



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

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR J D HOUGH (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors R Wootten (Vice-Chairman), W J Aron, Mrs J Brockway, S R Dodds, Ms T Keywood-Wainwright, C R Oxby, Mrs S Ransome, Mrs L A Rollings, Mrs N J Smith, S M Tweedale, L Wootten, C J T H Brewis, C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott and C L Strange

Added Members

Church Representatives: Mr S C Rudman

Parent Governor Representatives: Mrs E Olivier-Townrow

Councillors: Mrs P A Bradwell and D Brailsford attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Debbie Barnes (Executive Director of Children's Services), Keith Batty (Director of Programme, CfBT Education Services), Stuart Carlton (Assistant Director Children's Lead Early Help), Matthew Clayton (School Organisation Planning Manager), Charlotte Gray, Tracy Johnson (Senior Scrutiny Officer), Heather Sandy (Chief Commissioning Officer for Learning) and Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer)

50 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B Adams, A G Hagues, B W Keimach and Mrs S Wray.

Apologies for absence were also received from Mr P Thompson and Mr C V Miller.

The Chief Executive reported that having received notice under Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, he had appointed Councillors C E H Marfleet, J R Marriott, C J T H Brewis and C L Strange as replacement members on the Committee in place of Councillors B Adams, A G Hagues, B W Keimach and Mrs S Wray, for this meeting only.

The Committee was informed that this would be the last meeting for Mrs Emma Olivier-Townrow and Mr Craig Miller as their term of office as a Parent Governor Representative would end on 2 March 2016 and neither of them were eligible to stand again. The Committee thanked them for all their hard work and commitment over the last four years.

51 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

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

52 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 2015

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2015 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

53 PROPOSAL TO DISCONTINUE THE USE OF THE MABLETHORPE SITE AND CONSOLIDATE PROVISION FOR MONKS' DYKE TENNYSON COLLEGE AT THE LOUTH SITE, AS A SINGLE SITE SCHOOL

The Committee was invited to consider a report on the proposal to discontinue the use of the Mablethorpe site and consolidate provision for Monks' Dyke Tennyson College at the Louth site, as a single site school which was due to be considered by the Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services on 29 January 2016.

It was reported that the proposal under consideration was the closure of the Mablethorpe site of the Monks' Dyke Tennyson College (MDTC) with effect from 31 August 2016. Members were advised that this proposal had been made by the Governors of MDTC, a split school with two sites located in Mablethorpe and Louth (15 miles apart), and concerned the closure of the school's Mablethorpe site, thereby consolidating provision at Louth.

A pre-publication consultation process took place between 2 September and 7 October 2015. The proposal to close came from concerns regarding the educational provision (currently 171 pupils on the Mablethorpe site) and financial viability (following a staff restructure a deficit of £350k was still projected at the end on 2015/16 and rising to £673k for 2016/17) of the Mablethorpe site. Falling numbers and increasing pressure to deliver a suitable curriculum were the main contributing factors.

It was reported that 16 options had been identified in relation to future provision in Mablethorpe, however, the majority were out of the control of the Local Authority which was the decision maker for any proposal resulting in the closure of the Mablethorpe site, whilst the school remains maintained by the Local Authority.

The Committee was advised that members of the Governing body and Headteacher of MDTC as well as campaigners from the Save Tennyson School group were in attendance at the meeting, and would be given 3 minutes each to speak to the Committee.

The Chief Commissioning Officer for Learning introduced the report and advised that the proposal to close the school site and consolidate provision in Louth had come

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

from the governing body for reasons including financial viability, educational provision and falling numbers. The school was currently unable to maintain a broad and balanced curriculum and so it would also be unable to do this as a stand alone school.

The School Services Manager provided an update on the transport arrangements. The Committee was advised that should the Mablethorpe site close, the Council would be obliged to provide transport to an alternative provision. Free home to school transport would be provided to the Louth site, for those pupils transferring or for new joiners in September 2016. If pupils gained a place, they would also be entitled to free transport to John Spendluffe Technology College in Alford as the new nearest school, and to Somercotes Academy in north Somercotes as the new Designated Transport Area (DTA) school. New pupils after September 2016 would only be entitled to free transport to John Spendluffe and to Somercotes Academy. This was not provided at the moment as there was a school in Mablethorpe. The cost of this transport would be met by the county council from its home to school transport budget. It was stated that this would not come from the schools budget. It had been identified and accepted as a budget pressure.

It was acknowledged that the authority was faced with a very difficult decision, but it was the local authority's responsibility to ensure that the opportunities for every child were maximised and that the best education possible was provided.

David Bennet, Vice Chair of Governors was invited to speak for not more than three minutes, and some of the points highlighted to the Committee included the following:

- He had previously worked as a head teacher and had been invited to join the governors to assist in securing the merger with the Louth site which was handed over in 2012 to the governing body;
- The only option from the governors point of view was to close the site in Mablethorpe, as it could not offer the quality of education on that site that the children deserved;
- There were 162 children currently on roll at Mablethorpe, with 12 planned to start at the school in September 2016. It was not possible to attract the funding or provide a variety of education with those numbers;
- The governors were unable to set a balanced budget, which was a legal requirement;
- In terms of background on the falling numbers, it was not expected that there would be a significant demand for secondary school places for 10 years.

Mike Eyre, Headteacher was invited to speak for not more than three minutes and some of the points highlighted to the Committee included the following:

- He had worked in Mablethorpe for 10 years, and in 2006 it was known that the school was struggling, and had poor results and falling numbers, and by 2008 they were working towards a merger with the school in Louth. In that time the school had some excellent results and introduced a sixth form, with some students going straight to university. However, despite this the school was unable to increase its pupils numbers;
- There had been a lot of effort to make this school work. The governing bodies joined together in 2010 and the schools merged in 2012;

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

- It was planned that any students who would be transferring to Louth would have the opportunity to attend the school on a couple of occasions before the transfer took place to help with the transition.

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask clarifying questions to the Headteacher and Vice-Chair of Governors, and some of the issues highlighted included the following:

- It was queried whether when courses were offered, if they were based entirely at either Mablethorpe or Louth. Members were advised that they were, and options were delivered on a Tuesday and Thursday, and if the course was delivered at the other site to the one the child attended normally, they would have to travel to the other site. It noted that students generally travelled from Mablethorpe to Louth for courses;
- Teachers did teach at both sites, and would only be reimbursed if they were expected to transfer between the sites during the same day;
- It was commented that 174 students was not viable, and it was queried what the total capacity for each site was. It was confirmed that the capacity at Mablethorpe was 435 and at Louth 1200;
- It was queried whether it was possible that publicity regarding the potential closure could have contributed to the low numbers enrolled for September. It was acknowledged that this could have had an impact, but the previous year there were 24 new students, and the year before 33;
- It was queried whether there were any figures on how many Mablethorpe parents would take up the places in Louth. Members were advised that this information was not yet known as the decision to close had not yet been made;
- The school tried to operate courses on its home site, but for those that did need to travel, the school day would still start at the same time. Members were advised that there were about 30 students travelling to Louth from the Mablethorpe area.

Paddy Prince and Chris Flanagan from the campaign group "Save Tennyson School" were invited to speak for three minutes each and some of the points highlighted to the Committee included the following:

- They wanted to secure a high quality offer of education provision for Mablethorpe;
- The closure of the secondary school in an area of high deprivation would have repercussions for the town which should be considered;
- There was strong evidence to show that a large number of local businesses were owned by ex-pupils;
- There would be an impact on the children of traveling long distances, as well as a lack of access to after school activities;
- The merger of the two schools had a significant effect on parents' lack of confidence in the school;
- There had been dialogue with Multi-Academy Trusts, which had been very important in helping to form the thinking of the campaign group;

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

- In terms of the curriculum provision and finance, there was a need to academise MDTC, and the campaign group believed it had come up with a viable solution. However, time was not on their side;
- They would like an existing multi-academy trust with a proven track record of turning around failing schools, and one with several sites;
- It would be focused on turning the parental tide of choice by transforming the curriculum offer;
- They would like to establish a free school formally focused on students aspirations and a flagship of innovation and enterprise;
- Once they had a multi-academy trust on board it would help to progress the application to DfE. This was supported by the community and parents, and a petition had been brought to the County Council at its last meeting in December 2015;
- The group was supported by local councillors at all levels and across all parties;
- It was requested that the authority defer the decision on the closure of the school to allow the time to finalise the proposal for a free school.

Members of the Committee were provided with the opportunity to ask clarifying questions to the campaign group members and some of the points raised included the following:

- It was queried how much additional time the campaign group would need, and it was requested that the decision be deferred for 12 months;
- It was queried what the intelligence was regarding what parents in Mablethorpe wanted in the future, and were they happy with options of Louth or North Somercotes. Members were informed that parents wanted their children to be educated locally, and the parental preference choice for Louth was quite low. John Spendluffe School was quite popular, but there was limited capacity with no plans to expand further;
- Was there any evidence that parents who were currently sending their children to John Spendluffe would transfer their children back to Mablethorpe? It was commented that parents would support local provision of education if this was high quality following research carried out by the campaign group in October 2015;
- It was commented that academies were better at marketing themselves than maintained schools. There was a need for schools to be proactive in terms of marketing themselves. Any further provision in Mablethorpe would be personalised to the needs of the child;
- Not all academies were successful, and if an academy failed, it would fall to the local authority to 'pick up the pieces' as they retained the statutory sufficiency duty;
- The campaign group wanted to see an offer of high quality sustainable education;
- Members commented that the campaign group talked about a proposal for a free school, but nothing had been submitted;
- A free school had a lot of flexibility in how it ran its curriculum, and it would want to be a type of school known as a Studio School, which would be for 14-19 year olds and would be work based. This would allow children to work in

ways that were best suited to their skills. However, the DfE had recently changed the guidance on how free schools could open including studio schools, and so there had not been time to amend the proposal;

- One of the criteria was that a studio school must be part of or closely aligned to a secondary school rated 'good' by Ofsted;
- A free school would be able to open with just pupils in Year 7, which would give the opportunity for a fresh start;
- A lot of work had been done on the specific needs of coastal communities;
- It was queried what would happen to the 11-14 year olds if the studio school was catering for the 14-19 age range, and members were advised that there would be a proposal to open a free school for age 11-16 at least, and the studio school would be attached.

Once all guests had been given the opportunity to speak and answer any clarifying questions, members of the Committee were invited to debate the proposal and recommendations as well as the information provided by the guests. Some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- It was queried whether any parents in Mablethorpe sent their children, full time, to the Louth site. It was noted that if they currently studied full-time at Louth, they would not receive free school transport;
- The Head Teacher was aware of the discussions between the campaigners and the academies, and had established contact with the Regional Schools Commissioner, but at the moment, a multi academy trust had not come forward. It was noted that any proposal for a free school would require the school to be closed;
- Whilst it was acknowledged that there was no pressure on secondary places, it was queried what the position with the primary sector was and whether there would be more demand in five years for example. Members were advised that primary schools in the area had not needed to add any places;
- It was queried how long the coach journey between Mablethorpe and Louth would take between 7.30am and 9.00am, and it was reported that it should be 40-50 minutes, which was within the guidelines of what was considered acceptable for secondary age pupils;
- Concerns were expressed regarding integration as 38% of the pupils at the Mablethorpe site were on the SEN register;
- It was confirmed that the estimated £250,000 cost of transport took into account any additional transport for SEN pupils. It was noted that 20% had been added to the transport estimates for this purpose;
- It was noted that the distance to Louth was about 15 miles, to Alford was 8 miles and to North Somercotes about 11 miles;
- It was commented that the least amount of travelling time was best, but there were a lot of children who did have to travel to school, as Lincolnshire was a rural county;
- It was not believed that there was any antagonism between the communities of Louth and Mablethorpe, but the proposed closure had not helped matters, and there would need to be some careful planning for the transition;
- It was clear that the Louth school was valuable to the town and people wanted to see the same opportunities for parents in Mablethorpe;

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

- It was suggested that the low number of children signed up for September could be attributed to the potential closure, and there was clear opposition from the local community. There were concerns the closure could impact on where people chose to live, which could threaten the viability of primary schools in the long term. It was commented that Mablethorpe was not a small rural village, it was one of the largest settlements on the East Coast of Lincolnshire, and people would expect it to have a secondary school;
- It was not believed that parents in Mablethorpe wanted their children to go to school in Louth, and it could end up with parents having a very poor choice of schools;
- One member commented that this decision could fundamentally change the future of the town;
- It was proposed that the Committee support the campaign group and agree to defer the decision for one year to allow the group or other providers to come with proposals. It was suggested that as a budget pressure would be created by the need for home to school transport to be provided, could this instead be used to help the school with their budget difficulties? It was confirmed that this was not equitable across the school community;
- One member commented that they supported the recommendations in the report, and informed the Committee that they had not received any comments from residents regarding the potential closure, even though their division was close to Mablethorpe;
- There was a need for education to have good facilities, and if a school was struggling it was a dis-service to the children. MDTC needed to move on. More than £500,000 was needed to keep it going on an annual basis, and if it was going to become a free school, it needed to close first;
- It was noted that there were also flooding issues to be taken into consideration;
- It was noted that concerns had been raised by students at Mablethorpe regarding not feeling welcome at the Louth site, and there were reports that there was bullying taking place. The Committee was advised that transition arrangements would be carefully considered;
- There were concerns about making Louth the preferred option as it was so far away. However, it was clarified that this would only be for the children currently attending the Mablethorpe site. For new applicants, the nearest school could be the preferred for parents and parents would continue to have choice;
- It was commented that 8,500 signatures on the petition was an achievement, however, parents were sending their children elsewhere;
- It was also commented that it was not the fault of the Head Teacher and staff that the proposal to close had been put forward, they had put up a significant fight to keep the school going;
- It was noted that parental choice was very important, but so were the needs of the children;
- This was a rural county, and many children had to travel. One member commented that there was not a secondary school in their division and so all children had to travel, and it did not take children away from activities in the

community. The community supported the children, and there was no negativity about them going to school in a different area;

- It was commented that the concept of a free school was not a panacea, and that if the school did not teach the same curriculum that the rest of the country was following then the children would have gaps in their education;
- In terms of concerns regarding children missing out on extra-curricular activities by travelling to the Louth site, it was commented that many schools offered these activities before school and during lunchtimes;
- If a school was not viable it would be a negative environment for children;
- Members were advised that the funding for SEN followed the pupil. Detailed transition planning would only be carried out once a decision had been made;
- If a parent wished to explore another school for their child, it would be recommended that they went through the School Admissions Team;
- Many of the primary schools in Mablethorpe were within walking distance. Free home to school transport would only be provided if the nearest school was more than three miles away or the child had a statement of educational need/health, education and care plan which required transport;
- It was commented that just because Lincolnshire was a rural county, did not mean it was acceptable to transport a child for up to two hours per day;
- The school would need to close for the free school proposal to be successful;
- It was suggested that children would enjoy being in a bigger school, and it was thought that there was no other option but to go down the closure route;
- The age demographic of East Lindsey was older than in other parts of the county;
- It was commented that a school was not necessary for a thriving community;
- It was not possible to run a full curriculum with 160 students, and it was thought that a viable school needed almost 1000 students;
- There were some complications with the land, but the local authority could be sympathetic to not doing anything with the land for 12 months;
- It was proposed that the Mablethorpe site of MDTC be closed as per the recommendation, but that the authority retain the site for 12 months to allow time for a bid to be put together regarding alternative options. It was noted that the Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services advised the Committee that she would support this proposal;
- It was commented that the Campaign Group recognised that the current situation was not viable but it was asking for the decision to be deferred;
- There was a request that measures be put in place to ensure that the site remained usable and damage was limited if it was to close;
- Significant funding would be required to keep the school open for another year, as this additional year could result in almost £1million deficit. The formula would not allow for funding to be taken from the schools budget, and neither would other schools support reducing their funding to fund this schools additional costs. There were also significant challenges in terms of availability and recruitment of staff;
- There was the potential for redundancies but if the decision was to close the school, voluntary reductions would be sought as well as opportunities to redeploy staff;

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

- Additional resource was already available to assist with admissions if support was required;
- It was noted that as a decision had not been made, it could not be confirmed how much additional resource would be required to implement the transition plan. However, the school had requested and additional two teacher training days, and the authority would be minded to support this request. The Customer Service Centre had also received additional training to allow them to deal with queries relating to admissions.

It was proposed and seconded that the decision to close the school be deferred for 12 months. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

It was proposed and seconded that the recommendations as set out in the report be supported with the addition that the land be retained by the local authority for 12 months and that the community and other educational professionals be supported in their bid to secure a free school.

RESOLVED

1. That the recommendations to the Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services as set out in the report be supported;
2. That the Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services be recommended to retain the school site and land for 12 months to allow time for further exploration of alternative secondary education provision in Mablethorpe;
3. That the comments made by the Committee be passed to the Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services.

54 CHILDREN'S SERVICES BUDGET 2015/16 AND 2016/17

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Committee with information on the Children's Services budgets for 2016/17. The views of this scrutiny committee would be reported to the Executive prior to finalisation of the 2016/17 budget proposals for the full Council's consideration in February 2016.

The Committee received a presentation in relation to the Budget Proposals for Children's Services which provided detailed information in relation to the following areas:

- Current Financial Position
- Savings achieved since the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review
- Budget Pressures
- Commissioning Outcomes for Children's Services
- Proposals for Revenue Savings – Readiness for School
- Proposals for Revenue Savings – Learn and Achieve
- Proposals for Revenue Savings – Readiness for Adult Life
- Proposals for Revenue Savings – Safe and Healthy
- Capital Requirements

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

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

- It was clarified that there was an increasing budget in relation to Special Guardianship Order Placements. The executive Director for Children's Services explained the circumstances of Special Guardianship Orders and associated funding implications;
- There was a proposal to consult on the closure of phase 3 Children's Centres, however, the authority had a sufficiency duty which may be tested during the consultation process, alternative options would also be considered;
- There were concerns regarding the decommissioning of non-statutory school support services which supported vulnerable young people, and it was queried whether the business sector could be approached to help with education support. It was clarified that the business sector already provided internships and other work placements for learners with a learning disability;
- There were also concerns around the decommissioning of the Counselling Service for grief and loss and it was queried whether this could be passed to health or CAMHS. It was noted that CAMHS was already in a challenging position with regard to demand management;
- It was commented that Children's Centres provided advice, guidance and support to families if they felt as though they were reaching crisis point;
- In terms of post 16 transport, it was queried whether there was any legal obligation to provide transport for those families in poverty;
- One member commented that they could not support the decommissioning of these services as it would harm communities. If it was considered a good idea to introduce the services then they should remain. It was proposed that the Committee vote against the budget proposals and that the Executive be asked to look again at these services to see whether they could continue to be funded;
- The Executive Councillor for Adult Care and Health Services, Children's Services was in attendance at the meeting and responded to comments made and advised the Committee that the Executive had spent a lot of time since the summer examining budgets to try to find the extra millions that the authority was losing. However, there was still a gap of £30m. Government had been lobbied by the Executive for extra funding. Reducing services was not what the Executive wanted to do, but they needed to look at what was the best way to keep people safe. These had not been easy decisions to make, and there were reductions in every service. There was a requirement for the authority to set a balanced budget. If in 3/4 years' time local government started to receive more funding, then it was possible that some of these services could be reinstated;
- It was queried whether there was any further information in relation to the alternative operating model for the children's centres;
- It was acknowledged that the authority was in an incredibly difficult position.
- Children's centres provided a lot more help to communities than just help and advice;
- It was commented that the authority could not afford to continue these services, and had done its best over the last five years to make savings that

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

allowed the authority to balance its books, and there was no alternative but to accept the recommendations;

- Skills were a big issue, and it was reported that Justin Brown (Enterprise Commissioner) and his team were doing a considerable amount of work on this area. It was also commented that Councillor C J Davie (Executive Councillor for Economic Development, Environment, Planning and Tourism) was working very hard on the skills agenda;
- A member commented that they had had considerable concerns the previous year regarding the removal of funding from the Music Service, but she had looked into this further and was convinced that the model which had been presented would become self-sustaining and be viable. It had continued to deliver the service and children continued to access the service, including those from low income families;
- It was commented that not all of the Children's Centres were used as much as they could be, and if there was a way of providing the services elsewhere, and not paying for the building, then it should be looked into;
- In terms of the supported employment team, there was already a link with businesses to identify work experience placements. The authority had traditionally brokered and provided support for the young person to access that experience. If this service was decommissioned, colleges would have a role in supporting a young person to transition into work;
- In relation to the Grief and Loss service, it was acknowledged that this was a highly valued service, however it was not a statutory requirement for the local authority to provide this service. Members were advised that in response to the publication of the report, an e-mail had been received from the Lincolnshire Centre for Grief and Loss advising that there were many reasons why a young person would be referred to the service, including the preventative nature of the counselling intervention, as well as issues such as low confidence and self-esteem, or self-harming, in those affected by a broad range of causes including bullying, depression and anxiety, family separation and breakdown, physical and sexual abuse and serious family illness;
- In relation to academies, and the Education Support Grant (ESG), members were advised that there was a per pupil amount provided to the school and the local authority. When a school converted to an academy, the local authority would lose part of the education support grant. However, it was noted that there had been a slow down in conversions to academies, but that future consultation on the ESG was expected;;
- Children's Centres were highly valued, but the least worst options were being considered, as safeguarding was being protected. A lot of work was being done to ensure that the right families access the children's centres, and approximately 90% of the families in contact with the authority were registered with Centres;
- The alternative operating model for the Children's Centres would be looking to see whether community delivered services could be provided in other facilities in the community, such as village halls;
- School improvement was moving towards a sector led approach and the biggest concern was the capacity for schools to be able to support each other. However, there was a need to change the current model which had expended

its ability to move Lincolnshire's schools forward, as nationally schools were progressing much faster than they were in Lincolnshire;

- The schools budget had not been reduced, as it was protected;
- In relation to Post-16 transport, the statutory duty was to provide affordable transport, and Lincolnshire was slightly below average in its charges compared to other authorities. The option of means testing for low income families was explored, but the administration burden of this meant that potential budget savings were reduced;
- Recommendations from the Grammar School Transport Task and Finish Group would be presented to this Committee. It was not yet known what the recommendations would be, but they could generate a cost saving or a pressure. Members were assured that the work being carried out was very robust;
- In terms of youth centres, the delivery of positive activities was being transferred to the community, but there were still some residual costs from the running of the youth centres, such as maintenance.

It was proposed and seconded that the Committee should not support the recommendations in the report. Upon being put to the vote this motion was lost.

It was proposed and seconded that the recommendations in the report be supported, and upon being put to the vote this was carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the contents of the report be noted;
2. That concerns regarding the potential closure of phase 3 Children's Centres, and the decommissioning of non-statutory services be passed to the Executive.

55 OUTCOMES FROM SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT WORKING GROUP

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Committee with an opportunity to consider the outcomes from the School Improvement Working Group.

It was reported that at the meeting of this Committee held on 28 November 2014, it was agreed that a working group would be established to look at School Improvement. Following consideration of a report by the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee on 24 April 2015 which was subsequently agreed by the Executive on 5 May 2015 on the Future Delivery of the School Improvement Service, the remit of the working group was changed to focus on the risks and benefits of the new model for school improvement which would replace the existing CfBT contract.

The new model would be a sector led approach which would establish a collaborative Lincolnshire Learning Partnership which would deliver a tiered approach to School Improvement including peer review, quality assurance and appropriate governance arrangements.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

Members were advised that a number of meetings with officers from CfBT and Children's Services had been held to gain an understanding of the existing CfBT offer and the new sector led model. The Working Group analysed the new sector led model using the Signs of Safety approach.

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:

- This would be the introduction of a new culture, and with this there would always be a counter culture, which would need to be managed carefully;
- There may be more opportunity to look at governors supporting this model and they could be supported;
- The working group spoke to a lot of people, and it was commented that there were some things which would need to be watched for when implementing the new model and it was suggested that the group should meet every so often in an informal manner with Heather Sandy;
- There had been a lot of new information for the working group to work through, and it was thought that there would be a need for regular reviews by this Committee;
- It was thought that the report did not reflect the amount of meetings which had taken place or the information discussed;
- It was requested that a report on how the action plan would be implemented be brought back to the meeting in March;
- Members of the working group thanked Tracy Johnson, Senior Scrutiny Officer for all her work with the group and in ensuring that the group had all the information they needed;
- It was noted that the new model had not yet commenced, and had only been through consultation. There would be a launch in February 2016 with Head Teachers. It was requested that the members of the Working Group be invited to the launch.

RESOLVED

1. That the comments made in relation to the outcomes of the School Improvement Working Group be noted;
2. That a further report from the Working Group be brought to the march meeting;
3. That the Committee receive six monthly updates on the implementation of the new sector led model for school improvement.

56 CORPORATE PARENTING PANEL UPDATE

The Committee received an update on the work of the Corporate Parenting Panel.

It was reported that the Corporate Parenting Panel last met on Thursday, 10 December 2015. At the meeting, the Panel received a report outlining an audit of placement disruptions of Looked After Children. The audit had looked at 38 cases, of

which 15 had been disrupted, and highlighted some results which were expected and some new issues. It was highlighted that there was a need for foster carers to build good relationships with their social worker so that they had someone to speak to about any difficulties they were having.

The Panel also received the first joint annual report for Looked After Children between Children's Services and Health where it was highlighted that the biggest challenge was ensuring assessments were completed within statutory timescales as these had to be completed by a medical officer. The Panel had a discussion around children from other areas placed within Lincolnshire and the impact on the service due to their emotional and behavioural needs. At the time of the meeting there 440 children placed in Lincolnshire from out of county, which was in addition to the 654 children under the care of Lincolnshire.

It was reported that the next meeting was on 10 March 2016 and the Panel would be considering a report from Debbie Barnes on the outcomes from national research by the Association of Directors of Children's Services, the Virtual School Heads Network and the National Consortium for Examination Results. In addition the Panel would be receiving a six monthly update from Barnardo's on the Leaving Care Service.

Consideration was also given to the draft minutes of the previous meeting of the Panel which were attached as Appendix A to the report, and a concern was raised regarding the complaint which was received from a child. Members were advised that the complaint had been dealt with and had a satisfactory outcome.

Queries were raised regarding the children who were placed from out of county and whether there was a budget which accompanied them which was sufficient for the authority to meet their needs. Members were advised that this was a complex issue, and funding was broken down into different aspects. If they lived and were educated in Lincolnshire, the funding came to the authority to be pass-ported straight to the school, and if the child had a statement, but was a child from another local authority, then the school had to meet their needs. In terms of social care, Lincolnshire as an authority was not responsible for this (if the child was looked after by another local authority). If the child had a health issue then normally, the local health provider would meet the need except if specialist intervention was needed which was more complex.

RESOLVED

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

57 2016/17 CONTRACT WITH LINCOLNSHIRE COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES NHS TRUST FOR HEALTH VISITING, SCHOOL NURSING AND ANTENATAL WEIGHT MANAGEMENT

Consideration was given to a report which invited the Committee to consider a report on the 2016/17 contract with Lincolnshire Community Health Services NHS Trust

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 JANUARY 2016

Health Visiting, School Nursing and Antenatal Weight Management which was due to be considered by the Executive on 2 February 2016.

Members were advised that contracts were in place with Lincolnshire Community Health Services NHS Trust (LCHS) for a number of children's health services. This included a contract for Health Visiting (with a value of £8.650m per annum for 2015/16), and one for School Nursing and Antenatal Weight Management Services (with a value of £2.749m for 2015/16). Both of the contracts had an end date of 31 March 2016 and neither contained the provision to further extend the contract period.

Children's Services was conducting an extensive review of these services alongside other early years provision where there was a clear interface.

It was reported that a request for members' names to be put forward to form a working group to look at the details of this contract more closely had been received. It was confirmed that members would be contacted and included at the appropriate time to work with officers on the new arrangements.

RESOLVED

1. That the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee support the recommendation(s) to the Executive as set out in the report;
2. That a small number of members form a working group to work with officers on the new arrangements, at the appropriate time.

58 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK
PROGRAMME 2016

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Committee with an opportunity to consider its own work programme for the coming year.

It was reported that in addition to the items listed on the Work Programme, a further report on the School Improvement Working Group would be brought to the meeting on 4 March 2016. Members were also reminded that following the meeting on 4 March 2016, there would be a workshop on Progress 8 and Assessment Developments in Schools by CfBT.

It was also noted that there was a pre-decision scrutiny item on the agenda for 15 April 2016 regarding the potential closure of Saltfleetby Primary School. The consultation period would run from 10 February until 9 March 2016. It was suggested that a small working group be established to meet with officers to discuss the proposal to close the school. Councillors J D Hough, S R Dodds and C R Oxby volunteered to take part in this working group.

It was suggested and agreed that Emma Olivier-Townrow (Parent Governor Representative) should be invited to attend the meeting on 4 March 2016 to assist in the presentation of the School Improvement Working Group Report, after noting that this would be her last meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee before her term of office ended on 2 March 2016.

RESOLVED

1. That the comments made in relation to the Work Programme be noted;
2. That a report from the School Improvement Working Group be brought back to the meeting on 4 March 2016, and Emma Olivier-Townrow be invited to attend this meeting;
3. That a small working group of the following members – Councillors S R Dodds, J D Hough and C R Oxby be formed to discuss the proposed potential closure of Saltfleetby Primary School.

The meeting closed at 1.00 pm