

No.

LEARNING AND CULTURE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a remote meeting held on 10th February, 2022.

The Committee agenda is available [here](#).

The Meeting recording is available [here](#).

Present: Councillor G.C. Kemp (Chair); Councillor R.M. Birch (Vice-Chair);
Councillors: S.J. Griffiths, N.P. Hodges, T.H. Jarvie, J.M. Norman, A.C. Parker,
S.D. Perkes, L.O. Rowlands and N.C. Thomas.

Co-opted Members: L. Barrowclough (Parent Governor – Primary Sector),
G. Scott (Welsh Medium) and C. Williams (Parent Governor – Secondary Sector)

Also present: Councillors L. Burnett (Cabinet Member for Education and
Regeneration), G.D.D. Carroll, J.E. Charles and Dr. I.J. Johnson.

ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of the business of the Committee, the Chairman read the following statement: “May I remind everyone present that the meeting will be live streamed as well as recorded via the internet and this recording archived for future viewing.”

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE –

This was received from Dr. M. Price (Roman Catholic Church).

MINUTES –

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 13th January, 2022 be approved as a correct record.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interest were received.

No.

UPDATE ON THE CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSALS TO
AMALGAMATE BUTE COTTAGE NURSERY WITH EVENLODE PRIMARY
SCHOOL AND COGAN NURSERY WITH COGAN PRIMARY SCHOOL – CALL-
IN - COUNCILLOR G.D.D. CARROLL –

Councillor G.D.D. Carroll, not a Member of the Committee, had requested that the report (which had been considered by Cabinet on 10th January, 2022) be called in for consideration for the reason that “Cabinet did not give sufficient consideration to the views expressed in the consultation”.

In introducing the call-in, Councillor Carroll highlighted that this was a matter in which there was a large amount of public interest, with the consultation regarding Nursery provision in Penarth having received a higher than usual number of responses, and with a majority of those received having indicated opposition to the amalgamation of Bute Cottage Nursery with Evenlode Primary School and Cogan Nursery School with Cogan Primary School. Cabinet had proceeded to approve the proposals contained within the report on 10th January, and the Councillor had called in the item as he believed there had been insufficient consideration given to the level of public opposition to the proposals. He concluded his introduction by urging Committee to recommend to Cabinet that they reconsider the matter.

The Chair thanked Councillor Carroll for his introduction, and subsequently invited the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration to respond, and her representations could be summarised as follows:

- The Cabinet Member was disappointed that the reason provided for the call-in had stated that Cabinet had not given the matter due consideration. The proposals had been introduced at a Cabinet meeting on 13th September, 2021, and had been subject to discussion at that time. When the consultation report had been brought to Cabinet for their consideration, their discussion had lasted a considerable length of time at 45 minutes.
- As part of the consultation process the proposals had been presented to the Learning and Culture Scrutiny Committee on 14th October, 2021, and at that time while some queries had been raised these had been addressed by Officers and there had been no objection to endorsing the proposals from Committee Members.
- The Cabinet Member was concerned regarding the level of misinformation she had observed while attending meetings of the Governing bodies for both Nurseries and in reading approximately half of the consultation responses, which implied that Bute Cottage Nursery would be moving to the Evenlode Primary School site. She wished to reassure all present that the proposal would only merge the Nurseries and their respective Primary Schools at a Governance and Leadership level, and they would continue to operate from their existing sites.

The Chair subsequently invited Officers to add to the Cabinet Member’s response should they wish to do so, however given that the nature of the call-in related to

No.

Cabinet's consideration and decision Officers advised they had nothing to add at this time.

The Chair therefore invited Members of the public who had registered to speak to make their representations to Committee, having also advised at the beginning of the meeting that written representations had been submitted by the Governing bodies of three of the affected schools, and these had been circulated to Members for their consideration prior to the meeting and been made available alongside the agenda on the Council's website as supplementary information.

The first public speaker was Mr. R. Disley, Chair the Governing body at Bute Cottage Nursery. His representations could be summarised as follows:

- The Governing body had felt it difficult to get their voices heard during the consultation process and had not been informed they would be able to address the Scrutiny Committee when the proposal was considered at its October meeting. They had only been made aware of this mechanism subsequently by speaking with various Councillors.
- Their concerns centred on the wellbeing of current staff who were specialists with extensive experience in their field, and whose positions would only be guaranteed for 12 months should the amalgamation proceed. Staff had also not been offered support by the Local Authority during this stressful process.
- The Nursery's current governance and leadership structure supported planning and teaching which set a standard for early years education, and it would be difficult to maintain this in an amalgamated environment. Primary and Nursery education rightly focused on different educational settings with different objectives, and they should therefore have different leadership, management and governance structures.
- Bute Cottage should not be merged with a Primary school solely to fit a 3-11 educational model with no proven improved outcomes for pupils. Better outcomes for children had not been included in the proposal document nor had it been discussed by Cabinet.
- Estyn's response to the consultation indicated that the proposal had not considered the risk associated with the loss of a dedicated head teacher and the impact this may have on the quality of education provision.
- Concerns regarding how amalgamation would adversely affect funding that should be focused on three and four year olds had not been addressed.

In response to a point of clarification raised by Councillor N.C. Thomas, Mr. Disley advised that the Nursery's most recent Estyn report had graded the school as 'Good' rather than 'Excellent' although this had taken place six years ago.

The next public speaker was Ms. M. Canavan, representative of the National Education Union members in Cogan Nursery School, and her representations could be summarised as follows:

- Cogan Nursery School had been rated as 'Excellent' in all categories during its most recent Estyn inspection and there was concern that amalgamation would

No.

dilute the expertise of its staff members and its excellent Nursery provision would not be retained.

- While the consultation document indicated that the Nursery would continue with current staffing levels and on its current site, the indication that there would be no senior manager on site was of concern and it was contended this would be detrimental to management and oversight of the Nursery, raised concerns regarding the leading and safeguarding of Nursery staff and would dilute communication between the two schools.
- The lack of a requirement to integrate some governors from the Nursery to the new governing body could have a detrimental effect as those with knowledge and experience of Cogan Nursery school could be lost.
- The future of staffing was uncertain, and it was contended that specialist early years staff may be at high risk of redundancy in the future, a scenario which NEU members had indicated had already played out at Cadoxton Primary School.
- There was concern that the community work of staff would be lost as it might not be seen as a priority within a larger school setting.
- NEU members at the Nursery felt their voices had not been heard and maintained that specialist Nursery provision was better pedagogically for pupils.

The next public speaker was Mrs. S. Gillies, a parent of former pupils at Bute Cottage Nursery and a foundation phase teacher. Her representations could be summarised as follows:

- Mrs. Gillies had been bowled over by the provision and environment at Bute Cottage, with wellbeing at the heart of everything.
- The new Curriculum for Wales emphasised the importance of early years education provision in children's development, and this required highly skilled practitioners who were experts in the age range within a standalone nursery. A whole community of children had benefitted from the training and expertise of Bute Cottage's staff.
- Mrs. Gillies had personally seen specific funding for Nursery provision be dissolved across other areas and needs in a larger school setting.
- There was an opportunity to showcase the exceptional provision at Bute Cottage not only in its highly qualified staff but its superb facilities, which could offer valuable professional learning opportunities and training in theory and practice, and which in turn could generate an income and vital financial support for the school.
- A number of staff members from Mrs. Gillies' school had benefitted greatly from visiting Bute Cottage and observing practice in their early years setting, with the Nursery at that school having been transformed to mirror that of Bute Cottage.
- Bute Cottage could develop skills across many other schools, but only if it retained control of its budget and governance.
- Children with Additional Learning Needs (ALN) thrived in the environment at Bute Cottage, and with the number of children with ALN rising across schools it was recognised that early intervention could avoid the need to engage already stretched external agencies at a later stage.

No.

The next public speaker was Mrs. K. Rees, a parent within the community and former governor at Bute Cottage Nursery. Her representations could be summarised as follows:

- Mrs. Rees represented parents who opposed the proposals but who felt they had not been listened to. Having watched the Cabinet meeting on 10th January she had found it disappointing that more consideration had not been given to issues that were raised.
- She felt that implying the majority of objections related to location diverted from concerns expressed about the Nursery retaining its own head teacher, budget, governing body and specialist staff, which if lost could affect the learning experience that had been so special for her own children.
- She did not see how two Cabinet Members being members of the governing body at Evenlode Primary could not be deemed a conflict of interest.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor N.C. Thomas Mrs. Rees acknowledged that Bute Cottage's current head teacher was in fact an acting head (and as such the post would inevitably be subject to change), but stated that the acting head had provided the equivalent leadership and standards of a head teacher, and to her understanding the Nursery had not been permitted to appoint the acting head as permanent head teacher despite this having been advocated for.

The next speaker was Mrs. J. Bryan, an ex-teacher and head teacher with expertise in Primary and Nursery schools, and her representations could be summarised as follows:

- Referring to the concerns raised by Estyn in its response to the proposals, Mrs. Bryan wished to request that the Committee recommend to Cabinet that the proposals be withdrawn.
- She disagreed that there would be no difference to the quality of education provision if all staff and sites remained the same. An outstanding school depended on successive skilled staff, supportive governance and a shared belief that the needs of pupils would be the driving force behind decision making.
- Staff needed to feel trusted and empowered to make immediate, in the moment decisions regarding pupils' needs without the delay of discussions concerning a larger school setting. The responses to the consultation indicated which setting parents would prefer their children to attend.
- If a school was able to dedicate 100% of its resources to its own specific needs it could deliver on its core mission to give each child the support and encouragement needed for them to grow and develop, as opposed to a dilution of resources due to issues arising elsewhere in a larger school.

The final public speaker was Mrs. Helen Jones, a parent and parent governor at Bute Cottage Nursery school, and her representations could be summarised as follows:

No.

- The consultation report actually stated that no statutory consultation would be required to move schools from their current sites.
- The consultation report also stated there would be greater professional development opportunities following amalgamation based on the feedback of one staff member at Cadoxton. However, at Bute Cottage staff were already showing great professional development in their practice as demonstrated by the list of accolades awarded to them. These initiatives had been staff-led, helping themselves, pupils and the school's priorities. Staff had also taught parents how to play so provision could continue at home.
- This was only possible with independently controlled governance and finances.
- An External Independent School Improvement Partner had written to other schools within the consortium regarding innovative practice at Bute Cottage, and the consortium itself had engaged the Nursery in action research projects to demonstrate best practice to other schools.
- She did not see how amalgamation was fit for the new Curriculum for Wales as it wasn't best for three to four year olds.

The Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions which were greatly appreciated, and subsequently opened the matter up to debate amongst Committee Members.

Members expressed a range of views both in favour and in opposition to the proposals. The comments of those opposed to the proposals could be summarised as follows:

- When the matter had come to Committee initially, some had understood the debate at that time was regarding whether the matter would go out for consultation or not, and as they had been awaiting the feedback of parents and governors they had not expressed a particular view at that time.
- If the purpose of the proposal was not to address educational standards, or to implement a cost cutting exercise then it was not clear what the purpose was. It was also unclear why a feasibility study regarding the establishment of Nursery provision at Evenlode Primary would even be mentioned within the report if there was no intention to move Bute Cottage from its existing site. It was therefore generally unclear why Cabinet had chosen this route.
- While it was fair to say that buildings and location did not account for a school in its entirety, they did contribute to a sense of place which was also important.
- Parents and governors had made clear the great value they placed on having a standalone head teacher, and that they did not want a change in governance or structure.
- Bute Cottage and Cogan Nursery were viewed as 'crown jewels' in the Vale's education system, and as such Committee should look to preserve them rather than proceed with amalgamation.

The comments of those in favour of the proposals could be summarised as follows:

No.

- The schools would have the same staff, guiding ethos and standards of professionalism in place, and even with an amalgamation of governing bodies both of the Nurseries and Primary Schools would have a vested interest in maintaining standards. Both Primary schools in question were very good and were looked to for guidance within the Consortium, and some Councillors felt there was an implied lack of trust in the teaching professionals or their managerial standards in comparison with that of the Nurseries, and this was disappointing.
- Under amalgamation governors would still likely take on specific areas of responsibility within the curriculum and as such would be expected to undergo training and demonstrate their capacity and knowledge in that area.
- There was no reason professional development would not still take place, and it was unclear why the lack of a dedicated head teacher would prevent it.
- Councillor R.M. Birch had worked extensively at a two-site school with a head on one site and a deputy head on the other. Both would visit the other site, views would be exchanged and discipline was maintained, and she stated it was entirely possible to run a two-site school effectively.
- There had been a lot of misinformation spread regarding the proposed amalgamation, which was managerial in nature. Given council tax-payers consistently expressed that there were too many managers working in the Local Authority it seemed this proposal would address those concerns while ensuring consistency and continuation of the curriculum, which in turn would make pupils' transition between phases smoother, for instance through aligning reading schemes.
- Pupils at Bute Cottage would continue to benefit from its outside space, and Councillor N.C. Thomas clarified that if a proposal to change this were to be made in the future he would actively campaign against it, however there was no such proposal in place at this time.
- The Council advocated a through education policy, with Cadoxton now operating as one Primary across two sites, Ysgol Gymraeg Bro Morgannwg having become a 3-19 school on one site, and Cowbridge Comprehensive due to become a 3-19 school in September 2022. This had been received as a positive pedagogical step by Councillors with teachers able to share experience and knowledge.
- Many parents (including one public speaker) already chose to send their children to one of the Nurseries and then subsequently to the schools they were suggested to amalgamate with, and under the proposals this would not change.

In response to the above comments and other queries raised by Committee Members, Officers provided responses as follows:

- There were two standalone Nurseries remaining in the Vale of Glamorgan, which were the two affected by the proposals under discussion. Data had been provided during Committee's initial consideration of the proposals regarding the performance of pupils pre and post-amalgamation at Cadoxton Primary School, the most recent amalgamation to have taken place, and while the Officer didn't have the exact data to hand at this meeting she advised, as she had previously, that outcomes of learners at the end of Foundation Phase had improved following amalgamation.

No.

- With regard to Cadoxton Primary, the previously referenced movement of Nursery staff to the Primary setting had been at staff members' own requests for professional development opportunities.
- In response to a direct request from Councillor N.C. Thomas, Officers confirmed that there were no intended redundancies for either of the Nursery schools, and the governing bodies of the Primary schools had indicated they would not be looking to make any staffing changes within the Nursery settings, as had been made clear to staff during the consultation process.
- Both Nurseries currently had acting head teachers, so there was not a substantive head teacher in either setting. Following the retirement of the previous head teachers, there had been discussions with the governing bodies and some conversations had taken place suggesting these proposals might materialise in the future, and they had therefore decided to have acting head teachers in place for the interim period. This had been a decision of the governing bodies and not the Local Authority.

With permission to speak the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration made some further remarks as follows:

- She wished to re-affirm that there were no intended changes to staffing or surroundings, and there was no reason to believe that standards of teaching and learning would be altered under the proposals.
- The proposals had come to the Committee initially as part of the consultation exercise as was normal process, and the Committee's discussions at that time had in fact been circulated with the meeting papers.
- The purpose of the proposal was set out clearly within the consultation papers which had been considered by this Committee and Cabinet at both of its meetings. While there would be an impact on cost this was not the purpose of the proposal, and a feasibility assessment was referred to as it would be required to confirm whether the Vale was following the best model or not. The Cabinet Member was on record as saying she did not believe establishing a Nursery site at Evenlode Primary was feasible.

Councillor L.O. Rowlands moved that a recommendation be made to Cabinet that the proposed amalgamations as outlined in the report not go ahead. The motion was voted upon and was lost.

It was subsequently moved that the recommendations as contained within the report be supported, and with Councillor Rowlands having requested that it be formally noted he did not support the recommendation, it was put to a vote and the motion was carried. It was therefore subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the recommendations contained within the report, as approved by Cabinet on 10th January, 2022, be endorsed.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

No.

CORPORATE SAFEGUARDING MID TERM REPORT (REF) –

The Safeguarding Officer presented the reference, which provided a summary on the activity that had been undertaken in relation to Corporate arrangements for Safeguarding across the Council and had been referred by Cabinet to all Scrutiny Committees on 22nd November, 2021 for their consideration.

There was a Corporate responsibility to ensure that there were effective arrangements in place for safeguarding children and adults who required specific Council services. The report provided a mid-year update on the effectiveness of those arrangements and the developments to date. The Corporate Safeguarding Group (CSG) ensured that there was scrutiny and assurance of corporate safeguarding arrangements.

Of note, was the considerable support that the Council gave to local schools around safeguarding and that all Council employees, volunteers including school governors, elected members, contractors and partners within the Vale were informed through induction and training of their responsibility to comply with the Safeguarding Policy.

The Chair thanked the Officer for his report and with there being no comments from Members at this time it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the contents of the report be noted.
- (2) T H A T the Committee's congratulations be passed on to staff for the hard work undertaken.

Reasons for recommendations

(1&2) Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

RESHAPING OF THE ARTS SERVICE UPDATE AND ARTS CENTRAL GALLERY REVIEW (REF) –

Cabinet, on 20th December, 2021, had received a report which provided an update and options report regarding the Arts Service and potential future use of Arts Central Gallery following public consultation. Cabinet had referred the report to Committee for their consideration of the options outlined therein.

The Head of Strategy, Community Learning and Resources presented the report which advised that a review of Art Central Gallery had been conducted. The Gallery review had identified six potential options, with one preferred option for the future use of the space (Option 3: Establishment of a café bar and modernisation of Art Central Gallery), with an aim of the space being sustainable and cost neutral to the Council.

No.

The report also provided context regarding the change of circumstances that had taken place since the consultation had started, and highlighted that since the Council's initiative to reopen Penarth Pier Pavilion had been implemented, the Pavilion had made a huge and beneficial difference to the residents of Penarth and visitors to the area.

The Chair subsequently invited comments from Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson , not a Member of the Committee, and his representations could be summarised as follows:

- The Councillor was a local ward Member and a member of both Barry Arts Festival and Barry Town Council, who were the tenants of the same building as Art Central.
- In considering the role of the Arts in wellbeing he viewed them as worthy of investment in their own right and felt that cost neutrality or cost recovery should not be a primary focus.
- The practical impacts of Option 3 needed to be taken into consideration, for instance whether the introduction of a café/bar fundamentally changed the nature of the gallery which was already a small space, and whether it would be in competition with existing businesses in the area.
- He was concerned that the proposals focused more on budgetary matters rather than a real vision or high quality programme for the Arts in Barry.

Following Councillor Dr. Johnson's representations, the Chair invited comments from Councillor J.E. Charles, and her representations could be summarised as follows:

- Art Central was the best Council-run gallery in Wales due to its excellent range of internal and external facilities. It would be a costly travesty to diminish the scale of the space, which was underutilised, with few exhibitions or cultural events taking place and the Council not taking up those that were offered, which in turn prevented raising of gallery income via ticketed events.
- The gallery could support learning and was ideally placed to be a central focus within the new Curriculum for Wales. The Arts Development Service should liaise with subject teachers to develop a programme which would assist in the delivery of the Curriculum and increase the gallery's footfall and profile.
- Comparisons with the Pavilion were inevitable but the venues served different areas and demographics, with Penarth already being a tourist destination and Barry being in need of regeneration.
- The correct staffing team would be required to make a newly shaped space work, individuals with the vision and energy to organise regular workshops and cultural events.
- "A culturally vibrant Vale" was a stated Council goal and Art Central had to play a vital role in fulfilling this, with the potential to be an exciting and efficient hub for the Arts in the Vale.

The Chair thanked both Councillors for their comments and subsequently opened up the debate to Committee Members expressed a range of views both in favour and in opposition to the proposals, as summarised below:

No.

- The success of the Pavilion had resulted in increased footfall at Penarth seafront, which in turn had been of benefit to other local businesses. Option 3 for Art Central would also provide a vibrant destination venue and attract more visitors to Barry and having a positive impact on local businesses.
- The primary issue regarding Art Central was poor marketing, and if it was marketed well attendance would increase. The report noted that in 2018/19 241,070 people had visited Barry Library in comparison with 12,500 at the gallery, which was possibly due to the library already being an established and known venue.
- Publicity regarding exhibitions or events only tended to reach Councillors via Council emails, they weren't noticeably promoted in the press or on social media, and it was felt that Art Central was perhaps not prioritised in terms of marketing to the extent it should be, and it needed to be emphasised to the Council's Communications team that Arts Central was not second best.
- Opening up a café in the gallery would have an impact on local traders.
- Option 3 could create in Barry something comparable to the Chapter Arts Centre in Cardiff, with many different forms of art available throughout the day, and a café might mean visitors stop and stay for a little longer to view more of the art available.
- At present some did not feel comfortable going into the gallery whereas a move to make the space more inviting might encourage people to come in, and possibly return to the space.
- With the Tabernacle situated opposite the gallery having been sold to host music and entertainment events, in the future Kings' Square could become a good focal point in Barry.
- There had been a lack of events, advertising, quality and direction from the Council in terms of delivering the innovative space Art Central had been set up to become 15 years previously.
- A museum was also desperately needed in Barry, to increase income and civic pride in the area.
- External grants were underutilised and the Council needed to take advantage of sources of funding such as the Heritage Lottery Fund and Arts Council Wales. This should be prioritised over the notion that income from a café/bar would help make art and culture more affordable and accessible in the area.
- The lack of use of the outdoor space at Art Central was especially disappointing.
- Efforts needed to be made to make the arts in the Vale less elitist, as a lot of residents felt that spaces like Art Central weren't for them, and it needed therefore to be made more user-friendly. One possibility was offering options like craft classes or a children's play corner. It was important to ensure that the type of art on offer attracted everyone and was not just 'high-brow'.
- Previous suggestions regarding establishing a café at Art Central had not been well received, and it had been suggested this might utilise approximately 30% of the space available.
- Initiatives in Penarth Library had seen some Section 106 funding, and it was queried whether Section 106 funds could be made available to support the arts in Barry, given the amount of housing that had been built in the area in recent years.

No.

- Alternative options suggested by Councillors were unfunded and not thought through in terms of cost pressures

In response to comments made by Members, the Officer provided responses as follows:

- Many programmes which had been run during the COVID-19 pandemic had focused on the Arts and wellbeing, and with regard to funding since this matter had been raised previously by the Committee and subsequently a reserve had been established specifically for the supporting Arts and Culture. Any focus on cost within the proposals was to ensure sustainability, and enabling more to happen within the space by cutting overhead costs.
- The intention would not be to compete with local businesses, as the space would be a mechanism for holding additional events with an option of catering facilities. In opening the café at the Pavilion, Officers had engaged with neighbouring establishments to discuss how ventures could support one another, for instance through local traders providing supplies when special events are held.
- It was acknowledged that marketing of the gallery needed to improve and reflect the new content and programme that was being created, and the service area was working with Communications colleagues to develop a marketing strategy, with additional expertise to focus on marketing the space at Art Central.
- One of the potential benefits of establishing a café/bar would be that a member of staff would be present looking after the space and ready to welcome visitors, which had been proven in the Pavilion to get more people through the door. This in turn had resulted in increased exposure for artists in the Vale and this was reflected in sales of their pieces.
- It was acknowledged that there were sources of funding the Council could and should access to build capacity within arts and culture, although this work in and of itself required increased capacity within the service area.
- One element of the preferred option would be modernising the space in general, and providing additional facilities such as A/V systems, and ensuring both indoor and outdoor spaces were accessible to all visitors.
- The gallery at the Pavilion had run lots of events which brought in parents and children who had never been before, and many had subsequently signed up to classes and other activities on offer, and Officers recognised this was something the Council needed to continue to strengthen, and was one of the key areas of focus given the high footfall in Barry Library and the community, family and learning programmes held there.
- Option 3 was a model which paid for itself in that funding for the café/bar would be a joint venture with the Big Fresh Catering Company and reliant on their reserve for commercial expansion, which had been established following their success the previous year.
- Preliminary work had not been carried out regarding the space that the café/bar would take up as yet, but it was clarified that it would not use all of the space in the gallery and would not be to the same scale as that of the Pavilion.

No.

With permission to speak, the Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration wished to highlight that due to the impact of austerity and repeated budget cuts, non-statutory services such as the arts had gone into 'coping mode' due to a lack of internal funding. She queried whether improved marketing would help if there wasn't content to market, and added that what had been found with the Pavilion was a model which worked and provided a sustainable base to which grants could be added. The Cabinet Member also highlighted issues regarding resourcing and capacity which needed to be considered, and that cost pressures would be a factor in moving forward sustainably.

Following the debate, Councillor L.O. Rowlands moved that a recommendation be made to Cabinet that:

- A proper, meaningful marketing strategy for the promotion of Art Central was required;
- The service area needed to investigate external funding opportunities.; and
- A re-branding exercise should be undertaken in respect of Art Central with a view to making the space feel inclusive.

The motion was voted upon and was lost.

Councillor N.C. Thomas moved that Committee endorse Option 3 as set out in the report, and with Councillor Rowlands having requested that it be formally noted he did not support the recommendation, the motion was voted upon and carried. It was therefore subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the preferred option as outlined within the Cabinet report of 20th December 2021, Option 3, be endorsed.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

WELSH LANGUAGE PROMOTION STRATEGY (CX) –

The Head of Policy and Business Transformation and Mr. D. Thomas presented the report which sought Committee's views on the draft Welsh Language Promotion Strategy 2022-2027 and proposed action plan following a period of assessment and consultation.

Following approval from Cabinet in November 2021, the draft five-year Welsh Language Promotion Strategy 2022-27 and assessment of the current strategy were consulted upon from November 2021 – January 2022, with a referral to this Committee having taken place in December 2021 as part of the consultation exercise.

Appended to the report were:

- A report detailing the consultation activity undertaken and results (Appendix A).

No.

- An updated assessment of the current (2017-22) five-year Welsh Language Promotion Strategy (Appendix B).
- An updated five-year Welsh Language Promotion Strategy, following a period of consultation (Appendix C).
- An accompanying Action Plan to pursue the objectives and commitments contained in the Strategy (Appendix D).
- An Equality Impact Assessment relating to the Strategy and Action Plan (Appendix E).

The draft strategy and action plan was structured by the three themes of Welsh Government's Cymraeg 2050 Strategy:

- i. Increasing the number of Welsh speakers;
- ii. Increasing the use of Welsh; and
- iii. Creating favourable conditions – infrastructure and context.

The draft strategy also set out a number of aims within each of these themes that the Council, in partnership, would pursue over the five-year period.

Committee expressed their thanks to the Officer and Mr. Thomas for the report and with there being no further comments it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the Council's Welsh Language Promotion Strategy (2022-2027) and action plan, as attached to the report, be endorsed.

Reason for recommendation

To ensure that the revised strategy and action plan can be in place for the beginning of the 2022/23 financial year as required by the Welsh Language Standards.

SUMMARY OF WORK CARRIED OUT TO DELIVER THE WELSH GOVERNMENT'S PERIOD DIGNITY GRANTS IN LIGHT OF COVID-19 (DLS) –

The Prevention and Partnership Manager presented the report which updated Members regarding how the Vale of Glamorgan Council had been supporting both schools and families in low income households to ensure period dignity for women and girls throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

The report reflected a wide range of actions and activities that had been implemented by officers to ensure that grants were fully utilised and focused on ensuring that period products were made available to women and girls, free of charge and accessible in the most practical and dignified way possible.

The Chair thanked the Officer for the report and noted that the work of the Youth Service in particular was interesting, and that outdoor pop-up sessions had been a good idea.

No.

Members expressed thanks to the Officer and his team for the extensive work carried out in this area, it highlighted how essential such services were and it was great to see that period dignity had been ensured as best possible throughout the pandemic. It was also noted that some retail outlets ran schemes whereby sanitary products were available if shoppers asked at the counter for “a package for Sandy”.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration noted that she was involved with the Penarth Food Pod, and confirmed that their hygiene shelf had been well stocked for those who needed it thanks to this initiative.

There being no further questions at this time it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the contents of the report and Committee’s thanks to the Officers who have provided support in this area be noted.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.