

| |
|--|
| OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE |
| 6 MARCH 2013 |
| 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) monitor and manage the progress of the overall programme for scrutiny;**
- b) review the programme of scrutiny reviews, making amendments as appropriate; and**
- c) raise any ideas for potential policy briefing sessions.**

3. Background information

- 3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for setting, managing and co-ordinating the overall programme of scrutiny work. This is an ongoing role throughout the year.
- 3.2 The Committee has agreed a programme for scrutiny including scrutiny reviews and items to come to future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Health Scrutiny Panel and the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee are responsible for setting their own work programmes, focused around the statutory health scrutiny role. An updated summary of the overall programme for scrutiny, outlining the current and future work schedule is attached at Appendix 1.
- 3.3 At each meeting the Committee needs to monitor and proactively manage the progress of the programme for scrutiny, including evaluating the impact of scrutiny activity undertaken and using lessons learnt to inform future decisions about scrutiny activity. This will include reviewing the current programme of scrutiny reviews, making amendments and commissioning work as appropriate.
- 3.4 The programme has flexibility to incorporate unplanned scrutiny work requested in-year. However, the Committee is only able to schedule unplanned work after it has reassessed priorities across the scrutiny programme and considered the impact on existing reviews of the diversion of resources.

3.5 The Committee has agreed to the implementation of a priority methodology to identify appropriate issues for scrutiny review. 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.

The feasibility criteria includes:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Decision making and being a critical friend</p> | <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. Yes – include. No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p> | |
| <p>Public Interest and relevance</p> | <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? Yes – apply other criteria and consider inclusion No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p> | |
| <p>Ability to change or influence</p> | <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? Yes – apply other criteria and consider inclusion No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p> | |
| <p>Range and scope of impact</p> | <p>Is this a large topic area impacting on significant areas of the population and the council’s partners <u>or significant impact on minority groups.</u> Is there interest from partners and colleagues to undertake and support this review and will it be beneficial? Yes – apply other criteria and consider inclusion No – apply other criteria and consider removing</p> | |
| <p>Avoidance of duplication of effort</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? Yes – consider involvement in the existing activity or consider removing No – apply other criteria and consider inclusion.</p> | |

4. List of attached information

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

Appendix 1 – Programme for scrutiny

Appendix 2 – Programme for scrutiny: scrutiny panel reviews

Appendix 3 – 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, 14 May, 7 June, 5 July, 5 September, 3 October and 5 December 2012, 9 January and 6 February 2013.

7. Wards affected

Citywide

8. Contact information

Jane Garrard
Overview and Scrutiny Review Co-ordinator
jane.garrard@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
0115 8764315

Programme for Scrutiny: Summary of current and future work schedule March 2013

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.

| | March 2013 | April 2013 |
|--|--|--|
| Overview and Scrutiny Committee | Family support services | <i>tbc</i> |
| Call In Panel | | |
| Health Scrutiny Panel | NHS transitions Health needs of ex-service personnel | |
| Joint Health Committee | Cancellation of non-urgent elective operations at NUH Trust Development of services at Lings Bar Hospital Regional Stroke Pathway proposals Francis Inquiry implications EMAS change programme – response to recs. | Quality Accounts Psychological therapies service changes EMAS change programme |
| REVIEW PANELS | | |
| Personal Budgets | Evidence gathering Finalise recommendations Response to recommendations | Response to recommendations |
| Resettlement of Prisoners | | |
| Nottingham City Homes | | |
| Changing relationship between the Council, schools and academies | Evidence gathering | |
| 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? | | |

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 |
|--|---|----------------|
| <p>1. 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> | | Brian Parbutt |
| <p>2. 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?</p> | | Stephen Parton |
| <p>3. How is the changing relationship between schools, academies and the Council being managed and who will be responsible for educational performance outcomes for children?</p> | Scoping carried out and evidence gathering being organised | Glyn Jenkins |
| <p>4. 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?</p> | Meeting to consider response to recommendations scheduled for 25 March. Need to schedule meeting to review implementation of agreed recommendations | Emma Dewinton |
| <p>5. 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?</p> | Review in progress – evidence gathering in progress and due to finalise recommendations by end of March | Brian Parbutt |
| <p>6. 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?</p> | Meeting to review progress in implementation of agreed recommendations due October 2013 | Glyn Jenkins |

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 the City Council's neighbourhood working model help inform the development and delivery of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems? | Raised at OSC on 3 October 2012 If issue addressed during Committee's discussion on neighbourhood working structures in February 2013, remove from programme |
| 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. This is a major issue impacting on parents across the city. Action being taken: Request briefing note on current levels of school places and current action to address any shortage of school places; and consider whether scrutiny is required |
| 3. 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. |
| 4. How are the Council and partners addressing the needs of older carers? (OSC 27 July 2011, minutes - appendix list of review topics) | Action being taken: The two chairs, supported by NMc and Andrew Hall to establish a process for 'referrals' to the Health and Wellbeing Board from the OSC; then submit a 'referral' to the Health and Wellbeing Board asking how these concerns are being address by partners. |
| 5. 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)) | Topic identified during health inequalities discussion (December 2011). Area highlighted by colleagues as current focus for action – possibly review progress in 12 months time. Suggest timescale of 1 meeting Action being taken: Request update from Public Health colleagues to identify what work has already taken place and is planned on this issue; then consider whether further scrutiny is required. |
| 6. How can strategic decision-making and service planning be better informed by information about neighbourhood issues gathered through the councillor | Background research has identified that while the councillor casework system works well in terms of dealing with individual |

| | Comments/ notes |
|---|---|
| <p>casework system and local neighbourhood action work?</p> | <p>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>Action being taken: Chair plus one other member of OSC to meet with key colleagues to identify what progress has been made to improve the way that the casework system and local neighbourhood action work communicate to ensure the best outcomes for citizens. Following this meeting OSC to consider whether further scrutiny is necessary.</p> |
| <p>7. 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?</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>Action being taken: Request update on the activity and progress of schemes to establish whether there is any need for further review.</p> |
| <p>8. 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?</p> | <p>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. A briefing session was held following the OSC committee on 5 September 2012 which related to the consultation on the Council Tax benefit changes. A further policy briefing session took place in January 2013 relating to the broader impact of the universal credit changes. Following this OSC needs to decide whether there is a need for a scrutiny review.</p> |
| <p>9. 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)</p> | <p>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.</p> |

| | Comments/ notes |
|---|--|
| | <p>Action being taken: Request update on what monitoring is taking place on the impact of displaced parking across the city, to establish the need for review. (NB The focus of any review is not to be about the Work Place Parking Levy itself, but the impact of any displaced parking which has arisen since its implementation.)</p> |
| <p>10. 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?</p> | <p>Topic identified during voluntary sector discussion (November 2011) Further information to be requested</p> |
| <p>11. 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>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> <p>Action being taken: Request a briefing paper and the committee to decide whether a review is still needed. Possibility of linking with tenant scrutiny carried out by NCH.</p> |
| <p>12. 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>Action being taken: Request update on progress with service reorganisation from the appropriate Portfolio Holder and Councillor Dewinton, who has been involved in this. The Committee can then decide if a review is needed or to remove this item.</p> |
| <p>13. 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</p> |

| Comments/ notes | |
|---|--|
| <p>implementing recommendations from the Alcohol Related Harm review.</p> <p>Action being taken: To consider what value could be added by a further review of alcohol to ensure that there is no duplication with the scrutiny being carried out by the One Nottingham Board. If so, this could be removed from the work programme.</p> | |

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?

- 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?

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

Scrutiny review: 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?

- Councillor Brian Parbutt (Chair)
- Remaining membership to be determined*

Scrutiny review: How is the changing relationship between schools, academies, the Council and the wider community impacting upon issues that need to be addressed?

- Councillor Glyn Jenkins (Chair)
- Councillor Morley
- Councillor Healey
- Councillor Molife
- Councillor Choudhury
- Councillor Marcia Watson
- Claire Smith (Parent Governor Representative Statutory Co-opted Member)
- Assim Ishaque (Parent Governor Representative Statutory Co-opted Member)
- David Richards (Church of England Diocese Representative Statutory Co-opted Member)
- Ken Daly (Roman Catholic Diocese Representative Statutory Co-opted Member)

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?

- Councillor Stephen Parton (Chair)
- Cllr Liaqat Ali
- Cllr Azad Choudhry
- Cllr Emma Dewinton
- Cllr Gul Khan
- Cllr Bill Ottewell

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)