



Leicester  
City Council

**DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT**

**Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND SCHOOLS SCRUTINY COMMISSION**

Held: TUESDAY, 6 JANUARY 2015 at 5:30 pm

**P R E S E N T:**

**Councillor Willmott (Chair)**  
**Councillor Unsworth (Vice-Chair)**

Councillor Clarke  
Councillor Cleaver

Councillor Grant  
Councillor Dr Moore

**In Attendance:**

Councillor Dempster, Assistant City Mayor - Children, Young People and Schools

**Also Present:**

Arshad Daud, Youth Representative  
Ms Rabiha Hannan, Faith Representative (Muslim)  
Yash Sharma, Youth Representative  
Ryanvir Singh, Youth Representative  
Guled Yaqub, Youth Representative

\* \* \* \* \*

**55. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bhatti and Cole and from Anu Kapur (Leicester Secular Society), Carolyn Lewis (Church of England Diocese) and Bernard Monaghan (Roman Catholic Diocese).

**56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Dr Moore declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, as her company was teaching a Looked After Child.

Councillor Clarke declared an Other Disclosable Interest in the general business of the meeting, as he had a daughter in Key Stage 1.

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, these interests were not considered so significant that they were likely to prejudice the respective

Councillors' judgement of the public interest. They were not, therefore, required to withdraw from the meeting.

### **63. GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2015/16 TO 2016/17**

The Strategic Director Children's Services submitted a report outlining the 2015/16 – 2016/17 draft budget proposals for the Education and Children's Services portfolio.

Councillor Dempster, (Assistant Mayor with responsibility for Children, Schools and Young People), reminded the Commission of the funding cuts that the Council needed to make. Some service reconfiguration already had been done and this would continue as needed. It was important that services did not simply react to requirements for financial cuts, but that their structure reflected best practices, that they were not duplicated and that they worked in a joined up way with other services.

The Commission questioned whether the Council could meet from other sources the funding that would be lost under the proposed budget. For example, it was suggested that funding allocated to the capital programme could be used for revenue purposes.

The Assistant Mayor explained that learning services would be delivered in a different way. Some had been lost, but some had moved to schools, so schools now needed to provide peer to peer support for these. The Strategic Director Children's Services explained that this could include getting some subject specialists from sources such as outstanding secondary schools, not the local authority. It was recognised that schools could find it difficult to challenge each other, but this would be part of the development of new ways of operating. With regard to transferring funding from the capital programme, it was suggested that this could be imprudent, as capital investment could bring benefits to the city beyond just the provision of, for example, a new building.

Rabiha Hannan, (Faith Representative), addressed the Commission at the invitation of the Chair, welcoming the work being done with limited resources. However, she noted that there did not appear to be a financial allocation for community relations. In reply, the Assistant Mayor explained that this type of expenditure was no longer allocated in that way, but came within a range of things, such as encouraging participation by young people and funding for the local Safeguarding Board.

The Commission questioned whether sufficient funding had been made available for primary provision, both for the next financial year and in to the future, including contingency funding in case of unforeseen increases in the population. The Assistant Mayor assured Members that capital finance was available for the programme to increase the number of primary places and additional funding had been put in to expanding the admissions service. Funding would continue to be made available to ensure that the right number of pupil places was provided, but this had to be a long term plan.

Consideration also had to be given to the impact on schools, both immediately and in the future. For example, they could not be required to increase their Published Admission Number, as this could result in several hundred extra pupils going through schools over a number of years, which the schools could be unable to cope with. Consequently, as need continued to be identified, funding would be made available to meet pupil place planning challenges.

The Commission also questioned whether the issue of 5-year old pupils travelling over 2 miles to school had been resolved, as officers had indicated that funding was not available for bus passes or taxis for parents/carers travelling to school with those children. The Assistant Mayor advised that she was not aware of anything indicating that no such funding was available and undertook to look in to where this information had come from. In the meantime, she reiterated her previous undertaking that funding would be made available for these bus passes or taxi journeys.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the report be noted; and
- 2) That the Overview Select Committee be asked to consider the points raised during this Commission's discussion on this report for inclusion in its comments to Council on the 2015/16 – 2016/17 draft budget proposals.