

Children's Services Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting Held on Monday 26 June 2017
10am, Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

Present:

Mrs P Carpenter – Chairman

Mr D Collis

Mr S Dark - Vice-Chairman

Mr S Eyre

Mr T Garrod

Mr R Hanton

Mr E Maxfield

Mr R Price

Mr M Sands

Mr M Smith-Clare

Mrs A Thomas

Mr V Thomson

Mrs S Young

Voting Church Representatives

Mrs H Bates

Mr A Mash

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the first Children's Services Committee under the new Administration and round the table introductions were made.

1 Apologies and substitutions

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mr J Fisher (Mr S Eyre substituted); Mr B Stone (Mr T Garrod substituted); Mr G Middleton (Mrs A Thomas substituted) and Ms E Corlett (Mr M Sands substituted).

2 Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 14 March 2017 were agreed as an accurate record by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

3 Declarations of Interest

Mr R Hanton declared an other interest as his daughter-in-law is a teacher at a school in Dereham.

Mr R Price declared an other interest has some of his family Members are teachers.

Mr V Thomson declared an other interest as his son has a Norfolk County Council care plan.

Mr S Dark declared an other interest as his sister is a Headteacher at a Swaffham school.

Mr M Sands declared an other interest as his wife is a teacher.

Mr M Smith-Clare declared an other interest as he provides an independent training service in Great Yarmouth.

4 Items of Urgent Business

- 4.1 The Chairman advised the Committee that a one minute silence would be held at 12 noon for the victims of the Finsbury Park attack.
- 4.2 Members were also reminded that there would be a Children's Services Induction stall event after the meeting from 1pm in the marble map area and urged Members to attend.

5 Public Question Time

- 5.1 The public questions received and the responses are attached at Appendix A.

6 Local Member Issues/Member Questions

- 6.1 No Local Member questions were received.

7 Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring 2016-17.

- 7.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services setting out the performance data, information and analysis presented in the vital sign report cards. The Committee was asked to review and comment on the performance data and determine whether the recommended actions identified were appropriate or whether another course of action was required.
- 7.2 The Interim Executive Director of Children's Services advised that Norfolk County Council had placed an advertisement in the Municipal Journal to recruit an Executive Director of Children's Services. It was hoped that the interview process would be concluded before the summer break.
- 7.3 The Interim Executive Director agreed to pass on the best wishes of the Committee to Cathy Mouser, Assistant Director Social Work, who remained poorly from serious illness.
- 7.4 The following points were noted in response to questions by the Committee:
- 7.5 Support for Educational Improvement
 - 7.5.1 The Committee noted the following correction to the final paragraph of number 2.2.4 on page 18 of the agenda (End of Primary School – Key Stage 2 (age 11) Testing and Assessment):

“Across Norfolk in 2016 standards at Key Stage 2 showed considerable variation with ~~60%~~ 50% of pupils achieving the expected standard in all of reading, writing and mathematics compared to ~~63%~~ 53% nationally. Feedback
- 7.6 Early Help

7.6.1 A small multi-agency working group had been convened to develop an all-age early help strategy. An update on the progress with the strategy would be reported to the Early Help Improvement Board at its next meeting.

7.6.2 Reasons for the delay in early help cases being allocated after referral could be due to a number of reasons, such as the need to contact families for further information.

7.7 Social Work

7.7.1 Queries were raised about the percentage of Section 47 Assessments being completed in timescale and the worsening of performance in this indicator. The Interim Executive Director explained that the recent decline could be attributed to two factors:-

- i) Greater emphasis on quality meaning weak assessments were being sent back to be redone and thereby slipping out of time, and
- ii) Where social workers realised a Section 47 assessment was not appropriate and putting those low risk assessments to be closed NFA (Not for action) to one side, sometimes slipping out of time.

7.7.2 With regard to the percentage of children becoming subject to a Child Protection (CP) Plan for a second or subsequent time being higher than statistical neighbours and national averages, the Committee was reassured that the department was auditing all second or subsequent referrals to ascertain the reasons for re-referral. There was a range of activities within the Ofsted Improvement Plan to target improvement in this area.

7.7.3 Work was being undertaken with the Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Board to develop a Section 47 threshold document all agencies could use when considering whether Section 47 requirements were met before making a referral. This would mean all agencies had a list of descriptors to more effectively filter cases which should reduce the number of unnecessary referrals. If cases did not meet the Section 47 threshold, the Committee was reassured that an adequate system was in place for Early Help colleagues to follow up and assess cases at a lower level within the system. Weekly meetings were held between managers and social workers to determine levels of support for those families deemed to need a lower level of support.

7.7.6 The Interim Executive Director confirmed that Children's Services had the resources in place to deliver the current Ofsted Improvement Plan. He explained that to come out of intervention Children's Services need to be rated at least "requires improvement" overall at the next full Ofsted re-inspection, which will come in the next 3-9 months. The Interim Executive Director confirmed that there was still much to do, but that overall, he was optimistic that Children's Services could emerge from Intervention and be rated "good" at the end of the three year plan.

7.7.7 It was expected that the latest Ofsted Monitoring letter would be published on 6 July 2017.

7.7.8 Members noted that the report included end of year figures for 2017, but asked that ways of providing more timely data be considered. In response, it was noted that the Committee Members would be receiving monthly statistics in the near future.

7.8 Finance

7.8.1 The increase in post-16 and mainstream Home to School/College transport costs was acknowledged, together with the high expense incurred in transporting children from home to school.

7.8.2 The Interim Executive Director gave a verbal update on the Period 2 forecast as follows:

- An early financial forecast had been undertaken for the department, which had shown some emerging pressures.
- Reduced savings achievement were forecast in relation to the review of Education Services due to the extended general election purdah period and the Troubled Families grant from central government was forecast to be lower than originally expected.
- There was also an expected overspend relating to the contract costs of specialist intervention and support for children with behavioural and mental health needs, and their families. A change in commissioning strategy has meant we were continuing with the contract and new funding needed to be identified.
- These costs combined were expected to be in the region of £2m. Subject to further investigation by officers, options to use Section 106 monies to offset the one-off shortfall in savings would be brought to future Committee meetings.
- In addition the forecast for Looked After Children costs currently anticipated a £1m overspend on the basis of the current numbers of Looked After Children and the current mix of services provided. An action plan was being developed with the intention of mitigating the projected overspend; details of which would be reported to future Committee meetings.

7.8.4 The average cost for a Looked After Child (LAC) was between £50k and £60k per year, although the costs varied greatly and substantially increased for young people placed in residential care. It was also expected that the Edge of Care project with Barnardo's would help to reduce LAC costs. Please see additional information at Appendix B to these minutes.

7.9 The Committee **NOTED** the report.

8 **School Organisation – Current Consultation Proposals**

The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services providing information about three proposals for school organisational change in the public domain. The report also outlined the powers of the County Council, the consultation process and how decisions were made following consultation.

8.1 The following points were noted in response to questions by the Committee:

8.1.1 As the final phase of the housing development at Bowthorpe was built, the required number of school places would become clear. Discussions were taking place with Norwich City Council about acquiring a possible site, although there was no clear

indication of when the County Council's proposals for school organisation would be ready for consultation.

- 8.1.2 The Committee noted the extant consultation in the northern part of Great Yarmouth. With the current arrangements, substantial investment would be needed at both Alderman Swindell Primary School and North Denes Primary School to effect the accommodation improvements for a full primary phase school. If all children were on one site, the investment could be in significantly better facilities for the whole area.
- 8.1.3 If a decision was made to close Alderman Swindell School, the property would be considered for future educational use by Children's Services Department. There was a strong case to use the school for children with special or additional learning needs.
- 8.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:
- Note the Council's powers in respect of school organisation,
 - Note the three extant consultation exercises and offer the comments above on the current consultation exercise for north Yarmouth to inform the Director's decision on whether to proceed to Statutory Notice after the end of the consultation period.

9 Children's Services Schools Capital Building Programme

- 9.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services providing it with a summary of schools capital funding sources; a reiteration of the priorities which underpin the programme and the financial scale across priorities; a summary of the scale and location of new places provided across the county since 2014; proposals developed by Capital Priorities Group for amendments to the existing programme as it rolled forward; a schedule of proposed new schemes to enter the programme; a schedule of school sites which were likely to become available for alternative use or disposal during the course of programme implementation; a financial summary of the proposed forward programme. The report was based upon the advice and recommendations of the outgoing Capital Priorities Group at their meetings in January, March and April 2017.
- 9.2 In response to questions by the Committee, the following points were noted:
- 9.2.1 Section 106 Agreements required a developer to agree to pay a sum of money once a specified number of houses had been built or were occupied. Section 106 Agreements were legally binding so Norfolk County Council could be confident that all Section 106 money would be received if the houses were built, provided the developer remained in business.
- 9.2.2 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money required a different approach and there was less assurance around this money being received. The Capital Priorities Group would be receiving additional information on CIL money at its first meeting.
- 9.2.3 A Norfolk County Council owned property at Hooper Lane, Sprowston was being considered for providing school places for pupils who had been permanently excluded from other schools, although this was in the very early stages of a feasibility study at present. If it was decided to take this proposal further, a consultation exercise would need to be carried out before any arrangements were finalised.

9.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to

- Endorse the basis of programme prioritisation for the coming three years.
- Endorse the proposed amendments to the programme and introduction of new schemes.

10 Permanent Exclusions Action Plan Update

- 10.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services providing it with an update on the current rate of exclusions, actions taken to date in line with Members' recommendations and ongoing plans to address the issue into the new academic year.
- 10.2 The Committee agreed to the addition of a further recommendation – "to continue with the action plan agreed previously by the Committee".
- 10.3 The following points were noted in response to questions by the Committee:
- 10.3.1 Norfolk County Council had a responsibility to find suitable placements for young people who had been permanently excluded from school. Some work was needed to identify how funding could follow the young person to the new school or the special school facility.
- 10.3.2 The variation in how inclusive some schools were was recognised and many schools did not exclude any pupils, working with all parties to avoid exclusion. Some work was being carried out to ensure schools knew what services were available and where to find those services and to work with schools to avoid permanent exclusion. The current education services review would examine the staff resources allocated to this work.
- 10.3.3 Members raised concern about possible practices of some schools encouraging parents to remove pupils who were in danger of being excluded and were reassured that work was being undertaken to find evidence to support this and to discourage this practice where identified.
- 10.3.4 The word "exclusion" was a nationally used term. Schools had a legal right to exclude children, although this should be done as a last resort. Where it was considered this was not used as an act of last resort, work was being undertaken with the school to try to identify alternative solutions.
- 10.3.5 In many of the exclusion cases, there was a trajectory indicating a period of unacceptable behaviour, although in a minority of cases, children acted irrationally in a dangerous or unacceptable manner which led to a period of exclusion.
- 10.3.6 Norfolk County Council attended the majority of exclusion hearings, with many academies inviting representatives from Norfolk County Council to attend. There was also a supporting advocacy role to offer help and support to parents.
- 10.3.7 Members welcomed the possibility of the term "exclusion" being replaced by "fresh start" which provided a managed move for an excluded pupil to a new school and was felt a more appropriate term.

- 10.3.8 There were currently 125 children receiving home learning or e-learning whilst they were waiting for a school placement. This figure would reduce to 20 in September, mainly due to year 11 leavers and a reduction in the number of places needed at the Special School for Norfolk. It was recognised that a concerted effort would be needed to make sure there was sufficient provision to meet the need.
- 10.3.9 The Early Help Team provided support for excluded pupils during school holiday periods.
- 10.3.10 The Committee was pleased to note that new places at specialist schools would be coming on stream in the near future.
- 10.3.11 The role of Norfolk County Council in attending exclusion appeal hearings in county maintained schools was to ensure the legal process was correctly followed. Unfortunately there was no longer any legal right to intervene if it was felt the exclusion was not in the best interest of the child, although parents could appeal a decision. Any concerns about inappropriate exclusions in Academies and Free Schools were raised with the Regional Schools Commissioner.
- 10.3.12 At the present time only part of the pupil funding was extracted and passed to new schools, or if a new start school could not be identified the money went towards funding used for specialist provision funded via the High Needs Block.
- 10.4 The Committee **RESOLVED** to
- agree the report and
 - continue with the action plan.

The Committee adjourned at 11.45am and reconvened at 11.57am.

The Committee stood in one-minute silence at 12noon for the victims of the Finsbury Park Attack.

11 30 Hours childcare – Task and Finish Group Report

- 11.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services, presenting it with a report of the 30 hours Childcare Task and Finish Group set up by the previous Children's Services Committee.
- 11.2 The following points were noted in response to questions by the Committee:
- 11.2.1 It was recognised that the 30 hours provision for eligible 3 and 4 year olds would be a challenge, particularly in rural Norfolk. Some work was being carried out to encourage providers to work with other providers to try to reach a solution.
- 11.2.2 A suggestion was made about seeking support from other County Councils and making a request for additional funding from the Government. In response, it was acknowledged that the Leader and Deputy Leader of the County Council attended County Council Network meetings where the issue of rurality had been raised on a number of occasions. The rurality and funding issue was on Norfolk County Council's political radar and it was considered that the best way of joining with other shire counties and putting forward requests for additional funding to the Department for Education (DfE) in future should be led through this network. The Deputy Leader

agreed to take forward funding issues on behalf of the Committee and also raise any other issues the Committee identified at future meetings.

11.2.4 There were currently three teacher-led nursery schools in Norfolk. Being teacher-led meant these nursery schools attracted additional funding.

11.2.5 Members considered the proposal put forward by Mr M Sands to write to the Government putting forward a request for additional funding, but felt that the Committee should wait until there was more information available about the challenges faced and what effects the roll-out may have. The Committee agreed to receive a report at a future meeting.

- 11.3
- The Committee **noted** the proposals made by the 30 hours Task and Finish Group in respect of the new proposals for the funding of childcare provision and their implications for Norfolk and
 - Agreed to reconstitute the Task and Finish Group in December to review the situation post-implementation of the national roll-out.

12 Unregulated Accommodation Briefing

12.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services providing an introduction to the type of provision, profile of young people placed and to current and planned activity in relation to unregulated accommodation.

12.2 The following points were noted in response to questions by the Committee:

12.2.1 It was confirmed that Unregulated Accommodation was not subject to Ofsted Inspection.

12.2.2 Unregulated accommodation was generally geared towards helping young people gain independence. A Transition Panel met regularly to discuss the cases of those young people who required additional, or higher levels of support and to help young people manage their lives and become self-sufficient, in a non-institutionalised way.

12.2.3 The importance of Adult Social Care involvement in the transition of young people was recognised.

12.2.4 The age range mix would need to be carefully considered in any shared accommodation.

- 12.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to
- **note** the report, and
 - Authorise Officers to develop a feasibility study in relation to the use of NCC properties as accommodation for care leavers.

13 Corporate Parenting Board

13.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services setting out a proposal to replace previous arrangements known as the "Corporate Parenting Executive Group".

13.2 The Committee **agreed** the following Membership of the Board:

Chairman of Children's Services Committee – Penny Carpenter
Vice-Chair of Children's Services Committee – Stuart Dark
Labour Group Spokesperson for Children's Services - Emma Corlett
Liberal Democrat Group Spokesperson for Children's Services – Ed Maxfield
Children's Services Committee Conservative Member – Ron Hanton

13.3 The Committee was reminded that all County Councillors shared a responsibility as corporate parents for looked after children.

13.4 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** to the adoption of the proposed Terms of Reference, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, and
- **Agree** the Membership of the Corporate Parenting Board as set out in paragraph 13.2 above.

14 Internal and External Appointments

14.1 The Committee received the report by the Managing Director setting out the outside and internal appointments relevant to Children's Services Committee. The Committee was asked to review and make appointments to the external bodies, internal bodies and Champions positions.

14.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to

Make appointments to those external bodies, internal bodies and Champions positions as set out in Appendix C to these minutes.

The meeting closed at 12.50pm

Chairman



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Item 5 - Public Questions for Children's Services Committee 26th June 2017

- **Question received from Christopher Hole:**

Open Academy Norwich currently host a Specialist Resources Base which provides specific support for children with autistic spectrum disorder. The management/trust are proposing to close the SRB by the end of next academic year. What guarantees will you make that no child currently at the Open Academy SRB will suffer any loss of SRB provision as a result of closure? ie. that you will ensure that every child gets another SRB placement, not an alternative type of placement?

Reply by the Chairman:

An Academy has to make a business case to the Regional Schools Commissioner to close provision. The Local Authority is working with the Regional Schools Commissioner and the School to ensure that good planning is in place, regardless of the outcome of the consultation relating to Open Academy SRB. We are working now to secure additional SRB places in the event that the case to close is successful. These places will be priority for families affected by any closure at Open Academy.

- **Question received from Bryonie Jones:**

If the closure is stopped and the commission for the SRB at Open Academy is renewed, for how long will this new contract last ie. how can we be sure that this whole thing won't just start again in a year's time?

Reply by the Chairman:

SRB contracts are open ended, dependant on their effectiveness. The intention is that schools who chose to host SRB provision do so for the long term. In the past three year contracts added a level of uncertainty which we want to avoid. All specialist provision is kept under constant review to ensure that it is effective.

Supplementary question:

Will this contractual length be applied retroactively to other SRBs?

This service level agreement applies across all SRBs.

- **Question from Alison Hopley – Headteacher Alderman Swindell Primary School and Nursery (Agenda Item 8 – School organisation)**

Please could you define how the word reorganise is being used in the Executive summary, page 85, bullet point one. This has huge future employment implications for all Alderman Swindell staff. Does it mean to merge and thus create a new school out of an RI School and a Coasting School, where staff from both schools would have fair access to all posts both teaching and non-teaching or does it mean extension of North Denes, where current North Denes staff retain their jobs and surplus capacity is ring-fenced for Alderman Swindell Staff?

Reply by the Chairman:

The Local Authority is in an informal process of consultation with a wide range of stake holders to move children on to a single site. There is as yet no specific 'Proposal' that would offer clarification on staffing.

- **Question from Nicky Newstead**

With the Open Academy SRB threatened with closure by its host Academy and Trust, where are you going to provide suitable alternatives for those students as you are bound by law to do?

Reply by the Chairman:

The Local Authority are working to secure additional SRB places in the event that the case to close is successful. It is not possible to confirm their location until arrangements have been finalised.

- **Question from John Newstead**

Inclusivity is central to Education policy - is there not a legal case to be made against Open Academy and its Trust over their blatant disregard for inclusivity as shown in their reasons for wanting to close and their written responses to us, as follows?: 'Our commitment to being inclusive has meant that in some years we have seen a significant reduction in our GCSE results... which has affected OFSTED judgements and coverage in the local media' - Jon Platten, Principal, Open Academy in letter to us parents of a child currently in the SRB.

Reply by the Chairman:

The Diocese of Norwich Education Academy Trust is consulting as part of statutory regulation a formal process which results in a business case to the Regional Schools Commissioner. The Regional School Commissioner would be duty bound to consider the case in light of the framework. If parents have concerns about the inclusivity of a school that is, in this case, an Academy, they could raise these concerns with the Trust Board.

Norfolk Children's Services Stocktake Operational Improvement Meeting

June 2017

EDGE OF CARE BARNARDO'S PROJECT UPDATE

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. The meeting was last formally updated on the progress of the project at the end of March 2017. This paper provides a further update.

2. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

- 2.1. The purpose of this report is to update the stocktake meeting on the work of the Edge of Care project, the progress made and any immediate post-delivery issues.

3. PROGRESS UPDATE

- 3.1. The project went live as agreed on 6 June.
- 3.2. The service has been named "New Directions" following a consultation with members of the project team, young people and families. The name was actually generated in a session with young people, facilitated by the NCC participation worker.
- 3.3. The service is divided into 3 teams which will operate across the Council covering the following locations: Kings Lynn and Breckland; Norwich and South; Great Yarmouth, North Norfolk and Broadland.
- 3.4. The team managers for each of those teams are now in place; two of these on a permanent basis and one a locum who had been in a Norfolk team immediately prior to appointment.
- 3.5. The more senior role, the Head of Service, a Barnardo's role, has been advertised and the final interviews will be taking place in July. This role is being covered on an interim basis by Jill Greenfield, one of the Barnardo's senior managers who has been involved in the project from the outset.
- 3.6. The service comprises approximately 35 members of staff, who have been drawn from existing teams across children's services all of whom have some current input into preventing children from becoming looked after. All of these staff (with the exception of the Head of Service and one Team Manager) will continue to be NCC employees, employed under our terms and conditions. The staff were drawn from 4 service areas; Residential Outreach workers, 0-19 Outreach workers, Home Based Care workers and the therapeutic team.

- 3.7. The process for moving staff into the new service went very smoothly. The plans were discussed with staff groups at a number of consultation events and based on those discussions staff made decisions about preferred location and (for some), their specialism.
- 3.8. The key emphasis during this transition period has been on ensuring continuity of service, minimal disruption to families and an incremental approach within a defined timeframe for the service. Staff will continue to work with existing cases with a plan that the majority will be closed within the 3 month transition period.
- 3.9. A key emphasis within the new service has been on developing a highly skilled workforce which really has the skills to work with families who are on the verge of breakdown to provide concrete interventions that will support them to remain together. Access to some of the high level training that Barnardo's is able to offer is central to this process.
- 3.10. The referral pathways into the service have been agreed between the project and the front line social work teams. The overall aim has been to control and manage the work going into the new service so that no referrals come directly from social workers and all are signed off through the edge of care/access to resources panel process which is chaired by a senior manager. The intention is that the service will not be an emergency service although it will respond at short notice to families in crisis.
- 3.11. In relation to cases and case responsibility, primary case responsibility will rest with the allocated social worker who will be outside of the new service. This means that all key decisions about the child (ren), their safety and where they live will be taken in the Norfolk social work teams reinforcing established clear lines of accountability and responsibility.
- 3.12. Finally, the governance arrangements are that the service will report to a Project Board which will be jointly chaired by the Assistant Director, Early Help and the Assistant Director, Barnardo's Eastern Region. This will report into CSLT and the Improvement Board.

Children's Services Committees/Boards/Working Groups/Outside Bodies

2017/18 Appointments shown

(a) Children's Services Committees/Boards/Working Groups

1. Adoption Panels (1 member for each of the 2 Adoption Panels)

Alison Thomas
Graham Middleton

Plus 1 nominated substitute for each member

These are statutory bodies. Appointments to the Adoption Panels have by convention, not been made on a politically balanced basis, but instead on the basis of those best able to give the extensive time and commitment required.

2. Capital Priorities Group - 5

Chairman of the Committee (ex-officio of the Group)

1 Labour (David Collis)

2 Con (Stuart Dark and Vic Thomson)

1 Lib Dem (Ed Maxfield)

This Group should consist of members of Children's Services Committee. It:

- contributes to discussions about priorities for capital expenditure
- Develops consistent prioritisation criteria for capital expenditure
- Monitors capital building programmes
- Reviews the effectiveness of decisions it has taken and adapts criteria accordingly

3. Local Authority Governor Appointments Group – Pool of 3 Members (with 2 being called as necessary by Norfolk Governor and Leadership Services)

2 Con – Barry Stone and John Fisher

1 Labour – Emma Corlett

This Group makes recommendations to the Director of Children's Services on:

1. Dismissal of School Governors who have been nominated by Local members
2. Making appointments to educational trusts, as necessary

4. Norfolk Foster Panels – 1 for each Panel plus 1 nominated substitute for each member

Central Norfolk – TBA West – Stuart Dark
East – TBA
Substitute Members x 3

These are statutory bodies. Appointments to the Foster Panels have by convention, not been made on a politically balanced basis, but instead on the basis of those best able to give the extensive time and commitment required.

5. Teachers Joint Consultative Committee – 11

7 Con – Penny Carpenter, Thomas Smith, Colin Foulger, Barry Stone, Vic Thomson, Philip Duigan, and Richard Price
2 Labour - Mike Sands and Emma Corlett
2 LD – Ed Maxfield and 1 TBA

This is a forum for discussion between teacher unions and the County Council on employment related matters.

6. Youth Advisory Boards

Breckland –Terry Jermy
Broadland – Stuart Clancy
Great Yarmouth – Mike Smith-Clare
King’s Lynn and West Norfolk – David Collis
North Norfolk – Judy Oliver
Norwich – Emma Corlett
South Norfolk – Vic Thomson

7. Virtual School Reference Group (4)

2 Con - Stuart Dark and Tom Garrod
1 Lib Dem – Ed Maxfield
1 Labour (TBA)

8. Small Schools Steering Group (2)

This Group monitors the small schools strategy.

2 Con – Brian Long (Chair) and Stuart Dark

9. Corporate Parenting Board (6)

This Group ensures that Norfolk’s promise to young people leaving care is implemented, by holding to account people who are responsible for its delivery. It replaced the Corporate Parenting Strategic Group.

Chairman of the Committee (Co-Chair)
Vice Chairman of the Committee
1 Con – Ron Hanton
Labour Spokesperson – Emma Corlett
Lib Dem Spokesperson – Ed Maxfield

10. Joint Road Casualty Reduction Partnership Board (4)

No appointment required – Board deleted by Communities Committee

(b) Outside Bodies

1. Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (3)

3 vacancies

The organisation aims to ensure that the statutory provision of RE and collective worship is of a consistently high standard.

2. Whitlingham Outdoor Education Centre Partnership (1)

Vic Thomson

The Partnership exists to promote and co-ordinate the recreational activities delivered by forum members in the Whitlingham area, particularly in areas in and adjacent to Whitlingham Country Park. Previously appointed by Communities Committee.

c) Member Champions

Child Poverty – Will Richmond
Young Carers – Colleen Walker