

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S TRUST BOARD

5.00PM – 4 JUNE 2007

HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present:

Brighton & Hove City Council: Councillor Mrs Brown (Deputy Chairman – Chairman for this meeting); Councillors Bennett, Duncan, Harmer-Strange, Hawkes, Hyde, Kemble, McCaffery, Norman and Roy.

Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust: Julian Lee (Chairman) & Darren Grayson

South Downs Health: Quintin Barry and Mo Marsh.

Non-voting Co-optees:

Linda Hodgson(Parent Forum)

Naima Nouidjem (Community & Voluntary Sector)

David Standing (Community & Voluntary Sector Forum)

Emma Welfare (Sussex Police Authority)

Apologies for absence were received from:

Dr L Hulton (Brighton & Hove Primary Care Trust)

Anne Caborn (South Downs Health Trust)

Ray Gold (Parents Forum)

Lynette Gwyn Jones (Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust)

Rekta Rogers & Ruby Reynolds(Youth Council)

Imogen Taylor (Universities of Brighton & Sussex)

PART ONE

ACTION

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1A Declarations of Substitutes

1.1 Emma Welfare for Carole Shaves (Sussex Police Authority)

1B Declarations of Interest

1.2 Councillor Marsh declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in her role as Councillor at Brighton & Hove City Council and as a representative of South Downs Health on

the Children & Young People's Trust Board.

Councillor Marsh declared a personal interest in Item 9 as the proposed City Academy was within her ward.

Councillor Harmer-Strange declared a personal interest in Items 8 and 11 as he had two children in special education.

Councillor Roy declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in 11 as she was employed by the Sussex Partnership Trust.

1C Exclusion of Press and Public

1.3 The Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Schedule 12A, Part 5A, Section 100A(4) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

1.4 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

2. MINUTES

2.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2007 be approved and signed by the Chair.

3. CALLOVER

3.1 **RESOLVED** - That with the exception of the items reserved (and marked with an asterisk), the recommendations and resolutions contained therein be approved and adopted without debate excepting Notices of Motion, Deputations, Petitions and Letters which are reserved automatically.

4. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Mr J Lee informed the Board that Councillor Brown (Deputy Chairman) would be the Chairman for this meeting.

Councillor Brown welcomed the new members to the Board; Councillors Duncan, Harmer-Strange and Roy from Brighton & Hove City Council and Naima Noudjem from Community & Voluntary Sector. Councillor Brown confirmed that Councillor Marsh was a representative of South Downs Health and

apologised that her name had been omitted from the Agenda.

Councillor Brown provided the Board with the following overview of the role and function of the Children & Young People's Board.

"The C&YPT Board is the senior decision making body for the Children and Young People's Trust. The C&YPT itself has been created via a legal partnership agreement, under Section 31 of the Health Act 1999, through which the three statutory partners – the Council, the PCT and South Downs Health, have agreed to pool budgets and operate joint commissioning and provision of children's services covering health, education, social care, youth work and child care. Under the Section 31 Agreement, the Council has been nominated the lead partner in these arrangements, and the Director of Children's Services is the nominated chief officer. Since October last year, the C&YPT has been operating as a single organisation, with approximately 250 South Downs staff seconded to the council, where they have joined their 750 or so colleagues already employed by the council. There are thus around 1000 centrally managed staff, and in addition to these the C&YPT includes around 5000 staff employed in schools.

The Board has been meeting to oversee the work of the C&YPT for the past four years, but became 'official' as part of the governance arrangements through the Section 31 Agreement. Constitutionally it is actually three groups meeting simultaneously – the Council's Children, Families and Schools Committee, a sub-committee of the PCT Board, and a sub-committee of the South Downs Board. The intention is that each of these committees (or subcommittees) has delegated powers to make decisions regarding the business of the C&YPT. Each constituent group has one vote, so if there is any disagreement within one of the groups they need to sort it out before voting. If necessary, the meeting would have to be adjourned while this happened.

In addition to the three 'voting' groups on the Board, there are a range of other members, who take a full part in the discussions, but who do not have a formal vote. These so-called 'observer members' reflect the wider partnership of the C&YPT, and include parents, young people, voluntary sector organisations, the Police Authority the Universities, the Strategic Health Authority and the Hospital Trust.

There have not been any issues so far which have required a vote, but if one is needed, there is one further rule that would

apply. All three voting partners can vote on matters to do with the provision of services, but only the Council and the PCT can vote on matters to do with the commissioning of services. This is because, in the NHS, the PCT is the commissioning organisation, and South Downs does not have any say in commissioning decisions. The reverse does not apply, however, because as the commissioner the PCT is also able to have a say in all matters relating to the provision of services.

Under the Section 31 Agreement, there can be no split decisions. Decisions concerning provision must be passed by all three partners agreeing, and decisions about commissioning by the Council and the PCT agreeing. There is no 'chair's casting vote' – if there is a split vote the issue would get referred back to the chief officers to try to resolve. Ultimately if the partnership wasn't able to agree important policies (such as budgets), there is provision in the Agreement for it to be formally dissolved. Obviously this would only happen under extreme circumstances.

We hope that the Board will enjoy its work over the coming year. The agendas will be very broad and strategic, but hopefully allow members to get to grips with key areas of service. In addition to its role in agreeing policy, budgets and strategies, it will receive regular quarterly budget management reports, and reports on performance from the whole service. To support it in its statutory role, there are a number of strategic partnership groups, the most crucial of which are the Local Safeguarding Children Board and the Clinical Governance Board, both of which are chaired by the Director, and whose minutes are available to members. There is also a dedicated scrutiny committee for children and young people, which has a statutory role under local government legislation for scrutinising political decision making and service performance.

Last year the council's CFS Committee met separately from the Board to discuss educational matters, such as the school admissions proposals. We have not scheduled any separate meetings of this committee in the coming year, as we are expecting everything to be dealt with in the context of the Board meetings. However, if there are items of CFS business which are liable to take up a disproportionate amount of time, we still have the option of holding separate meetings of the committee if necessary."

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 There were no public questions.

6. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

6A PETITION: PROVISION OF NEW MEDICAL CENTRE IN THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE FORMER CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL ON DYKE ROAD

6.1 To receive a Petition by Councillor Pennington at Council on 8 March 2007 (642 signatures).

"We the undersigned, as patients of Montpelier Surgery and local residents in the Clifton, Montpelier and Powis areas call upon Brighton and Hove City Council, Brighton and Hove Primary Care Teaching Trust and George Wimpey Ltd to make provision for a new medical centre in the redevelopment of the former Children's Hospital on Dyke Road . "

6.2 **RESOLVED** – That the Petition be noted.

6B PETITION: SECONDARY ADMISSIONS REVIEW

6.3 To receive a Petition presented by Councillor Bennett at Council on 8 March 2007 (418 signatures).

"We the undersigned, oppose the proposals of the Secondary Admissions Review, and urge committee members not to implement them. We oppose the proposals for a lottery system in the event of over- subscription to a secondary school for admission. We believe that the distance link should be retained to enable children to walk to a local school, where one exists. Given the importance of this issue to parents and Children in Brighton and Hove, The Council must properly consult parents on the detailed proposals and take these views into account before making a final decision."

6.4 **RESOLVED** – That the Petition be noted.

6C DEPUTATION: SECONDARY SCHOOLS ADMISSION REVIEW AS PRESENTED AT COUNCIL ON 8 MARCH 2007 BY MS. JANE KISTNASAMY

6.5 "Following the decision to implement the new secondary school admission proposals there is a mood of genuine disappointment and anger that the voices within our community have been ignored by so many local politicians and leaders.

In January the governing body of Coombe Road Primary sent in a detailed response to the admissions proposals sent to them for consultation in November. As yet they have not received any formal acknowledgement of their concerns. Today I do need to raise some of the key issues that still remain.

The whole process of review and consultation has been characterised by mismanagement and bias against certain wards. Despite the Assistant Director of Schools reporting that the consultation via public meetings was communicated via local Councillors and schools, neither happened in the Moulsecoomb & Bevendean Ward. It wasn't until after 6 November 2006 that anyone in our area knew anything of the proposals or consultation. Our community did not have a representative on the Parent Stakeholder Group at the start of this process and this has affected all discussions since. We have been severely let down by the lack of response by Councillor Jack Hazelgrove, who is the representative of many of our families. Until the day after the last CF&S vote last week he has very carefully managed to avoid any interaction with his constituents by systematically failing to reply to letters and emails from concerned residents and also was not available at published surgery times. Out of the 189 questionnaire respondents last year, only 1 is possibly from our area, surely that reflected the lack of public awareness? Yet no action was taken by the authorities or Councillors to address this.

On what basis do you believe that some families should have the right to choice through a dual catchment area while other families have to accept no choice because of the nature of single catchment areas? Until now families from the Moulsecoomb & Bevendean Ward have had the opportunity to apply for and been successful in getting places at schools citywide. Now, in a single catchment there is the option of just one school, with little point of applying for schools outside our catchment as figures provided by the authorities have already shown that those schools will be oversubscribed. If a catchment area system is used then surely the conditions should be equal for all pupils. This system restricts the opportunities for families in our area, is unfair yet was voted in despite the Government's new admissions code describing itself as:

"...a system where all parents feel they have the same opportunities to apply for the schools they want for their child."

This city prides itself on schools with specialist school status. What an injustice that these schools will now only be accessible

to those living in the right catchment. Isn't it time to admit that apparent choice isn't choice at all?

The Governors' briefing on 8 January was brought hastily to an end before all questions had been answered. The representative from the working group on the panel at the front was clearly biased, pro-SAR and this gave the distinct impression that consultation was irrelevant.

The proposed single catchment area for Falmer is too narrow and the projected free school meal figure of 36% means that Falmer will have too narrow a social intake to continue the progress that is taking place at present. It is interesting that the proposal to move Coldean into the Patcham High catchment area has moved through so easily while a logical extension of the Falmer catchment to Elm Grove or beyond has been resisted with Councillor Pat Hawkes' reasoning being 'lack of consultation'. Why is it so easy to move the boundary in one direction and not another? More examples of inconsistency and bias!

The opposition to the SAR proposals has been considerable. It is alarming to so many that the future of our children's education be decided not by an expert team as one would inevitably deem fit for such purpose but by a working group of Councillors and parents. Where might I ask were the educational specialists throughout this process? Instead, at the 2 February CFS meeting there were representatives of this same working group present in the Council Chamber wearing "Vote Yes" t-shirts! No bias there then.

The new policy does not have the backing or the confidence of a significant percentage of the city, including parents and headteachers of primary and secondary schools. This is clearly evident from the recent articles in the Argus that highlight the concern of secondary school headteachers. We now hear that the Council has £1.4million to spend on extra capacity at Varndean, which even the headteacher is dubious will be completed in time for the 2008 intake! Why couldn't that same money be used to address the problem of the 7% that were not being accommodated on the old admissions policy, instead of moving the problem from one area of the city to another as this new policy does?

Residents, parents and the Coombe Road governing body alike feel let down and marginalised by this whole process. We already have families talking about moving away from our area so that they have some choice for their children's education.

There are serious issues facing the future of our neighbourhood and the new policy will seriously affect urban regeneration in this area. I trust that all parties now realise what a job they have on their hands to win back any support from the residents of Moulsecoomb & Bevendean at the forthcoming May elections."

6.6 RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR HAWKES AS GIVEN AT COUNCIL ON 8 MARCH 2007

"Thank you Ms Kistnasamy for your delegation and others who are represented with you.

I thank you for your comments, many of which, of course, have been answered previously when they have been brought to us, through emails, letters and at public and Council meetings. I feel I must refute and make comment on one or two facts.

Public meetings – there was certainly a public meeting held in Moulsecoomb Primary School which I attended and so did Jack Hazelgrove. We checked whether Moulsecoomb parents had been notified and the only parent who turned up was a parent from Patcham who said that they had not been informed by their school. It was a shame that nobody came to that meeting but certainly there was a consultation meeting there.

I would like to just refer to the confusion about surgeries. Some Councillors do surgeries, some do not do surgeries but when a surgery is advertised, as has happened both in my Ward and other Wards, it isn't always the person that you assume will be the one doing all the surgeries because we naturally take turns. I think, you know, it's quite wrong to assume that somebody has avoided a surgery when we have a timetable of them. I will be, for example, doing two more in my Ward than I would normally do because Councillor Framroze is unwell. That is the fact about surgeries.

I will just refer briefly to the Coldean issue and it does impinge on the rest of Moulsecoomb & Bevendean in fact, because at the present time half of Coldean children choose to go to Patcham, half of them choose to go to Falmer: so there isn't a great deal of difference when you have two which would be likely to be under-subscribed schools. I would argue the same goes with the Moulsecoomb & Bevendean Ward, because you will effectively find that that has not changed, so I didn't like that being as though it was somehow slipped in because that is almost a status quo.

The final fact I have is that on the working group, for more than two years now Brian Shields, as a Governor of Coldean School, agreed to represent my Ward. He served conscientiously right the way through, he happens to have children who went to Falmer School, he happens to live in Bevendean and I cannot answer for the fact that there was not a parent from the Bevendean area. It was requested and nobody came forward. Brian Shields represented the concerns in my Ward but he also happened to live there but that was just for factual information.

I am sorry you feel like that. What most of us are going to try and do, I hope, is make this work, so thank you for coming along today and I hope we can get things right."

6.7 **RESOLVED:** - That the deputation be noted.

6D DEPUTATION: SECONDARY SCHOOLS ADMISSION REVIEW AS PRESENTED AT COUNCIL ON 8 MARCH 2007 BY MR. MARK BANNISTER

6.8 "When we hear people say the lottery will result in children from poor and deprived areas getting into the best schools in the city, I say 'rubbish'. The new system involves lotteries with catchments and the catchments have been drawn so as to reduce almost to zero the chance of anyone from the two large public housing estates on the edge of the city from getting into the best schools.

The admissions battle in Brighton has been about which middle class parents can manoeuvre their children to the front of the queue and short term electoral considerations have dictated the outcome. Conveniently Councillor Hawkes said: 'Brighton & Hove is a city of haves and have nots and the have nots have been left out.' Well, today you can see a map that shows with devastating clarity the impact the new admissions system will have on the have nots. For most parents in our deprived communities there are no benefits, no gain: in fact, most are considerably worse off than they are now.

When the new catchment boundaries are superimposed over the areas of deprivation it doesn't take a genius to realise what is happening. The children in most of these areas are being shut out, forgotten and abandoned. The area at the north end of Moulsecoomb actually ranks in the bottom 1% of the country in terms of educational deprivation. Parents in the Falmer catchment currently choose, and obtain, places at many different schools for their children but not any more. The percentage of children eligible for free school meals is a broad indicator of deprivation. This percentage will increase

significantly within both the Falmer and Longhill catchments and will be much higher than in the other catchments. In last year's intake at Falmer High 20% of the children were eligible for free school meals, this figure will rise to 36% in the September 2008 intake under the new system. Councillor Hawkes actually says: 'We have taken into account the number of children receiving free school meals in each area.' Well, tell that to the parents in the Falmer and Longhill catchments.

In his presentation to CFS on 27 February David Hawker suggested that the FSM percentage at Falmer in 2008 would only increase slightly but that is because he has used the average of children within the whole school and he has not, therefore, explained that the current system has recently begun to deliver a more balanced social intake. The new system threatens that progress. We also don't subscribe to the view that because Falmer has always had an above average number of children with free school meals, that this somehow justifies keeping it high. When you point out that under the new admissions code it is a mandatory requirement for the LEA to proactively promote equity and opportunity for all, all other options that could have made Falmer more comprehensive were dismissed, why: because of the political self-interest of the Green and Labour Parties.

The Falmer Governors said: 'We feel an extension to the catchment will help balance the FSM situation.' Why were they ignored? We argued for free school meals banding and we were ignored too.

The other severely deprived area of the city is the Whitehawk Estate that ranks inside the bottom 1% in the country on the education IMD. Under the new system all children here will attend Longhill. Thus, as with Moulsecoomb and Bevendean these children are being denied access to the higher performing schools. The number of children on free school meals within the Longhill catchment has been severely under-estimated due to the incorrect division of the FSM numbers between the two halves of the BN25 postcode. This is still not being admitted by the Council but today we predict that the percentage of children on free school meals in the 2008 intake will be well over 25%, not 18%.

There is now a very serious risk of another COMART. We do not understand how the very same Councillor who presided over that disaster is still in place today and through undemocratic means and solely to obtain party political advantage has been allowed to foist another calamity upon the long suffering

parents of this city. As the ex-Head of COMART, Jill Clough, wrote in her book: 'He, the Director, added that the Council had agreed to a more just admissions process which might eventually help the school to recruit more students but there would be no public discussion of the proposals before the local elections in May 2003. There were many marginal seats and so the controlling Labour Party was afraid of provoking debate which might lose them. My feeling of exhaustion as I left the meeting was compounded by the thought that if the future of the children was to be manipulated yet again by political expediency my work would be futile.' Yet again indeed.

We've now had two years of education, education, education and as a former Chief Inspector of Schools said at the weekend: 'Having failed to deliver, the policy now is to spread the misery. The failure of public policy is cloaked in the rhetoric of equal opportunity.' Well, never a truer word spoken."

6.9 RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR HAWKES AS GIVEN AT COUNCIL ON 8 MARCH 2007

"Thank you, Mr Bannister, for your deputation. It is quite interesting isn't it: I wasn't going to say this but I will say it: another political speech. If I've read today's Argus correctly, one or other of you, like the previous lady is attempting to stand. Well, that's fine, that is what democracy is about but that's just an aside.

I thank you for what you've said and, as I said to Jane previously, many of your comments have already been answered when I have stood answering questions and letters in the public and Council meetings. There are just a couple of facts that I want to really refute without getting upset about an area of Brighton that I know very well and, with great respect, I don't think you know quite so well and that is Falmer School.

Falmer School has an outstanding Head and superb things are happening there. I would like to see more children choosing to go there but at the present time the school is doing fantastically well and I have every faith that those children will have equity of opportunity as they do at Patcham too because, you know, suddenly the interest is in them rather than the distance measurement from Dorothy Stringer.

One of the facts that I need to refute to you is that of the Year 7 children at the present time going into Falmer, 34.7% of them are on free school dinners and I do have to remind you that a

number of people, because as I say some of us know the area well, do not apply for free school meals but actually are entitled to them. 34.7% at this present time are in Year 7 going into Falmer, so that what had been said previously about the large number (interruptions from the Public Gallery)

I am saying that at the present time the Year 7 children going in, they are doing well, we are supporting the school well and I would like to think that everyone else took the same view but clearly we do disagree. There is a schism in this city and it's a great shame. I feel that that schism should be covered up, not covered up but we should come together ... (further interruptions)

I genuinely feel instead of people for whatever purpose they come repeatedly to Council meetings, repeatedly to CFS meetings, why can't we all care about all the children because it doesn't seem as though that is the case? I do and I am determined to make this work, so thank you for your deputation but I am afraid we can't just keep on with this continual sniping. It does not help our young people."

6.10 **RESOLVED** - That the deputation be noted.

6E LETTER FROM COUNCILLOR BENNETT

6.11 The Committee considered the following letter submitted by Councillor Bennett.

'I would like to pose the following questions at the next CYPT meeting on the 4th June.

Would the Committee agree to an urgent review of the new senior schools admissions system, delay the introduction by a year in order to analyse the results of distance with equal preference. Could the Chair please outline the new Administration's position on this issue?'

6.12 **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR BROWN**

Thank you for your question. As I assume Councillor Bennett knows, the current legal position, confirmed in advice from our legal department, is that, since there has been a referral of the 2008 admissions arrangements to the Schools Adjudicator, under the Admissions Code, until those objections have been determined, the Council as the Admissions Authority must refrain from taking any further decisions on admissions. As you will know, the adjudicator has called a public meeting on 12 June in order to hear all sides of the debate before reaching a

decision, and he is the only person with the authority to make changes to the 2008 admissions criteria.

As you will also know, at the request of the Administration, the Director has already given a public undertaking to review the new system for 2009 and this review will begin in the Autumn of this year. There will be a further opportunity for this Board to debate the issue when he presents his report to us in due course. It would not be appropriate to pre-empt this exercise by having a debate and reaching a premature conclusion at this stage.

6F LETTER FROM COUNCILLOR ALLEN

6.13 The Committee considered the following letter submitted by Councillor Allen.

'Does the new administration intend to proceed with the plan to increase Varndean admission numbers by 60 ? .If so, a) has the authority complied with the required statutory processes and b) is the administration confident that planning permission will be recommended for an extension that would obscure part of the main school building ?

Does the new administration support the view of Conservative Councillors representing the southern end of Withdean and Labour councillors representing Prestonville that Dyke Road and not the railway line is the natural boundary ? If so, when will catchment area boundaries be altered in order to allow children living in those areas to walk to Dorothy Stringer or Varndean, as traditionally been the case, rather than being forced to travel by bus or by car to schools with which there are fewer community links?'

6.14 RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR BROWN

Thank you for your question. We do intend to proceed with the plan to increase the capacity of Varndean School, since the number of secondary age pupils in the city justifies this, regardless of the new admission arrangements. The CFS Committee unanimously agreed an admissions figure of 300 for Varndean School for 2008, representing an increase of 60 over the current figure and we shall honour that agreement. The change in admission numbers for Varndean arose as a consequence of the consultation on the 2008 arrangements, and was agreed with the head and chair of governors of the school before it was presented to the Committee and then subsequently published. The Council's legal department has

confirmed that we have complied with all the required statutory processes. So far as the additional accommodation is concerned, officers from the C&YPT and Property Services, who are working on the plans for the extension, are liaising closely with their colleagues in Development Control, to ensure, as far as possible, that the planning application, when it is submitted, will be recommended to the Committee for approval.

Concerning the catchment area boundaries, as I am sure you are aware, the administration have asked the Director to review these in time for the 2009 admissions round and he has publicly committed to doing this. We will ensure that Prestonville is one of the priority areas to be looked at.

7. TO RECEIVE AN EXTRACT FROM THE CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECEIVING A SUMMARY OF SCHOOL OFSTED INSPECTION REPORTS

7.1 The Board considered the extract and the report on the outcome of the school Ofsted inspections

7.2 **RESOLVED** – That the extract and report be noted.

***8. SEN AND DISABILITY STRATEGY : INCLUSION OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES. BEHAVIOUR STRATEGY : INCLUSION OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH BEHAVIOURAL, EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL DIFFICULTIES**

8.1 The Board considered the content of the final versions of the two strategies. The two strategies had been developed by members of C&YPT, schools and partners and had been out to consultation across the city between 19 January 2007 and 23 April 2007.

8.2 **RESOLVED** – That the final strategies be noted.

***9. PROPOSED CITY ACADEMY AT FALMER - OUTCOME OF SITE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND PROGRESSION TO OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE**

9.1 The Board considered a report informing them of the findings to date of the Council's feasibility study into the suitability of the site for the proposed City Academy at Falmer and to recommend to Policy and Resources Committee that work on the Outline Business Case (OBC) commences.

9.2 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the project progress be noted, including the findings of the Council's feasibility study and Traffic

Management Study as detailed in section 4 of the report.

(2) That the proposal to progress the preparation of the OBC for the project was considered and agreed.

(3) That it be recommended to the Policy & Resources Committee to be held on the 28th June 2007 that work on the preparation of the OBC commences.

(4) That the forward timetable and work to be undertaken with the DfES in delivering the Academy at Falmer be noted.

(5) That it be recommend to the Policy and Resources Committee to be held on 28th June 2007 that a Project Board be set up to take the project forward.

(6) To recommend to the Policy and Resources Committee to be held on 28th June 2007 that an outline planning application be submitted as part of the OBC work for the retained land.

10. JOINT PLANNING AND COMMISSIONING FOR LEARNING SKILLS IN BRIGHTON & HOVE

10.1 The Board Considered a report which proposed that Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC) and the Learning & Skills Council (LSC) Sussex will be the joint commissioners of post 14 learning and skills provision in the city, in collaboration with partners. This report will also go to the LSC Council for endorsement.

10.2 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the proposed joint planning and commissioning framework is used to commission all post 14 education and skills provision in Brighton & Hove.

(2) To agree that new structures are adopted within the C&YPT and LSC Sussex, including a virtual team that brings together staff with complementary roles and responsibilities.

(3) To agree that BHCC and LSC Sussex lead a process of change, in collaboration with providers and partners, to an evidence based approach to identifying need, using resources collaboratively and planning the pattern of provision strategically at the city-wide level.

***11. DEVELOPMENT OF CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

11.1 The Board considered a report which set out the actions being taken to further develop the comprehensive Child and Adolescent Mental Health service (CAMHS) for Brighton and

Hove.

- 11.2 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the progress being made in the implementations of the commissioning strategy for CAMHS be noted.

12. YOUTH OPPORTUNITY AND YOUTH CAPITAL FUND

- 12.1 The Board considered the monitoring report of the first year's delivery of this new funding from the DfES to increase the active participation of young people and to create new places to go and things to do.
- 12.2 The Board also considered the allocations for the new financial year 2007/08 and the process for allocating funding, and the recommendations for future developments of this work.
- 12.3 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the positive impact of the development be acknowledged.
- (2) That the arrangements being made to allocate funding for the new financial year be agreed.

***13. OUTTURN 2006/07 AND 2007/08 BUDGET**

- 13.1 The Board considered a report updating them on the 2006/07 outturn and the 2007/08 budget
- 13.2 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the overspend of £1,654k on the Pooled budgets for 2006/07 be noted.
- (2) That the schools balances as at 31 March 2007 be noted and that the approach for the future as set out in paragraph 3.2.2 of the report be endorsed to the Schools' Forum.
- (3) That the budget for 2007/08 be endorsed.

***14. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S PLAN: ANNUAL REVIEW**

- 14.1 The Board considered a report enabling them to contribute to the annual review of the Children and Young People's Plan, which will help determine the grades for the 2007 Annual Performance Assessment. The report also proposed

changes to the structure and reporting arrangements for the CYPP.

- 14.2 The Board noted that paragraph 6.2.3. of the report requested that officers be given delegated powers to make any adjustments to the CYPP, but this was not included in the Recommendations paragraph of the report. It was agreed that this would be included.
- 14.3 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the summary assessment set out in paragraph 5 of the report be agreed.
- (2) That changes to the structure and reporting arrangements for the CYPP as set out in paragraph 6 of the report be agreed, and any final adjustments to the plan be delegated to officers.
- (3) That it be agreed to publish a new three year CYPP (2008-11) in 2008, subject to further advice from the Government Office of the South East about new arrangements for the Local Area Agreement (LAA).

***15. EXTENDED SERVICES IN AND AROUND SCHOOLS STRATEGY**

- 15.1 The Board considered a report seeking their endorsement of the Extended Services in and Around Schools Strategy for Brighton & Hove.
- 15.2 **RESOLVED** – (1) That the Extended Services In and Around Schools Strategy for Brighton & Hove 2006-09 be agreed.

16. Items to go forward to Council

- 16.1 **RESOLVED** – That no items be referred to Council

The meeting concluded at 19.20 pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this day of

2007