

**Minutes of the Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee Meeting held on 17 December 2015**

Present: Simon Tagg (Chairman)

**Attendance**

Len Bloomer	Geoff Martin
Tim Corbett	Rev. Preb. M. Metcalf
Carol Dean	Sheree People
Ian Hollinshead	Paul Woodhead
David Loades (Vice-Chairman)	Candice Yeomans

**Also in attendance:** Ben Adams and Mark Winnington

**Apologies:** Maureen Compton and Mike Worthington

**PART ONE**

**46. Declarations of Interest**

There were none at this meeting.

**47. Minutes of the Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee held on 12 October 2015**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee held on 12 October 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**48. Sportshire Strategy and Major Events Evaluation**

In recognition of the advantages to the County and its residents of a strong sport and leisure offer, and the health benefits of an active community the County (in partnership with Sport Across Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent) had developed its Sportshire Strategy in 2013. Significant progress had been made towards attaining the Sportshire initial objectives and a refreshed strategy for 2016-2020 had been produced, learning from experience to date and responding to new corporate priorities and the current sporting, economic and health landscape.

The Select Committee considered the four strategic objectives which worked towards ensuring that Staffordshire was a leading sporting destination with a booming sporting economy and residents who enjoy the health benefits of an active lifestyle. The four objectives were:

- The County has a thriving sports industry, which provides high levels of employment to local people;
- Staffordshire is known nationally as a “Sporting Destination” with a high-performing visitor economy;

- Out residents participate regularly in sport and physical activity and enjoy the health benefits of an active lifestyle; and
- The area hosts a calendar of significant events, delivering economic growth, promoting Staffordshire and inspiring further participation.

Members received feedback on the two major sporting events held in Staffordshire, Ironman and the UK Corporate Games. Ironman had seen over £1m spent by athletes and spectators. The television package had been broadcast by 27 channels with a reach of over 225 million viewers. The UK Corporate Games saw £3,089,827 spent by competitors during the games, with 4460 participants from 64 businesses. 79% of competitors travelled from outside of Staffordshire, with 8.6% from outside the UK.

Considering four criterion of: improving residents health and wellbeing; creating a positive economic impact; social impact and civic pride; and building reputation and profile; it was proposed that Staffordshire should bid to host The Great Swim and the 2017 UK Corporate Games. Ironman 2017 was already scheduled to be held in Staffordshire as part of their 2015 successful bid.

Members were aware of the benefits of sport and asked whether its positive impact on emotional wellbeing and mental health was considered when promoting and hosting events. This was a pan Staffordshire issue and consideration was given across all agencies to promote the advantages to wellbeing of a healthy active lifestyle.

Members asked whether sponsorship packages were offered to smaller local businesses for these events. The County Council had opportunities to promote the Staffordshire brand as part of their hosting package and consideration could be given to local businesses buying into this. There was the possibility of a financial benefit to the County should they be able to secure significant extra sponsorship for the events.

Members queried some of the figures set out in the report evaluating the financial impact to the County of the UK Corporate Games (UKCG). Direct economic impact figures around shopping and attractions was listed as £390,663 for the 2015 UKCG, which was exactly the same figure given for the 2010 UKCG in Liverpool. Members heard that it was more difficult to evaluate the UKCG than the Ironman competition as in most instances corporate companies paid for accommodation and other expenses, with individual participants surveys therefore not giving the level of information gained from other events. The Corporate Games partners had put these figures together, based on the figures from the Liverpool 2010 event. However Members felt this needed to be revisited and stressed the importance of having robust data to enable the event to be accurately evaluated.

Members understood that the County Council had paid to host the Ironman competition in 2015 and again in 2017 and suggested that in future a cost benefit analysis would help to provide transparency over the benefits gained. Members asked that this analysis should include all cost, for example officer time, not just direct costs.

The report did acknowledge some operational difficulties in hosting the Ironman competition. In particular the scale of the road closures created some difficulties with residents. Select Committee members shared concerns over the impact on some communities, with pockets of the County being effectively “locked in” during the event.

Every area should have had an alternative route diversion available, however work would be done to mitigate the impact for residents of any future event road closure. Work was already underway with effected Parish Councils to discuss best ways forward.

The Great Swim would be based at Chasewater and Members involved in the Courtyards Estate Review visits raised again their concerns around the red tape that prevented best use of this facility. This had been around the catering contract with Entrust and difficulties in alternative food sales on the site. Members were anxious that this issue was resolved prior to any future significant event being held on the Chasewater site. Members also suggested that, should the Staffordshire bid be successful, the event should be called the Great Midlands Swim – Staffordshire.

Members asked for a report evaluating the impact of the 2017 Ironman competition to a future meeting, approximately three months after the event and for clarification regarding future funding of the Great Swim.

**RESOLVED** – That:

- a) future evaluation reports include a detailed cost benefit analysis;
- b) any figures used to highlight the success of events should be robust;
- c) the negative impact on local communities of Sportshire events should be acknowledged and everything possible done to mitigate these; and
- d) an evaluation report of the 2017 Ironman event be brought to a Select Committee meeting approximately three months after the event.

#### **49. Review of Scrutiny of Governance and Report Arrangements on Infrastructure+**

The Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee had been engaged in regular scrutiny of the Infrastructure+ contract since June 2013, when an outline business case had been presented to the Committee. In February 2014 Cabinet had been asked to consider including a role for scrutiny in the contract monitoring arrangements prior to the award of the contract to Amey in August 2014. Following further scrutiny in March 2015 a working group was set up to advise the Cabinet Member on how it might be involved in future scrutiny of the contract.

Members now considered the final report of the working group and their recommendations.

**RESOLVED** – That the Select Committee endorse the final report of the Infrastructure+ review of scrutiny of governance and reporting arrangements for an Executive response.

#### **50. Impact of SEND reforms**

The Children and Families Act 2014 set out the need for wide ranging changes to the way in which children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) are supported to learn and achieve. The Act set out significant changes to statutory processes including the introduction of a single assessment and person centred support plan across education, health and social care for 0-25 year olds with SEND, to replace Statements of Special Educational Needs. It also set out the need for

all existing Statements to be converted to an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP) by 2018 as part of a transfer programme.

The Select Committee received details of progress made on performance measures relating to SEND assessment processes. The speed of transfers from SEN Statements to EHCPs had been slower than hoped for, however the plans were being carefully considered, with the child and their family at the heart of the plan. The process was speeding up, however it remained important to ensure each plan was appropriate and not merely a paper exercise.

Members raised concerns at those within the 16-18 age bracket and how this group would be effectively picked up as part of the SEND process. These young people would previously have received Learning Difficulties and Disabilities support. Work was underway to ensure no young person slipped through the net and that their needs were transferred to an EHCP. One of the benefits of the new process was that it brought together the previous statements of SEN and Post 16 support systems into one, removing artificial barriers for the individual. The new process wouldn't automatically see SEND young adults in education until 25, but acknowledged that the difficulties they faced may mean they need longer to complete their learning to ensure they progress well into positive destinations.

Members queried Staffordshire's 44% proportion of newly issued statements and plans with a placement in a maintained mainstream school. This was mainly due to the way in which Staffordshire's Special Schools were used and part of this exercise would be to review whether this was the best environment for that breadth of young people to learn. Historically Staffordshire had placed more pupils with moderate learning difficulties in special schools than other authorities.

Members were aware of frustration caused for individuals and their families where cases were taken to tribunal. A number of families had used the newly commissioned mediation service to try and resolve any potential disputes at an informal stage.

Members raised the importance of governor roles in supporting SEND in schools.

The Select Committee asked for an assessment of progress made in twelve months time.

**RESOLVED** – That the comments made by the Select Committee on progress with the SEND reforms be noted, and a report on progress made be brought in twelve months time.

## **51. Pupil Premium Plus Policy**

The Select Committee received a presentation on Pupil Premium funding which was specifically aimed to improve outcomes for disadvantaged children. In order to qualify for Pupil Premium funding 2015/16 a child needed to meet one of four possible criteria, these being:

- Being eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) at any point in the last six years;
- Left local authority care due to adoption, special guardianship order or child arrangements order;

- Been in local authority care for one day or more; or
- The children of service personnel (who attract “Service Pupil Premium”)

Members received details of the amount of funding per pupil and the number eligible. Concerns were shared over difficulties in ensuring all those eligible for pupil premium funding did so, particularly in respect of the FSM entitlement. Primary school pupils were all now entitled to a free meal and therefore the FSM eligibility was not always identified. Work was being done to promote the need for those eligible for FSM to complete the application process to ensure the school was able to access pupil premium funding.

Ofsted would expect to see details of how pupil premium funding was spent and the difference it had made. The County Council commissioned pupil premium training and support activity through Entrust for ten schools in the last two years. The School Improvement team also conducted regular visits to quality assure schools and part of this process was to consider their self evaluation of support for vulnerable groups. A summer conference for governors had also looked at the use of this funding and it was suggested that details from the conference should be included on the governor website to promote good practice more widely.

Pupil Premium Plus was a government grant to support and promote the education of children and young people in care. From 1 April 2014 each looked after child of school age had been allocated £1,900 to support their education, with eligibility from the first day they come into the care. The Virtual School and the role of the Virtual Headteacher was responsible for making sure there were effective arrangements in place for allocating Pupil Premium Plus funding. How the grant was used had to be clearly evidenced in a young person’s Personal Education Plan (PEP), in consultation with the designated teacher and social worker, alongside contributions from the carer and other appropriate professionals. Each PEP had to be signed off by the Virtual Headteacher.

The policy for allocating this funding was agreed by the Virtual School Governing Body, and was in line with other authorities. Of the £1,900 per pupil allocation, schools received £500 directly per term. The remainder of the funding was held centrally and used to address specific issues, for example to fund a reading scheme or to support an individual’s specific needs. In all cases evidence needed to be shown of how the funding had been used and what this funding had achieved. There was a school governor role to play in screening how this funding was used and what it achieved.

PEPs were currently held as paper copies and work was being undertaken to create electronic recording which would enable clearer analysis of processes and identification of areas of good practice. It would also enable a quicker and more responsive system. Regular audit was undertaken of the PEPs, with results used to inform training programmes.

The Letterbox reading scheme supported by centrally held Pupil Premium Funding helped to take reading into homes. Work was now being developed in partnership with libraries to help promote a love of reading.

**RESOLVED** – That: a) the progress on use of Pupil Premium Plus funding be noted and a further report analysing the results of this funding be brought to the Select Committee in twelve months time; and

b) the school governor responsibilities relating to looked after pupils and evidencing use of the pupil premium plus funding be noted.

## **52. Work Programme**

The Select Committee received a copy of their Work Programme. They noted that the School Improvement and School Attainment reports for the January Select Committee would be amalgamated into one report. Members also noted that the HGV working group had completed their work and were in the process of producing their report, as was the Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Services Working group.

**RESOLVED** – That the update on the work programme be noted.

## **53. Exclusion of the Public**

**Chairman**