

MINUTES of the meeting of the **CHILDREN & EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 10 July 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 18 September 2014.

Elected Members:

* Dr Zully Grant-Duff (Chairman)
 * Mr Denis Fuller (Vice-Chairman)
 * Mrs Liz Bowes
 * Mr Ben Carasco
 * Mr Robert Evans
 A Mr David Goodwin
 * Mr Ken Gulati
 A Mrs Margaret Hicks
 * Mr Colin Kemp
 * Mrs Mary Lewis
 A Mrs Marsha Moseley
 A Mr Chris Townsend

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Vice Chairman of the County Council
 Mr David Munro, Chairman of the County Council

Co-opted Members:

Cecile White
 Duncan Hewson
 Derek Holbird
 Mary Reynolds

Substitute Members:

Ernest Mallett
 Fiona White

In attendance

Mrs Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
 Mrs Clare Curran, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families

33/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from David Goodwin, Marsha Moseley, Chris Townsend, Cecile White, Derek Holbird, and Mary Reynolds.

Mary Angell, Cabinet Member for Children and Families also gave her apologies.

Fiona White substituted for David Goodwin and Ernest Mallet substituted for Chris Townsend.

34/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 14 MAY 2014 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

35/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of any pecuniary interests. However, it was requested that the following points were noted:

- Fiona White advised that she is a governor at Kings College and a member of the management committee at the Willows Short Stay School.
- Robert Evans advised that he is a teacher at a special needs school, however, it did not come under the Council's jurisdiction.
- Denis Fuller declared that he is on the board the Lifetrain Trust

36/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

37/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

There were no referrals to Cabinet at the last meeting, so there were no responses to report.

38/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The following members volunteered to join the School Governance Task Group:
 - Chris Townsend
 - Mary Lewis
 - Denis Fuller
 - Colin Kemp

And also:

- Sean Whetstone – who was proposed as a co-optee
2. The Committee discussed possible witnesses to contribute to the work of the Task Group. This included representatives from teaching unions and Babcock 4s. It was commented that these suggestions would be given consideration by the Task Group as part of the scoping process.
 3. It was highlighted that the recent work of the Young Carers' Research Group could be developed, following the report taken to the Adult Social Care Select Committee on 26 June 2014. The Chairman commented that this would be considered as part of the Committee's future work programme.

39/14 KEY STAGE 5: PARTICIPATION, PROGRESSION AND ATTAINMENT [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Joanne Lloyd-Aziz, Performance and Intelligence Manager
 Robert Atkins, Performance and Intelligence Manager
 Frank Offer, Head of Commissioning and Development
 Garath Symonds, Assistant Director for Young People

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Head of Commissioning and Development introduced his report to the committee, and emphasised that Surrey has the lowest number of NEETS in England. It was highlighted that the raising of the participation age had been an event that happens once in a generation.
2. The Committee commented that the improvement in A-Level results was positive. However, it was noted that Surrey was still under-performing when compared to statistical neighbours, in regard to A-Level results. The Committee commented that more advice and guidance is needed for young people progressing into further education. Officers highlighted that a new joint venture to provide advice and guidance to young people was proposed as part of the recommissioning of Services for Young People, as evidence suggested that the current model was not comprehensive enough. Officers outlined that all young people had access to online advice and guidance, and that work was being undertaken to develop a consistent face-to-face information, advice and guidance offer for schools. The Committee commented that support should be offered to young people just starting their GCSEs, around year 8 or 9.
3. It was noted that national statistics showed that progression to Higher Education had improved from 40%-61%. It was commented by officers that this information was not detailed or recent enough to draw comprehensive conclusions. However, it was highlighted that work could be undertaken to further investigate patterns of progression into Higher Education.
4. The Committee was informed that employers were keen to employ young people after completing their A-Levels, but before Higher Education, as on the job training such as apprenticeships were more sought after. It was also noted that there is no evidence to draw conclusions regarding young people progressing into independent schools, but this is estimated at 20%.

5. It was discussed that gaining information on what young people have progressed onto can be difficult, particularly where students were of an adult age. It was highlighted that secondary school Head Teachers would have information on student progression and that more data sharing should be encouraged.

Recommendations

The Committee notes the participation, progression and attainment outcomes detailed in the report, and recommends:

- That the service be congratulated on the high level of participation achieved in light of the recent raising of the participation age.
- That officers engage with all KS5 provisions to undertake further investigation into the patterns of progression for young people in Surrey, in order to gain an understanding of how this could influence future Information, Advice & Guidance provision to encourage the highest aspirations for Surrey young people.
- That officers ensure future Information, Advice & Guidance provision places an emphasis on face-to-face provision, and engages with students prior to choosing GCSE options

40/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: RECOMMISSIONING FOR 2015-2020 [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Frank Offer, Head of Commissioning and Development
Garath Symonds, Assistant Director for Young People

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Head of Commissioning and Development outlined a number of proposals concerning the recommissioning of Services for Young People. It was highlighted that the provision of face-to-face advice for young people regarding careers and education would encourage greater quality and ownership. This would link to an online youth platform, providing opportunities and accessible information. Officers gave an overview of time banking which encouraged young people to volunteer. Officers gave as an example young people volunteering to support Adult Social Care services, and so help to breakdown the intergenerational divide and lead to improved outcomes through the Family, Friends & Community Support initiative.
2. The Committee was informed that there was scope to share resources and improved outcomes with other services. The co-location of Public Health sexual health advice provision in youth centres was cited as a specific example of this.
3. The Committee was told that the service was setting out proposals for changes to the current model of delivery. Officers expressed the view that these would ensure the quality of provisions was improved and that bringing the Centre-based Youth Work Service in-house would

make services more accessible and enable future innovation. Concern was expressed regarding the implications that may arise from such changes, including the concern of working on different timescales and the chance of the quality of services being affected. Officers responded that staff and partners are excited about the developments and that they were working with the team in question to ensure positive change. The Committee queried whether a five-year commissioning cycle presented a risk if the commissioned services were not performing. Officers clarified that, although the contracts would be for five years, they would have suitable break clauses in relation to performance and outcomes.

4. The Committee highlighted the potential for local business and community expertise to contribute towards developing social enterprises with young people.

Recommendations

- That Cabinet supports the proposal concerning bringing the provision of Centre-based Youth Work Service in-house, but also notes the need to ensure continuity and employment security for the high quality staff that deliver these services.
- That the Cabinet support proposals concerning social enterprises and time banks, and encourages officers to consider how community business expertise and experience can be utilised to support these activities.

In order to build an evidence base for how public savings are shared across services within the Council, and other public sector bodies, it is recommended:

- That officers bring a future report to the Committee demonstrating the benefits in improved outcomes through engaging with Health & Wellbeing partners, such as Public Health, in sharing youth centre provision and resource.
- That officers explore with Adult Social Care how the benefits of Time Banks can be evidenced as impacting on the savings required as part of the Family, Friends & Community Support project.

41/14 DEVELOPING THE FIRST UNIVERSITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE IN SURREY [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Frank Offer, Head of Commissioning and Development

Garath Symonds, Assistant Director for Young People

P-J Wilkinson, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Head of Commissioning and Development introduced the report and added that key partners have been confirmed including CGI, SATRO and Royal Holloway College. After a question was raised regarding academic selectivity it was noted that the University Technical College (UTC) would have an admission policy that was not academically selective, instead candidates would have a discussion and placement would be based on the student's choice. It was queried how this was distinct from an interview, and officers clarified that whereas following an interview an offer is made by the institution, following a discussion the student is invited to consider whether the institution would be their choice. Officers explained the admissions policy would reflect the anticipated initial levels of demand.
2. The Committee was informed that the UTC would be sub-regional and have defined catchment areas, as the UTC became more popular catchment areas may extend.
3. The Committee was told that the UTC is being developed through a close collaboration between Royal Holloway College, Guildford College of Further and Higher Education, Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership and Surrey County Council. It would be closely involved and projects would be organised for students to undertake work-based employment, in order to gain real life skills.
4. The Assistant Director for Schools and Learning noted that where UTC will be sited faces strong competition from existing schools; and that its success would need to be established over time. Members expressed concern around the possible issues that could arise with regards to the UTC's student capacity not being met. Officers recognised this, but expressed confidence that the UTC would achieve capacity as its reputation grew.
5. The Committee discussed how the Council would continue to influence the UTC following its establishment. It was highlighted that it would operate as an autonomous body, but that the Council would have a governance responsibility alongside other key partners.

Recommendations

That Cabinet supports the proposal for the establishment of Surrey's first University Technical College. It is asked to consider:

- How the Council can support the UTC to ensure capacity is met in future years;
- How positive, collaborative dialogue can be developed between the UTC and local schools and colleges, to ensure they work in partnership; and
- How the benefits of vocational education are communicated to young people and their families.

Witnesses:

Dominic Forbes, Planning and Development Group Manager
 P-J Wilkinson, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Committee discussed the different methods of travelling to school other than driving; this included cycling. The Committee expressed the view that it was not safe for children under eleven to cycle to school. It was also noted that a flexible approach was required to reflect the variation between different school sites and their respective locations. The Committee discussed how parent behaviour could be altered over time; different methods were considered including fines from parking attendants and designated parking areas to park and then walk.
2. Members expressed the view that more money should be spent on public transport, this included improving the regularity of bus routes. It was added that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be used to improve school transport options. It was added that some schools had not engaged with improving pick up and drop offs. Members commented that parking enforcement was the responsibility of district and borough councils, and not individual schools.
3. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning commented that school parking was a sensitive area, and made a number of suggestions as to how schools could engage with improving school transport issues. The Committee was informed that the role of the Sustainability Community Engagement Team was integral, and that they should be involved in the early stages of planning.

Recommendations

The Committee acknowledges the complexity of transport considerations in relation to the planning for the Schools Place Programme, and commends an approach that recognises local factors and influences. It recommends:

- That officers consider how partners can be encouraged to make use of the Community Infrastructure Levy to support school transport initiatives.
- That officers engage with District & Borough partners in how parking enforcement can minimise the impact of school transport issues.
- That, in relation to action 12 of the Transport Strategy, planned school expansion is taken into consideration when reviewing current public bus routes, and other public transport provisions.
- That any future parking review gives consideration to a flexible approach in relation to school pick up/drop off points.
- That Local Committees are provided information on impacts to public transport, as part of any future engagement arrangements on planning applications concerning schools.
- That the Sustainability Community Engagement Team is involved earlier in the process for delivery of school places map.

43/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The Committee noted that the date of the next meeting would be 18 September 2014 at 10:00am

Meeting ended at: 1.04 pm

Chairman