

**SCRUTINY BOARD**

**Thursday, 15th July, 2010**

**11.00 am**

Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone

**Please note the start time**







## AGENDA

### SCRUTINY BOARD

**Thursday, 15 July 2010 at 11.00 am**      Ask for:      **Paul Wickenden**  
**Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone**      Telephone      **(01622) 694486**

*Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the meeting*

#### **Membership (10)**

Conservative (9):      Mr E E C Hotson (Chairman), Mr P W A Lake (Vice-Chairman),  
Mrs A D Allen, Mr C J Capon, Mr M C Dance, Mr C Hibberd,  
Mr G A Horne MBE, Mrs E M Tweed and Mr K Smith

Liberal Democrat (1):      Mrs T Dean

#### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)*

#### **Item No**

- 1      Substitutes
- 2      Declaration of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting
- 3      Minutes - 21 May 2010 (Pages 1 - 6)
- 4      Dates of meetings - 2011

The Board is asked to note the following dates for its meetings for 2011.

Tue 1, February 2011  
Thurs, 10 March 2011  
Wed, 27 April 2011  
Thurs, 26 May 2011  
Thurs, 23 June 2011  
Wed, 13 July 2011  
Wed, 28 September 2011  
Wed, 2 November 2011  
Thursday, 1 December 2011

All meetings will start at 10.00 am at County Hall and may run into the afternoon if the weight of business dictates.

- 5      Kings Hill Schools expansion (Pages 7 - 8)

- 6 The Overview and Scrutiny Functions Relationship with the Press and Media (to follow)
- 7 Feedback from Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees (POSC's) on arrangements to contribute to the development of the budget. (Pages 9 - 10)
- 8 Member Information (Pages 11 - 12)
- 9 Feedback Mechanisms for the recommendations arising from the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Pages 13 - 18)
- 10 Sharing of good practise

### **EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)*

Peter Sass  
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership  
(01622) 694002

**Wednesday, 7 July 2010**

*Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers maybe inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.*

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### SCRUTINY BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Board held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Friday, 21 May 2010.

PRESENT: Mr E E C Hotson (Chairman), Mr P W A Lake (Vice-Chairman), Mr C J Capon, Mr M C Dance, Mrs T Dean, Mr C Hibberd, Mrs E M Tweed and Mr K Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Mr A H T Bowles, Mr A J King, MBE and Mr R J Lees

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P D Wickenden (Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager)

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

#### **17. Minutes - 22 April 2010**

*(Item 3)*

(1) During the receipt of these minutes there was a discussion on the importance of Cabinet Members and Managing Directors producing at least a list of the issues that they would be raising in their update to the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to the meeting. This was commended as good practise to enable Members to be prepared for the items that would be mentioned at the meeting. It was agreed that there was an expectation that there would be a written list of update items circulated prior to the meeting.

(2) The matter of ensuring that Cabinet Members did not sit next to the Chairman of the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to reinforce the Committees role to hold the Executive to account, was raised. It was acknowledged that for Committees that met in the Council Chamber it was not so easy to get this separation but every attempt should be made to achieve it where possible.

(3) RESOLVED that (a) the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2010 are correctly recorded and they be signed as a correct record, subject to the addition of the following sentence in Minute No 12 paragraph (5) "A Member suggested that steps should be taken to lobby for the abolition of the Strategic Health Authority.";

(b) the Cabinet Member(s) and the Managing Directors be asked to prepare for circulation in advance of the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee a list of specific points that they intend to raise during their update to the Committee.

#### **18. Overview and Scrutiny - The Constructive Critical Friend**

*(Item 4)*

(1) Mr King and Mr Bowles introduced the report and set out the context within which the Overview and Scrutiny function was developing. Mr King emphasised the importance of supporting all Members to ensure that they were well equipped to carry out their multi faceted role with particular emphasis on their role as "community leaders".

### *Context and changing the culture.*

(2) Mr Bowles referred to the Local Government Bill which was likely to be published in the summer and other amendments that may be made by the Government under secondary legislation. He agreed with a comment from the Chairman that there was need for a change in the officer culture and emphasised the important role of the new Group Managing Director who was joining the authority shortly.

(3) Comments were invited on the contextual part of the report. These included:-

- It was important to break down the silos which existed within and between Directorates.
- It was suggested that consideration should be given to ensuring that officers held relevant professional qualifications.
- In relation to the Joint Transportation Boards, Members shared mixed experiences of the effectiveness of these. One of the key issues was the lack of feedback on issues raised at the Boards. It was suggested that if there were unresolved issues from a Joint Transportation Board then these could be raised at the relevant Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- The importance of Members playing a part in changing the culture of the organisation and then leading officers to support the elected Members in the new direction of the authority was emphasised.
- As the Government had proposed a power of general competence which would give the public the power to take over public services it was essential that County Council ensured that the services it provided were what the public wanted.
- At “Local Boards” there was in some areas a tendency for responsibility for an issue to be passed between different tiers of local government which was not helpful for the public.
- It was suggested that funding from all tiers of local government should be put together and allocated by community forums so that there were larger sums available to distribute.
- Whilst it was acknowledged that officers should be encouraged to attend meetings of “Local Boards” the way that this was organised should be as efficient as possible to make best use of the finite resources.

### *Forward plan of key decisions*

(4) Mr King referred Members to the example of an enhanced Forward Plan of Key Decisions which was set out in appendix 1 to the report.

(5) The Chairman emphasised the importance of making effective use of the agenda setting meetings for the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The agenda setting meetings provided a real opportunity to ask both Cabinet Members and Senior Officers what the key challenges were for them and invited to indicate how the Committee could assist. The Forward Plan of Key Decisions was an important tool for setting the agendas for Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees. A Member stated that it was important that officers were given enough time to prepare effective reports and that once the agenda was set, additional items should be the exception to be added to the agenda.

(6) The importance of making sure that there was an opportunity at an appropriate stage for the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee to constructively comment on an issue that had been the subject of a consultation, prior to the decision being made was re-emphasised.

(7) In relation to the papers circulated for a Cabinet Member decision, the need for Members to have copies of the report that informed the Cabinet Members decision was emphasised.

(8) One Member raised the lack of items on the current Forward Plan of Key Decisions, i.e. six decisions in the next six months. The importance of ensuring that all Cabinet Member and Officer Key Decisions were placed on the plan as far in advance as possible was highlighted.

#### *Select Committee*

(9) Mr King referred to the limited resources available to support Select Committees and the need to build on the abilities of Members to act as rapporteurs and use their expertise for the benefit of Kent. Mr King also welcomed comments on the monitoring of Select Committee recommendations. It was noted that there would be an update report on progress with Select Committee recommendations to the County Council on 22 July 2010.

(10) Members were assured by the Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager that, as part of their assessment of any suggested topic review, information was supplied on which other local authorities had also carried out a similar review, to avoid duplication and to make effective use of resources.

(11) The Chairman acknowledged the importance of ensuring that there was a framework to control the number of rapporteurs operating at any one time which would be a dialogue between the suite of Overview and Scrutiny Committees and this Board. It was also possible that a "rapporteur" would not necessarily be an individual Member but could be a small number of Members. The importance of ensuring that there was a work programme agreed for all rapporteur work was emphasised, this would be formulated as part of the assessment process.

(12) Although Select Committees were resource intensive there was the potential for them to come up with recommendations which saved resources in the long term.

(13) The Sports Group, which was an informal meeting of Members organised by the Directorate, was mentioned as an example of Members making an informal contribution with minimal officer support. Concern was expressed that this meeting was informal and therefore not held in public. The need for this subject to be discussed in private was questioned.

#### *The Overview and Scrutiny Functions Relationship with the Press and Media.*

(14) Mr King stated that following consideration of the report that would be produced for the June or July 2010 meeting of the Board, arrangements would be made for the Scrutiny Board to meet with the County's leading press and media.

(15) The importance of finding out what the press wanted from us and what would make a good storey was mentioned. The use of methods other than the standard press release was suggested. The County Councils corporate communications unit should be included as they had a role in promoting overview and scrutiny.

#### *Database of Experts and Advisors*

(16) Mr King informed the Board that this Database was being established and invited any suggestions for inclusion to be submitted to the Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager within the next three weeks.

#### *Partnership working in Overview and Scrutiny Functions*

(17) Mr King referred to discussions that the Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager had had with colleagues across the County to share work programmes.

#### *Community Engagement – potential to ask “live questions”*

(18) Mr King stated that he had had to make choices in relation to limited resources. He informed the Board that he was not able to take this piece of work forward at the moment as he did not consider it to be a top priority.

(19) The Chairman of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee expressed disappointment that this was not being taken forward at this time.

(20) Regarding what other local authorities were doing in relation to this he Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager explained that although other authorities had appeared to be using this system on further investigation this use was limited and was not a “real time” question process.

#### *Member information*

(21) Mr King explained that he had tasked two officers with looking at the recommendations from the Informal Members Group on Member Information. Also a Member Information Member/Officer Group had been established under the Chairmanship of Mr Bowles. Work was being carried out with Chief Officers to establish what information they provide to Members what was specialist to their areas and what was general. The aim was to bring all general information together via the Information Point. He undertook to submit an update report to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Board.

(22) The importance of ensuring that the Information Point was supported at the highest level in order that effective use was made of this resource was emphasised.

(23) RESOLVED that :-

(a) the Scrutiny Board endorses the enhanced version of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions as set out in Appendix 1 to the reports and wishes to draw to the attention of Cabinet Members and officers the importance of ensuring that comprehensive information is included in the revised Forward Plan;

- (b) the framework of a Rapporteur Scheme and the draft assessment form be noted along with the comments made by Members;
- (c) a full report be submitted to the June or July 2010 meeting of this Board, which would include a draft protocol for overview and scrutiny engagement with the press and media and the running of a 100 day campaign in the autumn;
- (d) no further work be done to establish a facility for questions and texted from the public to be into Overview and Scrutiny meetings at this time;
- (e) a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Board on Member Information.

## **19. Sharing of good practise**

*(Item 5)*

- (1) Members were invited to share any example of good practise.
- (2) The Chairman of the Learning and Development Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee referred to the issues around the timescale and number of meetings of this Committee. Also the issue of how Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees could play a positive part in restructuring was raised. The Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager emphasised the importance of making effective use of the agenda setting meetings to assist in the effective management of Committees and to ensure that Committee agenda contained the items which Members wished to consider including restructuring.
- (3) In response to a question on whether there was support for scrutinising decisions before they were taken by Cabinet or the Cabinet Member, the Chairman stated that there was no prohibition on pre-scrutiny.

RESOLVED that the comments be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

**By: Peter Sass: Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership**

**To: Scrutiny Board – 15 July 2010**

**Subject: Kings Hill School Expansion**

---

## **Background**

The Cabinet Member was asked to clarify a number of issues relating to the decision to expand the Discovery School at Kings Hill. A Member raised concerns about the following:

- whether the decision to expand the Discovery School at Kings Hill by one class was a formal Cabinet Member decision
- whether the expansion of the Discovery School was subject to consultation with the relevant local schools
- what the formal process for authorising expansion of schools is.

The response from the Cabinet Member has been reproduced below, however this item has been called in to the Scrutiny Board as the Member who originally raised this issue remains unsatisfied with the response.

Mr Chris Jones, Area Children's Services Officer will be in attendance at the Scrutiny Board meeting to answer any questions Members might have on this issue.

## **Response from the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Education**

A decision was taken to expand the Discovery School at Kings Hill in consultation with KCC Officers in response to discontent from a considerable number of anxious parents who were resident on Kings Hill and unable to be placed in either on of their local schools.

All local schools had been subject to consultation with officers over a period of several months and were appraised of the potential need to expand school places locally if the suspected pressure on places materialised. The true extent of the problem was not known until offer day. The Local Authority had hoped to manage the pressure within surrounding school provision but received several complaints from parents based on Kings Hill concerned that their allocated school in Watringbury was a five mile journey away and equally complaints from Watringbury parents concerned that placing children form Kings Hill would potentially displace children from the village in later years as the sibling link would afford children from Kings Hill priority over local children to the school.

Having considered these factors the Local Authority took the decision to temporarily increase the numbers at the school to ease these pressures. The Local Authority has not formally increased the Published Admission Number this is a temporary measure taken to ease a problem specific to Kings Hill in 2010.

In regard to the formal process for the expansion of schools, there are several avenues and approaches that can be taken, but in this instance this was not a formal expansion of a school, the Published Admission Number (PAN) has not been increased. A decision was taken by the Local Authority to allow the school to admit above its admission number to ease the pressure on places locally.

The School Admissions Code clarifies in section 1.19 that in the case of maintained schools, the Local Authority, as the strategic commissioner of school places, has the final decision over whether a school can admit above its published admission number. The code goes on to say that....admitting above the admissions number does not amount to an increase in the school's admission number which can only be changed via the determination of admission arrangements or via an in year variation if already determined.

### **Options for the Scrutiny Board to consider**

Decisions by Officers and Council Committees:

The Scrutiny Board may:

- (1) comment to the Chief Executive and the relevant Senior Manager
- (2) report to the Council
- (3) refer any issues arising from its debate

---

**Contact:** Anna Taylor    Tel: 01622 694764

---

By: Paul Wickenden – Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager  
To: Scrutiny Board – 15 July 2010  
Subject: Feedback from Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees (POSC's) on arrangements to contribute to the development of the budget.

---

Summary: This report sets the outcomes to date of the consideration by the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees of the request to formulate their arrangements to contribute to the development of the Budget.

---

## **Introduction**

1 (1). At the meeting of the Scrutiny Board on 22 April 2010 Members discussed how the POSC's could build on the way that they had been involved in the budget process in previous years so that they could have a constructive input into the development of next years budget.

(2). The Scrutiny Board agreed that at the June/July meeting of the POSC's, as part of their financial outturn reports, all POSC's would be asked to formulate their arrangements for contributing to the development of the budget so that they were able to have an input at an earlier stage than previous years.

(3). To support Members in this work, Mr Wood (Head of Financial Management ) has arranged two training sessions for Member to focus on advising and supporting them in their role of considering the revenue budget options for the next Medium Term Plan. The first of these sessions was held on 21 May 2010 and attended by 10 Members. The second of these sessions is due to be held on the afternoon of the Scrutiny Board meeting (15 July 2010).

## **Establishment of POSC Informal Member Groups (IMG's) to consider the Budget and Medium Term Plan**

2 (1) Set out below are the outcomes to date from the consideration by each POSC of their arrangements for contributing to the budget process:-

### *Adult Social Services POSC – 25 June 2010*

(2) It was agreed that an IMG would be established which would meet on a regular basis in order to get a fuller understanding of the implications of potential budget reductions and to report back to the full POSC.

### *CFE Joint POSCs*

(3) Although the CFE POSC with responsibility for Budgetary issues is the Resources and Infrastructure POSC, it was recognised last year that all three POSC's have a contribution to make to the development of the Budget.

(4) The agreement of the three CFE POSC chairmen has been obtained to having an IMG consisting of 6 Members (2 from each of the POSC's including the Liberal Democrat Spokesman) to contribute to the development of the budget for CFE which will report back to the Resources and Infrastructure POSC.

*Corporate POSC – 1 July 2010*

(5) This POSC agreed to establish an IMG to contribute to the development of the budget which would have its first meeting in September (date to be agreed).

*Environment Highways and Waste POSC - 29 July 2010*

(6) As this POSC is not due to meet until 29 July 2010 at the agenda meeting it was agreed to establish an IMG for this POSC.

*Regeneration and Economic Development POSC - 8 July 2010*

*Communities POSC – 9 July 2010*

(7) These POSC's have been asked to formulate their arrangements for contributing to the development of the budget. As they will not meet until the papers for the Scrutiny Board have been despatched, the outcome of their consideration of this matter will be reported on 15 July 2010.

**Officers Attendance at IMG's**

3. The Board is requested to confirm that they would expect the relevant Heads of Finance to attend the IMG meetings along with any other Directorate Managers at the POSC's request.

**Recommendations**

4. The Scrutiny Board are asked to note the progress make any comments on the operation of these IMG's.

Paul Wickenden  
01622 694486  
paul.wickenden@kent.gov.uk

Background Information: *none*

By: Alex King – Deputy Leader  
Paul Wickenden – Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager

To: Scrutiny Board – 15 July 2010

Subject: Member Information

---

Summary: This report updates the Scrutiny Board on the work of the Member Information/Member Officer Group (MIMOG).

---

## **Introduction**

1. The Scrutiny Board are aware that the conclusion from the IMG on Member Information report, agreed by County Council on 11 December 2008, is that there is a desire from Members to have a better understanding of/and access to 'information'. This piece of work is a very important strand of pivotal activity in the transformational change of the County Council.
- 1.2 The IMG recommendations roughly split into five areas:
  - (a) An audit of those involved in Information Management & research functions;
  - (b) Structure of information and research services;
  - (c) Growing of the analysis and research function;
  - (d) Member training;
  - (e) Web based applications: a Members 'Portal'; a data 'observatory ('Kent View').

## **Member Information/Member Officer Group**

2. The Member Information/Member Officer Group (MIMOG) met on 15 June to review the recommendations of the IMG endorsed by the County Council. Set out below is a summary of the highlights

### *Progress on the recommendations:*

- Member training programmes are largely being carried out. Greater joining-up between the differing units servicing Members would be advantageous;
- There is a significant amount of research and analysis already being carried out - it is just that a greater awareness of what exists is required, and a co-ordination of this work across the authority to eliminate duplication

## *Work in Progress*

- An 'audit' of Information Management / research: A light-touch mapping exercise has taken place, high-lighting existing teams and individuals – however a more through exercise, ideally, needs to be carried out;
- A Members' 'Portal' was recommended as part of the IMG on Member Information in December 2008. Currently this is predicated on the refresh of K/net and further direction has been provided by the convening of further Members Focus Groups to ascertain commonalties of view.

An emerging theme from the Focus Groups is that a specific Member 'Portal' may not be the solution. Word of mouth and face-to-face discussion are still preferred ways of getting information. Information Point is critical.

Views expressed indicate that the KCC website might need to be re-engineered and that it is questioned whether the Intranet (K/Net) adds anything to our collective knowledge requirement.

- The data-centre (which is central to the IMG recommendations) is encompassed by the Kent Partnership led 'Kent View' - but is now reaching a point where a re-think is needed;
- The structure of information and research services is an Executive decision yet to be taken. This includes the appointment of a Head of Information and the placing of the Information Point.

### **Recommendations**

3. The Scrutiny Board are asked to note the progress in implementing the recommendations of the IMG: Member Information endorsed by the County Council in December 2008.

### Contact

Jude Sage, Staff Officer to the Lib Dem Leader  
01622 694428 (x4428)  
[jude.sage@kent.gov.uk](mailto:jude.sage@kent.gov.uk)

Edward Thomas, Policy Officer  
01622 694049 (x4049)  
[edward.thomas@kent.gov.uk](mailto:edward.thomas@kent.gov.uk)

By: Alex King – Deputy Leader  
To: Scrutiny Board – 15 July 2010  
Subject: Feedback Mechanism for recommendations arising from the Policy Overview Scrutiny Committees

---

Summary: This report sets out an option for a feedback mechanism from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

---

### **Introduction**

1. There is a well established mechanism for feeding back to Cabinet the outcomes of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee. There is not a similar mechanism for the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees (POSCs). That being said Action Sheets for all concerned are provided following each Policy Overview Scrutiny Committee which set out when an action is required by a Cabinet Member(s), Managing Director(s) or report author.

### **Feedback Mechanism**

2. (1) Attached as an Appendix is an example of the feedback of outcomes from the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee which could also include the outcomes from the POSCs.

(2) I believe that we should add the outcomes from the POSCs to the Cabinet Scrutiny outcomes feedback thereby creating formal feedback to the Cabinet from all Overview and Scrutiny suite Committees. This can also be used as a key document for each respective POSC to consider as part of its Committee business as well as at the agenda setting process when Committees focus on the business which add value and outcomes to Kent residents.

(3) This provides all Members with an assurance that their recommendations have been formally considered.

### **Recommendation**

4. The Scrutiny Board is requested to consider adopting this practise for all POSC's

Paul Wickenden – Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager  
01622 694486  
paul.wickenden@kent.gov.uk

Cabinet Scrutiny Committee – 9 April 2010

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions	Cabinet Member Response
<b>Weather Damaged Roads</b>	Members noted from the Cabinet report that it is hoped, as far as possible, that the tendering process for the road surface repair contracts would be won competitively by local small and medium-sized contractors. Members had queries about this process, how it will be administered, the cost of this administration and the inspection arrangements for work undertaken. Members also had concerns with regard to the standard of work to repair the roads prior to this winter.	Mr P Carter Mr M Austerberry Mr J Burr Mr K Hills	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thank Mr Carter, Mr Austerberry, Mr Burr and Mr Hills for attending the meeting and answering Members' questions;</li> <li>2. Support in principle the process of inviting local companies to submit tenders for the road surface repair contracts;</li> <li>3. Ask for confirmation of the level of backlog to road repairs, the level of government support, and the level of expenditure which would be required to clear the backlog;</li> <li>4. Ask for written confirmation that the total cost of administering the process and overheads is no more than 10% of the total cost of the contract;</li> <li>5. Ask that Members, Parish Councils and Town Councils be informed when teams will be working in their areas;</li> <li>6. Ask that the frequency of inspection of utilities work to road surfaces is increased to ensure benefits and high performance of utility companies;</li> </ol>	

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions	Cabinet Member Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Thank the witnesses for their assurance that there would be systematic monitoring of the work and ask the Scrutiny Board to review the Weather Damage Repairs to Roads in Kent contract and the work to date after £1million has been spent.</li> </ol>	
<b>Kent Digital Service</b>	<p>Members asked for clarification on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.the urgency of the decision</li> <li>2.cost</li> <li>3.governance</li> <li>4.advertising revenues</li> </ol>	Mr R Gough Mrs T Oliver	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thank Mr Gough and Mrs Oliver for attending the meeting and answering Members' questions;</li> <li>2. Ask that a note be provided once the staff consultation period has finished, explaining the process in terms of what was undertaken, why it was undertaken in that way and the cost of the process;</li> <li>3. Ask that a copy of the legal advice regarding the need to use TUPE be provided.</li> </ol>	The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support Services and Performance Management has agreed that this information will be supplied to all Members of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee
<b>Safeguarding Children</b>	Members had concerns about the information flow on Serious Case Reviews to Members of the County Council	Mrs S Hohler Mrs K Weiss	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thank Mrs Hohler, Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Education and Mrs K Weiss for their attendance at the meeting and for answering Members' questions;</li> <li>2. Thank the Cabinet Member Children Families and Education for her offer that when the summary of a serious case review</li> </ol>	

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions	Cabinet Member Response
			<p>is published and available to the public it is made available to all Group Leaders, Mr Lees and local member(s) and ask that this be extended to all Members;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Ask that the Cabinet Member Children, Families and Education in conjunction with the Deputy Leader (who has the portfolio for the Overview and Scrutiny Function) look again at the interrelationship with the Vulnerable Children's Policy Overview Scrutiny Committee, the Children's Champions Board, the Safeguarding Board and report the outcome to the Scrutiny Board;</li> <li>4. Ask that the Scrutiny Board receive a report addressing how and whom should have the responsibility for elected Members as "Corporate Parents" supporting the needs of Looked After Children;</li> <li>5. That the Cabinet Member for Children Families and Education in conjunction with the Managing Director be asked to prepare a briefing note setting out for Members the information and</li> </ol>	

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions	Cabinet Member Response
			<p>resources made available to schools and governors to ensure that the risks and vulnerability of children, as occurred in the recent case in Tunbridge Wells, is avoided.</p> <p>6. Ask the Cabinet Member for Children Families and Education to draw up a protocol for dealing with future Serious Case Reviews in as far as it affects Information to Members, Members' input into the recommendations flowing from the review and the monitoring of the recommendations. It was suggested that the Vulnerable Children's Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be the appropriate body to consider such a protocol in the first instance.</p>	
<b>Local Member Information</b>			<p>1. Throughout the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee's discussion on each of the items was a common theme about how local Members are kept informed of issues, initiatives and decisions affecting their electoral divisions;</p> <p>2. The Committee are aware of a range of important initiatives being undertaken which will improve the</p>	

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions	Cabinet Member Response
			<p>quality and flow of information to elected Members for example implementation of the Informal Member Group: Member Information (approved by the County Council – December 2008), the enhancement and refresh of the County Council website and the decision to develop Kent Digital Service. However there is a lack of cohesiveness in pulling all these factors together and a lack of clarity over who has the overall vision which the Committee recommends must be addressed. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Localism and Partnerships be asked to report to the Scrutiny Board on how and when he proposed this work to be taken forward, and this be reported to Members of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee through their follow up items report.</p>	