

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE
 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
 15 JULY 2016**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR J D HOUGH (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors R Wootten (Vice-Chairman), W J Aron, S R Dodds, A G Hagues, B W Keimach, Ms T Keywood-Wainwright, C R Oxby, Mrs H N J Powell, Mrs S Ransome, Mrs N J Smith, S M Tweedale, L Wootten, Mrs S M Wray and P J O'Connor

Added Members

Church Representatives: Mr S C Rudman and Mr P Thompson

Parent Governor Representatives:

Councillors: Mrs P A Bradwell and D Brailsford were also in attendance.

attended the meeting as invited guests.

Officers in attendance:-

Stuart Carlton (Assistant Director Children's Lead Early Help), Charlotte Gray, Tracy Johnson (Senior Scrutiny Officer), Andrew McLean (Service Manager Commissioning), Heather Sandy (Chief Commissioning Officer for Learning), Sally Savage (Chief Commissioning Officer), James Sharples (Senior Project Manager), Yvonne Shearwood (Quality and Standards Manager), Janice Spencer (Assistant Director Safeguarding) and Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer)

11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs J Brockway and Mrs L Rollings.

Apologies for absence were also received from added members Mrs P J Barnett and Dr E van der Zee, Parent Governor Representatives.

The Chief Executive reported that, under Local Government (Committee and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, Councillor P J O'Connor had been appointed to the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee to replace Councillor Mrs J Brockway for this meeting only.

12 DECLARATION OF MEMBERS INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

13 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 MAY 2016

It was reported that both Mr S Rudman and Mrs P J Barnett were in attendance at the meeting but had not been shown on the minutes.

Apologies from Councillor Mrs H N J Powell for this meeting were also noted.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2016 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the above being noted.

14 NATIONAL DISPERSAL OF UNACCOMPANIED ASYLUM SEEKING CHILDREN

Consideration was given to a report which invited the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee to consider the Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children – National UASC Transfer Protocol 2016/17 which was due to be considered by the Executive on 6 September 2016.

It was reported that there had been a significant increase in the number of people seeking asylum within the United Kingdom, and within this cohort there had been increases in the number of children who were unaccompanied and seeking safety.

Members were advised that the large number of unaccompanied asylum seeking children had resulted in the government requesting all local authorities to sign up for a voluntary agreement whereby unaccompanied asylum seeking children were dispersed around the country with all local authorities contributing to the welfare and maintenance of the children. This had been particularly important given the high numbers of children who had presented as unaccompanied asylum seeking children in Kent.

The Committee was provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- Lincolnshire had always taken its responsibilities towards unaccompanied asylum seeking children seriously.
- It was queried how the extra money would be allocated, and if foster carers and schools would receive some of this extra money. In terms of the UASC already in the care of the authority, this would continue to be funded by grants from government which paid the foster carers. The local authority must submit accounts to government to receive this funding. It was reported that there were also grants available if the children required additional resources, such as CAMHS.
- In Lincolnshire, the approach was taken that a child which had gone through trauma to get here, and who required additional resources, it was the authority's legal and moral responsibility to provide that service to the child.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JULY 2016

- It was queried whether the people allocating the young people take into account the fact that Lincolnshire already had 65 unaccompanied asylum seeking children and ensure that there was an even distribution of children between authorities. Members were advised that the government was aware of how many children each local authority had in its care, and a list containing these numbers was produced, and authorities were requested to notify government if the figure was wrong. On a regional level, there was a Strategic Migration Board which also kept a record of how many children were in the region.
- It was commented that very careful supervision would be needed for those young people where it was difficult to prove their age.
- Members were advised that as soon as a young person presented as an unaccompanied asylum seeking child (UASC) the police would be notified, who would then notify Children's Services. The appointed social worker must be trained to age assess. In cases where there were disparities between the age the child claimed to be and the age that authorities believed the child to be, there would be tribunals, and recent case law now compelled young people to take part in any other assessments which were required to determine their age. Members were advised that within Lincolnshire, there was a very good record of appropriately age assessing UASC.
- Concerns were raised regarding adult family members who may accompany children (as referred to on page 7 of the report), and whether sufficient checks would take place. Members were advised that local authorities had not had an opportunity to carry out any inspections of family members, and would not have the opportunity to do so. It would be government who would make the assessment of who would be the most appropriate people to offer these resources to. The government had indicated a commitment to take the most vulnerable people from the refugee camps.
- Members were informed that the proposal in this report was not about the resettlement of families at this point. Resettling families was a very different situation to that of UASC.
- Members were advised that there was not yet a protocol to work to, and councils would not be forced to accept UASC. However, when young people or families came into the East Midlands they would be assessed at this point.
- It was noted that this was a very complex situation, and the East Midlands had made it very clear that there were some areas of the country which had no asylum seekers or UASC.
- Kent County Council had over 900 unaccompanied asylum seeking children, of which 300 have been placed in other authorities.
- Lincolnshire had just received its first request to accept two young people who had recently arrived in Kent. It was noted that Lincolnshire had the second highest number of UASC in the region, however, the county did remain as an entry point for young people coming into this country.
- Lincolnshire had had a statutory duty and responsibility for UASC for a long time.
- One member suggested that all councillors should attend training on all the different programmes which were in existence which could assist asylum seeking children and adults, so that members had all the facts.

- Security vetting was being carried out by the UN in the camps, including biometric testing. It was noted that those young people and adults that were selected to enter the UK would arrive with a national insurance number.
- It was commented that there was a huge commitment to these young people in local communities, but it was acknowledged that there was more that could be done to engage with local communities.
- The vast majority of young people coming in were around 16/17 years old, and the authority had a responsibility to place them in accommodation which suited their cultural and educational needs. Most of these young people ended up around the borders of the county as they wanted to be able to access more culturally diverse areas.
- Concerns were raised regarding the foster carers, as the authority was currently trying to recruit foster carers for its own needs, so how would it manage to recruit the extra carers. It was also queried whether there would be additional training put in place for foster carers who took in UASC as they were likely to have additional needs.
- Members were assured that Lincolnshire had been taking in UASC for years, and they were encouraged to reach their full potential. Children younger than 16 would be placed with foster families, and from 16 onwards would be placed in semi-independent accommodation. It did not feel like there would be a need for additional resources, as the authority had always ensured that a child's needs were met and would continue to do so. It was also noted that the county would not be receiving a large number of children at one time, it would be a 'trickle' of children over a longer time period.
- In relation to foster carers, it was noted that they were all trained to be able to provide care to children who were traumatised, as all children that entered care would have experienced some level of trauma. Additional support would continue to be provided to foster carers as and when it was required.
- Concerns were raised regarding accepting more children into the county when the authority was placing children out of the county. However, members were advised that it did not cost particularly more to place a child out of county, but was mainly about how far staff had to travel to make their visits. It was reported that there were currently only 23 children placed out of county and of those 8 were UASC (funds for care were fully recovered), of the remaining number, those children were placed out of county as they were living with family members.
- Lincolnshire was very good at recovering funds where it could.
- One member commented that they believed the authority had a national duty to play its part, and had a lot of respect for Children's Services teams nationally and believed that they were fully equipped to deal with this.
- It was queried what would happen if a young person was age assessed as being over 18, and members were advised that if a child was age assessed as being under 18, every authority had a responsibility to provide care. If they were age assessed as over 18 then the authority would work with the Border Agency, but in the most sensitive way possible.
- Members were advised that if a parent of an UASC identified themselves, then the authority would be obligated to return the child back to the parent.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JULY 2016

However, there was no transfer of any rights for the parent to be able to come here to join the child.

- It was noted that some children who arrived had relatives in other parts of the country, and in those situations the authority would contact the relative. The relative would then be assessed, in the same way as any other potential foster carer, and if it was appropriate the child would always be placed with the relative.
- Members were advised that local authorities had a statutory duty around the Prevent agenda to recognise the radicalisation of any child of any race and to work closely with the Police to put appropriate measures in place.
- It was reported that the majority of young people coming in were 16/17 years old and were predominantly male. It was commented that there should be just as many females who wanted to come here.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee supported the recommendations to the Executive as set out in the report.
2. That the last paragraph on page 7 of the report be rewritten to clarify that the decision to be taken only refers to unaccompanied asylum seeking children, and not the resettlement of family groups.

15 DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR THE CHARGING OF LCC SERVICES TO SCHOOLS

Consideration was given to a report which informed the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee of the development of a common approach to the recovery of costs, academies and other education organisations in Lincolnshire access services delivered by Lincolnshire County Council (LCC).

It was reported that this approach would also involve exploring opportunities to provide a single comprehensive source of information and access for schools, academies and other organisations to receive all of the services they need. The LCC services in scope of cost recovery would be reviewed periodically to ensure each offer was comprehensive, with clear benefits and an agreed cost structure for each support package. To support the process by which schools, academies and other education organisations were able to learn about and access the support available it was aimed to translate the services offered into a digital form similar to an 'e-commerce' environment.

The Committee was advised that at its meeting on 5 July 2016, the Executive approved the recommendations as detailed in the report. As the proposals related to a range of council services, the Executive report was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee at its meeting on 30 June 2016, where it supported the recommendations in principle but requested a further report on the charges for individual services.

Members were provided with an opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report and some of the points raised during the discussion included the following:

- This proposal was an opportunity to review the terms and conditions and the way in which departments costed their services. It was reported that some departments charged a fixed amount as that was what they had always charged; some recovered the costs of the officer dealing with the request, and some included back office costs. The proposal was for a cost recovery model, which would look at the full costs to the authority, and the true cost of what it took to deliver that service. A lot of the services provided were classed as discretionary.
- Comments submitted by Mr Anthony Partington, Head Teacher of Stamford Welland Academy were circulated to the Committee as he had been unable to attend as scheduled.
- The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee was in attendance at this meeting as a replacement member, and advised the Committee that he had attended the meeting of the Executive where this had been approved. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee came to the view that it was difficult to fully support this when the exact costs were not known. It was felt that a business plan was needed and the Committee wanted more detailed information in relation to the charges, and requested detailed figures at a later date.
- One of the concerns was that most schools had very tight budgets and some of the services which were currently provided for free were going to be charged for, but it was felt that some of these were very important e.g. the anti-bullying training for staff and anti-bullying workshops for pupils.
- The Committee received clarification in relation to the charges to schools for free school meals. It was reported that the 50p charge previously reported was a historic cost, and this was charged per pupil on roll at the school to determine which children were eligible for free school meals. The school would then receive £900 back for every eligible child via the pupil premium.
- The proposal was that the increased charge would only be charged per eligible child, and the school would still receive the £900. It was believed that this could result in a net saving for some schools.
- Concerns were raised regarding the proposal to charge for road safety awareness lessons to secondary schools, as it was believed that as children got older, this would become more important.
- It was reported that a lot of consultation had been carried out, and it was believed that the only way to protect certain services was to issue a small charge. The offer to schools would be looked at as a whole, and it was hoped that this would provide options for schools.
- Members were advised that it was difficult to provide costs for these services as it would be a cost recovery rather than a flat rate charge, and would depend on the level of delivery.
- Lincolnshire was a high delegator of funds out to schools, and £497m was given to schools to allow them to buy in the services that they needed. With the new model there would be no element of surplus, the authority would just

recover the cost of delivering that service. The volume of services being taken up and their costs would be reviewed.

- A tool kit had been designed through corporate finance.
- Officers would gain a better understanding of the types of need of schools as the years progressed, and packages of services could also be put together.
- In terms of schools' affordability of services, schools were being encouraged to work more collaboratively and to purchase joint services. The charging model would allow the authority to continue to offer this service.
- There were concerns that schools would not access these services unless they knew how much they would cost. It was commented that it was difficult to scrutinise without the business model. Members were advised that when the brochure went out to schools detailing the services available, it would include costs.
- It was queried whether officers had been in contact with schools and academies to find out what they wanted the authority to provide. It was reported that this model had been discussed at head teacher briefings. It was confirmed that there were schools who were asking for particular services, and it was thought it would be helpful to have a website available which listed all the available services. The diocese would support the new model and would sign post schools to the website.
- There were concerns that if the authority started to charge for some services that the schools would decide not to buy them from the county council but from other accredited training providers. It was noted that these were discretionary services and the take up of them would be assessed throughout the coming year for viability. If schools were going to buy services elsewhere, the authority may need to consider whether it would continue to provide that service. There would be monitoring and reports provided on the demand and take up of these services.
- There would be a need to run the services through the cost recovery model before the costs could be determined. Service area leads were already using the toolkit to start to identify costs.
- Concerns were raised regarding how the small rural schools would cope with buying in the additional services, as larger schools would be able to offer more services. Members were advised that smaller schools would be encouraged to come together and share the costs, in order to make the services affordable. It was also possible that some charges could be waived in rural areas depending on the situation.
- It was considered important that there was investment in the education system, as Lincolnshire did not get the benefit of the scarcity funding for rural schools. It was important that the costs were sustainable.
- This model was a way of moving to a better way of interacting with schools, so they could have the services which were relevant to them. It was also about protecting some of the services.
- It was queried whether counselling services for staff would still be on offer as this was considered to be a valuable service. It was clarified that this was not classed as a service to schools, but a service for employees and should be detailed in the schools policies and procedures. It was noted that this was a

service which would be commissioned by the authority, and so would only be available in local authority schools, but academies could be signposted to it.

- It was commented that the report did not give a view on what the authority, as an education authority, wanted to provide to support schools. It was noted that this model was regarding the discretionary services which were provided and it would give the head teachers the opportunity to choose the most relevant services for their schools and their communities.
- In relation to the domestic abuse and anti-bullying workshops, it was noted that free online training and support was provided as part of safeguarding practices. It would be up to schools to determine how they delivered these services.
- It was suggested that PE and life skills lessons needed to be mandatory.
- It was queried how this would affect home schooled children, and it was noted that there were policies and procedures in place regarding what to expect from this provision.
- It was hoped that expertise would be retained to enable the authority to be responsive in the future.
- It was commented that this model was the pragmatic compromise to keep expertise within the authority.
- There were a lot of unanswered questions with this model, such as what the take up would be, what the costs would be etc. It was requested whether some additional information on these areas could be reported back to the Committee when appropriate.
- The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee thanked the Committee for some interesting and quality scrutiny of this item.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee note the support services currently provided by LCC to maintained schools and academies as set out in Part 4 of Appendix A of the report for which LCC charges and would continue to charge.
2. That the Committee note the support services currently provided by LCC to maintained schools and academies set out in Part 3 of Appendix A to the report for which LCC does not charge and does not propose to charge.
3. That the Committee note the principle of charging schools, academies and other education organisations for discretionary services provided by LCC on a cost recovery basis.
4. That the Committee note the new and existing support services set out in part 1 and 2 of Appendix A of the report, that from September 2016, LCC recover the cost of the provision of such services from schools, academies and other education organisations through appropriate charging mechanisms to be developed for each such service.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JULY 2016

5. That the Committee note that in relation to all support services to schools the development of a single source of information and access to services including by way of digital access similar to an e-commerce environment.
6. That the Committee note that authority be delegated to the relevant Chief officer, in consultation with the relevant Executive Councillor, for each service area to the amount and recovery mechanism appropriate to each service set out in Parts 1 and 2 of Appendix A of the report and the offering of further discretionary services to schools, academies and other education organisations and the amount and cost recovery mechanism appropriate to each such service.
7. That the Committee note that authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Children's Services in consultation with the executive Councillor responsible for Children's Services to approve the final form of the proposed single source of information and access to LCC support services.
8. That the Committee note the making of a flat rate charge of £6500 for standard conversions to schools that chose to convert to academy status to cover officer time and legal charges incurred by LCC.
9. That the comments made by the Committee be noted.

(NOTE: Mr P Thompson left the meeting at 11.50am)

16 CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL UPDATE

Members were advised that the Corporate Parenting Panel had last met on the 9 June 2016 and received a report from Legal Services which provided an update on care proceedings issued in 2014/15. It was highlighted that cases were now taking longer to process due to changes to the judges and also due to a large number of cases, about 40%, having an international element. The Panel had requested training on the legal processes for care proceedings to help them understand the procedure better.

The Panel had also received a report on the performance indicators relating to looked after children. The Panel had specific concerns in relation to key stage 4 attainment of looked after children (LAC) and the stability of placements for looked after children and suggested that this Committee should consider establishing two working groups to look into this issue.

However, following, discussions with officers after the meeting, it was now planned to incorporate the key stage 4 attainment of LAC into the ongoing School Performance Working Group. In relation to the Stability of Placements, a meeting had been arranged with relevant officers and Councillors D Brailsford, J D Hough and Mrs P A Bradwell on 5 October 2016 to discuss what could be done to improve placement stability and a report on this would be brought back to the December meeting of the Panel.

It was reported that the next meeting was scheduled for 8 September 2016 where the Panel would receive the annual leaving care report from Barnardo's, and the annual reports on fostering, adoption and private fostering.

RESOLVED

That the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee note the work of the Corporate Parenting Panel.

17 EARLY YEARS SERVICES MODEL AND COMMISSIONING PLAN AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN'S HEALTH SERVICES

Consideration was given to a report which outlined the early years' service model and commissioning plan and contractual arrangements for Children's Health Services. It was reported that the Children's Strategic Commissioning Service was reviewing early years and children's health services which were currently outsourced. The findings of the report to date, and options for future service models had been presented to a variety of Boards and Groups, and a preferred model for new services was provisionally agreed.

Members were advised that further public engagement, via an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) questionnaire was taking place to understand any positive or negative impacts the preferred model may have and following this, due consideration would be given to any further changes that may be needed. As well as the final service model, the commissioning route for new services would also need to be agreed.

It was reported that early years and children's health services were currently commissioned separately and the preferred model would continue to uphold this. Changes to the preferred early years' service model were not significant but the existing contractual arrangements were due to cease on 31 March 2017, with few options to extend. In order to establish the new early years' service by 1 April 2017 and consequently meet the savings target in 2017/18, a decision was sought from the Executive Councillor responsible for Children's Services to agree the final service model and preferred commissioning route.

Members were advised that four Early Years Locality Leads were in attendance at the meeting, in order to represent parents. It was noted that they had recently completed peer reviews across the county and worked with parents in their locality so they would be able to give some up to date parent feedback on early years services. Some of the comments made to the Committee included the following:

- The paper had been shared with the locality leads fairly recently, and the model fitted with what parents were saying.
- There was a need for a very strong team ethos, and this model would help to bring this back.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JULY 2016

- There were 28 different contracts for children's centres, and it was suspected that services users would not notice any change.
- A peer review was recently carried out at the Grantham centre, and some of the comments from parents included – staff were very supportive; there was an opportunity to talk to other parents; children were growing in confidence.
- It was commented that parents seemed to be very happy with the services being provided, but they valued consistency in terms of members of staff. This was particularly important with the most vulnerable families.

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- Clarification was sought regarding the relationship with the health side of these arrangements, and members were advised that the health aspects of these arrangements would be due for decision in November 2016. The report presented at this meeting was just looking at the early years services.
- It was queried whether the breastfeeding service, which had been cut in children's centre the previous year would be reinstated. Members were advised that this fell under Children's Health and was separate to early years. Members were assured that there would be a robust pathway around supporting infant feeding and breastfeeding. It was reported that there would be an enhanced offer, alongside midwifery and health visiting, where there would be more focus on breastfeeding initiation and support, particularly in the early weeks. The introduction of an ante-natal offer would also be of benefit, to help develop peer networks and relationships before the baby was born.
- It was queried whether there were alternative models and how the external provider market had been tested. It was highlighted that an open questionnaire had been carried out along with an event held for existing and new providers. A working group was also held with a range of representatives from the county council, public health and commissioning, to devise a number of options for the new model. The model options were then taken through Departmental Management Team (DMT), Corporate Management Board, the Women and Children's Board (commissioner group) and Executive DMT who came up with the preferred model. This preferred model then went out to further public engagement. Members were advised that all teams had been engaged in shaping the model, which was within the funding available, as was the best attempt at what the staff and public thought the model should include.
- It was queried whether there would be any flexibility in the commissioning of PEEP sessions as some vulnerable families may not initially see the benefit of engaging in these sessions but would be in need of that service. It was reported that if a children's centre was serving a high number of deprived wards, there would be a need for more sessions. Informal taster sessions would be offered to families to start them on the journey. It was noted that there was good engagement at children's centres with vulnerable families with clear targets set.
- It was queried whether there would be sufficient capacity in the health visiting system to cope with any increases in demand. It was highlighted that the model had been reviewed across early years and health and there was a

strong service in place. It was noted that the health visiting role had good access to families in their homes, but it was felt that there was capacity to deliver more work in children's centres as well.

- Members were encouraged to visit their local children's centre.
- One member commented that in their work with the Adoption Panel, in the past, where there was a match, potential adopters were encouraged to engage with their local children's centre, and it was queried whether this practice could be reinstated. Members were advised that this still took place, and it was suggested that social workers should reflect this in their reports as well.
- Concerns were raised regarding the low registration of children with disabled parents, pregnant teenagers and teenage parents at children's centres and if the accuracy of these figures was correct. Members were advised that the figures were a snapshot from June 2015 and would have been correct at that time. However, officers did not have the current figures and so could not confirm whether they had improved since. It was highlighted that generally registrations and attendance figures were very good, but there were still some groups that the centres needed to target further.
- It was requested whether the Committee could be provided with the current figures for children with disabled parents, pregnant teenagers and teenage parents registered at children's centres.
- It was queried whether the 'Bounty packs' were still given out free to new parents as they contained a lot of useful information as well as free products. Members were advised that these packs were still available through the midwifery service and were given out when the baby was born. However, there was currently no universal ante-natal offer and it was hoped that when this was put in place it would help to target vulnerable groups of parents.
- Members queried where the survey had been carried out and how much had been received so far. It was reported that it was an online survey, and it was being promoted through Facebook and Twitter to target families and young people. Letters had also been sent out to the Clinical Commissioning Groups and providers for cascading. Members were informed that 324 responses had been received so far. It was also noted that 1200 responses had been received to the earlier questionnaire. Members were advised that an analysis of the responses would be undertaken and an overview of the responses and themes would be published on the Council's website. It was agreed that the responses would be shared with the Committee.
- It was noted that the big change would be the way that the services would be commissioned rather than a change in the services provided and it was suggested that the impact on service users would be minimal.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee supports the recommendations to the Executive Councillor responsible for Children's Services as set out in the report.
2. That the comments made in response to the report, as detailed above, be passed to the Executive Councillor responsible for Children's Services.

18 LINCOLNSHIRE SAFEGUARDING BOARDS SCRUTINY SUB-GROUP -
UPDATE

It was reported that at the meeting on 6 April 2016, the Scrutiny Sub-Group received an update on the new Ofsted Inspection Framework which would introduce joint targeted area inspections of frontline practice and multi-agency arrangements. The Sub Group raised concerns about information sharing between the different agencies, but was reassured that this was being addressed.

The Sub Group also received an update on Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and the successful launch of the STOP CSE Campaign in March. A dedicated website had been set up (www.couldbeanyone.org.uk) which had further information on CSE and links to resources.

Members were advised that the Scrutiny Sub-Group had since met on 6 July but unfortunately had to be held informally due to being inquorate. The Sub Group had asked officers to look into the possibility of finding new police and health representatives for the Sub Group to fill the vacancies that existed. There had been previous attempts to fill these vacancies but without any success. However, there were no new people in post so officers would try again to see if they could be filled.

The minutes from the July meeting were due to be presented to the next meeting of this Committee on 9 September, but this item would now need to be a verbal update as there would be no formal minutes from that meeting to report back to the Committee.

Members expressed their disappointment that the meeting was not quorate, particularly as at that meeting, the Sub Group was due to consider a serious case review. It was suggested that it was important that the notes were informally reported at this meeting.

It was suggested that as this was a joint sub-group, also looking at adult safeguarding issues, the chief whip should be formally asked to follow up the attendance issues. It was also suggested, that if it was not likely that a full attendance would be achieved, could the membership be re-examined and the numbers reduced accordingly which would then reduce the quorum.

RESOLVED

1. That the minutes of the Lincolnshire Safeguarding Boards Scrutiny Sub-Group held on 6 April 2016 be noted.
2. That the comments raised be noted.

19 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK
PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to a report which enabled the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee to consider its own work programme for the coming year.

Members were advised that there were two amendments to the work programme, the report on Open Select List for Placements would be deferred from the September meeting to the October meeting to allow for further work. The Scrutiny Sub Group update on the September agenda would also be a verbal update as there would be no formal minutes from the last meeting on 6 July to report back to the Committee.

The Committee was also reminded about the Safeguarding Focus Group on 18 October at 2.00pm and whether they could attend. It was reported that so far 5 members had confirmed their availability. The Post 16 Priorities and Area Based Review Working Group would now be held on Monday 25 July 2016, with Councillors J D Hough, Mrs J Brockway and Mrs L A Rollings.

It was also commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had requested a Budget Briefing for all councillors which was due to be held at the end of July, and it was requested whether this Committee could receive a report in September on the Children's Services budgets, to enable the Committee to have early involvement in the budget setting process.

Concerns were raised regarding the increased numbers of young people who were accessing foodbanks and it was queried whether this was something which this Committee should look into. Members were advised that this could fall under the Child Poverty Strategy, which now sat with Public Health. Officers advised that they would ask Public Health colleagues to look further into this issue.

RESOLVED

1. That the content of the work programme, as set out in Appendix A to the report, and the amendments highlighted above be noted.
2. That the content of the Children's Services Forward Plan, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be noted.

The meeting closed at 12.40 pm