

ADULTS, CHILDREN AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY, 20 JANUARY 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Maureen Hunt (Chairman), Julian Sharpe (Vice-Chairman), Christine Bateson, Carole Da Costa and Amy Tisi

Also in attendance: Councillor John Baldwin and Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra

Officers: Laurence Ellis, Mark Beeley, Hilary Hall, Lynne Lidster, Kevin McDaniel, Clive Haines, James Norris and Adele Taylor

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies of absence received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes from the meeting held on 22nd September 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record.

HIGH NEEDS FUNDING FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Kevin McDaniel, Executive Director of Children's Services, introduced the item, which was based on a request from the Panel for information on the overall funding in education and what was being done around the funding for special educational needs. This came about in a previous meeting after it was reported that the expenditure for High Needs Block elements was running in deficit.

James Norris, Head of Finance for Achieving for Children, gave a presentation to the panel on the Dedicated Schools Grant and High Needs Block.

He started off giving a summary of the Dedicated School Grant Funding (DSG), which allocated school funding into 4 blocks. Each block had its own formula to calculate the funding to be distributed to each local authority. The 4 blocks and their budgets were: Schools Block (£102 million allocated), the Central Schools Services Block (£1 million), Early Years Block (£10 million) and High Needs Block (£27 million).

James Norris then gave the current financial projection for 2021/22 for each block. The total net budget was £69.7 million with an in-year overspend of £900,000. When applying the £900,000 overspend to the deficit position from the previous financial year, the projected culminated deficit was £2.7 million or 2% of the total DSG budget allocation. Because of this overspend, a deficit management plan had to be prepared for submission to the Department for Education to explain how the in-year overspend would be brought in-budget and in future years and then reduce the overall accumulated deficit.

James Norris moved on to the financial trend. In summary, the deficit started in 2018/19 financial year and the deficit in 2022/23 is projected to be £4 million or 3.5–4% of the overall school budget.

James Norris then discussed the High Needs Block deep dive which he divided and analysed into 7 categories. He stated some of the blocks were “relatively on track” and a couple of block categories experienced a projected underspend: ‘Retained DSG’ experienced an underspend of £91,000 (-1%), while ‘Alternative Provision and other non-SEN’ experienced a £215,000 (-20%) underspend.

Meanwhile, to varying extents, other block categories experienced a projected overspend, including ‘OLA Schools Top Ups’ (£60,000 or 7%), ‘Placements-Independent, ISS, NMSS’ (£1.003 million or 18%), ‘Free Schools’ (£520,000 or 61%), ‘Placements-FE Colleges/ISPs’ (£370,000 or 23%), and ‘SEN Support Services’ (£184,000 or 9%).

The overall total High Needs Block budget was £21.7 million with a projected variance of £1.8 million overspend (or 8%).

James Norris then moved on to the progress update on the Deficit Management Plan. He stated that a deficit management plan was being formulated to address the cumulative deficit position with a recovery period of 3-5 years. This plan had to be submitted to the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) on behalf of the Department for Education.

Following a Schools Forum meeting in October 2021, it was agreed amongst the School Forum members and officers to explore key themes including expansion of the local offer within the Borough, increased local partnerships incorporating working with neighbouring authorities, and improved commissioning arrangements with greater focus on annual reviews and unit costings.

The Deficit Management Plan had to be signed off by the Executive Director of Children’s Services and the Executive Director of Resources. It would then be reported to the School Forum in April 2022.

The Panel then asked their questions.

Councillor Tisi asked for clarity regarding the significance of the free special schools, namely did different placements in different settings cost differing amounts of money. James Norris replied that the free special schools were state-funded, independent special schools which offer more places, and the local authorities had to pay the place funding rate. He also added this could create more costs compared to people remaining in the mainstream school. He also stated that the Borough did pay on an individual child-by-child basis.

Councillor Tisi followed on by asking what mechanism was used for schools that wanted or needed more places and therefore more funding, whether this was done by the school itself or a child’s EHCP (Education Health and Care Plan).

Kevin McDaniel answered by using Forest Bridge School, a specialist school, as a case study. Recently, the school moved to a larger building which was funded through capital expenditure from the government. As a result of this move, the school had more places which then the High Needs Block would fund the first £10,000 per place in that school. This would obviously take money from the budget. The local authority then pays a top-up based up on the individual pupil needs.

He added that when a child was placed by another local authority, then that local authority would pay for the additional amount, while the Borough would pay for the place funding. As such, Kevin McDaniel mentioned that one of the downsides of developing free schools is that it would have impact of the regular budget.

The Chairman asked Kevin McDaniel if it was correct that there were six applications for placement. Kevin McDaniel explained that families and schools could apply for Educational Health and Care Plans (EHCP) – typically receiving a dozen new applications every week – if they believed the child required support. This would then go through a process which has a

statutory 20-week target timescale to go through the assessment process to name a school to place that child. Once a school was named, the child would be placed either in a mainstream school with an EHCP, a special school or a non-maintained special school. At this point, more money would be taken from the budget. He then stated that in the last couple of weeks, six pupils were placed in special schools from this process, albeit at “significant cost” to the High Needs block.

He also stated that it was forecasted that £200,000-400,000 was to be spent on new placements for the rest of the year as new applications came in every week.

Referring to James Norris’s comment that the Borough’s situation in terms of funding was not unusual, Councillor Sharpe asked James Norris how the Borough compared to other local authorities in terms of this financial situation.

James Norris answered that the deficits of Richmond and Kingston boroughs were in the double digits or more, believed to be around 10-14%. Meanwhile, RBWM’s deficit was around 2%. He added that, according to ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency) representatives, the deficit being at around 2-5% was a sign that the borough was doing quite well. Therefore, RBWM’s deficit situation was seen favourably compared to other boroughs but it still needed to be addressed by the plan.

Councillor Sharpe further asked if other boroughs were in a similar situation to RBWM in having a deficit recovery plan. James Norris confirmed this: all boroughs in deficit had to submit a deficit management plan. Kevin McDaniel elaborated James Norris’s answer. He stated most of the 19 local authorities in south-east England had a deficit on the High Needs Block. Because of this, there was work with DfE (Department of Education) to work on the unpublished SEND (special educational needs and disabilities) review. This was dealing with the financial issue caused by different pressures within the system, such as more children with complex needs which therefore required support, and schools struggled to balance their budgets because everything was becoming expensive.

Kevin McDaniel also added that in some local authorities in other parts of the country there was a significant fall in school numbers, and therefore they were not experiencing the same financial pressures as they had less pupils for similar resources. In contrast, it was a common situation in the south of England at the moment.

Mark Jervis asked Kevin McDaniel on whether the 9% increase in volume for the High Needs Block was driven by Forest Bridge School moving to a larger building, the impact of the Covid pandemic or was it a long-term continued trend. Kevin McDaniel answered that the 9% increase in volume was caused by an increase in education health and care plans across various schools, including maintained special schools and non-maintained independent schools. This was because RBWM was experiencing an increase in request for specialist education as this was seen as better serving young people. He also mentioned that Covid would have played a role as well.

Councillor Carole Da Costa asked what the consequences would be if the deficit was not curtailed. Kevin McDaniel, Adele Taylor, Executive Director of Resources, and James Norris collectively answered. The financial deficit for education was an issue on a national level, hence why there were SEND reviews. There was mention that there was a school surplus balance for the maintained schools at the end of December 2021 was over £2.3 million in credit, compared to last year where there was a £1.8 million deficit. This reduced concerns of deficit during the last financial year but was unsustainable in the long-term and therefore work needed to be done to resolve the deficit.

Councillor Carole Da Costa followed up by asking where the Borough was going to make savings or cuts. Kevin McDaniel answered that it would be difficult to reduce expenditure as every child had a right to an adequate education. Therefore, it would be better to find alternate methods. James Norris elaborated Kevin McDaniel’s answer by stating the 4 themes to tackle

to the deficit: maximise value for money for all services, raise the effectiveness of commissioning arrangement, maximise the local offer and new programs of intervention.

In reference to the Borough paying for the first £6,000 per school placement as part of the notional SEM budget, Councillor Tisi asked about if Kevin McDaniel mentioned a fixed rate or fixed fee that the authority pays per placement. He answered that mainstream schools got their finances through a formula based on the number of children enrolled. Special schools and resource units were commissioned at £6-10,000 per placement, giving the schools a base budget to be able to recruit sufficient staff. When children were placed, the schools would receive a top up amount.

ANNUAL EDUCATION STANDARDS REPORT – INCLUDING IMPACT OF COVID ON POST-16 EDUCATION

Kevin McDaniel introduced the item on education standards. He also highlighted that the DfE (Department of Education) had reduced the school improvement grants to local authorities by half from 1st April 2022 and then to 0 from April 2023. He added that during the Schools Forum meeting earlier in the day, the maintained school representatives agreed to fund the shortfall from a reserve of school's budget to continue school services as well as collaboration on how to keep the services running.

Clive Haines, Schools Leadership Development Manager, gave a presentation on the standards and quality of education, starting off with Ofsted results. As of January 2022, the Borough stood at 97% where schools were judged as good or outstanding, compared to the last reported position of 94%. Only two schools, including a PVI (private voluntary and independent nurseries) were judged as requiring improvement.

As for disadvantaged pupils, Clive Haines reported that the pandemic had led to a growing gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers. Methods to resolve this included catch-up strategies in schools, pupil premium strategies such as the National Tutoring Programme, continuing Pupil Premium Networks and encouraging Quality First Teaching.

Clive Haines then discussed Key Stage 4 Attainment. Due to the pandemic, summer examinations were cancelled in 2020 and 2021; therefore, alternatives processes were set up to award grades. The proportion of pupils who achieved a grade 5 or higher in both GCSE English and Maths was 55.7%, about 3.8% above the national average of 51.9%.

Clive Haines then moved on to the School Centre Initial Teaching Training (SCITT), a school-led teacher training programme to aid in the recruitment of teachers in RBWM which would lead to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). The programme was overall successful: 29 teachers (16 primary, 13 secondary) were successfully trained during the last academic year, training continued throughout the lockdown, all trainees had at least two teaching experiences, all trainees received QTS, and 100% of primary trainees received employment.

Clive Haines then discussed absences. The rate of absences due to positive Covid cases in RBWM had reduced from 3.1% in 2021 to 2.7%; compared to the national average from 2.8% to 2.5%. As for persistence absence, 11.3% of pupils were persistently absent during the autumn term 2020/21 compared to the national rate of 13%. The Education Welfare Team continued to support schools with persistent absence through a traded service for allocated education welfare officer.

Clive Haines moved on to permanent exclusions in schools. The number of exclusions in RBWM decreased from 31 in 2018/19 to 20 in 2019/20 and 2020/21, though lockdowns influenced this reduction. In 2019/20, there were 4 permanent exclusions of primary pupils. Because of this, the SHEMH programme was launched in the same academic year to reduce primary exclusions.

Clive Haines then discussed the SEMH programme (Social Emotional Mental Health Service), which was established in September 2019 to reduce primary permanent exclusions. Evidence suggested that this was beginning to have an impact: the programme had supported 23 pupils at risk of exclusion and no pupil who had received support from the service had been excluded. The programme had evolved to include a secondary model in the 2021/22 academic year.

Clive Haines then moved on to Elective Home Education. There had been a significant increase in children being electively home educated (EHE) in RBWM from 77 children in 2019/20 to 232 children in 2021/22. To ensure all children who were electively home educated were receiving adequate education, an additional fixed-term, full-time post was appointed, funded by a one-off pandemic grant.

Clive Haines then moved on to Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (or NEET for short). The percentage of NEET and Unknown in RBWM was 5.3 % in 2021, which was below the England average of 5.4%. Meanwhile, the percentage whose status was "Unknown" was 3.7% in August 2021, which was higher than the England average of 2.3% but had fallen from 19.7% in 2017.

Clive Haines then discussed the SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) service, which was responsible for carrying out statutory Education, Health and Care Assessments of children and young people with special educational needs in RBWM and manage the placement and provision for all children and young people with EHCPs.

The service had managed 1,043 EHCP across the 0-25 age range, including 452 in mainstream school, 123 in FE College, 253 in state-funded special school and 137 in independent/non-maintained sector.

The highest primary need in RBWM was Autism, followed by Speech and Language Needs and Social, Emotional and Mental Health Difficulties.

The 2021/22 budget for SEN expenditure on independent, non-maintained and free special schools was approximately £5.7 million.

Clive Haines then finished off by giving a summary of the main priorities for education.

Councillor Bateson asked a couple of questions. Referring to GCSE and A-Level results being assessed under Covid, she asked how many pupils had their results reassessed due to challenging their original result. She then asked how many autism schools in RBWM were private or belonged to another association and if children from within or outside RBWM attended them. Clive Haines answered that results went through a peer-to-peer moderation and not only a teacher assessment. He also added that there was a process to allow pupils to appeal their results. As for how many students went through re-appeal, Clive Haines could not give a figure as it was not reported. Councillor Bateson reiterated the importance of knowing about grade appeals.

After agreeing with Councillor Bateson on the need to understand grade appeals, Kevin McDaniel answered that there were a significant number of schools which catered for young people with varying needs, such as autism support.

Councillor Sharpe asked if the issues in education were a key concern for the Borough, or were there other things that should be of concern. Clive Haines answered that the focus as a Borough was the gap between advantage and disadvantage, especially due to the Covid pandemic. In addition, the initial teaching training program was also a focus, which Clive Haines believed meant that the Borough did not have a teacher recruitment issue compared to other boroughs.

The Chairman asked how many pupils had left RBWM for boarding schools. Kevin McDaniel said the exact number was unknown; but he stated that what was known was roughly 10-12% of secondary age young people in RBWM went to grammar schools outside the Borough. He also speculated that approximately 200 children from RBWM go to other schools which were “not necessarily known” to the Borough out of a population of 35,000 children and 22,000 being enrolled into schools in RBWM.

Referring to a presentation slide, Councillor Carole Da Costa asked why children in elective home education (EHE) was considered an issue. Clive Haines responded that the issue was more to do with the reasons as to why children were being electively home educated (EHE). He stated a couple of reasons for EHE, such as continued anxiety from the Covid pandemic and parents seeking to prevent a situation of their child being excluded from the school. Therefore, support was needed to be provided to help children get back into mainstream schools when EHE was not the parental preference.

Councillor Tisi asked some questions regarding school exclusions. Firstly, she asked to shed some light on the exclusions of 60% of children with SEND and children without EHCPs (Education Health and Care Plan). She then asked if there were provisions or services offered to support Gypsy-Roma and Traveller children in education. And finally, she asked about the differences in exclusions between maintained schools and academies, namely what was causing it and what could be done about it.

While not knowing all the reasons as to why some schools excluded more than others, Clive Haines answered that a factor for high rates of exclusion in secondary schools was due to school policy, such as a zero-tolerance policy towards drugs and knives. A countermeasure he mentioned was to encourage the schools to further investigate the context (e.g., a butterknife is not a dangerous weapon). He also stated that style of leadership could also influence the rate of exclusions. He also mentioned that there was a fair access panel to get excluded children back into school as soon as possible.

Kevin McDaniel mentioned factors that influenced the rate of exclusion, including a recent increase in difficult behaviour, such as physical assault, and the school leadership style, namely schools acting early and firmly to maintain behaviour. He also suggested an increase in of young people having a lack of appreciation for the consequence of their actions and the need to understand the importance of a consistent set of rules and boundaries. This is the aim of the SEMH (Social Emotional and Mental Health) services.

Answering Councillor Tisi’s other questions, Clive Haines stated that exclusions of children without EHCPs or with SENDs was something he was focusing on. He also added that all exclusions went through exclusions panels, allowing for cases to be investigated and be challenged. As for Gypsy-Roma and Traveller pupils, Clive Haines stated that assistance was done within the education welfare for attendance and specialist teachers reached out to these communities.

The Chairman asked if there was an officer who took care of the welfare of Traveller children and schools they attend. Clive Haines replied that there was no dedicated or specialist officer, rather its shared within the services.

Referencing Councillor Tisi’s question regarding exclusions of children without EHCPs and children with SEND, Kevin McDaniel stated that schools without additional resources or finances could be unable to accommodate and meet the needs of pupils requiring support. This had been known to make challenging relations between parents and schools, contributing to exclusions or lack of access to education.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel noted the report.

Q2 DATA AND PERFORMANCE REPORT

Hilary Hall, Executive Director of Adults, Health and Housing, introduced the item. She noted that the report was for Quarter 2 (July–September 2021) and therefore would also give an update on where the Borough was presently at the end of Quarter 3 (December 2021).

Hilary Hall explained the status of the Adults Services.

She started with Care Package reviews. At the end of Q2, care reviews were slightly below target but within tolerance thresholds due to the impact of vacancies in the workforce as well as more complex new cases which had taken officer time. The position at the end of Q3 was improving, the figure was still just below target but there were still ambitions to reach the target. Hilary Hall added that all cases were risk assessed to ensure that reviews were prioritised according to need.

Hilary Hall then moved on to Permanent Admissions to care homes. By the end of Q2 (September 2021), there was an increase in admissions to care homes (above tolerance thresholds) mainly due to people being discharged from hospital with much more complexity of need and therefore required more intense support. The position at the end of Q3 had been the same with an increase in care home admissions and no expectation that this would be reduced in Q4 (January–March 2022).

Hilary Hall then discussed Reablement. By the end of Q2, the percentage of rehabilitation clients still at home 91 days after discharge was below target but within the tolerance threshold. While still below target in Q3, she predicted that the target would be reached by the end of 2022.

On Carers' Assessments, Hilary Hall stated that performance had been dropping throughout Q2; therefore, there had been a focus on improving this over the last two months. There was a data cleansing exercise which was completed in November 2021, enabling a clear view of the people that needed to be reviewed. Hilary Hall added that a carers' survey was conducted with the results being positive comments from carers about the support they received.

For satisfaction with the adults' safeguarding process, Hilary Hall reported ongoing good performance.

Councillor Bateson asked if people left hospital and go into care outside the Borough and they have no money, does the area the person goes to pay for it or does the Borough do it. Hilary Hall answered that if the individual was a RBWM resident and their financial assets were below £23,000 then the Borough would pay for it, wherever they were located.

Councillor Bateson followed by asking about waiting times for people going into care homes. Hilary Hall replied that there was typically no waiting time, usually people go straight from hospital to the care home placement. At the moment, it was taking a bit longer to find placements due to the demand. She added that direct payments were being offered to families to support them to take their relatives back home rather than move them into care homes which may not be in their best interests. Essentially, due to pressure on the NHS, a series of methods were being used to support discharge from hospital.

Kevin McDaniel then discussed the status of children's services during quarter 2.

In summary, for care leavers, there was a positive performance for the number of care leavers who went into education, employment or training.

For health visiting, Kevin McDaniel stated that the rate of health visiting from parents was decreasing below target. In response, the trend was being monitored, recognising that it was tracking towards pre-pandemic levels.

Kevin McDaniel then mentioned there was a positive increase in School Ofsted ratings.

For children's social care, there was an increase in re-referrals in the past 2 to 3 months, driven by factors including Covid concerns and anxieties. Despite this increase, there were no concerns of the rate at the moment, and it was being monitored.

Regarding Child Protection Plans, Kevin McDaniel stated he was confident that the improved processes and monitoring of the Plans was maintain quality as well as timeliness.

For Special Education Needs and Disability, there was a high level of performance of completing Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), reaching above target.

Councillor Tisi asked if health visiting checks had fully returned to in-person meetings or a hybrid model was in place in which video calls were offered. Kevin McDaniel stated that hybrid models were still being offered; but were also running in-person and clinical appointments as a first preference.

Councillor Sharpe asked officers how long it would take before they thought life would return to pre-pandemic normality with the lifting of Covid restrictions. Kevin McDaniel gave a children's social service perspective on the Covid situation. During the early stages of the pandemic, there were regulatory changes which released the Council from its duties, such as visiting in-person. As these measures had come to an end in autumn 2021, Kevin McDaniel believed these measures had passed. He added that there was work to help overcome any residual fears which discouraged people from using services in the way they are best engaged, such as elective home education, admission to school and in-door group activities. Kevin McDaniel speculated that the change in season with warmer weather would cause more restrictions to be lifted as well as enabling people to do outdoor activities.

Hilary Hall then answered Councillor Sharpe's question from an adult social care perspective. In spite of the pandemic, care and support continued to be provided for people in care. In addition to residual anxiety, Hilary Hall stated an area of concern was the long-term impact of pandemic on people's health and wellbeing as well as the knock-on impact on adult social care.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel noted the report and:

i) Noted the 2021/22 Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel Q2 Data & Performance Report in Appendix A.

ii) Requested relevant Cabinet Members, Directors and Heads of Service to maintain focus on improving performance.

DEMOGRAPHIC GROWTH PRESENTATION

The Chairman informed Panel members and the public that the 2022/23 budget was discussed at the last Corporate Overview and Scrutiny meeting in December 2021. She mentioned that during the meeting, it was recommended that the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered whether there was evidence of growth demand, this was what the Panel was now considering.

Hilary Hall introduced the item by giving a verbal report.

Hilary Hall presented a couple of slides. The first slide showed the make-up of the budget for Adult Social Care.

The second slide summarised the demand for adult social care which encompassed learning disability, mental health, and physical disability and older people. It also showed a fluctuation in total costs: an increase before the pandemic (2018-20), then dropped slightly during the first

year of the pandemic (2020-21), and then a slight increase during the second year of the pandemic (2021-22).

Kevin McDaniel then added some comments. With children in care – numbered around 130 per year – there was usually a churn of around 25 per year with children moving in and out, whether it was children going into care, being returned to family and relatives, going into adoption or care leavers moving on. The RBWM churn rate was relatively low compared to neighbouring boroughs and the England average; Kevin McDaniel hoped this rate would be maintained.

Kevin McDaniel also stated the key drivers for the future was to transform how to work with families, particularly with parenting needs, to earlier work by helping families with developing their parenting skills rather than from post-referral and becoming a child in care.

Referencing a slide stating the unknown quantity of support needed, Councillor Tisi asked Hilary Hall if there was a way of modelling what brackets people could fit in so that RBWM could prepare for this, mentioning that it appeared to be a risk to the budget.

Hilary Hall agreed it was a strategic risk to the budget. She then stated that while some modelling would be conducted, it would be difficult, adding there was little information on self-funders who would fall under the new capping regime. She also stated that domiciliary care providers and care homes would be asked if they could provide information on the numbers of self-funders.

Adele Taylor commented that until the statutory guidance came in, modelling on the potential costs would be difficult due to the complexity.

UPDATE ON THE RE COMMISSIONING OF DOMICILIARY CARE

Lynne Lidster, Head of Commissioning for People, introduced the item on the Domiciliary Care Update for January 2022 by giving a presentation. In summary, she gave an update on the progress and date of the Task and Finish Group established in Autumn 2021 to inform the tender for the new domiciliary care service.

Lynne Lidster moved on to the vision for the new service which was to be “personalised and [would] enable and empower people to ‘live their best life.’”

Lynne Lidster then discussed the new contract. The aspirations for the new contract included high quality service, a focus on prevention, enabling people to be self-reliant, flexibility of the responsiveness of service provision and contributing to a reduction in demand across health and social care systems. The people who would be supported through the services under the new contract included people who needed to settle back home following an episode resulting in hospital admission, people in crisis (or post-crisis) recovering after a period of reablement, people whose recovery could take longer than 8 weeks but were likely to not require support within 12 months, and people with long-term conditions who needed support to enable them to live independently.

Lynne Lidster then gave an overview of the model, a Dynamic Purchasing System.

Lynne Lidster then finished off by discussing the next steps for the Task and Finish Group. A third and fourth meeting was to be arranged, with the latter arranged to formulate recommendations for the Cabinet.

ACTION – Lynne Lidster to contact Democratic Services to arrange the next Task and Finish group meeting.

Councillor Tisi asked for confirmation on the new hourly rate for the providers. Lynne Lidster

answered that under the main contract, the payment would be £19.40 – the price under the current contract was £17.95.

ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT

The Chairman introduced the item, which was to suggest content for inclusion on the annual scrutiny report, for consideration at Full Council.

Councillor Sharpe expressed support for the report.

Councillor Tisi suggested if there was anything to add, then the Panel could send an email to the Chairman.

The Chairman then asked the Panel if they agreed to bring the annual scrutiny report to the next Panel meeting on 27th April 2022. The Panel expressed agreement.

WORK PROGRAMME

ACTION – Laurence Ellis to add the annual scrutiny report to the work programme for the next Panel meeting in April 2022.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.35 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....