

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & SKILLS COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 6 MARCH 2017**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD, HOVE, BN3 3BQ**

**MINUTES**

**Present:**

Councillors

Councillor Chapman (Chair), Councillor Brown (Opposition Spokesperson), Phillips (Group Spokesperson), Daniel, Knight, Taylor, Russell-Moyle, Mac Cafferty, Cattell, Miller, Moonan and O'Quinn

Co-optees

Mr J Cliff, Ms A Holt, Ms B Connor, Mr B Glazebrook and Mr M Jones

**PART ONE**

**67 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**67(a) Declarations of substitutes**

67.1 Councillor Cattell declared she was a substitute for Councillor Penn

Councillor O'Quinn declared she was a substitute for Councillor Bewick

Councillor Miller declared he was a substitute for Councillor Wealls

**67(b) Declarations of interest**

67.2 Mr M Jones declared a declared a personal but non-pecuniary interest in Item 75, as his wife worked at Hillside School.

Councillor Cattell declared that she was a governor at Downs Junior School.

Councillor Miller declared that's he was a governor at Longhill Secondary School.

Councillor O'Quinn declared that she was a governor at the Connected Hub

**67(c) Exclusion of press and public**

In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(I) of the Act).

**67.3 RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded

## **68 MINUTES**

**68.1 RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2017 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## **69 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

**69.1** The Chair gave the following communication:

I would like to begin by thanking Councillor Bewick for his time Chairing the committee, and all the work he undertook for this Committee. I am proud to have now been appointed Chair, and look forward to working with you all.

I would like to welcome Josh Cliff, as the new Youth Council representative to the Committee.

### **Youth Service**

Members of the committee will be aware that there were initial proposals to reduce the overall funding for youth provision next year by £800,000. Questions were asked about this at the last meeting of the committee and young people also asked questions at other committee meetings and a petition was presented at Full Council. Following the initial proposal the level of savings were reduced by £205,000 (of which £100,000 was for one year only). At the recent Budget Council the savings were reduced by a further £440,000 of which £250,000 is funded via the Housing Revenue Account. Officers are looking at a redesign of the provision that both reflects the new level of funding, but which also includes engagement with council housing residents. Once these have been developed we will share this with young people and the sector.

### **LGA Peer Review of Safeguarding**

In September 2016 the Families, Children & Learning Directorate invited the LGA to the city to carry out an independent review of our safeguarding services. We wanted an external view to check on the progress we had made since our Ofsted inspection in 2015. The report has now been published and their key findings were:

- Social workers and support staff at every level were impressive
- Improvement actions set by Ofsted are being addressed and are integrated into ongoing service planning
- The new model of practice in social work is helping to promote a learning culture where staff at all levels have confidence and are motivated to improve

- Among those that received praise are our legal services team, the performance officers and system plus the range of bespoke provision in place to support our most vulnerable residents.

There is still work to be done, however this process helped give us assurance that our improvement plans are taking us in the right direction. I would like to thank everyone who was involved in meeting with the LGA team.

### **Ofsted Inspection of the Friends Centre**

Ofsted have recently inspected the Friend's Centre, a provider of adult learning in the city, and their provision has been rated as good. Brighton & Hove City Council works in close partnership with the Friends Centre which delivers some of the key priorities for the City Employment and Skills Plan. Officers talked to the Ofsted Inspectors about the focus on developing skills for those learners who have significant barriers to learning and employment, and how this partnership supports those in the areas of highest deprivation in the city. The positive outcome from the recent inspection reinforces the significance of the Friends Centre in the delivery of adult learning locally.

## **70 CALL OVER**

70.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 73
- Item 74
- Item 75
- Item 77
- Item 78
- Item 79
- Item 80
- Item 81

## **71 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

### **71a Petitions**

71.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1350 people regarding school catchment areas. The petition had been presented by Ms S Fearn at the Council meeting held on 26 January 2017. The petition stated:

*"We believe that every child in Brighton and Hove should be treated fairly. The University of Brighton intend to provide a Secondary school for children in the central AND the east of the city which will open in 2018. For the first year, any child in the city can apply. However, the working party have recommended that the new school should be located in the central catchment from 2019. (Dorothy Stringer/Varndean school catchment which would be increased towards the west of the city to Montpelier Road). They also recommend that Coldean should be moved into the BACA catchment whilst the other existing catchments would remain the same. In effect, children in the BACA (Moulsecoomb/Bevendean including Coombe road area), Longhill (Whitehawk, Woodingdean, Ovingdean, Rottingdean and part of Saltdean), PACA (Portslade, Mile*

*Oak) and Patcham (Patcham, Hollingbury and Westdene) will have ONE "choice/preference" whilst children in the central catchment will have THREE choices. This is unfair and contradicts the School Admissions Code (2014) which states that admission policies should be 'fair, clear and objective'.*

*We, the undersigned, ask Brighton and Hove City Council to end this unfairness and inequity and ask that children from all over the city are given at least two secondary schools in their catchment area so that ALL children have a choice."*

71.2 The Chair gave the following response:

Thank you for the petition that has been referred from the Council meeting in January. We have noted its comments and will take the views expressed into consideration when we come to review the secondary school catchment areas at the time the permanent site of the new school is known. The premise that all catchment areas contain at least two schools is one that we shall actively consider further for the whole city and should not be ruled out at this stage. I recognise that parents in the catchment areas of BACA, PACA Longhill and Patcham do not have the same opportunities and where possible we should be fair to all.

71b **Written Questions**

71.3 There were none.

71c **Deputations**

71.4 The Committee considered a deputation regarding school allocation.

The Deputation stated:

*We are a group of parents from the Varndean/Stringer catchment area, parents of some of the 16% of year 6 pupils across Brighton and Hove shocked and devastated that we did not achieve a school allocation from any of our three preferences. Instead we have had a life changing decision made about our children's education beyond our control and in a school that has been deemed as 'requires improvement' in all five effectiveness areas of Ofsted; an educational and social environment that we know our children would not thrive in. This is in direct contrast to the recent quote by Head Teachers in their joint letter to parents, pupils and the public this week. '...standards in secondary schools in our city are high and this truth continues to be validated by a succession of Ofsted inspections'.*

*Our children have been given an LEA allocation;*

- *That is in a community that they have no knowledge or experience of, or social connections with*
- *Which requires them to travel miles away from the city on their own on public transport.*
- *Where 'School leaders have not improved the quality of teaching and outcomes consistently since the previous inspection'. Ofsted 2016*
- *Where 'Teaching does not consistently provide work that is well matched to the range of attainment of pupils in the class' Ofsted 2016*

*To quote Councillor Daniel Chapman, Head of Children's, Young people and Skills Committee; 'We have always tried our best to ensure parents are offered a place in their catchment area if they apply for one'*

*There are 147 families throughout the city that disagree with you, an increase of 28% on last year's figure, where 106 preferences were not offered. These 'unlucky' families are now to be placed in a re-allocation pool with all other families who may have already received one of their preferences.*

*This is an unfair system and does not honour your statement in ensuring these catchment area preferences for parents. Our children are being penalised for entering secondary school in a year where the council has failed to adequately plan a new school or offer additional places, in time for an overburdened catchment area. The council knew this was going to be a problem as far back as 2014. In 2014 Councillor Sue Shanks said 'At present there are enough secondary places city-wide for the numbers of students requiring them, but we are acutely aware that secondary school numbers will be going up significantly in the next few years'.*

*Our children are the now victims of this failure.*

*In 2015-16 and 2016-17 the council was given specific government funds totalling £24 million to provide extra places. eg:*

- 2014 - 22 extra children were divided between Varndean and Dorothy Stringer.*
- 2016- 28 extra children were divided between Varndean and Dorothy Stringer.*

*Whilst the random allocation system seems fair, it is utterly devastating for the unlucky minority. In the last three years, the council have made a commitment to placing all children in a catchment school or one of their preferences. Why is there no commitment for our children?*

*We are demanding the following:*

- 1. That you commit to providing additional places for all children in their catchment area if they apply for one, as you have in previous years. We would like the same equality of opportunity. We ask that the council and the Head Teachers work together to make this possible. To quote Andrew Stevenson, Business manager of Varndean School, 'The school is happy to take part in regular reviews of admissions arrangements to respond to demographic changes and needs of families'.*
- 2. Following the school registration deadline of March 15<sup>th</sup>, these 57 children must be given priority before the reallocation pool is opened to everybody. Under the current system, a child who has already been allocated a catchment place has the same priority as a child who has not been allocated any of their preferences. This seems wholly unjust and unfair.*
- 3. To meet with councillors of the Children, Young Peoples and Skills Committee as a matter of urgency (this week) to seek solutions to the points raised above.*

*As a result of your failure to provide our children with one of their preferences, they are already suffering emotional distress, feeling socially isolated and feel treated unfairly compared to their peers. In a highly pressurised year, with imminent SATS exam, the end of their primary school years and pre-existing worries about starting a new school, this additional anxiety of moving to a school far from their community is making them fearful about their futures. Sending children to schools which are deemed by Ofsted to require improvement could limit the educational opportunities and attainment of our children, impacting on their future prospects. This is totally unacceptable. These children*

*have been placed in a very vulnerable position by a department that is responsible for the welfare and wellbeing for children across the city.*

71.5 The Chair gave the following response:

Thank you for your Deputation and I do appreciate that behind all the headlines are real children and families who are affected by the decisions made when school places are allocated.

The council has ensured that there are sufficient school places for all pupils who require them but with a finite resource it is not possible to meet all parents' preferences. Our published admission arrangements make it clear what we will do when we receive more applications than places available and whilst every effort is made to offer a place at your child's catchment school this cannot be guaranteed. At a time of public sector funding pressures we must use our resources efficiently and consider the appropriateness of additional expenditure.

When determining how many pupils can be admitted into a school, careful consideration must be given to the capacity of the school to admit additional children. In past years the number of pupils who could not initially be offered a catchment area school were small and both Dorothy Stringer and Varndean were both allocated a small number of extra pupils on allocation day with the expectation that the number on roll would drop down to their published admission number by September. This year, due to the large number of pupils in the area not able to be offered any preferences, it was not possible for the schools to accommodate these additional pupils as both are already operating above their capacity in many year group. Given the existing accommodation, neither Dorothy Stringer nor Varndean could increase their capacity in order to admit the 57 pupils living in the catchment area not offered any of their preferences.

When pupils have not been offered their preferred school a waiting list or reallocation pool is created. A reallocation pool is ordered according to the council's agreed admissions priorities, if there are more pupils in any given priority than the number of available places, a random allocation is used as the tie break. While it is understandable for parents living in this area who have not been offered any preference schools to feel this is unfair, there is no facility within the existing admission arrangements to priorities these pupils above any other children living in the catchment area waiting for a place.

If you remain unhappy with the school place your child has been offered, you can appeal to the independent appeal panel. The appeal panel will make a decision about whether the school is full and whether to admit additional pupils would prejudice efficient education and the efficient use of the council's resources. If the panel agree that the school is full and that to admit additional pupils would be prejudicial they move onto the individual hearings. Every parent then has the opportunity to make their case at an individual hearing as to why their child should attend the school in question. Once all of the individual hearings have been heard the panel make a balancing decision for all of the appellants to see which if any of these cases to attend the school outweigh the prejudice.

I would encourage you to ensure your child's name is entered in the reallocation pool for any school you would wish them to attend. I would encourage you to consider making an appeal to an independent panel and, following on from the open letter written by the head teachers of the city's secondary schools, I would encourage parents and carers uncertain about a school to visit it for yourselves first, to see what it is like.

## **72 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **72a Petitions**

72.1 There were none.

### **72b Written Questions**

72.2 There were none.

### **72c Letters**

72.3 There were none.

### **72d Notices of Motion**

72.4 There were none.

## **73 SCHOOL OFSTED PRESENTATION**

73.1 The Head of Standards & Achievement, Education & Skills provided an update on schools which had recently been inspected by Ofsted.

73.2 The Committee were advised that since the last meeting, three secondary schools had been inspected. Brighton Aldridge Community Academy (BACA) had a Section 5 inspection, and the Head of Standards & Achievement, Education & Skills was pleased to report that it had now moved from 'Requires Improvement' to 'Good'. Cardinal Newman had a Section 8 inspection, and it was noted that it was taking effective action to move back to its Good rating. Blatchington Mill had also had a Section 8 inspection, but the outcome of the inspection had not yet been formally released.

73.3 Councillor Phillips congratulated BACA on their Good Ofsted rating. Councillor Phillips noted that 23% of schools nationally were rated as 'Outstanding' and hoped that all schools in the city aspired to reach that level. The Head of Standards & Achievement, Education & Skills assured her they were.

73.4 Councillor Taylor said he was very pleased for BACA, and that the inspectors had vindicated the leadership of the school. Councillor Taylor noted that the school still had problems with attendance, and asked what support the Local Authority was providing the school to address that issue. The Head of Standards & Achievement, Education & Skills said that the school was an Academy and so its involvement with the School Improvement Team was less than the maintained schools, but there was a known correlation between attainment and attendance, and so there was a city wide focus on

improving attendance. Councillor Taylor noted that whilst the GCSE results last year were very good, there were only around 80 pupils in that year group, and as the number of students increased the school would have to expand its curriculum, and he asked if there was partnership work which could be undertaken to ensure the improvement was cemented. He was advised there was, and that the school worked closely with other schools in the city to share expertise.

73.5 Councillor Russell-Moyle said he was very pleased with the improvement at BACA, and congratulated the school and in particular the teachers for the work they were doing. He noted it wasn't possible for schools to move from 'Good' to 'Outstanding' following a one day inspection, and asked if the Authority or schools could request a longer inspection themselves. The Head of Standards & Achievement, Education & Skills said that if a school currently had a 'Good' rating and then had a one day Section 8 Inspection, the inspectors could decide to convert that to a two-day Section 5 Inspection which would then allow for the possibility of reclassifying the school as either 'Outstanding' or 'Requires Improvement'. A school could potentially request a longer inspection, but logistically it was more difficult as it would need a much larger team of inspectors.

73.6 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee noted the update.

#### **74 LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT**

74.1 The Committee considered Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2015-16. The report had been considered by the Health & Wellbeing Board at its meeting on 31 January 2017; it was referred to the Children Young People & Skills Committee for information. The report was introduced by Graham Bartlett, Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB).

74.2 Councillor Brown thanked Mr Bartlett and the Local Safeguarding Children Board for all their work. Councillor Brown noted that one area, which was listed as a high priority, was Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and she asked what steps were being taken to address that. Mr Bartlett said that this was a relatively new area of child abuse, and there were high level governance arrangements looking at what the agencies were doing. Two audits had been undertaken on CSE, and one was the only audit where children spoke about their experiences. There was good inter-agency work and dedicated teams within the Police and Children's Social Care, as well as the Voluntary Sector who were picking up on the highest risk children. Some of those children had been through some very difficult experiences before becoming victims of CSE, so they had complex needs and there were variety of things in place to help them.

74.3 Councillor Phillips noted that this report related to 2015-16 and asked when the report for 2016-17 would be available. Chair of the LSCB said that he hoped it would be available in September 2017.

74.4 Councillor Phillips asked if the cuts to the Early Help service would impact on the work of the LSCB and the MASH. Mr Bartlett said that a sub-committee of the Board had been asked to look at the work and effectiveness of the new Early Help system.

74.5 Councillor Daniel referred to Return Interviews, and asked why they were important and what steps were taken to make sure they were regularly conducted. Mr Bartlett said that

at the beginning of 2016, the Missing People group were commissioned to conduct Missing Return Interviews on behalf of the three authorities in Sussex. The LSCB were due to meet shortly, and the Board would be looking at the data from those interviews to assess how effective they were. The interviews were important as children went missing for a number of reasons and it was important for them to talk to someone about why they went missing, and what they may have been exposed to whilst they were missing. The interviews were carried out by trained and independent people.

- 74.6 Councillor Daniel asked how GPs were encouraged to engage with the work of the LSCB and if there was anything Councillors could do to help with that. Mr Bartlett said that there was a GP who sat on the Board, however GPs were independent and it could be difficult to engage with them on new initiatives. Doctors were subject to the Care Quality Commission, which covered safeguarding of children and the need to identify Child Protection Issues and to identify groups of children who were starting on the pathway to becoming vulnerable.
- 74.7 Councillor O'Quinn noted that there had 15-16 recorded cases of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) within the city, and asked if that was an area the LSCB were involved with. Mr Bartlett said that those cases related to adults rather than children, but it was something the Board would be addressing where appropriate.

- 74.8 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee noted the Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report.

## **75 SPECIAL SCHOOL AND PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT (PRU) REORGANISATION PROPOSALS**

- 75.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning regarding the Special School and Pupil Referral Unit reorganisation proposals. The report was introduced by the Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities.
- 75.2 Councillor Phillips asked if the proposals were agreed whether Homewood College would be able to recruit a permanent Head Teacher. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that it would, but the position could not be advertised until after the end of the consultation period. Councillor Phillips said that whilst she understood the rationale for the proposals, she was concerned that if Patcham House was closed that there could be loss of expertise. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that no one wanted to lose experienced staff, and to address that the other schools had agreed to give priority to any staff from Patcham House if they had any vacancies.
- 75.3 Councillor Brown noted that although the new Special Facility was due to be opened in 2018, the location for it wasn't yet known, nor was it known where the provision for very young children based at the Jeanne Saunders Centre will be located. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that there were still a few issues around the site of the nursery school, but hoped the location should be announced the beginning of May 2017. A commitment had been given to the schools that had shown an interest, that the location would be confirmed by the summer term 2017 in order to allow a year to get the facility ready before it was due to open.

- 75.4 Councillor Brown asked whether the Swan Centre at Brighton Aldridge Community Academy and the Phoenix Centre at Hove Park were full, and whether the Autistic Spectrum School at West Blatchington would remain at that site. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that both the Swan Centre and Phoenix Centre were popular and were full. There were currently 18 at the Swan Centre, rising to 10 next year, 13 at the Phoenix Centre and 14 at West Blatchington. With regard to the Autistic Spectrum Centre at West Blatchington, there were no plans to move it although currently the pupils were on roll on West Blatchington School but the facility was managed by Downs Park School, so that may be reviewed in due course.
- 75.5 Councillor O'Quinn said that she supported the intention that all three hubs also developed post 16 provision, and asked if the Committee could be advised on what it was hoped could be provided. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that the level of those who were classed as NEET (not in education, employment or training), was higher than the national average. To address that the Authority were looking at ways to ensure the Hubs were able support the young people. The schools were good at getting college placements for their students, but they then needed support during their courses.
- 75.6 Councillor Russell-Moyle suggested it would be useful, before the consultation on the closure of Patcham House begun to identify where the new special facility would be. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that they hoped to announce the new special facility quite soon, but said that most pupils at Patcham House were in Years 10 and Year 11 and so wouldn't need an alternative school.
- 75.7 Councillor Miller said that there would be children attending the new schools who had a range of needs, some physical and some behavioural and who would need different support. He suggested that parents may be concerned that they were sending their child to a school which historically had supported children with different needs to their own. Councillor Miller referred to the funding and asked if there would be a capital allocation for the new facility at the existing school. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said they had worked hard with families involved in the system, and consulted with them on all steps being taken and considered. The Authority were recommending a consultation, and when that started officers would sit down with all parents and staff of every school and explain what was being suggested and reassure them that the wellbeing and education of the young people would not be disrupted in any way. Capital funding had been put aside, and that might be increased if some of the sites were disposed of.
- 75.8 Mr Jones noted the proposal to provide a range of extended day opportunities and asked if any of those provisions would be free. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that there was a range of extended provision such as respite care, and that was free if you were an eligible student i.e. if it had been determined that was needed. It was also the intention to offer an extended day to other families and there would be a cost, but it was hoped to keep that to an affordable price. Mr Jones said that it was good that the West Hub would have post 16 provision, and asked for assurance that officers would still be liaising with colleges to ensure they also provided opportunities for those over 16 years of age. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that the Authority would continue to work in partnership with the colleges. Mr Jones noted that some children found it difficult to learn in large classes

and that could impact on their attainment and asked if that had been taken into account. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that they had and had created a special facility within the SEMH Hub to accommodate the needs of those students.

75.9 Josh Cliff asked what SEN provision was available at the Phoenix Centre. The Assistant Director, Health SEN and Disabilities said that it offered a place within the school for children who had EHCPs where they could go for specialist support.

#### 75.10 RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Children, Young People and Skills Committee should confirm the proposal contained in the statutory notices and make a final decision to:
  - (a) Extend the age range of Hillside School from the existing 4-16 years to 2-16 years with effect from September 2017
  - (b) Extend the age range of Downs View School from the existing 3-19 years to 2-19 years, with effect from September 2017
- (2) That the outcome of the formal consultation on the proposal to close Patcham House School should be noted and agreement be given to the publication of statutory notices to progress this proposal.
- (3) Formal Consultation – Integrated Hubs East & West  
That the Local Authority should agree to proceed to formal consultation on the proposal to:
  - (a) Expand, re-designate and extend the age range up to the age of 18 years for Hillside Community Special School and to close Downs Park Community Special School to form the integrated hub for learning difficulties in the west of the city
  - (b) Expand and re-designate Downs View Community Special School and close the Cedar Centre Community Special School to form the integrated hub for learning difficulties in the east of the city
- (4) Integrated Hub for Social Emotional Mental Health needs  
To agree that the Local Authority should:
  - (a) Consult on the creation of an integrated hub for pupils with social, emotional and mental health needs by merging the two Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) and bringing them together with Homewood College under the oversight of an executive head teacher.
  - (b) Begin a formal consultation on the expansion of pupil numbers and site of Homewood College and extension of the age range of pupils from 11-16 years to 5-18 years.

## 76 CONSULTATION ON REDUCING MAINTAINED SCHOOL NURSERY CLASSES

76.1 The solicitor to the Committee said that the wording in recommendation 2.2 in the report was incorrect and should be amended to read:  
'That, subject to findings from the initial consultation stage, a decision on whether or not to proceed to statutory notices with full proposals for Queen's Park and Middle Street

primary schools is delegated *to the Executive Director Families Children & Learning, following consultation with the Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee*.

76.2 The Committee noted the amendment.

76.3 **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed -

(1) That in accordance with DfE statutory guidance *Making 'prescribed alterations' to maintained schools (April 2016)* the process is started for closure of the nursery classes at Queen's Park and Middle Street primary schools immediately following this committee meeting. The local authority has to be the proposer regarding this alteration and the statutory process must be followed.

(2) That, subject to findings from the initial consultation stage, a decision on whether or not to proceed to statutory notices with full proposals for Queen's Park and Middle Street primary schools is delegated to the Executive Director Families Children & Learning, following consultation with the Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee.

(3) That at the end of the statutory notice period, a decision on whether or not to proceed with closure of the nursery classes at Queen's Park and Middle Street primary schools is taken at the June Children, Young People and Skills Committee.

(4) That the committee notes that the governing body of St Mark's Voluntary Aided primary school intends to start the non-statutory process for closure of its nursery class and that the school will be supported by the local authority in doing so.

## **77 EDUCATION CAPITAL RESOURCES AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2016/2017**

77.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning on 'Education Capital resources and Capital Investment Programme 2017/18'. The report informed the Committee of the level of available capital resources allocated to this service for 2017/2018, and to recommend a Capital Investment Programme for 2017/18. The report was introduced by the Head of School Organisation.

77.2 Councillor Phillips noted that in the previous administration funding had been made available for the installation solar panels at schools, and asked how that funding had been used. The Head of School Organisation said he didn't have that information, but would advise after the meeting.

77.3 Councillor Brown noted that for a number of years there had been a rolling programme for the removal of asbestos from schools, and asked how near the Authority was to completing that task. The Head of School Organisation said that he would provide clarification outside of the meeting.

77.4 Councillor Taylor noted that £5m allocated for provision of secondary school places in 2016-17 had not been spent. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning said that that the money would be carried over until needed for purchasing/building the new secondary school.

- 77.5 Councillor Miller suggested that there was a discrepancy in the figures provided. He noted that the total works amounted to £4,688,321, but the Capital Maintenance 2017/18 was £5,047,510, so there was a difference of around £350,000. In addition, under Basic Needs for 2017/18 there was a capital commitment of £700,000, so in total there was a gap of around £1.1m. The Head of School Organisation said the difference was that the figure of £4,688,321 included the addition of fees, whereas the other figures were only the cost of the work. It was suggested that a fuller discussion be held with Councillor Miller outside of the meeting, and if there were any discrepancies it would be reported back to the Committee.
- 77.6 Councillor Miller asked if the Committee could be advised on what had been spent last year. The Head of School Organisation said a report could come to the Committee on works delivered if it would be useful. The Chair agreed it would.
- 77.7 Councillor Miller said that it would be useful if information on S106 allocations could be provided for the Committee, and was advised that a report was already scheduled to come to the next meeting. He noted that in Appendix 2 there was no Basic Need spending for 2018/19 and asked why that was. The Head of School Organisation said that no Basic Need spending had been allocated to the authority based on our projection of pupil numbers showing there is less pressure on school places in that year.
- 77.8 Councillor Miller noted that £15m had been allocated for the provision of secondary school places, and asked how that would be spent. The Head of School Organisation said it was funding for the purchase of the new secondary school site.
- 77.9 Mr Glazebrook noted that the 67 Centre was included in the Capital Works programme and asked if there was any thought on the future use given the cuts to the Youth Service. The Head of School Organisation said it was work required for maintaining the building itself rather than its future use.
- 77.10 Ms Holt asked how the new school build would be funded, and was advised that the cost of the school site would be met from the Basic Need allocation.
- 77.11 Ms Holt noted that the report did not include spending on Voluntary Aided schools, and asked who scrutinised the needs and spending for those schools if it wasn't this committee. The Head of School Organisation said that there was a separate funding stream through the Department for Education, rather than through the Local Authority, for Voluntary Aided schools. Ms Holt asked if that information could be provided within future reports to the Committee. The Head of School Organisation agreed to incorporate this in a future report if the committee felt it would be useful. The committee agreed that it did.
- 77.12 **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed:
- (1) That the level of available capital resources totalling £39.947 million for investment relating to education buildings financed from capital grant be noted.

- (2) That Committee agree the allocation of funding as shown in Appendices 1 and 2 and recommend this to Policy & Resources and Growth Committee on 23 March 2017 for inclusion within the council's Capital Investment Programme 2017/18.
- (3) That Committee agree to recommend to Policy & Resources and Growth Committee that they grant delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Property & Design to procure the capital maintenance and basic need works and enter into contracts within these budgets, as required, in accordance with Contract Standing Orders in respect of the entire Education Capital Programme.

## **78 ANNUAL STANDARDS REPORT**

- 78.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning regarding the Annual Standards Report. The report was introduced by Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion.
- 78.2 Councillor Daniel was concerned that the method of assessment of pupils changed each year, which made it difficult to monitor progress. It appeared that there was a drop on the level of achievement for disadvantaged children in Maths and English. The Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion said that due to changes in the way the achievements were assessed, there had been a drop for all groups. However, the levels for Brighton & Hove pupils had dropped less than the national average and had improved since 2014. It was accepted that the achievement for disadvantaged pupils wasn't good enough, but there was no quick fix and there were many things in place to continue to support those children.
- 78.3 Councillor Phillips noted that in the statistics for those attaining 5+ A-C GCSEs, there were no figures for 'Statistical Neighbour Disadvantaged' and 'South East Coastal Strip Disadvantaged'. The Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion said that those figures would not be available to the end of March 2017.
- 78.4 Mr Jones said that it would be useful to have information comparing the attainment of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils in the city, which would be more useful than comparisons against national statistics. The Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion said that there was a statutory requirement to report the data in that way, but she was happy to look at providing further information if it would be useful. Mr Jones referred to the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile for different groups, and was concerned that if some children had a poor start in areas such as literacy it could impact on the whole of their future education. He was advised that the Authority were doing it all it could to ensure that those who had a poor start were supported to assist them in catching up with other pupils.
- 78.5 Councillor Miller asked if the two week holiday introduced for October could lead to lower attendance and, if it did, whether that could impact on the strategy to close the gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils. The Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion said there was some concern from Head Teachers on driving up attendance and extending holiday periods, but she thought that the important issue was to raise the aspirations of young people to be at school.

- 78.6 Councillor Taylor said that he wanted to thank the Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion for arranging two very useful workshops, which allowed him and other councillors to understand the context for this report. Councillor Taylor asked why Brighton & Hove were below the national average for Year 1 phonics attainment. The Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion said that the Authority were looking at the quality of teaching and the Early Years curriculum, and would come back with a more specific response in due course.
- 78.7 Josh Cliff said that Brighton was a diverse city and so was surprised that the achievements were lower for BME students. The Head of Standards & Achievement Education & Inclusion agreed that the city was ethnically diverse, but said that the number of BME students was small which could skew the statistics. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning asked the Chair if it would be useful to have a report on the attainment of BME children at a future meeting of the Committee, and the Chair agreed that it would.
- 78.8 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee
- (1) Noted the report and endorsed the focus across the City on improving outcomes for all children and young people, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds.
  - (2) Noted the changes in the curriculum, assessment and benchmark measures for Key Stages 2 and 4 and for determining the performance of disadvantaged groups which meant that there was significant difficulty in establishing trends when not comparing like with like.

## 79 SCHOOL FUNDING

- 79.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning on school funding. The report informed the Committee on the proposed changes to school funding in the move to a National Funding Formula from 2019/20, and provided an update on the work being undertaken with schools to support them in addressing expected budget pressures which would be encountered. The report was introduced by the Head of School Organisation, and the Principal Accountant Families & Schools.
- 79.2 Councillor Phillips referred to paragraph 3.11 of the report, and asked when it would be known how the Strategic School Improvement Fund could be accessed. The Head of School Organisation said that the Authority was still awaiting that information. Councillor Phillips noted that there was no Equalities Impact linked to the report, and was advised that until it was known how the Fund could be accessed the equalities impact couldn't be assessed.
- 79.3 Councillor Miller asked when it was decided that the Schools Forum could decide on school budgets. The Executive Director said that the Schools Forum was a statutory requirement. The Principal Accountant said that the Forum had some decision making powers, and that the papers for that meeting were on the Council's website.
- 79.4 Mr Jones asked if it was known what the future level of financial pressure on High Needs Block would be. The Head of School Organisation said that the Authority were

currently looking at the pressure for the next academic year, and that would be reported to the Schools Forum in June 2017.

- 79.5 Councillor Russell-Moyle said the schools should be congratulated for working together. However he was concerned that whilst the Government were saying that savings needed to be made, and for schools to work together, they were taking money from funding and giving it back to individual schools.
- 79.6 Councillor Taylor commended the work being undertaken by schools to address the changes in funding. He noted that the school budget was ring fenced, and had kept in line with increases in pupil numbers so the budget was not actually being reduced. The new formula was more timid than had predicted, and there was protection for schools which were facing particular difficulties.
- 79.7 The Chair said that school budgets were under pressure, and he would encourage people to look at the Audit Office report which showed that schools were looking at facing an 8% reduction in real terms in their funding.

79.8 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee

- (1) Noted the move to a complete National Funding Formula from 2019/20 and the anticipated impact this would have on the city's schools.
- (2) That the committee agreed that the actions being taken to support schools in their preparation for changes to school funding were appropriate and proportionate.

## 80 POVERTY PROOFING THE SCHOOL DAY UPDATE

- 80.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning, which outlined the proposals to address the Fairness Commission's recommendation that the council, working with the schools, should bring to the city the 'Poverty-proofing the school day' initiative to ensure no child missed out on the opportunities and experiences at school because of low family income. The report was introduced by the Senior Adviser – Education Partnerships.
- 80.2 Councillor Brown was concerned that only 13 schools engaged in the initiative, and felt that with the current budget pressures that the money could be better spent elsewhere.
- 80.3 Councillor Daniel supported the initiative, and said that children were affected by coming from a low income family and the suggested scheme supported schools to address the areas of concern.
- 80.4 Ms A Holt said that the cost of the scheme was comparatively low and the benefits could help many children, and she would therefore support the proposals.
- 80.5 Councillor Taylor said that whilst 'poverty-proofing' was a good idea, he said that Head Teachers and School Governors already did a great deal of work on this area, and did not feel that the cost of initiative was necessary.

- 80.6 Councillor Phillips said she supported the proposal, and whilst it wasn't possible to poverty proof the school day, it would help alleviate some of the symptoms of poverty.
- 80.7 Councillor Cattell said that cost of initiative was relatively low for a scheme which could help many pupils, and was surprised that there was complete support for it and noted that the proposal had already been agreed by another Committee.
- 80.8 Josh Cliff said that when he was at primary school he had been on Pupil Premium, and understood the impact of coming from a low income family and so supported the proposal.
- 80.9 Councillor Phillips suggested two amendments to the recommendations.  
Recommendation 2.1 to read 'That the Committee supports the proposed method for the introduction of 'Poverty-proofing' the School Day'.  
Recommendation 2.2 to read 'That the Committee is kept *involved and* informed of the progress of the initiative through regular reports'.

Councillor Daniel seconded the amendments.

- 80.10 The proposed amendments were agreed.
- 80.11 The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning said that an update report would come back to the Committee next year.

**80.12 RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- (1) Supported the proposed method for the introduction of 'Poverty-Proofing' the school day
- (2) Were kept involved and informed of the progress of the initiative through regular reports.

**81 BRIGHTON & HOVE EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP PROPOSALS**

- 81.1 The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Families, Children & Learning on Brighton & Hove Education Partnership Proposal. The report outlined the proposal for the next stage in the development of the Brighton & Hove Education Partnership. The report was introduced by the Senior Adviser, Education Partnerships.
- 81.2 Councillor Brown felt that for the proposals to work all schools should be involved, and she was therefore concerned that it appeared that not all Head Teachers and Governors were convinced of the value of the Partnership, with only 22 Head Teachers and 18 Governors responding to the consultation. The Senior Adviser, Education Partnerships agreed the response to the consultation had been disappointing
- 81.3 Councillor Phillips asked if there were any cost implications in developing the partnership, and was advised there weren't with any costs being met within current budgets.

- 81.4 Councillor Miller asked at what stage, and under what delegation were we giving, for a legal entity to be set up. The Executive Director Families, Children & Learning confirmed that at this stage the Partnership would not be a formal body or have a legal entity; if that changed any proposals would come back to the Committee.
- 81.4 Mr Jones suggested that if the Partnership was not expected to have a legal entity it should be stated in the recommendations. The Legal Officer referred to recommendation 2.2 and said it was clear that the Committee were not being asked to approve a legal entity.
- 81.5 Mr Jones asked how often it was expected the Partnership would meet. The Senior Adviser, Education Partnership said that would depend on what issues were being discussed, as not all partnerships would discuss the same thing.
- 81.6 Mr Glazebrook said that there were a range of areas where schools were working with the community and voluntary sector, and he wanted to ensure that that contribution was not lost going forward.
- 81.7 Councillor Mac Cafferty was concerned that such a partnership could be a backdoor for developing multi-agency trusts. The Senior Adviser, Education Partnerships assured the Councillor that the proposals were not a development for multi-agency trusts, but was intended as a point to share good practice amongst the schools.
- 81.8 RESOLVED:** That the Committee
- (1) Noted the feedback from the engagement phase on developing the Brighton and Hove Education Partnership
  - (2) Approved the proposed approach and timeline for development of the partnership

## **82 ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL**

- 82.1 **RESOLVED:** That no items be referred to Council.

The meeting concluded at 8.25pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of