

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

(a) Mr John McInnes

“Currently most B&H schools have a dedicated Ethnic Minority Achievement Service specialist teacher working directly with pupils new to English on a weekly basis. It is proposed that EMAS, a frontline teaching service, is to lose its entire council funding of £165,000. This cut has led to the proposal that two teachers would have responsibility for all schools, 54 primary, 9 secondary and 6 special. How does this ‘further develop the effectiveness of provision for EAL/BME pupils?’”

(b) Ms Maggie O’Connor

“The statutory duties still in force and currently delivered through Connexions IAG staff are:

- * (a) the Education and Skills Act 2008
- * (b) The Employment and Training Act 1973
- * (c) Section 139 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000 and the SEN code of practice

Please tell us which specific delivery tasks will no longer be undertaken for each of the following groups of young people who:

- a) are NEET
- b) have Learning Difficulties or Disabilities
- c) attend schools and colleges?

The new configuration could deny residents their legal entitlement and leave the City Council open to litigation. “

(c) Mr Mark Fleming

“The 26.01.11 Scrutiny committee stressed the importance of early intervention to reduce the number of children in care. Proposed 50% cuts in Education Welfare Service will seriously reduce the chance for early intervention from this frontline service. In the last academic year, there were 1077 referrals to EWS; without early intervention, many referrals would go to social care and be dealt with in a more costly and inefficient way with implications for safeguarding children. Savings involved in reducing EWS are likely to be outweighed by the increased number of children taken into care. How can this obvious contradiction be justified?”