

**MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 7PM ON THURSDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2018  
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Councillors J Goodwin (Chair), S Bashir, G Casey, A Dowson, A Ellis, M Farooq, S Lane, M Mahabadi, D Over (Vice-Chairman) B Rush, B Saltmarsh  
Co-opted Members: P Cantley, A Kingsley, Parish Councillors J Bhatti and S Lucas

**Also Present:** Councillor Sam Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services  
Cllr Lynne Ayres, Cabinet Member for Skills, Education and University  
Ben Chapman, Peterborough Youth Council & Deputy Youth MP  
Erika Nareikaite, I.T. Officer - Peterborough Youth Council

**Officers Present:** Russell Wate QPM - Chair of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board  
Belinda Evans, Customer Services Manager  
Gary Perkins - Assistant Director, Education  
Lou Williams, Service Director, Children and Safeguarding  
Karen Dunleavy – Democratic Services Officer  
David Beauchamp – Democratic Services Officer

**12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Flavio Vetesse (East Anglia Roman Catholic Diocese Education Co-opted Member) and Rizwan Rahemtulla (Independent Co-opted Member representing the Muslim Communities).

**13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS**

Agenda item 8, Outcome of Ofsted Inspection of Peterborough's Children's Services, Service Director report and Portfolio Holder.

Councillor Saltmarsh declared that she had a non-statutory disclosable interest as a Member of The Adolescent and Children's Trust (TACT). Following advice from the Democratic Services Officer, Councillor Saltmarsh declared that her non-statutory disclosable interest was not of a significant nature and was not likely to prejudice her judgement of the public interest and therefore remained in the meeting for the item.

**14. MINUTES OF THE CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 12 JULY 2018.**

The minutes of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 12 July 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

## **15. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS**

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

## **16. CAMBRIDGE & PETERBOROUGH SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18**

The Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Board accompanied by the Cabinet Member for Children's Services introduced the annual report which highlighted the significant events during the last year and summarised the work of the Safeguarding Children Board. It highlighted areas of good practice and included statistical information regarding performance.

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members referred specifically to the figure of 18.7% of Peterborough children living in poverty mentioned on page 27 and to the page 28 which discussed the high levels of deprivation in Peterborough and requested further detail. Officers responded that deprivation and poverty were dealt with by a different sub-group that reported in to the safeguarding board. Deprivation was tackled through the work on neglect and stated that deprivation was an issue for the whole city, not just specific areas. The information was intended to put Peterborough into context rather than referring to the activity of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough safeguarding board who aim to tackle neglect among all children and young people.
- The Cabinet Member for Children's Services highlighted the Council's Troubled Families Agenda which included helping parents back into employment or training and helping to ensure children go to school. This agenda did specifically address the demographic concerns raised by members about neglect in specific areas.
- The success of the Local Authority was better measured by the amount of time that a child spent on a child protection plan rather than the number of times. A child who had been on a plan for more than twelve months would be concerning as it would suggest that the safety plan was not working or they were other actions that needed to be taken.
- There was 'flow' of children coming on and off child protection plans so the numbers do not always correlate.
- It was more important to measure what actions were being taken to help children on child protection plans rather than the fact they went on them in the first place. The Local authority should continually assess if children were being taken off before they were safe or being kept on too long in which case the local authority should monitor what the plan was doing to keep them safe.
- Members expressed concern about the amount of time that children were on plans and suggested that they were not receiving the level of care needed. Officers responded that they do scrutinise and challenge this area on a continuous basis. The number of children on child protection plans had dropped in Peterborough over four years to be among the statistical norm.
- The Service Director for Children and Safeguarding added that good performance was indicated by not having many child on child protection plans for longer than 12 months. There were currently 35 subject to child protection plans for 12-15 months, none for 12-18 months and none for longer than this.
- Ofsted were complimentary about the child protection plans, processes and interventions and that performance was good.

- Members stated that the joint nature of the report was beneficial as it gave an opportunity to compare figures between Peterborough and Cambridgeshire.
- Members queried why there were significantly more type 1 disposals in Peterborough than Cambridgeshire. Officers responded that there was no consistency between Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to enable adequate comparisons.
- Members stated that it would have been beneficial to see a comparison of priorities between Peterborough and other councils as well as a regional comparison.
- Members referred to the figure of 47.6% of school children who came from minority ethnic backgrounds as mentioned on page 28 of the agenda pack and that these were considerably higher than the National Average and asked if there were any special plans or resources in place to integrate these children. Officers responded that a programme of training the trainers was in place to cover faith groups as well as ethnic groups. Government funding had been bought in approximately two years ago to bring in resource packs and deliver training across the partnership. Examples of the impact of this work includes the high praise given to the safeguarding procedures implemented by the Muslim Council. Also, safeguarding concerns were starting to be reported by ethnic groups that had not been previously done so. The funding for this work was a one-off but it had nonetheless been integrated into mainstream practice. The work also covered Fenland.
- Members stated that the report has become more complete and detailed over the years.
- Members commented on the lack of data from prior years to enable the identification of particular areas of concern that were growing as hot-spots.
- The Committee asked the Chair of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board to provide the Committee with a briefing note containing safeguarding data from previous years for comparative purposes and identify any 'hotspot' areas where there was a particular concern.
- There was a considerable amount of work that went into Children's Social Care in Peterborough as evidenced by the 10,000 contacts made in a relatively small area and this volume of work had increased.
- After noting that 2 out of 10 children in Peterborough were living in poverty, Members requested that the Public Health team provide the Committee with a briefing note containing data on child poverty from previous years and in comparable urban areas.
- The poverty figures in the report came from Public Health. Children living in poverty were not always likely to be abused or neglected. The Safeguarding Board were focused on the neglect aspect of poverty and queries regarding poverty more generally should be referred to the Public Health and the Poverty Strategy.
- Members asked for information on private fostering arrangements and how this differed from council-led arrangements and sought assurance that checks were in place to keep standards high. Officers responded that private fostering was often done by a relative or someone known to the child and was not referring to those for whom the council had a corporate parenting responsibility. Private fostering in the city was poorly recorded. Work was being done with doctor's surgeries, schools etc. to try to establish who was being privately fostered as fostering legislation must still be adhered to in these cases. There was more work to do in this area.
- Members asked why rates of domestic abuse appeared to be much higher in Peterborough than Cambridgeshire and commented that these figures were not clearly highlighted in the report. Officers agreed that domestic abuse was an issue in Peterborough and throughout the country and mentioned that the 2,000 children who witnessed abuse was a very high number.
- Although the figures were high, comparisons must be made with comparable urban areas and not a rural county such as Cambridgeshire. Tackling domestic abuse and protecting children who witness it was a core piece of work. Domestic Abuse was highlighted on the child protection plans because of the emotional abuse caused by a child witnessing these incidents. Officers suggested that numbers were high because the reporting of domestic abuse had improved in Peterborough.

- The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services stated that Peterborough had moved towards a family safeguarding model in which specialist domestic abuse workers went into homes with social workers to help the parents with their issues while the social worker focussed on safeguarding the children.
- Officers referred to a ‘toxic trio’ of issues of which domestic abuse was one and highlighted that substance misuse and mental health issues are also significant problems. Innovative work was underway in Peterborough to tackle the causes of domestic abuse through looking at parental risks. The Chair of the Board commented that the Cabinet Member was correct to refer to domestic abuse as one of the key causes of child abuse.
- It was confirmed that references to March 2017 on page 27 of the agenda pack should in fact refer to March 2018.
- Members suggested to officers that the glossary of key terms should be at the front of reports in future and that hyperlinks should be used to take full advantage of the paperless agenda packs. The Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board acknowledged and agreed with these points.

### **AGREED ACTIONS:**

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to receive and note the content of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2017-18 and requested that:

1. The Chair of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Safeguarding Children Board provide the Committee with a briefing note containing safeguarding data from previous years for comparative purposes and identify any ‘hotspot’ areas where there was a particular concern.
2. The Public Health team provide the Committee with a briefing note containing data on child poverty from previous years and in comparable urban areas.

### **17. ANNUAL CHILDREN’S SOCIAL CARE STATUTORY COMPLAINTS REPORT 2017 - 2018**

The Customer Services Manager, accompanied by the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, introduced the report which was an annual report which allowed the Committee to scrutinise complaints received under the Children’s (Social Care) Services statutory complaints process.

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members were pleased that complaints had reduced.
- The average response time had increased from 15 working days in 2016/17 to 21 days in 2017/18. Monthly data was provided to senior management to make them aware of outstanding complaints. Performance had been impacted by staff changes and the Service Director for Children and Safeguarding stated the people tasked with responding to complaints were under considerable pressure.
- The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services received a weekly report containing outstanding complaints and these were dealt with quickly and there were generally not too many.
- Members referred to section 4.29 of the report and restated their wish for comparative data with other authorities. Officers responded that it had been difficult to find a comparable unitary authority with similar demographics. However, a peer-reviewed comparative study with Milton Keynes had been completed but the report had yet to be written at the time of this meeting. A supplementary report could be provided to committee on this in 2019 if needed. Data of this nature was not made publically available except through committee reports such as this which made comparisons difficult.

- It was agreed that the Customer Services Manager would provide the Committee with a briefing note summarising the findings of the peer-reviewed comparative study undertaken with Milton Keynes.
- Members referred to complaint CS17/041 on page 88 of the reports pack and asked if taking a mattress and bedding away from a child was a typical disciplinary method. Officers responded that this was not a typical punishment and this was the first complaint of this nature they had ever received. The complaint was upheld, the punishment recognised as unacceptable and guidance given to staff. It was suggested that this particular incident was likely to have been caused by the risk of a child with severe behavioural difficulties damaging or destroying the bedding and a possible fire risk.
- Officers stated that many of the children in the secure Children's home in Peterborough were not from Peterborough but still had the right to use Peterborough's complaints procedure if the complaint was regarding the home itself and not their care plan for example.
- Members stated that the summary of specific complaints and the information on which complaints were upheld was useful.
- There had been many changes to teams and structures. At one point, looked after children and those leaving care had been managed by one team. They were therefore reported as one team and data had to be extracted from the system in the way which it was recorded. This was to change back to recording information from two separate teams in the following year.
- Members requested more detailed information on the reasons for the increased response time for complaints. Officers responded that when a complaint was received and accepted, the team manager should make contact with customers over the telephone to understand the complaints better as most had been received via email. If this did not take place, complaint escalation could result. Officers were seeking to achieve better initial contact with complainants but it could be difficult to control.
  - As a follow up question to the above answer, members asked what steps were being taken to improve this situation. Officers responded that a monthly report on outstanding complaints was sent to the Children's Services department and a performance meeting with managers took place regularly. It was emphasised that complaints staff were extremely busy. Appropriate processes were in place and the Customer Services Manager was involved in these.

## **AGREED ACTIONS**

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to note the report and make recommendations for further scrutiny if deemed appropriate. The committee also requested that the Customer Services Manager provide the Committee with a briefing note summarising the findings of the peer-reviewed comparative study undertaken with Milton Keynes.

## **18. A VISION FOR READING IN PETERBOROUGH 2017 – 2021 – UPDATE REPORT**

The report was introduced by the Assistant Director for Education accompanied by the Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, the purpose of which was to provide Committee Members with an update on progress made since November 2017 in developing and implementing the Vision for Reading.

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses included:

- Members congratulated officers on the Vision for Reading and stated the importance of reading as a tool of learning.

- Members stated the importance of promoting reading at a very young age to encompass parents reading to their infants for example and getting parents engaged in the importance of reading. Members suggested that there needed to be more engagement with partner organisations such as the NHS to help with this. Members thought that parents should be engaged in the importance of reading even before a child was born.
- Officers responded that members' question underlined the linkage between the School Readiness work and the Vision for Reading. The School Readiness Board engaged with partner organisations. Even prenatal impacts on children were going to be factored into school readiness work. 4,000 free books were distributed in the last 18 months, with many going to children who would not ordinarily have access to these books.
- Officers referred to research from Cambridge University that spoke of 'Learning Poverty' which related to limited learning activity taking place in the home. This mentioned things that parents could do with children to help with learning that would not traditionally have been considered as such. These were discussed at school readiness events and with parents of pre-school children and those about to start pre-school.
- It was agreed that the Learning and Teaching Adviser (EYFS) would provide the Committee with an update on the proposal for councillors to help children with their reading.
- Members congratulated officers on the quality of the report.
- Members referred to the fourth bullet point in section 4.26 on page 95 of the reports pack which referenced an increase in active library use by children and asked for more information on this. Members asked if this was due to extra funding going to particular places and if it accounted for the £28,000 from Barnack Primary School from a section 106 agreement being moved and spent in Eye and Thorney. In response, officers stated that a target had been set by Vivacity and they were investing in schemes such as a book bus to tour the city's schools and promote the enjoyment of reading. When the book bus visited a school, all children who used it became library members.
- Officers were in discussions with Vivacity to agree what constitutes active usage of a library.
- Members welcomed the reading buses but expressed concern about library provision in Barnack.
- Members expressed concern that the report was unjustifiably positive and was not justified by the city's results and asked what was being done to improve this. Officers acknowledged that that situation needed to be improved but stated that steady progress was being shown and the list of actions taken in the report shows a determination on the part of the City Council and partners to improve the quality of children's reading.
- Families make an important contribution to improving children's reading.
- Members stated that families in poverty were often those who did not take reading seriously and had limited reading material in the home although some Members wished to emphasise that there were families in poverty who still supported their children with reading.
- Officers responded that it was important to recognise that there were families in poverty who supported children with their reading and that reading online was also relevant, not just physical books.
- Members felt that Peterborough had an excellent library service compared with many other areas and it was sad that counties such as Northamptonshire had suffered cut backs in this area.
- It was suggested that libraries should be used to provide other services such as children's groups and NHS services to make better use of underutilised libraries. Officers agreed and emphasised that the fact that Vivacity were a leading partner gave the Council a perfect opportunity to make this point.
- Officers felt that it was important that libraries were a place where children could relax and feel safe and secure so that they could learn without even realising that they were learning. It was very difficult to navigate through life without good reading skills and it was this that many children were struggling with.

- It was suggested by members that the local press should be involved in promoting reading. Officers responded that the Peterborough Telegraph were present at a previous meeting of the Committee where this was discussed with reading pledges left on the table so the opportunity was there. All businesses had the opportunity to sign up and promote the pledge and it was their responsibility to do so.
- Members felt that getting the press and businesses involved was a key part of improving reading among children in Peterborough.
- The gap between Peterborough and national reading attainment had narrowed by 3%. Officers emphasised that reading in Peterborough was not yet where it needed to be.
- Members stated that it was often difficult for parents to find time to read to their child when they work long hours and suggested that the Council should be helping in this area
- Whilst acknowledging the quality of Peterborough's library service Members stated that difficult decisions must still be made due to funding constraints.
- Members felt that while libraries were good places to host other services, the link between reading and libraries must be maintained.
- Members expressed concern that there might not be proper library provision in Barnack as it developed and stated the importance of improving provision for residents, including those in other rural areas as well as those in the inner city and townships.
- Members felt that while this report was good, further progress was needed and there should be an emphasis on promoting reading as a pleasure.
- Members felt that the upper floor of Peterborough Central Library could be better utilised to help promote the library as a hub of everyone in the city with a particular emphasis on the ethnic minority population, many of whom spoke English as second language. Officers stated that there were existing opportunities for community engagement at the already in place at the City College but they would take members' suggestions forward.
- The Assistant Director of Education or the Learning and Teaching and Advisor (EYFS) should be contacted for requests for the reading bus to come to a particular school and they would direct the request to the appropriate people.
- Officers were looking outside Peterborough and researching schools with similar demographics that were achieving more to help facilitate best practice.
- The Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University emphasised the enthusiasm of the education team, mentioned joint working with Cambridgeshire County Council and thanked the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee for their involvement.
- The Chairman thanked officers and the Cabinet Member and stated that she looked forward to the next report being even more positive.

## **AGREED ACTIONS**

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to

1. Note and comment upon the content of this report;
2. Offer their support to relevant officers in pursuing actions to promote continued improvement in the quality and enjoyment of reading of children, young people and their families in Peterborough;
3. Continue to do all that they can to promote the enjoyment and benefits of reading well through their role as Elected Members; and requested that:
4. The Learning and Teaching Adviser (EYFS) provide the Committee with an update on the proposal for councillors to help children with their reading.

## **19. OUTCOME OF OFSTED INSPECTION OF PETERBOROUGH CHILDREN'S SERVICES, SERVICE DIRECTOR REPORT AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER REPORT**

The Chairman offered her congratulations on the outcome of the OFSTED inspection. This was the first time Peterborough has been given a 'Good' rating in all areas of inspection.

The report was presented by the Service Director, Children and safeguarding, accompanied by the Cabinet Member for Children's Services. It provided Members with an overview of the outcome of the inspection of children's services in Peterborough, undertaken between 25th June and 6th July and provided a brief additional summary of key performance measures within children's services. The report also updated the Committee on relevant activities and responsibilities of the Cabinet Member for Children's Services.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services stated that she was proud of the children's service team, especially as the outcome of the Ofsted Inspection had been achieved without any additional funding. The feedback from Ofsted stating that Peterborough was an excellent place to work was notable and it was hoped that this would be nationally recognised to attract people to work for the city council. Listening to young people was important, and Youth Council members were thanked for their attendance and stated that she would see how they could be consulted in the future.

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses included:

- The service provided by The Adolescent and Children's Trust (TACT) received a positive report from OFSTED. This was the first time that fostering and adoption services had been provided by another provider on Peterborough City Council's behalf. The quality was improving although there had been a learning curve for both TACT and the City Council. At the time of the meeting, they were at 18 months into a 10 year contract. Certain tweaks were needed and a report on these would be produced for the next meeting of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee. In relation to the above, foster carers feel that the support they received had improved and more carers were now being recruited. Overall the quality of the service provided by TACT was positive.
- Members offered their congratulations to officers on the result of the Ofsted inspection and it was agreed that The Service Director for Children's Services and Safeguarding would pass on the Committee's congratulations to all members of his team of social workers and education staff, especially considering the financial challenges faced.
- Members emphasised the importance of continuing the hard work and not becoming complacent as Peterborough had a long history of problems within child social care.
- OFSTED were impressed with the enthusiasm and commitment of staff and how well they knew the children and the families they worked in including the assessment teams where they were only starting to get to know the children.
- Officers explained the areas of improvement from section 4.29 on pages 105 and 106 of the agenda pack:
  - *"Assessments of children who are missing or who are at risk from child sexual exploitation"* – There had been a group manager in place for the last six months who was focussing on this area so officers were that the issues around the use of specialist risk assessment tools would be addressed.
  - *"The use of chronologies in underpinning children's assessments"* – This was an area that most local authorities and social workers struggled with. Although it sounded straightforward, it could be difficult to assess whether an event in a child's life was significant until later on. Ofsted felt that chronologies were being used and they were much improved but they were not feeding through to assessments. A 'chronology champion' would be appointed and further peer-learning around the use of chronologies informing assessments
  - *"The number of return interviews that are successfully completed with children who have been missing from care"* – Peterborough City Council perform well in this area for children who went missing from home but less so for those who went missing from care. If a child goes missing from care regularly, it can be difficult to catch up and ensure a return interview takes place every time as the guidance recommends.



- Cambridgeshire had good practice in this area and Peterborough would aim to learn from them.
- *“The quality of information provided to care leavers about their rights and entitlements, including how to access their health histories”* – Although information was good, there was a need to make sure that care leavers and those around them know where to access it. This was also true of Health Records as children in care might not have somebody they could go back to ask about childhood illnesses that might be relevant in future years. Work had been done with health colleagues and the team had made sure that GPs held this information. However, young people may not always have known this as much as they should have done.
  - *“Consistency of management oversight, including recording of casework supervision across all social work teams”* – Team managers were some of the busiest people in children’s services. While regular supervisions took place, these were not always recorded as well as they should have been. Work would continue to see how managers could be supported to record supervisions better.
- Members referred to Chart 5 – Single Assessment Timescales (within 45 working days) in Appendix 2 (page 129 of the agenda) and asked what was being done to increase the %YTD figure. Members felt that the revised target of 90% was almost as unobtainable as the previous target of 95%.
  - Officers responded that it was difficult to set a target that showed that they were satisfied with anything less than 90/95%. Changes still needed to happen to the Integrated Front Door. This was being done jointly with Cambridgeshire and was part of a wider set of changes. There were too many single assessments being done. 60-70% of assessments concluded with no further action or a step down to Early Help services. Performance in this area would only improve when the Integrated Front Door became better at filtering which children required an assessment as reducing the number of assessments would make the goal of 90% much more achievable.
  - The consultation around the changes in Cambridgeshire had now closed. The changes to the Front Door service should be in place between the beginning of December and Christmas and this should result in significant changes to the KPI figures mentioned.
  - Members suggested there had been changes to the Front Door thresholds in the last two to three years and asked what would be different this time. Officers stated that thresholds had not changed but they had previously moved Peterborough’s Front Door service to be co-located with Cambridgeshire’s. A peer review of the Front Door was done and this was not the best designed model. Although it helped to build resilience among Peterborough’s small team the processes and screening methods used by the Cambridgeshire Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) were not as good. The Peterborough team have therefore based their approach on what is common practice in larger local authorities where it does work and officers were confident that the changes would work this time.
  - Very few authorities gain ‘Outstanding’ ratings and this would be a very challenging target for Peterborough to achieve. Caseloads tended to be lower than Peterborough’s in areas where this was achieved. It was important for resources to be matched with local priorities. It would be a mistake to seek a higher rating by temporarily spending more money as this would not be sustainable..
  - Achieving an outstanding rating might be possible for the specific area of ‘experience of early help’.
  - The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services met regularly with the Chairman of Cambridgeshire County Council’s Children and Young People’s Committee and joint peer reviews had been undertaken. However, the Chairman’s level of responsibility was lower than Peterborough’s cabinet member as Cambridgeshire use a committee system.
  - Joint working across two authorities enabled the sharing of best practice.
  - The Combined Authority was not currently involved in Children’s Services.
  - Children’s Services’ use of self-assessment had been beneficial and OFSTED recognised this. Peterborough’s self-assessment aligned with the results of the report and this gave the Council credibility. If inspectors felt that officers did not know where the weaknesses

were in their own service then they would not feel that they would be capable of making the changes needed to improve outcomes for children.

- The member of the Peterborough Youth Council and Deputy Youth MP thanked the Cabinet Member for Children's Services for wanting to engage with the Youth Council.

#### **AGREED ACTIONS:**

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the positive outcome of the Ofsted inspection of Children's Services under the new inspection framework: The Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services [ILACS]; Acknowledge the commitment and dedication of staff within Peterborough in children's and allied services and the support provided by partner agencies in improving outcomes for vulnerable children and young people in Peterborough
2. Note the areas for development noted in the inspection report and agree to receive an update on progress against these areas within the next Service Director and Portfolio Holder report.
3. Note the further detailed performance information contained within the report
4. Continue to offer support and challenge to the Cabinet Member and senior officers in Children's Services in order to improve outcomes for all children and young people in Peterborough, and vulnerable children and young people in particular: and requested that:
5. The Service Director for Children's Services and Safeguarding pass on the Committee's congratulations to all members of his team of social workers and education staff.

#### **20. FORWARD PLAN OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of Executive Decisions, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Forward Plan and where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

Members referred to the forward plan item - KEY/14MAY18/02 (Construction of new school building - Heltwate School) and suggested that there needed to be more consultation with ward councillors regarding this and it was agreed that Democratic Services Officers would pass this on to the relevant officers and Cabinet Member for Education as well as pass on the Committee's suggestion that 'Relevant Wards' should be changed to 'All'.

Councillor Lane left the meeting at 9.00pm

#### **AGREED ACTIONS:**

The Committee noted the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions and referred to the forward plan item - KEY/14MAY18/02 (Construction of new school building - Heltwate School). It was agreed that the Democratic Services would pass on the suggestion that 'Relevant Wards' should be changed to 'All' as well as their feedback that consultation with ward councillors should be referred to the Cabinet Member for Education.

#### **21. WORK PROGRAMME 2018 -2019**

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2018 - 2019 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

## **AGREED ACTIONS**

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note the work programme for 2018 – 2019.

## **22. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

1 November 2018

CHAIRMAN  
7.00pm to 9.03pm

This page is intentionally left blank