Members that most schools in the County had their own school admissions policy, which the LEA had no authority to demand who the school admitted that was the judgement of the Headteacher and Governors. He felt that it would not be the direction to pursue but there was an option to appeal to the Adjudicator.

(10) In response to Mr Vye's request, Mr Cooke agreed to a report being presented to the next meeting of the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee giving details of the percentage pass figures for grammar schools throughout the County.

(11) In reply to a question by Mr Horne, Mr Ward advised that the outline business case had been agreed and the funding had been released by the Partnership for Schools and Treasury for the Skinners' Kent Academy, Tunbridge Wells. The only obstacle to stop it from being built would be KCC's inability to arrive at a satisfactory agreement with a contractor, which would not happen and the school would be delivered.

(12) In response to follow up questions by Mr Horne, Mr Abbott advised that once the Skinners' Kent Academy was established, funding would be received by them directly via The Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA) one of the new agencies that had replaced the Learning Skills Council that handled the funding on behalf of the Department of Children, Schools and Families.

(13) In response to questions by Mrs Rook, Mr Ward stated that KCC would continue to lobby government about the funding for BSF being extended to be used for the benefit of not just buildings but providing excellent teaching etc. There was national recognition that as we moved forward there was a need to be far more joined up both across the programmes and across individual directorates of the authority and what was happening within Total Place but also in the linkages with District Councils where there had been some success. He gave the example of the new BSF scheme in Herne Bay High School where KCC was integrating some investment from Canterbury City Council for the replacement of some of the leisure facilities. Mr Ward commented that he felt school admissions was functioning well and that the chances of there being zero percent of school places being allocated by the local authority was slim, unless the schools were able to run with 20% vacancies and were expanded, virtually all children could be placed. Referring back to teaching and learning he stated that another challenge in schools was the effect of the change in the quality of the Headteacher and a change in the senior management team which had an affect on parents choosing a school.

(14) RESOLVED that:

- (a) a report be submitted to the next meeting of this Committee giving details of the percentage pass figures for grammar schools throughout the County; and
- (b) the responses to Members questions and comments on the verbal updates be noted.

26. Home to School Transport

(Item B3)

(Report by Mr G Ward, Director of Capital Programme & Infrastructure, Mr K Abbott, Director of Resources & Planning and Mrs S Hohler, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Education)

(1) Members received a report produced in response to a request for a factual overview of the CFE Directorate's transport budget, excluding the Special Educational Needs (SEN) transport provision, which was being reviewed by the Informal Member Group for SEN Transport established by this Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

(2) Members of the Committee were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

(3) In response to a question by Mr Vye, Mr Ward advised that there were figures available on children from low income families, which he would provide to the Committee outside the meeting.

(4) In reply to a question by the Chairman, Mr Abbott advised that the number of children with freedom passes had made a saving of £1m against the mainstream budget, which was built into the budget last September 2009.

(5) RESOLVED that:

(a) the figures available on children from low income families be forwarded to the Committee; and

(b) the responses to questions and comments by Members and the report be noted.

27. CFE Strategic Action Plan for Equalities

(Item B4)

(Mrs J Wainwright, Director, Commissioning and Partnerships, Mrs R Turner, Managing Director, and Mrs S Hohler, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Education)

(Mrs A Agyepong, Equality & Diversity Manager and Mrs J Wainwright, Director, Commissioning and Partnerships were present for this item)

(1) The Committee discussed a report that outlined the aims of an updated draft Equality and Diversity Strategic Action Plan 2010-2013.

(2) The Chairman asked that Mrs Wainwright introduce the report. Mrs Wainwright explained that it was important that this report was produced and before Members now as KCC was committed to equalities and diversity and there was a need for a Strategy to plan and implement the work across the Directorate. Reports of this kind were also essential in the inspections that apply across the County Council and as part of the Comprehensive Area Assessment and other inspection processes. KCC had made a commitment to achieve excellence, under the Equality Framework for Local Government during 2011, a higher rating than currently held across the County Council. The Children, Families and Education Directorate was working toward providing the necessary environment to achieve excellence. The report gave a series of examples and a strategic action plan over a number of years on how this would be achieved.

(3) Mrs Agyepong highlighted the five key areas of performance within the strategic action plan and gave examples of work being carried out in those areas as follows:

- Knowing your community and equality mapping;

- Place shaping leadership, partnership and organisational commitment;
- Community engagement and satisfaction;
- Responsive services and customer care;
- Modern and Diverse Workforce.

(4) Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments which included the following:

(5) In response to questions by Mr Critchley, Mrs Agyepong advised that measuring best practise would be carried out by looking across KCC and across several partners to see how new ways of working were being developed, which could then be implemented across the County. She gave the example of colleagues based in a Children's Centre in Ashford who were developing a framework for questions that needed to be asked for children who came from families where English was a second language as they began to enter the education system. They had been doing this piece of work just for their Centre and had not thought about other parts of Kent that were experiencing the same issue that they could share that practise to produce good outcomes for the children. Mrs Agyepong said that she had worked with them to pull the framework together and linked them back to the Early Years Team so that once this was piloted the practise could be shared more widely and the impact it had measured.

(6) Mrs Agyepong said that work was being undertaken to look at the Customer Impact Assessments to ensure that the people who needed our services could access them taking into account the equality measure.

(7) In response to a question by Mr Vye, Mr Abbott stated that for future meetings the finance report could highlight the budget that underpinned the work on the Equalities and Diversity Strategic Action Plan for the Children, Families and Education Directorate.

(8) Members commented that future reports should have less jargon and contain examples of how the aims would be achieved and the required resources to explain how, for the Committee to keep equalities at the heart of its agenda. Mrs Wainwright said that this area was not an exact science. She explained giving the example ... "To continue to expand the mechanism used to engage the community in policy and service development and evaluation would be carried out through local working, engaging groups that might be around Children's Centres by talking to; parents, professionals in those Centres and asking them questions such as what they thought about our current policy?, what they felt could be done better?, and were there particular problems in their area? If a number of people came up with the same thoughts those would be embedded into practise". Mr Cooke felt that the outcomes that could be measured were not dependant on this; the measures in the report were complimentary measures that supported other programmes that were within the Committees remit, eg Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET). Mrs Agyepong said that she was clear about the strategic objectives which would be put forward in an action plan. She gave the example of knowing the groups that were being consulted at present but there being a need for clarity on why those groups were being consulted and not others and how other groups in communities could be reached to consult with to inform services. Mrs Agyepong agreed to reword the report to include outcomes.

(9) RESOLVED that:

- (a) the responses to Members comments and questions be noted;
- (b) agreement be given to the covering report being reworded to make the outcomes clearer by giving examples;
- (c) that future finance reports highlight the budget that underpinned the work on the Equalities and Diversity Strategic Action Plan for the CFE Directorate be noted;
- (d) agreement be given to the new strategic approach to Equality and Diversity within the Children Families and Education Directorate; and
- (e) the Committee received regular reports of activity against the Equality and Diversity Strategic Action Plan 2010 to 2013 be noted.

28. Informal Member Group on SEN Transport - Verbal Update
(Item B5)

(Verbal update by Mr G Ward, Director of Capital and Infrastructure Group)

(Mr G Horne, MBE, Chairman of Informal Member Group for Special Educational Needs Transport (IMG SEN) was also present for this item)

(1) The Chairman asked Mr Ward to begin with his presentation to the Committee. Mr Ward advised the Committee of the work that had been carried out by the IMG, which included interviewing Mr Harlock, Commercial Services Director on contract letting and Mr Myers, Parent Governor Representative on the Children, Families and Education Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the parent of a child attending Valence School, Westerham. The IMG had also been looking into a scheme run by Manchester City Council for independence training as an alternative to a child with Special Educational Needs being taxied to and from school and problems arising when the child left education and was not as independent as they could be. Three officers from KCC were presently visiting Manchester City Council to speak with parents and officers on how the scheme was working. The outcome of this visit would be reported at the next meeting.

(2) The IMG was also making enquires on schools that arranged their own school transport contract such as Goldwyn Special School, which seemed to produce a consistent service through having the same drivers and escorts, which from the evidence seemed to improve attendance and attainment, and whether this would be an option for other special schools. Mr Tolputt added that another advantage of the schools arranging their own transport was the pupils would not be restricted by time, under the constraints of taxis, allowing them in attending after school activities.

(3) Mr Horne added that the IMG had agreed to observe the transport arriving at a special school to see the transport requirements in practical terms. He felt that the review was not about saving money it was to ensure that the right support was in place by looking at all the options, giving young people with a disability their rightful share of educational opportunities.

(4) Mr Critchely requested that the time of transition of contracts be specifically looked at as there had been serious issues that had occurred during the times of transition which could have been thought about within the contract eg knowing the routes. Mr Ward said that this was noted and would form part of future contract renewals.

(5) In response to a question by Mr Whiting, Mr Cooke advised that there was an ongoing Special Schools Review, which looked to ensure that the appropriate provision was made for children with special needs. The IMG was set up to look at the budget for SEN Transport and whether there were ways of, whilst maintaining the service, making savings. There were issues that had been drawn out by the IMG including supporting independence, which could have implications for the whole Council.

(6) RESOLVED that:

- (a) the responses to comments and questions made by Members be noted;
- (b) the continuity of travel arrangements during the transition period of SEN transport contracts form part of the future contract renewals;
- (c) a progress report by the Informal Member Group for SEN Transport be submitted to the next meeting of this Committee; and
- (d) the verbal report be noted.

29. Future visits to Building Schools for the Future sites and Academies- Verbal report

(Item B6)

(Verbal update by Mr G Ward, Director, Capital and Infrastructure Group)

(1) Mr Ward remind Members that at the last meeting there was a discussion where Members had indicated that they wished to visits some of the new schools facilities. He urged the Committee when arranging a schedule of visits to have a cross section of schools not just those in the Building Schools for the Future Programme.

(2) The Chairman suggested, and the Committee agreed to, the Deputy Cabinet Member and the Chairman drawing up a list of schools for the Committee to visit.

(3) In response to comments by Mrs Rook and Mr Smith, Mr Ward felt that the visits were necessary as a lot of funding had been committed to schools and Members needed to be clear about what they wanted, had been delivered. The Chairman said that Mrs Rook and Mr Smith had made valued comments as resources needed to be considered and duplication of visits with other Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees avoided when arranging the visits. He envisaged that the list of schools would be short and varied to give Members comparisons throughout Kent.

(4) RESOLVED that:

- (a) the Chairman and the Deputy Cabinet Member draw up a list of schools for the Committee to visit be noted; and
- (b) the responses to comments and question by Members and the verbal report be noted.

30. Select Committee - Update

(Item C1)

(Report by Mr P Wickenden, Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager)

(1) The Committee considered a report that detailed the progress to establish the Select Committee on Extended Services and sought suggestions for future reviews to be included on the Select Committee Topic Review Programme during the period of November 2010 and January 2011.

(2) RESOLVED that:

- (a) suggestions for Select Committee Topic Reviews be forwarded to the Democratic Services Officer; and
- (b) the report be noted.