



## **MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, 6 October 2011 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillors Gladbaum (Chair), Aden, Al-Ebadi, Harrison and Mr A Frederick, Ms E Points, Mrs H Imame, Dr J Levison and Mrs L Gouldbourne

Also Present: Councillors Arnold, S Choudhary and Lorber

Apologies were received from: Councillors Green, Mitchell Murray, Mrs Abassi, Ms J Cooper, Ms C Jolinon and Brent Youth Parliament representatives

### **1. Declaration of personal and prejudicial interests**

Councillor Harrison declared an interest with regard to the item on the Strategy to Provide Primary School Places in Brent up to 2014/15. She advised that she was a governor for Preston Park Primary School, which had been identified for expansion in the report.

Councillor Gladbaum also declared an interest with regard to this item as she was a governor for Capital City Academy.

Councillor Arnold advised that she was a governor for Kilburn Park School.

### **2. Deputations (if any)**

There were no deputations.

### **3. Minutes of the last meeting held on 12 July 2011**

The minutes of the meeting of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 12 July 2011 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments: -

- i. Ms Elsie Points to be included in the list of those present
- ii. Mr Hank Roberts to be included in the list of those present and it to be recorded that he was attending in place of Mrs L Goudbourne and Ms C Jolinon.

### **4. Matters arising**

Councillor Aden queried whether the recommendations of the Youth Offending task group had been adopted by the Executive. The Chair advised that they recommendations of the task group had been approved by the Executive at its meeting on 19 September 2011.

Councillor Aden further noted that the committee had agreed that a school places update should be a standing item on the work programme but that there was no such item on the agenda for the current meeting. Rik Boxer (Assistant Director, Inclusion and Achievement) explained that he would include this update in the report on the Strategy to Provide Primary School Places in Brent up to 2014/15.

#### 5. **Brent Youth Parliament Update (Verbal Report)**

The Chair advised that the representatives of Brent Youth Parliament were unable to attend the meeting and a written report would be circulated during the meeting.

The written update report was tabled at the end of the meeting for the committee's information.

#### 6. **Review of the Policy for the Provision of Early Years Full Time Places**

Sue Gates (Head of Integrated and Extended Services) presented a report to the committee on the implementation of the council policy on the allocation of full time Early Years places to disadvantaged children. This policy had been agreed by the Executive in February 2010 and as titled, set out criteria to ensure that full time Early Years places (education places for children aged three to four years old) were offered to disadvantaged children. Prior to this time, the criteria for allocating Early Years places had been determined by each school separately. This had often resulted in Early Years places simply being provided to those who were first to apply, with no prioritisation for disadvantaged children.

Sue Gates explained that the implementation of the new policy had initially been delayed following the receipt of advice from the School Admissions Forum that a wider consultation needed to be conducted. A further delay had resulted from the introduction of a new statutory duty placed on local authorities requiring them to offer places to all children aged two years old who were deemed vulnerable. It had been determined that there were not enough of these places currently available in Brent to meet the estimated demand. Consequently, several options exploring how the Council would meet this requirement were considered and it had been proposed that children aged three to four years old would only be offered places based on their statutory entitlement of fifteen hours per week in order to free up capacity. However, following consultation with the Schools Forum in June 2011 and in consideration of its strong view against the suggested action, the proposal had been rejected in favour of maintaining provision of full time Early Years places for disadvantaged children. Alternative proposals to ensure that the council was able to meet its statutory duty with respect to vulnerable two year olds were currently being explored

Sue Gates further elucidated that following these delays, the implementation of the Early Years places policy was now underway. It was intended that the policy would be in place for September 2012 and Brent schools were currently being consulted on the proposed arrangements for the admissions process. In particular, views were being sought on what role the local authority should take in administering the policy. Responses to this consultation were pending. The proposed admissions process would allow schools to administer the process of managing full-time admissions themselves with minimal central involvement. A summary of the

process and an indicative timetable were set out in the report. The timetable aligned the process with that for statutory school age admissions. If a schools full time Early Years places were not oversubscribed, the proposals set out several options of provision including that of offering of mixed provision of full and part-time places and the switching to part-time provision only. Governing bodies, however, would be encouraged to consider the financial and operational implications of these options before deciding on the type of provision to offer parents from September 2012.

In the subsequent discussion members raised several issues. Councillor Harrison sought clarification on the admissions criteria set out in the admissions process. Sue Gates advised that the first criterion that would have to be met was the one of deprivation. If there were still places remaining after this, there were three further categories by which applications would be prioritised. It was important to note that not every school offered full time Early Years places and several schools had actively opted out from the scheme. Councillor Harrison queried what safeguards were proposed to ensure that the council was meeting its statutory duty. Sue Gates clarified that it was only a statutory duty to offer places to children aged two years old who were deemed vulnerable. She added that there were several mechanisms in place to ensure that the local authority had the necessary information to determine whether it was meeting its statutory requirements and noted that schools were required to provide a certain amount of information to the council for this purpose.

With reference to the report, the Chair noted that parents would have no statutory right of appeal against the decision of the school and expressed her concern at the possible inequality which could result from this arrangement. Sue Gates advised that as the provision of full time Early Years places to disadvantaged children aged three to four years was not a statutory duty, the local authority had no power to implement a statutory right of appeal. Rather, any appeals against a decision to refuse a full time Early Years Place would have to be dealt with by the internal procedures of the school in question. Sue Gates added that the council did not have the staffing to monitor its provision of this non-statutory service. The Chair queried whether the application forms for Early Years places would be provided in a variety of languages to accommodate those families for whom English was not their first language. Sue Gates clarified that application forms would be provided by the schools. The Committee was further advised that the council did not have the resources to provide application forms in several languages.

Mrs Elsie Points sought clarification as to whether all children of the appropriate age would be offered their fifteen hour entitlement. Sue Gates explained that whilst all three to four year olds would be given an education place for their fifteen hour a week entitlement, not every child would be given the often preferred place in a school.

In response to a further query by the Chair, Sue Gates advised that the consultation with Brent schools would conclude in three weeks' time. The consultation document had only just been recently sent to schools and the total consultation period would be quite short.

The Chair reiterated concerns regarding the equality of access to the full time Early Years places provision. Councillor Arnold, Lead Member for Children and Families, acknowledged these concerns but noted that currently there were no mechanisms

in place to ensure prioritisation for disadvantaged children. In order to ensure that the most vulnerable families were aware of the policy and would apply for places, the policy could be promoted via children's centres. Sue Gates added that front line staff such as social workers and family support workers would be asked to promote the policy to families in need. In response to a query, Sue Gates explained that the council would monitor that the places were being given to disadvantaged children via information collected by the schools during the application process.

Following a query from Dr Levison, Sue Gates advised that the council could not ensure equality in the provision of full time Early Years places to disadvantaged children because the number of places available was not and had never been sufficient to meet the demand. Councillor Arnold added that it was good that the council was still able to offer full-time places for disadvantaged three and four year olds, in the current financial climate.

In light of the queries and concerns raised by the Committee, the Chair suggested that a further report be presented to the Committee at its next meeting setting out the following: -

- The outcome of the consultation with Brent schools
- The views of the Schools Forum
- Projections for the provision of places for vulnerable children aged two years old, including the expected demand and the use of children's centres as a natural provider.
- An overarching perspective of the development/implementation of the policy for full time Early Years' places, including the embedding of safeguards and how an equal opportunity of access would be ensured. The Chair added that if an equality of opportunity regarding access to the places could not be achieved this should be stated in the report along with the implications of this.

RESOLVED: -

- i. That the report be noted
- ii. That a further report be presented to the committee at its next meeting setting out the following: -
  - The outcome of the consultation with Brent schools
  - The views of the Schools Forum
  - An overarching perspective of the development/implementation of the policy for full time Early Years' places, including the embedding of safeguards and how an equal opportunity of access would be ensured. The Chair added that if an equality of opportunity regarding access to the places could not be achieved this should be stated in the report along with the implications of this.
  - Projections for the provision of places for vulnerable children aged two years old, including the expected demand and the use of children's centres as a natural provider.

## 7. **Strategy to Provide Primary School Places in Brent up to 2014/15**

Rik Boxer (Assistant Director Achievement and Inclusion) introduced a report to the committee detailing the severe shortage of primary school places in Brent and the measures required to address the shortfall. It was noted that this deficit of primary school places in Brent echoed a national trend and one which was particularly acute in London. The report proposed a three pronged approach to this issue, encompassing a robust lobbying campaign to central government, a medium term to deliver a fit for purpose school portfolio, and a short term strategy to maximise the capacity of the existing portfolio. This report had been considered by the Executive on 17 August 2011, at which time the recommendations set out in the report had been agreed.

Rik Boxer advised that it was modestly estimated that by 2014/15, a further fifteen forms of entry would be required in Brent; by 2020 this deficit was predicted to rise to twenty three. It had been determined that £52m of capital would be necessary to meet the predicted shortfall for 2014/15. At its meeting on 17 August 2011, the Executive had agreed that £20m of the required £52m would be provided via the Council's Main Capital Programme and from Section 106 Capital Receipts. It was highlighted to the Committee that the government had announced that an additional £500m would be allocated to fund more school places in areas of greatest need; however, an allocation model had not yet been provided and it was possible that these funds might prove insufficient. Consequently, the Council would be lobbying central government, along with the GLA and London Councils to emphasise the acute nature of the problem and to ensure Brent's case was made with respect to the additional funds to be supplied by the government.

In providing further detail of the council's approach to the issue of the deficit of primary school places, Rik Boxer advised that for the short term the council was prioritising schools to be considered for permanent expansion by September 2012. A short list of schools (included at Appendix 6 to the report) had been compiled based on criteria including risk, shortage of places in the local area and availability of funding. Of these, four schools had been selected as being most suitable for expansion and would be subject to feasibility studies. These plans for short term expansion were being developed in the context of the council's longer term strategy for providing primary school places. This strategy would be underpinned by a set of proposed planning principles, set out at paragraph 8.19 of the report, and would include a review of the entire education portfolio and consideration of new models for schools, including five form entry primary schools, all-through schools and 'urban' style schools.

Rik Boxer concluded his introduction to the report by drawing members' attention to the recommendations agreed by the Executive at its meeting on 17 August 2011, set out at paragraph 2 of the report.

During members' discussion several queries were raised. The Chair sought an update on the implementation of the recommendations agreed by the Executive on 17 August 2011. Rajesh Sinha (Interim Programme Manager) advised that the feasibility studies for the four schools shortlisted for potential expansion had commenced. It was estimated that decisions as to whether to proceed with the expansion schemes would be made by early November. Discussions had already been held with the governing body of Fryent Primary School, which had indicated

that it was in support of expanding the school. Following receipt of the results of the feasibility studies, where the results were positive the council would liaise with the governing bodies of those schools to seek their approval. It was emphasised that the school expansion schemes were required to be completed by September 2012; however, it was possible due to the restricted timescales involved, that a partial result in which the reception year classes would be completed but other facilities and classrooms would follow, may be achieved.

Rajesh Sinha added that recommendation 2.10, the allocation of £150k from the Council's Main Capital Programme for updating the information on school condition and cad database, was underway. Data collected via this process had already revealed that the number of pupils on roll at many schools exceeded the respective net capacity figures. It was suggested that this was due to the acute pressure on school places which had led to various short term solutions including the addition of bulge classes. With regard to the allocation of the total sum of £20m from the council's Main Capital Programme and the Section 106 Capital Receipts, these funds had yet to be received and the latter source was dependent on the finalisation of the Section 106 agreements.

Councillor Harrison queried whether any of Brent's schools had expressed an interest in becoming all-through schools. The committee was advised that Wembley High School and Capital City Academy had expressed an interest in becoming all-through schools. Councillor Arnold (Lead Member for Children and Families) added that a thorough consultation on the various models of schools would be conducted. In addition, a wider audit of all of Brent's Schools would be undertaken. In response to a further query, Rik Boxer advised that a report would be brought to the committee setting out the evidence base for the different models of schools. Rik Boxer clarified that urban style schools were those which occupied sites of a limited size and which made innovative uses of the space available. An urban style school would make use of tall buildings and complementary facilities such as a play spaces located on the roof. Rajesh Sinha added that such schools might also focus on providing only statutory facilities, for example, by choosing to establish an agreement with a local leisure centre rather than providing a play space on site. Arrangements of these types had already started to be implemented in Free Schools.

Councillor Al-Ebadi queried whether consideration had been given to purchasing spaces in private schools in Brent, as he knew of at least one school where there were approximately one hundred places available. Rik Boxer advised that he was not aware that this was an area which had been explored and that a cost analysis would be required to ascertain whether this was a viable option.

Councillor Lorber advised that he was a school governor for Barham Primary School which was one of the four schools identified in the report as being most suitable for permanent expansion. He explained that the governing body had in recent years twice rejected proposals to expand the school and had just completed an alternative project to establish a nursery. Rajesh Sinha advised that discussions had been held with the head teacher of Barham Primary School. Once the feasibility studies had been completed, detailed proposals would be presented to the selected schools. Inherent within the process was the opportunity for the selected schools to obtain some improved facilities and it was in this aspect that it

was felt interest might be expressed by those schools which might otherwise reject proposals to expand.

Councillor Lorber commented that previous school development projects, particularly those for Wembley Park Primary and Sudbury Primary school had resulted in a significant overspend and that the council needed to ensure that similar circumstances did not arise. Rik Boxer noted that there had been good examples of recent school development projects as well but added that the comments would be taken on board.

Dr Levison queried whether the expansion projects encompassed the addition of supporting facilities or if they just included extra classrooms. Rajesh Sinha explained that the council had taken a holistic view to the projects and depending on the needs of each school had added additional facilities such as halls, staff rooms and food preparation and dining areas. Rajesh Sinha added that traffic assessments would also be conducted prior to expansion.

Following members' initial discussion, Rik Boxer provided a brief update to the committee on school places in Brent. For 2011, 4200 applications for reception year places had been received. Of these, 3439 had been on time and 561 had been received after the deadline. This latter figure was indicative of the number of new arrivals to the borough, and Rik Boxer advised that this figure increased daily. Despite the provision of an additional 260 reception year places for September 2011, there were at present 241 unplaced children for this year group, with 60 reception year vacancies across the whole of Brent; however, these vacancies were not necessarily in the required areas. A further 60 vacancies would become available in November 2011 following the completion of a current school expansion project. There were also unplaced children in years 1, 2, 3 and 4 and as of 30 September 2011 there were 707 unplaced children across the system and 370 vacancies. It was highlighted that the pressure on school places was slowly working its way through the year groups.

Councillor S Choudhary queried whether the limit of 30 children per class could be raised to allow larger class sizes to accommodate all of the unplaced children in Brent. Rik Boxer advised that all Council maintained schools were subject to statutory legislation which stipulated that class sizes for Reception Year, Year 1 and Year 2 could not exceed 30 pupils. In some limited circumstances the council had approached the school to request that it exceed this limit but the council did not have the authority to enforce such measures. Mrs Gouldbourne expressed that large class sizes would impair the ability of the teachers to meet the different needs of their pupils.

The Chair requested an update on the expansion of Newfield Primary school and Brentfield Primary school. The committee was advised that phase one of the Newfield Primary school project would be finished by 27 October 2011 and phase two, by 9 December 2011. The project would be complete before Christmas 2011. There had been severe delays to the delivery of the Brentfield Primary school expansion project due to the discovery of asbestos. Phase-one of this project would now be delivered by 18 November 2011, with a final completion date set for the second week of December 2011. The expansion project for Preston Manor primary school was still on-going and phase-one was scheduled to be finished by 19 November 2011 and phase-two, by 16 December 2011. These projects had been

delivered in 12 to 14 months but would usually be expected to take 48 to 50 months.

Councillor Lorber noted that there was a significant number of late applications and queried why this was. Rik Boxer clarified that the deadline for applications had been in January 2011 and therefore, the 500 late applications principally reflected the number of families which had moved into the area since that time. Councillor Al-Ebadi commented that it would be important to consider that due to the housing reforms there would be more people moving in to Brent from areas such as Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea. Rik Boxer explained that in forming the projections of the number of school places that would be required by 2014/15, several factors had been considered including the changing housing situation and a housing expert had been secured for this purpose.

The Chair thanked the officers for their report.

RESOLVED: -

That the report be noted.

## 8. **2011 Education Standards (Verbal Report)**

Faira Ellks (Head of Services to Schools) provided a verbal report to the committee outlining the educational standards achieved for 2011 in Brent Schools. A supporting document was tabled for members' information. Faira Ellks noted that educational achievement in 2011 had been largely good. The committee received a brief overview of achievement for each educational stage from Early Years Foundation stage to Key Stage 1 through to Key Stage 5. Faira Ellks also provided the committee with an analysis of educational attainment by ethnic group and for those children in receipt of free school meals.

- **Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)**

Faira Ellks advised that there had been a significant improvement in EYFS outcomes in 2011 against the two main performance indicators. The first of these performance indicators examined the percentage of children scoring 78 points or more across all areas of learning. Performance against this indicator had improved from 43% in 2010 to 57% in 2011, which brought Brent in line with the 2010 national average (the 2011 national average was not yet available). The second key indicator measured the gap between the lowest achieving 20% and the remaining results. This gap had narrowed from 35.2 in 2010 to 32.1 in 2011, representing a significant improvement. The national average in 2010 was 32.7.

Faira Ellks noted that key priorities for EYFS for 2011/12 and the measures required to achieve these, were set out on page 3 of the supporting document.

- **Key Stage 1**

The committee was advised that performance at Key Stage 1 had improved, with attainment for Level 2 broadly in line with national averages. Whilst attainment for Level 2B remained slightly below the national average, it was

highlighted that improvement was evident across all three areas of reading, writing and mathematics. Faira Ellks added that achievement at Level 2 was a good indicator of achievement at Level 4. For instance, it had been found that those children who achieved well at Level 2 were likely to achieve a Level 4 in Year 6.

- Key Stage 2

Faira Ellks noted that the number of pupils attaining Level 4 and above in both English and mathematics had fallen from the unusually high figure of 77%, achieved in 2010, to 73% in 2011. When this figure was adjusted to account for recent arrivals to Brent schools, it was expected that it would rise to bring Brent in line with the national average of 75% for 2011. In addition, progress rates from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 were at 85% for English and 83% for mathematics, as calculated under the new formula introduced for 2011 by the Department for Education (DfE); these figures were above the national averages for 2011.

- Key Stage 3

Faira Ellks advised that children were not required at this stage to take a statutory test and therefore, progress at Key Stage 3 was measured via teacher assessment. Consequently, due to a high degree of variation in the assessments conducted, this data did not create an accurate overview of performance in Brent at Key Stage 3. Currently, the data indicated that Brent's performance for English, Mathematics and Science were all below the national averages, although results had improved from 2010.

- Key Stage 4

The key performance indicator for Key Stage 4 measured the percentage of pupils who gained five A\* to C grades at GCSE, including English and mathematics. Brent was likely to be above the national average having achieved 63% for 2011, compared to 60% in 2010. Another performance indicator measured the percentage of pupils who gained five A\* to C grades in any subjects. Against this performance indicator, Brent had achieved 81% which was an increase of 6 percentage points from 2010.

- Key Stage 5

Faira Ellks informed the committee that there were two main performance indicators for Key Stage 5 which focussed on A level average point score per pupil and average point score per entry. For the latter of these, Brent continued to perform above the national average. For the former, Brent's performance had improved incrementally in recent years and the gap between Brent's performance and the national average was now minimal.

- Performance by ethnicity / free school meals (FSM)

Faira Ellks highlighted some of the trends evident from the analysis of the data on educational attainment by ethnicity and noted that there was an uneven

pattern overall. However, whilst there were still significant gaps between the performance of all Brent pupils and that of the three ethnic groups whose performance in recent years had caused the greatest concern (White Other, Somali and Black Caribbean), there had been significant improvements. The performance of children on FSM had also improved considerably.

Specifically, Fairra Ellks noted that outcomes for Somali pupils at Key Stage 2 had been poor but had improved at Key Stage 4. At Key Stage 4, the gap between the performance of Black Caribbean pupils and all Brent pupils had widened. The attainment of White Other pupils had improved reducing the overall gap between their performance and that of all Brent pupils. Outcomes for pupils on FSM were below those of non-FSM pupils at Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4; however, this group performed better than their counterparts nationally at Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2.

During members' discussion Councillor S Choudhary queried why educational attainment had fallen for Black Caribbean pupils at Key Stage 2, noting that English would not be a second language for children of that ethnicity. Fairra Ellks advised that there were many contributing factors that could be considered. An 'improving outcomes working group' had been established to identify such factors and devise measures to improve performance. It was also important to note that performance varied considerably across schools. Rik Boxer (Assistant Director, Achievement and Inclusion) reiterated that there were a variety of factors including poverty and peer pressure, which could affect educational attainment. However, lessons could be learnt from how the best performing schools supported pupils and monitored performance.

In response to several queries by the committee, Fairra Ellks advised that there were many different measures in place in schools to improve performance. In particular, good monitoring procedures in schools allowed interventions, such as one to one tutoring, to be appropriately targeted. Monitoring the overall performance of schools was a key function of the service offered by the council. The council worked intensively with schools to help identify problem areas and put appropriate measures in place; however, raising a school's performance took time. Responding to a concern that parents needed to be involved and made aware of bad schools, Fairra Ellks explained that there were not really any bad schools in Brent and noted that the role of the head teacher in encouraging parental involvement and creating a positive educational climate was key. She added that not all head teachers would be outstanding in this area. It was highlighted that governors would also play a key role in encouraging parental involvement.

The Chair thanked the officers for their contributions.

RESOLVED: - That the verbal report be noted.

## **9. Provision of Services for Children with Disabilities (Verbal Report)**

A verbal update report was presented to the committee by Rik Boxer (Assistant Director, Achievement and Inclusion) on the provision of services for children with disabilities. Rik Boxer noted that this item had been added as a standing item on the committee's work programme, following the decision taken by the Executive at

its meeting on 23 May 2011 to restructure the short term break offer provided by the Council. The restructure of the service encompassed the closure of the centre at Crawford Avenue and the provision of an enhanced service at the centre on Clement Close. He further clarified that the report did not aim to revisit the decision of the Executive but rather to update members on the implementation of the decision.

Rik Boxer informed the committee that on 23 August 2011 a judicial review had been filed against the decision of the Executive to close the centre at Crawford Avenue and restructure the provision of services for children with disabilities. The judicial review had since been concluded and notice of the outcome was expected imminently.

The schedule for implementation of the Executive's decision had been delayed as a result of the judicial review. It had been intended that the expanded service at Clement Close would be in place by October 2011 and in order to achieve this, a comprehensive staff training programme and a series of capital works had been planned. However, until the results of the judicial review were known, the centre at Crawford Avenue had remained open and the staff training programme and capital works had been put on hold. As part of the implementation of the Executive's decision, it had been intended to secure an independent adviser to provide advice and guidance to parents in choosing the most appropriate service options for their children. The committee was advised that an independent adviser was now in place.

The committee was reminded that the restructure of these services reflected the council's longer term strategy to concentrate the council's short break service for children with disabilities in a single site, namely that of the Village School. This centre was due to be open in late 2012 and the development of the site was currently on schedule. The building would be finished by early 2012 to allow sufficient time for the required Ofsted inspection to be conducted, which could take up to six months to complete.

During members' discussion, Councillor Harrison sought further information with respect to the implications of the staff at Crawford Avenue having been notified of their redundancy but the centre currently remaining open. Rik Boxer confirmed that the redundancy notices were issued to staff prior to the judicial review being submitted. The nine members of staff to whom these notices had been issued currently had the option to take their redundancy and discussions had been held with each staff member. Any individuals that did leave whilst the centre remained open would have to be replaced in order to maintain service delivery and a decision as to the best way to do this would have to be made.

RESOLVED: - that the verbal report be noted.

#### **10. Items on the Forward Plan in relation to Children and Young People**

Andrew Davies (Policy and Performance Officer) advised that the attached issue of the Forward Plan showed those items of relevance to the committee. He added that a new issue of the Forward Plan had been published since the agenda for the committee had been distributed.

The Chair sought further details regarding the report entitled 'future of Children's Centre childcare provision'. Councillor Arnold noted that a consultation was currently being held and a report would be brought to the Executive in December 2011 for a decision.

RESOLVED: -

That the items on the Forward Plan of relevance to the committee be noted.

**11. Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme**

Andrew Davies (Policy and Performance Officer) noted that there were several items listed for the next meeting of the Panel and suggested that a meeting be held with the Chair and Rik Boxer to agree which reports should be included on the agenda for the next meeting. The Chair added that there were a number of additional reports, arising out of the current meeting which would also need to be added to the agenda for the next meeting and/or the work programme.

Rik Boxer advised that the council was currently subject to an inspection around looked after children and safeguarding. The outcome of this inspection would be available by the next meeting of the committee. Councillor Arnold (Lead Member for Children and Families) advised that the council had also recently had an inspection on Youth Offending which might be of interest to the committee.

RESOLVED: - that the work programme be noted.

**12. Date of next meeting**

Several members of the committee noted that they may not be able to attend the next meeting scheduled for 7 December 2011 as it clashed with a meeting of the Schools Forum. It was subsequently agreed that the date of the next meeting would be changed to avoid a clash of dates with the Schools Forum meeting.

**13. Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

H GLADBAUM  
Chair