



Leicester
City Council

Minute Extract

Minutes of the Meeting of the
EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Held: THURSDAY, 7 OCTOBER 2004 at 5.30pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Willmott - Chair
Councillor Mrs Maw - Conservative Spokesperson
Councillor Vincent – Liberal Democrat Spokesperson

Councillor Bhatti	Councillor Porter
Councillor Garrity	Councillor Sood
Councillor Hunt	Councillor Thompson
Councillor Kitterick	Councillor Waddington
Councillor Panchbaya	

Co-opted Members (Voting)

Mr Edward Hayes - Roman Catholic Diocese

Co-opted Members (Non-Voting)

Mr Chino Cabon	- Leicester Racial Equality Council
Ms Jane Rolfe	- Primary Sector
Mr Peter Flack	- Secondary Sector
Professor Baskerville	- De Montfort University/University of Leicester
Mr Adam Suddaby	- Incorporated Colleges
Mr Geoff Rawnsley	- City of Leicester Governors Association

* * * * *

122. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were requested to declare any interests they may have in the business to be discussed and/or indicate that Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applied to them.

The meeting was asked to note the general interests of Members as governors as follows:

School / College	Category	of
------------------	----------	----

		Governorship
Professor Baskerville	Leicester College	LEA
Mr P Flack	Eyres Monsell Primary Linden Primary School	Co-opted Parent
Cllr Kitterick	Hazel Primary School & Community Centre	LEA
Cllr Mrs Maw	Willowbrook Primary School	LEA
Cllr Panchbaya	Spinney Hills Primary School	LEA
Mr G Rawnsley	Crown Hills Community College Mayflower Primary	LEA LEA
Cllr Sood	Spinney Hills Primary School Leicester College	LEA LEA
Mr. A. Suddaby	Leicester Adult Education College Ellesmere College	Co-opted Co-opted
Cllr Thompson	Sandfield Close Primary Northfield House Primary	LEA LEA

Councillor Sood declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 8 - Strategic Options for the Delivery of Adult Learning by Leicester City Council (minute 129 refers) as her son taught in an Adult Education establishment. She left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Adam Suddaby declared a personal interest in item 8 - Strategic Options for the Delivery of Adult Learning by Leicester City Council (minute 129 refers) as he was employed by Leicester College.

Councillor Bhatti declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 9 - Proposals for the Relocation of Gateway College to the Rushey Mead Secondary School / Soar Valley College Campus (minute 130 refers), as his son was employed by the school. He left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor Kitterick declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 9 - Proposals for the Relocation of Gateway College to the Rushey Mead Secondary School / Soar Valley College Campus (minute 130 refers), as an employee of De Montfort University. He left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillors Garrity and Panchbaya declared a conflict of interest in item 9 - Proposals for the Relocation of Gateway College to the Rushey Mead Secondary School / Soar Valley College Campus (minute 130 refers), as members of the Development Control Committee, and undertook to leave the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor Mrs Maw declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 10 - Lifelong Learning Divisional Organisation Review: Progress Report and Update (minute 131 refers) as she is on the Management Committee of two of the Community Centres.

Councillor Waddington declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 10 - Lifelong Learning Divisional Organisation Review: Progress Report and Update (minute 131 refers) as an employee of NIACE, and as her Grandson was an employee of the Division.

127. NOTE OF INFORMAL MEETING BETWEEN MEMBERS OF EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AND PARENTS AND STAFF OF SPECIAL SCHOOLS REGARDING THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS REVIEW - 30 JUNE 2004

The Committee gave consideration to the notes of an informal meeting held on 30 June 2004 following a presentation made to the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee on 12 May 2004, and to the response of the Corporate Director of Education and Lifelong Learning.

In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution (4E, Rule 7b), the Scrutiny Committee invited Mr E Hasman to speak on this item to provide information which would assist the Committee in performing its functions.

Mr Hasman stated that special education facilities in the City were excellent, and expressed concerns that mainstream schools would not have the necessary staffing levels to teach pupils with special needs. He was also worried that despite the intention to integrate special needs pupils into mainstream education, many would still be segregated due to disrupting classes or being unable to sit exams.

Officers stressed that these were informal proposals, and that it was not proposed to put all special needs pupils into mainstream schools, but to reconfigure the system, although many pupils were already successfully integrated into mainstream schools. It was stated that there were still options to be considered, but that the timescale was increasingly tight as some of the schools were already experiencing financial difficulties.

It was noted that over the past four years, three rounds of consultations had taken place with parents, some in 'surgery' settings where over 500 parents had attended. Officers had also attended 14 parents' and staff consultation meetings. Officers stated that the representation from parents and the outcomes of the meeting with parents and staff had been taken into account.

A member of the Committee drew attention to the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) papers which included information with regard to special schools, in particular the '3 schools' option. He was concerned that this option may have been pre-determined without the SEN review having been through the democratic process. In response, Members were informed that it hadn't yet been decided how to fund SEN provision.

Councillor Willmott, seconded by Councillor Waddington, proposed that it be noted that the Committee supports the conclusions of the meeting with parents, that the Cabinet be asked to give consideration to the alternatives and to agree a timetable which allows for consideration of the Special Educational Needs review and Building Schools for the Future and does not allow the decision on the SEN review to be influenced by the BSF decision, and that a report on consultation be brought back to the next meeting.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Committee supports the conclusions of the meeting with parents;
- (2) That the Cabinet be asked to give consideration to the parents' views with particular reference to alternative options for SEN provision;
- (3) That the Cabinet be asked to agree a timetable which allowed for meaningful consultation on the Special Educational Needs Review and Building Schools for the Future, which did not allow the BSF decision to prejudice the outcome of the SEN review;
- (4) That a report on consultation undertaken be brought back to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.

