

CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillor Liz Atkins (Chair), Councillor Mary Atkins, Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Nicole Griffiths, Councillor Dr. Mahamed Hashi, Lynette Murphy-O'Dwyer and Councillor Philip Normal

APOLOGIES: Councillor Emma Nye and Mrs Penny Smith-Orr

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, Councillor Ben Kind and Councillor Mohammed Seedat, Cabinet Member for the Voluntary Sector, Partnerships and Community Safety (job share)

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Councillor Liz Atkins, Chair of the Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee, welcomed everyone to the meeting with all attendees introducing themselves.

Councillor Dr Mahamed Hashi informed the Committee that he worked with Young Lambeth Cooperative.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (04.07.18)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2018 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

3. LAMBETH CHILDREN SAFEGUARDING BOARD: UPDATE ON RESPONSES TO YOUNG PEOPLE AT RISK

The Chair explained that the meeting would focus on young people at risk. She expressed concern that Lambeth had been identified as one of the top five boroughs in London for serious youth violence and this had increased by 13% in the last 12 months. Also, Lambeth had the highest number of first time entrants (FTE) within the criminal justice system, with the largest proportion of young people being from the Black, Asian and Minority and Ethnic (BaME) communities with a quarter of young people having been diagnosed with a learning disability. Although the Council recognised that a new approach to address issues was needed, no evidence of progress had been documented in the report. However, she hoped that an update on the achievements made would be discussed at the meeting and the work required to protect children and young people in Lambeth.

The Chair, Councillor Liz Atkins, then invited parents and representatives to address the meeting.

A parent advised the Sub-Committee that:

- Her 16 year old son had previously attended a school in Lambeth for 4 years up to Year 10, before he was permanently excluded in October 2017.
- Her son currently received no education and she paid for private tuition costing £40 per week which she could no longer afford.

- Prior to her son being excluded, she had asked for a managed move to another school as her son was unhappy but her request was refused.
- She had been advised at the Independent Review Panel (IRP) hearing by the Principal stated that her son could not be managed by another school and was recommended that he should attend a Secondary Alternative Educational School) instead. However, on speaking to the Head, she decided that it was not suitable for her son's needs. As a result of issues, he could not travel to the areas which prevented him from attending the school.
- The family GP had referred her son to the Well Centre to assist with his mental health problems.
- Her son had been threatened by drug dealers to have him sell drugs for them.
- She had received letters from the Council threatening court action as a result of her son not attending school.
- She had been advised that her son could attend College to study for his GCSEs in order to become a Stock Broker. However, the college advised that she required a referral letter from the Council so that her son could commence the programme but this was refused, as the Council wanted him to attend the Secondary Alternative Educational School instead.
- She had received no support from the Council.

A parent, explained to the meeting that:

- She was the parent of a 14 year old son who currently attended a school in another borough.
- At age 8, her son's behaviour escalated as a result of her being diagnosed with a serious illness which emotionally affected him in school and consequently, he received numerous internal and external exclusions.
- In Year 7, at secondary school, his behaviour again escalated as a result of her medical illness. He received numerous internal and external exclusions and spent time at a neighbouring school.
- Although some school support had been put in place, her son was permanently excluded but a managed move to another school was arranged. However, after two weeks, he was permanently excluded (as at that time, his diagnosis for ADHD was not known by the school). She appealed the decision but was unsuccessful.
- She contacted Lambeth for assistance but was advised that her son would need to attend the Secondary Alternative Educational School despite her views. As a result of not receiving proper support from Lambeth, she had no choice but to send her son there where his ADHD was eventually diagnosed.
- At age 12 her son began selling drugs as a result of being mentored by gang members.
- A mentor from an organisation previously provided support to her son but this service no longer existed.

Mel Christodoulou, Director of the Yellow Qube, said that:

- Yellow Qube operated an open door policy that provided support for parents.
- She expressed concern about the information she heard from parents regarding the exclusion process, especially for children who received in-school exclusions at different schools.
- It was important to provide advice to parents who raised concerns in exclusion meetings on the language barriers faced in understanding the exclusions process and on their children's mental health and well-being.
- The Qube provided assistance with food provisions and toiletries to families.

Councillor Mary Atkins then highlighted the following points:

- She made reference to a parent whose son, with special needs, had issues at a particular school and was eventually permanently excluded. As a result of being moved to another school, he was now thriving without any issues.
- Although parents had concerns regarding their children being affiliated with gangs, they feared approaching schools.
- Schools failed to understand the violent issues associated with estates, such as Tulse Hill with significant overcrowding issues and adequate services unavailable that provided support to families. Nevertheless, she recognised that good practice existed within Lambeth and emphasised the need to share this to ensure parents were supported.

The Chair then invited Annie Hudson, Strategic Director of Children's Services to introduce the report and she highlighted the following points:-

- She thanked parents for attending the meeting to share their experiences.
- The report outlined the work undertaken by Children's Services, schools, community safety and the police in supporting and assisting children at risk.
- The report also provided an update on the work undertaken during the past 18 months. For example, the Lambeth Safeguarding Children's Board agreed that joint work with statutory agencies and the private sector to provide better support for children and young people were required. This included supporting young people involved in sexual exploitation; missing young people and young people being at risk of being radicalised, by developing a Young People at Risk (YPaR) Strategy to ensure that over time, the Council would be better equipped to protect affected children and families.
- It was recognised that huge challenges existed, including how services operated together to support families and children, especially concerning youth violence.
- Changes had been made in children's social care to work jointly with the police, education, health and organisations, such as Young Lambeth Cooperative, to share information concerning young people. The changes made were already evidenced by Ofsted, which showed that the Council were addressing problems.
- She recognised that extra work needed to be done and the Council had developed a long term strategy to address some of the cases and manifestation of serious youth violence, in particular BaME males.
- She felt that focus should be made on:
 1. Joint community engagement with parents, council and police;
 2. Further data information to be provided pertaining to estates and communities;
 3. Joint integrated working with both the voluntary and statutory sector services; and
 4. Earlier engagement of services to support families and children in order to solve problems was needed.

The Chair then invited Jim Henderson, Headteacher of Arbichbishop Tenison's School, to address the Committee and he highlighted that:

- He had worked in three different schools in Lambeth and Southwark and was familiar with the issues raised.
- Headteachers only imposed permanent exclusions as a last resort.
- Schools were aware of the challenges and problems that existed for some children. Staff also appreciated that children made mistakes and tried to provide appropriate support in order to prevent exclusions. However, schools must be a safe environment for every child, including difficult children and therefore, exclusions could not be avoided.
- Schools imposed internal exclusions to ensure that staff worked with children to provide

support.

- Headteachers previously had capacity to bring in additional aides to support children but resources were now limited. Therefore, joint working between schools, the police and social services were required.
- Earlier identification of children's problems by outside agencies should be made known to headteachers, as schools were only notified of issues when problems had already manifested.
- Joint working was needed with outside agencies to ensure coherent approaches with parents in order to avoid parents relying on a single service and children being permanently excluded.
- He had worked with the Inclusion team at Lambeth to secure managed moves for children to another school which had proven to be successful for those children.
- He had visited Park Campus and understood the issues associated with the campus and the fear of parents not wanting their children to be associated with other young people at the campus. However, the campus supported children back into successful pathways through education.
- It was recognised that children could not be supported in school without a joined up process with other agencies to provide assistance.

Exclusions

The Chair began this part of the debate by explaining that although data on exclusions was not currently available, she required an update on exclusions imposed on out-of-borough children with the support provided for them and exclusions within Lambeth. Also, she wanted the outcomes for excluded pupils, in particular, those children referred to the Pupil Referral Units (PRUs).

The Strategic Director for Children's Services, the Head of Inclusion and Delivery Lead Education Strategy responded that:

- Strategic work was being undertaken by the Council entitled: '*Raising the Game: Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils in Lambeth*' that provided support for children, in particular BaME males at risk of being permanently excluded.
- Data statistics for 2016/17 showed that 00.09% exclusions occurred within Lambeth's schools, which was in line with the Council's statistical neighbours and inner London. This was lower than the United Kingdom's rate of 0.10%. Although data was not expected by the Department for Education (DfE) until August 2019, figures showed that exclusions within Lambeth remained steady.
- Joint work with the Council and headteachers was underway to consider other alternatives, such as managed moves to other schools that prevented exclusions and provided a fresh start for children; outreach services provided by alternative provisions such as the PRU; supporting headteachers and finding alternatives for young people to avoid exclusions occurring.
- The Young People at Risk project involved the attendance of the Youth Offending Service (YOS) at meetings to provide early help in various areas. This involved looking at statistics and data to identify schools with high levels of exclusions; children absent from schools; children that received repeated fixed-term exclusions and at risk of heading towards being permanently excluded. Earlier intervention of those cases were required to ensue appropriate support was provided.
- Outreach support was available to all schools and was promoted in order to support schools in terms of alternatives.
- Although concern existed regarding data pertaining to the over-representation of black

males, the Council aimed to minimise the amount of exclusions that occurred in schools. 66% of support went to Black Caribbean males in terms of cohorts with 70% to females.

- Data statistics were not currently available regarding education outcomes for excluded children, as examination results were awaited. However, in terms of the PRU, for the past 2-3 years a 100% avoidance rate existed for not sending children not in education, employment or training (NEET) to the campus at secondary level.
- Primary level reintegration occurred at the point of secondary transfer with appropriate support provided to get children back into mainstream education.
- Data for the last academic year showed that 20 managed move transfers within Lambeth and out-of borough schools had been undertaken to avoid exclusions.
- 24 successful re-integrations to place children back into mainstream schools were supported by the Council, out of a cohort of 81.

The Chair, then opened up the debate on exclusions to other members of the Sub-Committee and in response to questions, the Head of Inclusion, the Head of Inclusion and Delivery Lead for the Education Strategy and the Strategic Director for Children's Services, responded that:

- Records for children that received internal exclusions were only kept by the school as they remained on the school roll.
- A headteacher could not remove a child from their school roll until alternative provision had been made for that child. If this occurred, the school would be challenged by the Council and a request made for that child to be re-instated by the school with immediate effect. Therefore, in terms of data, only fixed and permanent exclusions were recorded.
- All children were entitled to full-time education and if the Council became aware that a child's timetable had been reduced, this would be challenged.
- When a child was excluded the Council made a referral to the PRU and secured parental engagement for a risk assessment to take place. Before any referrals to the PRU were made, information pertaining to the child was received from the school. The Council also accessed internal systems, such as social care records and Youth Offending teams to obtain as much information as possible. Following a risk assessment, if any issues were found, the Council would be notified to provide alternative provision. That alternative provision would also be risk assessed against the cohort of that alternative provision in order to ensure that the child was appropriately educated.
- The Vulnerable Pupil Monitoring Group met on monthly basis and considered various case studies pertaining to children, including travel issues to school. If it was noted that a child involved in gang activity could not travel to a particular school, then alternative provision would be sought.
- The Strategic Director for Children's Services would welcome the opportunity after the meeting to speak to both parents who had addressed the Sub-Committee to obtain further details pertaining to their children, as it was appreciated that those issues needed to be addressed.
- Parents had the option to home educate their children if they refused a place at another school or PRU which some parents preferred to do. However, if parents refused to engage in the risk assessment process, this could result in a School Attendance Order being issued to the parent to put their child on the school roll automatically.
- '*Raising the Game*' consisted of a Lambeth Schools Partnership (LSP) that involved 34 schools which brought into the service. The working group comprised of four headteachers (three secondary and one primary) and two behaviour consultants that discussed and considered alternative provisions to exclusions. Also behaviour policies and appropriate training were discussed.
- Schools had a duty to notify the Council of any fixed-term exclusions imposed on a term

basis. On the sixth day of the fixed-term exclusion, schools must provide alternative provision for those children. The Council encouraged schools to provide information on fixed-term exclusion as soon as possible, so that this could be recorded and monitored to determine if any risk assessments existed. However, the Council must be informed of any permanent exclusions on the same day, as there was a need to obtain all relevant information for the PRU and meet with the family to ensure that suitable education could be commenced within six days.

Jim Henderson, Headteacher, Archbishop Tenison's School, added that:

- Internal exclusions were the responsibility for schools but some schools preferred to communicate with local authorities when an internal exclusion occurred.
- Headteachers must ensure that educational boundaries existed to prevent problem children causing disruption at school. Hence the reason for permanent exclusions being imposed.
- Internal exclusions were made to ensure conversations with families were held in order to raise the boundaries and prevent permanent exclusions.
- Schools behaviour policies should be examined as it demonstrated the sanctions imposed by schools, including internal exclusions which was considered as the first warning signs of issues with children.
- Real difficulty for schools existed in identifying problems that existed for children.
- He had experienced difficulty in referring children to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) and as mental health issues in children appeared to be increasing, he believed that (CAMHS) were overloaded with cases.
- Although issues might be identified by the parent or school, if relevant expertise was not available due to funding, this left the school in a difficult position regarding their next step.

In response to a question, Jim Henderson, Headteacher, Archbishop Tenison's confirmed that schools worked with the Inclusion Team at Lambeth regarding providing support for children with mental health issues. However, due to limited funding and the waiting list for CAMHS, it could result in children being permanently excluded.

The Chair invited Maria Taylor, Young Lambeth Cooperative, to address the meeting and in response to her questions, the Delivery Lead Education Strategy, the Head of Inclusion and the Director of Commissioning and Improvement, confirmed that:

- Community organisations were not involved in the Vulnerable Pupil Monitoring Group but the Council contacted relevant teams, such as social workers, that had access to community groups.
- Every location had a duty to report pupils that no longer received support from the NEET so that investigations could be made to ascertain if those children were engaged in further education or just changed their mind.
- The NEET team within the Council would need to be approached to obtain data statistics that documented the assistance provided for children NEET. However, the NEET team were notified of any cases in advance of the summer holidays so that appropriate education could be put in place for those children by September.
- The Council needed to identify cohorts of NEET children and work with those families to secure pupil engagement in order to find a resolution.
- In relation to CAMHS, for children waiting for appointments under Tier 3 (specialist services) a long waiting list existed. For Tier 2 (early help and targeted services), limited funding was available and it was recognised that more resources were needed for schools and joint working with health providers was required to ensure proper support for children.

Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, Deputy Leader of the Council (Children and Young People), highlighted the following points:

- She appreciated that the data on exclusion was lower than the national average. However, children being excluded in Lambeth were at risk of being either sexually exploited or becoming involved in gangs. Therefore, she would like to see that no exclusions occurred in Lambeth to ensure that no children were at risk.
- As a Cabinet Member, she had been approached by at least four parents whose children had been out of education for months, despite officers stating that school alternative education was found for children within six days.

Councillor Mary Atkins added that joint work with parents and the community was required. She also made reference to a recent press article regarding Dunraven School, which had set up an alternative on-site provision to support problem children instead of sending them to the PRU which had resulted in permanent exclusions being reduced from five to zero a year. She recommended that the Council might wish to consider that model for other schools.

Criminal Justice System and Serious Youth Violence

A member began by referring officers to paragraph 1.15 (agenda pack, page 13) and emphasised that no information had been provided regarding how successful the engagement process with schools had been. In particular no projects had been mentioned and how this would be fed into Phase 2 of the YPaR Strategy. In response the Strategic Director for Children Services and the Assistant Director of Quality Assurance for Children's Services, confirmed that:

- The YPaR Strategy involved the Council having better engagement with schools. Every school in Lambeth now had a team manager within Children's Social Care aimed at producing better partnership working with schools. Team managers met with Headteachers to discuss any problems with children, with particular emphasis made on sexually exploited children.
- A Child Exploitation Co-ordinator for the Council had visited various schools and carried out mapping exercises to examine the relationships between young people and find children at risk of being sexually exploited. The work undertaken had also assisted the Council in changing the language being used to shift the focus away from victim blaming and provide general support to young people instead. Joint work with parents and partners existed to deliver a good young people safety plan and to support young people through the process to help achieve change. The Council would like to see more children subject to a young people safety plan to in order provide support.

In response to further questions from members, the Assistant Director of Quality Assurance for Children's Services, the Strategic Director for Children's Social Care, the Director of Commissioning and Improvement, the Head of Inclusion and the Delivery Lead Education Strategy, confirmed that:

- Further work was required to ensure that missing children were offered an independent return interview to identify and understand any risks they faced whilst missing. In the Council, the missing co-ordinator had responsibility for tracking cases and ascertain whether an independent return interview had taken place and what had been offered to that young person.
- Further work needed to be done regarding FTE that come into the system as agencies tended to work differently. The Youth Justice Board (YJB) had visited the Council and provided advice with actions to be monitored by the YJB. More joint working with agencies, including the Black Thrive, YOS, police, schools and neighbouring boroughs

were required to address youth offending rates in order for the council to learn from YJB.

- If a child is absent for 10 days and no contact can be made with the family, the matter is referred to the Education Welfare Team for investigations to be carried out. If the family could not be located, the child would be removed from the school roll after 20 days.
- The School Governing Body and Headteacher monitored children missing from education and contacted the Council's social care team for further investigations to be carried out.

Members reiterated the point made above and felt that further clarity, data and outcomes for young people at risk were required in the report.

The Strategic Director for Children's Services apologised for the lack of information provided but emphasised that the subject area was quite complex and data for some information had been difficult to obtain.

Guillotine

Following discussion of this item the guillotine fell at 9.00 pm.

RESOLVED: That the meeting continue for a further period of up to 30 minutes.

In response to further questions, the Head of Inclusion, the Strategic Director for Children Services and Director of Commissioning and Improvement, confirmed that:

- The PRU was not presently full as some children would have left to be reintegrated into secondary school from September but a core number of places existed at the PRU for children that might need to attend. However, it was expected that as the academic year progressed, the PRU would be filled. Alternatives, such as out-of-borough placements would also be considered but this could pose increase risk, as children would be required to travel.
- The Director of Housing Services was a representative on the Serious Youth Violence Task and Finish Group.
- Every borough within London was required to submit a Knife Crime and Serious Violence Plan which had been completed by the Lead Commissioner for Crime and Disorder. The Youth Violence Strategy aimed to bring together all the work of the statutory agencies and the community in one place to change and improve how the Council could help prevent violence against young people. This involved working with the Young Lambeth Cooperative, estates and engaging with schools.
- The issue of a facility that had been available in the Town Hall where young people, subject to violence, could attend to feel safe would be raised.

In response to a question from Maria Taylor, Young Lambeth Cooperative, the Strategic Director for Children's Services and the Director of Commissioning and Improvement, confirmed that:

- The opportunity existed for the Council to submit bids for further funding from central government for youth violence work. At present, the funds received from the Mayor's Officer for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) were currently being used but an update on further bids were awaited.
- No changes to youth funding had been made by the Council.

A parent emphasised that parents were not aware of the alternative provisions available for their children, as the Council only intended to inform parents of the PRU.

The Strategic Director for Children's Services appreciated that further work was required to ensure that parents were informed of the alternative services available and further work in this area would be undertaken by officers.

The Chair expressed her thanks to everyone who had attended and contributed at the meeting. The Chair summed up the issues highlighted by the discussion and the headline issues for recommendations.

RESOLVED: That:

1. Focus on better, early identification of children at risk of exclusion and a joined up approach. School exclusion and absence from education has huge long-term effect on the life chances of children and young people. Many children who are excluded from school often already face a host of challenges including experiences happening outside the school environment. Schools and agencies need to liaise and engage much earlier, including with parents/carers, to understand what is happening in a young person's life and their community and through a joint, coherent approach better reduce the risk of exclusion.
2. Ensure better tracking of excluded children and more support to prevent children who have been permanently excluded from falling through the cracks. Whilst there is a statutory process which requires that pupils are found a new school place or suitable alternative provision within six days of a permanent exclusion, it was clear from the evidence presented by parents to the committee that there are incidences where the processes in place have not worked and excluded children/young people have become absent from education. Data on internal exclusions and managed moves also needs to be collected to look at trends and regularity. Internal audit could be used for this. Research on this, to include the voice of the child and parent, to be commissioned.
3. Noting the challenges faced by schools in accessing external interventions and in particular for those pupils identified with higher level (Tier 3) mental health needs, a review should be undertaken of the level of support available for children and young people and the availability and waiting time for CAMHS interventions.
4. Secure more data on exclusions particularly on the educational and other outcomes of all excluded pupils including those attending PRUs. The committee was not able to be provided with recent data and trends on exclusion and considers it particularly important that the outcomes for pupils who are excluded are tracked to contribute to an understanding of what is working and what might improve the life chances of vulnerable children and needs.
5. Review the learning, success and opportunities of a zero exclusions policy and alternative provision within mainstream schools for disruptive pupils such as the Dunraven School model. The committee notes the alternative on-site provision in place at Dunraven which includes bespoke interventions and re-integration back into the main school when a pupil is considered ready. *(It has been reported elsewhere that the educational outcomes for the cohort of students compares significantly more favourably than those who attend a pupil referral unit).*
6. The committee also notes the 'Raising the Game' initiative – a Lambeth Schools Partnership project looking at alternatives to exclusion and in particular avoiding repeat instances of exclusion, including through support, training and outreach. The committee would wish to be informed on the learning and outcomes from the assessment and review of the project.

7. There needs to be readily accessible and clear information made available to a parent/carer whose child has been excluded from school which sets out the alternative educational provision options available and how they can access advice and support on all options and next steps.
8. At all stages ensure that the voices of the child/young person and the parent are listened to.
9. The committee noted the input of the Head Teacher Archbishop's Tenison's School and would like further information on school exclusions from Head Teachers' perspective on the issues that face them and the solutions they would like to see.
10. The committee notes the work carried out by the local authority to encourage schools to report children missing education, however it is also clear that the data provided by schools is less than robust. Noting the confluence between children and young people caught up in serious youth violence, child sexual exploitation and criminal exploitation and those who go missing from education, schools must be made accountable for monitoring and reporting children who miss or are absent from education. This includes a role for the School Governing Body and involvement of the Safeguarding Governor. As necessary schools should be reminded of their associated responsibilities by the local authority.
11. It is not clear that Return Home interviews for children who go missing from home or care always take place. Children's Services should secure more information on missing children and ensure there are more independent return to home interviews. This in particular is an imperative for children who are in placements outside the borough.
12. Anecdotal evidence from parents suggests special needs issues are not being identified early enough and not enough relevant support given. This may also be confirmed by the number of young people entering the youth justice system with a special need. Special needs policies to be reviewed and unmet need to be quantified.
13. Lambeth has the highest number of first time entrants into the youth justice system per 100,000 of the whole country. Whilst there appear to be a range of diversionary activities commissioned including in high risk areas and some excellent community initiatives, it is not clear that there is a structured approach to measuring and gathering the learning of what works; there is also variety in quality of provision. The committee additionally notes that about a quarter of the children who end up in youth custody are even more vulnerable because they have a generalised learning disability. There should be more evidence gathered on the outcomes of the youth justice initiatives that Lambeth is pursuing. There is also a need to ensure a more joined up approach to reduce the number of FTEs into the criminal justice system.
14. In conjunction with (13) above, ensure the work to reduce violence on high risk housing estates is monitored and assessed.
15. It is understood that Lambeth Town Hall was previously designated a 'safe space' where children/young people seeking to escape violence or harm could attend and feel safe. Consideration should be given to reinstating the Town Hall as 'a safe space' facility along with the requisite training for staff.

16. It is noted that the bid to the Young Londoner's Fund (cited in the agenda report) has been unsuccessful. Whilst the committee is assured that other funding opportunities exist, in the context of tight resources and budget pressures the committee would welcome further information about the funding and evaluation of youth projects going forward. Information should include projects outside the Young Lambeth Co-operative model to enable a review of external and internal funding being used, such as lottery funds, independent charities etc.

4. **2018-19 CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chair discussed the work programme and explained that the 19 December 2018 meeting would focus on the budget. The meeting would also consider SEND and the early identification of children with special needs.

The Strategic Director for Children Services stated that SEND had recently been considered at the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting on 11 October 2018.

The Lead Scrutiny Officer advised that items still needed to be determined for the meeting scheduled for 19 March 2019.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee working programme as currently drafted (Appendix 1) be approved.
2. That the Lead Scrutiny Officer to provide further information of the details required for the SEND report to officers.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 9.25 pm

CHAIR

Date of Despatch:

Contact for Enquiries: Jacqueline Pennycook

Tel: 020 7926 2167

E-mail: jpennycook@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk

The action column is for officers' use only and does not form a part of the formal record.

This page is intentionally left blank