

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on Monday, 27th January 2014 at 6.00pm in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford.

PRESENT: Councillors M. Ion (Chair), G. Green, J. Loveridge, J. Pinter, C. Turley and Co-optees S. Ali, A. Atkinson, R. Aveley, S. Harris and S. Rayner.

Attending: J. Collins, Assistant Director Education & Corporate Parenting; J. Britton, Service Delivery Manager Safeguarding Advisory Service; C. Jones, Assistant Director Family & Cohesion Services; V. McKay, Interim Service Delivery Manager, Children and Families and Transport; R. Smith, Interim Assistant Director Adult Social Services; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

CYPSC-27 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 26TH November 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

CYPSC-28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr. A. Mackenzie.

CYPSC-29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

CYPSC-30 VALIDATED EDUCATION RESULTS

The Chair reminded members that the Committee had received a report on the unvalidated education results for the borough at the meeting in November and had requested a further report in January once the data had been validated and the results for Children in Care were known. An updated report had been circulated as Appendix B and the Chair invited the Assistant Director Education & Corporate Parenting (AD) to highlight the changes in the report since the last meeting.

The AD highlighted the following changes:

a) Key Stage 2

The change to the headlines was: *Value Added from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 is 99.5 compared to 100 nationally; this is significantly negative and places T&W in the 80 percentile.*

The AD acknowledged this was not good and that they would be working with individual schools to look at how this could be improved. Being in the “80 percentile” meant that Telford and Wrekin was in the bottom 20% in the country. The Department of Education had put more emphasis on progress results than before. Previously the emphasis had been on thresholds, but equally important this year was how much progress children had made so results could be good if the children had made good progress even if they had not reached the threshold. In some schools in Telford and Wrekin there could have been an element of “coasting” where children were reaching the threshold but not making as much progress as they could have. The AD hoped to report a better position next year.

The Chair said this was not an insignificant change and agreed it was not where the borough would want to be. Cllr. Green asked what specific steps were being put in place to improve the position. The AD said they had done a lot of work over the last few months, for example:

- They had done a lot of training with governing bodies to make them more effective in holding the schools to account for performance and progress. Mr. Atkinson said he was pleased to hear this because the role of governing bodies was often not well understood or well developed and a strong and effective governing body was a mark of a good school. The AD said that a Chair of Governors, a former head teacher in another authority and member of the executive of the National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT), had reported back to the NAHT representative that the training was second to none in the country.
- There was a Protocol for School Improvement. Schools were categorised into one of 4 categories aligned to Ofsted ratings - category 3 aligned to Ofsted’s “requiring improvement” rating (the old “satisfactory” rating). Schools in category 3 were expected to develop a focussed action plan and to report back to a senior moderator at the Council on progress. Ofsted inspectors were providing support and challenge to the authority’s school improvement arrangements.

Mr. Rayner requested the School Improvement Strategy and a breakdown of schools by category to come back to a future meeting.

The Chair asked about the Ofsted ratings of school in the borough and the AD said there were no schools rated “inadequate” and seven rated “requiring improvement”.

The Chair was concerned that two of the three schools below floor standard, Ladygrove and Wombridge, were so significantly below the national threshold for 2 levels of progress in Maths. The AD said for this reason they were subject to half-termly monitoring and support from a maths consultant in the School Improvement Team and Raising Attainment Plans (RAP) were in place. An Ofsted inspection was due at Ladygrove at the end of the month and the report could come back to the Committee. There were specific reasons for the issues at Ladygrove, but 64% was well below average. Dawley was close to floor (59% L4+ R/W & Maths) and one child would lift the school to floor standard (60%). All three schools were category 3 for monitoring. School Improvement Managers had met the Academies Performance division last week to discuss the improvement plans. The Chair wanted to know if any of the three schools were below floor in 2012/13. The information was not available at the meeting and would be circulated later.

b) Key Stage 4

The change to the headlines was: *Value Added from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 is 1005.0 compared to 1000 nationally; this is significantly positive and places T&W in the 28th percentile.*

The AD said that overall there was a mixed picture at KS4. The headline figure (5A*-C including English and Maths) had fallen from 2012. They had worked very hard to lift this above the national average and it was disappointing that it had fallen below. There was a pattern of schools who thought they would do well but hadn't. All 4 of the schools in the Multi-Academy Trust had dipped in performance. The Open Academies Performance division had visited and had given the schools the benefit of the doubt because of the competing pressures of becoming an academy trust, but they would revisit in 6 months.

Conversely, performance on 5A*-C across all subjects continued to do well (almost 88%) and well above national average.

The English Baccalaureate, a new measure introduced by the Secretary of State, had increased broadly in line with national average.

In terms of the value added, KS4 was opposite to KS2:

- KS1-KS2 T&W 99.5, national 100 = below national average = bottom fifth
- KS2-KS4 T&W 1005.0, national 1000 = above average = top third.

The Chair noted that the headline figures were for all pupils in the borough regardless of whether the authority maintained the school or not and he wanted to know what the picture would look like if the results were disaggregated. The AD said in terms of schools maintained by the Council the only community schools were Burton Borough and HLC, and the other non-academy schools were Ercall Wood (Trust), BRJ (Faith) and Charlton (Trust). The Chair noted the high number of schools over which the authority had no influence, but the AD said that through the Secondary Heads and Principals forum and the Learning Partnership the authority should still be able to hold the non-maintained schools to account. The authority cannot insist on inspection visits, but could request a termly visit, and if there was a significant dip in performance or the authority received a lot of legitimate complaints from parents, it would be feasible to notify the academy that they wanted to come in and examine the data and the Academy could not object. The Chair requested results disaggregated by school type i.e. those that were maintained by the authority and those that were not.

The Chair requested historical data on the schools below floor standard – Phoenix and Lakeside Academies – and said it would be useful to have a Protocol for working with the academies and this was one of the recommendations the Committee would make in the report on primary places looking at the Staffordshire Protocol as a model. Mr. Rayner said local authorities have no statutory powers of intervention in academies but are expected to report them to central government if they are failing and the Protocol set out the guidelines for reporting performance which had been jointly developed and agreed with the academies. The AD both schools were part of the

national challenge. They had been above floor in 2010 and remained above in 2011. Phoenix had fallen below last year which was why the school had been approached about joining the Multi-Academy Trust. Phoenix had fallen again this year. Lakeside had dropped below floor for the first time this year. They had been scrutinised by the Open Academies Performance inspectors who wanted to see fast progress as converter academies – the number of pupils making 3 levels progress was well below average and they wanted to see improvement. In terms of Ofsted judgements, schools do not keep their Ofsted judgement when they convert to academy status. Phoenix had an Ofsted rating of “Requires Improvement” before it had become an academy, but the judgement had fallen by the wayside when it converted. Lakeside had a “Good” judgement, but this had fallen by the wayside when the school had become a Co-operative Trust and then joined the Multi-Academy Trust in June 2013. The Multi-Academy Trust had come into being on 1st April 2013 (except Lakeside which had joined in June) and they would be inspected again in 12 months.

c) **Key Stage 5**

There were no new headlines since the last report. ‘A’ Levels were delivered in the schools Newport Girls’ High, Adams Grammar and a small number at BRJ with post-16 provision at TCAT, New College which had improved from Ofsted “satisfactory” to “good” and the Thomas Telford City Technology College had around 400 students post-16. There was nothing in the KS5 results to cause alarm.

d) **Analysis of the Results for Pupil Groups**

These were top line analyses of results by nationally significant groups. Performance above average was shown in green and below average in red. The results reflected the pattern of below average performance at KS2 and above average at KS4.

o Free School Meals

There had been a change to the way the measure was applied since last year from pupils in receipt of free school meals to pupils eligible for free school meals over the last 6 years. The gap in Telford and Wrekin had widened compared to the national gap and there was therefore a need to do some specific targeting to close the gap. The gap across the UK was wide and was a concern for the government – the Pupil Premium was meant to help address the gap. Schools are required to explain how the Pupil Premium is used and should publish the information. It was not having as big an impact as the government had hoped. The money had increased and interventions were being developed. Locally all schools would be monitored, not just category 3 schools.

The Chair noted the differential between Telford and Wrekin and national was not huge, and the AD said that was true but the national base was low. Mr. Atkinson said there seemed to be a lack of understanding about how to tackle the issue and the AD agreed that seemed to be the case – there had been a lot of national programmes but with little impact and the gap had remained.

- Children in Care

The report showed results for Telford and Wrekin children in care compared to their peers and children in care nationally from KS1 to KS4. The KS2 results made uncomfortable reading - of 14 in the cohort only 7% (1 child) had achieved a level 4 combined reading, writing and maths at KS2. The 14 children were spread over a range of schools with 1-3 pupils per school. Of the 14, 10 were Telford & Wrekin children in care and the other 4 were placed in Telford and Wrekin by other authorities. The AD outlined of the factors and barriers affecting the 10 young people (7 were on statements or School Action Plus) which had contributed to the low level of attainment. They were challenging the schools to put the right interventions in place to support the young people. Children in foster care are not in receipt of free school meals so they do not attract the Pupil Premium and these strands need to be tied together. The numbers in the children in care year cohorts are small and fluctuate from year to year which can affect results hugely but 1 out of 14 was not good enough and more needed to be done.

The Chair said the report only provide a snap shot in time. He requested the trend data for children in care and the predicted outcomes for 2014 for children in care in years 6 and 11. He said this would help us see what direction things are going in and what practitioners are saying and they could go back to the teachers next year to evaluate what happened. He said that they should also be talking to teachers about all 14 of the children in care and not just the 10 Telford & Wrekin children in care and this was more difficult to do if they did not know what teachers had been saying a year ago.

Mr. Rayner asked whether there was a Virtual Head for children in care as required nationally and what difference they were making. The AD there should be better identification of where children in care are but they had to rely on the placing authority notifying them that a child had been placed in the borough. The Chair said the Committee had picked this up as an issue and made recommendations, and he thought identification had improved through the provider conference. The AD said they relied on being notified by placing authorities. The Virtual Head had been in place since April 2013 (2 terms) and he was confident they would make a difference - a report could be brought back to the next meeting.

Cllr. Green asked how information about results for children in care could be presented so performance is not politicised. The Chair said the duty of schools for all children should not be conflated with the role of governing bodies in holding the schools to account – they should be asking these questions. Mr. Austin said levels of responsibility needed to be unpacked. The AD said they had worked hard with the designated teachers - sometimes there was only one child in care in the school. Outcomes for children in care nationally were not good – 45% of children in care achieved KS2, L4 combined maths/reading/writing compared to 76% of non-children in care. Telford and Wrekin was way adrift this year but the specifics of the cohort accounted for the figures and should not be compared with poor national averages. It was necessary to be realistic with children in care.

- Ethnicity

The Chair asked for the numbers in each cohort to be provided. The AD said the group of most concern was the Pakistani learners. This was not new and had been the same for a number of years and they had tried to tackle this, for example in Shortwood there had been one year of disappointing results so the group had had concerted support and they had shown good improvement but it needed to be sustained and it was difficult. There were also contributory social and cultural influences. Mrs. Harris said there had been an on-going issue with extended holidays for Pakistani children, for example 3 year 6 children had been away for 6 weeks during the period leading up to the SATs, so in spite of government guidelines some parents were making the wrong decisions for their children. The Chair asked if they had done an analysis of the impact and Mrs. Harris said they had for Shortwood and the AD said he was not sure this was done for the borough.

When there were no further questions the Chair thanked the AD who left the meeting for another engagement.

CYPSC-31 IRO ANNUAL REPORT

The Chair reminded members that this item was to fulfil the Committee's recommendation in the report on the Children in Care Placement Strategy that the IRO (Independent Reviewing Officer) Annual Report should be brought to the Committee and the LSCB (Local Safeguarding Children Board). The Committee had also recommended that the service should be moved out of safeguarding and into scrutiny which had not been agreed but the service had been moved into the skills and education service to be independent from safeguarding.

The report had been circulated as Appendix C and the Chair said he felt there was much to celebrate in the report. He invited the Safeguarding Advisory Service Manager to highlight the key points from the report.

The Manager highlighted the following points:

- The report had been presented to the LSCB two weeks previously and had been well received.
- The report was set in the context of wider quality assurance activity of the conference and reviewing unit
- The main author of the report was the Principal Officer for Child Protection
- The report described the role of IROs, the legal context and the team in Telford & Wrekin. Key roles were to scrutinise care planning activity and the discharge of the authority's duty as corporate parent. The service had been moved into Education & Skills to enable the IROs to provide independent challenge with a separate reporting structure. The Children & Young People's Act had introduced a suite of reforms to make the IRO role more robust with guidance set out in the IRO Handbook. There were 5.4 FTE IROs including one temporary post. In 2011/12 the IROs' had an average caseload of 120-140. Under Care Planning regulations, the IRO Handbook and the Family Justice Review the recommended caseload per officer was 70. The additional temporary post had reduced caseloads to around 90 including children on child protection plans and children in care.

- The section on data and performance showed the trends in the number of children subject to care protection plans and the number of children in care. Children on care protection plans had reduced from the previous year. Detailed data was provided in Appendix 1 and 2.
- Children's participation in care reviews was fairly pleasing although work was being done to improve performance especially around child protection conferences. More staff had been trained in advocacy and a protocol had been developed and there had been an improvement in the number of children and young people attending conferences.
- Feedback from young people who had a review during March was shown in the report and examples were given of how the feedback had been taken on board or taken up with foster carers so they could support the young person, for example children said they were hungry if they went to the review straight from school. There had been good feedback from the Meet Your IRO day which was about increasing participation and involvement.
- A key part of the report was the section on Quality Assurance – a lot of hard work had been done on the QA systems and processes. At each care review the IRO makes a judgement and gives the care plan a RAG rating. The percentage of all RAG ratings are recorded and analysed to highlight themes, positive practice or areas for action. This system of monitoring meant that issues were moved forward quickly and there were strict timescales for addressing each type of issue. Red issues were serious concerns and must be addressed within 1-2 weeks.
- Section 5.2 set out some of the challenges for IROs. Capacity to monitor was an issue and the appointment of the temporary IRO post had relieved some of the caseload pressure. A significant amount of work had been done to change the culture of the service and to give the IROs the confidence to challenge, supported by their managers. Specific examples of challenges were set out in Appendix 3. A key element was the introduction of the 2 week timeline which had a massive impact for the young people. They were concentrating on effectiveness and impact which was difficult to convey in a document.
- Dispute resolution, child protection conferences and audit activity were within the scope of the QA framework and reported back to the Director. Details of themed audits carried out over the year were described in section 6. In terms of participation in reviews, the Manager said that a child may not want to attend a review or they may not want their parents to attend, so participation happens in a different way – possibly through a number of different meetings – and the important point was the quality and effectiveness of the participation.
- The service had been reviewed by Ofsted in their 2012 inspection which had looked at capacity issues. There were a number of recommendations which had been implemented.

There were then a number of comments and questions from Members:

- The Chair asked the Manager what she felt were the key successes. The Manager said the increased capacity to monitor effectively had made a big difference. The drive to increase capacity had come from the IRO Handbook, the Family Justice Review and the Ofsted inspection which highlighted the impact of capacity issues on outcomes. Another success was the change of culture and

increased confidence of the IROs to challenge and embedding practices which social workers and service delivery managers were taking on board.

- The Chair asked what the biggest challenge was. The Manager said improving effective participation was a big challenge especially children with learning disabilities in case conferences.
- The Chair said there was much to celebrate in the report and that as a group the Committee was delighted with progress. He was delighted that the Cabinet member had responded so positively to the Committee's recommendations and delighted to receive the report.
- Cllr. Green noted 54% of children had attended reviews and which was just over half and she wanted to know why the other half had not. The Manager said the report used old categories for reporting back. There were different ways of participating and they were working hard to improve the effectiveness of participation for example through advocacy (29%) or in writing (15%). 1.5% had not attended or participated in other ways and these cases were being challenged to look at why. The important thing was the quality and the effectiveness of participation which is what they were putting a lot of work into. Mr. Atkinson said he felt the focus on quality shone through the report and he said well done to the officers.
- The Chair noted from the feedback from young people on reviews, 8 said they had got a copy of the notes from the meeting and 7 said they had not and he wanted to know what the young people should expect. The Manager said the sample was relatively small. They had looked at mechanisms to make better outcomes for the children in care and the young people may have had the outcomes from the meeting but not the final report. The administration process had been looked at and the next report would look different because it would be standard practice to get the notes.
- The Chair turned to the Quality Assurance and the RAG ratings and checked his understanding that it was the IROs making a judgement about whether a care plan was progressing well or not. The Manager confirmed this was the case. The Chair wanted to know who quality assured and moderated the IROs. The Manager explained the IROs used a new tool with different thresholds for deciding ratings. There were round table discussions and on-going monitoring in team meetings and the team leader acted as moderator.
- The Chair asked how many care plans the 4% rated red related to and how a red rating acted as a trigger for action. The manager did not have the number of care plans to hand at the meeting but confirmed a red rating indicted a serious concern and possible breach of the child's human rights and triggered immediate discussion with the team leader. There were timescales for actions so the care plan was not compromised. If the problem was not resolved quickly, the IRO could escalate to the Dispute Resolution procedure and if the problem was still not resolved the IROs could refer cases to CAF/CASS. The Chair said this information

should be included in future reports and Mr. Rayner said it would be useful to report trends on the RAG ratings each year.

When there were no further questions the Chair asked the Manager to pass the good feedback from members about the excellent progress to the rest of the team which he would also confirm in writing. The Manager then left the meeting.

CYPSC-32 QUEENSWAY CARE CONTRACT

The Chair reminded members that a recommendation in the scrutiny report on Children in Care Placements had been for a report on the outcomes of the care contract at Jigsaw to be brought to the Committee after 6 months. A report had been circulated as Appendix D and the Chair invited the Assistant Director Family & Cohesion Services (AD) and the Interim Manager to highlight the key outcomes.

The Manager flagged up the following points:

- The residential care contract at Queensway (formerly known as Jigsaw) had been awarded to Bettercare Keys and commenced 1st August 2013
- The headline was that the previous weekly unit cost had been around £3000 and the weekly cost under the new contract was around £1900.
- There had been a smooth transfer to the new contact with continuity of care for the young people; the staff and manager had remained the same.
- House 2 (used previously for residential care) was registered by Ofsted and handed over. House 3 (not used as a residential home for 5 years) was registered by Ofsted in October and is now being used. Members had been invited to an open day at House 3 before it was occupied.
- An Outcomes Tracker tool was used to measure outcomes for the young people, linked to the IROs to benchmark children in care outcomes. The tracker had been revised and improved. There were 5 outcomes based on the Team Around the Child measures. The children living in the homes, social workers and care workers carried out self-assessments to measure progress which would be reported at the end of the year.
- In terms of cost savings, the previous cost of residential care at Jigsaw of £3000 per week had reduced to £1900 per week for spot beds (6) and £1965 for block beds (2). This compared to the average weekly unit cost of residential care for children in care placements of £2649 and had resulted in a saving to date of £77k. The contact had brought down the average weekly cost of residential placements which would impact on the Cost Improvement Plan and had brought more of the children in care closer to home.
- There were regular contract meetings and dialogue so there was a good handle on the position. There was a mix of young people in the houses. There was high occupancy (76%) and the plan was to increase occupancy to 85% over the next 6 months.

There were then the following comments and questions:

- The Chair remarked that the report was incredibly positive and the outcomes were

better than could have been hoped for. He congratulated the officers and asked them to pass on the Committee's thanks and congratulations to the rest of the team.

- Mr. Aveley asked whether House 3 was fully up and running now and the Manager confirmed Houses 2 and 3 were both up and running. House 4 was used for supported accommodation and there were 3 occupants. House 1 (previously the resource centre) had changed use and was used for alternative education provision for children not attending school. This was separate from the Queensway school on the same site run by HLC. Mr. Aveley suggested that they should consider different names for the Houses and the school if they were separate as it may be confusing. The Manager said the site was known as Queensway but each of the houses had their own name. The AD said they had been working with the Skills & Education team to look for creative solutions for children not attending school and the education provision at Queensway offered a local solution instead of placing children out of the borough. A member of Council staff was working there. There were about 3 young people there who were not in mainstream school who were being supported and prepared to move back into mainstream education.

There were no further questions and the Chair thanked the officers again and they left the meeting.

CYPSC-33 LEAVING CARE GRANT ADMINISTRATION

The Chair started by congratulating the Interim Assistant Director on his recent appointment into post. The AD had been invited to the meeting to provide assurance to the Committee on the process for administering the Leaving Care Grant as members had expressed concern about the administration and auditing of the grant previously.

The AD provided the following information:

- The scrutiny recommendation to uplift the grant to £2,000 in line with national guidance was not without challenge. The Children's Minister Edward Timpson had recommended authorities set the grant at £3,000 but this was not affordable locally. A paper had been prepared for senior managers proposing an uplift in the grant from £1,000 to £2,000 in line with scrutiny's recommendation and this had been included as a proposal in the Service & Financial Strategy for 2014/15 creating an additional budget pressure of £30k.
- The grant would be renamed the "Starting up Home" grant. It was not straightforward because young people leave care at different times – some may stay in residential care and the Staying Put policy encouraged young people to stay with their foster carers.
- Scrutiny had wanted assurances about the administration of the grant.
- The need for the grant is identified by social workers, foster carers and the young person and is identified in the care plan. A Pathway Plan itemises requests for items - furniture, utensils, deposits etc. – which the social worker submits to the

team leader to approve spending. Goods are purchased with a GPC card and the VAT is reclaimed. Everything is invoiced and receipted. Sometimes the young person goes shopping with the foster carer so they can choose items and this is supported.

- All spending is recorded on Protocol (the young persons' record) and coded to a cost so that a range of budget reports can be generated. There are good governance and audit arrangements in place. There is a running total for each child and the system keeps track of spending against budget. The average spend over the last 12 months was £2,200 per month which was what would be expected for the number of care leavers.
- The Leaving Care team had moved back to the Placement team within Safeguarding. The leaving care grant was one of a range of grants available and the suite was being tidied up and a policy document would be issued for consultation at the end of the week. The young people themselves wanted the grant linked to achieving milestones to demonstrate that they are ready for independence and checks and balances would be built into the policy.

There were then a number of questions and comments:

- The Chair sought assurance that the scrutiny's recommendation to uplift the grant to £2,000 in line with other authorities would be implemented. The AD said the increase had been proposed in the budget strategy.
- The Chair asked for assurances that all spending was cost coded, that a set of procedures were in place to allocate and monitor spending and that there was a commitment to incorporating the leaving care grant into the development of a wider policy for the administration of grants. The AD confirmed this was the case. The Chair remarked that this was very positive and it was good to hear that things had moved forward.
- Mr. Aveley asked whether they had asked retailers to support the care leavers by offering discounts. The AD said that the social workers and personal advisors haggle on prices to get the best deal but they do not want to disclose the fact that the young person is a care leaver. The Policy also states that the young person should have some level of choice over what they buy – for example the type of cooking equipment.
- Cllr. Green said she was very pleased to hear about the proposed increase and asked whether there was a formula for increasing the grant in future as it had not been reviewed for a number of years. The AD said one formula which had been suggested was to increase the grant inline with increases in the level of Council Tax, but if this had been applied over the last few years the grant would only have increased to £1300 and the grant needed to be tracked to keep up to date with actual costs of starting up a home. The Chair suggested adding a check in the systems and processes to ensure the grant was reviewed regularly.

There were no further questions and the Chair thanked the AD who left the meeting.

CYPSC-34 CHAIR'S UPDATE

The Chair updated members on progress on reviews as follows:

1. Minor amendments had been made to the draft recommendations for the review of primary places following comments from the Primary Heads' Forum Executive. The overall conclusion from the review was that there would be sufficient primary places across the borough but that there were challenges in some areas. Proposed changes to catchment areas in the north of the borough were out for consultation until 28th February. The Committee should do due diligence on how the consultation had been carried out and the Chair suggested the outcome of the review should come to scrutiny to make further recommendations. Mrs. Harris remarked that there were issues around Lightmore. Mr. Aveley said he was sure developments around Hadley Quarry, the Sugar Beet Factory and Wrockwardine/Wellington would impact on demand for school places. The Chair agreed there were local pressures but that Telford & Wrekin did not have the kind of shortages that existed in other parts of the country. The revised draft recommendations would be circulated for agreement.
2. Draft lines of enquiry for the review of Youth Unemployment would be circulated for feedback. The suggested areas to explore were the barriers to employment, how key partners are supporting young people into work and identifying gaps / overlaps in provision. The next meetings would be working group meetings to take evidence for the review from TCAT, New College, Jobcentre Plus and to gather views from young unemployed people.
3. The Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee would be considering the Cost Improvement Plan at the meeting at 6.30pm on 4th February and members of the committee were invited to attend and would be allowed to ask questions.

The meeting ended at 7.45pm.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....