

ADULTS, CHILDREN AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY, 21 JANUARY 2021

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

Also in attendance: Councillors John Baldwin, Gurpreet Bhangra, John Bowden, Mandy Brar, David Cannon, Gerry Clark, Karen Davies, David Hilton, Andrew Johnson, Lynne Jones, Sayonara Luxton, Samantha Rayner, Shamsul Shelim, Gurch Singh, Donna Stimson, John Story and Simon Werner, Derek Moss, Mark Jervis and Nigel Foster

Officers: David Birch, Daniel Brookman, Andy Carswell, Lin Ferguson, Hilary Hall, Tracy Hendren, Lynne Lidster, Kevin McDaniel, Michael Murphy, Fatima Rehman, Duncan Sharkey, Adele Taylor and Andrew Vallance

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Cllr Hunt nominated Cllr Sharpe for the role of Vice Chairman. This was seconded by Cllr Bateson. Cllr Tisi nominated Cllr da Costa for the role of Vice Chairman. This was seconded by Cllr da Costa.

Three members voted in favour of the motion to appoint Cllr Sharpe to the role of Vice Chairman and two members voted against the motion. As the motion was approved, the second motion to appoint Cllr da Costa to the role of Vice Chairman fell.

RESOLVED: That Cllr Sharpe be appointed Vice Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Tony Wilson.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Panel members. Cllr Baldwin stated he was a volunteer with Maidenhead Foodshare, which may be of relevance.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on September 30th 2020 be approved as an accurate record.

UPDATE ON THE ACUTE TRUST

Cllr Hunt highlighted that Janet King from the Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust had given a presentation at September's Panel. Due to Covid19 the Panel had requested a further update on the Trust and Cllr Hunt was pleased to introduce Nigel Foster, the Trust's Director of Finance, to the meeting. She thanked all NHS staff for the huge contribution they had made towards tackling the Covid19 pandemic. Nigel Foster said he hoped an ongoing relationship could be built between the Trust and the Council, after Janet King had attended the previous Panel meeting. He then gave a presentation to Members giving an update on issues affecting the Trust.

Nigel Foster said the Trust employed 10,000 people, who had been doing extraordinary things during the pandemic. Among the photos to be included in the presentation were staff from Wexham Park receiving a thank you at a Christmas angel in Slough; a bed in a refurbished staff rest area; and Di Dodsworth, the head of nursing in the intensive care team who received an MBE in the New Year's honours. Nigel Foster said he received an email from her this week, asking to pass on thanks to a member of the IT team who had helped the intensive care team on a Saturday afternoon. He said he received an email from an ITU nurse who described her feelings of being stressed and physically and emotionally exhausted, and Nigel Foster said this reflected how a high number of staff across the Trust were feeling.

Figures included in the presentation showed the current levels of staff sickness, which accounted for six per cent of the workforce. Of those, they were divided roughly proportionally equally into those who had Covid-related sickness, those who were isolating, and those who had some other sickness. Rates had decreased, as at one point more than 1,000 staff members were off sick.

Members were told about the number of meetings taking place relating to the management structure at the Trust, and how this related to service delivery. This had been particularly important in recent weeks as the number of patients had increased. Nigel Foster explained that Covid patient numbers had been very low in August, but there had been around 700 in the last few days. This was more than double the number of patients that had been experienced during the first wave of infections, and had placed great pressures on the hospital. There had been a significant spike since December 10th and assistance had needed to be sought from other hospitals. Some patients had needed to be transferred to other parts of the country and there had been transfers out of the ITU, both of which were unprecedented. Some facilities within the independent sector were being used to cope with the demand.

Nigel Foster said Wexham Park was one of the first sites in the country to start Covid vaccinations. As of the day before the Panel meeting, just under 14,000 vaccinations had been administered at a rate of around 500-600 per day. The majority of these were social care and care home workers, and Trust employees, although the vaccination roll-out was now being spread into the wider community.

The Panel was told the restoration and recovery programme was now being considered, as there was a significant backlog in terms of elective care. At the same time last year there were a small handful of patients who had been waiting for more than 52 weeks for their care to be completed; this figure was now more than 600. Nigel Foster acknowledged that the long-term impacts of this were still unknown, and it could take years to resolve the backlog.

Nigel Foster told the Panel that the Trust had been due to launch its future strategy on April 1st 2020 but this had had to be postponed. The strategy's aim was to develop the Trust over the next five years into a leader in the field of health and wellbeing and delivering exceptional services. Although it was often referred to as the Acute Trust, there was more to its scope than this, including delivering community and wellbeing services in the most appropriate way. In its six main objectives there was an aim for the Trust to be within the top ten nationally for patient safety and experience, efficiency and digital advancement, as well as being among the top ten Trusts to work for. The objectives had been developed before the first phase of Covid19 and were still considered to be the right ones to take.

Regarding Heatherwood Hospital, Members were told this was still on time and budget. Work taking place at the moment was mostly internal. Major roadworks on the main roundabout were due to start in February, and were likely to last for several months. It was hoped that the new Heatherwood Hospital would be able to accept its first patients on December 6th. The new GP Hub built alongside the hospital was also on target for completion. A new IT system called EPIC was being installed at a cost of £100million over the next ten years, which was due to be completed by March 2022. This sought to coordinate the IT needs of all the Trust's different teams, who were each using different systems.

The presentation also included photos of new robots that would be used during certain surgeries. Nigel Foster said the Trust was the only one in the world using the new Versius and da Vinci robots in theatres. These helped with some surgeries as they were able to make more precise incisions compared to human involvement.

Replying to questions from Cllr Hunt regarding staffing numbers, Nigel Foster said he was unsure on redundancy figures but would be surprised if there were many as the Trust was keen to retain as many staff as possible during the pandemic. There was an aversion to using agency staff as far as possible, with existing staff employed on banked shifts. However more agency staff had been brought in out of necessity during the last few weeks.

Cllr da Costa said the presentation had been informative and she was pleased to see the changes that were being made. She asked what would be done to support members of staff during the post-Covid recovery period, when their mental wellbeing was likely to be at its lowest. This was of particular concern to staff in ITU. Nigel Foster assured the Panel that arrangements were being made with two mental healthcare providers to increase the level of support, and access to those services, for staff. It remained to be seen however how many of the 10,000 staff were likely to need to use these services.

Cllr Tisi asked Nigel Foster how he thought hospitals would be assessed in future. Nigel Foster replied that there was likely to be a focus on recovery rather than meeting the backlog of targets, and a focus on treating certain demographics. He said he expected the backlog of patients waiting more than 52 weeks for the completion of their treatment would be the focus of a lot of political and media attention. There was an expectation there would be different targets and monitoring in future.

Responding to a question from Cllr Bateson, Nigel Foster said the new IT system would help eliminate a need for patients to repeat their symptoms or medical history if a follow-up appointment was made in a different hospital to the one where they had their first appointment. Different IT systems were in place in Wexham Park and Heatherwood Hospitals and there was little coordination at the moment.

Cllr Carroll asked about the ongoing plan to improve the CAMHS service and reduce waiting times. From speaking to schools and teachers, Cllr Carroll had learned there were concerns about youngsters' ability to access services due to the Covid19 pandemic. Nigel Foster said colleagues in Berkshire Healthcare had already indicated they were concerned there would be an increase in demand for services following the pandemic, and demand was already outstripping supply. Consideration needed to be given to whether other services needed to have funding increased or decreased, and already some areas of expenditure were being postponed. Nigel Foster said increasing funding for CAMHS would help to alleviate pressure points elsewhere in the healthcare system.

Cllr Sharpe asked what the key concerns relating to healthcare in the area were likely to be over the coming months, and how long it could take the Trust to recover from the pandemic. In relation to waiting lists, Nigel Foster stated his belief this could take some years to fully resolve. He also stated his belief that funding for the NHS was lower now than it had been in the early 2000s when he had first started work for the Trust. However he felt there was now a public will to increase spending on the NHS. Nigel Foster said he was concerned that increased pressure on healthcare services would make it harder to discharge certain patients from hospital, which in turn could negatively impact on local authorities who provided services relating to providing care at home.

Cllr Hunt thanked Nigel Foster on behalf of the Panel for attending and hoped he would be able to attend another meeting in the future. She said the presentation had been very helpful and informative.

BUDGET 2021-22

The item was introduced by Cllr Hilton, who advised that the report set out areas of growth and pressures, including those for Covid19; potential savings; and fees, charges and capital schemes relevant to the Panel's area of interest. Comments from the Panel for consideration by Cabinet were welcomed.

Cllr Carroll stated in his introduction to the Panel that the budget proposals represented four main principles: protection of vulnerable people; innovation; embracing of transformation; and to financially futureproof the Council's budget. It was noted that a small increase in the adult social care precept had been proposed as part of the overall budget.

Cllr Hunt told the Panel that she would go through each line in each appendix and invite comments and questions from members.

Appendix A

Kevin McDaniel advised that the seven items relating to children's services reflected the cost of continuing to deliver services that were already being supplied. Regarding line five, Kevin McDaniel said that, following the transfer in 2017, Achieving for Children staff were in a pension fund pool administered by Wandsworth Council which meant their pension costs were no longer included in the RBWM budget. A tri-annual re-evaluation of the fund had led to an increase in contributions, which was effective from April 2020. Other changes to the budget head described in line five reflected posts that were now being funded directly by the Local Authority as the job roles had been shown to improve delivery of services for children with additional needs; and also the removal of a staff vacancy factor budget as this has shown to be ineffective with the current level of demand.

There were no questions or comments from the Panel relating to lines one to six.

In relation to line seven, Kevin McDaniel responded to a question from Cllr da Costa by explaining that Achieving for Children had a credit facility with RBWM in order to help pay bills to suppliers on time. This had existed previously but had not been included in any earlier budget statements.

Regarding line eight, Lynne Lidster explained that RBWM held an annual contract with DASH to provide support for adults and children who were victims of domestic abuse. The contract was worth £100,000, of which RBWM contributed around £67,000. The rest of the funding came from a grant from Thames Valley Police but it was unclear if they would be able to meet this funding requirement this year. The amount shown in line eight was to cover the funding shortfall in the event Thames Valley Police did not have the grant funding to contribute. Cllr Carroll stated this was a particular service that the Council wanted to futureproof, due to an increase in domestic abuse during the course of the Covid19 pandemic and lockdown.

There were no questions or comments from the Panel in relation to line nine.

Regarding line five, Cllr Baldwin asked for clarification on what was meant by salaries that had previously been funded from capital. Kevin McDaniel said a review of the education estate team, following the recent CIPFA review, showed all salaries were funded through capital; this was not appropriate and had now been reduced accordingly.

The Panel agreed that they had no comments they wished to forward to Cabinet relating to Appendix A of the report.

Appendix B

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on lines one and two.

Regarding line three, in response to a question from Cllr Hunt Kevin McDaniel said all 400 staff had needed to be equipped with mobile phones, so there were a significant number of

new devices needed. In addition a new system that enabled previously paper-based information to be shared digitally had been implemented. Some of the budget would also be used to ensure longer-term sustainability of the new working arrangement.

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on lines four to nine.

Regarding line ten, Cllr Tisi asked for clarification on what job roles were being fulfilled by the new staff members. Lin Ferguson said three new members of staff had been recruited, of which two were social workers. The other was an independent reviewing officer to chair child protection conferences, which was required due to an increase in child protection issues during the pandemic.

Adele Taylor advised the Panel that there was £9million worth of Covid-related growth items throughout the whole of the budget, and the majority of this was covered by expected funding from central government. Some areas of underspend during 2020/21 had been set aside to cover ongoing support for Covid-related issues in the 2021/22 budget,. Cllr Carroll said he had been in contact with the government on this issue, as had most other local authorities. He said the Chancellor was due to bring forward a Comprehensive Spending Review in the new financial year.

Responding to a question from Cllr Baldwin relating to line two, Kevin McDaniel said the figure quoted was an estimate based on having to write off receiving any income from the space released by the transformation to family hubs for 2021/22. He explained it was considered impractical to try to dispose of the buildings or seek long term lessors, given current market conditions.

The Panel agreed that they had no comments they wished to forward to Cabinet relating to Appendix B of the report.

Appendix C

In relation to line one, Cllr Tisi asked for details on how developed the plans were for replacing community options, and how the risk was being mitigated. Cllr da Costa asked about ensuring quality of delivery from any volunteer organisations providing support, acknowledging that levels of professionalism differed. Michael Murphy said a number of support networks had been strengthened and the Council was working towards being able to supply services at an earlier point of contact with users. In future community options would not necessarily be wholly reliant on voluntary organisations. Mitigations would depend on the individual needs of each support network, although it would be ensured that the appropriate governance would be put in place to make sure everyone was protected from Covid19. Michael Murphy said anyone using services would be given the appropriate level of safeguarding.

Regarding line two, Hilary Hall said in response to a question from Cllr Tisi that it was a statutory requirement for the Council to assess an individual's particular needs, and given the proposal listed in line two it was even more vital that assessments were updated in line with the proposed changes. The business case related to supported living was still being worked on, and when this had been completed this would form its own line in future budget papers. Lynne Lidster said the current day centre model was limited in opening times from 9am-5pm on weekdays, and the proposed new model would afford greater flexibility and provide more opportunities. Users with complex needs would use the day centres for socialisation rather than providing respite to their families. The Covid19 pandemic had made the Council look at different ways of providing services and had brought forward the proposed changes to delivering services provided by the day centres. Easement protocols, which were introduced by the government during the pandemic to allow councils not to meet the requirements of the Care Act where they were experiencing significant capacity issues, were in place but they had never been implemented in the Royal Borough.

During discussions, lines three to five were taken together as their subject matter was closely interlinked. Cllr da Costa noted that assessments were made in-house or by Optalis staff and asked for assurance that these would not show any bias. Hilary Hall gave assurances that all assessments were made by qualified staff in Optalis. Cllr Sharpe stated that although value for money needed to be taken into consideration when creating care packages, this should not be to the detriment to the level of care that was provided; instead the focus should be on providing the most appropriate care possible. Hilary Hall assured the Panel that care provision was the primary driver of all statutory assessments, rather than simply value for money. Responding to a question from Cllr Bateson relating to care packages for people leaving hospital, Michael Murphy said levels of care provision would vary. The packages would focus on maximising a person's ability to function when they left hospital; as an example, sometimes a patient may have muscle wasting from spending a long period being in bed and would need support to get used to being able to use those muscles again, and gain confidence as a result. Michael Murphy said technology existed that meant some patients may now only require one carer, whereas previously they may have needed two. Cllr Tisi asked how likely it was that levels of care package provision may increase. Hilary Hall said she was confident the current arrangements were appropriate, and that all patients in receipt of a care package would receive an annual review. However if there was an increase it was expected that this could be met through the existing budget.

Regarding line six, Cllr Tisi asked for a real-life example of what was meant by ensuring the level of subsequent long term care was appropriate. Hilary Hall said this was generally aimed at improving a patient's confidence and functionality, which would be done on a fairly intensive basis to make sure a patient was able to live independently again as soon as possible after leaving hospital. This would generally be done over a six week period. Michael Murphy said around 60 per cent of patients leaving hospital would not need any reablement. Cllr da Costa stated her belief that reablement was better for somebody long-term compared to providing care for them.

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on line seven.

In relation to line eight, Lin Ferguson reassured the Panel that this was not a full restructure of the service as it provided an important function, but this proposal was aimed at improving efficiency. She stated that it was often difficult to recruit new health visitors but recruiting staff nurses was often much easier. The staff nurses would take some tasks away from health visitors to enable them to focus on their main priorities of making new birth visits. Lin Ferguson also said that antenatal contact may cease. Ways of managing clinics in a way that would not disadvantage service users were also being investigated.

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on line nine.

In relation to line ten, Kevin McDaniel explained there was a statutory duty to provide home to school transport assistance to children who were attending their nearest appropriate school when this was either two or three miles away, depending on their age, and for those on low incomes and with disabilities. The proposed budget changes were to ensure a greater level of consistency in the level of subsidy. It was noted for example that the costs some parents were paying in order for their children to attend the Windsor middle schools varied, and the proposals sought to level these out. Kevin McDaniel told the Panel there was no statutory duty to provide transport for those over the age of 16 going to sixth form or further education, and it was proposed to look at the way this could be provided in a fairer way.

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on line 11.

In relation to line 12, Kevin McDaniel said Achieving for Children had reduced printing costs, travel fares and accommodation expenses. For example, prior to the Covid19 restrictions a child who had been placed into care outside of the Borough for their safety might have their case reviewed by three or four officers in a face to face meeting, along with the expenses that

would entail. Due to new technology and ways of working the associated costs had been reduced with the key workers still travelling and seeing children face to face.

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on lines 13 to 16.

In relation to line 17, Kevin McDaniel explained that this saving related to the retirement of a member of staff who was not being replaced. He said there was an agreement with the Nursery School Foundation to support all settings as much as possible. Although it was noted there was no additional capacity to support any setting that went into crisis, the Council would be able to call upon the assistance of the NSF for support. In any case, in the event of the proposed closure of a school, there would need to be an 18 month notice period.

In relation to line 18, Lin Ferguson stated she chaired a resource panel comprising commissioning and social care colleagues about the right plans and provision for children, and this had been working well. Children in residential care were tracked on a fortnightly basis to ensure they were in the right place. Commissioners were mindful of costs when allocating settings for children in order to ensure value for money, and some savings had been made over the last year.

There were no comments or questions from Panel members on line 19.

In relation to line 20, Kevin McDaniel said schools' budgets were set through a different budget to the one being considered in the report. There was a total budget of about £89million available for all schools in the Royal Borough. Currently the maintained schools were not charged for using RBWM's finance tracking system, and the proposal was for a small charge of between £400 and £750 depending on the size of the school to cover expenses the Council already incurs. It was not straightforward for each school to put in place its own financial system, and in any case it was not considered viable to do so at the current time.

Cllr Tisi proposed that the Panel recommended to Cabinet that the recommended proposals in lines three to five, looking at various packages of care, should be considered from the point of view of providing the appropriate level of care rather than taking into account value for money as the most important aspect when considering packages of care. She said the actual levels of care needed to be the prime concern when making decisions.

Regarding the planned closure of day centres referenced in line two, Cllr da Costa said she felt the proposed changes would provide a better, more enriching service for users, but expressed concern at the speed with which the changes could be implemented. Hilary Hall said any changes would be subject to a full 12 week consultation, subject to them being agreed by Full Council. This was anticipated to be effective from April 1 and would be carried out through many different formats. Work was also being carried out to identify means of alternative provision of services. Cllr Tisi said she had been contacted by residents who were unclear as to how the proposed changes would affect them. The Panel felt the consultation should involve as many parties affected from as early an opportunity as possible.

Cllr Carroll said he was happy to go along with the Panel's views on the consultation, but stated they were recommendations that he would be making to Cabinet anyway and was a legal requirement.

It was UNANIMOUSLY AGREED that Panel pass the following comments on to Cabinet in relation to Appendix C of the report:

- **Regarding line two, a full and comprehensive consultation on the planned closures of the Windsor and Oakbridge Day Centres should be conducted with all affected parties involved from as early a point as possible, and any closure should not be carried out with undue haste.**
- **Regarding lines three to five, the overriding factor when considering residential care placements, supported living packages and community packages for**

people with learning disabilities, should be the appropriate level of care that is being provided rather than the value for money any agreement would provide.

Appendix D

There were no comments or questions for officers on any of the points in Appendix D of the report, and the Panel agreed they had no comments to forward to Cabinet.

Appendix E

There were no comments or questions for officers on any of the points in Appendix D of the report, and the Panel agreed they had no comments to forward to Cabinet.

Members thanked officers for their help in preparing the report and assisting during the course of the meeting.

Q2 PERFORMANCE REPORT

Cllr Hunt informed Members that the report looked at the performance of the Council's revised medium-term financial strategy, focusing on the impact of Covid19 and government policy and how this had affected the focus of the Council's interim strategy. Hilary Hall advised the Panel that the indicator relating to annual reviews of residents with long-term healthcare packages had dropped below anticipated delivery levels during quarter two as a result of the peak of dealing with Covid19. However, this was now on an upward trajectory and was likely to be on target by the end of quarter three and achieved by the end of the year.

Cllr Sharpe asked if there was anything in the report that was of major concern to officers. Hilary Hall said there was nothing to cause concern in the adult care sector, although some of the performance indicators had dropped during quarter two as a result of the impact of some services needing to be redeployed in order to help combat Covid19. Although levels of formal reviews of carers had dropped during this phase, interactions between the Council and carers had been done on a more informal basis and services had not been negatively impacted. In some cases, support for residents had been accelerated and enhanced. Kevin McDaniel agreed there was nothing in the children's service area that caused him concern. Although more action was required to help with education, employment and training of care leavers, this was partly attributable to an increase in the number of children in crisis.

Lin Ferguson told the Panel that a Performance Board met on a monthly basis, and scrutinised the full set of performance indicators applicable to Children's Social Care and Early Help. This had concluded that whilst individual performance indicators may shine a light on a particular issue, they should not be seen in isolation. Lin Ferguson said that when individual indicators are viewed alongside other indicators and trends over time, as happened at the Performance Board, they were more valuable. Lin Ferguson said this monthly scrutiny gave assurance that there were no systemic issues that would give cause for concern. She added the three performance indicators listed as red in the report were for those areas that had been most significantly impacted by Covid19. Particularly challenging had been training and employment opportunities for some care leavers as they either worked zero hours contracts or had part time jobs, often in industries such as entertainment that had been most badly affected by Covid19. Regarding the number of families who had re-referred to children's social care within 12 months, Lin Ferguson said a similar pattern was being noticed at other local authorities. This related to families who did not have the resilience to be able to manage with the issues affecting them and had referred themselves as they needed additional support. Cllr da Costa said this could be viewed as a positive, because families were seeking the support they needed rather than suffering and not getting the appropriate levels of care.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Panel noted the report and:

i) Noted the 2020/21 Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel Q2 Performance Report in Appendix A.

ii) Requested the Lead Member, Directors and Heads of Service maintain focus on performance.

UPDATE ON THE RESPONSE TO THE OMBUDSMAN PUBLIC INTEREST REPORT

Cllr Hunt thanked officers for all of the measures that had been implemented at the recommendation of the Ombudsman, and that all of the actions had been completed. She expressed regret for the fact the issues that led to the Ombudsman complaint had not been picked up on earlier.

TASK AND FINISH GROUP - STREAMS OF FUNDING TO SUPPORT CHILDREN IN CARE AND CARE LEAVERS

Cllr Hunt introduced the item and reminded Members that they had agreed they wanted the Council Tax exemption to be considered for implementation for care leavers up to the age of 25. Lin Ferguson stated that Council Tax exemptions were in place for care leavers aged up to 21, but the consideration for extending it up to the age of 25 was considered fair as the Council had increased levels of responsibility towards care leavers aged up to 25. Officers were looking to see if this proposal was financially feasible and would report back to Members. It was agreed that a timescale for a future meeting would be agreed between Lin Ferguson and Kevin McDaniel, with a likely date in March.

A need for improved education and training opportunities for care leavers had also been identified, and this had been discussed at an officer group meeting the day before Panel. Lin Ferguson said a number of actions had been agreed to develop an employment, training and education strategy and action plan, and the officer group was due to meet again in March.

ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT

Andy Carswell introduced the item and explained that the Annual Scrutiny Report would be considered by Full Council in June. Members were told a draft version of their report should be collated and agreed at the next Panel meeting in April. It was agreed that all Members would be contacted via email to ask for suggestions for items to include in the report, and responses should be sent to Cllr Hunt and Andy Carswell. The draft report would then come back to the next Panel meeting for agreement, prior to consideration by Full Council.

WORK PROGRAMME

Cllr Tisi said at a recent training workshop Members had been advised to have a greater amount of discussion on the work programme to set a clearer schedule of items to discuss. Cllr Hunt suggested that discussions about future agenda items could be agreed via email. Cllr Sharpe said items to be put on the work programme should be for the benefit of residents, rather than as a training exercise for Members.

Cllr Bateson asked about the update on the Lynwood Clinic that was listed on the work programme but had not yet been scheduled. Hilary Hall said she would investigate what this item was about. Kevin McDaniel's suggestion that the item on school funding changes could be removed from the work programme was agreed by Members. Members also agreed they would like a future agenda item on high needs funding.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 9.39 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....