

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

NOTICE OF MEETING

You are invited to attend a Meeting of the

PWYLLGOR RHAGLEN CHRAFFU

At: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

On: Dydd Llun, 9 Mehefin 2014

Time: 4.30 pm


AGENDA

Page No.

- | | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| 1 | Ymddiheuriadau am absenoldeb. | |
| 2 | Derbyn datgeliadau o fuddiannau personol a rhagfarnol. | 1 - 2 |
| 3 | Gwahardd pleidleisiau chwip a datgan chwipiau'r pleidiau. | |
| 4 | Cofnodion.
Cymeradwyo a llofnodi fel cofnod cywir gofnodion y cyfarfod a gynhaliwyd ar 14 Ebrill 2014. | 3 - 7 |
| 5 | Rôl y pwyllgor (gan gynnwys cylch gorchwyl). | 8 - 15 |
| 6 | Rhaglen Waith Craffu 2014/15. | 16 - 37 |
| 7 | Aelodaeth paneli a gweithgorau craffu. | 38 - 40 |
| 8 | Llythyrau craffu: | 41 - 43 |
| a | Llythyr at/gan Aelod y Cabinet dros Les (cyfarfod y Panel Perfformiad Lles - 3 Chwefror) | 44 - 48 |
| b | Llythyr at/gan Aelod y Cabinet dros Les (cyfarfod y Panel Perfformiad Lles - 17 Mawrth). | 49 - 54 |
| c | Llythyr at/gan Aelod y Cabinet dros Les (cyfarfod y Panel Perfformiad Lles - 7 Ebrill). | 55 - 65 |
| d | Llythyr at/gan Aelod y Cabinet dros Les (cyfarfod y Panel Perfformiad Lles - 28 Ebrill). | 66 - 69 |
| e | Llythyr at/oddi wrth Aelod y Cabinet dros Les (cyfarfod y Panel Perfformiad Lles - 12 Mai). | 70 - 71 |
| f | Llythyr at/gan Aelod y Cabinet dros Leoedd (cyfarfod pwyllgor - 17 Chwefror). | 72 - 78 |
| g | Llythyr at/gan Aelod y Cabinet dros Adfywio (cyfarfod pwyllgor - 17 Mawrth). | 79 - 85 |
| 9 | Gwella effaith craffu. | 86 - 151 |

- 10 Protocol cyfethol. 152 - 155
- 11 Adroddiadau craffu - Mehefin 2014. 156 - 159
- 12 Craffu Da? Cwestiwn Da! - Astudiaeth Wella Archwilydd
Cyffredinol Cymru: Craffu mewn Llywodraeth Leol. 160 - 203
- 13 Dyddiad ac amser cyfarfodydd yn y flwyddyn ddinesig 2014/15:

7 Gorffennaf 2014	27 Hydref 2014	16 Chwefror 2015
4 Awst 2014	24 Tachwedd 2014	16 Mawrth 2015
1 Medi 2014	22 Rhagfyr 2014	13 Ebrill 2015
29 Medi 2014	19 Ionawr 2015	



Patrick Arran
Head of Legal, Democratic Services & Procurement
Dydd Mawrth, 3 Mehefin 2014

Contact: Democratic Services - 637292

Agenda Item 2

Disclosures of Interest

To receive Disclosures of Interest from Councillors and Officers

Councillors

Councillors Interests are made in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Conduct adopted by the City and County of Swansea. You must disclose orally to the meeting the existence and nature of that interest.

NOTE: You are requested to identify the Agenda Item / Minute No. / Planning Application No. and Subject Matter to which that interest relates and to enter all declared interests on the sheet provided for that purpose at the meeting.

1. If you have a **Personal Interest** as set out in **Paragraph 10** of the Code, you **MAY STAY, SPEAK AND VOTE** unless it is also a Prejudicial Interest.
2. If you have a Personal Interest which is also a **Prejudicial Interest** as set out in **Paragraph 12** of the Code, then subject to point 3 below, you **MUST WITHDRAW** from the meeting (unless you have obtained a dispensation from the Authority's Standards Committee)
3. Where you have a Prejudicial Interest you may attend the meeting but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the business, **provided** that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise. In such a case, you **must withdraw from the meeting immediately after the period for making representations, answering questions, or giving evidence relating to the business has ended**, and in any event before further consideration of the business begins, whether or not the public are allowed to remain in attendance for such consideration (**Paragraph 14** of the Code).
4. Where you have agreement from the Monitoring Officer that the information relating to your Personal Interest is **sensitive information**, as set out in **Paragraph 16** of the Code of Conduct, your obligation to disclose such information is replaced with an obligation to disclose the existence of a personal interest and to confirm that the Monitoring Officer has agreed that the nature of such personal interest is sensitive information.
5. If you are relying on a **grant of a dispensation** by the Standards Committee, you must, before the matter is under consideration:
 - i) Disclose orally both the interest concerned and the existence of the dispensation; and
 - ii) Before or immediately after the close of the meeting give written notification to the Authority containing:

- a) Details of the prejudicial interest;
- b) Details of the business to which the prejudicial interest relates;
- c) Details of, and the date on which, the dispensation was granted; and
- d) Your signature

Officers

Financial Interests

1. If an Officer has a financial interest in any matter which arises for decision at any meeting to which the Officer is reporting or at which the Officer is in attendance involving any member of the Council and /or any third party the Officer shall declare an interest in that matter and take no part in the consideration or determination of the matter and shall withdraw from the meeting while that matter is considered. Any such declaration made in a meeting of a constitutional body shall be recorded in the minutes of that meeting. No Officer shall make a report to a meeting for a decision to be made on any matter in which s/he has a financial interest.
2. A "financial interest" is defined as any interest affecting the financial position of the Officer, either to his/her benefit or to his/her detriment. It also includes an interest on the same basis for any member of the Officers family or a close friend and any company firm or business from which an Officer or a member of his/her family receives any remuneration. There is no financial interest for an Officer where a decision on a report affects all of the Officers of the Council or all of the officers in a Department or Service.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

HELD AT COMMITTEE ROOM 2, CIVIC CENTRE, SWANSEA. ON
MONDAY, 14 APRIL 2014 AT 4.30 PM

PRESENT: Councillor A M Day (Chair) presided

Councillor(s)	Councillor(s)	Councillor(s)
A M Cook	P Downing	P M Meara
A C S Colburn	E W Fitzgerald	M Thomas
D W Cole	J E C Harris	
J P Curtice	A J Jones	
N J Davies	J W Jones	

Co-opted Members:

D Anderson-Thomas

Also Present:

Councillor D Phillips – Leader of the Council / Cabinet Member for Anti-Poverty

Officers:

N Havard – Directorate Lawyer
B Madahar – Scrutiny Co-ordinator
J Parkhouse – Democratic Services Officer

126 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor R V Smith.

127 **DISCLOSURES OF PERSONAL & PREJUDICIAL INTEREST.**

In accordance with the Code of Conduct adopted by the City and County of Swansea, no interests were declared.

128 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the Minutes of Scrutiny Programme Committee held on 17 March, 2014 be agreed as a correct record.

Minute No.112 – Scrutiny Work Programme 2013/14

The Chair outlined that the co-option of the Deputy Chief Executive of Age Cymru onto the Social Care at Home Scrutiny Panel would not proceed owing to Age Cymru having an on-going contract with the Authority. The Deputy Chief Executive will therefore provide input as an expert witness.

The Chair requested that the Scrutiny Co-ordinator formulates a co-optee protocol.

129 **PROHIBITION OF WHIPPED VOTES AND DECLARATION OF PARTY WHIPS.**

None.

130 **CABINET MEMBER QUESTION SESSION - COUNCILLOR DAVID PHILLIPS, CABINET MEMBER FOR ANTI-POVERTY.**

The Committee took the opportunity to question Councillor D Phillips, Leader of the Council, on his work relating to his responsibility and accountability as Cabinet Member for Anti-Poverty.

The Cabinet Member detailed the areas covered by his portfolio and work he had carried out in his role as Cabinet Member for Anti-Poverty. He also detailed areas of joint working with Cabinet Member colleagues in relation to poverty and prevention. He outlined priorities and developments to date in respect of:

- Social Inclusion;
- Community Regeneration / Communities First;
- Child Poverty;
- Providing every child with the best start in life / readiness for school;
- Supporting families by prevention;
- Developing target areas;
- Developing youth services;
- The impact of welfare reform;
- Providing community based solutions to local problems;
- NEETs.

The Committee asked questions in relation to how progress is measured; the difficulty in measuring progress in relation to anti-poverty; on-going problems being generational; the impact on children of living in non-working households; the need to develop parenting skills; feedback from the Poverty Forum; expectations of Flying Start and how it will be measured; partnership working; target areas, particularly their size; achievements of the Local Service Board. The Cabinet Member responded accordingly. He also circulated a document to committee members which provided further information about the development of a Swansea Poverty Reduction Strategy.

RESOLVED that: -

- 1) the Chair of the Committee writes a letter to the Cabinet Member reflecting on the discussion and sharing the views of the Committee;
- 2) the Leader circulates performance information in relation to the poverty and prevention programme, when available; and
- 3) The Committee follow up in issues relating to Target Areas with Councillor Ryland Doyle, in relation to the vision and objectives.

131 **SCRUTINY LETTERS:**

The Chair referred to the scrutiny letters log and referred to recent correspondence between Scrutiny and Cabinet Members:

- a) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Social Housing Working Group Meeting – 12 February).
- b) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Learning & Skills (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 3 March).
- c) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 3 March).

RESOLVED that the above letters be noted.

132 **MEMBERSHIP OF SCRUTINY PANELS AND WORKING GROUPS.**

The Chair reported changes to the membership of the Streetscene Inquiry Panel and the Inward Investment Inquiry Panel.

Councillor M Thomas requested that he be removed from the Streetscene Inquiry Panel. Councillor P Downing stated that he wished to remain on the Panel.

RESOLVED that the following membership changes be approved:-

Streetscene Performance Panel

Remove Councillor C Lloyd & M Thomas

Inward Investment Performance Panel

Remove Councillor A Jones

133 **ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME REVIEW 2013/14.**

The Chair reported the Annual Work Programme Review 2013/14 in order to help the Committee to take stock of the work completed this year and to reflect on progress. A full summary of the work undertaken was provided, including details of the work of the Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups.

It was added that the key achievements from the scrutiny work carried out over the past year will be featured in the Scrutiny Annual Report which will be published during the next Municipal year.

It was noted that the Education Inclusion Inquiry was being suspended pending outcome of a departmental review into the Education Other Than at School (EOTAS) service.

The Chair stated that he will write to the Leader to request that Scrutiny Dispatches is removed as a 'for information only' item and included as an item for discussion in order to allow time at council for any questions to the Chair.

The Chair referred to the self-evaluation workshop held earlier in the year and suggested improvements for the coming year in relation to:

- scrutiny work programme
- preparing for meetings
- outcomes from scrutiny (this was highlighted as the priority for the coming year)
- following up on scrutiny recommendations
- public engagement

In addition comments were made about:

- scheduling of meetings
- access to research / background information

It was added that there was an error in the draft Council Diary 2014-2015 whereby Scrutiny Programme Committee was listed as commencing at 5pm. This will be amended to 4.30pm at Council.

The Chair expressed thanks to all those councillors who have acted as conveners over the past year and to the work of the various Panels and Working Groups. He also thanked the scrutiny team for the support provided.

The Chair announced that the next meeting (subject to agreement of the council diary) was scheduled for 9 June. Ahead of that he informed the committee that the Scrutiny Work Planning Conference would be taking place on 12 May (for all scrutiny councillors) to gather ideas and prioritise topics for scrutiny.

134 **SCRUTINY DISPATCHES - MAY 2014.**

The Chair reported the draft Scrutiny Dispatches for agreement and submission to Council in June 2014.

RESOLVED that the contents of the report be agreed and submitted to Council in June 2014.

The meeting ended at 5.40 pm

CHAIR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

HELD AT THE CIVIC CENTRE, SWANSEA ON THURSDAY 8 MAY 2014 AT 6.08 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillor(s):

A C S Colburn
D W Cole
J P Curtice
N J Davies
A M Day

Councillor(s):

P Downing
V M Evans
E W Fitzgerald
J E C Harris
T J Hennegan

Councillor(s):

A J Jones
J W Jones
P M Meara
R V Smith
M Thomas

1. **SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 "CHAIRMAN OF MEETINGS" IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE PRESIDING MEMBER TO PRESIDE OVER THIS MEETING**

RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 12 be suspended in order to allow the Presiding Member to preside over this meeting.

(COUNCILLOR D W W THOMAS PRESIDED)

2. **ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR THE 2014-2015 MUNICIPAL YEAR**

RESOLVED that Councillor A M Day be elected Chair for the 2014-2015 Municipal Year.

(COUNCILLOR A M DAY PRESIDED)

3. **ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR THE 2014-2015 MUNICIPAL YEAR**

RESOLVED that Councillor R V Smith be elected Vice Chair for the 2014-2015 Municipal Year.

4. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from A M Cook.

5. **DISCLOSURES OF PERSONAL & PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**

No interests were declared.

The meeting ended at 6.10 p.m.

CHAIR

Agenda Item 5

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee – 9 June 2014

ROLE OF THE SCRUTINY PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Purpose	To ensure understanding about the role of the Scrutiny Programme Committee.
Content	This report provides a description of the Council's overview and scrutiny arrangements. The terms of reference of the Scrutiny Programme Committee are attached.
Councillors are being asked to	Discuss the role of the Board as required
Lead Councillor	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee
Lead Officer	Dean Taylor, Director – Corporate Services
Report Author	Brij Madahar, Overview & Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The main aim of scrutiny is to act as a 'critical friend' to the Cabinet and other decision makers in order to promote better services, policies and decisions. Councillors involved in scrutiny will hold the Council's executive to account and examine the work of Council departments, as well as other public services.
- 1.2 The Scrutiny Programme Committee (first established in October 2012) is the Council's single Overview & Scrutiny Committee and is responsible for managing all scrutiny activity within the Authority through a single work plan. Although certain work is undertaken by the committee (e.g. holding Cabinet Members to account) detailed scrutiny of specific topics is carried out by establishing informal panels (for in-depth activities) or one-off working group meetings. This provides for greater flexibility within the scrutiny work programme and engagement of all non-executive councillors in the scrutiny process, regardless of committee membership.
- 1.3 Any Panel / Working Group topics that are agreed by the committee are advertised to all non executive councillors and expressions of interest sought. The membership of Panels / Working Groups, as well as a lead councillor for this work (known as 'convener'), will then be determined by the committee.

1.4 In conjunction with the committee the Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee maintains overall responsibility for agreed scrutiny activities, monitoring activities and outcomes to ensure that the work programme is being delivered effectively, and in accordance with any timetable set out.

2. Role of the Programme Committee

2.1 The role of this committee in general is to:

- Establish and manage the informal scrutiny panels and working groups to undertake the detailed work of scrutiny – these to be open to all back bench councillors
- Appoint ‘Scrutiny Conveners’ to chair the various scrutiny panels / working groups
- Manage the Scrutiny Work Programme and monitor outcomes
- Hold Cabinet Members to account in a formal public setting
- Meet the Council’s statutory responsibilities for overview and scrutiny, including performing the Crime and Disorder scrutiny function
- Coordinate pre-decision scrutiny
- Respond to urgent issues and referrals from Council
- To undertake any scrutiny not delegated to a panel / working group
- Agree any scrutiny reports that make recommendations to Cabinet, Council and other bodies

2.2 Terms of Reference (taken from the Council Constitution) are attached at **Appendix 1**.

3. Scrutiny Conveners

3.1 Scrutiny Conveners are appointed by the Scrutiny Programme Committee to lead specific activities (Panels and/or other informal Working Groups) and are responsible for:

- convening (or chairing) meetings of the relevant Panel / Working Group
- ensuring that the Panel / Working Group undertakes work to the specifications and timescales agreed by the committee
- reporting back to the committee with findings, conclusions and recommendations as appropriate

A role description for conveners is attached at **Appendix 2** (taken from ‘New Scrutiny Arrangements’ Council Report – 18 October 2012)

3.2 The Programme Committee may appoint conveners from outside of the membership of the committee. In this case conveners will attend the committee by invitation of the chair / vice-chair to provide updates and/or present final reports on the work of the panels.

3.3 Councillors who are appointed as conveners will be responsible for ensuring that Panels are operating effectively. If there are any issues with regard to membership (e.g. attendance / representation of different political groups) these should be raised with the chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee. The Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee will consult informally with group leaders in the first instance and then, if necessary, raise the issue as an item for the Scrutiny Programme Committee to consider.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no additional financial implications associated with this report.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Local Government Act 2000 requires that executive arrangements by a Local Authority must include provision for the appointment of one or more Overview and Scrutiny Committees. Guidance from the National Assembly (on executive arrangements) states that the precise arrangements for overview and scrutiny (including the number, membership and remit of the committees) are a matter for local choice. The proposed revisions to the constitution are consistent with this guidance and the other relevant provisions of the Local Government Act 2000.

Background Papers: None

Appendices:

1. Scrutiny Programme Committee Terms of Reference
2. Scrutiny Convener Role Description

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard
Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Scrutiny Programme Committee Terms of Reference

1 General

1.1 The Scrutiny Programme Committee will have the following general responsibilities:

- a. Holding members of the Council's executive to account.
- b. Monitoring the performance of public services, policies and partnerships.
- c. Contributing to corporate and partnership policy and strategy development.
- d. Conducting in depth inquiries into service and policy areas.
- e. Involving the public in service improvement and policy development.
- f. Considering the opinions of external inspectors.
- g. Making reports and recommendations to Council or Cabinet on the discharge of any functions of the authority as appropriate.
- h. To undertake reviews as directed by Council.
- i. Preparing and publishing a regular work plan.
- j. Contribute to an overall strategic work programme for scrutiny that will be reported regularly to Council.
- k. Observing the principles of effective scrutiny as set out in the Protocol for Scrutiny.

1.2 The Committee will have responsibility for coordinating the scrutiny of the following:

- a. The community strategy / single integrated plan.
- b. Swansea's Local Service Board.
- c. The Council budget.
- d. Central / corporate functions of the local authority.
- e. Groups and organisations with which the Council has formed links through grant funding, compacts, subscription or service level agreements.
- f. External bodies which are able to levy a statutory precept upon the Authority.
- g. The Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Annual Report, Mid Term Report and Quarterly Progress Reports.

2 Scrutiny Panels

2.1 The Committee may establish Panels / working groups for the purpose of undertaking in depth inquiries or for looking at the performance of particular areas of service delivery.

2.2 Each Panel / working groups will be led by a Scrutiny Convener who will be responsible for:

- a. Convening meetings of the relevant Panel
- b. Chairing meetings of the relevant Panel
- c. Ensuring that the Panel undertakes work to the specifications and timescales agreed by the parent board
- d. Reporting back to the parent Board with findings, conclusions and recommendations as appropriate

2.3 Councillors will be appointed to a Panel on the following basis:

- a. At least two political groups on the Council to be represented on the Panel.
- b. Membership of Panels will be open to any non executive members of the Council regardless of whether they are a member of the Scrutiny Committee.
- c. New panels will be advertised to all non executive members and expressions of interest sought. The membership of panels will be determined by the Committee.

3 Scrutiny Work Programme

3.1 The Scrutiny Programme Committee will be responsible for coordinating the work of the Scrutiny panels. Other tasks linked to the delivery of the work programme include:

- a. Monitoring the delivery of the scrutiny strategic work programme;
- b. Preparing and agreeing the scrutiny annual report as required by Council;
- c. Dealing with business relating to regional / national scrutiny meetings (for example in relation to the Welsh Local Government Association or the Centre for Public Scrutiny);
- d. Considering reports relevant to the development and improvement of the Council's Scrutiny function;
- e. Dealing with consultation and implementation of national policy changes relevant to scrutiny;
- f. Preparing and publishing a regular work plan;
- g. Making reports and recommendations to Council, Cabinet or the Democratic Services Committee on the discharge of any functions of the authority as appropriate.

4 Service and Policy Areas

4.1 Areas of responsibility cover all functions of the Council and specifically:

- a. All of the functions of the Council as a Social Services Authority under all relevant legislation;

- b. All functions of the Council under the Children Act (1989 and 2004);
- c. All of the functions of the Council as a Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning Acts and all other relevant legislation including countryside, nature conservation and rights of way matters, in force from time to time;
- d. Acting as the Council's designated Crime and Disorder Committee for the purposes of the Police & Justice Act 2006;
- e. All of the functions of the Council as a Housing Authority under the Housing Acts and all other relevant legislation;
- f. Outcomes of reviews undertaken by outside agencies or audit bodies;
- g. Items where Welsh Government Guidance suggests that matters should be considered by scrutiny.

5. Cabinet Portfolios

- 5.1 The work of the committee will not be limited to any particular Cabinet portfolio(s). Invitations to attend meetings, reports, letters and recommendations will be directed to the relevant Cabinet Member(s) as each issue requires.

Scrutiny Convener Role Description

1. General

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Convener will be responsible for a portfolio of scrutiny topics that they will manage and deliver. These topics, allocated by the Council's Scrutiny Programme Committee, will not be confined to a single subject or department. The scrutiny work led by these conveners will be done through informal task and finish groups / panels and the conveners will chair the meetings of these groups. Conveners will be accountable to the Scrutiny Programme Committee.

2. Providing leadership

- 2.1 To provide confident and effective management of the topics for which they are responsible.
- 2.2 To promote the role of scrutiny within and outside the council, liaising effectively both internally within the Council and externally with the Council's partners.
- 2.3 To contribute to the development of a balanced scrutiny work programme.
- 2.4 To ensure the programme takes account of relevant factors such as: the work programmes of the executive and other committees, strategic priorities and risks, and relevant community issues.
- 2.5 To demonstrate an objective and evidence based approach to scrutiny and to facilitate the identification of conclusions and recommendations accordingly.
- 2.6 To evaluate the impact and added value of scrutiny activity and identify areas for improvement.
- 2.7 To promote cross party working.
- 2.8 To keep any relevant deputies fully involved and informed to ensure they are able to cover the conveners' role as required

3. Managing the work programme

- 3.1 To ensure that the work programme is delivered.
- 3.2 To report on progress against the work programme to Council, and others as appropriate.
- 3.3 To liaise with officers, other members and community representatives to resource and deliver the work programme.

4 Effective meeting management

- 4.1 To set agendas containing clear objectives and outcomes for meetings.
- 4.2 To manage the progress of business at meetings, ensuring that meeting objectives are met.
- 4.3 To ensure that the necessary preparation is done beforehand.
- 4.4 To ensure that all participants have an opportunity to make an appropriate contribution

5 Community leadership

- 5.1 Where necessary to act as a focus for liaison between the council, community and external bodies in relation to the scrutiny function.
- 5.2 To build understanding and ownership of the scrutiny function within the community.
- 5.3 To involve fully external stakeholders for example, service users, expert witnesses and partners in scrutiny activity.
- 5.4 To support the involvement and development of scrutiny members
- 5.5 To encourage high performance from all scrutiny councillors in task and finish groups.
- 5.6 To assess individual and collective performance within task and finish groups and facilitate appropriate development.

6 Values

6.1 To be committed to the values of the Council and the following values in public office:

- a. Openness and transparency;
- b. Honesty and integrity;
- c. Tolerance and respect;
- d. Equality and fairness;
- e. Appreciation of cultural difference;
- f. Sustainability.

Agenda Item 6

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee – 9 June 2014

SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15

Purpose	This report explains the background and purpose of the scrutiny work programme. The report invites the committee to consider the scrutiny work programme for the year ahead and presents proposals for agreement.
Content	A proposed work programme is attached which includes a plan for future committee meetings, as well as Panels and Working Groups.
Councillors are being asked to	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• accept or make changes to the proposed scrutiny work programme, including the committee's work plan timetable• plan for the committee meetings ahead
Lead Councillor	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee
Lead Officer	Dean Taylor, Director – Corporate Services
Report Author	Brij Madahar, Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

1.1 The Scrutiny Programme Committee is responsible for developing the Council's scrutiny work programme, and managing the overall work of scrutiny to ensure that it is as effective as possible.

1.2 The broad aims of the scrutiny function are to carry out a significant and constructive programme of activities that will:

- help improve services
- provide an effective challenge to the executive
- engage members in the development of policies, strategies and plans
- engage the public

1.3 At the same time the committee must ensure that the work of scrutiny is:

- manageable, realistic and achievable given resources available to support activities
- relevant to corporate priorities and is focused on significant areas

- adding value and having maximum impact
- coordinated and avoids duplication

2. Methods of Working

2.1 The work of scrutiny is undertaken primarily in three ways – through the committee itself and by establishing informal panels (for in-depth activities) or one-off working groups:

- **Formal committee meetings** – as well as managing the overall work programme, the committee will focus on holding Cabinet Members to account by holding formal questioning sessions, and provide challenge on specific themes over the course of the year - this may cover a broad range of policy and service issues. Matters considered at committee meetings will typically be ‘one-off’ opportunities for questions, which will result in the committee communicating findings, views and recommendations for improvement through chairs letters to cabinet members, and where appropriate by producing reports.
- **Informal panels** – Scrutiny panels are established, with conveners appointed by the committee, to carry out in-depth inquiries (sometimes referred to as reviews) or undertake in-depth monitoring of particular services. The use of panels helps to ensure that scrutiny can be flexible and responsive to issues of concern:
 - a) **Inquiry Panels**: to undertake discrete in-depth inquiries into specific and significant areas of concern on a task and finish basis. These would be significant topics where scrutiny can make a real difference. The committee will agree an ‘Inquiry Brief’ before establishing any Inquiry Panel, which will outline the aim and key question that is to be explored. Inquiry panels will produce a final report at the end of the inquiry with conclusions and recommendations, informed by the evidence gathered.
 - b) **Performance Panels**: to provide in-depth monitoring and challenge for clearly defined service areas. Performance panels are expected to have on-going correspondence with relevant cabinet members in order to share views and recommendations, arising from monitoring activities, about services.
- **Informal working groups** – Although the majority of scrutiny work is carried out through the committee and panels, the committee can also establish informal working groups of councillors. This supports flexible working where it has been agreed that a matter should be carried out outside of the committee but does not necessitate the establishment of a Panel. This method of working is intended to be light-touch – effectively a one-off meeting to consider a specific

report or information, resulting in a letter to relevant Cabinet Member(s) with views and recommendations.

- 2.2 Non executive councillors who are not members of the committee have the opportunity to participate in panels and other informal task and finish groups. New panel topics, once agreed, are advertised to all non executive councillors and expressions of interest sought. The membership of panels and working groups is then determined by the committee. More than one political group should be represented on each panel / working groups. These bodies also need to be of a manageable size in terms of team working and effective questioning. A minimum of 3 members should be present at all meetings.

3. Work Planning

- 3.1 A Scrutiny Work Planning Conference took place on 12 May and was attended by 21 scrutiny councillors. At the conference councillors shared views about the scrutiny work programme and identified priorities for the year ahead. Councillors were asked to give thought to whether a particular topic merited in-depth inquiry, required monitoring, or could be dealt with through a 'one-off' discussion. As a starting point, suggestions that had been gathered from the annual councillor survey, cabinet members, officers, the public and partners were discussed. Ideas suggested were also cross referenced with the priorities in the One Swansea Plan (Swansea's Single Integrated Plan). A number of additional topics also emerged from the debate.

- 3.2 From the consultation the topics that gained most support were:

- Corporate Building & Property Services
- Governance of Schools
- Corporate Culture / Co-operative Council
- Sustainability
- Services for those with Learning Difficulties
- Target Areas
- Mental Health Services
- Obesity / Lifestyle
- School Readiness
- Roads / Roadworks / Highway Maintenance
- Young Carers
- Western Bay Health and Social Care Programme

- 3.3 Taking into account feedback from the conference, proposals for the scrutiny work programme are attached as **Appendix 1a**. The results from the prioritisation exercise at the conference are also attached as **Appendix 1b**. The programme is guided by the overriding principle that the work of scrutiny should be strategic and significant, focussed on issues of concern, and represent a good use of scrutiny time and resources.

- 3.4 This proposed work programme shows the topics that will be examined through various panels and working groups as well as a plan for future committee meetings. It includes work that is ongoing or already committed, either because of its importance or because work is incomplete, as well as new topics identified from the conference.
- 3.5 A work plan for committee meetings is also attached as **Appendix 2**, which includes a plan for Cabinet Member question sessions.
- 3.6 **Appendix 3a & 3b** provide a summary of progress on current scrutiny activities.
- 3.7 For further information about the work of specific panels / groups a contact list of lead scrutiny members and officers is contained in **Appendix 4**.

4. Monitoring the Work Programme

- 4.1 A report will be provided to each meeting to enable the committee to maintain an overview of all scrutiny activities to ensure that the work programme is co-ordinated and effective. In particular the committee will monitor progress of work undertaken by the informal Panels and Working Groups and findings to ensure that this work is effective and has the required visibility. Performance Panel conveners will be asked to attend the committee on a regular basis to provide updates and enable discussion.
- 4.2 The committee's own work plan will remain under constant review to ensure it is robust and effective. An updated work plan timetable will assist forward planning and help the committee to manage workloads and review progress made. Members should always review and confirm items for the next and future meetings giving specific consideration to who should attend and confirm expectations so that meetings are always well planned and prepared for, e.g. information required and key questions that the committee wishes to ask. The committee will have the opportunity to introduce issues of concern and review priorities, as and when they arise.

5. Support

- 5.1 Each in-depth Panel will have the dedicated support of a member of the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Unit. This lead scrutiny officer will project manage the work of the Panels and help to ensure that things runs smoothly, for example:
- Contact and arrange witness sessions
 - Carry out and assist with any consultation and public engagement exercises
 - Carry out research on behalf of the Board
 - Help to keep the work to time
 - Capture and reflect back the ideas, evidence gathered and any key issues that have been highlighted

- Assist in the compilation of final reports
- 5.2 The Executive Board and Service Departments are also an essential source of advice and support. Engagement with departments will be important in providing context for areas of work, knowledge about policies and service delivery, and technical expertise.
- 5.3 Prioritisation of scrutiny activities is vital in view of limited scrutiny time and resources. Aligning the amount of scrutiny with available resources will help to sharpen the focus on the quality of scrutiny and impact. The committee should recognise that a limited number of panels and working groups can be supported in any given year, keeping a degree of flexibility to adapt to issues that may emerge during the year.

6. Public Requests for Scrutiny / Councillor Calls for Action

- 6.1 In accordance with the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011 the Scrutiny Programme Committee has agreed arrangements to deal with requests for scrutiny from individual councillors (who are not members of the committee) and/or members of the public.
- 6.2 Councillors who are not on the Scrutiny Programme Committee who have suggestions for scrutiny during the course of the year should make these known to the chair and vice-chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee for consideration. However for a more formal route there is the Councillor Call for Action (CCfA). CCfAs specifically enable councillors to refer issues of local importance to an overview and scrutiny committee, however as a means of “last resort” in a broad sense, with issues being raised at a scrutiny committee after other avenues have been explored.
- 6.3 In accordance with the agree protocol for both councillor calls for action and public requests for scrutiny the chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee will consider any requests received and bring about proposals to deal with these to the committee for consideration.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 Any costs that arise out of work plan activities, for example expenses for witnesses or transport costs, are not envisaged to be significant and will be contained within the existing Scrutiny Budget.

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 There are no specific legal implications raised by this report.

Background papers: None

Date: 28 May 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard
Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Appendices:

Appendix 1a: Proposed Scrutiny Work Programme 2013/14
Appendix 1b: Work Planning Conference Write Up
Appendix 2: The Committee Work Plan 2013/14
Appendix 3: Progress of Panels and Working Groups
Appendix 4: Scrutiny Councillor / Officer Leads

Scrutiny Work Programme – 2014/5

Scrutiny Programme Committee

(formal committee chaired by Cllr Mike Day)

- Developing & managing overall Scrutiny Work Programme / monitoring progress
- Appointing Members and Conveners for specific informal scrutiny activities
- Cabinet Member Question Sessions
- Broad range of Policy and Service issues (incl. Gypsy & Traveller Site – Review of Process)
- Crime & Disorder Scrutiny
- Scrutiny Letters
- Sign-off final Panel reports
- Pre-decision Scrutiny
- Scrutiny Annual Report

Inquiry Panels

(time limited in-depth inquiries - max 6 months – report produced following evidence gathering)

Current:

- Inward Investment
- Public Engagement
- Streetscene
- Social Care at Home

PROPOSED (for prioritisation - 1 to be selected initially):

- **Governance in Schools**
- **Corporate Culture / Co-operative Council**
- **Services for those with Learning Difficulties**
- **Mental Health Services**
- **Obesity / Lifestyle**

Working Groups

(one-off meetings – letter to relevant Cabinet Members / decision-makers on views & suggested action)

Current:

- Planning Service
- Car Parking
- Local Flood Risk Management

PROPOSED:

- **Corporate Building & Property Services**
- **Sustainability**
- **Target Areas**
- **Roads / Highway Maintenance**
- **Young Carers**

(to be timetabled over the year)

Performance Panels

(ongoing challenge & in-depth monitoring of performance and correspondence with relevant Cabinet Members / decision-makers about views & suggested actions)

- Schools
- Wellbeing **(to include monitoring of Western Bay Health and Social Care Programme)**
- Service Improvement and Finance **(to include monitoring of major schemes as required)**
- Local Service Board (multi agency panel)

Scrutiny Work Programme 2014/5 – Suggestions Considered at Work Planning Conference

No.	TOPIC AREAS	DESCRIPTION	DOT VOTING		RAISED BY:				
			Inq	Oth	Scrutiny Cllrs	Cabinet / CMT	Public	Staff / Ptns	CIP / SIP
	INQUIRY:								
1.	Services for those with Learning Difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on either children or adults - how good are our services / performance (incl. day centres, access to services incl. education, leisure)? 	8	3					
2.	Mental Health Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. focus on dementia – how are we meeting demand & resources, carers and support, supporting people to live at home, residential provision, models of good practice? young people – are they getting assessments 	9						
3.	Transition of Service for Disabled Children to Adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are we meeting needs?; how do they become independent adults, services to support independence and well being?; sustainability of service provision 		1					
4.	Domestic Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on impact on Children & Young People 							
5.	Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> policies, service delivery and planning - are we planning longer term / being preventative / considering future generations? Focus on future risks e.g. climate change, energy supply, resource scarcity, food security, water, infrastructural resilience, ageing population. Monitoring activity in this area 	11	1					
6.	Governance of Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focus on role & support for School Governors 	14						

Appendix 1b

No.	TOPIC AREAS	DESCRIPTION	DOT VOTING		RAISED BY:				
					Scrutiny Cllrs	Cabinet / CMT	Public	Staff / Ptns	CIP / SIP
7.	School Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> how well are children prepared for school, support to parents, effectiveness of project e.g. flying start? 	5	2					
8.	Residents' Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review of provision - what % of a street should be reserved for residents, criteria for determining which streets have residents parking, management of remaining parking spaces, family visitors, carers etc 	1	2					
9.	Library Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> examine quality of the service / provision 	2						
10.	Supported Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sufficiency of provision to support vulnerable people in the community, what can the Council do? how can the Council affect public attitudes? what support does the community need? 		3					
11.	Anti-Social Behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> dealing with anti-social behaviour in our communities 							
12.	Roads / Highway Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> examine quality and effectiveness of highway maintenance and repair. Service practices and procedures (e.g. dealing with pot holes), use of resources, prospects for improvement 	6						
13.	Young Carers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> examine support to young carers to minimise impact on personal development, education, employment, training. 	6						
	ADDED AT CONFERENCE								
14.	Obesity / Lifestyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> promotion of healthy living, effectiveness of initiatives etc. 	9						
15.	Corporate Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> how we work corporately; value for money 	3						

Appendix 1b

No.	TOPIC AREAS	DESCRIPTION	DOT VOTING		RAISED BY:				
					Scrutiny Cllrs	Cabinet / CMT	Public	Staff / Ptns	CIP / SIP
16.	Facilitating Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to examine how communities can be better prepared to take on responsibilities for services e.g. parks, greens, community centres etc. 	2						
17.	Aids, Equipment & Adaptations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> access to services; how we can improve assistance to people with a disability or health condition, or those who are just finding it more difficult to get around. 	2	1					
18.	Corporate Culture / Co-operative Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to look at how the authority can empower staff and key stakeholders to improve services and service delivery by changing behaviours and cultures. 	14						
19.	Target Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact of new approach 	11						
20.	Hafod Renewal Area								

Appendix 1b

No.	TOPIC AREAS	DESCRIPTION	DOT VOTING		RAISED BY:					
					Inq	Oth	Scrutiny Cllrs	Cabinet / CMT	Public	Staff / Ptns
	MONITORING / ONE-OFFS:									
1.	Western Bay Health and Social Care Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of progress made - activity, delivery and governance 	5							
2.	Recycling* (In-depth review already undertaken – report published May 2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> examine ways to encourage recycling and increase participation 								
3.	Corporate Building & Property Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service briefing Cost of services / charges relating to schools and community centres etc 	17 ½	3 ½						
4.	Monitoring of Major Schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. schemes of over £10m should be monitored by scrutiny 	3							
5.	Roadworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of relationship with utilities, strategic planning / co-ordination of works to minimise disruption to major access roads 	5							
6.	Tend & Mend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of the gardening help scheme - to find out how it works, and how it could be improved 		1						
7.	Renewable Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of existing policy, progress / achievements, relevant projects, provision of advice 		2						

Appendix 1b

No.	TOPIC AREAS	DESCRIPTION	DOT VOTING		RAISED BY:				
					Scrutiny Cllrs	Cabinet / CMT	Public	Staff / Ptns	CIP / SIP
8.	Corporate Complaints Procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of current process / procedure 							
9.	Street Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of maintenance and repair, responsiveness to service issues raised by public 							
10.	Communities First* (In-depth review already undertaken – report published Jan 2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion of objectives, plans, achievements, value for money / success / impact of programme in Swansea 	2						
11.	NEAT & Community Payback Teams* (Has been covered within current Streetscene Inquiry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable discussion on impact and effectiveness - feasibility of having a list which the teams can address on a regular basis e.g. to tackle litter / fly-tipping hotspots 							

Scrutiny Programme Committee – Draft Work Plan

Standing Agenda Items:

Scrutiny Work Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To maintain overview on scrutiny work, monitor progress, and coordinate as necessary To plan for future committee meetings including key expectations e.g. key questions to explore, witnesses / information required
Scrutiny Letters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review scrutiny letters and Cabinet Member responses arising from all scrutiny activities
Scrutiny Dispatches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To approve content of Dispatches prior to reporting to Council, ensuring visibility and awareness of key issues, findings and outcomes from scrutiny activities
Membership of Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To agree membership of Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups (including appointment of conveners) and subsequent changes
Cabinet Forward Work Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure awareness of future cabinet business to consider opportunities for pre-decision scrutiny

Items for Specific Meetings:

Meeting	Reports	Purpose
7 Jul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Mitch Theaker 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Opportunities for Children & Young People, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Inquiry Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Inward Investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive the final report (including conclusions and recommendations) of the Inquiry Panel prior to submission to Cabinet for decision
4 Aug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Mark Child 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Wellbeing, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Wellbeing Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams, Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Inquiry Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Public Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive the final report (including conclusions and recommendations) of the Inquiry Panel prior to submission to Cabinet for decision

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny Annual Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To present the annual report of the work of overview & scrutiny for the municipal year 2013/14, as required by the constitution
1 Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Christine Richards (Deputy Leader) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Citizen, Community Engagement & Democracy, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Service Improvement & Finance Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Mary Jones, Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
29 Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Sybil Crouch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Sustainability, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Schools Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
27 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Ryland Doyle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Target Areas, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Wellbeing Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams, Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
24 Nov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr David Phillips (Leader) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Anti-Poverty, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities. Focus on Anti-Poverty - questioning on achievements / plans in this area Focus on Community Regeneration / Communities First - questioning on achievements / plans in this area
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Service Improvement & Finance Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Mary Jones, Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
22 Dec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Will Evans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Learning & Skills, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Schools Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
19 Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Rob Stewart 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Wellbeing Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams, Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
16 Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr June Burtonshaw 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Place, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Service Improvement & Finance Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Mary Jones, Convener attending to update on headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
16 Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr Nick Bradley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Regeneration, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Report – Schools Performance Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convener attending to update headlines from the Panel’s work and achievements.
13 Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet Member Question Session – Cllr David Phillips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question and answer session with Cabinet Member for Anti-Poverty, on relevant portfolio responsibilities and activities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plan Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reflect on the year’s work, achievements, experiences, issues, ideas for future scrutiny

To be scheduled:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Inquiry Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Social Care at Home § Streetscene 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive the final report (including conclusions and recommendations) of the Inquiry Panel prior to submission to Cabinet for decision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crime & Disorder Scrutiny 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress on Safer Swansea Partnership Performance with Co-Chairs - questioning on plans, performance, challenges

Other:

- Further special meetings re. Gypsy & Traveller Site Provision – Review of Process
- Reports on Relevant Regional / National Scrutiny Development & improvement Issues (incl. report back from WLGA / CfPS network meetings)
- Referrals from other council bodies, such as cabinet
- Referrals of items from members of the public or Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA)

Scrutiny Work Programme 2014-15

Appendix 3a

ACTIVITY	May	June	July	August	September	October
Scrutiny Programme Committee	27*	9	7	4	1	27
Inquiry Panels						
Current:						
Inward Investment (started Sep 2013)	13 20	3 18				
Public Engagement (started Sep 2013)		2				
Streetscene (started Oct 2013)		5 11				
Social Care at Home (started Jan 2014)	15					
Education Inclusion (started Feb 2014)						
work currently suspended pending outcome of departmental review						
Follow Up:						
Services for LAC (Cabinet 17/9/13)		26				
Public Transport (Cabinet 12/11/13)						
Affordable Housing (Cabinet 3/12/13)			17			
Tourism (Cabinet 14/1/14)						
Economic Inactivity (Cabinet 3/6/14)						
Attainment & Wellbeing (Cabinet decision awaited)						
	Key for Inquiries:					
	Scoping		Evidence Gathering		Final Report	
					Cabinet	Follow Up
Performance Panels						
Wellbeing	12	2	16 30 14	28 11	1	13 27
Service Improvement & Finance	14	11	16	20	15 29	15
Schools Performance		5	3	21	18	16
Local Service Board (multi-agency panel)	12		23	21	22	
Working Groups						
Local Flood Risk Management						
Planning Service		10				
Car Parking						

* special meetings

Progress Report – Current Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups

1. Inquiry Panels:

a) **Inward Investment** (convener: Cllr Jeff Jones)

Key Question: What can the Council do to influence inward investment into Swansea and the South West Wales region?

Progress Bar:

Scoping				Evidence Gathering				Draft Final Report			

The Panel are currently drawing up their final report.

b) **Public Engagement** (convenor: Cllr Joe Hale)

Key Question: How can the Council improve its engagement practices with the public, staff and external stakeholders?

Progress Bar:

Scoping				Evidence Gathering				Draft Final Report			

The panel has completed its evidence gathering. A meeting was held on 2 June to consider findings and identify conclusions and recommendations for the final report.

c) **Streetscene** (convenor: Cllr John Bayliss)

Key Question: How well does the Council maintain and keep clean the roads, footways and verges in Swansea, and what changes should it make?

Progress Bar:

Scoping				Evidence Gathering				Draft Final Report			

The panel is meeting on 5 June to discuss environmental enforcement activities. It is also meeting on 11 June to gather evidence from residents on their experiences of street scene services.

d) **Social Care at Home** (convenor: Cllr Jane Harris)

Key Question: How can Swansea Council and its partners support elderly people to enable them to remain in their own homes?

Progress Bar:

Scoping				Evidence Gathering				Draft Final Report			

The Panel is now taking stock of the evidence it has gathered and starting to consider its conclusions and recommendations. Following this, the Panel will consider whether any further evidence gathering is required prior to developing its final report.

2. Performance Panels:

a) Wellbeing (convener: Cllr Paxton Hood-Williams)

The panel has agreed its work plan for the next 12 months. It is continuing to meet fortnightly alternating between scrutinising the performance of adult social care and child and family services

b) Service Improvement & Finance (convener: Cllr Mary Jones)

The Panel met on 14 May to evaluate its work over the year and to plan for the year ahead.

The next meeting will take place on 11 June. The Panel have invited the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources to attend in order to discuss progress on achieving savings targets, the Panel's involvement in the Budget process for 2015/16 and the development of its work programme for year. The Panel will also receive a report from the Head of Finance and Performance, which outlines the Budget Tracker Progress and how the Authority will be monitoring the implementation of savings targets.

c) Schools Performance (convener: tbc)

The Panel will meet on the 5 June with the Chief Education Officer, Arwyn Thomas to discuss progress with the Local Authorities Education Inclusion review. They will also discuss/agree their work programme for the year.

d) Local Service Board (convener: Cllr Mike Day)

The Panel met on 12 May and received information about the Local Service Board (LSB) Delivery Framework, which is the document that is used to monitor progress against the LSB's priorities. They also had a further development session with Rebecca David-Knight from the Centre for Public Scrutiny, looking at a Return on Investment approach to scrutiny.

The next Panel meeting will take place on 23 June. The Panel have invited representatives from the statutory LSB partners (including the Local Authority, AMBU Health Board, SCVS and South Wales Police)

to attend to discuss their various roles in relation to delivering LSB priorities.

3. **Working Groups:**

A number of topics have been identified which will be dealt with through one-off Working Groups.

a) **Planning Services** (convener: Cllr Mark Thomas)

The Panel will meet on 10 June to look further at the issues it explored in December 2013 regarding planning enforcement, the performance of the Planning Area Committees and to monitor Planning Service performance indicators.

b) the following Working Groups will be convened in the next few months:

- **Car Parks** (convener: Cllr Tony Colburn) – this will be to discuss provision across Swansea, performance, and plans for improvement
- **Local Flood Risk Management** (convener: Cllr Susan Jones) – this will be a further meeting, following initial meeting in January 2013, to discuss Environment Agency flood risk and flood hazard maps and specific areas of risk. The Council has not yet received the maps in a format which can be used. It is likely that information will be ready to be presented to scrutiny by the summer.

Appendix 4

Lead Scrutiny Councillor / Officer Contacts:

Activity	Lead Councillor	Lead Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Programme Committee	Mike Day mike.day@swansea.gov.uk	Brij Madahar (01792 637257) brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk
<u>Inquiry Panels:</u>		
Inward Investment What can the Council do to influence inward investment into Swansea and the South West Wales region?	Jeff Jones jeff.w.jones@swansea.gov.uk	Michelle Roberts (01792 637256) michelle.roberts@swansea.gov.uk
Streetscene How well does the Council maintain and keep clean the roads, footways and verges in Swansea, and what changes should it make?	John Bayliss john.bayliss@swansea.gov.uk	Delyth Davies (01792 637491) delyth.davies@swansea.gov.uk
Public Engagement How can the Council improve its engagement practices with the public, staff and external stakeholders?	Joe Hale joe.hale@swansea.gov.uk	Delyth Davies (01792 637491) delyth.davies@swansea.gov.uk
Social Care at Home How can Swansea Council and its partners support people to enable them to remain in their own homes?	Jane Harris jane.harris@swansea.gov.uk	Dave Mckenna (01792 636090) dave.mckenna@swansea.gov.uk
<u>Inquiry Panels (follow up)</u>		
Tourism	John Newbury john.newbury@swansea.gov.uk	Michelle Roberts (01792 637256) michelle.roberts@swansea.gov.uk

Services for Looked After Children	Ceinwen Thomas ceinwen.thomas@swansea.gov.uk	Delyth Davies (01792 637491) delyth.davies@swansea.gov.uk
Affordable Housing	Terry Hennegan terry.hennegan@swansea.gov.uk	Rosie Jackson (01792 636292) rosie.jackson@swansea.gov.uk
Public Transport	John Newbury john.newbury@swansea.gov.uk	Delyth Davies (01792 637491) delyth.davies@swansea.gov.uk
Attainment & Wellbeing	Fiona Gordon fiona.gordon@swansea.gov.uk	Michelle Roberts (01792 637256) michelle.roberts@swansea.gov.uk
Economic Inactivity	Chris Holley chris.holley@swansea.gov.uk	tbc
<u>Performance Panels:</u>		
Wellbeing	Paxton Hood-Williams paxton.hood-williams@swansea.gov.uk	Delyth Davies (01792 637491) delyth.davies@swansea.gov.uk
Service Improvement & Finance	Mary Jones mary.jones@swansea.gov.uk	Rosie Jackson (01792 636292) rosie.jackson@swansea.gov.uk
Schools	tbc	Michelle Roberts (01792 637256) michelle.roberts@swansea.gov.uk
Local Service Board (multi-agency)	Mike Day mike.day@sswansea.gov.uk	Rosie Jackson (01792 636292) rosie.jackson@swansea.gov.uk
<u>Working Groups:</u>		

Planning Services	Mark Thomas mark.thomas2@swansea.gov.uk	Rosie Jackson (01792 636292) rosie.jackson@swansea.gov.uk
Local Flood Risk Management	Susan Jones susan.m.jones@swansea.gov.uk	Rosie Jackson (01792 636292) rosie.jackson@swansea.gov.uk
Car Parking	Tony Colburn tony.colburn@swansea.gov.uk	tbc

Agenda Item 7

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee – 9 June 2014

MEMBERSHIP OF SCRUTINY PANELS AND WORKING GROUPS

Purpose	The Scrutiny Programme Committee is responsible for appointing members and conveners to the various scrutiny panels / working groups that are established. This report advises of changes that need to be agreed.
Content	The report relates to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Schools Performance Panel• Wellbeing Performance Panel• Service Improvement & Finance Performance Panel
Councillors are being asked to	approve the changes to membership detailed in the report
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee
Lead Officer & Report Author	Brij Madahar, Overview & Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Programme Committee is responsible for appointing members and conveners to the various scrutiny panels / working groups that are established.

2. Changes to Membership

- 2.1 The committee is asked to agree the following changes:

a) Schools Scrutiny Performance Panel:

REMOVE Councillor Jennifer Raynor
ADD Councillor Penny Matthews

Following this change the revised Panel membership will be 12 (including co-opted members) as follows:

Labour Councillors: 6

Mandy Evans	Penny Matthews
Beverley Hopkins	Hazel Morris
Fiona Gordon	Jane Harris

Liberal Democrat Councillors: 3

Mike Day	Cheryl Philpott
Paul Meara	

Conservative Councillor: 1

Anthony Colburn	

Statutory Coopted Members: 2

Sarah Joiner	Parent Governor
David Anderson-Thomas	Parent Governor

(NOTE: New Convener to be appointed)

b) Wellbeing Scrutiny Performance Panel:

REMOVE Councillor Ann Cook

ADD Councillor David Lewis

Following this change the revised Panel membership will be 16 councillors as follows:

Labour Councillors: 12

Uta Clay	David Lewis
John Davies	Hazel Morris
Mandy Evans	Jennifer Raynor
Jane Harris	Paulette Smith
Yvonne Jardine	Gloria Tanner
Erika Kirchner	Ceinwen Thomas

Liberal Democrat Councillors: 2

Chris Holley	June Stanton
--------------	--------------

Independent Councillor: 1

Susan Jones	
-------------	--

Conservative Councillor: 1

Paxton Hood-Williams (CONVENER)	
--	--

c) Service Improvement & Finance Scrutiny Performance Panel:

REMOVE Councillor David Lewis

ADD Councillor Philip Downing

ADD Councillor Joe Hale

Following this change the revised Panel membership will be 13 councillors as follows:

Labour Councillors: 6

Philip Downing	Robert Smith
Joe Hale	Des Thomas
Jane Harris	Mark Thomas

Liberal Democrat Councillors: 4

Chris Holley	Mary Jones (CONVENER)
Jeff Jones	Cheryl Philpott

Independent Councillor: 1

Lynda James	
-------------	--

Conservative Councillors: 2

Anthony Colburn	Paxton Hood-Williams
-----------------	----------------------

3. Legal Implications

3.1 There are no specific legal implications raised by this report.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no specific financial implications raised by this report.

Background Papers: None

Date: 28 May 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard

Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee – 9 June 2014

SCRUTINY LETTERS

Purpose	To ensure the committee is aware of the scrutiny letters produced following various scrutiny activities, and responses to date.
Content	The report will include a log of scrutiny letters that are produced this year and provide a copy of recent correspondence for discussion.
Councillors are being asked to	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review the scrutiny letters and responses• Make comments, observations and recommendations as necessary
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee
Lead Officer(s)	Dean Taylor, Director – Corporate Services
Report Author	Brij Madahar, Overview & Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The production of scrutiny letters has become an established part of the way scrutiny operates in Swansea. Letters from the chair (or conveners) allow scrutiny to communicate directly and quickly with relevant cabinet members.
- 1.2 These letters are used to convey views and conclusions about particular issues discussed and provide the opportunity to raise concerns, ask for further information, and make recommendations. This enables scrutiny to engage with Cabinet Members on a regular and structured basis.
- 1.3 Scrutiny letters, whether they are written by the Programme Committee or conveners of panels / working groups, are published in the committee agenda to ensure awareness and enable the committee to comment on the response to the matters raised, as well as to ensure visibility across the council and public.

1.4 As the current municipal year progresses this report will contain a log of scrutiny letters produced to enable the committee to maintain an overview of this activity over the year – see **Appendix 1**. It also provides for discussion a copy of full correspondence of recent letters where cabinet member responses were awaited and have now been received or where a scrutiny letter did not require a response:

- a) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 3 February)
- b) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 17 March).
- c) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 7 April).
- d) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 28 April).
- e) Letter to Cabinet Member for Wellbeing (Wellbeing Performance Panel Meeting – 12 May) – no response was required
- f) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Place (Committee Meeting – 17 February).
- g) Letter to/from Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Committee Meeting – 17 March).

1.5 Where requested, Cabinet Members are expected to respond in writing to scrutiny letters within one month. The response should indicate what action (if any) they intend to take as a result of the views and recommendations made.

2. Legal Implications

2.1 There are no legal implications.

3. Financial Implications

3.1 There are no financial implications.

Background Papers: None

2 June 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard

Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Appendix 1

Scrutiny Letters Log (May 2014 – April 2015):

Responses Outstanding from 2013-14:

No.	Committee / Panel / Working Group	Main Issue(s)	Cabinet Portfolio	Letter Sent	Response Received	Reported to Committee
2014/13	Schools Performance Panel (6 Feb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dunvant Primary School 	Learning & Skills	18 Feb		
2014/18	Working Group (3 Feb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Buildings 	Place / Regeneration	25 Mar		
2014/23	Service Improvement & Finance Performance Panel (10 April)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance Monitoring – 3rd Quarter Performance Monitoring – 3rd Quarter Policy Commitments Tracker 	Anti-Poverty / Finance & Resources / Regeneration / Place Sustainability / Target Areas / Children & Young People	6 May		

Page 43

Letters since 8 May 2014:

No.	Committee / Panel / Working Group	Main Issue(s)	Cabinet Portfolio	Letter Sent	Response Received	Reported to Committee
14/15-1	Wellbeing Performance Panel (12 May)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telecare & Community Alarm Service 	Wellbeing	13 May	N/A	

Agenda Item 8a



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

Dinas A Sir Abertawe

Councillor Mark Child
Cabinet Member, Well Being
Civic Centre
Oystermouth Road
SWANSEA
SA1 3SN

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

*Direct Line:
Linell Uniogyrochol:*

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

**Overview &
Scrutiny**

01792 637491

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

CFS/11

4 February 2014

Dear Councillor Child

Well Being Performance Panel, 3rd February, 2014

The Panel met on 3rd February to consider the provision of the telecare and community alarm services in Swansea.

The panel welcomed the opportunity to provide its views on the community alarm and telecare services. Broadly the panel felt that the community alarm services was a good service that needed to be retained but that it did not know enough about the service or telecare to provide a detailed view. The panel agreed it needed further information before it provided its views. The further information required by the panel is:

- Details on the total running cost of the community alarm service
- Total income generated from users of the community alarm and telecare services
- Disaggregated costs of the community alarm and telecare costs
- Take up of each service
- What does the £240,000 Council subsidy cover?
- Spot purchasing expenditure (Tunstall and Care & Repair)
- How many calls are received at the Carmarthenshire call centre from Swansea residents – nightly demand


Once the panel has received this information, it will re-consider the report and provide you with its views.

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe
Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN

I hope you find this letter useful and informative and I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully



COUNCILLOR PAXTON HOOD-WILLIAMS
CONVENOR, CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES PERFORMANCE PANEL

✉ PAXTON.HOOD-WILLIAMS@SWANSEA.GOV.UK

CC: CABINET MEMBER

CAROL REA – HEAD OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams
City & County of Swansea

Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:
Direct Line:
Linell
Uniongyrchol:

Councillor Mark Child
(01792) 637441

E-Mail / E-Bost:

mark.child@swansea.gov.uk

Our Ref / Ein
Cyf:

MC/VHD

Your Ref / Eich
Cyf:
Date / Dyddiad:

27th March 2014

If you require this or any other information in another format e.g. Braille, audio tape or a different language, please contact me

Dear Councillor Hood-Williams,

Re: Well Being Performance Panel 3rd February

Further to your letter of 4th February, I am now able to provide you with the information requested to assist the panel in forming its view on the Community Alarm/Telecare service in Swansea.

I should begin by advising the panel that the Community Alarm and Telecare service is a single service and that Telecare (i.e. the provision of a range of specialist sensors which can be used to monitor health safety and wellbeing) will generally rely on the provision of the base Community Alarm (Lifeline) service which acts to connect the individual sensor to the community alarm call centre. It is not therefore possible to disaggregate the costs to any meaningful extent. I can however, provide the panel with the overall costs of running the current service.

-1-

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☒ (01792) 636196

✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

The headline budget for the current year and for 2014/15 is outlined below:

Budget 2013/14	Community Alarm Service	Budget 2014/15
£152,500	EMPLOYEES	£89,983
£0	PREMISES	£9,590
£2,100	TRANSPORT	£5,718
£228,400	SUPPLIES & SERVICES	£263,220
£179,000	THIRD PARTY PAYMENTS	£154,500
£235,500	INTERNAL DEBITS	£5,900
-£10,700	INTERNAL CREDITS	-£10,700
£786,800	GROSS EXPENDITURE	£518,211
-	INCOME	-
£559,900	Income less Expenditure	£353,628
£226,900		£164,583

The total income from current individual subscribers is currently estimated to be around £319,000 per annum. The figures above do not take into account the proposed changes to subscriber charges which will commence in June 2014.

There are currently around 8000 users of the service. Approximately 6000 of these users are individual subscribers – the remaining 2000 being tenants of sheltered housing schemes for whom the service provides back up support during the absence of the warden of the scheme. Of the 6000 individual subscribers approximately 500 also benefit from installed Telecare Sensors.

-2-

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
 SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
 ✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

The Council 'subsidy', which for this year is likely to be around £226,000 is the balance required once all income is received to run the service.

The Service currently procures the items of installed equipment via a framework agreement and therefore only purchases on a 'spot-purchasing' basis some limited maintenance and repair work from Care & Repair Swansea (around £30,000 this year) There are a few external contracts for provision of specialist support, such as maintenance of infrastructure equipment and out of hours maintenance which amount to a further £64,500 this year.

I also include a breakdown of calls received at the Carmarthen Call Centre from Swansea Residents for the period from 1st April 2013 to 28th February 2014. You might find this a more helpful analysis than any attempt to determine nightly demand on the Call Centre. This is because the call centre receives a significant level of contacts throughout the day and night and it is important to understand that requests from users of the service who might have fallen, become unwell or require other assistance or from Telecare devices which detect smoke, extreme temperature, unusual movements etc. could trigger a call to the centre at any time.

I hope that this response fully covers all outstanding matters.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING

-3-

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

Dinas A Sir Abertawe

Councillor Mark Child
Cabinet Member, Well Being
Civic Centre
Oystermouth Road
SWANSEA
SA1 3SN

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

**Overview &
Scrutiny**

*Direct Line:
Linell Uniogyrochol:*

01792 637491

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

CFS/10

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

18 March 2014

Dear Councillor Child

Well Being Performance Panel on 17 March 2014

The Panel met on 17 March 2014 to consider the Child and Family Services performance monitoring report with Dave Howes, Head of Child and Family Services and Simon Jones, Performance and Improvements.

Child and Family Services Performance Report – January 2014

The panel welcomed the opportunity to challenge performance in this area. Overall, the set of figures presented in January's report were very encouraging. The panel acknowledged that there had been good levels of improvement in performance over the year. The panel agreed that the Safe Looked After Children Reduction Strategy was a coherent and joined up strategy that had begun to produce positive results.

After reviewing the report provided and discussing the issues with officers the panel wished to highlight that:

- Although numbers of looked after children have stabilised, the panel remained concerned about the numbers of looked after children overall, and in particular at some schools in Swansea. Resources need to be targeted at the areas of greatest need.
- There must be sufficient levels of support for Special Guardians, including financial, training and social worker support to ensure that permanence is maintained

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe
Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN

- Looked After Children who reside in a particular area are often sent to schools outside of their area and this could have a negative impact on their friendship groups and socialisation. There needs to be a greater understanding of this and the factors which influence it.
- The panel required further information on the legal definitions of the different types of orders, legal frameworks and classes of children that are supported by Child and Family Services
- Unallocated cases amongst Children in Need and Looked After Children remained a concern of the panel, and in particular the length of time that cases were unallocated.
- The panel was concerned that no reason had been given for 9 children not being seen during their initial assessment.
- The potential for 50 new born babies requiring social services intervention in the coming months meant that new and appropriate mother and baby services would need to be developed.
- Children should not remain on the Child Protection Register for too long and that systems and scrutiny set up to ensure this did not happen were robust.
- The increase in the numbers and different types of foster carers was very positive.
- The large cohort of looked after children will transition to care leavers over the next few years and will require a range of support services to ensure that they are able to begin adult lives which are independent and successful.
- The panel was pleased to see that supervision levels had improved since the last quarterly check on performance in this area, but there still remained room for improvement.
- The panel was pleased to see that Child & Family Services had no agency workers. This was good in terms of the financial position and stability of the department.

Safe Looked After Children Reduction Strategy

- The panel was pleased to see that the total number of children becoming looked after to date had fallen in comparison with the same time last year. The panel was also pleased that the total number of children ceasing to be looked after had increased since the same time last year.
- Performance needed to be improved in adoption orders granted and adoptive parents approved as there are high demands across the region for this.
- The legal position of Special Guardians and their recourse to the “skills allowance” that is paid to foster carers needs to be clarified to mitigate the risk of legal challenge.

Performance Indicators

- The panel expects to see an improvement in performance over the coming months in the following performance indicators and a move from the “red” status:
 - timing of initial core group meetings held within 10 days of the initial case conference

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe

Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN

- percentage of looked after children with a PEP
- health assessments for looked after children


As a result of the issues highlighted above, the Head of Child and Family Services agreed:

- to look into the factors that influence the decisions to place looked after children in schools that are not in the areas where they live and report back to the panel
- to circulate the revised information on the reasons that 9 children were not seen during their Initial Assessment.
- to provide the panel with the legal definitions of the different types of orders, legal frameworks and classes of children that are supported by Child and Family Services
- to provide an analysis of the amount of time that cases remain unallocated and an explanation of what it means for a case to be unallocated.

The panel looks forward to your attendance at its final meeting of the year on 7th April.

I hope you find this letter useful and informative and look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR PAXTON HOOD-WILLIAMS
CONVENOR, CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES PERFORMANCE PANEL
✉ PAXTON.HOOD-WILLIAMS@SWANSEA.GOV.UK

CC: CABINET MEMBER
DAVE HOWES – HEAD OF CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES
CAROL REA – HEAD OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams
City & County of Swansea

Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:
Direct Line:
Llinell
Uniongyrochol:

Councillor Mark Child
(01792) 637441

E-Mail / E-Bost:

mark.child@swansea.gov.uk

Our Ref / Ein
Cyf:

MC/SH

Your Ref / Eich
Cyf:
Date / Dyddiad:

30 May 2014

If you require this or any other information in another format e.g. Braille, audio tape or a different language, please contact me

Dear Councillor Hood-Williams

Well Being Performance Panel on 17 March 2014

Thank you for your letter of 14th March and I apologise for the delay in getting back to you.

I note your comments that the Safe LAC Reduction Strategy is coherent and delivering desired outcomes. Whilst overall numbers of LAC are still high, reduction is the largest drop ever recorded, not that that is any reason for complacency.

As children "come home" there will be a tendency to concentrate more, and particularly as LAC tend to come from certain areas of Swansea, school catchment areas. This will lead to numbers in some schools rising and Social Services, Education and the school do need to be aware of any effect this may have.

The alternative is to place children in new schools, perhaps in the catchment area they are fostered. This is not done without there being good reasons. Normally the aim is to maintain as many familiar and safe factors in the child's life as possible when they become looked after. However, maintaining a school placement is not always in the best interest of the child, and many other factors need to be weighed when deciding which school is best for a child, often as ordinary parents do.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☒ (01792) 636196

✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 2 -

Permanence is vital for children, and support for Special Guardians, whilst not always the same as for Foster Carers, needs to be sufficient to ensure children are safe and secure. The current review of the Permanence Service includes a focus on ensuring the right supports are in place for Special Guardians.

Payment and other support for Special Guardians is currently subject to a legal case, and we will wait for the ruling. However, the LGA is supporting the current difference, as there is clearly a difference between the two groups; Foster Carers and Special Guardians, and treating them both the same, rather than equitably, would be very costly, and may even jeopardise the progress we have made with Foster Swansea.

I note that the Panel has agreed a series of actions with the Head of Service to allow for further scrutiny of various issues that emerged during the discussion about the Performance report.

The large number of babies expected is reflected in the proposed Regional Adoption Service having a specific target to increase the numbers of adopters across the region. Also a number of the expectant mothers are using the "Baby Steps" program run by the NSPCC to help vulnerable mothers.

I agree that children should not remain on the Child Protection Register for too long, and understand that cases are regularly reviewed to ensure the appropriate level of safeguarding is in place.

It is hoped some of the large cohort of children will no longer be looked after before they reach transition, and I also hope the quality of Fostering will also help reduce each individual's need for assistance when they start adult lives. However there does need to be awareness of this level of demand. This can be a very difficult time and the Panel is right to ask that we ensure sufficient resources are in place to cope with the number of children involved.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☏ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 3 -

I note that performance in relation to PEPs, Health Assessments and the timeliness of Core Groups are expected to improve. In relation to the Education & Health Performance indicators, Panel may wish to explore further with those Partners responsible for performance against those indicators.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☒ (01792) 636196

✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

Dinas A Sir Abertawe

Councillor Mark Child
Cabinet Member, Wellbeing

BY EMAIL

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

*Direct Line:
Llinell Uniongyrochol:*

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

**Overview &
Scrutiny**

01792 637491

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

CFS/11

14 April 2014

Dear Councillor Child,

Wellbeing Scrutiny Performance Panel, 7 April 2014

On behalf of the Panel I would like to extend my thanks to you and the officers, Simon Jones and John Grenfell, for attending our meeting and engaging in a comprehensive discussion about the issues we raised.

Session with Cabinet Member for Wellbeing

Transformation of Adult Services (TASS)

You were invited to attend the meeting in order to provide further details on the Transformation of Adult Social Services (TASS). You advised us that the process had stalled somewhat in several key areas due to the feedback received during the budget consultation process, namely residential care, respite care and day care services.

You informed us that the Council was currently consulting on a tender document, which was being developed to find a contractor who will carry out a public consultation exercise on the future of these services. You reassured us that a wide range of people have had the opportunity to be included in this process, including older people, councillors, local people, Trade Unions, a Housing Association representative, a Residential Home provider and representatives from the Third Sector. We are keen to ensure that the scrutiny can input into the consultation process once it commences, and therefore we wish to be kept updated on the progress of the consultation advised when it is appropriate for the Panel to give its views.

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe
Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN

Community Connectors

We were told that other areas within the TASS umbrella continue to develop well including, the Re-ablement Service, Community Connectors, and projects to increase joint working with Health such as the Joint Integrated Gower Team.

We were particularly interested to hear about the work of the Community Connectors and the methods by which their impact has been measured. We were advised that the indications so far were that the project has been a success. However, we felt that more work is required in order to develop measures to demonstrate their value. We would encourage the department to ensure that a review of the Community Connector posts is carried out. In the meantime we would like to be provided with the early evaluation report that has already been undertaken.

Availability of day services

We discussed with you our concerns around the continued availability of Day Services, and wish to re-state how important we feel these services are for older people and their carers. We noted with interest your comments around the nature of the challenges facing the Council, namely reducing budgets, increasing levels of need and changing expectations, which mean that we are required to find alternative means of providing the support that people need, and that Social Services cannot be the only recourse. We understand that the agenda behind TASS is to address these issues. However, we are concerned that the alternative ideas for service provision will not be in place before decisions are taken to end services. We trust that these issues will be well covered by the consultation exercise that is proposed. We would also like to know whether there are/or would be any contingency plans to deal with the risk of volunteers not coming forward to run specific day centres.

Service charges

You stated that serious consideration was being given to increasing service charges. You expressed concern that whilst during the pre-budget consultation people said that they would be prepared to pay more for services rather than lose them; whether in practice this would prove to be the case. Can you indicate to us which charges are being evaluated, in this respect, and your thoughts on full cost recovery for services provided, where legally allowable?

Strategic direction of TASS

Overall, we felt that whilst elements of TASS are progressing, more work should be done to ensure that there is a clear direction ahead, and for that reason we were concerned about the lack of an overall plan/strategy which clearly outlined the aims and objectives of TASS. You stated that whilst a plan/strategy as such does not exist you would be able to provide us with the document that details the aims of TASS.

Areas for further efficiencies

You provided your observations on the areas that you felt could provide further efficiency savings including:

- Moving to an area based model for the provision of domiciliary care, which would reduce travelling time and increase the time available for care.
- Increasing the number of suppliers of domiciliary care in order to increase resilience to market failure, including increasing the Local Authority's current share of the market (currently around 12-15%)
- Increase joint working with health to reduce the number of people staying longer than needed in hospital and influencing health to consider moving some of the money saved into the social care budget to increase the level of preventative work that can take place. We were pleased to hear that funding has been obtained from the Innovation Fund to provide a post to work on this issue.

We will pass these observations onto the Social Care at Home Inquiry Panel.

Adult Services Monthly Performance Report

We were pleased to receive the Adult Services Monthly Performance report and we are grateful to the officers who attended for the advice and information they provided.

Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act

We discussed the Bill and the impact it will have on the Local Authority in providing effective information, advice and assistance service and the development of the National Outcomes Framework. We wish to be kept updated on the progress of the implementation of the requirements of the Act.

Breakdown of referral figures

It would be useful to receive a breakdown of the referral figures into the various categories as an overall figure does not provide us with an indication of the level of demand on Social Services.

Delays in transfer of care

We looked at the indicators for delays in transfer of care. We felt that it would be useful to have a wider range of figures reported rather than the snap shot figure, for example the total number of delayed transfers of care in the month, and the length of time people are waiting. This would provide a more accurate picture.

Carers Assessments

We were advised that 97% of all carers are offered an assessment. Whilst this is a high level we believe that the number of carers who take up the offer of an assessment would be a more meaningful indicator, and should be monitored as well.

Flow Chart

We agreed that it would be useful to be provided with a flow chart that detailed the processes within Adult Social Services, along the same lines as the one created for Child & Family Services.

Data

We would like to receive more information regarding the number of people in the various age categories and the predicted rises. It would also be useful for us to receive information regarding the anticipated increases in levels of ill-health so we can better understand the pressures that the Authority is facing.

Swansea Safeguarding Adults Report Card

Unfortunately time did not allow us to discuss the report card in detail, therefore we will discuss this at our next meeting.

Work plan

We will be discussing and agreeing our work plan for the forthcoming year at our next meeting on 28th April and will share this with you in due course. The Panel will continue to meet on a fortnightly basis, looking at Adult and Child & Family Social Services on an alternate basis.


Summary of recommendations

- Ensure that the Panel is kept updated on the progress of the consultation on the future of residential and day care services and advised when it is appropriate for us to input into the process.
- Ensure that a review of the Community Connector posts is carried out and the meantime provide the Panel with the early evaluation report that has already been undertaken.
- Advise the Panel on whether there are/or would be any contingency plans to deal with the risk of volunteers not coming forward to run specific day centres.
- Provide the Panel with details of which service charges are being evaluated, and your thoughts on full cost recovery for services provided, where legally allowable.
- Provide the Panel with the relevant documentation that outlines the aims of TASS.
- Keep the Panel updated with the Authority's progress in implementing the requirements of the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act.
- Provide a breakdown of the Adults Services referral figures.
- Provide further indicators for delayed transfers of care.
- Provide figures on the number of carers who take up the offer of an assessment.

- Provide a flow chart detailing the Adult Social Services processes.
- Provide the Panel with data regarding the number of people in various age categories and predicted rises, and anticipated levels on increased ill-health.

I hope you find this letter useful and informative and I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully



COUNCILLOR PAXTON HOOD-WILLIAMS
CONVENOR, WELLBEING SCRUTINY PERFORMANCE PANEL
✉ PAXTON.HOOD-WILLIAMS@SWANSEA.GOV.UK



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams
City & County of Swansea

Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:
Direct Line:
Llinell
Uniongyrochol:

Councillor Mark Child
(01792) 637441

E-Mail / E-Bost:

mark.child@swansea.gov.uk

Our Ref / Ein
Cyf:

MC/SH

Your Ref / Eich
Cyf:
Date / Dyddiad:

1 May 2014

If you require this or any other information in another format e.g. Braille, audio tape or a different language, please contact me

Dear Councillor Hood-Williams,

Re: Well Being Performance Panel 7 April 2014

Thank you for your letter of 14th April.

Thank you for the offer of involvement in the independent review of Older Peoples services to meet the challenges of the future. As well as any relevant Scrutiny reports, it is also important the review has active involvement from councillors. This can be through the whole council, through political parties and I would like it to directly take evidence from Scrutiny. I'm not sure of the protocol, whether it is for you to invite or the investigator to request but I want input from scrutiny to feature. I hope the investigation in to Domiciliary Care provision in Swansea will be complete in time to be included as evidence too. I will be happy to keep you up to date with the process, although clearly I will not be able to comment on the outcome until the process is complete.

I am happy to share with you the earlier report on the effectiveness of Community Connectors, and following our conversation I realise that although difficult to put a numerical, statistical value on how their work is enabling people and helping them sustain their lives with none or little Social Services intervention is difficult, a further effort to evidence their valuable work is needed.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 2 -

With regard to day services, it has been a constant refrain since the start of discussions on the future of the Councils provision that nothing will change unless there is a suitable alternative in place for people, and I am happy to repeat that now. Of course now we will wait for the outcome of the independent review before coming forward with any plans to change. However, there is no doubt that work will be required to find alternatives for people. That is not to say that there are not already alternatives available for many who attend day centres, but not for all. In particular we need to ensure that those carers who get respite whilst the ones they care for are attending a day centre get their needs fully considered. The point you make about volunteers, is in essence covered by the first statement, that no change will take place unless suitable alternatives are in place. Obviously, should the aim to find alternatives be carried forward, then a number of efforts will need to be made, to speak to existing community provision about expanding, to speak with the third sector about what they may wish and be able to provide.

With regard to service charges; currently the Telecare service is moving to full cost recovery. It was clear, as you say, that a number of expressions of willingness to pay towards the cost of services were made during the budget consultation exercise. We are not currently reviewing the pricing structure of other services, although you will be aware that the contract for the provision of community meals ends in May and will not be renewed. This will leave those individuals who choose to continue to receive a home meal delivery to pay the full cost for this support.

You may be aware that a presentation on the overall aims and objectives of the Transformation programme (TASS) has been made jointly to the Executive Board and Cabinet. This presentation has been updated and you might find it helpful to have the same presentation given by an officer to your Board.

Adult Monthly Performance Report

Happy to keep the Board updated on progress of the implementation of the Care and Wellbeing Bill.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 3 -

I am enclosing some information about the breakdown of referrals and service provision for your information. These are both tabular and graphical representations broken down by age range, which I hope you will find useful.

The figures for delay in leaving care are the statutory ones the Council has to report on, but you are correct that there are a number of ways of looking at this matter, and I will see if the total number of delays in transfer each month can be gained as well as the duration of those delays.

You requested information on the numbers of carers receiving an assessment and I have been provided with the statement which I believe has already been given to the scrutiny panel on provision of care at home, namely:

'There have been 2093 carers identified on our systems for the period 1st April 2013 to 28th February 2014. Of these cares 2002 were offered a carers assessment and 611 received an assessment'.

We will try and produce the flow chart requested along the lines of that provided by Steve Walker for Children's services. It may be useful if a copy of that chart were provided as a better guide of what is expected.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING


COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN


☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk


Referrals by Age Group: 2013/2014

	Adults Under 65	65-74	75-84	85-plus	All Age Groups
Adult Care Management	1,361	1,145	1,955	1,929	6,390
Adult Service Provision	134	278	726	964	2,102
Learning Disability Services	432	33	10	6	481
Mental Health Services	2,444	128	33	13	2,618
Younger Disabled Adult Services	358	87	155	171	771
All Adult Services	4,729	1,671	2,879	3,083	12,362



Age Group of People Referred to All Adult Services 2013/14





Agenda Item 8d



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

Dinas A Sir Abertawe

Councillor Mark Child
Cabinet Member, Well Being
Civic Centre
Oystermouth Road
SWANSEA
SA1 3SN

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

**Overview &
Scrutiny**

*Direct Line:
Linell Uniogyrochol:*

01792 637491

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

CFS/12

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

1 May 2014

Dear Councillor Child

Well Being Performance Panel on 28 April 2014

The Panel met on 28 April 2014 to consider the Safeguarding Adults Score Card and to draft its work plan for the coming year.

The panel also discussed a number of Convener's letters and your responses and there are a number of issues for you to be aware of. These are

- The panel was grateful for the additional information provided on Telecare and the Community Alarm Service. You will see from the attached draft work plan that the panel intends to take a detailed look at this when it next meets on May 12th.
- The panel was concerned about the process by which the specification for a tender document was developed to find an independent contractor to carry out consultations on the future of the delivery of adult services. The panel agreed that it wanted to see the specification document and the review report before any decision is taken. This will enable scrutiny to contribute its views prior to a Cabinet decision.

Safeguarding Adults Score Card

The panel had a number of concerns which are detailed below and we would welcome your comments and views on them.

- **Referrals**
 - Referrals have increased 50% between 2012/13 and 2013/14. We seek assurance that you will analyse the data to fully understand the reasons for the increase. We also ask whether

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe
Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN

you are satisfied that you have sufficient staffing resource to manage the increase in referrals


- The number of referrals from provider agencies and those which meet the threshold have increased. It was suggested that this is an indication of risk averse practices within provider agencies. It is vital, given the authority's recent history of inappropriate referrals to Child and Family Services, you ensure that partner agencies understand what is an "appropriate" safeguarding referral and what can be dealt with through their own processes. Please inform the panel how plan to approach this issue and tackle risk averse practices.
- **Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard**
 - This will mean an increase in workload in teams across adult services and legal. It will have an implication on resources in general and on assessment capacity resources. Please inform the panel how you plan to meet these resources pressures.
- **Headline indicator – SCA019 - % of referrals where risk is managed**
 - The panel would like to see this data trended in future performance monitoring reports.
- **Other data – Sources as % of all referrals 2013/14**
 - There are some discrepancies in the data. Please ensure that the figures are clarified in the next report that is presented to the panel.

Draft work plan

The panel's draft work plan for 2014/15 is attached and we would welcome your comments and views. We have built in a degree of flexibility into our work plan to ensure that we have capacity to respond quickly to important issues as and when they arise.

I hope you find this letter useful and informative and look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR PAXTON HOOD-WILLIAMS
CONVENOR, CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES PERFORMANCE PANEL
✉ PAXTON.HOOD-WILLIAMS@SWANSEA.GOV.UK

CC: **CABINET MEMBER**
DAVE HOWES – HEAD OF CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES
CAROL REA – HEAD OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe
Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams
City & County of Swansea

Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:
Direct Line:
Linell
Uniongyrochol:

Councillor Mark Child
(01792) 637441

E-Mail / E-Bost:

mark.child@swansea.gov.uk

Our Ref / Ein
Cyf:

MC/SH

Your Ref / Eich
Cyf:
Date / Dyddiad:

23 May 2014

If you require this or any other information in another format e.g. Braille, audio tape or a different language, please contact me

Dear Councillor Hood-Williams,

Well Being Performance Panel on 28 April 2014

Thank you for your letter of 1st May relating to the panel meeting of 28th April.

I will send the Performance Panel the final specification document for your information as soon as it has been agreed. As you may know it is on the forward look to go to Corporate Briefing on 10th June and Cabinet on 1st July for information. In parallel it will be advertised for interested parties to bid for.

Safeguarding Adults Score Card

Referrals –

In 2012/13 there were 956 referrals, in 13-14 there were 1338 referrals up to the end of February. There has been a significant increase and the council is working hard to understand the reasons for this but clearly some increases link to an increased knowledge of the safeguarding process amongst provider agencies which the greatest source of referrals.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 2 -

There are currently 31 designated lead managers within Adult Services and we anticipate training 4/5 more shortly. We are confident that this is sufficient staffing resource to manage the workload.

With reference to the appropriateness of safeguarding referrals, work is undertaken with provider agencies to enable them to understand what should be dealt with through the assessment and care management process and what should be referred for a potential safeguarding investigation. It is often a difficult balance to achieve but the view is that this is best addressed through the ongoing training programme.

Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard –

Designated admin resources have been made available to process the high volume of applications, additional accredited best interest assessor training has been secured to increase the pool of staff available and appropriately trained external people are being commissioned to undertake assessments.

SCA019 – Yes, this will be trended for you in future.

Other data – I have asked that those discrepancies identified by the panel be corrected in future.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
MARK CHILD
CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LES

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637441 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ mark.child@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

Agenda Item 8e



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

Dinas A Sir Abertawe

Councillor Mark Child
Cabinet Member, Well Being
Civic Centre
Oystermouth Road
SWANSEA
SA1 3SN

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

**Overview &
Scrutiny**

*Direct Line:
Linell Uniogyrochol:*

01792 637491

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

CFS/01

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

13 May 2014

Dear Councillor Child

Well Being Performance Panel on 12 May 2014

The Panel met on 12 May 2014 to consider the additional information you provided on Telecare and the Community Alarm Service.

The panel was concerned about the quality and accuracy of the financial information which pertained to the Community Alarm Service; it felt that further detail was needed to fully understand the true cost and provision of the service. It was disappointed that inaccurate data had been presented to the panel.

The Panel agreed that the analysis of the type of calls received at the Carmarthen call centre was confusing and it felt unable to determine the true volume of calls made to the call centre by Swansea residents.

The panel agreed that a more detailed breakdown of the budget and the total expenditure of the service was needed, ie, supplies & services and Third Party Payments. It also requested that the number of calls made to the Carmarthen call centre by Swansea service users be disaggregated from the figures previously supplied.

The panel rescheduled this discussion for the meeting of the 16th June when it will also discuss the Adult Services quarterly performance report. The panel would like to invite you to this meeting to held at 2pm in Committee Room 3.

I hope you find this letter useful and informative and look forward welcoming you to meeting next month.

Overview & Scrutiny / Trosolwg a chraffu

City and County of Swansea / Dinas a Sir Abertawe
Civic Centre, Swansea, SA1 3SN / Canolfan Ddinesig, Abertawe, SA1 3SN

Yours sincerely

Paxton Hood-Williams

COUNCILLOR PAXTON HOOD-WILLIAMS
CONVENOR, CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES PERFORMANCE PANEL

✉ PAXTON.HOOD-WILLIAMS@SWANSEA.GOV.UK

CC: CABINET MEMBER
DAVE HOWES – HEAD OF CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES
CAROL REA – HEAD OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

Agenda Item 8f



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

**To/
Councillor June Burtonshaw,
Cabinet Member for Place**

BY EMAIL

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

Scrutiny

*Direct Line:
Llinell Uniongyrochol:*

01792 637257

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

SPC/2013-14/12

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

31 March 2014

Dear Councillor Burtonshaw,

Cabinet Member Question Session – 17 February

Thank you for your attendance at the Scrutiny Programme Committee on 17 February 2014 and answering questions on your work as Cabinet Member for Place.

We were grateful for the detailed note you circulated of your portfolio responsibilities, key activities, achievements, and plans for the next 12 months. It was remarked how varied your portfolio responsibilities, covering a number of big services (including housing, planning, waste management, and highways) which could reasonably be under separate portfolios. However we acknowledged that this is a matter for the Leader of the Council to consider. We noted that you were working jointly with other cabinet members on certain aspects of your portfolio.

We thought it would be useful to write to you in order to reflect on what we learnt from the discussion, and share the views of the committee. A number of specific issues were discussed, which are summarised below:

Impact of Recent Poor Weather

Flooding: We asked about the impact of recent bad weather in terms of flooding and raised issues about the provision of sandbags. You clarified the circumstances under which the council would supply sandbags – flooding to council property or where highway flooding was responsible – and that Natural Resources Wales were responsible for dealing with river flooding. We asked whether in times of such emergency the authority could supply bags more widely but acknowledged the practical issues around this which you

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY / TROSOLWG A CHRAFFU

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA / DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

CIVIC CENTRE, SWANSEA, SA1 3SN / CANOLFAN DDINESIG, ABERTAWE, SA1 3SN

www.swansea.gov.uk

raised. You reiterated the advice to householders that they should be prepared to protect their properties from flooding. You may need to publicise the position so that people can put preventative measures in place.

Blowing Sand: With the heavy winds experienced in the area the issue of sand being blown from across Oystermouth Road was brought up and the impact on pedestrians and motorists alike. Your view on this was that the financial cost of any action would not outweigh the benefits for something whose occurrence was rare.

Dangerous Trees: We asked about the legal position with regard to dangerous trees and any damage to property caused. You invited councillors to alert you to any specific areas but clarified that it would depend on whether trees were on council land and any relevant Tree Protection Orders. Members expressed some concern about a lack of clarity about advice to the public and the point of contact for issues so that preventative action could be taken.

Waste Management

The committee was aware of the recent cabinet decision which is placing a limit to the number of black bags that a household can leave out for collection. The committee understands the need to improve the council's recycling performance and reduction of waste to landfill. The committee would stress the continued need to educate households in order to achieve the desired change. We asked how the new policy would be enforced. We anticipate that issues and complaints will arise in communities, such as residents dumping bags away from their own properties.

We also asked about efforts, and whether more could be done, to encourage commercial organisations to participate in waste segregation and recycling, for example fast food outlets.

Council Housing & Welsh Housing Quality Standard

We discussed progress in relation to delivering the Welsh Housing Quality Standard (WHQS) by 2020. We noted that a business plan for the WHQS has been prepared and accepted by Council and the Welsh Government and that plans were on track for 2020. We asked about the use of the housing revenue account reserves to deal with repairs over the last year and what has been achieved.

Public Transport

We asked about the relationship with First Cymru and the council's financial support for the retention of bus services. We asked about how you were considering the link between poor transport links and social exclusion. You highlighted recent initiatives including a reduction of charges for 16-18 year olds and the launch of a scheme which has involved the adaptation of council

vehicles out of hours to provide a transport system in North Gower, as one example of supporting non-commercial bus routes. You stated that you were working closely with community transport providers to extend public transport initiatives. We also asked what progress had been made on exploring the potential of a Quality Bus Contract / Partnership in Swansea. You confirmed that you and the Leader were in dialogue with First Cymru about this.

The issue of sustainability of the city centre was raised and we were interested in knowing how you were planning to improve safe cycling and walking routes through the city. You explained that a report would be coming forward shortly in respect of the High Street and that you were also looking at the infrastructure around the Sandfields area. We also talked about the importance of green space within the city centre and queried what ideas you had for achieving this.

We informed you that the committee had received correspondence from a member of the public which referred to public transport issues affecting a specific community in Fforestfach. We asked that you respond directly to the member of the public and would be grateful for confirmation that you have dealt with this matter.

Blue Badge Scheme

We talked about a large number of issues which have been raised following the introduction of new regulations and changes to the eligibility criteria across Wales. We asked whether you were looking at this. You explained that the authority had to follow Welsh Government Guidance but had fed back on the problems experienced and were awaiting their response.

District Heating Scheme

We noted that you were working with the Cabinet Member for Sustainability to look at how best to implement an innovative pilot district heating scheme. We were interested in what this entailed and understanding any specific plans.

Fracking / Underground Coal Gasification

In view of growing concern about the possibility of such activity in the area we recommended that you liaise with the Cabinet Member for Sustainability to arrange a councillor briefing session. It was felt that clarity was needed about the current position and possible impact in the area so that councillors are in a better position to respond to queries from concerned residents.

Suggestions for Scrutiny

We noted your suggestions for scrutiny to look at how to encourage more residents to recycle, and also you indicated a need for a review of residents' parking across Swansea e.g. what % of a street should be reserved for

residents, criteria for determining which streets have residents parking, management of remaining parking spaces, family visitors etc.

We would be a grateful for your response to this letter. It would be helpful to receive your reply to this letter by 30 April so that it can be included in the agenda of a future committee meeting at the earliest opportunity.

We also look forward to our next meeting with you to follow up on portfolio developments and achievements.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Mike Day'.

COUNCILLOR MIKE DAY

Chair, Scrutiny Programme Committee

✉ mike.day@swansea.gov.uk



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Councillor Mike Day
Chair, Scrutiny Programme Committee

Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:
Direct Line:
Llinell Uniongyrochol:

Councillor June Burtonshaw
(01792) 636926

E-Mail / E-Bost: June.burtonshaw@swansea.gov.uk
Our Ref / Ein Cyf: JEB/SH
Your Ref / Eich Cyf: SPC/2013-14/12
Date / Dyddiad: 29 April 2014

If you require this or any other information in another format e.g. Braille, audio tape or a different language, please contact me

Dear Cllr Mike Day

**Response to Scrutiny Programme Committee -
Cabinet Member Question Session - 17th February 2014**

Thank you for your letter in which you set down what you learnt from the discussion at the meeting. I am pleased that you found the meeting and the note I circulated useful. Whilst your letter does not ask for specific further clarification on the matters discussed I thought that in some areas I could provide you with some updated information.

In relation to responding to bad weather I have asked officers to review the information pertaining to poor weather, flooding and the provision of sand bags on the Council's web-site to ensure it is clear. On the specific issue of blowing sand a report on this matter has been considered, as this is becoming an increasing problem. This has resulted in an external expert on sand movements being engaged to produce a report. A balance is required between the ecology of the beach and the operational responsibilities of the Authority in terms of the highway and leisure use. A group of officers will be meeting in May to discuss the findings of the report. This matter is being led by Deborah Hill of the Conservation Team.

On the issue of dangerous trees I can confirm that the point of contact for all tree safety issues is the Parks Department. The Tree Service also operates an out of hours service (the contact number **out of hours** for dangerous/fallen trees is 07850 824951).

**COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
JUNE BURTONSHAW
CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LEOEDD**

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 636926 ☒ (01792) 636196
✉ june.burtonshaw@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk
Page 76

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 2 -

In terms of waste management I am delighted to report that we have now gone live with the three bag limit and the initial indications are that this is showing very positive results. In the first week of household waste collections since the limits were brought in, refuse crews picked up 69.3 tonnes less black bag waste than they did two weeks before the introduction of the limit. The primary focus of the campaign is on education and engagement with communities and this is going very well, with the message on the new limits seeming to have been taken up by communities. Where households are putting out more than three bags waste crews are putting stickers on the bags and then officers are speaking to the householders to advise them of the new limits. Any ongoing issues will be logged and where necessary officers will take action to establish the source of the waste.

On the commercial waste side we will shortly be introducing a system where we will require all commercial premises to separate out food waste from their waste prior to collection. We will also be targeting businesses that do not currently recycle and encourage them to take part, with an initial focus on cardboard recycling.

Your letter also references the outcomes that have been achieved in relation to the spend on repairs to our council housing stock. The 2013 /14 HRA Capital programme, which is projected to spend approx. £25.5m, has achieved the following headline outcomes (the figures are approximate as completions are still being formally recorded at the time of writing):

- The external refurbishment (wind and weatherproofing) of 309 properties
- The refurbishment of 111 non-traditional dwellings
- The installation of 230 new external doors
- The installation of 183 new kitchens and bathrooms
- The installation of 1,112 new boilers
- Electrical rewiring to 506 properties
- The replacement of 364 smoke alarms
- 343 roof renewals
- 594 property adaptations for tenants with a disability.

Funding for the HRA Capital programme is normally via a combination of Major Repairs Allowance (a Welsh Government capital grant), contributions from the revenue account, capital receipts and balances on the account (i.e. reserves).

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
JUNE BURTONSHAW
CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LEOEDD

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 636926 ✉ (01792) 636196

✉ june.burtonshaw@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

- 3 -

As approved by Council on the 18th February 2014, slippages in the 2013/14 programme (mainly as a result of the detailed preparations needed for the high rise refurbishment programme) meant that funding from reserves was not required. However, the approved 2014/15 programme of £38.5m will in part be funded by the full balance of reserves above the reasonable contingency level of £4m.

On public transport matters, since the meeting we have looked further at the Quality Bus Contract/Partnership for Swansea and it has been decided not to progress with the Quality Contract approach but to look at more informal partnerships with the bus company, like we currently use for the metro service.

I am pleased to report that the extension of cycling routes in the city centre has also been agreed. Further information and maps showing the proposed new routes are available from Ben George in the Transportation Team.

I can confirm that I have already responded by email to the question raised by the member of the public in relation the public transport issue in Fforestfach.

In terms of the District Heating Scheme, if you need further information on this the Cabinet Member for Sustainability will be able to assist.

I note your request for a councillor briefing session on the issue of fracking and underground coal gasification and I will speak to the Cabinet Member for Sustainability about the possibility of putting on an information session for councillors on this issue.

I hope this letter helps to clarify the issues raised, if you required anything further please let me know.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR JUNE BURTONSHAW
CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
JUNE BURTONSHAW
CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE
AELOD Y CABINET DROS LEOEDD

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 636926 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ june.burtonshaw@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

**To/
Councillor Nick Bradley,
Cabinet Member for Regeneration**

BY EMAIL

*Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:*

Scrutiny

*Direct Line:
Llinell Uniongyrochol:*

01792 637257

*e-Mail
e-Bost:*

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

*Our Ref
Ein Cyf:*

SPC/2013-14/13

*Your Ref
Eich Cyf:*

*Date
Dyddiad:*

8 April 2014

Dear Councillor Bradley,

Cabinet Member Question Session – 17 March

Thank you for your attendance at the Scrutiny Programme Committee on 17 March 2014 and answering questions on your work as Cabinet Member for Regeneration.

We thought it would be useful to write to you in order to reflect on what we learnt from the discussion, and share the views of the committee. A number of specific issues were discussed, which are summarised below:

Cultural Projects (incl. Dylan Thomas Centenary)

Despite missing out on the UK City of Culture title we noted that there is going to be a re-launch of cultural projects. We asked about progress with regard to the Dylan Thomas Centenary and possible impact. You were confident that it would give the city a much needed profile boost.

Economic Development

You informed the committee that there will be a new, more proactive approach to economic development and we look forward to seeing the difference that will make over the coming year.

Cont'd...

High Street

We asked about progress in the regeneration of High Street. You were confident that the High Street was moving in the right direction, with a decline in anti-social behaviour and signs of self-regeneration. We also noted that the Glynn Vivian Art Gallery was to reopen next year. We welcomed the fact that you are planning a conference on the city centre. You will recall the previous scrutiny review of the city centre which, amongst its recommendations, emphasised the importance of holding an annual event to engage stakeholders in the development and delivery of the City Centre action plan.

Greening the City

We were interested in what you were doing in terms of greening the city. We noted that there was a policy commitment to engage in a public debate, inviting submissions, and ideas for providing green space / recreational areas in the City Centre, culminating in all ideas being brought together in an exhibition to be held in the City Centre, in parallel with a high level conference debating the issues. We look forward to seeing progress on this. You felt that this was an issue which placed more responsibility on the public to help generate improvement, rather than just being up to the council to determine, but that regeneration money will be invested where possible.

We asked about the loss of trees due to work in the city centre and noted your assurance that the numbers will at a minimum be maintained at current levels. We also noted that replacement trees will be a variety more suitable for an urban environment.

Boulevard Scheme

We asked about progress and whether the project was going to be delivered on time and within budget. You confirmed that whilst within budget there have been delays to the project. We understood that funding for the project has come from external sources and for a specific use however the impact on those living, working, and travelling to/from Swansea has been significant and we all look forward to the completion of works, and hopefully the last time that the council digs up the City Centre roads for a long time. We will look with interest at the delivery of improvements and views of the public.

Swansea Market

We noted that green credentials were being improved within Swansea Market, for example investing in solar panels to improve energy efficiency and the promotion of recycling with the market.

Future Management of Parks

Within the recent budget debate there has been much said about the role of and possible future reliance on community volunteers in taking over the management of certain public services, like parks. We have already stressed the need for due diligence ahead of any possible transfer of service to evaluate the capacity, skills / capability of community management and financial arrangements. We have already seen positive examples of 'friends of' organisations developing and discharging certain responsibilities and we can see this as a way forward.

The committee felt that it would be helpful if you and/or the Cabinet Member for Place engaged with community councils about their possible future involvement in this by raising this at a meeting of the Community Councils Forum. There was a view amongst the committee that there may be some confusion within communities about the council's position and your clarification about the expected extent of community council and public involvement (e.g. through 'friends of' organisations) would be welcome.

There was some concern raised about possible lack of community capacity in the east of city if services are to depend more on community involvement. We did consider whether this could be a potential topic for future scrutiny e.g. 'transferring assets and responsibilities to the community' focusing on governance, accountability and community capacity.

We asked for clarification about the political responsibility for parks. You confirmed that the Cabinet Member for Place was responsible for the environmental aspects but you, as the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, were responsible for park activities.

360 Beach & Watersports Facility / Tidal Lagoon Project (Public question)

We had received correspondence from a member of the public who wanted the committee to ask about the:

- Council's involvement (financial / resources) in the establishment of 360 Beach & Watersports facility and value for money / impact
- Council's position with regard to the Swansea Bay Tidal Lagoon project and involvement in this major development

In response you stated that the 360 facility provided value for money for the council as its financial investment was relatively small. In terms of a view on overall value for money it was perhaps too early to judge but early indications were that it was working well as a coffee shop / eatery but may not be fulfilling the primary water sports purpose as it should. It was noted that there will be summer re-launch of activities e.g. beach rugby / football.

You agreed to respond directly to the member of the public in relation to both the question about the 360 and the tidal lagoon project. We would be grateful if you can confirm that you have done so.

Suggestions for Scrutiny

We noted that a review of libraries is underway and is likely to report in August. We noted your invitation for scrutiny to get involved in the discussion about the quality of the service / provision. We will consider this as part of the annual scrutiny work planning conference in May.

We would be a grateful for your response to this letter. It would be helpful to receive your reply to this letter by 8 May so that it can be included in the agenda of a future committee meeting at the earliest opportunity.

We also look forward to our next meeting with you to follow up on portfolio developments and achievements.

Yours sincerely,



COUNCILLOR MIKE DAY

Chair, Scrutiny Programme Committee

✉ mike.day@swansea.gov.uk



CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Councillor Mike Day
Chair
Scrutiny Programme Committee
City and County of Swansea

Please ask for:
Gofynnwch am:
Direct Line:
Llinell
Uniongyrochol:

Councillor Nick Bradley
(01792) 637442

E-Mail / E-Bost: nicholas.bradley@swansea.gov.uk
Our Ref / Ein Cyf: NB/JW
Your Ref / Eich
Cyf:
Date / Dyddiad: 8 May 2014

Dear Councillor Day

Cabinet Member Question Session – 17 March

Thank you for your letter of the 8th April, 2014 highlighting a series of specific issues raised by the Committee. I have sought further clarification from the relevant officers and I have addressed my responses in the order raised by you.

Cultural Projects (incl. Dylan Thomas Centenary)

The Council did very well to get to the final shortlist of the UK City of Culture 2017 and despite not being successful progress is being maintained to ensure that the Swansea is recognised as the Welsh City of Culture. In particular the Dylan Thomas Centenary programme is a major project being delivered in partnership with a range of partnership including Welsh Government, Carmarthenshire Council, Arts Council of Wales, national Library of Wales and local partners such as the Taliesin Arts Centre, Swansea University, University of Wales Trinity St David and the Dylan Thomas Birthplace. During the year a wide ranging programme of events will be taking place and significant national and international interest has been generated which will result in increased visitor numbers and spend locally. Notably, the Heritage Lottery Fund have awarded a grant of just over £900k to the city to redevelop the Dylan Thomas Exhibition and this will be completed by October in time for the actual centenary of Dylan's Birth. Work continues with the £9m project to refurbish the Glynn Vivian Art Gallery which is recognised as the leading regional gallery in Wales and also is a Tate Modern partner. The gallery is currently closed, but an exciting offsite exhibition and education programme has been organised and an enduring partnership has been forged with the YMCA.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
NICK BRADLEY
CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION
AELOD Y CABINET DROS ADFYWIO

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637442 ☎ (01792) 636196
✉ nicholas@bradley@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Page 2

Economic Development

I can confirm that the new, more proactive approach to Economic Development has commenced with the joint hospitality event at the Liberty Stadium organized at the end of April – this was very well received. This is just the beginning as we, the Leader, myself and colleagues take a forward aggressive approach to encouraging new businesses.

City Centre Event

A stakeholder engagement proposal has been submitted for consideration which sets out a number of stages leading to a joint conference with DCfW in October.

Boulevard

The project is on currently on target and budget. It will be completed in November 2015 as originally agreed.

Swansea Market

Tenders are being sought for the roof works and work will get underway shortly.

Future Management of Parks

I would agree with you that it is vital to evaluate the eligibility, capacity, skills and financial circumstances as appropriate of all those who may be involved or engaged in the future management of Parks. It is clear that there will undoubtedly be a range of different types of partners in the future, from local volunteer friends support groups to full blown, formal self management service providers. As you rightly point out Community capacity will be one of the key issues surrounding any future opportunities that may be explored, and there are many sensitivities to be considered as part of this developing agenda.

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
NICK BRADLEY
CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION
AELOD Y CABINET DROS ADFYWIO

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637442 📠 (01792) 636196
✉ nicholas@bradley@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA
DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

Page 3

There are a number of projects underway that will help test various partnership proposals and these are being developed as we speak. Our intention is to continue to develop these partnerships and research further delivery options before we roll these opportunities out to the Communities at large. Once we are clear on the types of models available we will be more than happy to meet the Community Councils to discuss these options.

360 Beach and Watersports Facility/Tidal Lagoon Project (Public question)

360 beach and Watersports Centre cost £986,000 to build of which £836,000 was obtained through grant funding.

The Authority's contribution was by way of a previously agreed developer's contribution resulting from the development on the St Helen's Baths site and the removal of the public conveniences on that site. The Authority was responsible for obtaining the grant funding, project managing the building of the facility and procuring the third party operator.

Since the centre opened there have been more than 175,500 users of the facility. Considering activity levels were minimal prior to the centre being established, the level of beach sports activity is very encouraging. The beach and watersports programme continues to expand and the centre launched this year's programme on 5th April and which now includes 9 activities

The Tidal Lagoon application is being determined by PINS, not the Council; however we will be a major consultee in the process. I can confirm that I have responded to the member of the public on these issues.

I will of course be writing to Scrutiny with updates.

Yours sincerely



COUNCILLOR NICK BRADLEY
CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION

COUNCILLOR/Y CYNGHORYDD
NICK BRADLEY
CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION
AELOD Y CABINET DROS ADFYWIO

CABINET OFFICE, CIVIC CENTRE, OYSTERMOUTH ROAD, SWANSEA SA1 3SN
SWYDDFA'R CABINET, CANOLFAN DDINESIG, HEOL YSTUMLLWYNARTH, ABERTAWE SA1 3SN

☎ (01792) 637442 📠 (01792) 636196

✉ nicholas@bradley@swansea.gov.uk www.swansea.gov.uk

Agenda Item 9

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee – 9 June 2014

IMPROVING THE IMPACT OF SCRUTINY

Purpose	To propose how scrutiny can improve its impact over the next 12 months.
Content	The report includes a definition of impact, approaches to improving impact and specific proposals for scrutiny councillors to adopt.
Councillors are being asked to	Consider and endorse the proposals Act on the proposals that relate directly to their own roles within scrutiny
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee
Lead Officer(s)	Dean Taylor, Director – Corporate Services
Report Author	Dave Mckenna, Scrutiny Manager Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: dave.mckenna@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The current scrutiny arrangements were introduced in November 2012 and have since been successfully bedded in. Swansea's take on the single committee model has also been attracting interest from other councils in Wales.
- 1.2 While there is much to feel pleased about, and many examples of good work being done by scrutiny councillors in Swansea, there is nevertheless still room for improvement. At the Committee's evaluation workshop in January 2014 the following improvement themes were identified:
 - Scrutiny work programme / management
 - Quality of information and reports provided to scrutiny
 - Outcomes from scrutiny
 - Public engagement
 - Follow up on previous comments / recommendations
 - Preparing for meetings (e.g. developing questioning strategies)
- 1.3 While all of these issues will need to be addressed, the focus on outcomes seems the most appropriate to focus on given that the new arrangements have now had a chance to establish themselves. It is of

course important to ensure in any case that scrutiny is able to make the greatest possible difference. For this reason, over the next 12 months, the committee are asked to take 'impact' as an overarching theme for its work.

- 1.4 The rest of this report, therefore, will propose a series of actions that the committee, panel conveners and scrutiny councillors can take in order to improve the impact of scrutiny. These ideas were shared at the annual work planning conference last month. First, however, it is important to say something about what is meant by 'impact' in order to bring some structure to the discussion.

2. Defining Impact

- 2.1 The 'Characteristics of Effective Scrutiny', recently developed by the Wales Scrutiny Officers Network, define impact in the following four ways:

- Overview and scrutiny regularly engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers and service providers.
- Overview and scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems.
- Decision makers give public account for themselves at overview and scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities
- Overview and scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes.

- 2.2 Each of these aspects can be considered in turn. For ease of reference an action plan table summarising all of the proposals detailed below is at **Appendix A**.

3. Approaches to Improving Impact

- 3.1 Broader approaches that can be use to measure and improve the impact of scrutiny include Results Based Accountability (RBA) and Return on Investment (ROI). While it is not the purpose of this report to consider these methods in detail they are nevertheless important to note. Members may wish to explore either / both as they might be applied to scrutiny as part of the work programme. Ideas from both methods have been used in this report.

- 3.2 *Results Based Accountability* has been described as 'a disciplined way of thinking and taking action that can be used to improve the quality of life in communities and also the performance of programmes and services'. It advocates the use of clear outcomes, measures and questions so has much in common with scrutiny. A Results Based Accountability Toolkit, designed for health professionals has been attached by way of background.

3.3 The term Return on Investment comes from commercial decision making and refers to the financial return on investment or the time taken to pay back the original investment. The Centre for Public Scrutiny have developed a model for applying these principles to in-depth scrutiny work. This approach, described in the attached Centre for Public Scrutiny publication, 'demonstrates that focusing on the 'return on investment' of scrutiny activity can revolutionise the way topics are chosen and outcomes of recommendations are measured'.

4. Evidence Based Challenge of Decision Makers and Service Providers

4.1 This aspect of impact is delivered through the four scrutiny performance panels and the Committee's ability to undertake pre decision scrutiny on Cabinet Reports before they are presented to Cabinet Meetings. Issues and concerns, as well as recommendations, are documented in scrutiny letters to the relevant Cabinet Member or to the Chair of the Local Service Board as appropriate. Impact can subsequently be seen in the written responses to scrutiny letters.

4.2 While the performance panels have been active, there have been very few examples of pre decision scrutiny. In fact there have been no examples over the last 12 months. In order to raise visibility of opportunities for pre decision scrutiny, therefore, it is proposed that content from the council's forward look document is included in the papers for this committee.

5. Viable and Well Evidenced Solutions to Recognised Problems

5.1 The main scrutiny mechanisms for suggesting solutions are the in-depth inquiry panels and one-off working groups. While six Inquiries have reported over the last 12 months, six working groups have met and made suggestions to Cabinet.

5.2 It is, however, the in-depth inquiries that provide the greatest opportunities for improving impact. While the inquiry 'method' is well established and tested over time, there are a number of ways in which impact could be improved at the different inquiry stages:

5.2.1 Scoping

- Establish Measurable Outcomes at the outset of inquiries: In line with Results Based Accountability, each inquiry should determine, if possible the population or performance indicator that the inquiry wants to influence. By identifying one measure it will help the inquiry to stay focused and to assess what its impact has been.
- Ask results based questions at the start of inquiries: Results Based Accountability provides simple questions that can be used to support the scrutiny of services (performance accountability) or the scrutiny

of strategic issues (population accountability). Each inquiry should consider whether to use these questions to structure their work.

- Determine the intended return on investment for each inquiry: Each inquiry should consider at the outset what they expect the impact to be in terms of its level of priority, its measurability, its potential influence and its likely value (see the attached Centre for Public Scrutiny report)
- Involve the right stakeholders in inquiries: Working out who needs to be involved at the start helps to ensure not only that a range of evidence is collected but also supports wider awareness and therefore impact.

5.2.2 Cabinet Response

- Ensure a constructive dialogue with Cabinet about inquiry reports: It is important that Cabinet Members have a clear understanding of an inquiry and the rationale behind any recommendations before they finalise their response. It is proposed therefore that panel conveners meet with the relevant Cabinet Members following the presentation of the report to cabinet to discuss the report and its implications
- Ask Cabinet what difference an inquiry has made: A new report template has been developed (**Appendix B**) that allows the Cabinet member to show, for agreed recommendations, what work is already going on and what will be new.

5.2.3 Follow up

- Widen follow-ups of inquiries to consider the wider impact: Follow-ups to in depth inquiries currently focus on the actions plans agreed by Cabinet in order to implement agreed recommendations. Instead inquiry panels could be reconvened to assess the wider impact of the inquiry process. This could include other stakeholders and consider; the value of the process itself; what has changed since the inquiry finished; and whether the inquiry made a difference. A revised follow up report template for Cabinet Members is attached at **Appendix C**.
- The following inquiries are due to be followed up during the next 12 months:

Inquiry	Cabinet Decision	Timescale for Follow Up
Services for Looked After Children	17 Sep 2013	June - Sep
Public Transport	12 Nov 2013	June - Nov
Affordable Housing	3 Dec 2013	June - Dec

Tourism	14 Jan 2014	June - Jan
Economic Inactivity	3 Jun 2014	Dec - Jun
Attainment & Wellbeing	1 Jul 2014	Jan - Jul

5.2.4 Communication

- Communicate the impact of in-depth inquiries: It is important to ensure that in depth inquiries are visible to all those affected and that people know when scrutiny has made a difference. The intention is, therefore, to communicate at each stage of inquiries via press release and social media.

5. Decision Makers Give Public Account for their Portfolio Responsibilities

- 5.1 Cabinet Member Question and Answer sessions are a standing feature of Committee meetings and give Members the chance to hold Cabinet to account in public. One way in which the impact of these sessions could be improved would be to widen involvement in questions setting by councillors and the public.

6. Enables the 'Voice' of Local People and Communities

- 6.1 While public engagement remains an important element of scrutiny and has been used in particular for in-depth inquiries, there is clearly much more that could be done. One way to improve public engagement is through improved use of social media. The ongoing 'scrutiny bytes' project, reported previously to the committee is one avenue through which this can be done.

7. Next Steps

- 7.1 The proposals contained in this report have been summarised in the attached action plan for the Committee to consider and endorse (**Appendix A**).

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 There are no specific legal implications raised by this report.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 There are no specific financial implications raised by this report.

Background Papers: None

15th May 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard
Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

APPENDIX A: Improving the Impact of Scrutiny Action Plan

What	How	Who
Improve the visibility of opportunities for pre decision scrutiny	Include Forward Look content in Scrutiny Programme Committee papers	Scrutiny Programme Committee
Establish measurable outcomes at the outset of inquiries	Include 'an indicator we want to change' in every scoping report	Inquiry Panel Conveners / Members
Ask results based questions at the start of inquiries	Discuss whether Results Based Accountability questions can be used for each inquiry at the scoping stage	Inquiry Panel Conveners / Members
Determine the intended return on investment for each inquiry	Consider using the return on investment method set out in 'Tipping the Scales' by Centre for Public Scrutiny for each inquiry at the scoping stage	Inquiry Panel Conveners / Members
Involve the right stakeholders in inquiries	Consider using the stakeholder wheel set out in 'Tipping the Scales' by Centre for Public Scrutiny for each inquiry at the scoping stage	Inquiry Panel Conveners / Members
Ensure a constructive dialogue with Cabinet about inquiry reports	Meet with the relevant Cabinet Member(s) to discuss the Cabinet Response before it is finalised	Inquiry Panel Conveners
Ask Cabinet what difference an inquiry has made	Provide revised 'follow up' report for Cabinet Member(s)	Inquiry Panel Conveners
Widen follow ups to inquiries to consider the wider impact	Reconvene inquiry panels to assess impact of inquiries and involve other stakeholders where appropriate	Inquiry Panel Conveners / Members
Communicate the impact of in-depth inquiries	Press releases, blog posts and social media to raise awareness at key stages in the inquiry process	Scrutiny Programme Committee / Conveners / Scrutiny Councillors
Widen involvement in questions setting by councillors and the public	Emails to councillors, blog posts and social media	Scrutiny Programme Committee
Improve public engagement through greater use of social media by scrutiny councillors	Scrutiny bytes project	Scrutiny Programme Committee / Scrutiny councillors using social media

Report of the Cabinet Member for XXXX

Cabinet - Date of Meeting (e.g. 5th July 2013)

RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE XXXX INQUIRY PANEL – (insert title of report)

Purpose:	To outline a response to the scrutiny recommendations and to present an action plan for agreement.
Policy Framework:	None
Reason for Decision:	To comply with the requirements of the Council Constitution.
Consultation:	Legal Services, Financial Services
Recommendation(s):	It is recommended that: 1) The response as outlined in the report and related action plan be agreed.
Report Author:	
Finance Officer:	
Legal Officer:	
Access to Services Officer:	

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The XXXX Inquiry report was submitted to Cabinet on the XX June XXXX after the XXX Scrutiny Inquiry Panel completed a detailed inquiry into XXXXX.
- 1.2 Having considered the contents of the scrutiny report, and specific recommendations made, advice to Cabinet on whether it should agree, or not agree, with each recommendation is detailed in this report.
- 1.3 Cabinet is also asked to consider, for each of the responses, any relevant policy commitments and any other relevant activity.

2.0 Response to Scrutiny Recommendations

Recommendation 1
(insert full text of recommendation here)
Relevant Policy Commitments: (list briefly)
Action already being undertaken: (Briefly list relevant action taking place NOT as a consequence of the recommendation)
New actions following from the recommendation: <i>Any actions already in train or proposed</i>
Cabinet Member Comments: Any issues not covered above
Recommendation is AGREED / NOT AGREED <i>(please delete as appropriate)</i>

[repeat as required]

3.0 Equality and Engagement Implications

3.1

4.0 Legal Implications

4.1

5.0 Financial Implications

5.1

Background Papers:

- 1. The list of background papers are to be numbered. If none, please state 'None'.*
- 2. Note that Background Papers must be retained for 6 years.*

Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed Cabinet Action Plan

Contact Officer:

(01792

File Reference

Report of the Cabinet Member for

Panel Name – Panel Date

IMPACT REPORT: SCRUTINY INQUIRY INTO

Purpose	To help the Scrutiny Inquiry Panel to assess the impact of their report into XXX
Content	This report deals with three questions related to the impact of the inquiry: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What has changed since the report was presented to Cabinet? 2. Have the agreed recommendations been implemented? 3. What has been the impact of the scrutiny inquiry?
The Scrutiny Inquiry Panel are being asked to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the contents of the report • Reach conclusions about the impact of the inquiry
Lead Councillor(s)	Cabinet Member for XXX, Councillor XXX
Lead Officer(s)	
Report Author	

1. Introduction

1.1 The xxxx Scrutiny Inquiry Panel undertook an in-depth inquiry between xxx and xxxx. This final report is attached at Appendix A. The Cabinet Member response and action plan are attached at Appendix B.

1.2 The reporting timeline of the inquiry is as follows:

Commenced	Xxx
Agreed by the Scrutiny Programme Committee	xxxx
Presented to Cabinet	Xxxx
Cabinet Response agreed	Xxxxx

1.3 The final stage of the scrutiny inquiry process is the follow up. It is at this point that the original panel reconvenes in order to assess the impact of the work.

1.4 The purpose of this report is to assist the panel as it seeks to answer the following three questions, each of which will be dealt with in detail below:

- What has changed since the report was presented to Cabinet?

- Have the agreed recommendations been implemented?
- What has been the impact of the scrutiny inquiry?

2. What has changed since the report was presented to Cabinet?

2.1 [If applicable] The inquiry report highlighted the following as the key measure of impact:

[Outcome measure]

2.2 Since the inquiry concluded the following changes [to the measure] have taken place. [details of high level changes particularly as they affect the public / service users]

3. Have the agreed recommendations been implemented?

3.1 In responding to the inquiry an action plan was drawn up showing what steps would be taken to implement all of the scrutiny recommendations agreed by Cabinet (Appendix B).

3.2 The table at Appendix C [to be completed] shows progress against each recommendation and specifically:

- the Cabinet decision in respect of each recommendation
- the action taken / proposed to implement the recommendations
- the responsible officer(s)
- timescales involved

4. What has been the impact of the scrutiny inquiry?

4.1 [In completing this section consideration should be given to whether, in the opinion of the Cabinet Member:

- The inquiry has raised the profile of the issue in question
- The inquiry has improved understanding / awareness
- The inquiry has provided useful research / evidence
- Any individual recommendations have had a particular impact
- There has been a positive impact from the implementation of the recommendations as a whole]

Background Papers:

None.

Contact Officer:

Legal Officer:

Finance Officer:

Equality Officer:

Results Based Accountability Toolkit
A resource for health professionals

December 2010

Prepared by: Ruth Jordan
Cardiff Chronic Condition Management Demonstrator

ABBREVIATIONS

RBA	Results Based Accountability
CCM	Chronic Conditions Management
SDD	Service Development Directive
PSU	Partnership Support Unit
WLGA	Welsh Local Government Association
DNA	Did Not Attend
NICE	National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence
LSB	Local Service Board
GP	General Practitioner
DToC	Delayed Transfers of Care

Contact for further information

Ruth Jordan,
Cardiff Chronic Condition Management Demonstrator Lead
Email: Ruth.Jordan@wales.nhs.uk

Contents

Introduction	4
Purpose	4
Results Based Accountability (RBA)	4
What is RBA?	4
Population v Performance Accountability	4
Implementation	5
The Cardiff and Vale Experience	7
The Cardiff Chronic Conditions Management Demonstrator	7
Case Study 1: RBA and the Welsh Epilepsy Unit	7
Getting Started with RBA	7
The Process	8
Benefits and Outcomes	8
Challenges	9
Next Steps	9
Case Study 2: RBA and the Cardiff West Neighbourhood Team	9
Getting Started with RBA	9
The Process	9
Benefits and Outcomes	10
Challenges	10
Next Steps	10
Websites and Further Information	11
Bibliography	11
Appendices	12
Identifying Performance Measures – The Five Step Method	12
Epilepsy Report Card	15

INTRODUCTION

The Cardiff Chronic Conditions Management Demonstrator has been working to establish how Results Based Accountability (RBA) can be used to drive improvements in the management of people with chronic conditions. This toolkit has been developed to share the Demonstrator teams learning and practical tips with people from other areas who wish follow this approach. Whilst the Demonstrator is focussing on the management of chronic conditions the toolkit is not solely for people working within this area but for any people who wish to use RBA performance accountability.

PURPOSE

The toolkit is designed to give practical tips and advice to people who are about to start using RBA Performance Accountability. It does not attempt to fully describe the detail of RBA which can be found in '*Trying Hard is Not Good Enough – How to Produce Measurable Improvements for Customers and Communities*' by Mark Friedman and at the websites www.resultsbasedaccountability.com and www.raguide.org. The tips and case studies in the toolkit are based on the experience of the Cardiff Chronic Conditions Management (CCM) Demonstrator.

RESULTS BASED ACCOUNTBILITY (RBA)

What is RBA? How will it help?

Mark Friedman (2005) describes RBA as a disciplined way of thinking and taking action that can be used to improve the quality of life in communities and also the performance of programmes and services. It has a number of basic ideas:

- It starts with ends and works backward, step by step, to means. For communities, the ends are conditions of well-being for the community such as Children being Healthy. For programmes or services, the ends are how service users are better off when the service works the way it should
- It provides step by step processes to enable partners to get from talk to action quickly
- It uses plain language and avoids jargon
- It uses common sense methods that everyone can understand
- It's an inclusive process where diversity is an asset and everyone in the community/service can contribute
- It places importance on the collection, baselining and understand of data as without it we don't really know if things are getting better or worse.

Population v Performance Accountability

RBA has two components: population accountability and performance accountability. In population accountability, a group of partners takes on responsibility for the well-being of a population in a geographic area. In performance accountability, a manager or group of managers takes responsibility for the performance of a programme or service.

Population accountability is about a geographic area, e.g. all children in Wales, all adults in Cardiff, whole populations without regard to whether they are getting service from anyone or not. This first kind of accountability is bigger than any one department or programme.

Performance accountability is about our role as managers, and how well we run the programmes and services for which we are responsible. Performance accountability focuses on the well-being of customer populations, as distinct from whole populations.

The principle distinction here has to do with who is responsible. With programmes and services, we can identify the manager or managers who should be held responsible. For cross community conditions such as Health Children, there is no one person or agency that can be held responsible. Population accountability requires broad partnerships that take collective responsibility for progress.

This toolkit covers Performance Accountability and not Population Accountability although a number of the tips would be transferrable.

IMPLEMENTATION

The following section contains a step by step suggestion on how to implement RBA based on the experiences of the Cardiff CCM demonstrator.

Step 1. Determine whether population or performance accountability is appropriate. It is not always easy to do this and it is worth taking time at the beginning to make sure the decision you make is correct. Remember to ask yourself who is responsible.

Step 2. Decide who needs to be involved in developing the framework and invite them to the RBA sessions. Try and identify all of the partners that need to be involved at this point as it is easier to have everyone included at the beginning rather than have people join mid-way through the process. The number and length of the RBA sessions depends on the RBA experience of the group. An experienced group can complete a framework in one two hour session however a group new to RBA will need at least two sessions.

Step 3. If the group is new to RBA provide an introduction to RBA training session in advance. This can either be at the start of the first session or in a dedicated session before hand.

The 7 RBA Performance Accountability Questions

- Question 1 - Who are our customers?
- Question 2 - How can we measure if our customers are better off?
- Question 3 - How can we measure if we are delivering our services well?
- Question 4 - How are we doing on the most important of these measures and why?
- Question 5 - Who are the partners who can help?
- Question 6 - What works to do better?
- Question 7 - What do we propose to do?

Step 4. Facilitate the group through the development of the RBA framework. Start at step 1 of the “7 RBA Performance Accountability Questions” and work through the questions in order. Don’t underestimate how long it takes to agree on the customer group. It isn’t always as straight forward as you anticipate.

Step 5. Complete questions 2 and 3 using the “5 Step Method for Identifying Performance Measures” (Appendix 1). The process challenges the data that is collected by organisations. Don’t forget

to create a data development agenda to cover this. Including information analysts in the group from the start may be beneficial when determining which performance measures are possible.

Step 6. When completing question 4 ask the group to use their experience to best guess the baseline and then collect the real data later. The best guess baselines are generally very accurate.

Step 7. Complete questions 5 – 7. Ensure the action plan developed in step 7 is clear with determined actions, timescales and ownership.

Step 8. Develop a report card for the framework. RBA advocates the development and use of one-page report cards as a tool to highlight the work undertaken to local people and professionals and as a reporting method to accountable Boards. The report cards can be used to highlight the area that is being considered, demonstrate and explain the data, promote the work plan and provide an update on progress.

Step 9. Collect and baseline the data for the performance measures. It can be difficult to do this when the information is held in various different information systems. Be prepared for this when choosing performance measures and don't let it hold up the rest of the work.

Step 10. Schedule meetings to review any additional data and progress against the action plan. Be prepared to re-visit aspects of the framework if things change e.g. if data is unavailable, if curves are not turned as predicted or if the story behind the baseline changes.

THE CARDIFF AND VALE EXPERIENCE

The Cardiff Chronic Conditions Management Demonstrator

The delivery of co-ordinated, comprehensive and consistent Chronic Conditions Management (CCM) services in the community is an integral part of effective mainstream service delivery in the community. This is a key Ministerial priority, the basis of which was drawn from international evidence and published in *Improving Health and the Management of Chronic Conditions in Wales: an Integrated Model and Framework for Action* (WAG).

Improving CCM across Wales depends on good integrated planning and management in partnership with all stakeholders. The aim of the strategy was to improve health and well-being and reduce the incidence and impact of chronic conditions and the inherent inequalities that exist across Wales.

To help deliver and drive improvements in CCM across Wales in an action centred way, three large scale Service Improvement Demonstrator Projects were established, one in Cardiff, one in north Wales and one in Carmarthenshire. This provided an opportunity to focus effort, support and resources in localities to test and learn from concerted effort across organisational and professional boundaries. Lessons and practical solutions were worked through and used to develop the business case for change which supported further mainstreaming across Wales. The aim of this was to;

“Provide and test a sustainable, affordable generic CCM service model that supported patients’ needs locally and promoted independent living within the community in order to communicate and inform service change across Wales”

The Cardiff CCM demonstrator was tasked with establishing how Results Based Accountability (RBA) could be used to drive and support implementation of the CCM strategy to ensure services deliver on meaningful outcomes for the population.

CASE STUDY 1.

RESULTS BASED ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE WELSH EPILEPSY UNIT

The Welsh Epilepsy Unit is a tertiary referral centre for specialist epilepsy services in south Wales. The immediate catchment population covered is 700,000 but many referrals are also taken from elsewhere in Wales. The unit offers a multi-disciplinary approach to epilepsy care and offers a very broad range of services to people with epilepsy, their family and carers.

Getting Started with RBA

In the summer of 2009 a multi-agency steering group was formed to develop and test service improvement opportunities in line with the Epilepsy Service Development Directive (3). One of the core objectives of the group was to establish an RBA framework for monitoring performance and evaluation of epilepsy service improvement. Prior to undertaking any RBA training or workshops a comprehensive service mapping exercise was carried out to ensure the steering group had a common understanding of the gaps in current service provision.

Support was provided by Richard Morton from the Partnership Support Unit (PSU) in the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) to deliver an introduction to RBA session to steering group members. Following this session, trainers were trained within the Health Board and all further training and facilitation was carried out internally by the author (CCM Demonstrator Project Lead for Cardiff).

Following discussion it was clear that performance accountability was appropriate. Discussions then focussed on whether the epilepsy “customer group” should be divided to ensure that the needs of patients at different points along the care pathway were met. Using information from the service mapping and gap analysis exercise members of the steering group determined that the group should be split and that “patients with a first suspected seizure or unexplained blackout” would be the customer group for the first RBA exercise.

The Process

A facilitated session was held with the steering group to work through the 7 performance accountability questions for this customer group. Participants completed up to question 6 of the exercise during the 2 hour workshop. A number of tasks were identified regarding the collection and baselining of information and an action plan (question 7) was developed at a further meeting.

The 7 question process for performance accountability was repeated at 2 hour facilitated sessions for other customer groups within the epilepsy service:

- Women taking medication for epilepsy between the ages of 14 – 45 who may become or who are pregnant
- People who are admitted to hospital as a result of a presumed seizure

A further introduction to RBA session was held when new partners joined the group after 6 months. The introduction session followed the same format as the original session.

A report card (Appendix 2) was developed for each of the epilepsy customer groups. Data for these report cards are monitored by the steering group on a monthly basis. All of the Epilepsy report cards and details of the epilepsy developments are available at www.ccmdemonstrators.com.

Benefits and Outcomes

Curves have been turned for the first customer group. Preliminary outcomes include:

- The average length of time from seizure to a confirmed diagnosis has decreased by 81 days from 111 days to 30 days
- The number of patients who have been seen by a specialist within the NICE guideline of two weeks has increased from 35% to 61%
- The average waiting time to see a specialist has decreased from 22 days to 11 days
- The number of admissions following a seizure have decreased from 5 a month to 2 a month on average

Other benefits that have been observed include:

- All stakeholders are fully engaged and have ownership of the service
- The team have felt committed and empowered to drive service development
- Performance management is now positively viewed by the team as a tool to enable improvement
- The development of a clear line of sight between Board and LSB priorities and patient outcomes at a departmental level

Challenges

Challenges experienced by the team included:

- Knowing how to start the process was difficult and needed support from the PSU e.g. ‘how long does it take?’, ‘who needs to be in the room?’ etc.
- The lack of availability of patient outcome data was an issue. During the process the performance measures chosen were changed to enable meaningful data collection.
- Whether partners that joined the group mid-process needed “training” in RBA. One additional training session was undertaken as described above but partners joining later on have not had access to this.

Next Steps

The Epilepsy Steering Group continue to collect and monitor data for the performance measures and develop the agreed actions.

CASE STUDY 2.

RESULTS BASED ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE CARDIFF WEST NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAM

The Cardiff West neighbourhood team are a newly developed multi-disciplinary and multi-agency team supporting the development and delivery of community based services for patients registered with 9 GP practices with a practice population of approximately 50,000. The decision was made to provide a framework for the team using RBA.

Getting Started with RBA

In September 2010 a list of stakeholders in the Cardiff West neighbourhood was drawn together and all people identified were invited to take part in two facilitated RBA sessions. In advance of the session participants were asked to consider “from your perspective how will we know if we are improving things for the patients/clients in Cardiff West”.

Participants were not trained in or given any information about RBA in advance of the session. This was incorporated into the first of the two sessions which was facilitated by the CCM demonstrator lead (Ruth Jordan).

It was agreed in advance that a performance accountability framework was appropriate as the team could only be responsible for their service users as opposed to all residents in the Cardiff West neighbourhood.

The Process


Two facilitated sessions were held 10 days apart. The first session began with a presentation on RBA. The group then determined the customer group - “People who use health and social care services in Cardiff West” and then agreed the performance measures using the five step method.

During the second session the rest of the framework was developed including an agreed action plan. The framework was incorporated into a report card that is available at www.ccmdemonstrators.com. Project groups have been set up by the neighbourhood and they are monitoring progress.

Benefits and Outcomes

Benefits that have been observed include:

- RBA has facilitated team development and engagement. It has enabled conversations to begin between stakeholders to develop a joint understanding and accept joint responsibility for outcomes for patients within Cardiff West.
- RBA has enabled the community based team to take responsibility for outcomes that were traditionally seen as hospital based responsibilities. This will begin to facilitate the “*Setting the Direction*” (4) strategy in an operational setting.
- The development of a clear line of sight between Board and LSB priorities and patient outcomes at a departmental level. The Cardiff West Neighbourhood Management Team are developing an RBA population accountability framework and members of the health & social care team are also involved in this.



Challenges

Challenges experienced by the team included:

- Some members of the team did not attend both sessions. This meant that those who missed the first session did not get any training into RBA and therefore struggled to participate fully.
- The agreed actions were only “first steps” towards improving patient outcomes. Further actions will need to be developed before any improvements are seen in the performance measures.
- Defining the performance measures was difficult. Traditional measures e.g. Delayed Transfers of Care (DToc) had different definitions for different stakeholders. It may have been beneficial to attempt to correlate and ensure a common understanding of language in advance.
- The session facilitator has not been involved in monitoring progress of the action plans. This has meant a reliance on team members to understand RBA to follow it through. In future it may be beneficial to develop a level of focussed RBA expertise in the team rather than just provide a base level of training to everyone.

Next Steps

- Progress with the RBA framework is being monitored and supported by the Locality team. A review meeting is planned with the session facilitator to update the framework if necessary.

WEBSITES AND FURTHER INFORMATION

Websites

Information on RBA can be found on the following websites:

www.resultsbasedaccountability.com

www.raguide.org

www.resultsleadership.org (publications)

Information on the Chronic Conditions Demonstrator and the Cardiff Epilepsy/RBA workstream:

www.ccmdemonstrators.com

CCM strategy document "Improving Health and the Management of Chronic Conditions in Wales: An Integrated Model and Framework for Action":

http://www.wales.nhs.uk/documents/Chronic_Conditions_English.pdf

Epilepsy Service Development Directive:

<http://wales.gov.uk/topics/health/publications/health/strategies/epilepsy/?lang=en>

Setting the Direction – Primary and Community Services Strategic Delivery Programme

<http://wales.gov.uk/topics/health/publications/health/strategies/settingthedirection/;jsessionid=q12cMr2FXTZMHHSZH24bjK88JvFhMQbm1Mzs26IBxpvTQL7KQbFn!-971712554?lang=en>

Further information

Ruth Jordan, Project Manager Chronic Conditions, Cardiff and Vale University Health Board

ruth.jordan@wales.nhs.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Friedman M (2005) 'Trying Hard is not Good Enough – How to Produce Measurable Improvements for Customers and Communities'

WAG (2010) 'Setting the Direction – Primary and Community Services Strategic Delivery Programme'

WAG (2009) 'Designed for People with Chronic Conditions Service Development Directive – Epilepsy'

WAG (2007) 'Designed to Improve Health and the Management of Chronic Conditions in Wales: An Integrated Model and Framework for Action'

Identifying Performance Measures – The Five Step Method

Put yourself in the place of being an organisation or agency accountable for delivering a service to the customer group identified. Your task is to complete the Performance Measures quadrant for the customers being served by that organisation in five steps.

First of all, draw the Performance Measure Quadrant template on a piece of flip chart paper (see fig. 1)

1. How much did we do?

In the Upper Left Quadrant, under “Number of Customers Served” consider if there are any specific categories of customers you should specifically identify (e.g. number of patients with chronic conditions).

Next, under “Number of Activities”, ask what activities are performed and convert each activity into a measure (so “training people” becomes “number of people trained” etc). Don’t try and include every single detail – pick the most important categories of customers and activities.

2. How well did we do it?

Review the “Common Measures” listed in the upper right quadrant of the “Summary of Performance Measures” grid (Fig. 2). Write in the upper right quadrant of the flip chart grid (under % Common Measures) all those that apply.

Next, under “% Activity Specific Measures” on the flip chart (upper right quadrant), list what measures tell us how well the activities you’ve identified in the upper left quadrant are carried out. If you’re struggling, use the list of measures on the Fig 2 grid as a guide. (If you’re not sure if a measure belongs in the top right or bottom right quadrants, just put it where you think best and move on – we’ll consider both equally in steps 4 and 5).

3. Is anyone better off?

Ask yourselves “if this service is working really well, in what ways are the lives of our customers better off: How could we observe this? How could it be measured?” This will be expressed as a number in the lower left quadrant and as a percentage in the lower right. As a guide, think about the four measures of “better offness” listed in the bottom quadrants in fig. 2 (skills/knowledge; attitude/opinion; behaviour; circumstances). If you get stuck try the reverse question – if the service was terrible how would that reflect on the lives of our customers?

4. Headline measures

Review the list of both upper right and lower right quadrant measures you’ve come up with and identify those for which there is timely and reliable data available. Draw a circle alongside each one of these measures (big enough to put a number inside the circle later on).

Next ask: “If we had to talk about the performance of the service in a public setting (such as a conference or scrutiny committee) and we could use only one of the measures with a circle next to it, which one would we choose?” Put a number 1 inside the circle. Then if you could have a second of the circled measures, which one would you choose? Mark

this with a number 2. Carry on identifying no more than 3 to 5 of the circled measures in this way, numbering correspondingly.

You should now have a mix of upper right and lower right headline measures identified in numbered priority from 1 to no more than 5.

5. Data Development Agenda

Finally, review the right hand quadrant measures without a circle next to them (the ones for which you don't have good data). Consider "If we could buy data for only one of these measures which one would it be?" Write alongside this measure (in a different coloured marker) "DD1". Next consider, "if I could buy a second measure what would it be?" Mark this "DD2" and carry on to identify no more than 3 to 5 measures. You now have your data development agenda in priority order.

You now have a three part list of performance measures:

- **Headline Measures:** Those 3 to 5 most important measures for which you have good data, the ones you would use to present the services performance in a public setting.
- **Secondary Measures:** All other measures for which you now have good data. These measures will be used to help manage the service and inform the story behind the baseline.
- **Data Development Agenda:** A prioritised list of measures where you need new or better data (your budget will determine how far down the list you can go!)

Flip Chart Template (Fig. 1)

<u>How much did we do?</u>		<u>How well did we do it?</u>	
Number of Customers Served		% Common measures	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
Number of Activities		% Activity Specific Measures	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
<u>Is Anyone Better Off?</u>			
(Quantity)		(Percentage)	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	
•		•	

Summary of Performance Measures (Fig. 2)

<u>How much did we do?</u>	<u>How well did we do it?</u>
<p>Number of Customers Served</p> <p>Number of Activities</p>	<p>% Common Measures Workload ratio, staff turnover rate, staff morale, percentage of staff fully trained, worker safety, unit cost, customer satisfaction: Did we treat you well? etc.</p> <p>% Activity Specific Measures Percentage of actions timely and correct, percentage clients completing activity, percentage of actions meeting standards etc.</p>
<u>Is Anyone Better Off?</u>	
<p>(Quantity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills/knowledge • Attitude/Opinion • Behaviour • Circumstances 	<p>(Percentage)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills/knowledge (e.g. parenting skills) • Attitude/Opinion Including customer satisfaction: Did we help you with your problems? • Behaviour (e.g. school attendance) • Circumstances (e.g. working, in stable housing etc)

THE WELSH EPILEPSY UNIT

Service Description: The Welsh Epilepsy Unit is a tertiary referral centre for specialist epilepsy services in South Wales. The immediate catchment population covered is 700,000 but many referrals are also taken from elsewhere in Wales. The Unit offers a multidisciplinary approach to epilepsy care and offers a very broad range of services to people with epilepsy, their families and carers.



DEFINED SERVICE USERS: Patients with a first suspected seizure or unexplained blackout




HEADLINE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1. % seen by a specialist within 2 weeks (NICE guideline)
2. No. admissions to hospital for a seizure
3. Average waiting time to see a specialist
4. % did not attend (DNA) first seizure clinic

DATA DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

1. Seizure frequency
2. Death rate
3. % prescribed incorrect medication
4. % who report they feel satisfied or better off

HOW ARE WE DOING?



Page 110

STORY BEHIND THE BASELINE

Limited clinic capacity with unpredictable demand
 Small team – unable to cover absence to prevent clinic cancellation
 Low frequency of clinics causing delay if appointment not suitable for the patient
 Clinic booked by Epilepsy Unit admin staff – if admin staff on leave the clinic slots are not filled
 Consultant triage's fax referrals – delay if unavailable
 Patient anxiety and concern re implications of a diagnosis e.g. driving
 Stigma attached to Epilepsy
 Patients put off by unit name – diagnosis seems pre-determined
 Nurses unable to refer for EEG leading to delay in diagnostics and confirmed diagnosis
 New nurse led emergency unit assessment service for first seizure patients has improved performance measures but out of hours service reverts to old pathway
 Primary Care does not have fast track access for first seizure clinics
 Primary Care are not made aware if a patient DNA's so can't follow up

PARTNERS WHO CAN HELP US

Emergency Unit, Radiology, Neurophysiology, Medical Records, A&C staff, Consultants, Specialist Nurses, Ambulance Trust, Cardiology, Psychology, Care of the Elderly, Neurosurgery, Prison, Voluntary Sector, Practice Nurses, GP's, Family members/witnesses, Drug & Alcohol Services, Occupational Health, Referral Management Centre, Obstetrics, Management, Communications Department, Patients


WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE?

1. Change the name of the "Epilepsy Unit" to the "Alan Richens Unit"
2. Develop nurse led first seizure clinics to cover when Consultants unavailable
3. Develop dedicated fast track clinic for Primary Care referrals
4. Enable specialist nurse referral for EEG
5. Develop process to inform Primary Care of DNA

Tipping the scales!

A model to measure the return on investment of
overview and scrutiny





The Centre for Public Scrutiny

The Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS), an independent charity, is the leading national organisation for ideas, thinking and the application and development of policy and practice to promote transparent, inclusive and accountable public services. We support individuals, organisations and communities to put our principles into practice in the design, delivery and monitoring of public services in ways that build knowledge, skills and trust so that effective solutions are identified together by decision-makers, practitioners and service users.

Acknowledgements

This publication has been written by Su Turner from the Centre for Public Scrutiny, and Linda Phipps, Independent Consultant and Regional Advocate for the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

We are very grateful to the councillors, officers and partners from the five Scrutiny Development Areas (SDAs) for their hard work and commitment to the programme. We are also grateful to the Expert Advisers who worked alongside and supported the SDAs to develop this innovative approach to scrutiny.

Ministerial foreword

In the first publication from the Centre for Public Scrutiny's Health Inequalities Scrutiny Programme 'Peeling the Onion', the role of councils was highlighted as critical in tackling the many lifestyle and society driven health problems we face, and to reducing health inequalities.

The Health and Social Care Act 2012 puts the people who use services, and those who plan and deliver services, at the heart of decisions about how to improve care. The role of councils remains central to this. The leadership role of individual councillors and the collective action that councils can take to improve public health by bringing people together to develop a common understanding of need and aspiration, and a common desire to change things for the better, is critical.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny is helping Overview and Scrutiny Committees maximise the contribution they can make to improve the health of local people, by showing that scrutiny is a valuable asset that needs resource. If effective, it is a highly respected way of changing ways of working.

This report from the Centre for Public Scrutiny demonstrates that focusing on the 'return on investment' of scrutiny activity can revolutionise the way topics are chosen and outcomes of recommendations are measured.

I am grateful for the contribution made by the Scrutiny Development Areas to our collective knowledge about what works. I hope this will help other areas to make the most of the freedom they now have to break free from traditional ways of working to make a significant difference.



Anne Milton

Anne Milton MP

Parliamentary Under Secretary Of State For Public Health





The Centre for Public Scrutiny has run a very successful Health Inequalities Scrutiny Programme since 2009. Phase one of the programme brought together the key learning from 10 Scrutiny Development Areas as they trialed new ways of working and sought to develop scrutiny as an effective public health tool. The work was showcased in our publication “Peeling the Onion”¹.

This follow-on programme (phase two) ran until April 2012 and builds on the success of the above work. It was funded by the Department of Health with the following objectives:

- ✓ Support Scrutiny Development Areas to undertake a review of health inequalities – using the guidance from within ‘Peeling the Onion’.
- ✓ Continue to promote the value of overview and scrutiny as an effective public health tool.
- ✓ Develop a new and innovative tool that will allow the value and impact of overview and scrutiny to be measured – its return on investment.

Developing the new tool for measuring impact

Overview and scrutiny activity typically produces recommendations about subjects reviewed, but practitioners have not always focused on measuring their impact. Scrutiny of health inequalities provides an opportunity for local leaders and health scrutineers to be able to show that they have had an impact. The Marmot review² has shown all too clearly how challenging this is. The idea of looking at what is the impact of health overview and scrutiny – what is its “rate of return” on the investment made – is one that has been met with enthusiasm as a way to develop practice across the spectrum of council scrutiny.

With a range of reforms taking place to how public services are planned and delivered, a greater focus for overview and scrutiny on outcomes and how they are realised is an imperative. In our publication ‘Exploiting Opportunities at a Time of Change’³, we explored this more proactive outcome focused role in more detail – and the value that it can bring to improving health. We think that other aspects of council scrutiny can benefit from this learning.

In the spring of 2011, a small team of CfPS Expert Advisers, a member of the Marmot review team and CfPS staff met to consider how concepts of “rate of return” on investment might usefully be transferred from the world of economics, business and commerce to the world of health and wellbeing. The concept of ‘return on investment’ is typically used in commercial decision-making, to determine which project(s) have the highest rate of return financially (the highest % return), or will pay back the initial investment the fastest.

1 Peeling the Onion – Learning, Tips and Tools from the Health Inequalities Scrutiny Programme
<http://cfps.org.uk/phase-one>

2 <http://www.marmot-review.org.uk/>

3 Exploiting Opportunities at a Time of Change - <http://cfps.org.uk/publications?item=7008&offset=0>

The projects with the highest rate of return/fastest pay-back usually secure investment. Through a range of discussions, the team debated how relevant such concepts were to the world of council scrutiny, what could actually be measured in a health and wellbeing context, as well as the challenge of relating commercial concepts to the world of social capital, community “assets”, and immeasurable items.


The issue of timescales was examined – the long-term (even generational) nature of changes in health outcomes and the difficulty of attributing change to a single input activity. However, there were also risks to credibility of having no evidence of outcomes. If overview and scrutiny has no impact, why would we do it? CfPS has therefore created a “tool” which aims to help practitioners:

- ☑ Make overview and scrutiny more robust - focusing on impacts and outcomes.
- ☑ Integrate the policy objectives of the Marmot review into scrutiny reviews and local authority leadership – enabling local leaders to lead on Marmot objectives and outcomes.
- ☑ Embed the wider determinants and their impact on health.
- ☑ Estimate and evaluate the impact of scrutiny recommendations.

The five Scrutiny Development Areas helping to develop this new approach to carrying out a scrutiny review were:

- Adur, Worthing and Arun – Homelessness.
- Haringey – Men’s health.
- Rotherham – Morbid obesity.
- Sheffield - Diabetes in the South Asian community.
- Tendring – Falls and fall prevention.





Learning from the Scrutiny Development Areas



This publication is aimed at those councillors and officers involved in an overview and scrutiny role and who have an interest in tackling health inequalities or using the learning from this work to develop a new approach to other non health aspects of council scrutiny. It is also aimed at local leaders, to demonstrate there is a ‘business case’ for scrutiny. What sets this programme apart from some of the Centre’s previous health work is that scrutiny development areas have been helping to test and refine a new way of working – ensuring that the model explained later in this publication benefited from practical local experience, informed by ‘action learning’ about the practical application of the tool.


Although this publication addresses health inequalities, the principle of the return on investment approach can be applied to any issue. This publication therefore presents a creative approach to scrutiny, explains how each of the scrutiny development areas helped develop it and provides top tips at every stage to help you to implement it locally.

Measuring the impact – a model for measuring the ‘Return on Investment’ of an overview and scrutiny review

The model is based on **4 stages** of a “scrutiny journey”, utilising a variety of tools:

1. **Identifying and short listing topics:** understanding the health inequalities in your area and knowing what strategies to look to, to source ideas for a review of health inequalities.
2. **Prioritisation:** to make a good final decision on which topic to choose, using new ‘impact statements’ that are linked to the policy objectives of the Marmot review.
3. **Stakeholder engagement and scoping:** broadening out the review via a stakeholder event that uses a wider determinants of health approach to produce the ‘Key Lines of Enquiry’ for the review.
4. **Undertaking the review - designing measures and measuring impact – processes and outcomes:** estimating and evaluating the impact of overview and scrutiny, and testing the ways in which a potential “return on investment” may be calculated – measures of process and outcome impacts.


These stages are explained over the following sections. Each of the Scrutiny Development Areas completed their review over a six month period (however they were also testing and refining the new model at the same time). It is possible to complete the review in less time than this however it is important to give sufficient time to each stage – as not doing so may have an impact on a later stage.



Stage one – identifying topics to review

Identifying and short listing topics

Since the Centre’s previous publication “Peeling the Onion”, more and more overview and scrutiny committees are beginning to tackle reviews of health inequalities. There is a better awareness of the need to understand local health inequalities; however the breadth of health inequalities can mean that there are often many aspects that an overview and scrutiny committee could choose to review. Therefore the Scrutiny Development Areas identified the need to focus early on to:



- ✓ **Develop a long-list of topics** - getting to understand the health inequalities in an area, how to find the information and who to involve in gathering information.
- ✓ **Develop a short-list of topics** - reducing a high number of potential topics to those most relevant for overview and scrutiny.

Developing a long-list of topics

Developing a long-list of priority topics requires an amount of desktop research to help you to understand health inequalities within your area. Our health inequalities publication ‘Peeling the Onion’ gave advice on how to produce a long-list of priority topics and also how you could begin to reduce these to a more manageable short-list. In particular it promotes two tools for effective prioritisation. However in summary, there are a number of sources of information to refer to when you are generating ideas for potential topics. These include:

- The **Marmot Review of Health Inequalities in England 2010 Fair Society, Healthy Lives**, opened up a different view of health inequalities and strengthened the link to the wider social and economic determinants of health – such as local council services. Marmot demonstrated that it was not enough to focus on health outcomes and illnesses, but that work to address health inequalities needed to link to the causes of the causes of health inequalities – the wider social and economic determinants.


-
- **Joint Strategic Needs Assessments** have been in place and refined for a number of years now. The Health and Social Care Act places Joint Strategic Needs Assessments as one of the main drivers for intelligence for health and wellbeing boards and clinical commissioning groups, informing the joint health and wellbeing strategy and commissioning plans. This will ensure that they are a more robust source of information to help areas understand health inequalities that exist locally, and plan for services more effectively.
 - **Public Health Staff**, including the Director of Public Health have a vast amount of information and advice that they can give to support the review and identifying a topic for the review. Engaging them early on will enhance the review.
 - New priorities adopted by the **health and wellbeing board** and **clinical commissioning groups**.
 - **Previous overview and scrutiny reviews** may have been held on this or similar topics that could highlight relevant information and topics.
 - **Gaining local understanding** by using the knowledge of local councillors, officers, partners and communities. Intelligence from a range of sources helps to build up a picture of local inequalities that are sometimes missed when referring to data alone, including hidden vulnerable groups. Consider using national data and comparing your area to other similar demographic areas.

Developing a short-list of topics

Having developed a long-list of topics that members of the overview and scrutiny committee could pursue, there will be the need to refine and prioritise. Stage two of the model works best with no more than three or four priorities.

To produce the short-list Scrutiny Development Areas either held short-listing meetings, or produced a summary of the key priorities arising from the contextual documents such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment into a short briefing. They used information that they had gathered from the steps above to understand the top three or four priorities for the council partners or community and took these forward to the next stage.





Scrutiny Development Areas – experiences of using stage one

Adur, Arun and Worthing produced a long list of priorities from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment that encompassed the priorities of the three district councils. They used the guidance within “Peeling the Onion” to produce a short-list for discussion at the first meeting where members could add value by providing local intelligence.

Haringey used information and conversations with the Director of Public Health and the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment to come up with their long-list; they then developed a process for short listing.

Rotherham found that it can be difficult to know where to start. They also found it difficult to negotiate large and complex documents where priorities are not clearly indicated or consistent. To make best use of the sources of information, they used an officer summary and the personal experience of local councillors to add value.

Sheffield referred to the priorities within their Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and used member knowledge to prioritise.

Tendring recognised a risk that scrutiny might be overwhelmed, with over 20 topics initially proposed. The short-listing stage allowed the overall approach of the committee to be unpicked, and to start to focus on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Tendring’s own health inequalities strategy. An email questionnaire was developed and sent to all members to develop the shortlist, and incorporate their own experiences as well as the strategy and Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.

Top tips for stage one

The following tips have been created by the Scrutiny Development Areas – reflecting the things that helped them:

- ✓ Have a clear process/flow chart at the very beginning so all participants understand what they’re doing, when and why.
- ✓ Use a mix of published strategies, data and local knowledge to build up a long list of priorities.
- ✓ Don’t stick to traditional health or social care services - broaden subjects involved in the long-list, include health related areas such as education, health, crime, unemployment, housing, lifestyles etc.
- ✓ Identify which are the best ways to access information, data and experience about each topic.
- ✓ Identify the time and resources to complete reviews of potential topics.
- ✓ In cases where all the topics are high priority, identify the ones where the overview and scrutiny process can add most value – this is an estimation at this point of perceived value to the council, partners or the community.
- ✓ Consider any previous work of the council, scrutiny committee or NHS organisations on the topics.

Stage two – prioritisation and impact statements

Prioritisation

Stage one created a short-list of priority topics using needs and issues presented in the local Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, strategies and from members' knowledge etc.


The second stage of the process is detailed “**prioritisation**” of the actual topic to choose, and uses the new model for considering the return on investment. Using a more structured approach to choosing topics has the potential to revolutionise the overview and scrutiny process by focusing attention on impact and outcomes from the very start. It is important that this stage involves members and officers, perhaps an officer group producing the impact statement(s) in the first instance and members adding to this at a meeting.


The Prioritisation Stage comprises three steps:

- Step one: thinking about the potential impact of each of your short-listed topics.
- Step two: deciding which one to choose.
- Step three: considering the impact of the review and how you could measure it.

Step one – Producing an Impact Statement

This step requires you to assess the impact that the overview and scrutiny review could have. You need to complete an impact statement for each of your short-listed topics.





The impact statement process has been designed with a member of the Institute of Health Equity and is based on the policy objectives of the Marmot review. You will need to consider how your review could impact on the Marmot policy objectives of:

- ✓ Giving every child a good start in life.
- ✓ Enabling all children, young people and adults to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives.
- ✓ Creating fair employment and good work for all.
- ✓ Ensuring a healthy standard of living for all.
- ✓ Creating and developing healthy and sustainable places and communities.
- ✓ Strengthening the role and impact of ill health prevention.

Appendix one at the end of this publication offers a template for impact statements. This is based on an impact statement completed by Haringey. The impact statement(s) help you to explore the six Marmot policy objectives in more detail and has prompt questions to help you tease out more information or ideas. There are questions on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, how you measure the impact of the actions and recommendations from the review, what influence you may have, and performance to date etc.

It may not be possible to answer all of the points at once, and this could indicate some areas that you could explore later.

In addition to considering the Marmot policy objectives, two further generic questions need to be answered:

- ✓ What ideas do you have about how you could measure the difference made by your scrutiny review?
- ✓ What do you think would be the value of doing the review? Is this high, medium, or low? - consider the value to the council, its partners or the community.

Impact Statements help to focus decisions about prioritisation - however the focus on impact and measures at this early stage will help to make later conclusions and recommendations more influential.

Step two – Using a “scoring matrix” to choose the topic for review

Prioritisation concludes with the use of a scoring matrix to help you to understand where overview and scrutiny would have the most relevance. The matrix (appendix two) helps you to compare and review all of the impact statements together; and enables you to make a structured and transparent final choice of which priority to review.

Overview and scrutiny is most effective when it is able to contribute to the case for change in services or policy, therefore the level of influence is a major factor in considering whether to review the topic. If scrutiny is not able to influence the direction of action on the topic then why would you chose to review it?


The matrix is a simple form that enables you to score elements of the impact statements and consider whether:

- The topic is a priority within the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.
- Data (qualitative and quantitative) is available to support the work.
- The scrutiny review is likely to have influence.
- There is value in doing the review.

Step three – Considering what to measure

Once you have used the scoring matrix to choose the review topic, you will need to begin to define what a good quality outcome would be for the review. Having identified the desired outcome you can then begin to explore what you know about the topic already and how you could measure the potential benefits of conducting this review – the ‘return on investment’. The measurements that you select now may be refined over the life of the review and particularly within the next stage (stakeholder engagement). However it is worth investing time at this stage to consider what information is available or what needs to be created to make an estimate/forecast of the review’s impact at the end, as you will need to ask your research team or partners for this information, or you may even want to collect new information during your review.





Scrutiny Development Areas – experiences of using stage two

Adur, Arun and Worthing - topics that might have been chosen in the past (because they were ‘popular’) were dismissed as not providing sufficient value. Previous scoping processes wouldn’t have uncovered this. The questions helped focus attention and gave prompts.

Review Topic	Possible measures identified in impact statement
Homelessness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on GP cases - registrations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A&E admissions

In **Haringey** impact statements helped focus the review so it added value. They added a ‘what it means’ box to the impact statement to add clarity.

Review Topic	Possible measures identified in impact statement
Men’s Health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mortality rate from all cardiovascular disease <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Smoking prevalence and increasing 4-week quitters <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sports and leisure usage and sport participation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Percentage of population exercising 3 or more times a week <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NHS Health Checks

In **Rotherham** unusual topics emerged rather than the ‘usual suspects’, helping to uncover a hidden issue. Thinking about impact and sources of information early on helped to enrich the review.

Review Topic	Possible measures identified in impact statement
Morbid obesity BMI > 50	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support and advice for those with high BMI levels – better self management <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Targeted prevention <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Could be measured by numbers of BMI + 40/50 in deprived areas

Sheffield used impact statements to identify gaps in information. This helped challenge available measures and data.

Review Topic	Possible measures identified in impact statement
Diabetes in a South Asian community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patients on diabetes register <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduction in annual rate of complications <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase in number of people accessing services aimed at promoting self care

Tendring created their impact statements by “buddying” members and officers to work together. This helped to build relationships and also raised awareness of each others role across scrutiny and the wider functions of the council. They then used the scoring matrix to make a systematic and structured decision on which topic to take forward. The process allowed them to identify the ways that different inequalities are interlinked and how they all impacted on the wider determinants of health. It was important for a district OSC to be able to tell the story of how it identified a topic in a systematic way to enable it to raise the profile of scrutiny within the council and with wider partners.

Review Topic	Possible measures identified in impact statement
Falls and falls prevention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Falls prevention activity and outcome data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patient experience data & personal stories, LINKs data

Top tips for stage two

The following tips have been created by the Scrutiny Development Areas – reflecting the things that helped them:

- ✓ Develop a common understanding early on of the social and economic determinants of health, health inequalities and the outcomes of the Marmot review.
- ✓ Ensure that all those involved understand exactly the impact statements and the reasons why the topic of the review was chosen and the desired outcomes.
- ✓ Impact statements can take up to two hours to complete. Plan how you will complete each impact statement to mitigate the risk of investing time and energy at the beginning that 'disappears' later on. A steady pace will help full consideration of each shortlisted topic.
- ✓ A key asset is councillors' local knowledge. It can add richness to the review and help to secure commitment to scrutiny.
- ✓ Leave politics at the door – aim for cross party consensus.
- ✓ Engage a wider group of members. Selecting members for skills, interest and passion in the topic will bring a different skill set as they are able to wear other 'hats'.
- ✓ Ensure that you have buy-in from the Cabinet. Consider creating a full council debate, or having cabinet member(s) at a stakeholder event and getting them on board early.
- ✓ Officers bring great value to this stage of the model, and their local knowledge and awareness can be utilised to great effect.
- ✓ Members are local people elected by their community, they can help to engage 'real' people and translate public health speak.
- ✓ Use the model to explore the benefits of choosing a complex hidden topic compared to a more straightforward obvious one.



Stage three - stakeholder engagement and scoping

Early work from the Health Inequalities Scrutiny programme found that to get the most benefit from a review, you need commitments from partners from the start. Most of these reviews were not conducted by overview and scrutiny committees working on their own but were partnerships including a wider range of key stakeholders.

Taking a “whole systems approach” to the wider determinants of health we developed a model for stakeholder engagement and getting started with the review. This involved planning and holding an engagement event with a wide group of stakeholders.


The stakeholder engagement stage comprises two steps:

- Step one: Holding a stakeholder event.
- Step two: Starting the review.

Step one: Stakeholder engagement

This step involves broad stakeholder engagement via an event that uses the determinants of health to begin to develop a whole systems response to the review topic. Participants need to consider what they already know about the following:

- What works and what doesn't - what's the evidence?
- What more can be done to tackle the issue and by whom?
- What appears important to you?
- What actions would make the most difference? Would this be:
 - a radical difference?
 - a small incremental step(s)?



Involving the right people is key to success. Undertaking a stakeholder analysis will help work out who you need to attend the event. To ensure that you invite representatives from across the whole system, consider using a matrix to identify a good mix of people for the subject. For example invite a cross section from the public, private, voluntary, community and faith sectors (depending on your topic) who have:

- **Authority** – i.e. decision makers or community champions.
- **Resources** - i.e. commissioners.
- **Expertise** – i.e. professionals and local people.
- **Information** – i.e. data and intelligence.
- **Needs** – i.e. people or groups you are trying to help.

To support this approach to scrutiny, the CfPS has developed a “Stakeholder Engagement Wheel” (Appendix three).

The wheel is based on the wider social and economic determinants of health; and prompts participants to consider the different roles and questions highlighted above for:

- individuals
- organisations; and
- communities.

Using this type of approach helps you to develop the scope of your review, generating your ‘Key Lines of Enquiry’ for the review as areas to focus on or gaps to fill emerge.



Sheffield SDA



Haringey SDA



Step two: Getting started with the review

This will look at all of the research and information gathered so far on the chosen topic from the prioritisation stage and from the stakeholder event. This information and evidence will be used to help councillors agree:

- ☑ What should be reviewed of ‘what works or what doesn’t’?
- ☑ What actions, activities and outcomes could the review influence?
For example you might consider investment / disinvestment recommendations.
- ☑ Refine the ‘Key Lines of Enquiry’ – developing the questions you want to ask during the review.

You may well find simple project planning tools help to support different aspects of scrutiny activity.

Scrutiny Development Areas – experiences of using the Stakeholder Engagement Wheel

Haringey used the stakeholder wheel as a mechanism to highlight gaps in review strategy by adding additional key lines of enquiry. The tool helped to illustrate a subset of challenges - how to reach everyone and being realistic and targeted about what could be achieved.

Sheffield used the wheel to get buy in from stakeholders at an early stage by demonstrating the value of what people had to say and that their input would influence the review. People worked in small groups so that everyone could contribute to framing key lines of inquiry.

Adur, Arun and Worthing used the stakeholder engagement tool as part of a broader evidence gathering element, which helped to include ‘real’ people. The wheel was a highly visual illustration of where scrutiny could have impact. The event brought people together that wouldn’t have otherwise met.

Rotherham used small group work to develop new contacts around a shared desire to continue to build relationships. Using the wheel helped identify the concept of wider determinants of health, health inequalities and the impact of factors outside the control of the NHS (e.g. housing).

Tendring used the wheel alongside ‘a gifts and hooks’ exercise (a workshop exercise to look at the knowledge, expertise, personal or professional experience that the stakeholders can bring to the review and what they want to get out of it). Local facilitation showed local leadership of the issue, and stakeholders recognised that overview and scrutiny could be a powerful catalyst in driving improvement.

Top tips for stage three

The following tips have been created by the Scrutiny Development Areas – reflecting the things that helped them:


- ✓ Involve the right people by using a stakeholder matrix to ensure the ‘whole system’ is involved.
- ✓ Give people information beforehand so they know what will happen and can prepare for a potentially different way of working.
- ✓ Define your partners and their roles and responsibilities. What do you expect from them?
- ✓ Clarify the purpose of engagement. It is to:
 - Get views on what aspects of the topic it would be most valuable to pursue.
 - Build relationships.
 - Identify other people to talk to or further sources of information.
- ✓ Emphasise that this is innovative. Overview and scrutiny has previously chosen the topic and decided on witnesses to call, so asking for ideas on areas of focus for the topic, in advance of starting the review, is new, innovative, and inclusive.
- ✓ Set the scene for collaborative, cooperative working. Lead by ‘doing’; understand how working together adds value.
- ✓ Recognise and showcase overview and scrutiny’s importance, what it can and can’t do. Overview and scrutiny can bring everyone together creating synergy and energy; it can break down barriers etc.
- ✓ Create a no blame atmosphere.
- ✓ Value every comment and demonstrate how stakeholder comments and views have been listened to and influenced outcomes.
- ✓ Ensure that all participants are well briefed and have sufficient seniority to take part effectively.
- ✓ Different stakeholders have very different information – there is value in engaging with as wide an audience as possible.
- ✓ Make the most of jointly appointed health employees – they can add value and momentum to the review.



Stage four - Undertaking the review

Designing measures and measuring impact

Stages one and two identified the topic that should be reviewed; stage three helped to understand what was already happening with regards to that topic and what angle the investigations should take. Stage four is carrying out the review, simultaneously estimating and evaluating the impact of overview and scrutiny and testing the ways in which a potential “return on investment” may be calculated. This is the stage where you will need to decide on what and how to measure and evaluate.



To do this, you need to go back to work you did to prepare the initial Impact Statement. This was when you first started to think about measures for six Marmot policy objectives and how the review could have influence.

Developing measures is difficult, especially at the start of the review, rather than at the end! However, it is helpful to be thinking about how overview and scrutiny can impact on, and add value to reducing health inequalities, the Marmot objectives, and the wider determinants of health in a whole systems context. To do this, you need to choose or create measures.

This Stage comprises two steps:

- Step one: Understanding the concept of return on investment and how it applies to your review.
- Step two: Estimating the potential return on investment.

Step one: What is return on investment, and how can we apply it to a review?

Classically, the concept of a return on investment captures the increase or change in something, for example, monetary value. We might consider the following for example:

- If we invest £1,000 will we get back more than we invest? And if so what is the percentage increase?
- If we invest £1,000, how fast will we get the money back - in 2 years? 10 years? 30 years?
- How do we choose between a high return and a quick return?

We're all familiar with this to some extent through loans, mortgages or other investment decisions - but translating these concepts into social and qualitative domains has been fraught with difficulty!

So how does this relate to overview and scrutiny? Questions to ask are:


- If we put time and/or money into overview and scrutiny activity, what will it change, improve or increase?
- What's the "payback" from scrutiny, how fast do we get it and who will experience it?
- If we can't answer these questions, why are we doing it?

Obviously, we do think overview and scrutiny is valuable. So how do we capture that? We suggest that there may be two sorts of value from overview and scrutiny that you could measure or estimate. These are the:

- ☑ Value of the review itself as a process – producing a good quality report with well argued recommendations for action; and capturing overview and scrutiny's impact on process changes, such as better networking, better awareness etc.
- ☑ 'Outcome impacts' – improving access to services or improving the health of individuals and communities; and providing value for money.

As ever with overview and scrutiny, asking the right question is key! You will need to turn the chosen topic and the key lines of enquiry identified in stage three into a question that will begin to explore the return on investment of your actions. It is important not to have a narrow focus at this stage. Using the wider determinants of health, we can generate a wide range of ideas for action. For example, what actions would have most impact on the desired outcome (i.e. the highest rate of return)?





Each of the five Scrutiny Development Areas identified a topic, used the stakeholder event to understand the topic and identify areas for the review (key lines of enquiry). Following this, members and officers debated the question that they wanted the review to answer. Below are examples of the topics and questions that they used.

Area and chosen topic	What was the question that you wanted the review to answer?	What was the Return on Investment (ROI) question?
Adur, Arun and Worthing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Homelessness	What is the impact of a homeless person not having access to a GP?	What would be the ROI of enabling homeless people to register with a GP?
Haringey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Men's health	How do we engage men over 40 years of age in Haringey's corridor of deprivation in prevention and early intervention services to close the life expectancy gap and reduce premature death from cardio vascular disease?	What would be the ROI if we engaged men over 40 who were at risk of cardio vascular disease with health and wellbeing services?
Rotherham <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Morbid obesity	How can we improve co-ordination between services so as to improve the quality of life and care of people with a BMI>50 and who are housebound and unable to get out of their home unaided?	What would be the ROI of better service coordination and improving their quality of life and care?
Sheffield <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Diabetes in a South Asian community	How can we improve and target information about diabetes at 'at risk groups' in order to raise awareness and combat myths about the condition?	What would be the ROI if we are able to improve and target information about diabetes at 'at risk groups' in order to raise awareness and combat myths about the condition, leading to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> improved case finding; and <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> increased number of people who are able to effectively manage their condition?
Tendring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Falls prevention	What potential is there for reducing the number of falls for different groups of the population in Tendring?	What is the rate of return of health scrutiny helping to reduce the number of falls in Tendring District?

Step two: Estimating the process and output “return on investment”

As mentioned above there are two ways to measure the impact of your review:

- Measuring the review **process** itself – what has the review achieved that is hard to measure (‘soft’ outcomes).
- Measuring what has or will change as a consequence of the review – the **outcomes**.

Here are some examples of **process** and **outcome** measures that might be developed:

Process benefits of the review	Outcome changes in the topic/condition/area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Improved networking. ✓ Increased awareness of the chosen topic by all and the value of better communication. ✓ A shared understanding of a problem and possible solutions. ✓ Clear recommendations created on what can be measured and for which groups. ✓ Recommendations valued and adopted by Council's Executive, Health and Wellbeing Board, Commissioning Groups and providers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Short-term change in a proxy measure. ✓ Aspirations for long term improvements and commitment to measure progress over time. ✓ An increase in the number of people from X group who self manage. ✓ A movement along the social determinants “wheel”. ✓ % improvement in smoking cessation. ✓ Increase in community activity. ✓ % improvement in the number of children deemed ready for school. ✓ % reduction in young people Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEETs).

Let’s think this through with a topic: Giving every child a best start in life, particularly making sure that they are ‘ready’ for school. The overview and scrutiny review panel could estimate both process changes and their impact on the likeliness of achieving the Marmot objective of improving the readiness of children for school.

If only 35% of pre-school children are prepared for school now, what interventions (or more of them) could shift this to 55%? Their **process** benefits might be:

- A process that has involved the right players.
- A better understanding of the range of interventions available.
- A better understanding of which interventions have most influence on outcomes.
- An identification of the likely savings long-term.
- A process that has influenced implementation and X actions.





The **outcome** changes generated might be: fewer NEETS in 10-15 years time.

We expect that one of the advantages of carrying out a whole-systems, return on investment type of review may be that a much wider range of interventions from across the whole span of the social determinants get considered in order to secure the outcome.

Over the following pages you will see how each of the Scrutiny Development Areas identified the return on investment of their review. Also attached at Appendix four is a copy of a matrix produced by Tendring that shows the outcome measures and process measures.

Assumptions and health warnings

In assessing the potential return on investment, changes in ways of working and a focus on health inequalities will no doubt realise a financial saving both in joined up delivery and less money spent within the health service, however this is difficult to quantify and assign credit to the review alone. Therefore in order to determine the potential return on investment that the review could realise, a number of assumptions need to be made. These included estimating how much the actual review cost, and measuring the value of intangibles, such as networking. Below is a summary of what the Scrutiny Development Areas did:

Scrutiny Development Areas calculated the **review costs** using the number of hours taken up within the review. This included officer research, attendance at meetings etc. Each area tackled this slightly differently when assigning a cost to the review hours.

- ✓ **Arun, Adur and Worthing, and Tendring** used the average wage of those involved within the review.
- ✓ **Haringey** used the median wage for their area.
- ✓ **Rotherham and Sheffield** used the average scrutiny officer and member costs.

Some of the most valuable aspects of the reviews were intangible.

Networking and new contacts made during the reviews, leading to a greater awareness of the challenges and opportunities both in reducing health inequalities and of working in partnership leading to more joined up services. Therefore how can you measure the value of networking?

- ✓ **Rotherham** measured the activity that took place as a consequence of the review i.e. the number of hours of networking that took place, and applied a notional average hourly wage of £30 to reflect the average wage of the professionals around the table.

This publication and the model within it is not an exact science. Most of the Scrutiny Development Areas did not use health economists or finance professionals within their reviews and therefore the calculations represent the potential return on investment – not a definitive saving.

Adur, Arun and Worthing – Measuring the return on investment

In **Adur, Arun and Worthing** they quickly became aware from evidence that Arun District has the 4th highest number of people in the UK who sleep rough on its streets. The review was undertaken to consider the ROI of improving the health and wellbeing of homeless people.

Return on investment

The rate of return question evolved during the course of the review and although it appeared relatively easy at first, answering it became more difficult. As the recommendations evolved, the actual ROI statement focused on the benefits of enabling homeless people to register with a GP as this would reduce attendance at A&E with resulting reduction in health care costs. The review explored the demand on A&E and hospital admission for homeless people and compared that to if they were registered with a GP – it found that it was cheaper for a homeless person to register and visit a GP as this then reduced the burden on A&E services. It also found that homeless people were on average 8 times more likely to visit A&E if they were not registered with a GP. Further work then identified the cost of undertaking the review. Using this, it was possible to calculate the numbers of homeless people required to register to have an overall net saving.

Return on investment calculation

- ✓ Review costs: 334 review hours x average wage £11.60/hr = £3874
- ✓ Estimated cost per visit to A & E = £131
- ✓ Cost of registration and visit to GP = £79
- ✓ Potential saving if registered with GP = £52 (£131-£79)

Return on Investment of the review £416 per person this being saving to A&E per person registering with GP = £52 x 8 visits = £416

- ✓ Number of homeless people needed to register to balance review = 10

Benefits of using the model

Use of the model enabled a “hidden” topic to be raised with some robust and significant recommendations arising out of it. Because of the nature of the topic, it was difficult to assess immediate short-term outcomes. However short-term process benefits were:

- Acceptance by all three Councils of the recommendations of the Review.
- Working groups have been set up to design action plans to take forward the recommendations.
- There was an increase in collaborative working and engagement across the three Council's stakeholders.
- A sharing of information and networking of likeminded groups who had not known of each other's existence.

Key learning points

- It is important to have a data specialist helping with the review - someone with expertise in how to do this type of calculation early would help to identify the type of data they need to look for.

NB These calculations are indicative and have not been created with health economists or finance experts.



Haringey – Measuring the return on investment

Haringey's scrutiny review was entitled: Men's Health: Getting to the Heart of the Matter; and considered what the ROI would be if they engaged men over 40 who were at risk of cardio vascular disease with health and wellbeing services.

Return on investment calculation

They found the process of measuring the ROI of the review difficult – with so many contributing factors to improving health they felt it was difficult to assign credit to the review alone, as many of the outcomes are long-term, so the potential impact has to be considered as well as short-term outcomes. They agreed that the ROI would be calculated using:

- ✓ The review costs (estimated hours spend on the review using the median weekly wage)
- ✓ The income of a person who stops smoking over an 8 year period.
- ✓ Cost to the NHS to help one person stop smoking – £209.

Assumptions: This calculation assumes that a person that stops smoking will live eight years longer and that they will work for this time – there are also other factors to consider.

Review costs

- ✓ 1308 (36.3 wks) at median wage of £562pw = £20,400

Increased life expectancy

- ✓ 1872 hrs worked times 8 years added life expectancy = 14,976 extra hours worked
- ✓ 14,976 extra hrs worked over 8 years = 416 extra weeks worked
- ✓ 416 extra weeks worked times by Haringey median wage = £233,792 in extra earnings

Return on investment

- ✓ £233,792 minus £209 = **£233,583**
- ✓ £233,583 minus cost of the review (£20,400) = **£213,182.**

Benefits of using the model

Haringey found the model very useful and have taken this a step further and are working to identify a methodology of incorporating the quality of life equation used in public health. Short-term process benefits have been identified such as:

- Enhanced networking and new contacts made and taken forward.
- A reduction in professional silos as organisations work together to improve the health of men.
- One immediate and unexpected return was the Whittington Health Urgent Care Centre Project, a web-based health information tool for the general public which is currently being piloted. Due to the review the developer is designing a men focused version with specific language which will appeal to them.

Key learning points

- There's a danger of using a cost benefit analysis with a long-term issue.
- Calculation of specific figures are not necessary when you can have a broad answer e.g. all of costs for this work would have been paid for 20 x over if one person gave up smoking. So you can give the working behind the ROI rather than the final figure.
- Does not allow for other factors e.g. work already taking place elsewhere in the borough and therefore it is not possible to accurately quantify.

NB These calculations are indicative and have not been created with health economists or finance experts.

Rotherham– Measuring the return on investment

Rotherham's review aimed to assess the return on investment of improving coordination between services so as to improve the quality of life and care of people with a BMI>50 and who are housebound. However it proved difficult to define “currencies” – other than money – that could be used to value impacts and also to value “softer” impacts such as the creation of new networks. Therefore two calculations were developed for assessing the ROI:

- Short-term/process/outputs of the review, comparing the time spent on the review with the value of networking.
- Long-term/outcomes impact of the review, estimating potential benefits and savings from implementing the three core recommendations, e.g.
 - Costs and benefits of anticipatory risk assessments.
 - Co-ordination of information sharing leading to reduced duplication of callouts/wasted time.
 - Reduced costs of injury to fire/ambulance staff etc.

Return on investment calculation – Short-term ROI calculation

☑ Review costs: 160 review hours x average salary £20/hr = £3200

☑ Networking value: 248 hours x average salary £30/hr = £7440

Short-term ‘Return on Investment’ of the review = £4240 or 232%

Long-term ROI calculation - Review savings including:

- Savings to ambulance/fire service for exceptional incidents and injury = £11,115 per year and for early retirements due to injury avoided.
- Savings to NHS in relation to delays in discharge from hospital.
- Savings to NHS and Social Care in relation to extra care support required following an incident.
- Savings to each agency to undertake assessments = approx £50 per assessment.

Estimated long-term ‘Return on Investment’ = £50k pa or 1562%

Benefits of using the model

- Thorough initial prioritisation of potential scrutiny topics enabled a new area for scrutiny to come forward – a specific and relatively “hidden” group with real focus on health inequalities.
- Creating networks of public and 3rd sector partners who have not engaged with each other before and can now focus on the issue collaboratively.

Key learning points

- The value of highly engaged and committed Councillors.
- Essential to explain to all that this is a different and innovative way of deciding on what aspects of the topic scrutiny should focus on.
- Participants loved using the “wheel” and it created animated discussion and ideas – widened the debate beyond health.
- Accessing ‘real’ people/service users was a problem, as were ethical issues around capturing personal stories to evidence the impact of the review. This learning will be built in to future work.
- Maximizing your influence by having only 2-4 key recommendations – that are do-able and have been discussed with those whose budgets will be called upon.

NB These calculations are indicative and have not been created with health economists or finance experts.





Sheffield – Measuring the return on investment

Sheffield's review focused on diabetes in South Asian Communities and considered what the ROI would be on improved information about diabetes to 'at risk' groups in order to raise awareness and combat myths about the condition – leading to improved case finding and increasing the number of people managing their condition.

Return on investment calculation

The value per person with diabetes of moving them from being poorly managed to moderately managed; and from moderately managed to well managed have been calculated. The impact of the recommendations can therefore be estimated by finding out how many people locally are in each category and estimating how many can be encouraged to improve their category, using national or local data.

Review hours	Review costs	Diabetes management level	Cost per patient to NHS
137 costed out review hours at £25/ph	£3425	Moderately managed	£2000
Other review costs	£230	Poorly managed	£8500
Total review cost	£3655	Difference	£6500 per patient
Estimated impact through Diabetes UK supporting 30 people a year to move from managing their diabetes poorly to moderately, 30 x £6500 = £195,000 pa saving			
Return on investment - £195,000 less cost of review = £191,345 or 5235%			

Benefits of using the model

- Raising public profile of the issue.
- Raising Member awareness of public health issues – particularly around the value of community interventions.
- Engaging people in the democratic process that otherwise wouldn't have been.
- Recommendations developed with the people who will be responsible for implementing them.

Key learning points

- All that counts can't be counted – difficult to put a value on some things.
- Attributing impact – difficult to estimate scrutiny impact vs other factors.
- Stakeholder event/engagement wheel good way of starting review process.

NB These calculations are indicative and have not been created with health economists or finance experts.

Tendring – Measuring the return on investment

After completing the impact statements, **Tendring** chose to review falls preventions and in particular the ROI from preventing a fall.

Return on investment

The committee used a monetary value to measure its ROI. They used a calculated cost of the review, and also a mix of data including:

- ✓ Cost for treatment of a fall as a person travels through the care path way.
- ✓ Time and cost of ambulance response for a person who has fallen.

Return on investment calculation

- ✓ Review costs: 316 review hours x average wage £12.29/hr = £3885
- ✓ A figure of £25,000 per fall was identified as a realistic approximation of the costs of a person falling and requiring hospital treatment.

Return on Investment of the review if it prevented one fall £21115 or ROI 643%

Benefits of using the model

Tendring found the process valuable:


- Stage two was particularly useful – the focus on prioritisations and producing impact statements helped them to justify the reason for the review in real terms.
- Considering outcomes and process outcomes helped them to get great value from the review – see appendix 4 for the matrix that they used.

Key learning points

- Creating links between members and officers at the impact statement stage was an effective way to build relationships and involve the wider council in the scrutiny process.
- It was important to explain the health inequality dimensions of the topic of falls and communicate the reasons for choosing this topic to a wider audience.
- A collaborative approach to the scrutiny process, and in particular to the way the scrutiny committee meetings were managed, ensured that all the stakeholders felt able to contribute to improving the effectiveness of services and ensured that scrutiny could address the issues of inter-agency working and partnerships in an open and honest way.
- Involving stakeholders from the three key sectors - statutory, voluntary and private - was important to obtain a full picture of the incidence of falls in Tendring.
- Having a defined and structured model for scrutiny through the ROI impact model has helped to promote the potential of effective scrutiny locally.

NB These calculations are indicative and have not been created with health economists or finance experts.





Top Tips for stage four

The following tips have been created by the Scrutiny Development Areas – reflecting the things that helped them:

- ✓ The model helps to identify short-term **process** outcomes and also longer-term **outcomes** on health.
- ✓ Consider engaging an expert (financial or data) as having expertise in how to do this type of calculation early on can help people to know the type of data they need to look for.
- ✓ Clear understanding of what it is the review wants to achieve (outcome) and that you have access to or can develop a way of measuring success.
- ✓ Recognise early on that this stage of the model can be trial and error; persevere as when you have found an answer it will demonstrate the value of the review.
- ✓ It is OK to have a mix of process benefits and outcomes.
- ✓ Don't over think it!
- ✓ It can be difficult to define “currencies” – other than money – that could be used to value impacts and also to value “softer” outcomes such as the creation of new networks. Do consider different categories of measurement, such as:
 - social value – community value
 - time and effort
 - values
 - quality of life
 - self esteem
 - health
- ✓ Value relationships, networking, partnerships, stakeholder engagement and softer outcomes.

Conclusion

This programme was built on the desire to demonstrate the value that overview and scrutiny can bring to tackling health inequalities and to develop understanding about how this learning might apply to other non health aspects of council scrutiny – how to focus scrutiny on activity that really makes a difference, capturing measures to demonstrate a ‘business case’ for resourcing scrutiny. It took the complex task of creating a way to measure the return on investment of overview and scrutiny and produced a usable model that actually shows the value of a review and its recommendations.

The journey was not easy, developing a tool that is simple and easy to use has been a challenge; and over time it will be further refined. There are elements of the work that are still in progress, such as using personal stories as evidence of the difference a review can make. However, there was consensus amongst the Scrutiny Development Areas that the model helped them to demonstrate the value of their work, and to choose topics where scrutiny was able to make a real difference. Most scrutiny development areas will be using the model in subsequent work.

CfPS believes that there is a revitalised role for overview and scrutiny within the health reforms; a more proactive role that focuses on the outcomes and the effect of services and interventions for our communities. This new model allows overview and scrutiny to assess the possible effect of a review before committing time and resources.

What the Scrutiny Development Areas thought

“The best piece of scrutiny work we have ever done”

Adur, Arun and Worthing Scrutiny Development Area

“The project team found the scrutiny engagement wheel a fantastic way to map our progress in the review and to identify hidden aspects and relationships within our micro health economy”

Cllr David Winskill, Chair of the Review Panel, Haringey Scrutiny Development Area

“The review model tested by this scrutiny review has been acknowledged by members as good practice for future reviews of a similar nature”

Report from Rotherham Scrutiny Development Area

“All that counts can’t be counted – difficult to put a value on some things”

Sheffield Scrutiny Development Area

“The model enabled us to try new approaches to scrutiny in Tendring and we were able to work with a large group of local stakeholders to really understand the issue of falls.” “We also want to use the model again and return to some of the other health inequality topics we identified when we wrote the impact statements”

Tendring Scrutiny Development Area

If you would like support to use this model, please email scrutiny@cfps.org.uk



Appendix one – Impact Statement from Haringey Scrutiny Development Area

Men’s Health: Getting to the Heart of the Matter

Key questions	Responses
<p>Giving every child a good start in life?</p> <p>What this means?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce inequalities in the early development of physical and emotional health, and cognitive, linguistic, and social skills. 2. Ensure high quality maternity services, parenting programmes, childcare and early years education to meet need across the social gradient. 3. Build the resilience and well-being of young children across the social gradient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could you measure this? • How could you measure the Marmot indicator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy at birth • Readiness for school • Are measures / information available – very, reasonably or scarcely? • How much influence do you think the review could have – High, Medium, Low? • How could you structure dissemination to have most influence? 	<p>The review will have a low impact on this policy objective. There is an indirect link as the foundations for virtually every aspect of human development- physical, intellectual and emotional are laid in early childhood, although this is not the specific focus of the review.</p> <p>Should there be parents within the target group, there may be a cascading effect as their own health conditions improve. A reduction in smoking could improve the physical environment in which children are born and raised. More emphasis on healthy eating could impact on the general diet for the whole family. Improved well being could allow the parent to then focus attention on their child’s development. This would require longitudinal research however of identified family groups and is outside the scope of the review.</p>
<p>Enabling all children, young people and adults to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives?</p> <p>What this means?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce the social gradient in skills and qualifications. 2. Ensure that schools, families and communities work in partnership to reduce the gradient in health, well-being and resilience of children and young people. 3. Improve the access and use of quality lifelong learning across the social gradient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could you measure this? • How could you measure the Marmot indicator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readiness for school • Young people NEET • Are measures / information available – very, reasonably or scarcely? • How much influence do you think the review could have – High, Medium, Low? • How could you structure dissemination to have most influence? 	<p>The review will have a low impact on this policy objective. There is an indirect link as inequalities in educational outcomes affect physical and mental health, as well as income, employment and quality of life, however again this is not the focus of the review.</p>

<p>Creating fair employment and good work for all?</p> <p>What this means?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve access to good jobs and reduce long-term unemployment across the social gradient. 2. Make it easier for people who are disadvantaged in the labour market to obtain and keep work. 3. Improve quality of jobs across the social gradient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could you measure this? • How could you measure the Marmot indicator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people NEET • % of people in households receiving means tested benefits • Are measures / information available – very, reasonably or scarcely? • How much influence do you think the review could have – High, Medium, Low? • How could you structure dissemination to have most influence? 	<p>The review will have a low impact on this policy objective.</p> <p>There is an indirect link as being in good employment is protective of health. Employment however must be sustainable and offer a minimum level of quality (i.e. development, flexibility and protection from adverse working conditions) to contribute to good health. This however is not the focus of this review.</p> <p>Accepting the above, by engaging with health services, the target group may then not be subject to restrictions on work arising from ill-health thus giving them continuity of employment as well as overall increasing their working lives.</p> <p>On reflection the Panel felt that the review had a medium impact on this area. A recommendation was made on health acknowledging employment as a wider determinant of health.</p>
<p>Ensuring a healthy standard of living for all?</p> <p>What this means?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a minimum income for healthy living for people of all ages. 2. Reduce the social gradient in the standard of living through progressive taxation and other fiscal policies. 3. Reduce the cliff edges faced by people moving between benefits and work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could you measure this? • How could you measure the Marmot indicator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of people in households receiving means tested benefits • Are measures / information available – very, reasonably or scarcely? • How much influence do you think the review could have – High, Medium, Low? • How could you structure dissemination to have most influence? 	<p>The review will have a low impact on this policy objective.</p> <p>There is an indirect link as having insufficient money to knead a healthy life is a highly significant cause of health inequalities; however this is not the focus of this review.</p>

<p>Creating and developing healthy and sustainable places and communities?</p> <p>What this means?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop common policies to reduce the scale and impact of climate change and health inequalities. 2. Improve community capital and reduce social isolation across the social gradient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could you measure this? • How could you measure the Marmot indicator? • Are measures / information available – very, reasonably or scarcely? • How much influence do you think the review could have – High, Medium, Low? • How could you structure dissemination to have most influence? 	<p>The review will have a low impact on this policy objective. There is an indirect link as communities are important for physical and mental health and wellbeing. Access to open green spaces and healthy foods are also important for improving health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Should the identified group engage with health agencies as envisioned, the resulting improvement in their working lives, coupled with the commensurate certainty of income, may well increase spending power within the local community thus enhancing its sustainability. In addition continuing good health will enable them to fully engage with their communities. Again however, this is a long-term outcome for this group and requires longitudinal study which is outside the scope of this review.</p> <p>On reflection the Panel felt that the review had a medium impact on this area. This was following discussion around two large regeneration projects in the borough and a recommendation on the potential for them to contribute to the reduction in health inequalities, particularly when coupled with local primary care changes. It was also following hearing more about the work of the Tottenham Hotspur Foundation projects as well as Health Champions, Health Trainers and evidence from the Local Involvement Network.</p>
<p>Strengthening the role and impact of ill health prevention?</p> <p>What this means?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritise prevention and early detection of those conditions most strongly related to health inequalities. 2. Increase availability of long-term and sustainable funding in ill health prevention across the social gradient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could you measure this? • How could you measure the Marmot indicator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy at birth • Disability free life expectancy at birth • Are measures / information available – very, reasonably or scarcely? • How much influence do you think the review could have – High, Medium, Low? • How could you structure dissemination to have most influence? 	<p>The review will have a high impact on this policy objective. Many of the key health behaviours significant to the development of chronic disease, including CVD, follow the social gradient: smoking, obesity, lack of physical activity, unhealthy nutrition.</p> <p>In Haringey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On average there is a nine year difference between men living in Tottenham Green ward (72.5 years) and those living in Fortis Green ward (81.5 years). • Circulatory diseases are the greatest contributor (28%) to the gap in male life expectancy between Haringey and England. • Death rates from cardiovascular disease under 75 years are highest in the east of the borough, in particular in Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale. • Around 28.6% of men smoke compared with 25.3% for London. • In 2006 over 50% of men were overweight or obese. • 23.3% of the adult population took part in moderate sport and physical activity three times a week.

Sources of Data: a range of data can be found on the [Haringey: Our Place](#) page, in particular on the [Healthier People with a better quality of life](#) section. Data is sourced from a number of sources for example Joint Strategic Needs Assessments, the Borough Profile, Haringey Health Profile and NHS Haringey Neighbourhood Plans.

Through the review we will focus on the prevention and early intervention of cardiovascular disease in men in the east of the borough. You could measure this via:

- Reducing the mortality rate from all cardiovascular disease (including heart disease and stroke)
- Reducing smoking prevalence
- Increasing the number of 4 week smoking quitters who attended NHS Stop Smoking Services
- Increasing sports and Leisure Usage
- Increasing adult participation in sport and active recreation
- Increasing the percentage of population exercising 3 or more times a week
- Increasing NHS Health Checks

What ideas do you have about how you will measure the difference made by your scrutiny review?

By focusing on what would be the return on investment (ROI) if, the life expectancy corridor of the Borough, we engaged men over 40 who were at risk of cardio vascular disease (referred to hereafter as Group A) with health services.

The hypothesis is that with engagement, Group A's health improves as they take responsibility for action, resulting in decreased health care costs, increasing life expectancy and earning power. A financial calculation will be made as to the numbers required to make this change to demonstrate an ROI for the review.

In addition, the recommendations arising from the review in order for this to occur will also demonstrate an ROI.

What do you think would be the value of doing the review? High, medium, low.

- 73% of the difference in male life expectancy gap between Haringey and England is due to men over 40 years of age.
- By changing certain risk factors in those over 40 years of age a significant improvement can be made as to whether or not the persons suffers from Cardio Vascular Disease.
- The Health Check programme focuses on those over 40 years of age and so it is hoped that this review complements this work.


Thus reviewing how engagement with health services can be improved for this risk group provides high value and will build upon work already undertaken within the Borough.

Recommendations of the review are also due to feed into the Health and Wellbeing Strategy Delivery Plan.

Appendix two – Impact Scoring Matrix – from Rotherham Scrutiny Development Area

Impact considerations	Topic 1 (obesity)	Topic 2 (Mental health & Alcohol use)	Topic 3 (Drug use in young people)
<p>How high a priority is the topic within the JSNA?</p> <p>High, medium or low</p>	<p>High – obesity as a whole features strongly as an issue</p>	<p>High - For mental health broadly</p> <p>Alcohol specifically – not featured (but this could be a gap)</p>	<p>Low - This topic does not figure highly in the JSNA (which may indicate a gap in the JSNA)</p>
<p>How available are measures and info?</p> <p>Very, Reasonably or Scarcely</p>	<p>Very – lots of work already in relation to obesity issues and specific interventions</p>	<p>Scarcely for alcohol specific issues linked to mental health – would need more work to establish what is available</p>	<p>Scarcely - reasonably for some data and measures</p> <p>Very - available for NEETS info and data</p>
<p>How much influence is the scrutiny review likely to have?</p> <p>High, medium or low</p>	<p>High – although lots of interventions and work already going on, there is nothing focusing on those with a BMI 50+</p>	<p>Low – due to the issues, complexities and nature of this type of review</p>	<p>Medium – although an important issue, not sure of the impact which would be made</p>
<p>Overall, what is the likely value of the review?</p> <p>High, medium or low</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>High - If a larger review could be done</p> <p>Low In this instance</p>	<p>Low - Potentially too broad an issue to add real value</p>

Appendix 3 – Stakeholder Engagement Wheel



Key

- inner circle - individual
- mid circle - community + vs
- outer circle - org/agency

Appendix 4 - Return on investment measures matrix - Tendring Scrutiny Development Area

Outcomes Measures		Process Measures	
Measure	Evidence sources	Measure	Evidence sources
1. Reduction in the number of falls in older people in Tendring in 2012	PCT / Acute / GP / Ambulance activity data	1. Report and recommendations adopted by Tendring District Council cabinet	Scrutiny report and recommendations
2. Better understanding of the distribution of falls amongst different demographic and health inequality groups in Tendring in 2012. (Specific measures for people with disability, people with visual impairment, gender, people living alone, people aged over 85 years)	PCT / GP data JSNA	2. Greater involvement of private sector health and social care agencies in falls work with statutory and voluntary sector organisations and agencies	Meeting and participation data
3. Development of the care pathway for the prevention and treatment of falls in Tendring. The care pathway is targeted to relevant demographic and health inequality data.	PCT / GP strategy documents	3. Increase in information sharing and networking between stakeholders involved in the falls pathway	Information sharing data Meeting and forum data
4. Rates of access to falls prevention and education services for groups of the population in Tendring	Falls prevention activity and outcome data	4. Development of the local evidence base about falls in Tendring – linking research with local data and user experience	Scrutiny report
5. Capture of wider patient and carer experience and feedback from people living in Tendring	Patient experience data Patient and carer stories, case studies and insights LINKs data	5. Increase in awareness of the topic of falls amongst the public and organisations in Tendring	Feedback questionnaires Stakeholder event evaluation Media reports Multi-agency events
		6. Development of health overview and scrutiny processes and profile in Tendring District Council	Learning event outcomes

The Centre for Public Scrutiny
Local Government House
Smith Square
London SW1P 3HZ

Tel +44 (0)20 7187 7362

www.cfps.org.uk

CfPS is a registered charity no 1136243

Agenda Item 10

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee - 9 June 2014

PROTOCOL FOR CO-OPTION

Purpose	This report seeks agreement on a protocol for co-option to ensure a consistent approach across Panels and Working Groups.
Content	Information from relevant guidance is presented to ensure understanding about the power to co-opt and benefits. This report focuses on non-statutory co-option.
Councillors are being asked to	agree the protocol to aid consideration of co-option to scrutiny
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of Scrutiny Programme Committee.
Lead Officer & Report Author	Brij Madahar, Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Guidance on Co-option

- 1.1 Scrutiny has the power to co-opt non-voting members for either a topic or a term up to the next Annual Meeting of Council. There is no formal mechanism for co-option and relevant legislation / guidance focuses on co-option as a way of involving those who are not councillors in the scrutiny process (*that does not preclude the co-option of other councillors as non voting members but there is no automatic right for members to be co-opted onto a scrutiny committee / body or their request to be placed on an agenda*).
- 1.2 Co-option in the main is about scrutiny reaching out for expert knowledge or skills from others to support elected members in their deliberations and adding value to their work. It would effectively mean having someone work alongside Panel / Working Group members at all stages, e.g. planning of meetings, evidence gathering, drawing up conclusions and recommendations.
- 1.3 Any scrutiny body interested in co-option should consider:
 - the range of expertise, skills and knowledge needed to effectively deliver its work
 - the range of expertise, skills and knowledge the existing members are already able to bring
 - where there are gaps in the required expertise, skills and/or knowledge that a co-opted member could fill

- whether the need for the expertise, skills and knowledge is time-limited
- 1.4 According to Statutory Guidance from the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011 ‘in all instances where co-option is being considered, care should be taken to ensure that co-option is in fact the best way for some individuals or groups of interest to be involved in the work of scrutiny committees’ (p. 36). Co-option is not the only means for scrutiny to engage others. Other arrangements include the calling of expert and other witnesses, and consultation through a range of means designed to reach members of the public, and receiving evidence or hearing from interested parties.
- 1.5 Ultimately it is for the scrutiny body to come to a view about co-option but the advice would be that this is done with a clear rationale about what the committee is looking for in a co-optee and consideration given as to whether other people ought to be asked / included, who may meet any criteria set out.
- 1.6 When considering co-option it would be good practice to:
- determine the number of co-optees to be sought
 - identify the range of experience, skills, knowledge and expertise sought and seek nominations from organisations and individuals who demonstrate they have these
 - guard against seeking nominations from organisations or individuals with a single issue perspective or personal agenda
 - be inclusive and fair
- 1.7 Co-opted members would not count towards a quorum of a meeting nor be eligible to serve as Chairman or Vice Chairman. Co-optees would also be required to declare any interest / conflict of interest / predetermination.

2. Protocol

- 2.1 It is proposed that Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups adopt the following approach when considering co-option:
- a) at the outset of any inquiry / task consider whether co-option is necessary and the rationale behind it – identifying the gaps in the required expertise, skills and/or knowledge that a co-opted member could fill;
 - b) consider whether co-option is the best way to involve others, as opposed to inviting relevant persons to appear as a witness;
 - c) consider who would be the most appropriate person(s) to act as co-optee, e.g. seek nominations from organisations and individuals who can demonstrate they have the required experience, skills, knowledge and expertise

- d) once suggested co-optee(s) are identified consult with relevant officers to ensure there is no conflict of interest;
- e) invitation to be sent to proposed co-optee to join the Panel / Working Group, outlining duration of co-option;
- f) report to the Scrutiny Programme Committee to ensure awareness of the agreement to co-opt.

2.2 In the case of a member of the public requesting co-option onto a specific Panel / Working Group the following process should be followed:

- a) further information be sought as to the experience / skill / knowledge / expertise that they can add to the scrutiny process;
- b) refer the request to the relevant convener for consideration;
- c) consider whether co-option is the best way to involve the individual, as opposed to inviting them to give evidence as a witness;
- d) if co-option is agreed consult with relevant officers to ensure there is no conflict of interest;
- e) invitation to be sent to proposed co-optee to join the Panel / Working Group, outlining duration of co-option;
- f) report to the Scrutiny Programme Committee to ensure awareness of the agreement to co-opt.

2.3 Where a member of the public has a general interest in being a co-optee the scrutiny team will:

- a) obtain further information about what they can add to the scrutiny process;
- b) invite them to observe relevant Panel / Working Group meetings to develop an understanding of scrutiny and way of working;
- c) raise awareness of their interest in scrutiny with conveners, allowing for the discussion about the appropriateness of co-option to develop naturally.

2.4 Subject to committee discussion this report will be shared with scrutiny conveners to ensure clarity about the process that should be followed for co-option.

3. Legal Implications

3.1 The report sets out the Constitutional requirements. In assessing any particular person as a co-optee it is vital, as the report makes clear, to consider any potential conflicts of interest.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There may be a financial cost to co-option, for example in the payment of expenses, which will have to be met from the existing scrutiny budget.

Date: 29 May 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard
Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Background Papers:

Council Constitution

Statutory Guidance from the Local Government Measure 2011 (Welsh Government June 2012)

Agenda Item 11

Report of the Chair

Scrutiny Programme Committee – 9 June 2014

SCRUTINY DISPATCHES

Purpose	To provide draft dispatches report for agreement and submission to council which will provide headlines from recent scrutiny activity to ensure visibility and awareness of key issues, findings and outcomes.
Content	The report appends the latest 'Scrutiny Dispatches', which is presented to each council meeting.
Councillors are being asked to	approve content of the 'Scrutiny Dispatches'
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Committee
Lead Officer(s)	Dean Taylor, Director – Corporate Services
Report Author	Brij Madahar, Overview & Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Programme Committee is responsible for the various informal scrutiny activities and monitoring progress to ensure that the work is effective. The committee also wants to ensure that findings from performance panels and working groups have the required visibility.
- 1.2 'Scrutiny Dispatches' is a short but informative summary of the headlines from the work of scrutiny. It is reported to each council meeting. Rather than provide a detailed progress report across all activities it aims to provide headlines, for example, key outcomes, findings, and events, typically with one major story each time.
- 1.3. Content from the dispatches is also posted on the Swansea Scrutiny blog so that it can be shared across social media platforms to develop public engagement in scrutiny.

2. Scrutiny Dispatches

- 2.1 The latest 'Scrutiny Dispatches' report is attached as **Appendix 1**.

- 2.2 The dispatches report will be included in the agenda of the next council meeting (17 June).
- 2.3 The committee is invited to comment on the content and propose changes to ensure coverage of the significant issues.
- 2.4 Scrutiny Dispatches is listed in the Council agenda under the section 'For Information Reports. (Not for Discussion)'. Following the committee meeting in April it was agreed that the Chair write to the Leader and Chair of Council with a request that this be changed. The committee felt that there should be time for discussion and any questions to the Chair of the Committee based on the content of the Dispatches report. The Chair of Council has confirmed that although the report is marked 'for information' the opportunity is available to any Member who wishes to ask a question for clarity or further information.

3. Legal Implications

- 3.1 There are no specific legal implications raised by this report.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 There are no specific financial implications raised by this report.

Background Papers: None

29 May 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard
Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Scrutiny Dispatches

City & County of Swansea - June 2014

Scrutiny enables councillors who are not in the cabinet to examine the quality and effectiveness of services and policies, hold decision makers to account and make recommendations for improvement

Annual scrutiny work planning conference

(Lead: Councillor Mike Day)

Scrutiny councillors recently got together to explore topics for the work programme over the coming year. A Scrutiny Work Planning Conference took place on 12 May and was attended by 21 scrutiny councillors. At the conference councillors shared views about the scrutiny work programme and identified priorities for the year ahead. Councillors were asked to give thought to whether a particular topic merited in-depth inquiry, required monitoring, or could be dealt with through a 'one-off' discussion. As a starting point, suggestions that had been gathered from the annual councillor survey, cabinet members, officers, the public and partners were discussed. Ideas suggested were also cross referenced with the priorities in the One Swansea Plan (Swansea's Single Integrated Plan). A number of additional topics also emerged from the debate.

From the consultation the topics that gained most support were:

- *Corporate Building & Property Services*
- *Governance of Schools*
- *Corporate Culture / Co-operative Council*
- *Sustainability*
- *Services for those with Learning Difficulties*
- *Target Areas*
- *Mental Health Services*
- *Obesity / Lifestyle*
- *School Readiness*
- *Roads / Roadworks / Highway Maintenance*
- *Young Carers*
- *Western Bay Health and Social Care Programme*

The Scrutiny Programme Committee, taking into account feedback from the conference, will put together a scrutiny work programme for the year. The programme is guided by the overriding principle that the work of scrutiny should be strategic and significant, focussed on issues of concern, and represent a good use of scrutiny time and resources.

The Committee will also consider a report at each of their meetings that will enable the committee to maintain an overview of all scrutiny activities to ensure that the work programme is co-ordinated and effective. In particular the committee will monitor progress of work undertaken by the informal Panels and Working Groups and findings to ensure that this work is effective and has the required visibility.

Gypsy & traveller site provision – scrutiny review of process

(Lead: Cllr Robert Smith)

Special meetings of the Scrutiny Programme Committee are continuing in order to develop understanding of the process that was followed in the search for a second Gypsy & Traveller Site, culminating in the report to Council last October. The committee has now taken in evidence from officers and a number of councillors and members of the public who have wanted the opportunity to bring certain matters to the committee's attention. The committee will take stock of its work so far, determine next steps in evidence gathering, before drawing the review to a close, with conclusions and recommendations on the process and learning points for the future

Good Scrutiny? Good Question!

(Lead: Councillor Mike Day)

A report of the Auditor General for Wales called 'Good Scrutiny? Good Question!' was published on the 29 May 2014. The report concluded that 'Local government scrutiny in Wales is improving but councils need to do more to develop consistently rigorous scrutiny to increase public accountability in decision making. Councils demonstrated a genuine commitment to learning and improvement throughout the course of the study, and in many councils scrutiny practice at committees has improved. However many challenges remain.

In summary the report found that:

- Scrutiny practice is improving, but the impact that scrutiny is having is not always clearly evident
- Whilst a majority of councils consider that there is a supportive environment for scrutiny, some lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities can limit the effectiveness with which scrutiny holds the executive to account
- Better planning, more effective chairing, and improvements to the range, quality and use of information are required to improve scrutiny across councils in Wales
- In general, council scrutiny is not always fully aligned with other council improvement processes, nor builds on external audit, inspection and review; and
- More effective engagement with the public and partners will improve scrutiny and increase public accountability.

The report makes nine recommendations, including:

- Further developing scrutiny forward work programmes
- Ensuring that scrutiny draws effectively on the work of audit, inspection and regulation
- Undertaking regular self-evaluation of scrutiny

The full report can be accessed at: www.wao.gov.uk/publications.

Schools Performance Panel focusing on the key issues

The Schools Performance Panel met on the 29 April to assess their year and plan for the year ahead. The Panel highlighted the key issues it would like to focus on over the coming 12 months. It also agreed to make more use of case studies as examples to performance, and seek more insight from the public and meet in a school setting. Some of the topics the Panel has scheduled include: EOTAS Pathways and Behaviour Strategy, ensuring consistency in teacher and classroom assessments, and schools use of the Pupil Deprivation Grant.

Cabinet responds to economic inactivity inquiry recommendations

(Lead: Councillor Chris Holley)

Cabinet formally responded to the Economic Inactivity Scrutiny Inquiry report on 3 June. The inquiry considered how well the council and partners were tackling economic inactivity in our communities. Cabinet has accepted the report and provided an action plan to implement recommendations. The Inquiry Panel will monitor the action plan over the next year and report back to the Scrutiny Programme Committee its view about progress and the impact of the inquiry.

Connect with Scrutiny:

Room 3.3.7, Civic Centre, Swansea. SA1 3SN (Tel. 01792 637732)

Web: www.swansea.gov.uk/scrutiny

Twitter: @swanseascrutiny

Email: scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

Blog: www.swanseascrutiny.co.uk

Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/swanseascrutiny

Archwilydd Cyffredinol Cymru
Auditor General for Wales

Good Scrutiny? Good Question!

Auditor General for Wales improvement study:
Scrutiny in Local Government



WALES AUDIT OFFICE
SWYDDFA ARCHWILIO CYMRU



I have prepared and published this report in accordance with the
Public Audit (Wales) Act 2004

The team who delivered the work comprised Chris Bolton, Tim Buckle,
Louise Fleet, Non Jenkins, Helen Keatley, Ena Lloyd, Huw Rees, Martin Gibson
and Katherine Simmons under the direction of Alan Morris.

Huw Vaughan Thomas
Auditor General for Wales
Wales Audit Office
24 Cathedral Road
Cardiff
CF11 9LJ

The Auditor General is independent of the National Assembly and government. He examines and certifies the accounts of the Welsh Government and its sponsored and related public bodies, including NHS bodies. He also has the power to report to the National Assembly on the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which those organisations have used, and may improve the use of, their resources in discharging their functions.

The Auditor General, together with appointed auditors, also audits local government bodies in Wales, conducts local government value for money studies and inspects for compliance with the requirements of the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009.

The Auditor General undertakes his work using staff and other resources provided by the Wales Audit Office, which is a statutory board established for that purpose and to monitor and advise the Auditor General.

For further information please write to the Auditor General at the address above, telephone 029 2032 0500, email: info@wao.gov.uk, or see website www.wao.gov.uk.

© Auditor General for Wales 2014

You may re-use this publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium. You must re-use it accurately and not in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Auditor General for Wales copyright and you must give the title of this publication. Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned before re-use.

Contents

Local government scrutiny in Wales is improving but councils need to do more to develop consistently rigorous scrutiny to increase public accountability in decision-making


Summary	4
Recommendations	7
Detailed Report	8
Scrutiny practice is improving, but the impact that scrutiny is having is not always clearly evident	8
Whilst a majority of councils consider that there is a supportive environment for scrutiny, some lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities can limit the effectiveness with which scrutiny holds the executive to account	13
Better planning, more effective chairing and improvements to the range, quality and use of information are required to improve scrutiny across councils in Wales	16
In general, council scrutiny is not always fully aligned with other council improvement processes, nor builds on external audit, inspection and review	21
More effective engagement with the public and partners will improve scrutiny and increase public accountability	23
Appendices	
Appendix 1 - Self-evaluations and peer team evaluations	27
Appendix 2 - Outcomes and characteristics for effective local government overview and scrutiny	43

Summary

'Effective scrutiny is vital in ensuring high quality public services which meet the needs of the public and in ensuring public services make best use of their money'

Local Government Minister, Lesley Griffiths, November 2013

- 1 The importance of effective scrutiny is magnified as public services respond to the challenge of the global financial situation whilst continuously seeking to improve services. Effective scrutiny can improve the evidence base for decisions on the allocation of resources as well as ensuring that decisions are transparent and in accordance with the needs of the local community. Scrutiny also has an important role to play in contributing to developing policy, undertaking specific reviews and in monitoring performance. The development of effective joint scrutiny arrangements for new and emerging collaborations is also likely to be a key focus for public services over the next few years. Scrutiny functions will also need to continue to respond to the changes introduced through the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011. These changes include the requirement to take into account the views of the public, and the ability to form joint overview and scrutiny committees with one or more local authorities.
- 2 Weaknesses in council scrutiny arrangements have been identified in numerous reviews and audit and inspection reports since scrutiny arrangements were introduced into local government following the Local Government Act 2000. For example: the Welsh Government's Review of Local Service Delivery¹ in 2006; the Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) Chief Inspector's Annual Report 2010-11²; Estyn's Annual Report 2009-10³; and the Welsh Government's explanatory memorandum to the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011⁴.
- 3 The Auditor General for Wales recognises the need for improved scrutiny arrangements and the need to focus on issues of transparency and openness to challenge. These improvements are necessary to ensure that scrutiny plays a fully effective role in the good governance of local authorities in Wales. For these reasons, in 2012, the Auditor General committed to undertake an Improvement Study to explore how scrutiny could improve in councils in Wales.
- 4 Our approach to this study was innovative and differed from the traditional audit approach by involving facilitation of 'real-time' peer review, learning and improvement in scrutiny over a period of just over a year. The aim of the study was to help councils achieve lasting improvements in scrutiny. Wales Audit Office staff worked with councils to provide an opportunity for those involved in scrutiny to identify where improvements to their own arrangements may be required, and to share knowledge and experience with others to find solutions.



1 *Beyond Boundaries: Citizen Centred Local Services for Wales*. Review of Local Service Delivery: Report to the Welsh Assembly Government, Welsh Government, Crown Copyright, 2006.

2 *CSSIW Chief Inspector's Annual Report 2010-2011*, Crown Copyright, 2012.

3 *Estyn Annual Report 2009-2010*.

4 *Local Government (Wales) Measure – Explanatory Memorandum incorporating the Regulatory Impact Assessment and Delegated Powers Memorandum*, Welsh Assembly Government, July 2010.

- 5 The study enabled councils to evaluate their own performance, share knowledge, develop skills, build and strengthen relationships, and identify new opportunities for working together with other councils and partners. To support shared learning, we developed Peer Learning and Evaluation Teams at each council, comprising scrutiny members and officers. These teams were involved in observing and evaluating scrutiny at another council. Results of these peer evaluations are set out in [Appendix 1](#).
- 6 The study helped to shape the proposed Key Characteristics of Effective Overview and Scrutiny that the Welsh Local Government Association and partners had initially crafted from existing good practice guidance. Since the completion of the study an agreed set of 'outcomes and characteristics for effective local government overview and scrutiny' has been developed by the Wales Scrutiny Officers Network, supported by the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS)⁵. These characteristics are listed in [Appendix 2](#).
- 7 On 28 November 2013 a national conference, *Scrutiny in the Spotlight: Investing to maximise its impact*, was organised and hosted jointly by Cardiff Business School, the CfPS, the Wales Audit Office, Welsh Government, and the Welsh Local Government Association. Part of the conference programme was developed to explore some common themes that emerged from the Wales Audit Office study and to seek ways of addressing the challenges ahead.
- 8 The national conference generated a lot of activity on social media, particularly via 'Twitter'. Participants and those engaged virtually, made useful contributions and observations that we have reproduced at various points throughout the report.
- 9 This report aims to highlight the challenges discussed at the conference and is based on: councils' self-evaluations; peer evaluations carried out by member and officer teams from other councils; and observations and existing accumulated knowledge of staff of the Wales Audit Office on councils' scrutiny functions and governance arrangements. It sets out what the Auditor General sees as the main challenges to more effective scrutiny and draws on various contributions to the national scrutiny conference in outlining potential solutions.
- 10 Overall we conclude that: local government scrutiny in Wales is improving but councils need to do more to develop consistently rigorous scrutiny to increase public accountability in decision-making. Councils demonstrated a genuine commitment to learning and improvement throughout the course of the study, and in many councils scrutiny practice at committees has improved. However many challenges remain. In summary we found that:
- a scrutiny practice is improving, but the impact that scrutiny is having is not always clearly evident;
 - b whilst a majority of councils consider that there is a supportive environment for scrutiny; some lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities can limit the effectiveness with which scrutiny holds the executive to account;
 - c better planning, more effective chairing, and improvements to the range, quality and use of information are required to improve scrutiny across councils in Wales;
 - d in general, council scrutiny is not always fully aligned with other council improvement

⁵ The Centre for Public Scrutiny is an independent charity, focused on ideas, thinking and the application and development of policy and practice for accountable public services.

processes, nor builds on external audit, inspection and review; and

- e more effective engagement with the public and partners will improve scrutiny and increase public accountability.

- 11 Subsequent to the study and national scrutiny conference, the 'Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery'⁶, established by the First Minister of Wales, published its findings in January 2014. The Commission's report identified scrutiny as an important lever to secure improvement, but highlighted that it needed development as, amongst other factors, the fundamental importance of scrutiny in driving improvement was not recognised. Amongst the Commission's recommendations were that:
- a The importance, status and value of scrutiny must be recognised, prioritised, continually sustained and reinforced.
 - b Organisations must regard scrutiny as an investment to deliver improvements and future savings. They must resource and support scrutiny accordingly.
- 12 Throughout this report we will refer to extracts and recommendations of the Commission's report where relevant.

⁶ Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery – January 2014.

Recommendations

Recommendation	Responsible partners
R1 Clarify the role of executive members and senior officers in contributing to scrutiny.	Councils, Welsh Government, Welsh Local Government Association
R2 Ensure that scrutiny members, and specifically scrutiny chairs, receive training and support to fully equip them with the skills required to undertake effective scrutiny.	Councils, Welsh Government, Welsh Local Government Association
R3 Further develop scrutiny forward work programming to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a clear rationale for topic selection; • be more outcome focussed; • ensure that the method of scrutiny is best suited to the topic area and the outcome desired; and • align scrutiny programmes with the council's performance management, self-evaluation and improvement arrangements. 	Councils
R4 Ensure that scrutiny draws effectively on the work of audit, inspection and regulation and that its activities are complementary with the work of external review bodies.	Councils, Staff of the Wales Audit Office, CSSIW, Estyn
R5 Ensure that external review bodies take account of scrutiny work programmes and the outputs of scrutiny activity, where appropriate, in planning and delivering their work.	Staff of the Wales Audit Office, CSSIW, Estyn
R6 Ensure that the impact of scrutiny is properly evaluated and acted upon to improve the function's effectiveness; including following up on proposed actions and examining outcomes.	Councils, Welsh Government, Welsh Local Government Association
R7 Undertake regular self-evaluation of scrutiny utilising the 'outcomes and characteristics of effective local government overview and scrutiny' developed by the Wales Scrutiny Officers' Network.	Councils
R8 Implement scrutiny improvement action plans developed from the Wales Audit Office improvement study.	Councils
R9 Adopt Participation Cymru's 10 Principles for Public Engagement in improving the way scrutiny engages with the public and stakeholders.	Councils


The responsible partners named above should co-operate in ascertaining how they will respectively and collectively address these recommendations and how others may be involved; for example the Wales Scrutiny Officers Network and the Welsh Government Scrutiny Reference Panel.

Detailed Report

- 13 The detailed report that follows explores the challenges set out in our conclusions in more detail, and points to potential solutions using ideas explored at the national conference as a springboard to improvement.

Scrutiny practice is improving, but the impact that scrutiny is having is not always clearly evident

- 14 This part of the report examines the extent of scrutiny activity taking place in councils across Wales and whether councils are able to demonstrate the contributions that the activity is making and the impact that it is having.



Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery

'As part of raising the status and profile of scrutiny, and engaging citizens, there must be increased visibility of the outputs and outcomes from local government scrutiny.' – recommendation 31.

- 15 During the autumn of 2012 and spring of 2013 all councils in Wales took an active part in our scrutiny improvement study, and engaged well with peer councils during peer evaluations and learning workshops. Peer Learning and Exchange Teams, consisting of both councillors and officers, were established at each council. The Peer Learning and Exchange Teams provided an external perspective to a peer council by evaluating its scrutiny function against criteria developed jointly by the Wales Audit Office, the Welsh Local Government Association, Welsh Government and the Wales Scrutiny Officers

Network. The Peer Learning and Exchange Teams also took part in regional learning workshops.

- 16 Staff of the Wales Audit Office who acted as co-ordinators throughout the study reported back that councils demonstrated a genuine commitment to learning and improvement throughout the course of the study, and many have continued to work with their peers to share information to improve practice. In many councils, Wales Audit Office staff have witnessed improved scrutiny practice at committees that they have attended since their involvement in the study.

- 17 In our national summary report *Local Improvement Planning and Reporting in Wales, September 2013*, we noted that many councils were providing scrutiny committees with a better range of relevant and up-to-date information than had previously been the case. This trend in relation to the range and timeliness of information being provided to scrutiny is encouraging, although the report also noted that there is scope for further improvement to ensure that information is consistently relevant, up-to-date and timely. Later in this report we will return to issues relating to the range and quality of information used by scrutiny committees to undertake their work.

- 18 Improvements to scrutiny practice need to be judged against the outcomes that result from its activities. Demonstrating the impact of scrutiny is important, not least in view of the considerable investment of time and resources in scrutiny functions across Wales, as well as the benefits that effective scrutiny can bring to governance, accountability and improvement. The Minister for Local Government and Government Business highlighted the importance of effective scrutiny in her keynote address to the national scrutiny conference, saying that: 'Scrutiny is at the heart and soul of effective governance and accountability. It is integral to demonstrating

local authorities are open and transparent.’ She supported the collective investment of time and resource in scrutiny activity, but stressed that it needs to add value and that scrutiny is ‘a classic ‘invest-to-save’ service for the public sector’.

- 19 Value, of course, must be seen in the context of the amount of time and money dedicated to the exercise of scrutiny, and the corresponding quality of outcomes generated. The Local Government Act 2000, which created separate Executive and Overview and Scrutiny functions within councils, requires that councils operating executive

arrangements create a minimum of one Overview and Scrutiny Committee which is composed of councillors who are not on the Executive Committee, or Cabinet, of that council. There is no national standard or prescription on the committee structure that councils adopt to satisfy these legislative requirements. A wide variety of designations and structures are in use, ranging from single committees to multiple committees with task and finish groups. The scale of local government scrutiny activity across Wales is significant as demonstrated in the table below.

Overview and scrutiny committees at the start of the 2013-14 civic⁷ year

	Wales total	Lowest/highest per council	Average per council
Number of overview and scrutiny committees	92	1 - 6	4.2
Number of overview and scrutiny committee positions	1221	16 - 92	55.5
Number of overview and scrutiny members	842	14 - 58	38.3

Scrutiny activity during the 2012-13 civic year

	Wales total	Lowest/highest per council	Average per council
Number of overview and scrutiny meetings	827	8 - 63	37.6
Number of task and finish groups	107	0 - 18	4.9
Number of task and finish group meetings	573	3 - 200	26.0
Number of executive decisions ‘called in’	27	0 - 6	1.2

⁷ The period between Annual Full Council meetings.

- 20 The amount of senior salary payable to an overview and scrutiny committee chair for 2013-14 is £21,910 (inclusive of a basic salary of £13,175 payable to all members of principal councils). Therefore, assuming that a senior salary is paid for the entire civic year 2013-14 for the chair of each of the 92 committees that were in existence at the start of the 2013-14 civic year, this would amount to approximately an additional £803,000.
- 21 In addition to the resources directly related to members' involvement in scrutiny, councils also expend resources on aspects of scrutiny support, including officer time and administrative support for meetings. The Welsh Government has also committed to spending £360,000 between 2012-13 and 2014-15 on supporting the Centre for Public Scrutiny to deliver a bespoke work programme in support of scrutiny in Wales. In addition, the Welsh Government has committed £300,000 over the same period in support of the third phase of the Scrutiny Development Fund in Wales. Also the Welsh Government, under the European Social Fund Local Service Board Development and Priority Delivery Project, funds the cost of an inward secondment to provide practical advice on the delivery of its programme of support for scrutiny, with a focus on Local Service Board scrutiny and developing collaborative scrutiny arrangements. Finally, the Welsh Government provides an improvement grant to the Welsh Local Government Association (£1.7 million in 2013-14), some of which is earmarked to support officers and members in delivering an effective scrutiny function.

- 22 Despite all this investment, and subsequent improvements in the quality of scrutiny practice, the impact of scrutiny activity is not always evident and is rarely captured. Of the 20 councils who responded to a study question on impact in their self-evaluations, a majority felt that scrutiny had a positive or significant impact. However, eight out of the 20 councils felt this was only partly the case. Peer evaluation teams were less positive about councils being able to demonstrate the impact of scrutiny. This resonates with the CfPS' Annual Survey of councils in England and Wales 2012-13, whereby in response to the question: 'How much difference do you think scrutiny makes to people's lives?' only three of 18 responses from Wales answered 'a lot', 10 'a little', four 'very little' and one 'none'⁸.



- 23 We observed some committees failing to arrive at clear conclusions and recommendations, along with a lack of 'summing up', or insufficient time being devoted to debating possible conclusions and recommendations. Some of the areas for improvement identified in councils' final self-evaluations included: the need for scrutiny committees to undertake better project planning and scoping of scrutiny activity with outcomes in mind; and the need for scrutiny committees to identify clear recommendations or outcomes from their work.

⁸ The options were 1. None. 2. Very little. 3. A little. 4. A lot.

An example of a positive outcome from scrutiny was given by Dave McKenna, Scrutiny Manager at **City and County of Swansea Council**, at the national scrutiny conference. The work done by Swansea's Overview and Scrutiny Child and Family Services Board led to a peer mentoring scheme being set up for young care leavers by people that had previously been care leavers. This scheme resulted in a positive outcome those being mentored but also for the mentors who received an accredited qualification. Dave wanted to illustrate that scrutiny is a process with a number of stages and if you get all of those stages right then that can lead to a really good outcome. A video clip of Dave explaining this example can be viewed using the following link.

Dave McKenna

Dave McKenna link - <http://vimeo.com/94525623>

- 24 There are some practical measures that councils can put in place to encourage scrutiny committees to have a clearer focus on outcomes. These could include:
- a clearly identifying anticipated outcomes at the topic selection stage;
 - b considering what method of scrutiny activity is likely to have the most impact;
 - c ensuring that reports submitted to scrutiny committees clearly outline the intended role for the scrutiny committee; and
 - d setting out the options available to the committee in drawing its conclusions.
- 25 The Centre for Public Scrutiny has developed practical advice and guidance to assist councils in focussing on outcomes and measuring the impact of scrutiny.



CfPS – 'Return on Investment' approach

Drawing on the concept of 'return on investment (ROI)', CfPS has developed models which can assist the development of work programmes that better demonstrate the value and impact of scrutiny activity. A more structured approach to choosing topics and appropriate methodologies can help ensure that the limited resources available to scrutiny are used to maximum benefit.


Action learning from practical application of ROI tools has shown scrutiny to have greater positive impact when outcomes are carefully considered at every stage of the process. Crucially this includes estimating and evaluating the measurable impact of scrutiny recommendations at the outset as a key part of developing the 'business case' for scrutiny. Furthermore, practitioners who have applied ROI methodologies in their area also found that identifying process and outcome measures builds a better understanding of local communities by triangulating local stories with data and national patterns and giving marginalised groups a voice in reviews.

The CfPS publication '**Tipping the Scales**' (2011) provides practical advice and guidance on ROI approaches as based on the experiences of five Scrutiny Development Areas. '**Valuing Inclusion**' (2012) provides a refinement on ROI and focusses on engagement as an essential component of the model enabling scrutiny members and officers to meet directly with members of local communities and listen to their experiences and expertise.

CfPS is currently in year three of its scrutiny support programme for local authorities in Wales aimed at strengthening capacity and capability for effective public service scrutiny in the context of public sector reform and continued financial austerity.

*Links - www.cfps.org.uk/publications?item=7137&offset=25
www.cfps.org.uk/publications?item=7303&offset=0*

- 26 It is also important that scrutiny members make clear the reasons why they have requested information and reports. Similarly, if officers suggest items to be considered by a scrutiny committee, they should ensure that there is a clear rationale for doing so. A more challenging task will be the development of more robust measures capable of demonstrating the impact of scrutiny. The agreement of a set of core characteristics and outcomes represents a good starting point for achieving this.
- 27 Robust self-evaluation of scrutiny functions could also help to ensure that scrutiny focuses sufficiently on outcomes. A number of councils referred to undertaking some form of self-evaluation of their scrutiny functions. Approaches to this included: the production of a scrutiny annual report; a chairs 'away day'; and committees undertaking an evaluation of their own performance after every meeting. Councils have welcomed the facilitation of self-evaluation through the Auditor General's study and recognise that this is an area that should be developed further and embedded within their work.



Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery


'Organisations must adopt a 'best practice' approach to scrutiny, not a 'least required'. The scrutiny outcomes and characteristics being prepared by the CfPS must be developed in discussion with other public sector organisations. Once agreed, they must be adopted by each organisation within 6 months.' - recommendation 32.

Key Characteristics of Effective Overview and Scrutiny

The Wales Scrutiny Officers Network, supported by the CfPS has developed a set of key characteristics that councils can subscribe to aimed at achieving 'better outcomes', 'better decisions' and 'better engagement'. Staff of the Wales Audit Office have been engaged at various times throughout the development of the outcomes and characteristics and view them as a very helpful description of effective scrutiny. These can be found in Appendix 2.

Whilst a majority of councils consider that there is a supportive environment for scrutiny, some lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities can limit the effectiveness with which scrutiny holds the executive to account

28 This part of the report examines the culture within which scrutiny operates, the value afforded to it, and the quality of the support, structures and processes in councils. It is based on a mixture of self-evaluations by councils themselves, observations of peer learning teams, and audit observations and accumulated knowledge.



Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery

‘All elected members, independent health board members, non-executive directors, and officers must acknowledge the importance and value of scrutiny in improving services for people and organisations in Wales. The independence of scrutiny must be strongly asserted and protected, as must its essentially constructive and positive nature.’

‘Executive members, non-executive directors, and officers, must similarly acknowledge the value of scrutiny in helping them to deliver services better. They must publicise and explain their decisions clearly, and invite scrutiny of them, including pre-decision scrutiny, willingly and openly. They must also acknowledge and respond to scrutiny reports promptly and in good faith.’ – recommendation 31.

29 Council self-evaluations were relatively positive about how well the role of scrutiny was understood, valued and supported. Several councils reported a number of contributions that scrutiny has made to policy and decision making and the positive way in which scrutiny is regarded. A majority of councils believe the relationship between overview and scrutiny committees, the executive and senior officers is supporting effective scrutiny. Some of the positive aspects noted included:

- a the development of pre-decision scrutiny;
- b cabinet members and senior officers making direct referrals of issues and decisions to scrutiny committees;
- c cabinet members and senior officers taking part in work planning sessions for scrutiny committees; and
- d the existence of protocols/role descriptions setting out how scrutiny committees, cabinet members and senior officers should work together.

30 However, some councils and peer observers felt that the relationship between scrutiny committees and cabinet members could be improved. Also, through committee observations we found that the relationship between the executive and scrutiny is not always clear. In some councils, cabinet members were invited to attend some scrutiny committee meetings to answer questions or provide perspectives on key issues, and a clear demarcation of roles taken at these meetings was evident. In other councils, cabinet members were not present at scrutiny committee meetings, or where they were in attendance, they did not participate in meetings and seemed to have no clear role to play.

- 31 There may be confusion about the role of scrutiny committees in holding the executive to account in councils where those roles and responsibilities have not been adequately set out. Scrutiny committees are unlikely to effectively hold the executive to account if cabinet members are rarely invited to attend scrutiny committee meetings to answer questions or provide evidence. Councils should ensure there is clarity about the role of the cabinet member at scrutiny committee meetings to ensure that accountability is clear and that constructive challenge is facilitated without undermining the independence of scrutiny. Scrutiny committees should also ensure that they are clear on the reasons why they wish cabinet members to attend meetings before inviting them to attend.
- 32 Where there is a lack of clarity of role and function, it is likely that there is no full appreciation of the value of scrutiny in the democratic process and in holding the executive to account.

'Holding to account – implications and consequences'

A keynote speaker at the national scrutiny conference was Peter Watkin Jones, solicitor to the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust public inquiry. Peter gave a captivating address on the importance of a strong accountability culture and the need for non-executives and scrutiny members to check and challenge assurances given to them in order to properly hold to account.

[A link to conference outputs and Peter's thoughts can be found here.](#)

Link - <http://goodpracticeexchange.wordpress.com/2014/01/10/scrutiny-beyond-boundaries/>


- 33 Councils' self-evaluations showed mixed views regarding the support received from the officers across the Council, with just under half of councils believing that this was only partly supporting effective scrutiny. A few councils also recognised the need to increase understanding of the role of scrutiny amongst officers, and some areas for improvement identified in the self-evaluations related to officers' attendance at meetings. Through observations of scrutiny committees we found that the role of senior officers in scrutiny appears to be unclear in some councils. Some councils had clearly set out the roles and responsibilities of officers, with officers being asked to attend committee meetings to answer questions and present reports or evidence. There were also a number of observations from peer teams that found officers attending for the duration of committee meetings without any apparent reason. A concern also identified is the extent to which the expertise of officers is consistently drawn upon by scrutiny committees.
- 34 In view of these observations, it is important that councils reflect on the role of senior officers in the scrutiny process to ensure that officers' time is used most effectively. The expertise and knowledge of officers should be drawn upon sufficiently by committees in carrying out their scrutiny role, whilst ensuring that scrutiny processes remain led by scrutiny committee members. We found that councils where officers were invited to attend for specific items as 'witnesses' to answer questions, rather than attending whole meetings almost as an ex-officio member of the committee, helped to encourage more effective and targeted questioning and to reinforce the distinct roles of scrutiny committee members, senior officers and executive members. Dedicated scrutiny support officers have a key role to play in helping scrutiny committees to plan for officer contributions and to liaise with those officers to ensure that the committees maximise the resources available to them.

Clarifying respective roles in overview and scrutiny

Clearly setting out the roles of scrutiny chairs, scrutiny committees, cabinet members and officers in the process of overview and scrutiny means that there should be no ambiguity, no overlap and that appropriate and timely contributions can be made. Making an 'Overview and Scrutiny Guide' available on council websites is an effective way of councils communicating clearly defined roles to the public. Currently nine Welsh councils have publicly accessible guides available through their websites, whilst a further five have broken or out-dated web links. Guides produced by Cardiff Council, Torfaen County Borough Council, and the Vale of Glamorgan County Borough Council set out respective scrutiny roles well. Examples outside of Wales, such as that developed by the London Borough of Merton ([scrutiny_handbook_2011-3.pdf](#)) and Leicestershire County Council ([overviewandscrutinyguide.pdf](#)), are also worthy of consideration.

Links - www.merton.gov.uk/council/decision-making/scrutiny_handbook_oct_2011-3.pdf
www.leics.gov.uk/overviewandscrutinyguide.pdf

Service Governance and Delivery recognised that the capacity and capability of scrutiny to drive improvement must be strengthened, and that scrutiny must be well resourced with sufficient support at officer level.



Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery

'Local authorities must make appropriate support available, at officer level, to develop co-ordinated scrutiny plans, identify gaps in expertise on the committees and provide proportionate and understandable information to committee members.'

'Mandatory training must be provided to all members and chairs of local government scrutiny committees.' – recommendation 32.

35 The number of officers directly supporting scrutiny varies between councils, and some officers also have additional roles in addition to scrutiny support. Some comments in councils' final self-evaluations recognised that resources were limited. Only one comment specifically referred to a recent reduction in the level of resources for scrutiny support whilst a few councils implied that teams had recently been, or were about to be, strengthened. Some councils identified several ways in which officers could provide more effective support, including assisting with the development of lines of enquiry and improving the quality of information and research provided to scrutiny committees. Evidence from CfPS annual surveys shows a clear linkage between the level of dedicated scrutiny support and the effectiveness with which scrutiny is able to perform its role. The Commission on Public

36 Ensuring that individuals involved in the scrutiny process have the right skills and competencies is a key element of preparing for effective scrutiny. This is not limited to those involved in supporting and providing information to scrutiny committees, but also applies to scrutineers. Many councils consider that access to training for scrutiny members that was focused on need positively supports effective scrutiny and referred to a range of training having been provided. Whilst local audit teams observed evidence of some strong scrutiny skills such as in chairing and questioning skills, there were also examples where these skills were less evident and needed to be improved. In their final self-evaluations some councils identified training as key to improving scrutiny, and a number of councils recognised the need to develop more tailored training based

on the needs of individuals. Some of the lack of clarity highlighted earlier in relation to the role of the scrutiny function within councils governance arrangements, and the respective roles of senior officers and cabinet members also suggests a need for further training and development in some councils.

- 37 During the study it was recognised by peer learning and evaluation teams that, to support the development of effective scrutiny, councils need to ensure that training and development are based on identifying individual training needs. These training needs include the development of scrutiny skills such as questioning, analysing and chairing, as well as supporting scrutiny members to develop their knowledge of the subject/ service areas they are scrutinising. It was also recognised that development activity is not limited to 'training', and that this could be broadened out to focus on wider learning and development. For example, some potential areas of development could benefit from 'on-the-job' member/officer interaction and collaboration rather than formal 'skills' training. These could include, for example, working together on scoping a review or observing directorate team meetings relating to performance reviews.

- 38 The Welsh Government Scrutiny Development Fund is currently supporting a project to identify the training and skills needs of Scrutiny Officers and then to deliver bespoke accredited training solutions. Training is being developed and delivered by the University of South Wales. The programme commenced in October 2013 and completes in June 2014. It covers three modules:

- a Political Awareness;
- b Scrutiny and Review/Understanding and Challenging public Service performance;
- c and Governance and Scrutiny.

Better planning, more effective chairing and improvements to the range, quality and use of information are required to improve scrutiny across councils in Wales

- 39 This part of the report considers the quality of scrutiny committees' activities. In particular it considers forward work programming and identifying topics for scrutiny and the important role of pre-meetings and the chair in effective scrutiny.

Selecting appropriate topics and the right method is vital to effective scrutiny

- 40 The selection of appropriate topics for scrutiny, led by scrutiny members with support from officers and informed by clear selection criteria, is a key element of preparing for effective scrutiny. Selecting the right approach to scrutiny activity is equally important, for example determining whether or not topics should be examined through a task and finish group or by a full committee.



- 41 Nearly all councils felt their work planning processes were effective, with many councils stating that members' choice of topics was appropriate. However, councils were less positive regarding the extent to which work programmes were balanced and focused appropriately, or were developed following consultation with the public and partners and in discussion with senior officers and executive members.
- 42 Councils should ensure that the contents of forward work programmes are based on sound criteria with a clear rationale for topic selection and that sufficient consideration is given to the method of scrutiny, rather than just the selection of topics. A key criterion for the selection of topics and the method of scrutiny should be the extent to which scrutiny committees are likely to have an impact in the area they have selected. A variety of sources of information can help to inform the selection of scrutiny work programmes. Information sources include: the views of senior officers, cabinet members and citizens; major policy changes; performance issues; risks; and inspectors' and regulators' concerns. Another key consideration for scrutiny committees should be the time available, including members' time, to undertake the scrutiny activity. Items should be programmed in a timely manner, for example, to encourage pre-decision scrutiny where this would add value. To help ensure that scrutiny has an impact, scrutiny committees may have to balance a desire to examine a large number of topics with the likelihood of securing greater impact through focusing on a small number of items in more detail.
- 43 Councils identified some common shortcomings related to forward work programming. These included:
- a the extent to which work programmes were focused on outcomes;
 - b that work planning processes were too 'officer driven';
 - c that some committee meeting agendas contained too many items;
 - d the extent to which the public were engaged in the selection of topics; and
 - e aligning with cabinet forward work programmes so that scrutiny could contribute to improving proposed or existing policies.
- 44 Task and finish groups, or their equivalent, often involving a smaller group of scrutiny members tasked with examining a particular topic in detail, are used in many councils to conduct in-depth reviews. A key theme for improvement identified in several council self-evaluations is the need to strengthen the evidence base for these reviews, including greater use of data, benchmarking information or broadening evidence bases to gather wider perspectives.
- 45 Effective topic selection and planning at the project selection stage can help to identify the evidence required and how it can be gathered, including a consideration of available information sources and the most appropriate way of gathering a range of perspectives. Due to potential resource implications it is important that careful consideration is given to the selection of topics and the approach taken to in-depth reviews, including timeliness and likely impact.



The CfPS has published a short guide, *A Cunning Plan*, that explains the basic principles behind good work programming and cites some examples of notable practice from English local authorities ([acunningplan](#)).

Link - www.cfps.org.uk/publications?item=113&offset=0

The information provided to scrutiny committees is not always sufficiently robust, clear or timely

- 46 The range, timeliness, presentation and relevance of information available to committees all have an impact on the effectiveness of scrutiny. Councils were mixed in their views on the extent to which information received by scrutiny committees supported improvement.
- 47 Councils identified a number of ways in which information to support scrutiny could be strengthened. These included a need for less irrelevant detail in reports, a broader range of information to give a more rounded picture, as well as better quality and more timely information. The need to strengthen scoping and/or forward work programming to ensure that the correct information was requested by scrutiny committees was also identified by some councils.
- 48 So that the information needs of scrutiny committees are clear, and that the information provided is relevant, timely and in an appropriate format, councils need to ensure that clear communication channels are in place between scrutiny committees and those responsible for providing information to them. This could include senior managers, scrutiny officers, cabinet members and any external witnesses or partners that the committee has requested information

from. Scrutiny members have an important role in shaping the content and format of information that is presented to them and, where appropriate, in challenging the way in which information is presented if it does not enable them to perform their role effectively. Scrutiny members also need to ensure that the information needs of committees and the availability of information are considered at topic selection and project planning stages. Members also need to be clear as to the purpose of requesting specific information and the outcome they are hoping to achieve as a consequence of examining it.

- 49 As well as being presented with appropriate information, reports to scrutiny committees need to be suitably analytical and to arrive at an evaluation. Often self-evaluation reports merely present data without identifying unsatisfactory performance or progress. Reports are often too descriptive and do not focus enough on evaluating the impact of services.
- 50 Councils should also have regard to the report by the Auditor General entitled *Local Improvement Planning and Reporting in Wales*⁹. The report identified 'In a small number of authorities, information presented to scrutiny committees is not sufficiently consistent or impartial' and that 'councillors, who have a key role in driving improvement through effective scrutiny, are not being informed by comprehensive data and information'.



9 *Local Improvement Planning and Reporting in Wales*, Wales Audit Office, September 2013.

The quality of advance preparation for scrutiny committees varies considerably between councils

- 51 Pre-meetings, whereby scrutiny committees meet in advance of formal committee meetings, can assist with the planning and preparation of scrutiny activity in a number of ways. Pre-meetings that take place well in advance of formal committee meetings can enable committees to discuss and determine: the information required; key lines of enquiry; the choice and order of witnesses; and the committee's objectives for the items it is due to consider. Committees could also use a pre-meeting to allocate provisional timings for items to enable witnesses to only attend for relevant item(s).
- 52 Planning ahead in this way also enables 'witnesses' to be briefed in advance on the subject matter the committee would like to discuss, and any information it would like to be contained in reports presented to it. These discussions do not have to take place as a separate meeting, but could form part of the discussions of the previous formal meeting of the committee. Pre-meetings that take place immediately prior to the formal committee meeting can provide an opportunity for members to discuss and agree the intended outcome to be gained from the meeting, key lines of enquiry for questioning and the approach to questioning the committee intends to take. Pre-meetings can also encourage committees to work as a team in jointly planning their activity.

A good example of preparing for effective scrutiny was given by Alison Ward, Chief Executive of **Torfaen County Borough Council**, at the national scrutiny conference. Alison spoke about how she saw scrutiny as the most challenging bit of democracy but the most important. After the 2012 elections Torfaen CBC started working with Members to improve scrutiny. They commissioned the Welsh Local Government Association to do an appraisal of their scrutiny function, and as a result they have significantly changed the way they approach scrutiny. One major change that they have made is to run Annual visioning sessions using information from the public and staff to form a picture of what issues that they'd like to explore through the scrutiny process. This has resulted in stronger scrutiny sessions with improved questioning and improved recommendations being made. A video clip of this example can be viewed using the following link.

Alison Ward

Link - <http://vimeo.com/94525623>

- 53 Not all scrutiny committees hold pre-meetings and, of those that do, we found a variety of approaches. Approaches range from those that typically take place a number of days or weeks prior to a full committee meeting, to those which are held immediately prior to or at the beginning of the formal committee meeting prior to witnesses arriving. We have also observed some confusion about the role of pre-meetings. There were some concerns that the use of pre-meetings could undermine the formal committee meeting leading to 'staged' questions with little spontaneity or follow-up questions.
- 54 However, we are of the view that scrutiny committees could make more effective use of pre-meetings. This could be achieved through ensuring that pre-meetings have a clear and agreed purpose and that they follow an agreed format for preparing for the formal committee meeting without undermining it. Whichever method of planning is employed, it is important that committees have the opportunity to discuss

and plan their scrutiny activity to ensure that: the purpose of each item is clear; the information needs and required witnesses are agreed; and that the committee has an effective mechanism for developing lines of enquiry. These would not be considered formal meetings of committees as they would be for planning purposes only, and as such they would not be required to be open to the public.

There are some examples of good challenging questioning by scrutiny committees but in some cases questioning is ineffective

55 Successful scrutiny relies on effective questioning that: follows lines of enquiry; probes for further information; is prepared to challenge where necessary; and is clearly linked to the role of the committee. The quality of questioning is partly a result of the skills and knowledge of scrutiny committee members and the contributions of those answering questions. However, it also depends on effective preparation including selecting the right topics, planning scrutiny activity and ensuring that members and officers understand their role in the challenge process.

56 Councils were generally positive about the extent to which scrutiny committees challenged through effective questioning skills. A number referred to having been provided with questioning skills training; with some noting that the standard of questioning was improving. A few councils recognised that questioning skills needed to improve further. From our own observations of scrutiny committee meetings, we found members' questioning to be of variable quality. We noted some good examples of challenging and probing questions; however, there were also examples of ineffectual questioning, such as:


- a parochial and personal-agenda driven questioning;
- b committees not following any particular lines of enquiry;
- c a lack of cohesion to members' questioning;
- d members making statements instead of questioning witnesses;
- e meetings appearing 'over scripted' with a lack of spontaneity in questioning; and
- f committees being insufficiently probing in their questioning.

57 Our study highlighted the importance of the role of the chair in facilitating and leading scrutiny committees. We observed examples of effective chairing of meetings, where the chairs summarised discussions, ensured that questions and discussions remained focused and set an appropriate tone for meetings thereby allowing members and witnesses to contribute constructively. However, we also observed some instances where the chairs were less effective, for example, in allowing discussions to end without the agreement of any clear conclusion or recommendation. It is particularly important that councils ensure that scrutiny chairs receive the necessary level of training and support in order to develop the range of skills required to undertake the role effectively.

In general, council scrutiny is not always fully aligned with other council improvement processes, nor builds on external audit, inspection and review

58 This part of the report examines how scrutiny interacts with and utilises the work audit, inspection and review bodies to help inform and shape their work.

In general, scrutiny does not build on the learning highlighted in the work of external audit, inspection and review



Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery

‘Scrutiny, audit, inspection and regulation must become complementary, clearly aligned and mutually reinforcing - recommendation 4.

‘Auditors, inspectors and regulators who report on individual organisations must do so directly to the appropriate scrutiny or audit committee. Where appropriate, they should assist the committee in its consideration and holding the executive to account.’ – recommendation 34.

59 There are opportunities for scrutiny committees to use the reports of external review bodies to inform its own work planning, and to provide evidence to inform the findings of scrutiny reviews. These external review bodies may also look to take assurance from the work undertaken by the Council’s scrutiny function. Statutory guidance for the Local Government (Wales) Measure

2009 also states that: ‘If an authority’s scrutiny processes are sufficiently developed to discharge the above, and there is clear evidence that this is the case, then this scrutiny activity can be drawn upon by the Auditor General and relevant regulators in the course of their dealings with the authority.’



60 Our study found that the majority of councils believe that communication between scrutiny committees, and the council’s auditors, regulators and inspectors could be improved. Some of the councils’ self-evaluations referred to examples of external auditors, regulators or inspectors being invited to attend scrutiny committees, and a few councils also recognised the role of Audit Committees in liaising with auditors, regulators or inspectors.

61 Councils also recognised that the sharing of work programmes between external review bodies and scrutiny functions could be improved. Only one council thought that this was an area of strength, whilst three thought that the lack of sharing was actually hindering improvement. Several councils referred to its scrutiny work programmes being available on council websites, but there was no evidence of councils actively sharing scrutiny work programmes with external review bodies.

62 To build on the work of auditors, inspectors and regulators, councils and external review bodies should explore practical ways in which communication regarding future work plans and findings from their respective work could be improved. The Commission on Public Service Governance and Delivery cited that the way that the Wales Audit Office reports to the Assembly's Public Accounts Committee (PAC) as strengthening the evidence base for the PAC's inquiries and gives its own findings and recommendations greater impact. It also helps to ensure that the accountability of the Welsh Government to the Wales Audit Office and to the Assembly are better aligned and thus less burdensome and more effective.

In general, scrutiny is not well aligned with wider council improvement processes

63 The role of scrutiny in the improvement agenda for local government is recognised in statutory guidance. The Guidance on Part 1 of the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009 states: 'There is a clear role for an authority's scrutiny function in its improvement processes: as part of its role in holding local decision makers and policy makers to account, and in its policy development role.' The guidance suggests that the role of scrutiny should extend to 'scrutiny of the fitness of the organisation to discharge the general duty to improve', as well as its role in policy development and scrutinising performance and improvement. Our experience is that scrutiny rarely examines capacity and fitness for purpose, and that scrutiny programmes would benefit from including such activity. In practice this may include scrutiny enquiries that examine capability and deliverability, rather than the apparent quality of policies and plans.

64 Two-thirds of councils believed that the extent to which scrutiny has had a clearly defined and valued role in the council's self-evaluation, performance management and improvement arrangements, was either positively or significantly supporting improvement. However, for seven councils this was only partly the case. A few councils also identified a need to improve or clarify the role of scrutiny in corporate self-evaluation arrangements. Other areas for improvement that were identified included: training for elected members; the need to change the format of data presented to scrutiny committees; and the timing of when scrutiny committees received performance information. The need to improve the alignment of internal processes, including with executive work programmes, and improve internal communication was also identified as an area for improvement.

65 Only just over half of councils consider that scrutiny committees challenge poor performance effectively. We found that most council scrutiny committees have a role in performance management arrangements and that regular reporting of performance information occurs. However, where reporting does occur we found that the level of understanding of the data provided varies amongst scrutiny members, questioning of performance is not always effective, and there is limited connection between performance data provided to committees and the outcomes that it purports to relate to. This means that, in these cases, scrutiny committees are not equipped to effectively contribute to performance evaluation and management.

More effective engagement with the public and partners will improve scrutiny and increase public accountability

66 This part of the report examines the extent to which council scrutiny functions engage and involve partners, stakeholders, community groups and members of the public in their work.

67 Engaging the public can help to ensure that the selection of topics for scrutiny takes into account the views of local communities, improves the evidence base for scrutiny recommendations and demonstrates accountability for decisions, policies and performance. As community leaders, elected members are ideally placed to facilitate the engagement of the public and partners in scrutiny through their links to the community and local partners. The Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011 requires scrutiny committees to take into account the views of the public. The role of scrutiny in holding local partners to account is also emphasised in statutory guidance covering the integration of plans and partnerships – *'local authorities should have in place effective scrutiny processes to ensure local democratic accountability for partnership actions'*.¹⁰



68 Most councils recognise that the extent to which scrutiny committees ensure that the voice of local people is heard as part of local decision-making is an area that needs to improve. During the study some councils referred to the need to develop a public engagement strategy for scrutiny, as well as the need to improve engagement of the public in the planning of scrutiny work. Broadening and improving engagement with partners was also recognised by councils as an area for development.



¹⁰ Shared Purpose – Shared Delivery Guidance on integrating Partnerships and Plans – Welsh Government, Version 2, Crown Copyright, December 2012.

69 During the scrutiny study councils also provided examples in their self-evaluations of the way in which they have attempted to improve external engagement, which included the use of social media, co-option onto committees and making use of citizens' panels. Several councils also referred to the opportunity for the public to complete a form requesting a topic for scrutiny. One council referred to a form being available for the public to provide comments on any topic being considered by a scrutiny committee.

At the national scrutiny conference Councillor Peter Farley of **Monmouthshire County Council** spoke of the importance of public engagement in the work of scrutiny. He explored the way public engagement can be a means of enhancing the work of scrutiny and also the value of public involvement at scrutiny committees.

He gave three examples of how this has been approached in Monmouthshire and how involving stakeholders, individuals, communities and interest groups has significantly improved the scrutiny function in Monmouthshire. A video clip of Councillor Farley can be viewed using the following link.

Councillor Peter Farley

Link - <http://vimeo.com/94525623>

70 However, in observing scrutiny committees, we witnessed a number of practices that may deter the public and councils' partners from engaging with scrutiny committee meetings. Such practices included poor acoustics, no spare copies of agendas being available, and the use of unsuitable meeting rooms that helped to create an overly formal environment or had limited seating for external observers.

71 There are clearly opportunities for scrutiny functions to broaden their engagement activity and for some to learn from a range of approaches that have already been implemented. Some councils are more proactive than others in their attempts to engage the public at each stage of scrutiny activity including: topic selection; planning and scoping; gathering evidence; and reporting findings. Effective engagement may require changing the venue, format, and layout of meetings and the content of work programmes to encourage more interest and engagement. Councils can also draw on the numerous approaches to engaging the public that have already been implemented across Wales and England. The recognition by many councils that engagement with partners is an area that could be improved suggests that scrutiny committees are often failing to make use of partners' knowledge, expertise and perspectives to inform their work.

72 The national scrutiny conference included sessions exploring ways that scrutiny could better engage with the public and partners. Details and links are contained in the boxes below.



Cynulliad
Cenedlaethol
Cymru

National
Assembly for
Wales

National Assembly for Wales – Public Engagement Toolkit

This workshop examined the principle of participation in scrutiny and outlined the use of an engagement tool. The National Assembly as an organisation has prioritised broadening participation in scrutiny. To 'engage with the people of Wales' is a corporate priority.

A link to the Public Engagement Toolkit can be found here.

Link - www.assemblywales.org/public_engagement_toolkit_2014.pdf

The Role of the Networked Councillor in Scrutiny

Catherine Howe of Public-i Group Ltd outlined why scrutiny is a perfect place to start developing the relationship between the networked councillor and the public.

For more information visit www.public-i.info

- 73 Engaging the public in council business is difficult and requires careful consideration of who to engage, on what, and for what purpose. Once this is established the method and style of engagement is important to be able to maximise potential contributions and the impact that they can have. There are no simple answers, and what worked for one council on a particular issue may not necessarily work for another. Often, however, the shift towards more effective engagement is a cultural one needed across the whole of a council, rather than just for the scrutiny function.
- 74 Councils may wish to consider using the 10 'National Principles for Public Engagement' developed by Participation Cymru in considering how best to engage and involve the public. Their guidance note on the National Principles provides a useful way of working through some of these issues (www.participationcymru.org.uk/media/288784/national_principles_for_public_engagement_aug1_.pdf).
- 75 In summary, the need to engage more effectively with the public and stakeholders is acknowledged as an on-going challenge for scrutiny functions, as it is for councils generally. However with more proactive planning of scrutiny activity, some dedicated effort and resources, and the support of organisations such as Participation Cymru and CfPS the voice of local people can play an important part in scrutiny and in local decision-making.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Self-evaluations and peer team evaluations

Appendix 2 - Outcomes and characteristics for effective local government overview and scrutiny



Appendix 1

Self-evaluations and peer team evaluations


Auditor General for Wales Improvement Study – Scrutiny in Local Government

This improvement study differed from the traditional audit approach by involving real time shared working activity, self-evaluation and peer learning exchange opportunities. These peer learning exchanges meant councils undertaking their own self evaluations of scrutiny arrangements with partner councils and observing and sharing views on each other’s’ scrutiny committees. This process enabled councils to build relationships with other councils, developing a better understanding, awareness and appreciation of themselves and others, as well as identifying opportunities for joint working and joint scrutiny in the future.


At the end of the study each council had an up to date baseline of its own and other councils’ scrutiny arrangements. This baseline was informed by real time observations, regional workshops, feedback from partner councils, a final self-evaluation relevant to each council and a local report from the Wales Audit Office. This enabled the councils to present their final self-evaluation to their own members and decide on an action plan for improvement.

Self-evaluations and peer team evaluations


Q1. Is there a clear and shared understanding and application of the role and purpose of Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) amongst executive and non-executive members, senior officers, scrutiny officers and key local partners?




Q2. Does O&S enjoy a high status and is it held in high esteem, trusted and respected both within and outside the Authority?




Q3. Is there a well-defined and constructive relationship between O&S, the executive and senior officers?




Q4. Does O&S have a clearly defined and valued role in the council's self-evaluation, performance management and improvement arrangements?




Q5. Is there regular and effective two-way communication between O&S and external/internal auditors, regulators and inspectors?




Q6. Does O&S have clear governance arrangements that are understood and applied effectively?




Q7. Are O&S chairs and executive members actively promoting the role and value of the scrutiny function to a variety of internal and external stakeholders?




Q8. Do O&S members have access to development and training opportunities focused on need, as part of the council's wider commitment to member support and development?




Q9. Does O&S have a sufficient level of dedicated support from officers who are able to research independently and are able to provide O&S members with high-quality, objective analysis and support?




Q10. Is the role of officers directly supporting scrutiny activity well-understood and valued within the organisation?




Q11. Does the O&S process receive effective support from the council's wider officer corp as and when required?




Q12. Is information provided to O&S relevant, robust, balanced, meaningful, responsive to requests, of high quality and provided in a timely and consistent manner?




Q13. Section One, Scrutiny Environment: Does the environment that O&S operate in support improvement?




Q14. Does O&S provide evidence-based, constructive challenge; operate objectively, apolitically and with independence from executive decision-makers?




Q15. Do O&S members identify appropriate topics for challenge or policy review/development and develop outcome-focused forward work programmes?




Q16. Do O&S members constructively yet robustly challenge policy and decision-makers and implementers (including partners etc) through effective questioning, listening and analysis, and develop a good understanding and knowledge of the subject under scrutiny?




Q17. Are O&S inquiries/reviews in-depth, rigorous and draw upon independent and objective perspectives from a wide range of sources (including making use of benchmarking information) within and outside the council?




Q18. Does O&S regularly engage with members, officers, the public and other external stakeholders in planning and conducting its work?




Q19. Does O&S have a balanced and focused work programme that is developed by O&S members, following consultation with the public and partners and discussions with executive members and senior officers?




Q20. Do O&S members plan their work considering the appropriateness of a range of scrutiny methods/methodologies, use of clear terms of reference and realistic project plans?




Q21. Are scrutiny forward work programmes routinely shared with auditors, inspectors and regulators to influence planning of improvement activity?




Q22. Does O&S play a key role in the council's self-evaluation and assessment arrangements and regularly evaluate itself to ensure that it continues to learn and improve how it adds value and impact?




Q23. Section Two, Scrutiny Practice: Is O&S practice effective?




Q24. Does O&S regularly contribute to the improvement of proposed/existing policies for the benefit of the area and its local communities?




Q25. Does O&S identify instances where agreed policies are not being implemented effectively and recommend appropriate remedial action to whomever is responsible within or outside the Council?




Q26. Does O&S challenge poor performance and its causes and alert senior officers, the executive, full council or partners to instigate remedial action as appropriate whilst continuing to monitor progress to remedy this?




Q27. When conducting in-depth inquiries/reviews into areas of poor performance, does O&S help shape responses to improve performance and the performance of other public sector providers?




Q28. Does O&S ensure that the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area is heard as part of local decision and policy-making processes?



Q29. Does O&S enhance democratic accountability through regular, robust, constructive and public challenge of local decision-makers/deliverers of services in the local area (including other public service providers/providers of 'shared'?



Q30. Section Three, Impact of Scrutiny: Does the O&S activity have impact?



Appendix 2

Outcomes and characteristics for effective local government overview and scrutiny

Wales Scrutiny Officers Network

Outcomes and characteristics for effective local government overview and scrutiny

Outcome <i>What does good scrutiny seek to achieve?</i>	Characteristics <i>What would it look like? How could we recognise it?</i>
<p>1 Democratic accountability drives improvement in public services.</p> <p><i>'Better Outcomes'</i></p>	<p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Overview and scrutiny has a clearly defined and valued role in the council's improvement and governance arrangements. ii) Overview and scrutiny has the dedicated officer support it needs from officers who are able to undertake independent research effectively, and provides councillors with high-quality analysis, advice and training. <p>Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Overview and scrutiny inquiries are non-political, methodologically sound and incorporate a wide range of evidence and perspectives. <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) Overview and scrutiny regularly engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers and service providers. v) Overview and scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems.
<p>2 Democratic decision making is accountable, inclusive and robust.</p> <p><i>'Better decisions'</i></p>	<p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Overview and scrutiny councillors have the training and development opportunities they need to undertake their role effectively. ii) The process receives effective support from the council's corporate management team who ensures that information provided to overview & scrutiny is of high quality and is provided in a timely and consistent manner. <p>Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Overview and scrutiny is councillor-led, takes into account the views of the public, partners and regulators, and balances the prioritisation of community concerns against issues of strategic risk and importance. iv) Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are well-planned, chaired effectively and make best use of the resources available to it. <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v) Decision makers give public account for themselves at overview and scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities.

<p>Outcome <i>What does good scrutiny seek to achieve?</i></p>	<p>Characteristics <i>What would it look like? How could we recognise it?</i></p>
<p>3 The public is engaged in democratic debate about the current and future delivery of public services.</p> <p><i>'Better engagement'</i></p>	<p>Environment</p> <p>i) Overview and scrutiny is recognised by the executive and corporate management team as an important council mechanism for community engagement, and facilitates greater citizen involvement in governance.</p> <p>Practice</p> <p>ii) Overview and scrutiny is characterised by effective communication to raise awareness of, and encourage participation in democratic accountability.</p> <p>iii) Overview and scrutiny operates non-politically and deals effectively with sensitive political issues, tension and conflict.</p> <p>iv) Overview and scrutiny builds trust and good relationships with a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>v) Overview and scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes.</p>