

MINUTES OF MEETING CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY 3RD JANUARY 2023

PRESENT:

Councillors: Makbule Gunes (Chair), Anna Abela, Lester Buxton, Lotte Collett, Sue Jameson and Mary Mason

Co-opted Members: Yvonne Denny and Lourdes Keever (Church representatives) and Venassa Holt (Parent Governor representative)

38. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members to item one on the agenda regarding filming at the meeting and Members noted the information contained therein.

39. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None. The Chair welcomed Venassa Holt who had recently been appointed as a Parent Governor representative on the Panel.

40. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

42. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

43. MINUTES

It was noted that the webcast of the last meeting of the Panel, on 7 November 2022, did not appear to be available on-line. It was agreed that this would be rectified.

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of 7 November 2022 be approved.

44. SCRUTINY OF THE 2023/24 DRAFT BUDGET AND 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2023/2028

Josephine Lyseight (Head of Finance (People)) introduced the 2023/24 draft budget for 2023/24 and 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy in respect of children and young people. She reported that the proposals had been developed before both the government's Autumn Statement and the Local Government Finance Settlement. The implications of these for Haringey were currently being analysed by officers. The proposals included additional growth of £14.8 million, £4.9 million of which was for Children's Services.

The proposals to make revenue savings of £1.5 million were in addition to existing targets. £1 million of this would come from improved commissioning. There was also a growth proposal to add £1 million to the budget in order to mitigate the effects of inflation on commissioning. It was also proposed to save a further £0.5 million through extension of existing savings programmes. This involved continuing to work with young people to support their needs and prepare them for stepping down from high cost placements to placements with families. The Children's Service had so far proven to be exceptionally effective in delivering savings targets.

The Panel noted that the number of children being taken into care nationally had gone up and this was often due to mental health issues. Beverley Hendricks (Assistant Director for Social Care) reported that an increase of people with mental health needs was being seen in Haringey. There was demand modelling and a LAC sufficiency strategy and this had focussed on identifying children who could no longer be cared for in their home and planning with partners regarding early intervention to prevent needs from escalating. The Panel asked whether the proposals to reduce the number of high cost placements by greater use of foster care were realistic. Ms Hendricks reported that not all foster carers lived in the borough. Recruitment of foster carers was being extended to communities that it had not been previously possible to engage with. She was confident that recruitment targets could be met. Targets for had been met through schemes like supporting foster carers to build additional bedrooms.

Ms Lyseight outlined the growth proposals, which amounted to circa £4.9 million. There would be additional funding for:

- The increased cost of social care placements;
- The rising demand and cost of SEND transport;
- 2022/23 base budget pressures;
- Continuation of the extension of free school meals;
- Rising Green Youth Centre; and
- The Social Workers in Schools scheme.

There was one additional proposal for capital funding and this was for the Safety Valve programme, The majority of the scheme would be funded by the High Needs Capital Allocation Fund and an application made to the Department for Education (DfE) Safety Valve Capital Programme that was pending approval would assist in the delivery of associated revenue budget savings. Approval of the Council's bid was still awaited.

In answer to a question regarding Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), Brian Smith (Schools Finance Manager) stated that it was split into four blocks. These were all calculated differently in a way that was determined by the government. The government for the schools block had provided additional funding of £7 million. However, there had been a reduction of 2.5% in the central schools services block,

which had also been impacted by falling school rolls. The funding helped fund statutory services that were undertaken by the Council, such as school admissions and education welfare. There had been an increase in the early years block due to higher unit numbers. This had arisen due to more children being in early years compared with numbers during the height of the Covid pandemic. There had been an increase of 10% in the high needs block. The additional funding was in recognition of the additional responsibilities for special educational needs given to local authorities since 2014.

Ms Lyseight reported that the current deficit in the DSG was shown separately. All local authorities had been given special dispensation to do this in acknowledgement of the significant pressures that there were arising from the high needs funding block. The Safety Valve programme would allow the Council to bring reduce the deficit and was therefore welcome. In the absence of the special dispensation, the overspend for Children's Services would be approximately £24 million.

The Panel raised the issue of consultation on the budget, which was currently taking place. It was felt that this needed to be a meaningful process and should not be reliant on the use of questionnaires, which often prompted limited returns. It was also felt that greater attention needed to be given to the equalities impact of proposals and that Equalities Impact Assessments should provide a greater level of detail than was currently the case.

In answer to a question regarding funding for early years in the DSG, Nick Hewlett (Acting Assistant Director for Schools and Learning) reported that funding was based on the number of hours provided. Numbers of children in early years settings had been going up. However, the challenge for schools was the inflexibility of what they were able to offer which often did not meet the needs of working parents.

In response to a question on where the greatest levels of risk lay, Ms Lyseight stated that these came from matters that the Council was not in a position to control. These included the cost of living crisis, inflation and high energy costs. In addition, there was also the increasing costs of care, which the service was trying to mitigate through savings. Jackie Difolco (Assistant Director for Early Help, Prevention and SEND) stated that reducing the overspend within SEND transport budget was a significant risk as this was a statutory duty and there were now higher numbers of children and young people eligible for travel assistance. New policies and actions had been agreed to mitigate against budgetary pressures and she was confident that these would be effective over time. Ms Hendricks stated that in social care there was a risk arising from market factors. The Council was very reliant on private sector providers for placements and they had been subject to pressures from inflation and the cost of living. They had raised their charges in response to this without negotiation. Work was taking place to develop closer relationships with providers in response, particularly those providing high quality placements for niche or acute needs. There were also risks arising from the volume of unaccompanied asylum seekers, which was an issue across Europe. The Home Office had indicated that it wished to work with local authorities in a different way and was increasing the levy that was provided. However, the levy did not take fully into account the acuity of needs. The Panel requested access to the regular quarterly updates of the risk register for the service.

In answer to a question regarding the level of inflation, Ms Lyseight stated that the budget proposals had assumed a level of 5%. However, the current level was higher than this although it was estimated that it would reduce to 7.4% in due course. The budget proposals would be reviewed in the light of this and decisions may be needed to address the increased level to balance the budget. In response to a question regarding whether the proposed growth funding of £1 million for SEND transport would be sufficient, she stated that any increase to this would need to be balanced by savings of the same amount unless additional funding could be found from elsewhere.

Ms Difolco reported that the main pressure on SEND transport arose from increased fuel costs, which had increased from 11% to 42% within one year. Mitigating actions included moving from a one year contract to three year contracts with providers to ensure stability, continuity and best value. Quarterly reviews had also been built into the contract monitoring cycle to enable a flexible response to accommodate increasing and decreasing costs. Fuel costs were expected to decrease.

In response to a question regarding the affordability of the capital programme, Ms Lyseight reported that it constituted a significant investment. Some of it was externally funded and efforts were being made to maximise the amount from these sources. Some was self-financed and involved borrowing. It was hoped that at least some of the investments would lead to revenue savings and these would be sought to help pay back borrowing. The capital programme would be reviewed annually and closely monitored for its impact on revenue costs.

The Panel made the following comments regarding the draft budget proposals:

- Consultation with residents and stakeholders on budget proposals in future years should aim to be more meaningful, reach a wider range of people and provide an enhanced opportunity for them to influence proposals;
- In view of the changeable external environment, external risks and measures to mitigate them needed to be monitored rigorously so that any changes could be responded to in a timely manner. In particular, the budgetary impact of the Safety Valve programme needed to be closely monitored. The Panel requested that this be included in the regular quarterly finance updates to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and
- The equalities impact of specific budget proposals should be outlined in greater depth in future years in order to provide Members with a clearer understanding of them and copies of Equalities Impact Assessments (EIAs) provided for information.

AGREED:

1. That the Panel recommend:

- (a) That consultation with residents and stakeholders on budget proposals aims to be more meaningful, reach a wider range of people and provide a greater opportunity for them to influence proposals;
- (b) That in view of the changeable external environment, external risks and measures to mitigate them be monitored rigorously so that any changes can be responded to quickly;

- (c) That the impact of the Safety Valve programme be closely monitored and that this be included in the regular quarterly finance updates reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and
 - (d) That the equalities impact of specific budget proposals should be outlined in greater depth in future years in order to provide Members with a clearer understanding of them and copies of Equalities Impact Assessments (EIAs) provided for information.
2. That the regular quarterly updates of the risk register for the service be shared with the Panel.

45. HARINGEY SAFETY VALVE UPDATE

Jackie Difolco, Assistant Director for Early Help, Prevention and SEND, reported that the High Needs Block recovery plan had evolved into the Safety Valve programme. Updates had previously been received on the plan, which aimed to reduce the overspend and improve outcomes for children and young people with SEND. A report had been made to the September Cabinet meeting on proposals to enter the Safety Valve programme and these had been endorsed. If no action was taken, there would be a deficit of £78 million by 2027/28.

There was strong support from Cabinet for the proposed programme, which included strong oversight and scrutiny. It would be the biggest current savings programme by the Council. There were three work streams associated with the programme - Demand Management, Effective Commissioning and Leadership and Governance. If successful, the programme would lead to a surplus of £1.6 million in 2027/28 and a reduction of the high needs deficit to £30 million. The savings made would be £48 million over five years. The Demand Management programme would lead to a reduction of Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans of 611, putting Haringey in line with the average for other London boroughs.

Capital proposals had been developed that would reduce unit costs through the development of in borough provision for an additional 118 places for children and young people within mainstream education settings. A review of bandings and top ups would also be undertaken and action would be taken ensure that there were effective commissioning arrangements. A large number of projects were now taking an early intervention approach, supporting schools and developing a graduated response to meet demand and reduce the need for specialist support. There would be strong partnership arrangements to create shared ownership and change the culture of the SEND system in Haringey. Ms Difolco provided examples of some of the projects with the three workstreams as well as details of the savings that would accrue from all of them in each year.

The proposals had been submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) in October. Feedback had now been received that the proposals might need to be revisited in the light of the announcement of the new budget settlement. They were being reviewed with finance colleagues but it was likely that the overall proposals would still remain the same and a request that the £30 million deficit be written off following successful delivery of the programme would still be made. Work with partners to implement the

proposals had already begun. Once approval from the DfE had been obtained, communication and engagement plans would be developed further. Robust governance processes had been developed and the Schools Forum had agreed to the transfer of 0.5% from the Schools Block to the High Needs block to reduce the overspend. Schools were very supportive of the programme as they knew that it would improve outcomes. There was a Safety Valve Steering Group that had oversight of the programme including relevant Cabinet Members.

In answer to a question regarding what success would look like, she stated that primarily savings would need to be achieved and there would be quarterly finance targets that would need to be achieved. The work being undertaken was work that the Council should, in any case, be looking to undertake. The aim was that when the projects started to deliver, there would be an increase in in-borough provision, more early intervention and a more confident and competent multi agency work force. There would be both soft and finance outcomes. There was a plan on a page for each project that provided detail of the savings as well as outcomes and it was agreed that a summary of these be shared with the Panel in the next stage of engagement.

Panel Members expressed concern at the lack of school governors on the Steering Group. Many schools were struggling at the moment and some were in serious financial deficit. The proposed programme could have a negative impact. In particular, schools needed EHC plans in order obtain intervention. Parents and carers in the more deprived areas of the borough were less able to exert pressure bring about action.

Ms Difolco stated that the programme had been informed by the SEND strategy, the Written Statement of Action and responses to consultation. In addition, a detailed report had been made to the Schools Forum. Headteachers on the Forum had raised similar concerns to the Panel but also recognised the need to act. A similar report had also been made to chairs of school governing bodies, where the proposals had been well received. The programme was not just concerned with finance issues but also the need to improve outcomes. It would have been necessary to undertake the work irrespective of the programme and it had already begun as part of the High Needs Block recovery plan. As an example, it should not be the case that children have to wait until they have an EHC plan to obtain help with speech and language and one of the projects would involve training the multi-disciplinary work force to be able to assist at an earlier stage. Good feedback had been received from the DfE on all of the projects and they were not dissimilar to ones being undertaken by other local authorities.

Councillor Brabazon, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families, stated that local authorities had been made an offer that they were unable to refuse by the government. If school governors did not feel that they had been sufficiently well briefed on the programme, she was happy to meet with them again. There was a systemic problem that there was insufficient money for SEND and the government was incentivising local authorities to make changes and offering to write off deficits in return. Irrespective of this, it should not be necessary for children to wait for EHC plans for interventions and the changes necessary were overdue. For example, there needed to be a lot more universal provision for speech and language therapy. The direction was consistent with work that was already begin done in response to the

written statement of action. The programme represented a big cultural change and a real opportunity to bring about change. She understood concerns regarding less articulate or assertive parents not getting as much support and this was shared by those across the partnership. It was essential for the interests of children and schools that the programme worked though.

Ms Difulco agreed to refer the suggestion that the chair of a school governing body be added to the Safety Valve Steering Group to the group for consideration. There were over 2600 children with an EHC plan in Haringey, which was higher than the average for other London boroughs and there was an overspend of £24 million. She reassured Panel Members that if children needed a plan, they would receive one as this was a statutory duty. All of the relevant background papers and reports regarding the transformation of SEND were available on the Councils SEND Local Offer website and a link to these would be shared with members.

In answer to a question regarding the lack of speech and language therapists, Ms Difulco stated that she was aware that there was a shortage and the time frame for targets involving them had been extended in response. In addition, one project involved the recruitment of speech and language assistants which would reduce reliance on specialist therapists. The target of 611 for reductions in the number of EHC plans did not only relate to early intervention and would also be met by revising plans, with some being ceased where they were no longer deemed necessary. In answer to another question regarding personal transport budgets, she reported that very few parents currently had these and this was an area that needed further development. She recognised that the SV programme was very ambitious but it was nevertheless the right thing to do.

AGREED:

1. That the one page summaries of each project to be undertaken as part of the Safety Valve be shared with the Panel in the next stage of engagement; and
2. That it be recommended that school governing bodies be represented on the Safety Valve Steering Group.

46. HARINGEY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT 2022

James Page, the Chief Executive of Haringey Education Partnership, provided an update on test and exam attainment. The current data was the first nationally validated data that there had been since 2019. There had been an overall reduction in attainment. There were gaps in early years and primary, where there had not been any changes to grading or assessment. In secondary schools, higher grades had been obtained but was reflective of a change in the baseline and performance had actually declined. There had been an impact from Covid and the lost learning arising from it.

Haringey's relative performance had been very positive with improved standings compared to other London boroughs and nationally. In early years, the percentage achieving Good Learning and Development had declined by 4% but the decline elsewhere had been higher and this had allowed Haringey to improve its position in

the top quartile in London. There was a similar picture in the percentage of children passing their Phonics test. In Key Stage 1, the percentage reaching the expected standard for Reading, Writing and Maths was also down but not as much as elsewhere and this had enabled Haringey to almost reach the London average. In Key Stage 2, the percentage reaching the expected level in Reading, Writing and Maths had only declined very slightly whilst elsewhere the decline was 5% in London and 6.5% nationally. This had enabled Haringey to reach the London average for the very first time. In the Attainment 8 measure of GCSE, Haringey had risen higher above the national average, which was especially welcome with the return of exam based assessment. The borough had slipped below the average during the period when assessment was by teacher assessment. In addition, the attainment gap for Black Caribbean and Turkish young people for GCSE had also reduced. Finally, A Level results continued to be above the London average. There had therefore been strong performance all the way from early years to post 16. Top priorities for development were closing further the attainment gaps for Black Caribbean young people at GCSE, for Turkish and Kurdish young people at Key Stage 2 and for EAL students at both points.

In answer to a question regarding the comparatively low levels of attainment for applied general qualifications at Key Stage 5, Mr Page stated that this was probably due to a range of factors. At post 16, more than half of young people went to providers who were out of borough and this was particularly true of those in the east of the borough. There was also strong A Level provision in the west of the borough. It was likely that it was a selection issue and that a comparatively large proportion those that remained came from the lower attaining cohort. He would nevertheless check with the data. In answer to a question regarding the impact of Covid, he reported that HEP and the Council had worked with schools to bring them together during the pandemic. This enabled them to focus on remote learning and share best practice, as well as maintain a focus on school improvement. In addition, schools had been inclusive and had provided tutoring and support. Support had been provided to them on a range of issues by HEP.

The Panel noted that there had been an influx of children with EAL and, at the moment, many were struggling to make progress and asked about the support that was provided for them. Mr Page stated that there were a number of things in place but acknowledged that more needed to be done to enable them to achieve as much as elsewhere. Schools had been working with providers such as the Flash Academy, who assisted them with teaching and learning support and a lot of good work was done on vocabulary at Key Stage 2. Work was being taking place to support schools to further develop parental involvement and, in particular, build a better understanding of different communities. Consideration was being given to how support could be improved further though although it was not always easy to determine what would make a difference.

In answer to a question, Mr Page stated that the different communities that came under the "other white" category were separately tracked. However, the DfE set the overall categories and these were not necessarily those that would be chosen locally. The performance of traveller groups was tracked but the numbers of them were very small, as was the case nationally. He was not aware of any specific work that schools were undertaking with them, other than general inclusion work. Data was kept on the

performance of children from eastern European countries. There were a range of outcomes but Bulgarians were not performing as well as other groups. It was important to note that it was not possible to dictate to schools how they addressed these issues and they had developed their own systems and methods. A large proportion of children with EAL were nevertheless highly proficient in English. Support could be provided by parents in many ways. In particular, listening to children reading was particularly effective and this did not necessarily need to be in English.

The Panel felt that there were a lot of demands on schools. A lot of parents of children from EAL communities struggled initially and there needed to be programmes to support them, including induction. It was important to engage and involve them. Children from EAL communities were particularly disadvantaged if they joined schools late in the year, especially if they were required to sit formal exams. It was felt that more could be done to provide support for parents. It was noted that some schools had successfully employed bilingual staff who were able to speak to children and parents in their mother tongue. However, many children were eager to speak more English at home and schools were engaging with parents regarding this.

Mr Page emphasised that many EAL children made excellent progress. The racial equity work that had taken place between the Council and schools in the borough had contributed to an understanding of inclusive culture and the development of systems to respond to needs.

47. SCHOOL PLACE PLANNING

Nick Hewlett, Interim Assistant Director of Schools and Learning, reported that the Panel's review on the Haringey Family of Schools had made specific reference to the impact of the reduction in demand for school places. This was having a large impact on the sustainability of schools and their ability to respond to the range of demands that were placed upon them.

Nick Shasha, School Place Planning Lead, reported that the Annual School Place Planning report was behind much of the action that was taking place to address this issue. The peak years for demand for primary school places were 2012-14, when there were over 3,000 first place reception preferences made. There had been a gradual decline since then and this figure had gone down to around 2,500. There had already been a number of temporary and permanent reductions in the number of entry forms in several schools but more still needed to be done to reduce the number of surplus places. Discussions and consultation was taking place regarding reductions in the Planned Admission Number (PAN) at a number of schools. There were two key guidelines behind these:

- Parental preference would not be undermined; and
- Schools could immediately revert back to their previous PAN should local demand warrant it.

The latest school place planning report stated that the projected annual demand for reception places would be 2,600 by the end of the decade so there was unlikely to be any change in the near future. It was felt that the current decisions were well based on the information available currently. Recent National Office for Statistics data had also continued to show a reduction in the birth rate. In respect of secondary schools,

there had been an upward trend in demand for places but this had now tapered off. Whilst there was likely to be surplus places in future, this was not anticipated to be as large as for primaries and the need to address the issue was therefore not as pressing.

In answer to a question, Mr Shasha stated that the reductions in demand for places were due to a number of factors including the high cost of housing, Covid, Brexit and a long term decline in the birth rate. The reductions had occurred over a number of years. Mr Hewlett stated that the impact on schools would be considerable, particularly on their finances. There would be a need to have some challenging conversations with a number of them regarding this, including the diocesan authorities. The issues were particularly challenging for smaller schools and there now a lot more schools that were one form entry.

In answer to a question, Mr Shasha stated that the trends were not unique to Haringey and were also being experienced in neighbouring boroughs. Mr Hewlett stated that, although there were significant housing developments taking place in the borough, these would probably not make much difference. Some schools would benefit but not all.

The Panel noted that schools within geographical clusters met together from time-to-time. These were felt to be useful and more were requested. It was also noted that Catholic schools in the borough were currently undertaking due diligence regarding conversion to academies. Mr Hewlett responded that it was important that schools met together to collaborate on addressing the drop in demand for places. It would provide an opportunity to explore what might make them more sustainable. Some smaller schools were performing very well and good practice could be shared. Staff in many schools were staying in post for longer, which meant that they were more expensive to employ and this was proving a challenge for schools. A number had made proposals to restructure in response. He was aware of what was occurring with Catholic schools in the borough and had spoken to the Diocese regarding it.

The Panel noted that one school had responded to the drop in admissions by setting up a class purely for SEND children, who had thrived by being in a smaller class. Mr Hewlett commented that he was aware of the arrangements being made for SEND children at the school in question. However, inclusivity needed to be maintained and the process managed carefully. One of the aims of the Safety Valve programme was to keep more SEND children in Haringey schools. More SEND children staying in the borough meant more money for schools and therefore benefitted all children.

48. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (LGA) PEER CHALLENGE - OUTCOME

Ms Hendricks reported on the outcome of the recent Peer Challenge that had been undertaken on children's social care within the borough by a team from the Local Government Association (LGA). This had been undertaken in November 2022 and its final report was now awaited. Peer challenges were undertaken by invitation from local authorities and this had been done in preparation for Ofsted inspection. The challenge had been an extensive process, including reviews of documents, data and case files, interviews and focus groups. In addition, there had been observation of practice. The scope of the challenge had been wide ranging.

A number of strengths had been identified by the team. In particular, the Early Help Panel had been found to be well attended and the social workers in school scheme had been shown to have an impact. There was also a greater range of services that were available now to the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), which was found to be well resourced and structured. There were a number of areas in respect of the MASH and the Front Door that were identified for further consideration. These included reviewing the contribution of partners to the MASH and governance arrangements and developing live data reports. In respect of permanency planning, senior leaders were found to be committed to this. The Foster to Adopt approach also promoted early permanency. They were also impressed by the quality of special guardianship assessments that were undertaken. Amongst areas identified for further consideration were the additional capacity in permanency planning so that it was considered across the spectrum. The workforce was identified as a strength and they were seen as passionate and committed. Consideration was recommended to responding to areas where there was higher staff turnover and reflecting the reasons for this in the workforce strategy action plan. The voice of the child was seen as an area of particular strength. Evidence was found that children were listened to and that their input shaped services. It was felt though that consideration should be given to strengthening the evidence that of the child's voice being used to influence plans. Leadership was seen as a strength, with a permanent, stable and committed leadership team.

Ms Hendricks reported that a 'Getting to Excellence Board', was to be established and there would be a range of activities developed in response to this, many of which would require the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders. This would include developing further the political engagement and there would be a range of activities in support of this, such as training for Members. Panel Members would be requested to be involved as part of this.

In answer to a question, Ms Hendricks reported that one area of concern that was identified was infrastructure. It was felt that the environment needed to be created where practice would thrive. The Cabinet Member stated that the challenge had confirmed that children's social care was not just the responsibility of the Children and Young People's Service. The infrastructure and external issues that could impact on care services were also significant. There was a very important role for the Panel and the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee in asking challenging questions.

49. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

It was noted that it was unlikely that the proposed review on physical activity and sport could be completed by the end of the current municipal year. Panel Members stated that they wished to look in detail at the issue of children and housing. There was an overarching review of housing taking place and a scrutiny review on this matter would be able to feed into it.

It was noted that it would take time to develop a scope and terms of reference for this and that it would also unlikely to be possible to complete a review on this by the end of the year. Physical activity and sport had also been identified as an area for review in response to feedback from young people who had attended the Scrutiny Café. It was

therefore agreed that the review on physical activity and sport would proceed as planned and that a scope and terms of reference for a review on children and housing be developed for discussion at the next meeting of the Panel. An informal meeting between the Chair and relevant officers would be arranged to facilitate the development of this.

AGREED:

1. That the draft scope and terms of reference for the proposed review on physical activity and sport be agreed and recommended to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and
2. That the scope and terms of reference for the proposed review on housing and children be developed and submitted to the next meeting of the Panel.

CHAIR: Councillor Makbule Gunes

Signed by Chair

Date