

Minutes

CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

19 September 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 – Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Heena Makwana (Chairman), Becky Haggar (Vice-Chairman), Kishan Bhatt, Philip Corthorne, Kamal Kaur, Tony Gill, and Jan Sweeting (Opposition Lead)</p> <p>Co-Opted Member Present: Tony Little</p> <p>Officers Present: Andy Goodwin (Head of Strategic Finance) Chris Mayo (Assistant Director Financial Management) Sheilender Pathak (Head of Finance for Children and SEND) Suzie Gladish (Safeguarding Partnership Quality and Improvement Manager) Alex Coman (Director of Service Delivery – Safeguarding, Partnership and Quality Assurance) Ryan Dell (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
20.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Peter Smallwood with Councillor Philip Corthorne substituting. Apologies were also received from Councillor Rita Judge with Councillor Kamal Kaur substituting.</p>
21.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
22.	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Members thanked officers for the additional information supplied on the previous Select Committee's Twice Yearly School Places Planning agenda item.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed</p>

23.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED AS PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED AS PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>
24.	<p>MID-YEAR BUDGET/ BUDGET PLANNING REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the mid-year budget/ budget planning report for items within the remit of the Children, Families and Education Select Committee.</p> <p>It was noted that this was the first appearance at the Select Committee for the new budget cycle. The consultation budget would be presented to Cabinet in December 2023, and would come back to the Select Committee as part of the consultation in January 2024, before being fed back to Cabinet in February 2024.</p> <p>For 2023/24, the Council was forecasting a net underspend of £23k, with the services with the remit of the Children, Families and Education Select Committee underspending by £174k. This was being driven by a reduction in for Looked After Children through an improved mix of service delivery alongside staffing underspends.</p> <p>There were £1.4M of savings to be delivered in 2023/24. £774k of this was designated as ‘Amber II – potential problems in delivery’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £229k for SEND Transport Management; £130k for Early Years Centres; and £415k related to Fees and Charges uplifts. <p>Most of these were recorded at Amber II due to the difference between the financial year and the academic year.</p> <p>The school’s budget was forecast to overspend by £4.5M, with this being wholly driven by the high needs block where funding had not kept pace with inflation and demand.</p> <p>On the Medium-Term Financial Forecast (MTFF), in February 2023, the Council’s saving requirement up to 2027/28 was estimated to be £55.4M, with the single largest factor being exceptional inflation, with this adding £60M to the budget gap. Within the remit of this Select Committee, the main inflation drivers were contracted spend for care provision and SEND Transport, with these two areas accounting for £7.8M of the £60M requirement.</p> <p>Service pressures were forecast to be £23M, up to 2027/28, predominantly driven by demographic growth within the Borough, with £7.7M of this related to services within the remit of this Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £3.7M for demand for Looked After Children; £3.2M for SEND Transport; £0.6M for Asylum Services; and £0.2M for Children with Disabilities <p>In terms of the Council’s wider budget strategy, Corporate Items were adding just under £12M to the Council’s savings requirement, with £6.5M of this</p>

related to the Capital Programme and £4.1M related to Transport for London Concessionary Fares which was related to the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Officers were going to continue to assess the budget gap prior to December Cabinet, with inflation remaining high, and the demand for Council services being linked to the cost-of-living crisis. Officers will also be looking for ways to reduce Council expenditure through efficiency gains while protecting front-line services.

Members referenced the new and emerging risks and noted that the Committee's current major review was looking at the Stronger Families Hub, during which witnesses had expressed the need for more resources. With this in mind, Members asked whether this had been taken into account within the current budget setting. Officers noted that as part of analysis of the budget gap, officers looked at the three main drivers:

- Inflation;
- Demand-led growth; and
- Corporate Items

Within the demand-led growth, officers considered demographics, including population projections and demand for services. Wider ONS projections were also considered, as well as local knowledge and performance management information. Officers also worked with services areas, and throughout the Autumn, MTFF strategy workshops would be run with Directors and Heads of Service.

On vacancies, Members asked about vacancy capacity, and whether unfilled posts may be deleted. Officers noted that the Council set a managed vacancy factor within its budget establishment. The Council's approach was to look at where services can have a level of vacancy and attach the managed vacancy factor to those services. This was monitored throughout the year. On front line services, there was no such target. In 2022/23, the managed vacancy factor was roughly £4M, and the underspend against staffing was £8M, and therefore an overachievement of the target. Officers would not look to remove posts if there was a need for such posts.

On SEND Transport, Members asked if cost pressures were due to contractors charging over and above petrol costs, and whether there were any volume drivers in terms of take-up. Officers noted that within the Council's budget strategy, there was a demand-led growth element and also savings which were used to bridge the gap. SEND Transport was reported in both areas. Within the Council's capital programme, there was also an increase in the number of SEND provision that officers were looking to increase within the Borough. It was not as straightforward as to say it was down to demand. Transport routes, for example, also needed to be considered.

Members noted that the demand of high needs was increasing and that it would therefore be difficult to achieve the savings on the transport side. Members asked if increased capacity was restraining growth rather than preventing growth. Officers noted that this was one of the reasons why SEND

Transport was at Amber II at the moment. It was difficult to say until the academic year had started. Officers were looking at historic trends and working with the service. Officers also noted the budget monitoring process.

Members referenced the budget gap strategy and asked how developed the Council's thinking was on this, and how officers were going about it. Officers noted that the budget strategy that was presented in February 23 had a £10 million saving requirement for 2024/25 and it had a savings programme of equal value. Within the savings program there was an element which related to ongoing Fees and Charges uplifts. Within future years the budget gap started to open up. 2024/25 had a largely balanced budget. There were some further bid savings still to be identified, but most savings to address the gap had been identified. Horizon scanning was ongoing, and in the Autumn, officers would reassess the budget gap in terms of latest intelligence on demand/ inflation. These workshops would look at how to shape the savings programme to maximise transformation opportunities, increase efficiency and protect frontline services. The proposals would be presented to Cabinet in December and brought back to the Committee in January 2024.

Members asked about the legacy element of the pandemic-driven demand for services. Officers noted that there had been increased demand for services during the pandemic for both adult's and children's social care. There was also a particularly high demand relating to mental health. Officers were working across service areas to see where they could help to support residents and manage that demand. There were still high numbers within the adult's mental health services, and so officers were looking at how to deliver an outcome that helps to support the residents and also reduce costs. For children's social care, the increase in demand was starting to level off. There was an underspend for Looked After Children in 2023/24 but this was not related to a reduction in the number of children being supported and was to do with having a better mix of service provision. During the pandemic there were issues with courts which made it harder to move children onto more suitable placements. There was a backlog so as time goes on that backlog reduced which enabled officers to bring the demand levels down. Additional demand on homelessness was related to the cost of living.

Members referenced the underspend of £174k with the remit of this Committee, and noted that this was unusual, and asked how these resources would be reallocated. Officers confirmed that it was unusual for children's social care and services to underspend. Officers noted that there was not a reduction in the numbers of children being supported. Some of it was related to the court backlog, there were fewer children in residential placements and the supported living unit costs had also come down.

Members noted that DfE had approved a disapplication to allow Hillingdon to take money from the school's budget to help reduce the high needs budget and asked why the Council had opted for this course of action. Officers noted that the current position on the high needs block was that the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) had been underfunded, going back to around 2015/16 which was why there was the accumulated deficit. This underfunding required

an additional contribution from schools. It was proposed to transfer 0.5% of the school's block to the high needs block to contribute to the additional cost of high needs placements. The schools Forum did not agree to that request and so the Council put in a disapplication request to which the DfE agreed. The primary drivers for the increasing costs in the high needs block was on independent placements and out-of-Borough placements.

Members noted that the DfE had required some Councils to cut EHCP funding by 20% and asked whether Hillingdon had been required to do so. Officers noted that there was no specific number in terms of reducing funding on EHCPs. There was a programme of works to reduce the spend in the high needs block, and there was a number of different schemes including reviewing the banding model. Officers were working within the safety valve agreement and with the DfE.

Members noted the forecast increase in the cost of care provision and SEND Transport asked if officers believed that the Council was at its peak economically at the moment. Officers noted that the Government did publish its forecast as part of the OBR (Office of Budget Responsibility), and within this was an inflation forecast. The forecast on inflation was 7% for 2023 falling to 3% for 2024 and 2% thereafter, with 2% being the Bank of England target rate. On the projections, the upper and lower limits of these were stark, but the Council adopted a low-risk strategy. For example, the £60million inflation requirement was part of a low-risk strategy to ensure that there was enough money if lower projections materialised.

Members referenced the contracted spend for SEND Transport and asked if this was outsourced. Officers confirmed that the service was currently outsourced and there would always be a discussion of in-house versus outsourced. This could vary on many factors such as demand as well as economic circumstances. With inflation remaining high, the pay award was coming out above the budgeted position and so this put pressure on in-house services. On SEND Transport, a holistic view was needed, to also consider route planning, the right number of buses, and the right number of transport assistants. The current way of working was probably the most efficient but this would always be monitored.

Members referenced the 200+ independent/ out-of-borough placements. Given that there was not the intention to build a new secondary school, Members asked what solutions there could be for this. Officers noted that the DfE were providing additional capital funding to increase the provision for special resource provision in secondary schools. Officers were also reviewing the need and requirement of EHCPs.

Members noted that another Local Authority had received additional funding, as a port authority, for their unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC), and asked whether Hillingdon, as another port authority, were going to receive similar additional funding. Officers noted that they were always on the lookout for further funding. Home Office funding had not risen with inflation. Services for asylum seekers should be funded through the Home Office and so

	<p>Hillingdon did end up incurring some costs. This was why there was a £600k pressure within the budget. Some asylum seekers may not qualify for funding. Hillingdon was not seeing any additional funding for inflation pressures.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the financial context in which the 2024/25 budget setting process will take place in advance of detailed savings proposals being developed and approved at Cabinet in December 2023.</p>
25.	<p>CHILDREN’S SAFEGUARDING PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REPORT <i>(Agenda Item 6)</i></p> <p>The report set out the work of the Safeguarding Adults Board and the Children’s Safeguarding Partnership for the year 2022/23. It provided an overview of how the partnership had strived to continuously improve safeguarding practices and how they had worked across the multi-agency network to keep children and adults safe.</p> <p>The vision of the partnership was that every child and young people is safe; that they feel safe; that they enjoy good physical, emotional and mental health; that they can take pride in their unique identities; and that they can feel that they belong and have opportunities to thrive.</p> <p>The Safeguarding Partnership was made up of the three statutory partners: the police; the Local Authority; and the Integrated Care Board. They each had an equal responsibility for safeguarding within the Borough and made up the Executive Leadership Group. The Children’s Safeguarding Partnership and the Safeguarding Adults Board reported to the same Executive Leadership Group.</p> <p>On an annual basis, the Executive Leadership Group commissioned independent scrutiny where an external expert provided an independent review around the work being done. On the work on contextual safeguarding – risks that young people face in the community – no areas of poor practise in service provision for adolescents at risk of harm were found. Strong leadership was identified from the leadership group.</p> <p>One of the areas of focus in the past year was ensuring that the voice of the child and the voice of the adult was effectively sought.</p> <p>The partnership had its very first children’s annual report. This was the culmination of a several months-long piece of work that included a co-produced quality assurance that sought to understand the experience of children and adults who received a safeguarding service in Hillingdon.</p> <p>On the children’s report, children were asked questions such as: ‘how do you feel?’; ‘do you feel listened to?’; ‘what is going well?’; ‘what can we do to make things better?’; ‘what worries you or makes you feel unsafe?’; and ‘what can we do to change it?’. Children reported that they could tell when professionals were going above and beyond. Children also commented on the impact of</p>

awareness raising work such as Child Exploitation Awareness Day. Children identified that all childcare professionals should have mandatory training to understand what it is like to be a young person. Walking in Our Shoes training was noted. Meaningful engagement and early intervention were important. Children would like to see more life skills in schools and wanted improved youth provision. Peer mentors was suggested as a possibility.

Each Board had a variety of priority areas of focus. The multi-agency sub-group used a simple framework of prevention, identification and response. Over the past year, the partnership had progressed work within the safeguarding sub-group, including the launch of the contextual safeguarding strategy and the education inclusion toolkit, which was designed to support education professionals to recognise where a child's behaviour might be indicative of an unmet need and to then be able to access support for that need.

The partnership was seeking to reduce the risk of school exclusion which then reduced the risk of a child experiencing actual familial harm. Within the child sexual abuse sub-group, the partnership had developed a successful partnership with the National Centre for Expertise on Child Sexual Abuse. The domestic abuse sub-group had concluded as a formal sub-group.

A 'learning from practise' framework had been implemented in both children's and adult's safeguarding. The partnership wanted adult practitioners to be thinking about child welfare, and wanted child focused practitioners to be thinking about adults with care and support needs.

Across the year, the partnership had undertaken three learning reviews. The serious youth violence learning review culminated in two well-attended safeguarding events and the launch of the contextual safeguarding strategy. The partnership also implemented a wide-ranging multi-agency quality assurance framework where partners sit down together and look at an area and may adopt a qualitative or quantitative review. In the past year, the partnership undertook the Section 11 safeguarding audit which provided assurance around safeguarding arrangements with partner agencies. There had been good take up particularly from GP practices. An area of recommendation included raising awareness of the role of the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) and the voice of the child.

There were findings in the education safeguarding audit – this was difficult for schools to complete, and there was a lot of discrepancy in the responses which may have been down to the tool not being as good as it could be. Officers were working with schools on this.

The partnership had undertaken audits in respect of Stronger Families and looking at MASH; looking at the quality of decision making and consistency. An area for development here was around ensuring the involvement of fathers and of male caregivers within the family.

Within the strategy discussion review, consistent decision making was highlighted, but there was some variation in recording practices.

The partnership wanted to operate from a strengths perspective as well as identifying opportunities for development.

All of the audits and learning from practise fed into the training programme. The partnership had had a successful year in terms of training. There had been a 43% increase in the number of sessions of continuous professional development. Training took a scaffolded approach including practice briefings; newsletters; webinars; learning events; or half day or full day training. Feedback on training was very good.

In terms of highlights from partners, Children and Young People's Services had taken in education and SEND within the integrated care partnership. There had been lots of work on annual health checks for people with learning disabilities starting at the age of 14. CNWL had celebrated the year of the child in the last year. Hillingdon Hospital had been working with a focus on how to support 16- and 17-year-olds who may be having their clinical needs met within an adult ward and how staff were being supported to understand that they were still children. Harlington Hospice Children's Bereavement Service had been working to develop the response to childhood bereavement for children who are neurodiverse and they had developed a practice approach that had won an award nationally.

Priorities moving forward were around child sexual abuse in all forms; around contextual safeguarding; education safeguarding (there was a dedicated sub-group in respect of education); and around stronger families and early help.

The Chairman noted that they were pleased see that the children and young people had produced their own annual report, and the easy read version was also helpful.

The Chairman asked about the independent scrutiny and whether this was unique to Hillingdon. Officers noted that this was a requirement and was undertaken by every safeguarding partnership. It was noted that what may be unique to Hillingdon was that the scrutineer considered safeguarding adult's arrangements in addition to children's.

The Chairman also asked about safeguarding priorities. The report noted that there had been some challenges in securing the engagement of education representatives. The Chairman asked for a further explanation of this. Officers noted that it was very difficult for one headteacher to be able to speak for other schools and for this reason, officers had implemented the education safeguarding sub-group. There was a focus on how to engage with partners in education and there was representation from early years, primary, secondary, further education and special schools within that group.

Members referenced children wanting more life skills and asked about the areas that this would involve. Offices advised that this included how to

manage money; how to travel; and other practical life skills. This applied especially to Looked After Children, who may live in residential provision.

Members noted the two rapid reviews and asked how this compared to previous years. Officers noted that these reviews included significant work done across the partnership, not just the Local Authority or just the police or just health, it was everyone working together. It also included the findings of independent scrutiny. It was noted that in a report such as this, it was not just about how many referrals or how many child protection plans there were. It was about everything that had happened across the partnership including hospitals/ policy/ ICB/ CNWL. As part of the Child Safeguarding Board, officers did monitor the performance of the partners. This was also reported to the Executive Leadership Group. On the rapid reviews, one of the strengths of the learning from practice approach was that there was learning from where there was a statutory need to do so, but also where the criteria were not met for a rapid review, there could still be learning opportunities. It was a smaller number of rapid reviews than the previous year, but this was not to say that there was not the same level of scrutiny. A rapid review was undertaken when a child had suffered serious harm due to abuse or neglect. This was a different threshold from significant harm.

Members noted that the report, under Corporate Finance comments, stated 'none at this stage', and asked whether there was an issue of funding of the service. Officers noted that the funding of the partnership was currently being provided by the all the safeguarding partners via various contributions. There was an annual contribution from police, from health colleagues and from the Council as well. It was noted that the working together framework was currently being consulted nationally, and a new version would be coming out soon. Part of the consultation included a demand to the DfE about including a funding strategy/ model. Contribution models across the country currently varied. It was noted that one Local Authority equalled one safeguarding partnership, whereas, for example, the Met Police may cover three Boroughs and the ICBs may cover seven/ eight/ nine Boroughs.

Members noted that education safeguarding had become a national issue and asked what was being done to ensure that no young people were slipping through the net. Officers noted that the work around children missing education was led by the Local Authority but there was a partnership element. When a child was missing from education there were various checks that the Local Authority completed in conjunction with the school and then there were also checks that were undertaken with other partner agencies such as Border Force. By reducing the risk of a child being suspended or permanently excluded, the likelihood of them being able to engage in education was increased. It was noted that there was a distinction between children missing education and children who were missing. It was further noted that children who were excluded were not necessarily missing education, they may be receiving education in a different way. A review was currently being finalised on alternative provision within the Borough. This was looking at alternative provision not being an end destination, but a different step in the child

returning to mainstream school. The children missing education numbers had decreased substantially.

Members referenced the numbers of suicides and near suicides stated within the report and asked how many of these were young people, and what was being done to support mental health/ disseminate information/ support families. Officers noted that the numbers were referring to adults. Within London there was the Thrive suspected suicide surveillance system which allowed identification where it was believed that there had been a death related to suicide. Contact would be made by specialists with those who were bereaved. In relation to adults, there was a learning from suspected suicide panel which considered the circumstances of the deceased person to identify areas of learning and to act on them. In relation to young people, it was necessary to be sensitive around using the word suicide, particularly pending the outcome of a coroner's report. On raising awareness, World Suicide Prevention Day was widely promoted, which included sharing resources and free-to-access training modules. Officers were working with colleagues in stronger communities who were leading work around International Men's Day and the theme for this was working towards zero male suicides, so the gendered aspect was considered. There was training for professionals to deliver suicides awareness training in conjunction with Rethink. This was also in conjunction with Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and mental health services. Members noted that it was important to apply a robust critical friend challenge to partners.

Members noted recent documented grooming cases whereby there were elements of lifestyle choices, cultural sensitivity and child protection. Members asked how lessons from this had been applied in practise. Officers noted that across the partnership there was a child-focused approach to safeguarding. The onus was on professionals to recognise that a child who may be being exploited was a child first and foremost. There was a very clear message to challenge this wherever necessary. Officers talked a lot about language and were talking about 'children' rather than 'youths' or 'young males' or 'young females'. The Local Authority's AXIS service routinely collated hard and soft intelligence around exploitation such as criminal exploitation, sexual exploitation and serious youth violence, and undertook a routine mapping exercise. The partnership was also monitoring to identify any early indicators. Officers had reviewed and re-implemented the escalation policy to ensure the right escalations were in place if necessary. The majority of escalations were resolved at stage one or two without needing to go all the way to the Chair of the Board. There was also a robust system of peer challenge. Reviews and guidance looked at learning on a national level, not just in Hillingdon. It was noted that this was not specific to one group of professionals or one agency. This was across all partners. Members were encouraged to look at the safeguarding partnership website as all resources were available there.

Members asked if there were any recent quality assurance findings or recommendations that were receiving attention currently. Offices noted that when an audit or review was conducted, recommendations were all monitored and an action plan would be developed and followed up. Monitoring was done

through the Board and through the Executive Leadership Group. There was nothing that needed more attention than it was being given.

Members asked how the young peoples' idea of peer mentors was being taken forward, and also asked who appointed the independent scrutineer. Officers noted that work on the peer mentors was ongoing. There was an event with children and young people at the end of October. There was not a solid time frame yet. The independent scrutineer was appointed by the Executive Leadership Group which was made up of the Local Authority Chief Executive, the Met Police Borough Commander and the Chief Nurse from the Integrated Care Partnership.

Members noted that the best way to look at safeguarding was that 'it could happen here'. Members asked if there were any weaknesses in safeguarding practices that could be improved upon. Officers noted there were some areas that could be described as perennial challenges, and these were challenges nationally. Things such as information sharing and information seeking; the need for professional curiosity all of the time; respectful uncertainty, which had been described by a young person as listening with your eyes as well as your ears. To mitigate this, officers revisited these areas within newsletters, practise briefings and sub-groups. These areas were often reflected in the partnership's priorities. The sub-groups were often chaired by various people across the partnership.

Members asked for clarity of whether domestic violence cases were increasing or decreasing. Officers clarified that the number of adult safeguarding inquiries undertaken due to domestic violence was what was decreasing.

Members asked how many safeguarding champions there were currently. Members also asked whether there were any specific areas within the Borough where there was more of an intake of safeguarding concern. Officers would update Members on the number of safeguarding champions outside of the meeting. In terms of areas within the Borough, officers noted that they did map the data and were aware of where the demand was; what the resources were; and where more focus was needed. Officers were working on a strategy that could 'lift and shift' to other areas. Overall, performance monitoring was reviewing the areas and issues and type of demand.

Members asked if there had been any challenges in engaging with schools or other stakeholders; what the challenges were; and how they could be overcome. Officers noted that there was a complex network of professional agencies all with different priorities at different times. Therefore, it was inevitable that at times these would not marry up. Where this occurred there would be some negotiation to identify ways to get things done. Where this was not possible, it may be discussed at Board level or via the Executive Leadership Group. Most of the time, partners did engage, and whether they could not, they would explain why.

	<p>Members noted the aim for a local Child Sexual Abuse Hub and asked whether a suitable location had been identified. Officers noted that work on this was being led by the Integrated Care Board rather than the Safeguarding Partnership, but it was thought that a location had not yet been identified.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is reassured that the partnership continues to provide leadership and scrutiny of the safeguarding arrangements for Hillingdon residents; 2. Is updated regarding the way in which the partnership has responded to the challenges posed by changing local, national and international contexts; and 3. Is informed of the strategic priorities for safeguarding for 2022-23
26.	<p>POLICY REVIEW DISCUSSION AND GUIDANCE (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Members suggested a number of potential topics for the next major review. These included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Absenteeism in schools and related problems in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic and its recovery (lessons to learn/ practices to adopt); b) Statutory pathways/ court system/ social work. How social workers work with the legal system; c) Youth Justice System/ numbers of secondary school children involved in County Lines; d) Children not in education/ permanent exclusions; e) Mental health; f) School standards/ improving communication with schools; g) Increase in cyber-bullying of young people and its links to mental health; h) Social media and its links to mental health; and i) Impact on mainstream schools of additional SEND places <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted the guidance on undertaking policy review in Appendix 1; 2. Sought to make use of the scorecard attached in Appendix 1 (Annex A) to assess any policy review topic ideas; 3. Developed a single or shortlist of potential topic ideas over the coming months or year for officers to scope further and report back to the Committee on feasibility; and

	<p>4. Delegated to the Democratic Services officer, in conjunction with the Chairman (and in consultation with the Opposition Lead) any further agreement on review topic selection as required</p>
27.	<p>FINAL REVIEW REPORT AGREEMENT (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Members considered the final draft of the current review into the Stronger Families Hub. Members thanked everyone involved in putting the report together.</p> <p>Members suggested some amendments to the wording of recommendation three, to include reference to comments made by the witnesses.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee delegated to the Democratic Services Officer, in conjunction with the Chairman and in consultation with the Opposition Lead, the amendment of the wording of the recommendations.</p>
28.	<p>FORWARD PLAN (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Members considered the Cabinet Forward Plan.</p> <p>Members noted an item coming to the 12 October Cabinet meeting on School Admission Arrangements. Noting that the Select Committee meeting was the 10 October, Members asked if the Select Committee would have an audit of the schools whose admission arrangements would be changed. Officers would review this and come back to Members.</p> <p>Members also noted an item coming to the 09 November Cabinet meeting on DPS for Alternative Provision – Education and SEND. Members asked if an update on this could be added to the Work Programme.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Children, Families and Education Select Committee noted the Forward Plan</p>
29.	<p>WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that at the recent Cabinet meeting, it was suggested that the Select Committee add a one-year review on the 0-19 family hubs strategy. Members suggested the same for the Youth Offer strategy.</p> <p>Members further suggested inviting the Youth Council to a Select Committee meeting, with a view to getting their thoughts on the Youth Offer.</p> <p>It was confirmed that an item on DPS for Alternative Provision – Education and SEND would be added to the Work Programme.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee:</p> <p>1. Noted the Work Programme; and</p>

	2. Added an item on DPS for Alternative Provision – Education and SEND to the Work Programme
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8:40 pm

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information of any of the resolutions please contact Ryan Dell at democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.