

Council**Thursday, 9 February 2017, County Hall, Worcester****Minutes****Present:**

Mr A P Miller (Chairman), Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Ms P Agar, Mr A T Amos, Mrs S Askin, Mr J Baker, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P J Bridle, Mr J P Campion, Mr S J M Clee, Mrs P E Davey, Mr P Denham, Mr N Desmond, Ms L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr A Fry, Mr S E Geraghty, Mrs J L M A Griffiths (Vice Chairman), Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Ms P A Hill, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Mr M E Jenkins, Ms R E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Mr T A Muir, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr S R Peters, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger MBE, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith, Mr R J Sutton, Mr C B Taylor, Mr J W R Thomas, Mr R P Tomlinson, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr P A Tuthill, Mr R M Udall, Mr G J Vickery, Mr T A L Wells and Mr G C Yarranton

Available Papers

The members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. 12 questions submitted to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (previously circulated);
- C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 (previously circulated).

1870 Apologies and Declaration of Interests (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies were received from Mr S C Cross and Prof J W Raine.

Mr M L Bayliss declared a general interest as a member of his wider family worked for Children, Families and Communities within the County Council.

Mr L C R Mallett declared an interest in Agenda item 6, Notice of Motion 2 as he did some work for a charity which recycled furniture but it was not within Worcestershire.

1871 Public Participation

Mrs L R Duffy presented a petition on behalf of Mr and Mrs Finch with regard to the A38 between Copcutt Island and Berryhill Island.

	(Agenda Item 2)	
1872	Minutes (Agenda Item 3)	RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
1873	Chairman's Announcements (Agenda Item 4)	<p>The Chairman drew members' attention to the printed announcements and particularly thanked Revd Phillip Jones who was attending his final Council meeting before moving to a new ministry in Stoke-on-Trent. The Chairman presented a gift as a token of appreciation from Members and Officers.</p> <p>The Chairman also mentioned that he had attended the Staff Awards and he extended a thank you to the hard work of County Council staff.</p>
1874	Reports of Cabinet - Matters which require a decision by Council - 2017- 18 Budget and Council Tax (Agenda Item 5 (a))	<p>The Council had before it a detailed report on the Budget for 2017-18, which the Cabinet had considered on 2 February 2017 and which the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet were recommending for adoption by the Council.</p> <p>All Councillors had received or had access to a copy of the full report and Appendices considered by the Cabinet on 2 February 2017 and had been requested to bring those to the meeting to allow full consideration of all the issues.</p> <p>The Leader introduced the budget and moved the recommendation as set out in paragraph 1 of the report; this was seconded by Mr A N Blagg. The Leader explained that the proposed budget as presented was a result of a year's work. It worked to minimise the effect on the frontline and invest in the plan for Worcestershire. It was based on residents' views of what was important to them based on Viewpoint surveys, roadshows, a survey of businesses and budget consultation meetings. It was a 'People's budget' based around their priorities of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting vulnerable children • Working with vulnerable older people and • Maintaining highways – especially tackling congestion and road and pavement improvements. <p>More than 60% of the budget would be aimed at the 'People' part of the budget. £1.5m would be spent ongoing with an additional £1m for 2017/18 and £1m for 2018/19 as a one off, also a one off £1m for capital investment and £1.5 being spent on SEN.</p>

To help adults the County Council would work alongside the NHS to deal with the demand-led service. They would invest £9m in adult social care paid for in part by the proposed increase in the precept, but the Government also needed to recognise the pressures caused by social care.

The 'Place' part of the budget addressed the desire to aspire to the best quality roads and pavements. £6m was to be added to the on-going amount of £2m for pavements, there would be a £1m base budget increase year on year for roads and £2m was allocated for town centres.

Congestion needed to be tackled to ensure that the positives of the County being in the top three for economic growth did not cause a negative effect with increased congestion. The A38 southern link road was progressing, as were projects for Bromsgrove station, the Parkway and Broadband.

The Leader paid tribute to Scrutiny members who had looked at the draft budget and reported their findings.

The Leader and Cabinet were proposing a precept increase of 2.94%. This meant that the Council Tax was still one of the lowest in the country.

The seconder stated that they would continue to lobby Government for fairer funding. The Business Rates Retention Scheme would provide £60m of funding in 2017/18 and 100% would be retained by 2020 but with extra money would come increased responsibility. Money would also be gained from various grants such as the Public Health Ring Fenced Grant (£29.9m) the ILF (around £3m), highways (13.3m) and potholes (£1.169m). They were working towards becoming a self-sufficient council by 2020.

An amendment was moved by Mr P M McDonald and seconded by Mr R C Lunn proposing:

- 1) *A decrease in the proposed non-Adult Social Care Precept from 0.94% to 0%*
To be met by:
- 2) *A one off release from the Future Fit release of £2.145 million;*
- 3) *A reduction by two in the number of Cabinet Members;*

and

- 4) *A reduction in the pay of the Chief Executive and Senior Officers to ensure that there are not any members of staff paid in excess of £100,000.*

In addition, the following is proposed as a budget reallocation

- 5) *A reduction in the fostering budget of £ 1million to recognise the savings that can be achieved by a further transfer of External Fostering Contracts to Internal Fostering Contracts; and*
- 6) *An increase in the Children's Centres budget of £1 million to reduce the reductions made in this service area during 2016/17.*

Summary of Changes in the Net Revenue Budget £000	2017/18 (Part Year)	2018/19 (Full Year)
Reduction in General Precept from 0.94% to 0%	2,300	2,300
Increase in the budget for the provision of Children's Centres	1,000	1,000
Sub-Total	3,300	3,300
To be met by:		
Future Fit Reserve	(2,145)	-
Reduction in Fostering budget to take account of a further transfer from External Fostering contracts to Internal	(1,000)	(1,000)
Cabinet Members	(35)	(35)
Reductions in Pay for Chief Exec and Directors	(120)	(120)
Sub-Total	(3,300)	(1,155)
Total	-	2,145

The mover and seconder of the amendment then spoke in favour of its adoption; the key points being:

- that the continuing cuts were effecting people so only a 2% increase in the precept would be supported. Wages were not rising and Worcestershire was a low paid area with a record number of people relying on food banks. It was

unfair to expect people to pay more and get less; rough sleeping had increased, more elderly people were not getting care or were receiving a 15 minute visit or phone call

- senior officers had seen salaries increase while responsibilities declined. A reduction in the highest salaries would not affect the differential because the next level down was £30,000 less
- the money paid for future fit should be stopped
- private fostering should not be supported because it could be done cheaper ourselves
- there had been no increase in council tax last year in the hope that the Government would respond – it did not. There was not enough money from Government
- a co-operative council reporting to the people would work better than a commissioning authority
- the two tier system was a bonus but all the back room functions could be shared.

Members also spoke against the amendment:

- the amendment was financially unsound and would starve services of money
- it would be unfair to move children in-house and after the Ofsted report you should not take any money away from fostering
- it would breach the contract of the Chief Executive to reduce her pay and if it was reduced all workers pay would need to be reduced to maintain the differential
- Labour-controlled councils in parts of the County had proposed increases of more than the 2% suggested by the amendment. Also the Labour administration at Worcester City had appointed a Chief Executive on more than the £100,000,
- it was necessary to pay Directors at their current salaries to recruit and retain staff
- Future Fit was not just for saving money but for improving services. It was a short term project which was a mechanism for protecting services
- A member of the 2013 group agreed the Government should provide more funding but disagreed with the amendment and felt a collaborative approach to budget-setting was required.

At the conclusion of the debate and on a named vote this amendment was lost.

Those voting in favour of the amendment were
Ms P Agar, Mr J Baker, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P Denham,
Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett,
Mr P M McDonald, Mr R M Udall and Mr G J Vickery (11).

Those voting against the amendment were: Mr A P Miller,
Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos,
Mrs S Askin, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss,
Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr J P Campion,
Mr S J M Clee, Mrs P E Davey, Mr N Desmond,
Ms L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty,
Mrs J L M A Griffiths, Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman,
Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson,
Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Mr M E Jenkins,
Ms R E Jenkins, Mr T A Muir, Mrs F M Oborski,
Mr S R Peters, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger,
Mrs M A Rayner, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith,
Mr R J Sutton, Mr J W R Thomas, Mr R P Tomlinson,
Mrs E B Tucker, Mr P A Tuthill, , Mr T A L Wells and
Mr G C Yarranton (41).

Mr P J Bridle abstained (1).

An amendment was then moved by Mrs E B Tucker and
was seconded by Mr T A L Wells.

Council recognises that the funding of Adult Social Care is in national crisis and this is reflected within our county of Worcestershire. The failure of central government to respond to the rising demographic pressures is a disgrace. It is left to us councillors to act to protect the more vulnerable members of our community. Accordingly we propose that the (unfair) mechanism of council tax be used this year to raise an additional £2.3m - to be dedicated entirely to the base budget of Adult Social Care. This would be an increase of 1% on Council Tax (equivalent to £11 pa at band D) over the Cabinet's recommended budget.

The 2013 Group are proposing the following amendments that will not affect the Revenue Budget as set out in the February 2017 Cabinet Report.

- 1) An increase in the Base Budget for the Adult Social Care Directorate of £2.3 million; to be met by:*
- 2) An increase in the proposed non-Adult Social Care Precept from 0.94% to 1.94%.*

Summary of Changes in the Net Revenue Budget	2017/18 (Part Year)	2018/19 (Full Year)

£000		
An increase to the Adult Social Care Base Budget	2,300	2,300
To be met by		
An increase to the proposed non-Adult Social Care Precept	(2,300)	(2,300)
Total	-	-

The mover and seconder of the amendment spoke in favour of its adoption. The key points in favour were:

- it was a difficult balance between the funds that were needed versus the cost to residents but increasing the precept was the only option once the Government had let the County down
- Worcestershire had one of the fastest growing aging populations in the country and it was known that 2018/19 would be difficult so an extra 1% would make things slightly easier
- One off amounts of funding would not solve the problems in years to come

Points made against the amendment included:

- That the Administration should tell the Government that we will not accept the underfunding and will not tax our residents more highly to solve the problems that the underfunding has caused
- The increase was too much when taken with the increase in the cost of utilities and no increase in wages. A zero-based budgeting exercise was needed to highlight where the money was being spent

After the debate and on a named vote this amendment was lost.

Those voting for the amendment were: Mrs S Askin, Mr M E Jenkins, Ms R E Jenkins, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr S R Peters, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr R J Sutton, Mr J W R Thomas, Mrs E B Tucker, and Mr T A L Wells (10).

Those voting against the motion were: Mr A P Miller, Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Ms P Agar, Mr A T Amos, Mr J Baker, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr C J Bloore,

Mr J P Campion, Mr S J M Clee, Mrs P E Davey, Mr P Denham, Mr N Desmond, Ms L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mrs J L M A Griffiths, Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Ms P A Hill, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Mr T A Muir, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith, Mr R P Tomlinson, Mr P A Tuthill, Mr R M Udall, Mr G J Vickery (40).

Mr G C Yarranton (1) abstained.

In debating the budget as originally moved and seconded the following main points were made:

Comments made in support of the proposed budget included:

- Scrutiny had looked at the budget and there was no alternative
- This budget had listened to the public and enabled investment in roads and pavements and more spending on social care. It also supported volunteers so communities could do more for themselves
- That the budget worked for all residents

Comments made against the proposal included:

- That it was not a budget for the people of Worcestershire. Youth Centres had been affected, it didn't help those on a low wage or disabled and every year promises were made to improve highways and that had not happened,
- That the precept should be increased to 4% increase otherwise the situation would continue to get worse
- That it was unfair that the people of Worcestershire should have to make up the deficit due to the past 10 years of underfunding by the Government.

On a named vote RESOLVED that

- a) the conclusions set out in the report concerning revenue budget monitoring up to 30 November 2016 be endorsed;**
- b) the virement and transfers to Earmarked Reserves in paragraph 20 of the report to Cabinet on 2 February 2017 be endorsed;**
- c) the budget requirement for 2017/18 be approved at £318.478 million including a**

transfer from earmarked reserves of £5.185 million;

- d) the Council Tax band D equivalent for 2017/18 be set at £1,155.31 which includes £44.05 relating to the ring-fenced Adult Social Care precept, and the Council Tax Requirement be set at £236.204 million;
- e) consistent with the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement that revenue cash limits be set for each Directorate:

	£m
Adult Services	130.999
Public Health*	0.101
Children, Families and Communities	82.766
Economy and Infrastructure	67.018
Commercial and Change / Finance	42.779
	<hr/>
	323.663

*Public Health services are funded by a £0.1 million budget as above plus a £29.9 million specific grant.

- f) the Council's Pay Policy Statement is recommended for approval as set out in Appendix 8;
- g) the conclusions set out in the report concerning capital budget monitoring up to 30 November 2016 be endorsed;
- h) the Capital Programme as set out in Appendix 9 be approved;
- i) that £10 million be added to the Capital Programme to support the overall A4440 Worcester Southern Link Road improvements;
- j) the Medium Term Financial Plan as set out in Appendix 10 be approved;
- k) the Treasury Management Strategy set out in Appendix 11 be approved; and
- l) the Statement of Prudential Indicators and

Minimum Revenue Statement as set out in Appendix 12 be approved.

[NB Appendices referred to are those presented to 2 February 2017 Cabinet]

Those voting in favour were: Mr A P Miller, Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr J P Campion, Mr S J M Clee, Mrs P E Davey, Mr N Desmond, Ms L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mrs J L M A Griffiths, Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Mr T A Muir, Mr S R Peters, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith, Mr R P Tomlinson, Mr P A Tuthill, and Mr G C Yarranton (32).

Those voting against were: Ms P Agar, Mrs S Askin, Mr J Baker, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P J Bridle, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill, Mr M E Jenkins, Ms R E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Mrs F M Oborski, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr R J Sutton, Mr J W R Thomas, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr R M Udall, Mr G J Vickery and Mr T A L Wells (21).

1875 Reports of Cabinet - Summary of decisions taken (Agenda Item 5 (b))

The Leader of the Council reported the following topics and questions were answered on them:

- Outcome from the Ofsted Inspection of Services for Children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers
- Scrutiny Report: Commissioning: Staff Terms and Conditions
- Scrutiny Report: Effectiveness of the Prevention and Recovery Drug and Alcohol Misuse Service
- Update Report of the Footways Overview and Scrutiny Taskgroup
- Pilot Intergenerational Project (Homeshare)
- A4440 Worcester Southern Link Road Dualling (SLR Dualling) – Final Phases

1876 Notices of Motion. Notice of Motion 1 - Inquiry into local government

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mrs E B Tucker, Mrs S Askin, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr T A L Wells and Prof J W Raine.

The motion was moved by Mr T A L Wells and seconded by Mrs E B Tucker who both spoke in favour of it.

overview and scrutiny (Agenda Item 6)

The Council agreed to deal with the Motion on the day.

An amendment was moved by Mr P M McDonald and seconded by Mr R M Udall that the last paragraph regarding holding a whole council workshop to gather members' views be deleted.

Those in favour of the amendment stated:

- they wished for the Labour group to give evidence to the enquiry rather than contribute to a diluted corporate view,
- that changes were necessary but further training and resources were required
- that Scrutiny Chairmen should be opposition members and Panels should not just receive reports from CMRs who were defensive about the decisions made.

Those against the amendment commented:

- that Scrutiny should not be about political bandwagons
- Scrutiny was not effective and changes were needed but that should be done by involving all members
- CMRs did have a valid input into the Scrutiny process.

On being put to the meeting the amendment was lost.

The substantive motion was then put to the meeting and was carried and **Council RESOLVED: The Communities and Local Government Select Committee has announced a new inquiry into the work of overview and scrutiny in local government and is inviting anyone with an opinion or case studies to provide a written submission before March 10, 2017.**

The government is interested in a range of issues such as the effectiveness of scrutiny, best practices, procedures for selecting chairs, and support for scrutiny function from leadership among many other topics. We would strongly urge those working in overview and scrutiny to take some time to submit evidence to inquiry.

In view of shortcomings of our own scrutiny practice as illustrated by the findings in the Children's Services' OFSTED, this Council asks that a whole-council workshop be held to gather members' views and that evidence be submitted to the Select Committee on the Council's behalf.

1877 Notices of Motion. Notice of Motion 2 - Recycling of unwanted furniture by charities (Agenda Item 6)

1878 Notices of Motion. Notice of Motion 3 - State visit by the President of the United States of America (Agenda Item 6)

After confirmation from the Cabinet Member with Responsibility that a new policy was to be introduced in March 2017 to allow Charities to continue to be able to dispose of unsuitable items at the County Landfill Recycling Centres, the Mover and Seconder agreed that the Notice of Motion should be withdrawn.

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mr R M Udall, Mr G J Vickery, Ms P Agar, Mr P Denham and Mr P M McDonald.

The motion was moved by Mr R M Udall and seconded by Mr R C Lunn.

The Council agreed to deal with the Motion on the day.

Those in favour of the motion made the following comments:

- Donald Trump should not be honoured with a state visit within his first year as President. No other President had been invited on a state visit in the first year. He could be invited for a political visit rather than a state visit. It would be embarrassing for the Queen to have to receive him
- Morally we as a country should not be supporting someone who appears to make racist, homophobic and bigoted comments
- It was important to reject the idea that refugees were not welcome, especially in Redditch where the first refugees have recently been welcomed
- That if President Trump were not told that his actions were not acceptable today he would go on and carry out more misogynistic actions tomorrow
- As well as the moral arguments there was also the financial cost of policing the visit to contend with

Comments made against the motion included:

- That the morals of the President may not be accepted but that should not mean the visit should be cancelled. He became President following a democratic vote and it was necessary to continue speaking to those you disagree with
- Local Councillors had not received any communications from people of Worcestershire

1879 Notices of Motion. Notice of Motion 4 - Safeguarding Children (Agenda Item 6)

regarding the State Visit

- The Queen was used to hosting a range of visitors and it was important to keep a relationship with America.

On being put to the meeting the Motion was lost.

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mr P M McDonald, Mr P Denham, Ms P Agar, Mr G J Vickery and Mr R M Udall.

The motion was moved by Mr P M McDonald and seconded by Mr P Denham.

The Council agreed to deal with the Motion on the day.

Comments made in favour of the Motion included:

- Poor recruitment practice and management had led to the current situation. An apology from the Chief Executive and blaming Scrutiny was not the answer. The Leader was at fault for the Council not having a process in place and it was necessary for portfolio holders to be changed. They had no confidence in the plan and felt intervention by the Secretary of State was necessary. A reversal after failure was possible but not at the same time as cut backs
- The Cabinet had given the impression that things were improving after the 2010 inspection when they had actually been getting worse
- Scrutiny had not been aware of the extent of the problem

Members also made comments against the Motion:

- The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children's Services said that he was sorry and would take his share of responsibility but pointed out that Ofsted had said it had seen improvement and recognised that there was now strong stable management in place
- Engagement in safeguarding was needed by all Members, but calling in the Secretary of State was not necessary
- The issue was so important it should transcend party politics.

Following the debate the Chairman announced, with the support of a majority of Council, that he would allow the Chief Executive to address Council. Following a point of order the Head of Legal and Democratic Services clarified

1880 Notices of Motion. Notice of Motion 5 - Outcome of

that although it was convention that Officers did not address Council they could do so if permitted by the Chairman.

The Chief Executive clarified that she had taken personal responsibility for the Ofsted report and had said sorry. Ofsted had been clear that the solution to the problems needed to be addressed by cross Council working. [Members of the Labour Group left the Chamber while the Chief Executive spoke.]

On a point of order as to whether the absent members could vote upon their return, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services clarified that although in quasi-judicial meetings (eg Planning or personnel decisions) if Members had not been present for the entire discussion they would not be allowed to vote as a matter of natural justice, this was not the case for 'ordinary' decisions such as in the current situation. Members could vote if they were present in the Chamber at the time for their vote.

During his right of reply to sum up, the mover of the Motion asked to bring an emergency amendment to his own Motion relating to the Chief Executive but having taken advice from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services the Chairman determined that it was not in order to do so at that point as the debate had closed.

A Member proposed a 'naming motion' against the Leader of the Labour Group, Mr P McDonald. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services explained that a naming motion could be brought and voted upon by Council if it were seconded and the Chairman agreed that the Councillor in question was misconducting himself by persistently disregarding the Chairman's rulings or behaving irregularly, improperly or offensively or wilfully obstructing the business of Council. If the naming motion were passed by Council then in these circumstances the Member would not then be heard again.

The Chairman issued Mr P McDonald with a final warning as to his conduct.

After a final summing up the Motion was put to the meeting and was lost.

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mrs E B Tucker, Mr T A L Wells, Prof J W Raine, Mr M E Jenkins, Mrs F M Oborski and Mrs S Askin.

**Ofsted
Inspection
(Agenda Item 6)**

The motion was moved by Mrs F M Oborski and seconded by Mrs S Askin.

The Council agreed to deal with the Motion on the day.

The mover and seconder spoke in support of the Motion:

- that every Councillor was a Corporate Parent and they needed to ask the question would this service be good enough for my child – if not it was not good enough
- the scrutiny function needed to be strengthened
- the Corporate Parenting Board must take on scrutiny work in partnership with the Children and Young Peoples' Scrutiny Panel and District Councils
- After the Ofsted report the Council must move forward

An amendment was proposed by Mr G Vickery and Seconded by Mr L Mallett that the word "mandatory" in paragraph 1 should be removed and replaced with the words "new, enhanced" so the first point should read *"to require every future Member of Council to participate in a programme of new, enhanced Corporate Parenting Training"*. It was clarified that in this context the word meant that Council would still require its Members to undertake training. It was argued that the word mandatory was not needed as the Motion already 'required' Councillors to participate in Corporate Parenting Training. It was more a matter of semantics rather than principle.

A number of points were made against the amended Motion including that the amendment could be seen as watering down the intention of the original Motion which was to ensure that all Councillors took their responsibilities seriously. "Mandatory" was a sign of intent and implied individual and collective responsibility.

The amendment was put to the meeting and was lost.

The substantive motion received general cross-party support when put to the meeting and was carried (all members in favour with 1 abstention) **and Council RESOLVED that "Council recognised that the outcome of the recent OFSTED judgement on this Council's Children's Services performance reflects poorly on the responsibilities of every Member of Council.**

Council therefore resolves:

- 1 To require every future Member of Council to participate in a programme of mandatory Corporate Parenting Training, which will properly inform them of their roles and responsibilities as Corporate Parents (and as set out in an updated Corporate Parenting Handbook).
- 2 To ensure that the Scrutiny Function is strengthened (with the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel having access to professional staff support in the process of holding the Cabinet Member and Administration to account).
- 3 To empower the Corporate Parenting Board to scrutinise such elements of the Council's functions with regard to the services for Looked-After Children as are felt necessary to ensure effective oversight (and with regular reporting back to the Children and Young People's Panel).
- 4 To revise and regularly publish an appropriate framework of Key Performance Indicators to include qualitative and quantitative measure in order to enable better performance monitoring in relation to services to Vulnerable Children".

**1881 Question Time
(Agenda Item 7)**

Twelve questions had been received by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and had been circulated before the meeting. All twelve were asked at the meeting within the half hour allowed. (All answers are enclosed with these minutes.)

The meeting adjourned between 1.10pm and 1.50pm for lunch.
The meeting ended at 4.33pm.

Chairman