

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOMS 1,2,3, CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET, BRIDGEND ON MONDAY, 30<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2013 AT 2.00PM

Present:

Councillor E P Foley – Chairperson

D K Edwards	D G Owen	C Westwood
P N John	G Phillips	D B F White
M Jones	H J Townsend	

Registered Representatives & Co-opted Members:

Reverend Canon E J Evans (Church of Wales)  
Mr T Cahalane (Roman Catholic Church)  
Mr G Isaac (Secondary School Parent Governor)  
Mr R Thomas (Primary School Parent Governor)  
Mr W Bond (Special School Parent Governor)  
Mr J Hopkin Thomas (NAS/UWT)  
Mr K Pascoe

Officers:

R Harries	-	Senior Scrutiny Officer
R Keepins	-	Scrutiny Officer
J Monks	-	Democratic Services Officer - Committees

Invitees:

Councillor H J David	-	Cabinet Member – Children and Young People
C Turner	-	Head of Safeguarding and Family Support
V Watkins	-	Group Manager – Case Management
D McMillan	-	Interim Corporate Director – Children
M Beauchamp	-	Group Manager – Children and Learning
A Fletcher	-	Principal Solicitor – Corporate Team

71 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from the following Members for the reasons so stated:

Councillor C A Green	-	Holiday
Councillor R L Thomas	-	Holiday

72 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were received from Members and Officers:

Mr W Bond	-	Agenda Item 4 – Learner Transport Policy – Mr Bond declared a personal interest, as his daughter benefits from free school transport.
Mr T Cahalane	-	Agenda Items 4 and 5 – Learner Transport Policy and Nursery Education Policy - Mr Cahalane declared a personal interest, as he is a Foundation Governor at St Mary's and St Patrick's

Catholic School and a Parent Governor at Archbishop McGrath School.

- |                         |   |   |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Mr G Isaac              | - | Agenda Item 4 – Learner Transport Policy – Mr Isaac declared a personal interest, as both his children benefit from free school transport.                            |
| Mr K Pascoe             | - | Agenda Items 4 and 5 – Learner Transport Policy and Nursery Education Policy – Mr Pascoe declared a personal interest as his son benefits from free school transport. |
| Councillor H J Townsend | - | Agenda Item 4 – Learner Transport Policy – Councillor Townsend declared a prejudicial interest as she is the Student Union Representative at Bridgend College.        |
| R Keepins               | - | Agenda Item 5 – Nursery Education Policy – the Scrutiny Officer declared a personal interest as her daughter currently benefits from nursery provision.               |

**73 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of meetings of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on the 20<sup>th</sup> May and the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2013 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**74 APPOINTMENT OF REGISTERED REPRESENTATIVES TO THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Scrutiny Officer presented a report to inform the Committee that Father Bill Isaac and Reverend Canon Evans had both completed a term of office as representatives on the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

She advised that Mr Tim Cahalane had been nominated by the Archdiocese of Cardiff to serve as the representative for the Roman Catholic Church and Reverend Canon Evans had been nominated by the Church of Wales for re-appointment to serve a further term on the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Conclusions:** The Committee recommended to Council the appointment of the following representatives to the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee, each for a term of four years:

- 1) Mr Tim Cahalane as the representative from the Roman Catholic Church.
- 2) Reverend Canon Evans as the representative from the Church of Wales.

**75 LEARNER TRANSPORT POLICY**

Councillor Townsend left the meeting during this item.

The Scrutiny Officer took Members through the cover report and explained, particularly for the benefit of the Registered Representatives and the Co-opted Members, the financial difficulties the Council, along with the other local authorities, was currently facing.

In January 2013, the Committee recommended to Cabinet that Home to School Transport be given priority consideration in identifying possible savings for subsequent years, as the level of provision the Authority provided was amongst the most generous in Wales.

The Interim Corporate Director – Children presented a report to provide the Committee with an opportunity to comment on the proposals to change the Learner Transport Policy, in order to deliver savings in line with the Medium Term Financial Strategy. She explained that the Children's Directorate had difficult decisions to make and considerable time had been spent on a whole suite of proposals in an attempt to meet the required £3.1m savings for next year alone. Appendix A to the report detailed the School/College Transport Statistics 2011/12 and Appendix B outlined the proposed savings.

**One Member was concerned about the impact assessment as he believed the proposed changes had the potential to destabilise school attendance, particularly in relation to the voluntary aided (faith) schools.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that the whole of the learning community had been considered, including post-16 and the report had been presented to Cabinet for approval to go out to consultation. She explained that once feedback was obtained from the public and other stakeholders, then more detailed and robust proposals would be put forward, as there may be other proposals resulting from the consultation.

The Group Manager – Children and Learning explained that in the Learner Travel Wales Measure guidance, it expressed the opinion that although the Welsh Government and local authorities had recognised the value of faith education, it was up to local authorities to use their own discretionary powers. However, Section 10 of the Measure stipulated that there was a duty of care in Wales to promote access to education and training through the medium of Welsh.

**Another Member pointed out that the report had not contained information on transport for those children involved in the 14-19 collaboration agenda. He also commented on the link between attendance and attainment, and the hard work that had been undertaken by the schools to drive up standards in attendance which he believed could be destroyed by the proposed cuts.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children explained that currently grant funding paid for the 14-19 transport that was offered to those young people who were moved through collaboration; however the future of the grant was not known and once that funding ended, they would be treated the same as everyone else. She informed Members that research had been carried out on neighbouring authorities who had reduced transport provision to statutory measures, and no evidence was found that attendance had fallen as a result of that decision. She advised that whilst alternative proposals would be considered for those young people who were entitled to free school meals, it would reduce the amount of savings the proposals would make which would then have to come from another area such as the Education Welfare Service or the Psychology Service.

**A Member asked whether tertiary post-secondary education through collaborative courses between the schools and colleges would be considered within the next few years in view of the cuts.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children reported that a study on collaborative working is currently being undertaken by Tribal Education Limited linked in to the Post-16 provision and early indications from that research show that the provision currently provided works for learners as it gave them choices. She advised that there was concern that some students would not be able to afford to travel, which meant their only option would be to stay on in the

sixth form, and therefore Tribal Education Limited would also be now taking into consideration as part of their research the possible long term impact of this policy decision.

**One Member felt that the proposals went against Welsh Government guidance in relation to faith schools proposals. He also asked whether the new measures would be introduced incrementally, as the guidance had recommended that pupils should be able to complete their course.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children reassured Members that other options would be considered through and after consultation. The Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that the guidance states that this measure is not statutory; however there would be further discussions after consultation, as this was still being explored.

**Another Member referred to the tight deadline of the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2014, which in their opinion did not provide much time to implement any proposals.**

With regard to the deadline, the Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that the proposals were going out to consultation throughout the autumn followed by a report to Cabinet in January 2014.

**One Member asked whether the Road Safety Officer would include all routes in determining whether or not a route would be considered 'dangerous', and what form of independent review and scrutiny would be put in place. He also requested details on the Road Safety GB Guidance.**

The Group Manager – Children and Learning assured Members that all routes would be considered and explained that there were many things that would be taken into account such as the flow of traffic. Ultimately it would be for the Authority to make the decision based on advice provided by the Road Safety Officer.

**A Member was concerned that the cutbacks may result in a number of courses becoming unviable, particularly for the 16 to 18 year olds, and was disappointed that no work had been carried out on an impact assessment.**

**Another Member asked what impact the transport cuts would have on the inevitable increase in traffic around schools.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that expert advice from road safety colleagues and the Police would be taken into consideration.

**One Member believed that there was discrimination against college students, as school learners would still be able to access forms of school transport through paying places on school buses. He also pointed out that it would be difficult for some parents who would be required to pay for transport, to be able to afford an annual payment, and asked if there was an alternative payment plan.**

The Cabinet Member – Children and Young People explained that the Children's Directorate were required to make savings of £3m out of a total £13m the Authority was required to make. He advised that the biggest budget was for schools, which was protected, and the second biggest area was home to school transport, followed by the access and inclusion service where savings were also being made. The only other area remaining was the Safeguarding Children service which was heavily over-stretched due to increased demand. In relation to the annual payment for paid places, the Group Manager – Children and Learning explained that there had been cases where parents had struggled to pay the full payment up front and so a payment plan had been arranged but these instances were dealt with by finance as and when it occurred.

**Conclusions:**

Following the Committee's consideration of the report and its appendices, Members wished to make the following comments and recommendations as part of the consultation process:

1. The Committee were supportive of Proposal (a) in relation to Rationalisation of SEN Transport and commented that strong management in terms of implementation and monitoring would be the key.
2. Further to this, Members requested that as part of the rationalisation of SEN Transport, Officers explore whether the Authority is double funding for SEN pupils who receive a Disability Living Allowance at the highest rate for mobility, as this includes an allowance/(car) for transport for their child.
3. The Committee commented on the lack of clear definitive guidelines from Welsh Government for Learner Transport provision for Welsh Medium and Voluntary Aided Schools. The ambiguity of the statutory guidelines had led to various interpretations and understanding between both Officers and Members, which was unhelpful.

**Recommendations:**

- A. The Committee recommended that Home to School Transport provision for Voluntary Aided Schools remain in line with the proposals for Welsh Medium Schools, whereby transport was provided irrespective of whether there was alternative non-faith or non-Welsh schools being closer.
- B. The Committee recommended that should any reductions be made to Home to College Transport, they would strongly support mitigation measure 3 in the report, which was to 'provide free transport for those students in receipt of an Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) and who live outside the qualifying distance criterion of 3 miles.'
- C. The Committee expressed concerns that the proposal for charging for post-16 transport did not treat all learners equally as it proposes partially subsidising transport for school learners, with no similar proposals for college learners. The Committee therefore recommend that if this proposal is taken forward, in order to treat all learners equally, a similar provision should be made such as a comparable contribution towards bus passes for post-16 college learners.
- D. The Committee recommended that any proposals for changes to school transport needed to be a 'phased in approach' whereby they are introduced incrementally. The Committee recommended that a phased approach was particularly important in relation to proposal (c); to remove all provision for Home to College transport; as well as proposal (e); to remove provision for Voluntary Aided schools where the school was not the nearest available school and beyond the statutory distance.
- E. The Committee recommended that termly payments for 'paying places' (as opposed to annual payments) be more widely promoted to parents in order to assist and encourage parents to take up those places.
- F. The Committee recommended that further discussions be held with FE providers to determine whether they could assist in contributions towards transport for their learners.

The Committee further highlighted the following as areas that still needed to be considered for any proposed changes to Learner Transport:

- Road Safety Issues;

- All routes needed to be risk assessed;
- Impact of increases in cars outside schools as a result of proposed changes to Learner Transport;
- Impact on attendance as a result of proposed changes to Learner Transport;
- Potential risks to children as there was no legal requirement for parents to accompany children to school, which could lead to an increase in children of a young age walking to school unaccompanied;
- Impact of proposed changes on the Authority's NEETs figures;
- Impact on the 14-19 Collaboration Agenda – Members highlighted this as a risk given the uncertainty of future grant funding for pupils' transport under this project. If grant funding were to be removed, these pupils would fall under the same transport policy as other learners and could therefore be greatly affected by the proposed changes to Learner Transport.

The Committee concluded by requesting that they receive the firm proposals, once they have been developed further following consultation, as a pre-scrutiny item, prior to any final decision being made by Cabinet.

## 76 NURSERY EDUCATION POLICY

The Interim Corporate Director – Children presented a report to inform the Committee of a range of options for proposed changes to the Council's Nursery Education Policy, to contribute towards the savings outlined in the Medium Term Financial Strategy, and provide Members with the opportunity to make their comments on the proposals. She stated that a project board had been set up, with representation from other Directorates, to oversee the Schools and Early Years budget savings. The project board identified four options to consider, which were detailed at paragraph 4.9 of the report.

**One Member referred to the 1% pay award that was being made to both teaching and non-teaching staff which, in his experience, was having an effect on primary schools and producing negative budgets already. Option 4, he believed, would add to this deficit and could possibly mean redundancies and have an impact on class sizes. He asked whether there was the possibility that, should Option 4 be adopted, the Authority would simply be looking again next year at reducing the Early Years Budget to make further savings again.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children explained that Option 2 and Option 4 had different outcomes in terms of whether a school was a Primary or a Secondary. If the Authority chose either Option 2a or 2b, it would mean a loss of £29k, but if Option 4 was chosen, then the top-slicing would be around £16k. Therefore the best option for Primary Schools would be Option 4, as the cost would be shared across the schools, and ultimately secondary schools would benefit from pupils receiving a good standard of nursery education.

**The Member noted this, however, also pointed out that the loss under Option 4 would affect the budget of the whole school and you would then also be providing the same nursery service on reduced funding. The loss under Option 2 would only affect the Nursery provision which would be a reduced service.**

**Another Member asked for confirmation that Option 4 was legal.**

The Cabinet Member – Children and Young People advised that confirmation had come from the Minister for Education who had been supportive of the Authority's commitment to the Early Years provision. International evidence had shown that to achieve the most effective improvement in education, as well as in social and wellbeing terms, investment must be made in the early years, particularly for those pupils who came from the most disadvantaged backgrounds. He explained that 1 in 5 children in the Borough had additional learning needs.

He added that there had been significant improvement in outcomes for children at foundation phase, due to full time provision, unlike most parts of Wales where only part time provision was available.

**One Member commented that it was important to also consider other options, as he did not want to see a “them and us” situation being created between the Primary and Secondary schools. He believed that the suggested cuts were a short term fix, which may create a problem in the future, particularly with regard to NEETS, and asked what the direct impact would be on secondary schools if Option 2 were to be implemented.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that all head teachers in the Borough had been made aware of the Cabinet reports, and whilst the secondary school head teachers had expressed concerns regarding top slicing, the primary school head teachers had focused more on the Learner Transport Policy. The reports would be debated at a future meeting of both the secondary head teachers and the Primary School head teachers.

**A Member asked if funding would continue for the Flying Start project.**

The Cabinet Member – Children and Young People informed Members that as it was one of its flagships, the Welsh Government was committed to double the number of places across Wales, including Bridgend.

**One Member asked about the vulnerable groups and enquired how much parents would be charged for the extra hours.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that it had not been determined who those vulnerable groups are as they could cover a number of different situations, such as children with ALN, LAC, children who are carers, children with parents who have alcohol or substance misuse issues, and following consultation they should have an understanding of who exactly those groups are.

The Cabinet Member – Children and Young People explained his concern that it would prove difficult to know where to draw the line as 1 in 5 children in the Borough had additional learning needs; 1 in 10 children were registered with Social Services and 1,200 children in need, which amounted to around a third of the children in Bridgend and it remained an option for consideration. He reported that there had been significant improvement in outcomes for children at the foundation phase, which was due to having full time provision available, unlike most parts of Wales which only had part time provision.

The Interim Corporate Director – Children advised that the provisional figures showed 82.3% provision in Bridgend as opposed to 80.5% for the Welsh average and the target for this year was 78.3%, therefore Bridgend was exceeding the set target. However, she advised that those figures could not be compared to different school years, due to a change in the target, but confirmed that there had been an increase in provision.

**One Member pointed out that he did not wish to see an “us and them” situation being created between primary and secondary schools; however the figures on page 67 of the report showed a reduction of £64,246.25 for Oldcastle Primary School, if Option 2 were to be chosen, which seemed a considerable amount for a small school. He stressed the importance of looking at other options. He believed that the cuts would create a problem in the future, particularly for NEETS, as it seemed to be a short term fix, and asked what the direct impact would be for secondary schools.**

The Interim Corporate Director – Children explained that Primary School Head Teachers had been extremely vocal with regard to the nursery education Policy and they will be sent copies of relevant Cabinet reports to debate at their Primary Head Teachers' meeting.

**Another Member referred to Bridgend's generous provision for nursery education and yet we were still only achieving 10<sup>th</sup> out of the 22 local authorities in terms of results, pointing out that some other authorities, who only provided the statutory provision, were doing better than Bridgend. He asked for clarification of where the Authority stood.**

The Cabinet Member – Children and Young People explained that the information contained in the report was accurate at the time of publishing, which was some time ago. Recent figures reported that the Authority was somewhere in the top quartile and Bridgend had above average number of disadvantaged children, which was testament to the quality of the schools in the Borough, compared to other local authorities, confirmed by the Estyn inspection.

### **Conclusions:**

Following the Committee's consideration of the report and its appendices, Members wished to make the following comments and recommendations in response as part of the consultation process:

- Members commented that there was not enough financial information on each school in order to compare between option 2 and option 4 effectively.
- After detailed deliberation the Committee determined to make a vote on the options put before them which led to the following results:

Option 1	–	0 Votes
Option 2a	–	0 Votes
Option 2b	–	6 Votes
Option 3	–	1 Vote
Option 4	–	5 Votes
- The Committee voted to support Option 2b; however, they further added that this option should also incorporate the inclusion of vulnerable groups to continue to receive enhanced provision.
- Members further identified the following groups for consideration for inclusion under the 'vulnerable groups' heading:
  - 1) Those eligible for Free School Meals;
  - 2) Those on the Child Protection Register or a Looked After Child;
  - 3) Those with Special Educational Needs;
  - 4) Those within Flying Start Areas.
- The Committee also made a further recommendation that Option 4 be amended to include the removal of parental choice of maintained versus non-maintained settings to ensure that public money is directed towards the maintained sector, (i.e. schools), and should not be used for private sector provision.
- The Committee concluded by requesting that they receive the firm proposals, once they have been developed further following consultation, as a pre-scrutiny item, prior to any final decision being made by Cabinet.

## **77 LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN – IMPACT OF THE PUBLIC LAW OUTLINE**

The Scrutiny Officer presented a report to advise the Committee of the impact of the Public Law Outline (PLO) on the Safeguarding and Family Support Service as well as the Legal and



Regulatory Service. The changes are one of the outcomes of the Review of the Child Care Proceedings System in England and Wales which the Committee were updated on in August this year. A report from the Corporate Director – Children was attached at Appendix A which detailed the impact of the recent changes arising out of the Family Justice Review 2011.

The Head of Safeguarding and Family Support advised that the new PLO process was compulsory and would have an enormous impact, presenting formidable challenges for both the legal and family support services.

The Group Manager – Case Management informed Members that the new PLO went live on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2013, and cut across all of the Safeguarding Teams. The previous protocol was 40 weeks for the completion of cases, but that had now been reduced to a maximum of 26 weeks, with a view that it could be achieved within 20 weeks. In addition to this, where the costs of assessments for a child's case were previously shared, the pre-proceedings costs now had to be met by the Authority. The positive side though, was that the Social Worker was now regarded as an expert witness in Court proceedings, therefore they would need to have the ability to prepare Court assessments.

The Group Manager – Case Management commented that Bridgend was experiencing some problems with these changes, mostly because at the moment the number of newly qualified social workers had increased drastically with nearly half to three quarters of the number of social workers assigned to each of the five teams being newly qualified. There were both advantages and disadvantages with recruiting such newly qualified staff, in that they brought with them new ideas and methods of working though they did not initially have the sufficient experience to process cases unassisted, which put added pressure on the senior practitioners who were required to mentor them.

She also informed Members that to assist with the changes under the PLO, they were looking at training up staff to carry out assessments in-house. Currently, assessments were outsourced, with costs, for example, of £1500 for a cognitive assessment, or £1750 for a family conference. By getting staff to carry these assessments out in-house, the cost would be drastically reduced.

The Principal Solicitor – Corporate Team also added that heavy penalties of up to £5000 were being enforced if the 26 week target was not reached, and there was no leeway. She reported that the number of children who were looking to be adopted far outnumbered those adopters who were waiting to adopt. This was partly the result of IVF becoming more easily available, as well as the increase in the number of children entering the care system. The effect was that adopters were becoming choosier as to what sort of child they wished to adopt, and children had to wait to be found adopters. She advised that the changes to the PLO and the reduction in the target meant that more lawyers would be required with smaller caseloads, and the Legal and Regulatory Services could not cut the amount it spent on resourcing.

**One Member referred to newly qualified Social Workers and asked whether the Authority was communicating with Universities on the necessity for those students to have an understanding of the new framework. She informed Members that students were required to have 240 hours of voluntary time before they are accepted on a course to become a Social Worker, and asked whether that was taken on board when recruiting.**

The Group Manager – Case Management reported that the training department regularly had meetings with the Universities and had attended a number of sessions by the Care Council. She advised that University reports had talked about what they were planning to do next year, or the year after, which meant that students were qualifying now, who did not have the experience and so Social Workers were coming into the profession ill-prepared.

With regard to voluntary work, she explained that the Safeguarding Teams did not have the capacity or staff to oversee such work as they were already struggling to provide mentors for the students.

**One member asked how the new Child Protection process had impacted on Social Workers.**

The Head of Safeguarding and Family Support reported that whilst the adoption plan was appropriate for younger children, they needed to ensure a permanency plan was submitted to the Court, particularly for older children, through special guardianship orders. Also the Integrated Family Support Services experience had a substantial number of people who were not qualified, such as volunteers and people on work experience. He advised that when those posts were advertised, they received in excess of 100 applications, so there was no shortage of people to train. He referred to the Workwise project, and advised that there were a lot of incremental changes in reducing paperwork; duplication and filing and the Assessment Team now had an electronic filing system. He commented that whilst it brought efficiencies in terms of access, Social Workers still spent 70% of their time on paperwork rather than directly working with families and the Safeguarding Teams had far more performance indicators than any other department in the Authority.

**Conclusions:**

- The Committee commented on the lack of financial information contained within the report in relation to the associated costs and impact therein from the Public Law Outline.
- The Committee praised and strongly supported the work that was being undertaken towards training staff to carry out assessments for Looked After Children in order to bring these in-house and reduce costs.
- Given the number of newly qualified social workers within Bridgend and the impact that lack of capacity to provide mentors for these individuals, the Committee proposed that the Directorate look to retired social workers to possibly assist in becoming mentors.
- Given the reduced timescale for the completion of cases, the Committee proposed that consideration be given to prioritising any further Workwise work related to this area that may assist in streamlining processes and achieving the 26 week deadline.
- Members proposed that the Scrutiny Committee write to the Education Minister, Huw Lewis, to express strong concerns over the Social Work Degree within universities in that the qualification they are obtaining is not providing them with the experience necessary to enter the workplace and carry out the job required of them. Members therefore questioned whether students were receiving value for money, particularly given the increase in tuition fees in recent years.
- The Committee noted the report and agreed that the impact of the Public Law Outline needed to be strongly incorporated into the LAC Strategy, and as such Members would need to consider this at their next meeting when receiving the draft strategy.

**78 SOCIAL SERVICES ANNUAL REPORTING FRAMEWORK**

The Scrutiny Officer provided a report to update Members on the work of the Joint Research and Evaluation Panel held on the Social Services Annual Reporting Framework in June and July 2013.

The Panel met on three separate occasions and relevant Officers from both the Children's and Wellbeing Directorates were in attendance at the last two meetings. Some of the Panel's main points were summarised at paragraph 4.3 of the report.

**Conclusions:** That the Committee noted the work of the Joint Research and Evaluation Panel.

**79 NOMINATION FOR JOINT RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PANEL INVESTIGATION INTO FOSTERING PLACEMENTS FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN**

The Scrutiny Officer presented to ask the Committee to nominate four Members to sit on the Joint Research and Evaluation Panel (REP) to consider the subject of Fostering Placements for Looked After Children. She advised Members that the REP would consist of a maximum of two meetings only.

The purpose of the REP would be to establish and understand why the costs for Independent Fostering Agency placements were so high and to try and determine what could be done to reduce those placements and increase the number of in-house placements, at a much lower cost to the Authority.

**Conclusions:**

The Committee appointed the following four Members to sit on the Joint Research and Evaluation Panel to consider the subject of Fostering Placements for Looked After Children:

Councillor D G Owen  
Councillor H J Townsend

Mr K Pascoe  
Councillor D B F White

**80 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

The Scrutiny Officer presented a report outlining the items due to be considered at the meeting of the Committee on the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013, and further sought confirmation of the information required for the subsequent scheduled meeting to be held on the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

**Conclusions:**

The Committee noted the topics due to be considered at the meeting of the Committee scheduled for the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and acknowledged the invitees to attend the subsequent meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairperson wished the Scrutiny Officer every success; as she was due to go on maternity leave.

The meeting closed at 6.10pm.