

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
5 SEPTEMBER 2012
PROGRAMME FOR SCRUTINY
REPORT OF HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

1. Purpose

To produce a well-managed and co-ordinated work programme for scrutiny which ensures that available resources are used to their full potential to make a positive impact on improving the wellbeing of local communities and people who live and/or work in Nottingham.

2. Action required

That the Committee:

- a) considers and agrees the proposed methodology for prioritising and managing the work programme as detailed in Appendix 1;**
- b) subject to approval of 2(a), applies the methodology to the current work programme enabling items with the most potential value to be prioritised for action and for those items which are no longer relevant or which are unlikely to have any significant benefit to the Council or its citizens to be removed;**
- c) considers and agrees to adopt the proposed methodology for carrying out appropriate scrutiny reviews, based upon a model used in Hertfordshire;**
- d) agrees that the Overview and Scrutiny Review Co-ordinators will revise the work programme to include indicative timings for reviews for the remainder of the year and removing items deemed to be of lesser value, based upon the actions agreed by the committee**
- e) notes that a policy briefing session relating to the council tax welfare reform changes will be held at the rising of this committee;**
- f) that a review panel be commissioned to consider the Housing Nottingham Plan consultation document and submit a response on behalf of the Committee, this review to be completed in one meeting;**
- g) raises and considers any items for future potential policy briefing sessions.**

The Committee will be supported in these actions by Overview and Scrutiny Colleagues.

3. Background information

3.1 Developing the O&S Work Programme

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for setting, managing and co-ordinating the overall programme of scrutiny work with the exception of the programmes

for the Joint City and County Health Scrutiny Committee and Health Scrutiny Panel which are responsible for their own programmes of work. This is an ongoing role throughout the year. The current O&S work programme for review panels and this committee (attached at appendices two, three and four) has now been in place for twelve months and has grown significantly. It is therefore timely to review the items included during this time to ensure they will result in focussed, relevant scrutiny activity where value for money and impact can be demonstrated. In order to achieve this it is proposed that the Committee adopt a methodology for prioritising the work programme. The suggested methodology, developed in consultation with the Chair of this Committee, based upon good practice guidance from the Centre for Public Scrutiny, is attached at appendix one.

- 3.2 When considering items on the work programme the following should be borne in mind:
- timescales should be realistic but challenging
 - available resources should be taken into account
 - a balance between topic areas and a mix of in-depth and sharper, focused work should be aimed for
 - flexibility to include unplanned scrutiny work requested in-year should be assumed.
- 3.3 Items may be identified in year through the Forward Plan of Key decisions. In preparing for the meeting, the Forward Plan has been reviewed and any issues for possible consideration will be reported at the meeting. Councillors can view the Forward Plan in the Committee Online section of the Council's Internet.

3.4 **Approach to Overview and Scrutiny at Hertfordshire County Council**

A concern expressed by Councillors since the adoption of the current model of Overview and Scrutiny has been the relatively slow progress that has been made in carrying out reviews. In seeking ways to address this issue Overview and Scrutiny colleagues have looked into practice at other local authorities to see what can be learned from them. Hertfordshire County Council have adopted a method of scrutiny which enable them to carry out large numbers of reviews. A version of this model, adapted to improve compatibility with the model operated here in Nottingham, is outlined in appendix five to this report. It is recommended that Councillors consider applying this approach to appropriate items in work programme.

4. **List of attached information**

The following information can be found in the appendices to this report:

Appendix 1 – methodology for prioritising the work programme

Appendix 2 – programme for Scrutiny: Summary of current and future work schedule

Appendix 3 – Programme for Scrutiny: Scrutiny panel reviews

Appendix 4 – Programme for Scrutiny: Overview and Scrutiny Committee future agenda plan

Appendix 5 – Overview and scrutiny: Approach at Hertfordshire County Council

Appendix 6 – Current scrutiny review panel membership

5. **Background papers, other than published works or those disclosing exempt or confidential information**

None

6. Published documents referred to in compiling this report

Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Committee 7 March 2012, 14 May, 7 June and 5 July 2012

Executive Forward Plan

A Cunning Plan: Devising a Scrutiny Work Programme – Centre for Public Scrutiny (2011)

7. Wards affected

Citywide

8. Contact information

Contact Colleague

Angelika Kaufhold

Overview and Scrutiny Review Co-ordinator

angelika.kaufhold@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

0115 8764296

Methodology and criteria for the Work Programme

1. The basis of the work programme for Scrutiny is that it must add value, and include timely and focused reviews with the potential to impact positively on the citizens who live and work in Nottingham. This methodology proposes a means of assessing potential work programme topics to ensure they achieve this without being too bureaucratic, formulaic and inflexible.
2. The Centre for Public Scrutiny researched different methods being used by councils and produced a document called ‘A cunning plan’ which evaluates the benefits and pitfalls of different options. This methodology is largely based upon their findings.
3. For the purpose of transparency and ease of decision making it is suggested that the Committee adopt this approach where topics are considered against a set of criteria to determine its priority in the work programme in partnership with member led open discussion at meetings. The methodology is not intended to be rigid but is a tool to support councillors in prioritising work programme issues. If the Committee agrees to this it is recommended that Councillors begin to apply these criteria to items currently included in the work programme with a view to prioritising them and removing any items no longer deemed to be of priority.
4. Any items removed from the work programme will be retained by the O&S team and will be reviewed at the end of the year to determine whether their priority should be increased.

The feasibility criteria could include:

Decision making and being a critical friend	<p>Is it a topic/decision recorded on the Council’s Executive Board Forward Plan which requires consultation with Scrutiny as a requirement <u>prior</u> to the decision being taken.</p> <p>Yes – include.</p> <p>No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p>	
Public Interest and relevance	<p>Is the topic still relevant in terms of it still being an issue for citizens, partners or the council in terms of performance, delivery or cancellation of services?</p> <p>Yes – apply other criteria and consider inclusion</p> <p>No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p>	
Ability to change or influence	<p>Can the Committee actively influence the council or its partners to accept recommendations and ensure positive outcomes for citizens and therefore be able to demonstrate the value and impact that scrutiny can have?</p>	

	<p>Yes – apply other criteria and consider inclusion</p> <p>No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p>	
Range and scope of impact	<p>Is this a large topic area impacting on significant areas of the population and the council's partners.</p> <p>Is there interest from partners and colleagues to undertake and support this review and will it be beneficial?</p> <p>Yes – apply other criteria and consider inclusion</p> <p>No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p>	
	<p>Is this topic area very similar to one already being scrutinised in another arena or has it already been investigated in the recent past?</p> <p>Yes – consider involvement in the existing activity or consider removing</p> <p>No – apply other criteria and consider inclusion.</p>	

5. Whilst scrutiny is a member-led process account should always be taken of the impact that scrutiny can have for citizens, the council and its partners, the resources available to support scrutiny, and ultimately whether a piece of work can add value.

Programme for Scrutiny: Summary of current and future work schedule 5 September 2012

Note: All items and timescales are subject to amendment depending upon a range of factors including progress of work; availability of key contributors; changing priorities. Once a scrutiny review has been completed it is removed from this summary work schedule.

	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Mar 2013	Apr 2013
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	The Nottingham Plan	The Councils Flood Risk Management (statutory)	Child Poverty – the City’s response to national changes and impact on families					
Call In Panel								
Health Scrutiny Panel	Transforming Community services (focus on midwifery, and podiatry)		NHS Transition arrangements					
Joint Health Committee	Care Quality Commission update Contraceptive and Sexual health services Psychological Therapies – update Cancellation of non-urgent elective operations			Lings Bar Update Cancellation of non-urgent elective operations	Patient Transport services Quality accounts	Dementia Care		
REVIEW PANELS								
Drug Education (AK)	Response to recs							
Personal Budgets (AK)	Evidence and report			Response to recs				
Resettlement of Prisoners (NMC)	Evidence and report			Response to recs				
Nottingham City Homes	Scope	Evidence	Evidence	Evidence and report				

Changing relationship between the Council, schools and academies	Scope	Evidence	Evidence	Evidence and report				
Fuel Poverty (NMc)		Review implementation of recs						

Programme for Scrutiny: Scrutiny Panel Reviews 2012/13

A. Current scrutiny reviews

Remit for review (as set by Overview and Scrutiny Committee)	Progress/ notes	Chair
1. Personal budgets – Are there tensions between choice and autonomy for the individual and the Council's ability to provide the level and range of services that enable choice? ACTIVE (AK)	Review in progress – 1 st meeting took place on 14 June 2012 – consultation taking place on further 3 meeting dates	Brian Parbutt
2. How well are partners working together on effective resettlement and rehabilitation and resettlement within Nottingham's communities of adult male and female prisoners following release from prison? ACTIVE (NMC)	First meeting scheduled to take place on 29 June 2012.	Emma Dewinton
3. How effective is the route that Nottingham City Homes' tenants have to follow to get a good quality housing repair, and how does Nottingham City Homes ensure its commissioning and procurement procedures ensure contractors for example for the Decent Homes Standards provide good quality, timely repairs which are quality assured? (NEW)	Scoping meeting to be arranged for September Topic identified by Council colleagues. Revisit when Nottingham City Homes reorganisation complete (spring 2012?) Suggest timescale of 2-4 meetings	Stephen Parton
4. How is the changing relationship between schools, academy's, the Council and wider community impacting upon issues that need to be addressed in the partnership? (NEW)	Scoping meeting to be arranged for September	Glyn Jenkins
5. How effective is drug education in schools in reducing drug use amongst young people, and how are those young people who do not attend school reached? (AK)	Report published on 28 May 2012. Mon 3 September 2012 – meeting to receive responses to recommendations (public)	Glyn Jenkins
6. How can we address fuel poverty, and consequent negative outcomes, in the light of the current recession?	Recommendations made – written response to implementation of recs expected from PHD in July 2012 – final meeting TBA for October 2012	Steve Parton
7. How is the Council ensuring that the voluntary sector is aware of, and fully consulted on future budget proposals relevant to their work? (AK)	Response to recommendations received and published. Need to schedule meeting to review progress in implementation of agreed recommendations (tbc)	Brian Parbutt

B. Potential scrutiny review topics

List of topics identified by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be revisited for potential inclusion on the current work schedule as resource is available/ at the appropriate time.

	Comments/ notes
1. How can OSC conduct scrutiny into the issue of domestic violence among elderly dementia sufferers in the home setting, alongside consideration of wider Adult Services issues.	Raised at OSC on 5 July 2012.
2. How is the council addressing the shortage of school places and impact on families where they are unable to get a place in their local, catchment school?	Raised at OSC on 7 June 2012.
3. How does the Council support the promotion of cycling in Nottingham as a means of addressing its Green Nottingham and Healthy Nottingham Council priorities and how are the super transport hubs being developed and linked in with this?	To contact and liaise with transport colleagues and the Pedals organisation in the first instance for further advice (identified at OSC in Mar 2012). Extended to include consideration of Super transport hubs at OSC on 7 June 2012.
4. How can the Council best manage the transition within the housing benefits regime to the universal credit system and changes in benefits payments and what measures are being put in place to support people during the transition?	To contact and liaise with the Head of Revenues, Benefits and Welfare Rights be approached in the first instance for further advice (identified at OSC Mar 2012). Remit extended and an update on progress requested at OSC on 7 June 2012 – briefing arranged to take place after OSC on 5 September 2012.
5. How are the Council and partners addressing the needs of older carers? (OSC 27 July 2011, minutes - appendix list of review topics)	Consideration needs to be given as to whether this is still a priority, whether it should now be scheduled as a review panel topic and more in depth focus and membership.
6. How effective is the traffic management service in responding to the negative impact on communities of displaced parking across the City? (OSC 27 July 2011, minutes – appendix list of review topics)	Consideration needs to be given as to whether this is still a priority, whether it should now be scheduled as a review panel topic and more in depth focus and membership. NB As the Work Place Parking Levy was only formally introduced on 1 April 2012 – this topic could be addressed later in the year when the real impact can be more accurately assessed.
7. How can the Council support the private sector to ensure its activity in relation to corporate social responsibility supports and complements a thriving voluntary and community sector?	Topic identified during voluntary sector discussion (November 2011)

	Comments/ notes
<p>8. How can strategic decision-making and service planning be better informed by information about neighbourhood issues gathered through the councillor casework system and local neighbourhood action work?</p>	<p>Background research has identified that while the councillor casework system works well in terms of dealing with individual pieces of casework, there could be scope for improving how this links with other sources of information about ward/ neighbourhood issues and is used to inform strategic planning. Suggest timescale of 1-2 meetings</p>
<p>9. Is the funding available for tree management and maintenance being used in the most efficient and effective way possible? Are there any improvements needed to manage and maintain trees across the City and, if so, what? How is the Council managing the problems caused by tree roots, in particular damage to pavements/ roads?</p>	<p>Revisit later in year as service review currently in progress. Specific focus for review would need to be identified</p>
<p>10. How can the 24 hour economy be managed to reduce the prevalence of binge drinking in the City?</p>	<p>Topic identified by Crime and Drugs Partnership. Many potential contributors to a review of this issue are currently engaged in implementing recommendations from the Alcohol Related Harm review.</p>
<p>11. What measures can be taken to minimise the negative impact of derelict and empty private properties (residential and commercial) on a local community?</p>	<p>Review postponed from autumn 2011 to avoid duplication with Executive work underway in relation to service reorganisation. Revisit at later stage to identify whether it remains an issue for scrutiny.</p>
<p>12. What progress has been made in engaging under-represented groups, such as men, in health improvement work to address health inequalities in the City? How to best measure and track performance against mental health and well-being targets and how health messages could be used to promote healthy lifestyles (OSC 7 December 2011, minute 24 ((2)(a-c))</p>	<p>Topic identified during health inequalities discussion (December 2011). Area highlighted by colleagues as current focus for action – possibly review progress in 12 months time (December 2012?). Suggest timescale of 1 meeting</p>
<p>13. How could the overview and scrutiny function engage with the revised performance agenda, to identify where it could make a difference and add value (OSC - 11 January 2012, minute 29 (2)(a))</p>	<p>This topic was identified in the context of how the OSC function could be integrated more systematically into the performance regime.</p>
<p>14. How could the OSC foster stronger collaborative working with Audit Committee, while avoiding duplication of effort (OSC – 11 January 2012, minute 29 (2)(b))</p>	<p>This was discussed in the context that 'the Audit Committee provided an additional role in ensuring that robust arrangements were in place for integrating priorities and resource allocation, and testing whether systems had ensured that investment and saving decisions aligned with strategic priorities. A need to work more closely with Audit Committee, cross-referencing particular issues</p>

	Comments/ notes
<p>15. How can the scrutiny of Nottingham City Homes and registered social landlord's performance be embedded within City Council Process? (OSC – January 2012, minute 29 (2)(c))</p>	<p>where it was considered appropriate to do so.’ Topic identified at OSC on 11 January 2012, during discussion of Managing the Council's performance, as monitoring of NCH was not integrated within the Organisational Planning and Performance Function. It was suggested that the Ward Forums being set up could provide a route for NCH and wider housing related issues and concerns to be made to OSC. (NCH publishes monthly and quarterly performance reports and ward councillors hold regular meetings).</p>

Programme for Scrutiny: Overview and Scrutiny Committee Future Agenda Plan

Date of meeting	Agenda item
5 September 2012	The Nottingham Plan
3 October 2012	Scrutiny of the Council's Flood Risk Management (statutory duty)
7 November 2012	Child Poverty: Nottingham's response to national welfare related changes impacting on families
5 December 2012	
9 January 2013	
6 February 2013	
6 March 2013	
3 April 2013	

Italics identify items that have not yet been confirmed.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY: APPROACH AT HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

An alternative method of scrutiny for the Committee's consideration considered is currently operated at Hertfordshire County Council. Hertfordshire conducts its overview and scrutiny activity almost entirely through a series of focussed one-off reviews, with a view to improving services through small, incremental and ongoing change. While the view within the Overview and Scrutiny Team is that this model doesn't lend itself to strategic scrutiny activity, we believe elements of the Hertfordshire model could be adapted for use in Nottingham. Here's how it might work:

Step One: Overview and Scrutiny Committee identify topics from the Work Programme which lend themselves to quick, focussed scrutiny, agreeing panel membership (5 maximum) scope and constraints (what scrutiny is not looking at).

[The Committee might also identify topics which could be addressed through other means, for example through correspondence with lead officers or, where additional information is required, through themed briefing or seminar sessions];

Step Two: a one-off focussed meeting is scheduled, involving key contributors. The contributors each provide no more than 3-4 pages of briefing/guidance in advance of the meeting for councillors' consideration. Depending on the topic, a site visit, for example to a health centre, might be considered appropriate in advance of this meeting.

Step Three: During the strictly-timetabled meeting, the O&S Team would build a series of conclusions and recommendations on the basis of discussions. Recommendations would be summarised and general agreement reached on the day, but final approval would be delegated to the Panel Chair and the O&S Team – a draft would not go to the Panel for approval. Reports would be very short outcomes-focussed documents;

Steps Four and Five: A written response is received from the Executive Lead within 2 months (4), and a final meeting of the Panel is convened within 6 months to provide final sign-off for the Review (5), highlighting implementation actions and service delivery outcomes.

While the approach described above would require a significant culture-shift in the conduct of scrutiny in Nottingham, it could help achieve an increased throughput of scrutiny activity over a wider range of service areas, and could lend itself in particular to scrutiny of local health services.

Current scrutiny review panel membership 2012/13

Following establishment of the remit, membership and chairing arrangements for the following scrutiny review panels by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, councillors have been nominated by Group Whips to be members of the review panels as set out below.

Scrutiny review: Personal budgets – Are there tensions between choice and autonomy for the individual and the Council’s ability to provide the level and range of services that enable choice? (ACTIVE)

- Councillor Brian Parbutt (Chair)
- Councillor Georgina Culley
- Councillor Glyn Jenkins
- Councillor Ginny Klein
- Councillor Thulani Molife
- Councillor Steph Williams

Scrutiny review: How well are partners working together on effective rehabilitation and resettlement within Nottingham’s communities of adult male and female prisoners following release from prison? (ACTIVE)

- Councillor Emma Dewinton (Chair)
- Councillor John Hartshorne
- Councillor Rosemary Healy
- Councillor Thulani Molife
- Councillor Steve Parton
- Councillor Marcia Watson

Scrutiny review: How is the changing relationship between schools, academies, the Council and the wider community impacting upon issues that need to be addressed in partnership? (New for September)

- Councillor Glyn Jenkins (Chair)
- Councillor Morley
- Councillor Healey
- Councillor Molife
- Plus two tba

Scrutiny review: How effective is the route that Nottingham City Homes’ tenants have to follow to get a good quality housing repair, and does Nottingham City Homes ensure its commissioning and procurement procedures ensure contractors, for example those who worked on the Decent Homes Standard, provide good quality, timely repairs which are quality assured? (New for September)

- Councillor Stephen Parton (Chair)
- Plus five tba

Scrutiny review: How effective is drug education in schools in reducing drug use amongst young people, and how are those young people who do not attend school reached?

- Councillor Glyn Jenkins (Chair)
- Councillor Rosemary Healy
- Councillor Eileen Morley
- Councillor Bill Ottewell
- Councillor Mohammad Saghir
- Councillor Marcia Watson
- David Richards (Church of England Statutory Co-opted Member)
- Ken Daly (Roman Catholic Statutory Co-opted Member)
- Claire Smith (Parent Governor Representative Statutory Co-opted Member)
- Assim Ishaque (Parent Governor Representative Statutory Co-opted Member)

Scrutiny review: How can we address fuel poverty, and consequent negative outcomes, in the light of the current recession?

- Councillor Steve Parton (Chair)
- Councillor Ginny Klein
- Councillor John Hartshorne
- Councillor Steph Williams
- Labour group vacancy
- Labour group vacancy

Reviews completed and closed down in 2012

Scrutiny review: Alcohol related harm

- Councillor Emma Dewinton (Chair)
- Councillor Merlita Bryan
- Councillor Georgina Culley
- Councillor John Hartshorne
- Councillor Ginny Klein

Scrutiny review: Dementia (early diagnosis)

- Councillor Ginny Klein (Chair)
- Councillor Emma Dewinton
- Councillor Steve Parton
- Councillor David Smith

Scrutiny review: How is the Council ensuring that the voluntary sector is aware of, and fully consulted on future budget proposals relevant to their work?

- Councillor Brian Parbutt (Chair)
- Councillor Mohammad Aslam
- Councillor Azad Choudhry
- Councillor Georgina Culley
- Councillor Sue Johnson
- Councillor Jackie Morris