

Public Document Pack

Notice of Meeting

People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Councillors Helen Taylor (Chair), Devon Davies (Vice-Chair), Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross, Carole Da Costa, Jack Douglas, Genevieve Gosling, George Shaw and John Story

Thursday 1 February 2024 7.00 pm

Council Chamber - Town Hall - Maidenhead & on [RBWM YouTube](#)

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1	Apologies for Absence To receive any apologies for absence from Panel Members.	-
2	Declarations of Interest To receive any declarations of interest from Panel Members.	3 - 4
3	Minutes To consider and approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 th October 2023.	5 - 12
4	Deep dive on SEND/Elective Home Education To consider the scrutiny review covering both SEND and Elective Home Education. These two topics have been scoped out by Councillors on the Panel and the scoping documents are attached for reference. The full pack of information for the review will be circulated once ready.	13 - 20
5	Appointment of co-optees to Overview and Scrutiny In accordance with section A3 of Part 4 of the council's constitution, the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel are permitted to appoint a number of individuals as co-optees on the Panel. Overview and Scrutiny has a vital role in performance management by linking the planning and delivery of services to the experiences of and impact upon local people. Expanding its membership to include representation beyond locally elected representatives strengthens these links and gives a voice to the key representatives from the local community. All relevant bodies and organisations have been informed of these positions and both Overview and Scrutiny Panels are asked to approve the appointments which have been proposed. The Panel are asked to note the report and recommend the listed appointments for approval by Full Council.	21 - 30

6	Work Programme To review the ongoing work programme.	31 - 32
---	--	---------

By attending this meeting, participants are consenting to the audio & visual recording being permitted and acknowledge that this shall remain accessible in the public domain permanently.

Please contact Mark Beeley, Mark.Beeley@RBWM.gov.uk, with any special requests that you may have when attending this meeting.

Published: 24th January 2024



MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIS (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

DPIS (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- *Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.*
- *Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her election expenses*
- *Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.*
- *Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
 - a) that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, and*
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.*

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.** If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests:

- a) any unpaid directorships
 - b) any body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
 - c) any body
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature
 - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or
 - (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)
- of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, or a body included under Other Registerable Interests in Table 2 you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a financial interest or well-being of a body included under Other Registerable Interests as set out in Table 2 (as set out above and in the Members' code of Conduct)

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter (referred to in the paragraph above) **affects** the financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

Agenda Item 3

PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Thursday 12 October 2023

Present: Councillors Helen Taylor (Chair), Devon Davies (Vice-Chair), Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross, Carole Da Costa, Jack Douglas, Julian Sharpe, George Shaw and John Story

Also in attendance: Mark Jervis (Co-optee)

Officers: Mark Beeley, Kevin McDaniel, Lin Ferguson, Lynne Lidster, Lucy Kourpas and Nikki Craig

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Gosling and Tony Wilson.

Councillor Sharpe was attending the meeting as a substitute for Councillor Gosling.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor C Da Costa declared a personal interest as she voluntarily gave up a portion of her Councillor allowance to Kickback and children in care.

Minutes

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes from the meeting held on 6th June 2023 were approved as a true and accurate record.

Annual Complaints and Compliments Report 2022/23

Nikki Craig, Assistant Director of HR, Corporate Projects and IT, explained that there was a statutory requirement on the council to publish compliments and complaints data on adult and children's services but RBWM published complaints data for all service areas. In total there had been:

- 1,408 contacts made with the complaints team.
- 269 contacts were progressed as complaints.
- 16 were for adult services and 85 were for children's services.
- 50% of adult services complaints had been responded to within timescales.
- There had been 38 compliments recorded for adult services.
- The vast majority of complaints on children's services were partially upheld.
- 45% of children's services complaints had been responded to within timescales.
- There had been 69 compliments recorded for children's services.

The report included narrative on areas of improvement and lessons learned by service areas in response to complaints. The council was performing well compared to similar local authorities.

Lin Ferguson, Executive Director of Children's Services and Education, added that complaints in children's services could be complex and therefore took time to resolve. She was disappointed that timescales were not as good as they could be but the relationship between the social work team and the complaints team had improved. There was a lot of learning done from complaints and action was taken to make improvements.

Kevin McDaniel, Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Health, said that the vast majority of complaints in adult services stemmed from disagreements about the cost of care and contributions required from residents. Additional resource had been focused on improving communication around this to residents.

Lynne Lidster, Director of Commissioning – People at Optalis, explained that a debt prevention officer post had been created. This role looked at developing an ongoing financial awareness training programme, to hold surgeries with practitioners, to develop a secondary care dashboard and supporting residents from getting into debt with the council.

Councillor C Da Costa expressed her concern at the number of complaints which had not been responded to within timescales. She asked if the additional deadline was not being requested or was this deadline also being missed.

Lin Ferguson said that staff were not always requesting the additional deadline. Work was being done to change this and make sure that deadlines were recorded correctly. This was also important in ensuring that families were kept up to date and aware of why complaints could take time to be resolved.

Councillor Shaw noted that the response time to complaints in adult services had improved. He asked if there was any particular reason which could be associated with this improvement and if this could be used to improve response times in children's services.

Kevin McDaniel said that the team had ensured that complaints did not become stuck between different teams and that complaints were progressed through the system in a timely manner. Learning had been shared between the service areas and it was hoped that there would be improvements shown in future years.

Councillor Story noted that children's statutory complaints had gone from 79% to 45% of complaints being responded to within timescales. This was a big drop and he wondered if there was any reason for this.

Lin Ferguson said that there was no clear issue or theme which was causing this but a substantial decline had been noticed.

Kevin McDaniel said that children's statutory complaints were rare but were often very long and complex cases around children in the care of RBWM. There had been three complaints received in this area and two had been responded to outside of timescales.

Councillor Story referred to the long delay in responses from the Housing team.

Kevin McDaniel explained that the Housing team received some of the highest numbers of complaints with a strong demand being seen. However, a significant majority of these were based around positions on the housing register.

Councillor Brar asked what measures would be taken to make sure that residents who needed to pay for adult social care did not fall into debt.

Lynne Lidster said that the speed of residents receiving their first invoice could be improved, with the aim of this being within 30 days. If invoices were sent out late, this could make it

difficult for residents to budget effectively. Individual circumstances and understanding the level of care required was the main reason for a delay to invoices being processed.

Kevin McDaniel said that there were different payment plans that could be offered and the priority was making sure that families had enough money to be safe, warm and dry.

Councillor Shaw asked if there was any link between the increase in response times to children's services complaints and the number that were being fully or partially upheld.

Lin Ferguson said that staff were being transparent in their responses to complaints and were able to understand where things could be improved.

Councillor Sharpe asked if there was anything in the report which should be highlighted to the Panel as a concern and if there was an action plan to improve these areas.

Kevin McDaniel said that it was expected there would be more complaints around the cost of adult social care due to the cost of living situation. This was why the team had been ensuring that residents were aware of the cost of adult social care and what their options were if they had any issues in paying.

Lin Ferguson said that communication was an area of focus, making sure that parents and families were kept up to date on the progress of their complaint.

Councillor C Da Costa asked if it was possible in future reports if complaints about financial contributions could be separated to other complaints, as this could paint an inaccurate picture that the council was receiving more complaints.

Kevin McDaniel suggested that this could be done by reviewing how data was captured in the database on complaints.

Nikki Craig added that there was a drop down list which could be selected to highlight the reason for the complaint being made.

ACTION – Kevin McDaniel to work with Nikki Craig to explore if complaints could be separated out for future reports, to highlight how many complaints were made about financial contributions.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel noted the report and agreed:

- i) That the report was published on the council's website.**
- ii) That the annual report continued to be produced and presented at future Overview and Scrutiny Panels.**

Achieving for Children Annual Reports 2022/23

Lucy Kourpas, Chief Operating and Finance Officer at Achieving for Children, explained that the annual reports were being presented to Cabinet as the council was a joint owner of Achieving for Children. The annual report was made up of the impact report, the equalities report and the accounts. The impact report outlined the strategic priorities, values and key impacts on families. Good progress had been made against these priorities with independent inspections showing positive results. A number of case studies were included, particularly around supporting families in the cost of living crisis and strengthening the local offer of support for those with SEND. There had been an escalation in mental health need and a programme of support had been rolled out across schools.

The equalities report provided information around the approach as an organisation, infographics about the workforce and residents who used Achieving for Children's services. There had been a focus on improving training and development for staff and awareness around the protected characteristics. A mentoring programme had been introduced and this had been popular, while a virtual support hub had also been introduced.

The accounts contained information on the financial performance and position for Achieving for Children and followed national reporting standards. Independent auditors had audited the accounts and they had concluded that it reflected a true and accurate financial performance. The overall value of Achieving for Children had improved by £73 million but the net worth was -£5.3 million. This was because the local government pension scheme was offered to all employees who worked for Achieving for Children.

Councillor Story asked if it was normal for the value of the pension fund change to be reflected in the accounts of an organisation.

Lucy Kourpas said that the pension fund was valued every three years and this informed employer contribution rates. The last valuation had come in from 1st April 2023 and there had been a small increase in the employer contribution rate. Achieving for Children was a community interest company, therefore it was likely that it always owed more than it owned and this explained why there was a negative net worth. There was an asset lock in place, so if Achieving for Children was ever wound up, the three joint owning councils would have access to these assets. The organisation had not been set up to deliver a profit, it had been set up to deliver services on behalf of the council.

Councillor Story noted that the families first scheme had over 100 families being supported in Kingston and Richmond, but there were only 11 being supported in RBWM.

Lin Ferguson said that Achieving for Children had been running the families first scheme in Kingston and Richmond for a number of years. Funding had recently been secured to run this scheme in RBWM and had only been run since July.

Councillor Story asked if staff had to attend all of the training sessions which were listed in the report. He questioned whether this was taking up too much time.

Lin Ferguson said that there were a number of specialist staff who needed to receive regular and specific training on certain matters. Not all sessions were mandatory for all staff, this would be a discussion within the team about which training sessions were appropriate. The training offer was extensive, staff often joined Achieving for Children as the support package was good.

Councillor Story commented on the attendance for training sessions being low, it had increased from 10% to 14%.

Lucy Kourpas clarified that there was one equality, diversity and inclusion module which was mandatory for staff and this took about an hour to complete. Staff were asked to refresh this every couple of years. For mandatory sessions, the target was 100% but this was currently around 60%. It was difficult to determine how many staff should attend each training session as training needs were different. Places on the sessions were also sold to other local authorities.

Councillor Story felt that this figure was portrayed negatively, he suggested to officers that this could be rewritten to clarify that not all staff needed to attend every training session to help explain and justify the low attendance figure.

Councillor Shaw said that RPI had been assumed as being 3%, he asked if this figure was higher what impact it could have on Achieving for Children.

Lucy Kourpas explained that this was a financial assumption over time on the pension fund, this was a long term average.

Councillor Shaw asked if the recommendations which had been highlighted as part of Ofsted inspections were achievable.

Lin Ferguson said that there was an action plan in place as a result of the inspection, this was monitored quarterly. There was an action plan from the last full Ofsted inspection which had taken place in 2020. Both action plans had been reviewed recently and the team were happy with the progress being made.

Councillor C Da Costa picked up the points made on mandatory training attendance. In her experience, mandatory training meant that unless it was completed, staff were not able to do their jobs.

Lucy Kourpas agreed that mandatory should be mandatory, this was the case for new starters. Managers had strongly encouraged staff to complete mandatory modules.

Councillor C Da Costa commented on recruitment and retention, she felt that the training offer in place would be attractive to potential staff. She asked if there had been thought given to try and improve retention rates or to bring in agency staff long term to try and save costs.

Lin Ferguson said that social worker recruitment was a national issue, many signed up to agencies where they could earn more money and were not fixed to a specific place. There was a recruitment and retention strategy in place which made comparisons with other Berkshire authorities. A good benefits package was offered. There was a good rate of agency staff who then joined Achieving for Children on a permanent basis. This was not just an issue with social workers, it was across the board.

Councillor C Da Costa said that she in her previous job there had been a bank trust, this meant that the worker got paid a little bit more and could attract staff from agencies. She asked if this had been explored in Achieving for Children.

Lin Ferguson said it had been considered but it was tricky to do, particularly as it was important that staff built up a relationship with the children and families that they worked with. She hoped for national support to help with retention.

Mark Jervis, Co-optee, said that there had been an increase in children's mental health issues. He asked for any comment on waiting times for mental health issue appointments and key strategies for tackling mental health.

Lin Ferguson agreed that there had been a spike in the number of mental health issues reported amongst young people and children. There was a waiting list for core Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) but not all children needed this. The team had been working on prevention activities, for example self-esteem groups, a youth counselling contract, a getting help team and a wellbeing team. The waiting list had remained relatively static, Lin Ferguson was happy to confirm this information.

ACTION – Lin Ferguson to confirm the waiting list time for CAMHS referrals and share this with the Panel.

Councillor Sharpe asked what Achieving for Children had done in the Ascot area. He asked if there was one thing that could be changed to help children achieve more, what would it be.

Lin Ferguson said that she would need to clarify examples in Ascot with the family hub team. The holiday activity fund had been put on for children with free school meals and there had been activities taking place in the Ascot area.

ACTION – Lin Ferguson to speak to Danny Gomm about the activities which had taken place in Ascot from Achieving for Children.

Lucy Kourpas said that life circumstances should not determine life outcomes and that all children should be able to achieve what they wanted to achieve in life.

Kevin McDaniel said that for many children days at school were being taken away due to personal circumstances. He wanted to see more done to ensure that school days were not lost.

Lin Ferguson agreed, education was key for all young people. Children just starting school were often not school ready because of the impact from the pandemic, school needed to be a good experience. Work was also done with those who refused to attend school due to emotional wellbeing and anxiety.

Councillor Sharpe asked how many children were currently not attending school due to anxiety.

Lin Ferguson said that the borough was not in a bad position but she wanted to improve the numbers. It was important to understand why the child did not want to attend school and each child had slightly different circumstances.

ACTION – Lin Ferguson to share report on the number of children not attending school across the borough with the Panel.

Councillor Brar asked how many children in the borough were educated at home.

Lin Ferguson said it was around 180 children.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel noted the report and submitted the discussion and comments on the item to be considered by Cabinet as part of the agenda pack.

Children and Young People's Strategic Plan for RBWM

Lin Ferguson shared a video with the Panel which highlighted the Children and Young People's Strategic Plan and detailed the priorities which formed the plan. This was the first time a plan of this kind had been adopted by the council. On the 'be healthy' priority, there was an aim to improve access to mental health, increasing the number of children who were breastfed and increasing the number of child immunisations. On 'be safe', there had been campaigns on water safety and safety outside of the home. It was important that all children were ready for school and that attainment for vulnerable groups was increased. The partnership was a written commitment between a number of agencies and would lead to a number of positive changes for children and young people, with many benefits already being seen.

Councillor C Da Costa commented on the video which had been shared, this was well put together and clearly explained the plans priorities. She questioned the higher than average number of children with SEND in the borough, was there any reason for this.

Lin Ferguson said that in more affluent areas there was a trend of children with SEND being identified at an earlier stage.

Councillor C Da Costa said that 6.3% of young people aged between 16 and 17 were not in employment, education or training. This was a high figure compared to the rest of Berkshire and England.

Lin Ferguson said that the Deputy Director of Education was currently writing a report on the reasons for this figure which would be presented to the Schools Forum. The pandemic had an impact on children wanting to learn and staying in education.

Councillor C Da Costa said it was disappointing to see that there were no free drop-in breastfeeding clinics in the borough. Early help needed to be protected as it was a really important service.

Councillor Sharpe asked why this was the first Children and Young People's Strategic Plan which had been brought forward.

Kevin McDaniel explained that there was a statutory requirement to have a children and young people plan and the council had always had one. This plan had been developed in coordination with other teams and organisations which meant the plan was shared widely and was more prominent as a result.

Councillor Sharpe asked if there were any obstacles which officers could see getting in the way of priorities in the plan being achieved.

Lin Ferguson said that the biggest challenge would be finance and budget. All agencies were working together in collaboration on issues which were important to children and young people. There had not been many barriers experienced so far, with active workstreams complimenting the five key priorities.

Councillor Sharpe asked whether joining up with other organisations had decreased the cost of the service overall.

Lin Ferguson confirmed that it was too early to say, it was about thinking differently to achieve positive results.

Mark Jervis, Co-optee, noted that there were no Key Performance Indicators included as part of the plan.

Lin Ferguson said that these were part of the action plan, this could be shared with the Panel.

ACTION – Lin Ferguson to share the action plan for the Children and Young People's Strategic Plan.

Councillor Cross mentioned a training course run by Kickback called 'total respect', which she recommended to other Councillors. Something that came out of this training was that when children in care passed a certain age, they would be transferred to a different service area. Councillor Cross asked what the council was doing to ensure that this gap was bridged and young people were being supported.

Lin Ferguson said that in children's services there was a responsibility to support care leavers until the age of 25. For those children with SEND, the service provided support for the whole time that an Education Health and Care Plan was in place. To ensure the transition between childhood and adulthood was smooth, there was a 'preparing for adulthood' board and there were plans for a strategy to be produced along with additional guidance.

Kevin McDaniel added that conversations needed to happen with young people to set out a route for those who would not meet adult support for their whole life. Adult social care needed to work with colleagues in children's services and housing to ensure that there are places for young people to live.

Councillor Shaw asked how the strategy would look to target an increase in uptake of children's vaccines.

Lin Ferguson said that the main issue was parental choice, the council could not force parents to vaccinate their children. Work was done with parents to highlight the benefits of vaccinations.

Kevin McDaniel said that the public health team had a responsibility to drive the messaging and communications around vaccines and this done working closely with GPs and children's services.

Work Programme

Mark Beeley, Principal Democratic Services Officer – Overview and Scrutiny, updated the Panel on the work programme. He said that two scoping documents had been completed, on support for children with SEND and support for home educated children in the borough. The Panel approved both of the scoping documents.

Councillor Shaw commented on the impact of the government decision on support for asylum seekers, as this was in relation to the change from 28 days to 7 days to leave their currently occupied space. This had a knock on effect for asylum seekers and Councillor Shaw was keen to understand what support was in place.

The Chair suggested that it could be worth inviting the housing allocations team to present to the Panel at a future meeting.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.00 pm

Chair.....

Date.....

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Overview and Scrutiny Panels

Scrutiny Review – Scoping and Planning Document

Title of the Review	How does the council provide support to children with Special Education Needs or Disabilities (SEND)
Panel Name	People Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Panel Members	Councillors Helen Taylor (Chair), Devon Davies (Vice Chair), Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross, Carole Da Costa, Jack Douglas, Genevieve Gosling, George Shaw and John Story
Support Officer(s)	
Lead Member(s)/Officer(s) Identify a nominated: - Elected Member - Lead Officer	Councillor Mandy Brar Councillor Devon Davies
Relevant Cabinet Member	Councillor Amy Tisi – Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education and Windsor
Purpose of the Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify exactly which Outcome(s) the review is examining? • Also being clear what the review is not looking at • What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve? • Where possible refer to VFM issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction. 	<p>There are a couple of goals in the RBWM Corporate Plan relating to children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that every child in the borough is able to experience positive outcomes in childhood, through healthy living, readiness to learn, and positive parenting, and support targeted at those most at risk. • An increase in the attainment ranking for Children in Care, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and children eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) in GCSE English and Maths. <p>These goals show that the borough wants to ensure that all children are able to thrive and achieve their potential. However,</p>

	<p>children with SEND and EHCPs require additional support from the council and schools.</p> <p>This review will look to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does RBWM currently use limited resources to achieve good outcomes for children with SEND? • Does the SEND Local Offer match the needs and difficulties faced by SEND children in the borough? • Are we reaching out to all residents to ensure that they know of the support available? • Are the parents, as well as the children, being supported appropriately? • How prepared is the council for future demand and strain on the service? • What improvements can be made to ensure that the support offer compliments the needs of SEND children in the borough?
<p>Criteria for Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has this particular topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny? • Which of the criteria promoted by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny does it satisfy? 	<p>Nationally, the number of children with SEND has increased and this has placed greater pressure on local authorities. The attainment gap between children with SEND and other children has increased, particularly over the course of the pandemic.</p> <p>The review will look to consider the range of support on offer for SEND children and whether there is data to confirm if all groups are being reached. Key performance indicators and metrics around attainment can be used by the Panel to assert whether support is helping to shorten the gap.</p>
<p>Terms of Reference</p>	<p>Single scrutiny item considered by the Panel. The report and SEND strategy can be reviewed and following discussion next steps can be confirmed.</p>

<p>What are the anticipated outcomes of the review?</p> <p>Key Lines of Enquiry</p> <p>Sources of Information/Evidence</p> <p>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</p>	<p>Do the priorities in the SEND strategy match the needs and priorities of children?</p> <p>How are we measuring these priorities?</p> <p>What are the key performance targets for the SEND strategy and are we achieving these targets? If not, why?</p>
<p>Corporate Risks associated with this Review?</p> <p>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</p>	<p>Need to ensure that all discussions are kept generic and that individual cases are not discussed.</p>
<p>Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?</p>	<p>Panel can make relevant recommendations to officers on reviewing the support offer available. If necessary, recommendations on the SEND strategy can be made to Cabinet.</p>
<p>What is the Review Timescale? • Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports, recommendations or decisions.</p>	<p>Agree scoping document.</p> <p>Item likely to be considered by the Panel later in the year.</p>
<p>How could a review be publicised?</p> <p>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement? • What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g. Flyers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</p>	<p>Through social media and newsletters.</p> <p>The Panel could appeal for parents of children with SEND to speak at a Panel meeting and share their experience.</p> <p>SENCO leads in schools, headteachers and governors would also be good sources of information for the review and could be invited as witnesses to the Panel meeting.</p>
<p>Completed by/ Date:</p>	<p>Councillor Mandy Brar</p> <p>Councillor Devon Davies</p> <p>Mark Beeley</p>
<p>Approved by Scrutiny Panel / Date:</p>	<p>People Overview and Scrutiny Panel – October 2023</p>

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Overview and Scrutiny Panels

Scrutiny Review – Scoping and Planning Document

Title of the Review	Home Education Support in RBWM
Panel Name	People Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Panel Members	Councillors Helen Taylor (Chair), Devon Davies (Vice Chair), Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross, Carole Da Costa, Jack Douglas, Genevieve Gosling, George Shaw and John Story
Support Officer(s)	Lin Ferguson – Executive Director of Children’s Services and Education
Lead Member(s)/Officer(s) Identify a nominated: - Elected Member - Lead Officer	Councillor Jack Douglas Clive Haines – Deputy Director for Education
Relevant Cabinet Member	Councillor Amy Tisi – Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education and Windsor
Purpose of the Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify exactly which Outcome(s) the review is examining? • Also being clear what the review is not looking at • What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve? • Where possible refer to VFM issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction. 	<p>The RBWM Corporate Plan has a target that:</p> <p>"At least 95% of the borough’s education settings are judged to be Good or Outstanding".</p> <p>This refers in the first instance to schools and other educational establishments - home education is too niche a topic to be addressed directly in the Corporate Plan. However, the same general principle can be inferred to apply to the home education setting and where the council has the capability, it should work towards helping parents achieve the home education analogy of 'good' or 'outstanding' education settings.</p> <p>Parents have the legal right to choose to educate their children other than by attendance at school, usually by providing</p>

	<p>education at home. In cases where a child is withdrawn from school, the Home Education team in the Education Welfare Service will then make initial contact with the family. AfC are committed to building trusting, positive relationships with parents.</p> <p>In other cases, the decision to keep a child out of school may not be known to RBWM and therefore the same level of support might not be provided.</p> <p>A review of the current situation would have two primary purposes, both focussed on supporting the best educational outcomes for children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding where AfC can offer useful low-cost assistance, beyond building trusting, positive relationships with parents. • Enabling the borough to intervene in cases where a home educated child is not receiving suitable education and AfC are currently unaware. <p>The review is not looking at the moral, legal, ethical or educational case for elective home education. It is assumed that choice and diversity are inherently a good thing and the balance of pros and cons are best weighed up by individual parents as the law provides.</p>
<p>Criteria for Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has this particular topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny? • Which of the criteria promoted by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny does it satisfy? 	<p>Four core principles have been established (by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny) to help people understand the most important qualities of scrutiny and accountability;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Constructive ‘critical friend’ challenge 2. Amplifies the voices and concerns of the public 3. Led by independent people who take responsibility for their role.

	<p>4. Drives improvement in public services</p> <p>This review will look to amplify the voices and concerns of the public by ensuring that there is adequate provision and support in place for those children in the borough who are home educated.</p> <p>The review will also look to drive improvement in public services, as parents could be supported with access to school exam halls or gym facilities.</p>
Terms of Reference	A report could be considered by the Panel outlining the support and options available to parents who choose to home educate their children. The Panel would then have the opportunity to speak to officers and satisfy themselves that the council provides a comprehensive support package. Should gaps or areas of improvement be identified, recommendations can be made to Cabinet.
<p>What are the anticipated outcomes of the review?</p> <p>Key Lines of Enquiry</p> <p>Sources of Information/Evidence</p> <p>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</p>	<p>Goals of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest ways to improve the data we collect on elective home education within the borough. • Suggest ways in which we can affordably assist with the education of home-educated children in the borough.
<p>Resource & budget requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specialist staff • any external support • site visits • consultation • research 	<p>None identified.</p> <p>Officer time and resource in preparing a report.</p>
<p>Corporate Risks associated with this Review?</p> <p>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</p>	None identified.
Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?	Cabinet

<p>What is the Review Timescale? • Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports, recommendations or decisions.</p>	<p>Scoping document agreed by the Panel.</p> <p>Item considered by People Overview and Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>Recommendations made to the Cabinet Member following consideration of the item.</p>
<p>How could a review be publicised?</p> <p>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement? • What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g. Flyers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</p>	<p>Review could be publicised through social media and the newsletter, residents with experience of home education could share their experience with the Panel and provide first hand evidence.</p>
<p>Completed by/ Date:</p>	<p>Councillor Jack Douglas</p> <p>Mark Beeley</p>
<p>Approved by Scrutiny Panel / Date:</p>	<p>People Overview and Scrutiny Panel – October 2023</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Appointment of co-optees to Overview and Scrutiny
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Meeting and Date:	People Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 1 February 2024 Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 5 February 2024
Responsible Officer(s):	Mark Beeley – Principal Democratic Services Officer – Overview and Scrutiny
Wards affected:	None

REPORT SUMMARY

In accordance with section A3 of Part 4 of the council's constitution, the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel are permitted to appoint a number of individuals as co-optees on their respective Panels.

Overview and Scrutiny has a vital role in performance management by linking the planning and delivery of services to the experiences of and impact upon local people. Expanding its membership to include representation beyond locally elected representatives strengthens these links and gives a voice to the key representatives from the local community.

All relevant bodies and organisations have been informed of these positions and both Overview and Scrutiny Panels are asked to approve the appointments which have been proposed.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That both Overview and Scrutiny Panels note the report and recommend to Full Council that:

- i) The appointment of the following representatives are made to the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel until May 2027:**
 - i. Louvaine Kneen as the Parish Councillor representing the Northern Parishes.**
 - ii. Roly Latif and David Sanders (sub) as the Parish Councillors representing the Southern Parishes.**
- ii) The appointment of the following representatives are made to the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel until May 2027:**
 - i. Tony Wilson as the Church of England diocese representative.**
 - ii. Catherine Hobbs as the Roman Catholic diocese representative.**

- iii. **Poornima Karunacadacharan and David Hicks (sub) as the primary parent governor representatives.**
- iv. **Noel Wood as the secondary parent governor representative.**
- v. **Mark Jervis as an additional co-optee on the Panel.**

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
<p>Approve the appointments outlined above to the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>This is the recommended option.</p>	<p>Overview and Scrutiny activities benefit from a wide range of knowledge, experience and viewpoints.</p> <p>Both Panels are keen to encourage wider participation and the approval of appointments will help expand the knowledge and expertise of those involved.</p>
Do Nothing	To not appoint co-optee representatives would constitute a missed opportunity to improve decision making and scrutiny.

People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

- 2.1 The People Overview and Scrutiny Panel, when dealing with education matters, shall include in its membership the following voting representatives:
- One Church of England diocese representative.
 - One Roman Catholic diocese representative.
 - Two parent governor representatives (One to represent the primary phase and one to represent the secondary phase).
 - One representative from the Regional Schools Commissioner.
- 2.2 All schools in the borough were contacted and informed of the positions available on the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel. This information was circulated to parent governors of each school.

- 2.3 Three nominations were received, one for the primary parent governor position and two for the secondary parent governor position. After discussing with both interested individuals from secondary schools, an agreement was reached for one to be the representative and one to act as the substitute.
- 2.4 The Church of England diocese representative and the Roman Catholic diocese representative who served on the Panel from May 2019 – May 2023 have expressed a preference to continue as the nominated representatives.
- 2.5 The Regional Schools Commissioner are unable to appoint a representative to the Panel at the current time due to resourcing.
- 2.6 Mark Jervis, who had previously been a parent governor co-optee on the Panel from May 2019 until May 2023, no longer fulfils this criteria. However, he is the Chair of Trustees for Pioneer Educational Trust which is a multi-academy trust that includes Desborough College and Trevelyan Middle School.
- 2.7 Mark Jervis has expressed his desire to remain on the Panel and would provide a good source of knowledge for the Panel in his new role. It is recommended that Mark Jervis is appointed as a co-optee, especially as the Regional Schools Commissioner were unable to appoint a representative.

Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel

- 2.8 The Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel shall include two further co-opted members when considering any matters of Crime and Disorder. These shall be one parish councillor representing each of the northern and southern parishes.
- 2.9 All Parish Councils were asked to put forward interested candidates and were given 28 days to submit a 100 word statement.
- 2.10 One nomination was received from the Northern Parishes, from Bray Parish Council. Two nominations were received from the Southern Parishes, one from Sunninghill and Ascot Parish Council and one from Wraysbury Parish Council.
- 2.11 As only one nomination was received from the Northern Parishes, this nomination is recommended for approval.
- 2.12 Two completed nominations were received from the Southern Parishes. However, one nomination was received after the deadline and therefore this nomination is recommended to be the substitute representative.

3. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 3.1 There are no financial implications as a result of this report. Co-optee appointments are volunteers and are not paid expenses to attend meetings.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 By appointing to the co-optee positions outlined above, Overview and Scrutiny would be fulfilling its obligations in the Constitution to appoint co-optees to the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel. The scrutiny function has an important role to play in delivering local accountability and transparency in decision making. It was introduced by the Local Government Act 2000 primarily to serve as a check and balance on Executive powers. Subsequent legislation has given council's the responsibility for scrutinising local NHS Trusts, the work of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, and other partners, like the Environment Agency.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 5.1 No risks identified. Expanding the membership of Overview and Scrutiny enables risks to be mitigated, particularly around reducing the potential for poor decision making. There is also the opportunity to be more transparent as a result of these appointments which is to the benefit of residents.
- 5.2 Effective scrutiny is important to the successful functioning of local democracy by securing the efficient delivery of council services and driving improvements. A robust work programme is essential in order to ensure that overview and scrutiny activity contributes successfully to the work of the council.

6. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 6.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A. All Parish Councils and parent governors have been informed of the co-optee positions and were given an equal chance to express an interest. If more expressions of interest than places were received, a vote could be held if necessary.
- 6.2 Climate change/sustainability.
There may be a small impact on climate change/sustainability as with an increase to membership there may be an increase in carbon emissions caused by co-optees attending meetings. However, co-optee representatives will have the option to attend meetings remotely which would mitigate this environmental impact.
- 6.3 Data Protection/GDPR.
The email addresses of co-optee appointments will be shared with Panel Members on Overview and Scrutiny to encourage discussion outside of meetings. This proposal is not proposing new ways of working and will continue to adhere to data protection and GDPR requirements.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The report is being considered by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel before going to Full Council for formal adoption.

7.2 Councillor Chris Moriarty (Chair of Corporate), Councillor Sian Martin (Chair of Place) and Councillor Helen Taylor (Chair of People) have been consulted on the report.

8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 The full implementation stages are set out in Table 2. Should both Overview and Scrutiny Panels approval the appointments, co-optees would begin sitting on each Panel immediately. The appointments would either last until May 2027, or following resignation from the Panel.

Table 2: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
01/02/24	Considered by the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel.
05/02/24	Considered by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel.
11/03/24	Considered by Full Council for formal ratification and approval.

9. APPENDICES

9.1 This report is supported by one appendix:

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

10.1 This report is supported by one background document:

- [RBWM Constitution - Part 4 - Overview and Scrutiny](#)

11. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i> Statutory Officer (or deputy)			
Elizabeth Griffiths	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	15/01/24	22/01/24
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	15/01/24	16/01/24
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Deputy Director of Finance & Deputy S151 Officer	15/01/24	
Jane Cryer	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer	15/01/24	
<i>Mandatory:</i> Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract			
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager	N/A	N/A

Mandatory:	<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>		
Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer	15/01/24	23/01/24
Mandatory:	<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer	15/01/24	22/01/24
Other consultees:			
Directors (where relevant)			
Stephen Evans	Chief Executive	15/01/24	
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	15/01/24	
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Adult Social Care & Health	15/01/24	
Lin Ferguson	Executive Director of Children’s Services & Education	15/01/24	19/01/24
Assistant Directors (where relevant)			

Councillor Chris Moriarty	Chair of the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel	15/01/24	15/01/24
Councillor Sian Martin	Chair of the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel	15/01/24	16/01/24
Councillor Helen Taylor	Chair of the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel	15/01/24	15/01/24

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Overview and Scrutiny Panel decision	No	No

Report Author: Mark Beeley – Principal Democratic Services Officer – Overview and Scrutiny
mark.beeley@rbwm.gov.uk
01628 796345

Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Appointment of co-optees to Overview and Scrutiny
Service area:	Governance
Directorate:	Resources

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

To approve the appointment of co-optees to the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Proposed appointments are detailed in the report recommendation.

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

Overview and Scrutiny plays a key role in holding the Cabinet to account and scrutinising the performance of council service areas. The co-optee appointments would help the Panel in their scrutiny work and look to improve the performance of the council through recommendations made.

All Parish Councils and schools/parent governors have been contacted for the relevant positions and have been given a fair opportunity to submit an expression of interest.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal? For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff
This will impact the nominated co-optees and the residents/communities who are represented by them.
Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented? For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?
No.
What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?• Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?
All Parish Councils and schools/parent governors have been contacted for the relevant positions and have been given a fair opportunity to submit an expression of interest.
What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment? Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.
N/A

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of age.</p> <p>Parent governors have been chosen to cover primary and secondary school communities.</p>	x	
Disability	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of disability.</p>	x	
Sex	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of sex.</p>	x	
Race, ethnicity and religion	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of race, ethnicity and religion.</p> <p>The particular inclusion of representatives from the Church of England and Roman Catholic dioceses reflects the presence of those faith schools within the borough.</p>	x	
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of sexual orientation and gender reassignment.</p>	x	
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of pregnancy and maternity status.</p>	x	
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of marriage and civil partnership status.</p>	x	
Armed forces community	<p>These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of membership of the Armed Forces community.</p>	x	

Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty	These are voluntary positions and co-optees do not receive any fees or expenses for attending meetings. Meetings can be attended virtually which can reduce the cost to co-optees of travel to meeting venues.	x	
Children in care/Care leavers	These positions were open to all members of the relevant groups, regardless of care experience.	x	

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

<p>What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it? For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group</p>
<p>Co-optees are able to ask for reasonable adjustments to help them fulfil their role.</p>
<p>Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.
<p>N/A</p>
<p>How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future? See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.</p>
<p>The same process would be followed should any vacancies arise and all equalities impacts would be considered.</p>

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Mark Beeley	Date: 11/01/24
Approved by: Ellen McManus-Fry	Date: 22/01/24

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------

WORK PROGRAMME - PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Evans (Chief Executive) • Kevin McDaniel (Executive Director of Adult Services, Health and Communities) • Lin Ferguson (Executive Director of Children’s Services and Education)
LINK OFFICERS & HEADS OF SERVICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clive Haines (Deputy Director for Education) • Lynne Lidster (Head of Commissioning – Adults and Children)

MEETING: 2nd APRIL 2024

ITEM	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
Stop Smoking Service	Jonas Thompson-McCormick
School Transport Policy 2024-25	Lynn Penn, <i>Achieving for Children</i>
Education Standard Report	Clive Haines, <i>Deputy Director for Education</i>
Social Care Inspections – Annual Self Assessments	Clive Haines, <i>Deputy Director for Education</i>
SEND Ofsted Inspections – Annual Self Assessments	Sarah Moran, <i>Deputy Director Children's Social Care & Early Help</i>
Work Programme	Mark Beeley, <i>Principal Democratic Services Officer – Overview & Scrutiny</i>

ITEMS SUGGESTED BUT NOT YET PROGRAMMED

ITEM	COMMENTS
Impact of Home Office decisions in relation to the dispersed support for Asylum seekers (all ages)	
Task and Finish Group – Air Pollution	<i>Waiting for briefing note to be completed and shared with Cabinet Members.</i>
Task and Finish Group – Domestic Abuse	<i>In progress – next meeting to take place on 29th January.</i>
Use of artificial intelligence	<i>Suggested by Councillor Cross – scoping document to be drafted.</i>
The Adult Social Care Budget - Cost of residential care	Kevin McDaniel, <i>Executive Director of Adult Services and Health</i>
Community and Voluntary sector – how well do we work together?	Kevin McDaniel, <i>Executive Director of Adult Services and Health</i>

[Terms of Reference for the People Overview and Scrutiny Panel](#)

[Cabinet Forward Plan](#)

This page is intentionally left blank