

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### **CHILDREN, FAMILIES & EDUCATION - LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Children, Families & Education - Learning and Development Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 20th May, 2010.

PRESENT: Mr K Smith (Chairman), Mr M J Vye (Vice-Chairman), Mr R B Burgess, Miss S J Carey (Substitute), Mr N J Collor, Mr M J Jarvis, Cllr S Manion and Mr A Wickham

CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES: The Reverend Canon J L Smith

PARENT GOVERNORS: Mr P Myers and Mr B Critchley

TEACHER ADVISERS: Mrs J Huckstep, Mr R Straker and Mr J Walder

PRESENT: Mrs J Whittle and Mrs A D Allen, Chairman, Vulnerable Children and Partnerships POSC

IN ATTENDANCE: Haeusler (Director For Learning), Mr M Baker (Strategic Director for Schools Settings & Colleges), Mr C Berry (Head of Attendance and Behaviour Service (Acting)), Ms S Dunn (Head of 14-24 Innovation Unit), Ms P Harris (Head of Service) and Mrs C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

#### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

##### **25. Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2010** *(Item A3)*

(1) RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2010 are correctly recorded subject to 'Deputy Lead Member' being altered to read 'Deputy Cabinet Member' and in the appendix 'Mr Cater' name being altered to 'Mr Carter'.

##### **26. Director of Learning and the Deputy Cabinet Member's update** *(Item B1)*

*(Verbal report by Mrs J Whittle, Deputy Cabinet Member (Learning) and Mrs M Haeusler, Director for Learning and Mr M Baker, Strategic Director for Schools, Settings And Colleges)*

(1) The Chairman asked Mrs Whittle to begin with her update. Mrs Whittle advised the Committee of the work she had been undertaking within her portfolio since the last meeting which included; the focus on Primary Attainment and progress on the National Challenge stating that she saw these areas interlinked and continued and strengthened collaboration between both Primary and Secondary schools was essential to tackle where there was low attainment in the schools. She spoke of the hard work being undertaken by staff, pupils and parents to develop a range of programmes and gave one example of a school offering support, The Hayesbrook School, Tonbridge, through a Family Learning

Programme for pupils and parents, to enable parents to understand how pupils learn at the school.

(2) Mrs Whittle referred back to Primary Attainment mentioning the County Council meeting held on 1 April 2010, where Members received a presentation from Clare Brice-Smith from the Audit Commission when she stated that there was a need for Kent to focus on raising Primary Attainment. Mrs Whittle said that she was pleased that there was to be a Select Committee looking at Primary Attainment. She advised that she had visited University of Kent and was to visit Canterbury Christchurch College that had carried out work in schools to engage children in the love of learning; she felt that it would be a good idea to engage them in the work of the Select Committee.

(3) Mrs Whittle mentioned the huge amount of work being carried out by the Schools Improvement Team to help schools that had not reached their floor target in their SATs and Key Stage 2 targets. The prediction was that the schools that had not reached their floor target would be halved next year. As part of the raising attainment in both primary and secondary schools would start as early as possible, most of the Children's Centres were up and running and integrating a range of services under one roof, including Early Years, engaging parents and children in their learning. Mrs Whittle paid tribute to the work undertaken by Jennie Landsberg, Principal Advisor on Early Years and her Team on the quality of early years settings which had improved substantially over the past 2-3 years, which Mrs Whittle felt would have a knock on effect of improving Key Stage 1 and then Key Stage 2 results.

(4) Mrs Whittle then gave further examples of collaborative work in Primary and Secondary schools where specialist teachers from secondary schools and 6<sup>th</sup> form students were teaching pupils in Primary schools. She gave one example of a gifted mathematic student in year 12 who was teaching gifted mathematic pupils in year 6 of the Primary school, which she said was wide spread across the county.

(5) Mrs Whittle then spoke on the 14-19 year olds agenda advising that she had been meeting with Further Education Principals to forge a closer working relationship with the colleges following the transfer of powers from the Learning Skills Council to KCC, which would be discussed in detail in a later agenda item. Mrs Whittle saw this as a holistic approach ensuring that 14-16 year olds received the right pre vocational curriculum and the 16-19 year olds curriculum at levels 1, 2 and 3 had a smooth transition between the levels by ensuring the governance arrangements reflect the new FE role KCC had taken on and with the help of the FE sector ensure that the quality assurance arrangements in the prevocational curriculum were in place.

(6) Members were advised on the number of Grammar schools that were rolling out the International Baccalaureate and A-Levels and a hybrid of the IBA levels known as Accrobac. Mrs Whittle suggested that the Committee may wish to speak with Headteachers on their examination choices, to ensure for the 16-19 year olds there was sufficient choice for all students.

(7) Mrs Whittle mentioned that she had visited the Blue Water Learning Shop and witnessed the work to help people through the apprenticeship drive and recruitment

of young people to do more apprenticeships and suggested that it would be beneficial to have a stronger focus on developing administration apprenticeships.

(8) Members were advised on the recruitment of teachers in particular secondary schools there had been problems in recruiting teachers in the specialist areas. There had been a focus in the graduate teaching programme nurturing their own talent and many schools were recruiting former gifted students to teach whilst taking their Masters and PhDs. Mrs Whittle advised that she was looking at the issue of how newly qualified teachers could be provided with accommodation.

(9) Mrs Whittle concluded by introducing the new Director for Learning, Mrs Merril Haeusler who had been in post for 4 months.

(10) Mrs Haeusler then spoke on the scope of responsibilities for the Learning Group referring to the chart that had been tabled appended to these Minutes, that pulled together the network and organisation of the Learning Group. Mrs Haeusler advised that the Learning Group accountabilities and agenda were early years foundation stage through to post 16 years. The Learning Group was responsible for; the quality provision in the early years settings, the standards and pupil attainment in primary schools through to secondary schools, post 16 and higher education. Wrapped around that was the professional development particularly in leadership, which she felt was important in times of change when it was difficult to attract quality teachers particularly to more challenging areas. Mrs Haeusler stated that there was a need for succession planning to Headteachers posts. The Learning Group was also responsible for Governance in schools. Governors had a strategic role in schools and needed to be supported on moving from an operational role to that strategic role looking at school improvement and looking at how they can contribute to taking a school forward. Mrs Haeusler stressed the need to work closely with a range of agencies

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

(12) In response to a question by Mr Jarvis, Mrs Haeusler advised that the Authorities responsibility for learners with additional needs continues until 24 years of age linked to the Specialist Children Services.

(13) In reply to a concern by Mr Burgess, Mrs Haeusler advised that there was no intension of decreasing the volume or quality training for Governors. She had met with school Governors to reassure them of the high quality training that they would continue to receive. The Governors at those meetings had requested more support to prepare for an OFSTED inspection and putting together their self evaluation that headteachers had to pull together and a better understanding of how they could lift themselves from being a Governing body that was operational to one that was strategic.

(14) In response to a comment by the Chairman, Mrs Haeusler referred to the tabled chart and said that it would be ideal to look at particular points of time in the year on areas under the Learning Group in terms of outcomes eg August/September - the SATs and GCSE results and progress on Early Years.

(15) Mr Vye commended the work being carried out visiting schools and colleges by the Deputy Cabinet Member and the Director. He then raised his concerns on the Advisors for Primary Attainment that would be lost with the Children, Families and Education Directorate restructure, Mrs Whittle assured Mr Vye that she felt it

was essential that support was retained for those schools that failed to reach their floor targets.

(16) RESOLVED that the responses to Members questions and comments and the verbal updates be noted.

## **27. Absence in Kent Schools**

*(Item B2)*

*(Report by – Mrs M Haeusler, Director of Learning Group, Mrs R Turner, Managing Director, Children, Families & Education Directorate and Mrs S Hohler, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Education Directorate)*

*(Mr C Berry, Head of Attendance and Behaviour Service (Acting was present for this item))*

(1) The Committee considered a report that outlined the priority in Kent for all schools, working with Local Authority (LA) support, to continue to address high overall absence, and within this, persistent absence (PA). This supported the delivery goal set by Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), that by 2010/11 no local authority would have more than 5% of its secondary school pupils identified as being persistently absent. This target was described as National Indicator 87 (NI87).

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

(3) In response to a question by Mr Vye, Mr Berry said that it needed to be clear that criteria for persistent absence of more than 20% could be for any reason including a broken leg. However if a child was absent for a day or a week the school should identify what was in place to improve their attendance. There was a link with attainment. He explained that in schools where there was very clear recording analysis, showing clear interventions being made, tended to be the schools that tackled poor attendance levels and also showed improving attainment levels. He felt that there was also a link with those schools that were being creative and flexible. The Schools Improvement Partners were able to offer support and the ability to challenge the school on provision it was making so that the school was a place where the children wanted to be. For the DCSF and OFSTED these were extremely high profile areas over the past two years.

(4) In response to questions by Mr Critchley, Mr Berry assured Members that regarding areas of deprivation Kent was not different to other parts of the country and that Kent was showing improvement in not just bringing down levels of persistent absence where there were social issues but the gap was also narrowing between attendance and absence records in the most deprived areas compared to the least deprived areas. Where school was not important and valued by parents that was where it was most difficult to change the entrenched apathy towards school and education. Links with the size of Kent meant that to reduce absence by 0.01% in Kent you would need to change the entrenched attitude of 78 pupils, the statistical analysis acted against Kent.

(5) In response to a question by Mr Walder, Mr Berry advised that the DCSF was being lobbied regarding the advice that it was giving on extreme weather conditions that it was better for schools attendance figures for them to close where the absence figures would not count against their overall figures. If the school remained open the school would have to make a judgement on whether a child could have made it into school and whether they were marked absent or not. This was felt unfair on the school and required greater clarity.

(6) RESOLVED that:

(a) the Scrutiny Board endorse the setting up of a Member Monitoring Group to look at Attainment, not overlapping the work of the Attainment Select Committee; and

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

## **28. Educational Reporting Cycles - Key Stage 2**

*(Item B3)*

*(Report by – Mrs M Haeusler, Director of Learning and Mrs P Harris Head of Service - Advisory Service Kent)*

(1) The Committee considered a report on the educational reporting cycle for Primary Key Stage 2, in particular the schools below the floor target.

(2) Mrs Harris had tabled colour versions of the reporting cycle within the papers. Referring to the reporting cycle, Mrs Harris said that it was the right time to report back on the actions in light of the results detailed within the report. She highlighted the effect of the recent national boycott by teachers on SATs tests in Kent, advising that out of the 440 Kent primary schools, 25 schools had boycotted the SATs tests, out of those 25 schools, 3 schools were in floor targets. Kent had 5% of its schools boycotted in comparison to West Sussex County Council, which had 45%. Mrs Harris said that she looked forward to seeing the results. Referring back to the chart she advised that the National Challenge had an early bank of results. She was able to divulge that out of 30 schools in the National Challenge the majority would be above the floor challenge, narrowing the gap between those children on free school meals and those non free school meals. Mrs Harris then went on to explained the school schemes for those children on free school meals applying for and receiving laptops.

(3) Mr Walder advised the Committee on the reasons why teachers belonging to the National Union for Teacher (NUT) boycotted the SATs tests.

(4) The Chairman felt that it was essential that it was clear when the Committee would be able to review and scrutinise during the cycle for Key Stage 2.

(5) In response to a question by Mr Critchely, Mrs Harris explained that a detailed report on the gifted and talented, in terms of the outcomes level 5 and 6 at Key Stage 2 and A\* in GCSE would be submitted to the Committee in the Autumn by Mr Silk, Gifted & Talented Adviser. The outcomes of those children gifted in sport,

Art and drama will also be looked at. In terms of scrutiny Mrs Harris suggested that the Committee could select a group of Gifted and Talented and an analysis of that group could be provided with the actions and questions outlined in the report. In terms of monitoring, Mrs Harris suggested that there was an opportunity to look in depth at free/non school meals gap.

(6) In response to a comment by Mr Jarvis, Mrs Harris explained that at 5A\* to C, Kent was ranked 1 out of 11 but not in the case of including English and mathematics. There was a need to work harder with the 74 schools that were below the floor target of 55% of children that achieved Level 4 in both English and mathematics with the right programme as it was different across the County. The East Coast, Dartford and Gravesham were linked with areas of deprivation. Mrs Harris felt that there was a real opportunity to analyse data to give patterns for urban and rural areas.

(7) Mrs Haeusler advised that it was her intention to revise the School Improvement Strategy looking in particular at how the resources were managed. She said that there was a need to be; proactive rather than reactive; let schools know about the concerns, monitor problems when they arise and move in when necessary well before OFSTED. The School Improvement Partners were in the schools daily and had a raft of data that could be drawn upon.

(8) The Chairman asked that information be circulated to the Committee on Primary Key Stage 2 between meetings.

(9) RESOLVED that the answers to Members comments and questions and requests be noted.

## **29. Presentation by Ms S Dunn, Head of 14-24 Innovation Unit** *(Item B4)*

*(Verbal Report by Ms S Dunn, Head of the 14-24 Innovations Unit)*

(1) The Chairman asked Ms Dunn to introduce herself to the Committee and give her presentation.

(2) Ms Dunn gave a presentation in three parts, which included; the formal transfer of the post 16 funding arrangements acquired from the Learning and Skills Council, the National Commissioning Framework (*tabled at the meeting*) and how Kent County Council (KCC) will move the agenda forward working with partners and providers supporting the young people of Kent.

*The formal transfer of the post 16 funding arrangements acquired from the Learning and Skills Council (LSC)*

(3) The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) ceased to function as from 31 March 2010. KCC had now taken over those functions which meant that 13 Members of the LSC staff had been transferred into KCC. Ms Dunn's Team had increased from 4 to 18 working on the 14 to 19 agenda. Two of those transferred staff were placed in Finance, which was a significant element of the former LSC activity and function. All the staff that had transferred from the LSC had undertaken a rigorous induction programme and all new providers, work place providers and colleges had been paid on time.

(4) Work was still being undertaken in the area of the Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LDD) especially with those placed outside Kent in Independent Specialist colleges. Those placements were costly up to £170k per year. Work was being carried out with the Young Peoples Learning Agency (YPLA) to solve a number of issues that had arisen.

#### *National Commissioning Framework*

(5) Ms Dunn referred to the tabled document highlighting the page headed 'Key Contributors to the Commissioning Process' advising that the Local Authority was duty bound to provide learning and training in Kent for 16 to 19 year old and LDD through working in a National planning and commissioning Framework. Ms Dunn stressed that this was not KCC's process and was a National Process that had to be followed prescribed by the Department of Education. The local authorities flexibility in using the Framework maybe to meet local priorities was very limited. The function was discharged through the Children's Trust arrangements and the sub group 14 to 19 Strategic Forum, which looked at how we plan 14 to 19 provision in localities. The partnerships included schools, colleges, work based providers, Connexions and in some cases employers. There were currently 9 Forums, however through the Children, Families and Education Directorate restructuring this would be arranged in 6 Planning Forum Areas. KCC had been asked to work with Medway to ensure a coherent pattern of learning across local authority boundaries as there were a number of young people who resided in Kent opted to look for provision in Medway and vice versa. There was also work to be undertaken to strengthen the cross boundary borders with Bexley and Dartford in particular.

(6) The agency that there would be most connectivity with was the YPLA, new relationships needed to be forged as this agency had the jurisdiction over funding and the overarching levels of funding to ensure that our colleges and providers had sufficient revenue to deliver the strategic priorities for Kent. The YPLA had no direct contact regarding planning which was entirely with KCC.

(7) Ms Dunn then spoke on the role of the Skills Funding Agency (SFA), office located a Kings Hill, West Malling, that oversees the National Apprenticeship Service. Kent's college Principals who interfaced with KCC on local planning and funding allocations would also have to work with the SFA on matters of quality assurance, performance management and capital. Ms Dunn felt that KCC needed to look at how it would work more effectively with the SFA as it was unclear how this would operate and was a priority for the 14 to 19 provision particularly in relation to, performance management, exchange of data, exchange of information to avoid an over bureaucratic process.

(8) Ms Dunn went on to explain the critical timeline for the process explaining that KCC was in data collection mode at present and had received, from the YPLA, its first bundle of data, which gave the first part of the strategic statistical analysis for post 16 provision to enable work to commence with colleges about what offer they should have in place for September 2011. Ms Dunn highlighted some of the challenges for KCC that included; narrowing the gap for post 16 at level 2 and 3, tackling the issue of 19 year olds not maintaining the same progress from Key Stage 4 to the end of Key Stage 5 and improving participation at 17. On a more positive note there was success in reducing the figures of those young people Not in Education Employment or Training (NEETs). This formed part of the information

that would be considered with the Strategic Forum and then aid discussions with the schools and colleges over the coming months.

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

(10) In response to a question by Mr Jarvis, Ms Dunn advised that although the local authority was given the power and duties to ensure that there was enough provision for learning and training there was a myriad of stakeholders before you get to front line delivery. Ms Dunn suggested that one function of the local authorities could be, through the Local Government Association and the FE Principals, to make constructive comments about how the system could be streamlined and focus more on the aspirations and opportunities of young people.

(11) In response to a question by Mr Myers, Ms Dunn reassured Mr Myers that discussions had been undertaken to ensure that the funding for special needs children was in place for the placements for 2010 with the LSC prior to its closure.

(12) RESOLVED that the answers to the questions by Members and the presentation be noted.

### **30. Interviews with Further Education Providers on 16-19 Years Old Strategy** *(Item B5)*

RESOLVED that the evidence received from three FE Providers; Alison Clarke, Principal, Canterbury College Bill Fearon, Principal, West Kent College Paul Hannon and Principal, Hadlow College (attached as appendix 1) be noted.

### **31. Recall Ms S Dunn on Evidence Heard** *(Item B6)*

(1) The Committee recalled Ms Dunn to discuss the evidence received from the FE Principals to answer questions and comments made by Members which included the following:

(2) In response to a question by Mr Wickham, Ms Dunn advised that pre 16 year olds KCC had jurisdiction through the Funding forum. Post 16 the funding was received through the Funding Formula which was a very complicated process that went down to the lowest decimal point for each qualification there was a different formula. Ms Dunn agreed to forward information on the funding.

(3) Mr Vye suggested that there was a job of work in the area of interplay between the schools and colleges to give young people optimum choice, well charted pathways, the flexibility of courses that take place in both schools colleges and pathways that took place in both schools and colleges with co planning for courses in the future. Ms Dunn explained that KCC did aspire to a parodizing shift of post 16 year old provision away from an institutional lead option in terms of choice and pathways more down to an individual lead pathway with a quality progression route. She indicated that that point had not been reached at this point in time and it was the role of the 6 planning areas to address. Ensuring there was a fuller choice as possible, that the pathways were correct and the need for flexibility, many young

people did not want to spend 2 years on one course, they may prefer a blended learning approach, more flexibility personal approach to a learning opportunity. In terms of co planning for schools and colleges, Ms Dunn advised that this was not easily to solve as the institutions were in competition, because the number of learners in an institution determined its overall budget, so there was a vested interest in a school or a college maintaining its current size of 6<sup>th</sup> Form or current size of engineering programme. This had formed detailed discussions and debate within the Learning Group on how to make 6 Planning Forums become effective. Mrs Dunn agreed to share the roles 6 Planning Forums with this POSC in the Autumn.

(4) In response to questions by Mr Burgess, Ms Dunn explained that the local authority had to be clear when college Principals were saying that there was not equity of funding, in relation to one particular aspect of the Funding Formula was hugely complex schools, in one strand of the funding it was correct to say that school 6<sup>th</sup> forms received slightly more money than college 6<sup>th</sup> forms based on a particular element of the funding stream. Because of the complexities of the funding stream it was the aggregated by other factors depending on what qualifications were, what the social indices of the locality were etc. Ms Dunn said that she was unable to fully answer the question at this present time but it would be necessary to speak with colleagues in Children, Finance and Education finance to consider the detailed data and produce a judgement.

(5) In response to Mr Burgess' second question, Ms Dunn advised that best value for money was not based on the allocation but was what was transferred into positive learner outcomes and positive journeys for young people. Ms Dunn advised that as far as she was aware the AS level qualification gained in a school was the same as the AS level gained at a college. A BTEC National qualification in Child Care and Development was exactly the same as the BTEC in Child Care and Development gained in a college. Ms Dunn said that she was interested to know why there needed to be such differences between a colleges funding and a schools funding if the qualification and the programme were exactly the same. Ms Dunn felt that questions could be asked at a nation level at the National Star Chamber that looked at the overarching formula that KCC may wish to interrogate, although it was early days and within KCC there needed to be a better understanding of the formula.

(6) In response to the question on learners support, Ms Dunn said that this was an important issue in particular for vulnerable learners at level 2, who may have the equivalent of 5 A\*to C grades with a vocational qualification but in terms of their learning were very vulnerable and KCC needed to work on a transitional programme between school and college and college and university and how that arms length support works at college.

(7) In reply to the further question, Ms Dunn advised that employers were being monitored through the Apprenticeship Service and the data would be available.

(8) Mrs Dunn advised the Committee on a strategy that she had been working on with employers and the skills sector, in line with Kent's Regeneration Strategy, with the aim of unlocking Kent's potential within five key sector areas. The first key area that she was currently looking at was low carbon, developed a Skills Plan that linked to wind farms and biomass technologies. Within that skills sector plan it highlights the skills and qualifications and what skills were needed, what were the

best qualifications and whether any of those qualifications were currently available in Kent. The work had highlighted that with the post 16 in particular a significant deficit in certain curriculum areas and qualifications to support the development of the wind farms and associated technologies in Kent. A report on the Strategy would be considered by the Learning and Skills Board on 26 May before it was developed further. Ms Dunn agreed to monitor the progress and report back to the Committee. The Chairman requested that Ms Dunn forward this information to the Select Committee that was reviewing Renewable Energy.

(9) Mr Manion suggested that all the evidence from the meetings with young people, employers, FE providers and officers be used to produce recommendations to inform policy so that they can be reviewed at a later date.

(10) Ms Dunn agreed to advise the Chairman of any changes made by the Department of Education relating to this POSC between meetings.

(11) RESOLVED that the responses to questions and comments made by Members be noted.

### **32. Members Conclusions and Chairman's Summary**

*(Item B7)*

(1) The Committee considered all the evidence and information that they had received from the interviews with the Students, Employees, FE College Principals and Officers and the evolving role of this Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee (POSC) and the wider role of the County Council.

(2) The Committee made suggestions and comments and agreed that the Chairman formalise the recommendations to progress KCC's role in the planning and commissioning of provision of learning and development for 16-19 year olds. The chairman agreed to circulate the recommendations to the Committee outside the meeting.

*(Following the meeting the Chairman produced the following recommendations using the Members conclusions from the evidence gained at the interviews with students, employers, FE College Principals and Officers)*

(3) RESOLVED that:

*Recommendations generated from student and employers interviews*

- (a) agreement be given that each year there be at least three, one to one relevant consultations on Information, Advice and Guidance for all 14 -19 students, and that activity is monitored and reported once a year to this POSC;
- (b) agreement be given to formalising the tracking of individual 14 -19 yr old students progression, by following yearly cohorts of 15 students drawn from and managed by providers and an annual report to be presented to this POSC;

- (c) following research of previous projects agreement be given to a new “certificate of employability” be developed to prepare students for the world of work;
- (d) across directorates agreement be given to, the present programs for apprenticeships and targets and their achievement be reviewed and reworked in the light of the current economic climate;
- (e) agreement be given to examine how talented people can be retained in Kent and a report be submitted to this POSC on the progress of the Graduate Gateway;
- (f) Dr Holt’s warnings of rigid division of academic and vocational qualifications be noted;

*Recommendations generated from the FE sector interviews*

- (g) agreement be given to the Canterbury College model of shared timetabling and premises be extended out to other towns and colleges;
- (h) agreement be given to KCC examining any comparable inequality of funding across providers in order to provide best value for learners;
- (i) agreement be given to examine and prevent re take of qualifications or learning at students’ transfer from school to post 16 education;
- (j) agreement be given to better partnership working, for student choice and Information Advice and Guidance (IAG) at the interface of school and college and college and university;
- (k) agreement be given to the Learning and Development POSC and other POSCs to visit the Canterbury, West Kent and Hadlow Colleges that presenting on 20 May 2010, to capture “ how it is on the ground”;

*The Learning and Development POSC’s evolving role.*

- (l) the Learning and Development POSC continue to use the distinctive and unique talents and experience of its membership for the benefit of learners and to be able to think and act “out of the box” be noted;
- (m) the Learning and Development POSC be able to use all the avenues of research, reporting and scrutiny, select committee techniques, rapporteurage, Informal Members Groups and Members Monitoring Groups be noted;
- (n) the Learning and Development POSC continue to “drill down” to children, learners and students and continue to develop its communication directly with young people, employers, providers and stakeholders be noted;
- (o) agreement be given to the scrutiny role for Learning and Development POSC being more fully developed;

- (p) agreement be given to the Learning and Development POSC strap line being established as “POSC that is different and a POSC that makes a positive difference for young people in Kent.”
- (q) the recommendations be endorsed by the Scrutiny Board;

#### *Strategic recommendations*

- (r) across directorates agreement be given to the student journey through learning, skills, education and experience becomes a priority in order to fulfil Kent’s economic, social and environmental regeneration aspirations;
- (s) agreement be given to KCC planning and commissioning for a vibrant and sustainable business network for at least six specialist sectors of the Kent economy; that network to feed back to the learning providers for 14-19 year olds in order to achieve a smooth progression through learning to better jobs;
- (t) agreement be given to KCC continuing to explore and develop new opportunities of planning and commissioning for 16-19 yr olds and a report submitted to Learning and Development POSC at least once a year; and
- (u) the Scrutiny Board endorse a Select Committee being set up after the reporting of the Regeneration and Economic Development POSC and Children, Families and Education POSC visits to districts “To examine and report on the integration of the learning skills and education with jobs and regeneration in Kent”.
- (v) the Deputy Cabinet Member be requested by the Chairman of the Learning and Development POSC to champion the recommendations.

### **33. Select Committee - Update**

*(Item C1)*

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

- (1) Members considered a report on the progress to establish the Select Committee on Extended Services and a request for suggestions for Select Committee topics.
- (2) The Chairman suggested a Select Committee being set up after the reporting of the Regeneration and Economic Development POSC and Children, Families and Education POSC visits to districts “To examine and report on the integration of the learning skills and education with jobs and regeneration in Kent”.
- (3) RESOLVED that:
  - (a) the Scrutiny Board be requested to endorse a Select Committee being set up after the reporting of the Regeneration and Economic Development POSC and Children, Families and Education POSC visits to districts “To examine

and report on the integration of the learning skills and education with jobs and regeneration in Kent"; and

(b) the report be noted.