

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Monday, 14th May 2012 at 2.30pm in the Scrutiny Meeting Room, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors D. White (Chairman), V. Fletcher, G. Green, A. McClements, R. Sloan, C. Turley.

IN ATTENDANCE: Jas Bedesha, Cohesion Service Delivery Manager; Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Group Specialist; Tracy Clarke, Scrutiny Officer.

SMB-42 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on the 18th April 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

SMB-43 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr. Miles Hosken. Cllr. Hosken apologised that he had been unable to attend the Scrutiny Management Board meetings this year due to the fact that they had been held at times when he was not able to attend because of work commitments.

SMB-44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

SMB-45 ENGAGEMENT OF TOWN & PARISH COUNCILS WITH SCRUTINY

Members considered the report of the Scrutiny Group Specialist on the Engagement of Town & Parish Councils (TPCs) with Scrutiny which had been circulated with the agenda. Members were recommended to:

- Consider and agree the preferred option for the engagement of Town & Parish Councils with the Scrutiny Committees.
- To consider whether an allowance equivalent to that paid to existing Scrutiny Co-optees should be paid to Town & Parish Council representatives if elected to the Scrutiny Committees.
- To note the terms relating to the election of Town & Parish Council representatives as set out in section 6.2 of the report.

The report set out the feedback from Scrutiny Members and Town & Parish

Councils on the proposal to elect a Town & Parish Council representative to each of the Scrutiny Committees. This showed that 2 Scrutiny Members, 3 Town & Parish Councils, 1 Town & Parish Council Chairman, 1 Town & Parish Councillor and 1 Town & Parish Clerk had responded. The responses had been collated and four options were set out for consideration:

1. That TPC representatives are not elected to the Scrutiny Committees but:
 - TPCs are notified of about meetings and agenda items
 - Scrutiny pro-actively involves TPCs in scrutiny reviews where relevant
 - TPCs receive progress reports as provided to the Scrutiny Management Board.
2. That one TPC representative is elected to each Scrutiny Committees at the Parish Forum.
3. That one TPC representative is elected to each Scrutiny Committee at the Wrekin Area Committee.
4. That one TPC representative is elected to each Scrutiny Committees as follows:
 - Scrutiny seeks nominations from all TPCs requesting short statement of experience, knowledge and interest from nominees
 - Nominee details posted on website
 - If fewer than 5 nominees, no election will be held and nominees will be allocated to Scrutiny Committees by Scrutiny Management Board.
 - If more than 5 nominees, each TPC will be asked to vote for their preferred nominee by e-mail. Results will be published. Top scoring 5 will be appointed to the Scrutiny Committees and allocated places by the Scrutiny Management Board.

Four further responses were then tabled. These were from a Scrutiny Member, 2 Town & Parish Councils and the Scrutiny Chairman. The comments had been received subsequent to the report for the meeting being published but before the deadline for responses. The feedback tabled led to 3 further options being considered:

5. That two TPC representatives should be elected to each Scrutiny Committee.
6. That the election process should be facilitated by the Shropshire Association of Local Councils.
7. That all Town & Parish Councils select 2 Councillors to put forward as representatives. Supporting background information for each nominee is provided, including their experience, and which Scrutiny Committee they are interested in. The Scrutiny Management Board meet to consider all the candidates and select up to 2 representatives for each Committee based on experience, skills and interest. This meeting would be overseen by an independent representative of the Association of Local Councils.

Candidates will be informed about whether they have been selected or not.

There was then a discussion about the feedback and the recommended options during which the following points were made:

- It was noted that only seven Town & Parish Councils had responded in any way to the consultation which was about a quarter of the total number. Members felt this could reflect the lack of understanding or disinterest of some Town & Parish Councils in scrutiny, and felt that this was something that scrutiny should work to overcome. However, the willingness to engage of TPCs who had responded positively was warmly welcomed. Cllr. Sloan felt that the approach for scrutiny should be to focus on building relationships with local Councillors who wanted to get involved, and if shown to be effective, this may then stimulate wider interest and engagement.
- Cllr. Green drew Members' attention to Option 1 in the report which was not to elect TPC representatives to the Scrutiny Committees, but for TPCs to be more involved as part of scrutiny reviews. The Chairman disagreed with this option as he felt it may mean that TPCs were not fully involved in all scrutiny work.
- Members discussed feedback on the idea that one representative should reflect the views of all Town & Parish Councils, and agreed there was a difficulty with this given the diverse interests of the Councils, and that it was unreasonable to expect one person to feedback to all other Councils. It was noted that details of scrutiny meetings and agenda items were already sent to Town & Parish Councils, and that in future they would also receive progress reports brought to the Scrutiny Management Board.
- This stimulated a wider discussion about the role of the representatives on the Committees. In the light of the previous discussion, Cllr. Sloan suggested that it would benefit scrutiny for the role of the TPC representatives to focus less on representing the views of all TPCs as this was difficult, and more on bringing the talent and skills that reside in the Town & Parish Councils to add value to scrutiny. This would bring the role more in-line with the existing scrutiny co-optees who had been recruited for their specialist knowledge and experience to supplement that of the elected members, and to bring an external voice to scrutiny. Cllr. Fletcher noted that some of the existing Scrutiny Co-optees were also Town or Parish Councillors, and that this should be taken into consideration in any arrangements agreed. Cllr. Sloan further suggested that a "pool" of Town & Parish Councillors should be identified with whom scrutiny could work.
- There was a discussion about how TPC representatives might be elected. It was agreed that the Wrekin Area Committee was not the right forum because not all Councils were members, and this discounted Option 3. The Chairman reported that he had spoken to Wendy Tonge in the Priority Action Team to find out what had happened as a result of the recent consultation on the Parish Forum. Feedback had shown that the majority

of councils responding had felt that the Forum was poorly attended and not effective. The Parish Charter Monitoring Group had considered the feedback on 10th May and it had been concluded that a further look at the Forum was required to decide how it could function more effectively in future. In the light of this uncertainty, Members agreed that the Parish Forum was not the right forum to hold an election, and Option 2 was discounted.

- There was a discussion about how many TPC representatives should be appointed to the scrutiny committees. The proposal had been to elect one per Committee, but a suggestion had been put forward to elect two. Members were of the view that allowing up to 2 representatives per Committee would help widen the pool of talent available to scrutiny, and increase opportunities for TPCs to get involved.

Drawing the discussion to a conclusion and taking all points into consideration, the Chairman proposed an option which he felt would fulfil the requirements discussed. This was that:

- Each Town & Parish Council would be invited to nominate up to 2 councillors for appointment to the Scrutiny Committees;
- All nominees would supply a statement to scrutiny highlighting their skills, experience, interests and what they feel they could contribute to scrutiny.
- The Scrutiny Management Board would consider all nominations and select up to 2 Councillors to be appointed to each Scrutiny Committee based on where the skills, experience and interests presented could add value to the expertise already on the Scrutiny Committees;
- That the selection process would be overseen by an independent observer from the Shropshire Association of Local Councils, and that Karen Roper should be invited to do this;
- That the Scrutiny Management Board would notify all nominees whether they had been selected or not;
- That Scrutiny Co-optees who are also Town or Parish Councillors would be included within the number of representatives selected.

This process was agreed by other members of the Board.

The issue of the payment of an allowance to TPC representatives was then considered. The proposal consulted on was that the TPC representatives would not attract an allowance on the basis that a budget had not been identified and because expenses could be claimed back from the Town or Parish Council. There was further discussion on this matter, and it was noted that there had been some feedback that the lack of an allowance could be a barrier to participation. Furthermore, there was an issue with equality as the existing Co-optees were paid a taxable allowance of £260 per year to cover expenses, and not paying the TPC representatives would create a two tier system which would be unfair and could create problems in future.

Cllrs. White and McClements reported that they had had further discussions regarding the payment of allowances, and confirmed that funding could be allocated from the Members' Allowances budget to pay the appointed Town & Parish Council representatives an allowance equivalent to that paid to the

servicing Scrutiny Co-optees. The Chairman sought views on the payment of an allowance, and Members confirmed they were in agreement with paying the allowance.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist drew Members' attention to the terms relating to the election of the TPC representatives in section 6.2 of the report. Members were in agreement with the principles of the terms and conditions but noted that they would need to be amended to reflect the process agreed at this meeting.

RESOLVED

- **That the Scrutiny Management Board appoint up to two Town & Parish Councillors to each Scrutiny Committee according to the process agreed at the meeting**
- **That Town & Parish Councillors appointed to a Scrutiny Committee would be eligible for an allowance equivalent to that paid to serving Scrutiny Co-optees**
- **That the terms and conditions for the Town & Parish Council representatives set out in section 6.2 be noted but would be amended to reflect the agreed process.**

SMB-46 POLICE REFORM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Jas Bedesha, Cohesion Service Delivery Manager, presented the report on Police & Crime Commissioners and the West Mercia Police & Crime Panel which had been reported to Cabinet on 26th April.

The report summarised the key changes brought about by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act with regard to the role and responsibilities of Police & Crime Commissioners and Police & Crime Panels, and the implications of the changes for the Council.

The following points were highlighted:

- Police & Crime Commissioners (PCCs) would replace Police Authorities.
- The PPC is an elected position, responsible for the allocation of budgets and appointment and dismissal of the Chief Constable. Elections would be held on 15th November.
- PCPs would be responsible for holding to account and scrutinising the actions and decisions of the PCC, but would not be responsible for scrutinising the performance of the police force.
- The PCP would be made up of elected councillors and lay members. Telford & Wrekin was in the West Mercia area which included Shropshire, Herefordshire and Worcestershire County Councils and 6 Worcestershire District Councils. The model agreed for the West Mercia PCP was 15 elected members and 2 lay co-opted members. The number of places allocated to each authority had been based on the population, and political balance would be required across the force area. All authorities had agreed to the proposed model as follows:
 - Herefordshire – 2 Elected Members
 - Shropshire – 4 Elected Members

- Telford and Wrekin – 2 Elected Members
- Worcestershire County Council – 1 Elected Member
- Worcestershire Districts – 6 Elected Members (one per district)
- 2 Co-opted non-elected members, one North (Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin, one South (Herefordshire and Worcestershire).

Delegated powers have been given to Jonathan Eatough by Cabinet to the two Telford & Wrekin positions, as the guidance requires a political balance across West Mercia before the PCP goes into shadow form in June/July.

- Worcestershire had been appointed as the lead authority for the day to day running of the PCP, and a cross-authority officer working group had been set up to support the PCP and look at how it would work with the PCC. The Democratic Services Manager represented Telford & Wrekin on this group.
- A key issue for the Council was the impact of the changes on funding. The Community Safety Grant, and potentially Drugs Intervention Programme grant, was likely to be passed from the Council to the PCC from April 2013. Potentially this would mean the West Mercia authorities would be bidding competitively to provide services on a commissioned basis. The authorities had therefore been working together to identify the priorities which each authority would support to try to minimise competition for resources, although this may be difficult to avoid. Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) had been identified as the priority for Telford & Wrekin because it was a key issue for the borough and because of the good work that had been done such as the ASB Hotline and the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Committee (MARAC) process. A shared Action Plan would be developed to ensure money was passported back to Telford & Wrekin to deal with ASB.

Following the presentation, members raised a number of issues and concerns:

- Members wanted to know whether the elected Members on the PCP would be scrutiny or Executive members given that the PCP has a scrutiny role. It was explained that nominations had been sought from group leaders and would be approved by Cabinet.
- Members asked how the elections for the PCC would be funded, and what the term of office was, and were informed that the authority had received no additional funding for the election, and the term of office was four years. Members were concerned that the authority may be expected to pay for the election, especially if the timing did not coincide with other elections whereby costs could be saved, and sought further clarity on this.
- Members were told that PCP members would receive annual expenses of £992, far less than was paid to Police Authority representatives. A rolling programme of meetings around West Mercia was being looked at.
- Great concern was expressed about the potential impact on funding. Members were informed that there had been discussions at officer level

about how to minimise the risk of competition through a shared action plan based around the priorities for each authority, and about how to make the case for localised funding. However, there was a risk of competing demands for resources with issues that were a priority for all authorities such as the Independent Domestic and Sexual Violence Advisors. Substance misuse funding would also be centralised with the PCC. Cllr. Fletcher was concerned that links would need to be made with Public Health in this respect. Cllr. Sloan expressed a concern that with the reduction to police budgets, the Community Safety grants could be used to offset cuts unless the funding was ring-fenced.

- There was concern that Worcestershire was disproportionately represented on the PCP due to the fact that there were 6 district councils as well as the county council. The regulations set out in the Act were that panels must include at least one elected representative from each local authority in the force area, including unitaries, counties and districts. This meant that Worcestershire had a statutory minimum of 7 representatives overall. The West Mercia model had been based on population size, balanced for political proportionality and would need to be agreed by all the member authorities.
- There was a discussion about the role of scrutiny in the new arrangements. The Scrutiny Group Specialist reminded members that the statutory powers of scrutiny in relation to the Safer Stronger Communities Partnership remained in place, although this would need to be considered as new funding and/or commissioning arrangements became clear. The relationship with scrutiny and the PCP would also need to be considered as the PCP would be responsible for scrutinising the PCC who was in turn responsible for allocating budgets to the community safety partnerships. It was agreed that the Scrutiny Group Specialist would contact scrutiny officers in the other authorities to find out how this was being looked at, and that a report would be brought back to a future meeting.

RESOLVED

That a report be brought back to a future meeting.

SMB-47 2012/13 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Scrutiny Group Specialist tabled a briefing note showing the proposed timetable for setting the 2012/13 Scrutiny Work programme which was agreed. As part of the process, Assistant Directors would be asked to identify the key work streams for the next municipal year and to identify particular pieces of work where scrutiny could make a useful contribution to policy development. This was to help inform scrutiny members' decisions about the work programme, and to assist with the internal planning of resources to support scrutiny work. Members firmly emphasised that decisions about the work programme would remain with scrutiny members.

The Scrutiny Management Board had requested an up to date list of partners on the Local Strategic Partnership which was provided. It was agreed that all

partners would be invited to make suggestions for the work programme.

RESOLVED

- **That the indicative timetable for setting the work programme be noted.**
- **That partners on the Local Strategic Partnership be invited to make suggestions for the work programme.**

Before the Chairman brought the meeting to a close, the Board wished to express their great sadness at the news that former Member and friend Rosemary Chaplin had passed away and to acknowledge the great contribution she had made to scrutiny over many years.

The meeting ended at 4.15pm.

Chairman:

Date:

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Wednesday, 16th May 2012 at 9.00am at the Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors D.R.W. White (Chairman), V.A. Fletcher, M.B.Hosken, M.G. Ion (substitute for R.J. Sloan), A.D. McClements and C.R. Turley.

Councillors S.Bentley, S.P. Burrell, A.J. Eade and J.M. Seymour (Call-in signatories)

Councillor P.R. Watling – Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families

Also Present: J. Collins (Assistant Director: Education, Culture & Skills), J. Eatough (Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection), S. Jones (Scrutiny Group Specialist), P. Smith (Democratic Services Team Leader), K. Swallow (SDM – Integrated Planning, Placements & Commissioning).

SMB-48 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors G.M. Green and R.J. Sloan

SMB-49 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

SMB-50 CALL-IN REQUEST – PLANNING OF SCHOOL PLACES: REVISED PLANS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL PROVISION UNDER THE BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE PROGRAMME

The Chair reported that a valid call-in request had been received following the publication of the following decisions by Cabinet on 26 April 2012:

(a) that, having taken into consideration responses to the formal consultation process detailed in the report, approval be given to submit the revised plans for the Building Schools for the Future programme to PartnershipsforSchools, namely:

- To build a new 900 place Christian faith Academy for ages 11-18 in Priorslee to replace the existing Blessed Robert Johnson Catholic College.

- To build a new 1200 place Co-operative Academy for ages 11–16 on the Oakengates Leisure Centre site.
- To relocate Lord Silkin and Grange Park Primary onto the shared site in Stirchley, to encompass an 1150 place Learning Community comprising primary, secondary and Post 16 education.
- To rebuild Charlton School as a 1200 place 11-16 school to enhance secondary provision in Wellington.

(b) that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director – Education, Culture and Skills, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, to co-ordinate the implementation of any interim governance arrangements as may be required.

Attached to the agenda was a copy of the Call-in request form, together with revised proposals that had been agreed at a preliminary informal meeting between the Chair and lead Call-In member (Councillor Burrell) on 9th May 2012. A proposed motion was tabled by the lead Call-in member, and the Chair advised that this would be the document which the Board would vote on at the end of the meeting. In accordance with the Member Call-in Protocol, the lead Call-In member and the Cabinet Member: Children, Young People & Families each tabled a document summarising the arguments and points they would be making during the meeting. Attached to the agenda was the report of the Assistant Director: Education, Culture & Skills that was considered by Cabinet on 26th April 2012.

The Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection then outlined the procedure to be followed at the meeting, a copy of which was attached to the agenda.

Councillor Burrell (lead Call-in Member) presented the tabled document setting out the reasons for the Call-in and the justification for the proposals calling on Cabinet to reconsider their decision. The revised proposal was as follows:

“1) The decision to build a 900 place Christian faith academy in Priorslee needs to be re-considered, taking into account a more detailed transport plan that details the implications for the Council, in respect of home to school transport, parents, in respect of the impact on them of transporting their children to the new school and the environment, in respect of the impact to the overall carbon footprint if these proposals are implemented;

2) The revised plans for the Building Schools for the Future programme are re-considered particularly in relation to the planning of school places across the Borough, but particularly in respect of

- a) the availability of school places for pupils from Priorslee;
- b) how current planning ought to be taking account of population growth in Newport and Muxton and the effect on Burton Borough, an

- already oversubscribed school;
- c) the overall reduction of school places in Telford, a growth area.

3) The strong consultation response against the closure of Wrockwardine Wood Arts College was not adequately considered when the original decision was made.”

The Lead Call-in Member put forward the view that the Cabinet’s plans would result in 400 fewer secondary school places in the Borough. While this might address the current “dip” in the number of secondary age children, after 2018 it was predicted that numbers would rise, and there were likely to be capacity issues in some schools. A longer term approach was needed, and it would be better to defer some of the capital to address any need for extra capacity in a few years time. The rationale for re-locating the Blessed Robert Johnson (BRJ) Catholic College in Wellington to a new Ecumenical Academy in Priorslee was challenged, and it was questioned whether the remaining schools in Wellington would be able to accommodate those non-denominational BRJ pupils that did not wish to move to Priorslee. In relation to the proposals for a new faith Academy in Priorslee, it was contended that there would not be enough places at the new school for the children of local residents, even based on current numbers and ignoring new house completions and proposals for the expansion of Priorslee Primary Academy. Concerns were also expressed that Burton Borough School in Newport had been oversubscribed for a number of years, and the Cabinet’s proposals failed to address a situation that would only get worse with the additional demand arising from planned new housing developments in Newport and Muxton.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families then responded to the call-in request. On taking office last year, the new Administration had felt that the original BSF proposals were not sustainable, particularly in Wellington where there were too many secondary school places. Officers had been asked to look again at the planning of school places in order to make it more sustainable, resulting in the current proposals. There had been extensive consultation with governing bodies, parents and pupils, and the Council had worked hard to address any concerns that had been raised. Officers then explained the rationale for the proposals, including the projected pupil admission numbers for future years both across the Borough, and, more specifically, those relating to the proposed Faith Academy at Priorslee – details of which were included in the tabled papers. The combined information suggested that there would be sufficient secondary places available in Wellington, Priorslee and Newport, and that there would not be a shortfall of places at the proposed Priorslee Academy for local residents. In terms of the suggestion about increased transport costs and carbon footprint as a result of the re-location of the BRJ College, data on BRJ pupils showed a significant number lived closer to Priorslee than to Wellington. Regard had been taken of the strategic Local Transport Plan, and a detailed travel plan for the new Priorslee Academy would be produced once the site had been finalised and a planning application submitted. In relation to the proposal to

build a new Co-operative Academy on the Oakengates Leisure Centre site, there would be significant benefits of economy of scale. The Council had worked hard with both Wrockwardine Wood and Sutherland Colleges to address the concerns that had been raised in the initial consultation, as a result of which the Heads of both schools could assure parents that the proposal would not damage the wellbeing and chances of pupils.

Following a short adjournment, Board members asked a number of questions to both the lead Call-In member and the Cabinet member. These related to:

- the consultation process on the Cabinet's proposals;
- that parents may have chosen to send their children to Wrockwardine Wood College on the basis of the original plan that the school would be moving to a new site in Priorslee;
- why any detailed transport plan could not be produced in advance of decisions on the re-organisation of schools;
- the capacity of the proposed Priorslee faith Academy to accommodate pupils from Priorslee and Redhill primary schools;
- the views of the Dioceses of Shrewsbury, Lichfield and Hereford on the proposals;
- the campaign that resulted in 1600 signatures on a standard letter opposing the proposals for Wrockwardine Wood Arts College;
- the impact that a new school would have at the proposed site in Priorslee

Having heard detailed responses from both sides to the questions, the lead Call-in member and the Cabinet member were invited to sum up. Councillor Burrell urged the Board to ask the Cabinet to re-consider its BSF policy, which would not meet the needs of the Borough in the longer term. Councillor Watling stated that Department for Education rules on BSF did not allow any planning beyond 2018. Within these constraints, it was believed that the current proposals took a broader view, were sustainable and would best meet the needs of children and young people in the Borough.

Having considered all the written and verbal evidence that had been submitted, and the responses to questions, the Board:

RESOLVED – that the Call-in request and proposal, as tabled at the meeting, be rejected, and that the original Cabinet decision be noted.

The meeting ended at 12.08 pm.

Chair:

Date:

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD– 4th JULY 2012

SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

REPORT OF SCRUTINY GROUP SPECIALIST

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To enable the Scrutiny Management Board to consider and agree recommendations on the Scrutiny Work Programme.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Scrutiny Work Programme should be a two year programme, refreshed after 12 months.
- 2.2 To agree the allocation of suggestions to the Scrutiny Committees as shown in Appendix 2 for further consideration by each Scrutiny Committee.
- 2.3 To endorse the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee Chairmen in Appendix 2 for further consideration by the Scrutiny Committees.
- 2.4 To agree the indicative allocation of meetings to each Scrutiny Committee as set out in 6.3.
- 2.5 To note the items for the Scrutiny Management Board work programme as set out in section 7.2.

3.0 PREVIOUS MINUTES

- 3.1 None

4.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 4.1 Following the implementation of the revised scrutiny committee structure and the appointment of Members to the committees at the AGM on 24th May 2012, the Scrutiny Work Programme needs to be agreed.

- 4.2 The process for setting the scrutiny work programme is set out in the Scrutiny Handbook and is shown in Appendix 1 with the timetable for agreeing the 2012/13 work programme.
- 4.3 The Scrutiny Management Board had acknowledged that with a 20% reduction in staff resource across the organisation, it was more important than ever for scrutiny to use resources efficiently and to add value with every piece of work carried out. The agreed approach was for scrutiny to focus on fewer, priority issues and in more depth.
- 4.4 To support this approach Assistant Directors and other senior officers were asked by scrutiny to suggest key areas of work and policy development opportunities within their service areas where scrutiny could make a difference, and where there would be capacity to support scrutiny work. The aim of this exercise was to help inform decisions about the work programme and it remains the prerogative of scrutiny members to determine which issues they want to scrutinise. However, capacity is an issue, and this must continue to be factored into work planning.
- 4.5 The Scrutiny Management Board may recommend items which should be prioritised for the work programme. The recommendations will be considered by individual Scrutiny Committees to agree the final work programme.

5.0 SUGGESTIONS FOR THE SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

- 5.1 Appendix 2 shows the suggestions put forward for the 2012/13 scrutiny work programme and the items carried over from 2011/12 by lead Scrutiny Committee.
- 5.2 The table also shows:
- Where the item cuts across more than one scrutiny committee and work maybe carried out jointly
 - The indicative timetable where known
 - Comments made by officers for scrutiny members to consider in their selection of topics and method of scrutiny. This includes topics being reviewed or monitored by other Council committees so that work is not duplicated.
 - Any recommendations made by the Scrutiny Chairmen.
- 5.3 In the last three years changes to the scrutiny structure have necessitated a break in the work programme between municipal years which is very disruptive. However, in anticipation of the structure remaining stable for the foreseeable future, it is recommended that

there is a two year rolling work programme, refreshed after 12 months, to allow for continuity of work.

- 5.4 The work programme must be flexible to allow for important issues which emerge during the year to be scrutinised. However, if a new topic is added to the work programme, an existing item must be removed to avoid the work load becoming unmanageable and losing focus.
- 5.5 Members are asked to be rigorous and focussed in selecting topics for the work programme. It must be accepted that the scrutiny team and the organisation as a whole simply does not have the capacity to support scrutiny of all the issues Members may wish to scrutinise. Scrutiny Committees should select 3-5 key topics for the work programme, and other items should be removed. An exception to this is the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee which aligns its work programme to the budget process and proposals.

6.0 ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT SCRUTINY MEETINGS

- 6.1 The allocation of scrutiny resources to support scrutiny committee meetings will be determined and managed by the Scrutiny Management Board. Adjustments may be made as deemed necessary to deliver the work programme depending on peak workloads.
- 6.2 During 2011/12 there were 47 formal Scrutiny Committee meetings at which a wide range of issues were considered. As discussed earlier in this report, the aim now is for scrutiny to focus on a smaller number of key issues in more depth to improve the impact of scrutiny and to ensure the work programme is manageable with reduced resources.
- 6.3 The Scrutiny Chairman has therefore proposed a baseline of Scrutiny Committee meetings is set for 2012/13 as follows:

Scrutiny Management Board	6
Scrutiny Committees	6 each
- 6.4 Remaining capacity will be allocated flexibly by the Scrutiny Management Board to the Scrutiny Committees according to the requirements of the work programme and the availability of resources. This approach ensures the work load is manageable and allows flexibility to target resources where required.
- 6.5 The allocation does not include informal or sub-group meetings which

may be held to gather evidence as part of a review, briefing meetings or regional/external scrutiny meetings.

- 6.6 To increase capacity, scrutiny members have expressed their intention to hold “member only” meetings whereby members take responsibility for gathering evidence without the need for a scrutiny officer to attend a meeting. A protocol for member-only meetings already exists in the Scrutiny Handbook and it is recommended that this approach is trialled on a limited basis to test and evaluate the approach.
- 6.7 It should be noted that if the recent pattern of Call-in continues, this may have a significant impact on workloads and the work programme would need to be adjusted to take this into account.

7.0 SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD WORK PROGRAMME

- 7.1 The Scrutiny Management Board is responsible for the strategic direction of the Council’s scrutiny function and for overseeing delivery of the work programme.
- 7.2 The Scrutiny Management Board work programme will include:
- Progress reports to monitor delivery of the work programme
 - Legislation updates and implications for scrutiny
 - Meetings to hold the Executive to account
 - Monitoring the implementation of scrutiny recommendations
 - Scrutiny of strategic issues identified by the Board
 - Statutory scrutiny of Community Safety Partnership
 - Decide Scrutiny Assembly meetings
 - Agree changes to the Scrutiny Handbook for consultation with Scrutiny Assembly, including Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Committees
 - Agreeing the Scrutiny Annual Report

8.0. EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

There are no specific equal opportunity impacts arising from this report. Equal Opportunity issues will be considered as part of any scrutiny work.

9.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

There are no specific environmental impacts arising from this report. Environmental impacts will be considered as appropriate to the topics in the work programme.

10. LEGAL COMMENT

The proposals contained in this report are in accordance with the Scrutiny Handbook and the Council's Constitution.

11. LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

Scrutiny members are asked to agree the work programme in the context of the Council's priorities.

12. OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS

There is an opportunity to focus the work programme on fewer topics and in more depth in areas of policy development where scrutiny can have a greater impact. There is a risk that too many topics are kept in the work programme so that it loses focus and impact.

13. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The work programme will have to be managed within existing resources and adjustments made accordingly to ensure that this is the case. Any variances will be reported through financial monitoring.

14. WARD IMPLICATIONS

There are no specific ward implications arising from this report.

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Report prepared by Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Group Specialist 01952 383114

Process and timetable for setting the Scrutiny Work Programme

Process	Timetable
Scrutiny Suggestion Form circulated to all Councillors, Scrutiny Co-optees, Senior Management Team, Town and Parish Councils and partner organisations to be returned by a specified date.	<p>15st May – 8th June As part of this process, Assistant Directors were invited to suggest key areas of policy development to scrutiny.</p>
Suggestions collated by Scrutiny Team.	<p>w/c 11th - 18th June New suggestions collated with items carried over from 2011/12 work programme.</p> <p>Scrutiny Chairmen consult relevant Assistant Directors/Cabinet members on suggestions to find out how they fit with priorities for the service area, any information that may affect a scrutiny review, the potential timing of work and what can be resourced.</p>
<p>Meeting of Scrutiny Management Board to consider Scrutiny suggestions.</p> <p>Scrutiny Management Board will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Determine whether the suggestions meet the criteria for scrutiny Agree topics for the Scrutiny Management Board work programme Allocate other suggestions to the relevant Scrutiny Committee to consider for the work programme, making recommendations about which should be prioritised or jointly scrutinised Propose the allocation of resources across the Committees based on the projected work load. 	<p>4th July Scrutiny Management Board meeting, including presentation/Q&A with the Leader and Managing Director on the challenges and priorities for the Council for the future. Scrutiny Assembly members invited to take part in meeting.</p>
<p>Scrutiny Committees meet to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The items to be included in the work programme The method of scrutiny The required schedule of meetings. 	<p>From 16th July onwards Scrutiny Committees agree 3-5 priorities for the work programme.</p>
Scrutiny Management Board reviews final work programme for on-going monitoring.	<p>On-going – progress reports to each Scrutiny Management Board meeting.</p>

Suggestions for the Scrutiny Work Programme 2012/13

New suggestions for the work programme are highlighted bold.

Items carried over from the 2011/12 work programme are in standard font.

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
Scrutiny Management Board				
Police reforms: Police & Crime Panel, impact of reforms on grants and services, impact on Safer Stronger Communities Partnership.			There is a statutory duty for scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership a minimum of once a year and this should be included in the work programme.	To include this in the work programme.
Domestic Violence – impact of funding changes arising from police reforms			This could be a specific focus as part of the above item.	
Budget & Finance	The Committee's work programme will be aligned to the budget consultation timetable/process and in addition to the items already identified for further monitoring the Committee will identify topics for the work programme through this process.			
Changes to local government finance				
Procurement - monitor savings made through procurement.		On-going	This forms part of financial monitoring. Audit Committee work plan includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICT procurement audit • Jacobs contract • Waste procurement • Contract monitoring 	
Capital Receipts – monitor capital receipts and any impacts on capital programme.		On-going	A report will be made to the Audit Committee in September.	Suggested Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee members attend Audit Committee in September, then continue to monitor.
Small Business Loans Fund – to look at how this is working.	HEI			
Financial Monitoring reports		As published		
Cost of care placements – monitor	CYP	Spring	Link to CYP review of Care Placement	

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
progress against budget.		2013	Strategy.	
Children & Young People				The Chairman recommends the Committee should agree 4 - 5 items from the list. Consultation with children and young people will be built into the work programme.
Children and young people's participation strategy.			Consultation with young people on work programme to identify what they want to be consulted on.	
Review of the borough's Children in Care Placement Strategy May include out of borough placements, permanence, child protection, foster care, adoption.	B&F		Links to costs of care placements by Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee.	
Future provision of primary places in the borough including school, SEN and PRU provision.				
School Improvement – strategies and action to support school improvement, especially with the move to academies and free schools.				
School admission arrangements.				
Services and programmes targeted at young people: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Offer - quality and impact of provision across the borough • Youth Offending Service – approach to commissioning (local/regional). 				
Review the impact of early intervention programmes, e.g: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening Families – the approach to helping troubled families • Family Connect 	C&C		This continues work on child poverty carried out in 2011/12. Possibly joint with Co-operative & Communities on social deprivation issue.	

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children & Family Centres – the Brookside pilot 				
Transition arrangements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition of learning practices from year 6 (primary) to year 7 (secondary) • Transition support for children in care to adulthood (Response to recommendations from care leavers meeting.) 				
<u>Standing items:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education – attainment, attendance, Ofsted reports • Corporate Parenting monitoring information – including education / attainment levels for children in care (update on development of PI recommended by Committee) 			Allocate 30 minutes per meeting for performance updates.	
Co-operative & Communities	The Chairman recommends the Committee selects up to 4 topics for the work programme.			
Co-operative Commission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of approach – benefits and risks, where does it fit in the democratic process? • Implementation of recommendations 				
Employee Commission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the model - what do staff think? Involvement / barriers / embedding the model. • Sharing the TWC model with other authorities 				

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of recommendations 				
<p>Co-operative Values – is the Council delivering on its values and how is the Council held to account? The Co-operative Commission recommended this comes to scrutiny.</p>				
<p>Adopter Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress on implementation of projects – identify topics for more detailed work. This will include – Single point of contact for businesses to Council Services - update on development of model and progress towards implementation. 				
<p>Update on impact of changes to leisure concessions</p>				
<p>Improvements to customer care</p>				
<p>Benefit changes – how the Council and partners are supporting people through benefit changes.</p>				
<p>Funding for Citizen’s Advice Bureau</p>			<p>Possibly part of a wider review of working with the voluntary sector which is currently under review as part of Co-operative Council work.</p>	
<p>Commercial opportunities for the Council – and threats – arising from the Localism Act.</p>				
<p>Social Deprivation – not covered in 2011/12 work programme. Chairman has asked for this to be carried forward for re-consideration.</p>	CYP		<p>Possible joint meeting with CYP committee (early intervention).</p>	

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
Community Environmental Projects. This was not covered in 2011/12 work programme; the Chairman has asked for this to be carried forward for re-consideration.	HEI			
Working with Town & Parish Councils. This was not covered in 2011/12 work programme; the Chairman has asked for this to be carried forward for re-consideration.				
Health & Adult Care	The Chairman has made recommendations about the priorities for the work programme.			
Community Trust			To include Foundation Trust application on 17 th July.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Staffordshire & Shropshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust (from HWB) • Mental health services – the impact of reduction of mental health workers and benefit changes especially on people with serious mental health problems, and the capacity of the NHS to support. 				
CAMHS service. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral processes and waiting times for appointments. • Counselling, anger management psychological services available for ALL children • The move from Telford to Shropshire and how it was dealt with • Prescriptions - not available from 	CYP		CAMHS service delivered by Community Trust. Review of service by commissioners currently underway. Report back to Health & Wellbeing Board in September.	Chairman recommends this is included in the work programme.

	Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
	doctors, having to phone CAMHS and having them sent in post.				
	Lack of community mental health support for children under 5 within the borough. Children have to go outside the area which costs a lot of money.	CYP		Query whether children under 5 are sent out of borough. Possibly link to CAMHS suggestion above.	
	Appointments in walk-in clinics.			Scrutiny currently has no authority to scrutinise GPs or surgeries but the suggestion may be reviewed if legislation brings GPs into scope.	
	Local Accounts for social care – annual statement for the public on how the Council is performing in social care. Public can input.			Possibly set up a sub-group to review. This is on the Health & Wellbeing Board agenda for final sign-off.	
	Is it true that hearing impaired people are no longer to be registered as disabled?				
	Unscheduled Care Strategy				
	Meals on Wheels – review of options for service change			This item was referred from the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.	Chairman recommends this is included in the work programme.
	Review the position on Continuing Healthcare funding.				Chairman recommends this is included in the work programme.
	Review of regulations and guidance for health scrutiny in secondary legislation.				
	Development of protocols for scrutiny to work with the Health & Wellbeing Board.				
	Priorities for the Health and Wellbeing Strategy			Stakeholder event 3 rd July. Overseen by the Health & Wellbeing Board.	
	Development of contract specification for Healthwatch			Stakeholder event 3 rd July. On Health & Wellbeing Board agenda.	
	Development of vision for Public Health			Stakeholder event 3 rd July.	Chairman recommends this item is

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
and the Transition of Public Health.			Scrutiny of transition relates to Alcohol Strategy below. On Health & Wellbeing Board agenda.	included in the work programme.
Alcohol Strategy				Chairman recommends this item is included in the work programme (part of transition of public health).
CCG authorisation process			Written updates can be provided. Monitored by Health & Wellbeing Board.	
Vulnerable Adult Safeguarding Board report, plus report from SSSFT on safeguarding thematic review (adults & children).		Sept 2012	Also on Health & Wellbeing Board agenda.	Chairman recommends this item is included in the work programme.
Discharge of patients – findings of Senior Citizens' Forum survey conducted by LINK				
CQC – update meeting to identify any issues arising from review of domiciliary care or other inspections.				
Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) as a sub-group of the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee.			Items in the work plan include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SaTH Foundation Trust application • WMAS • Implementation of reconfiguration: Travel & Transport Plan, Workforce development plans, training for GPs and midwives etc. • 111 service – this is being reviewed by the Health & Wellbeing Board 	The JHOSC will decide its own work programme.
Housing, Economy & Infrastructure	The Chairman recommends that the Committee select 3 topics as priorities for the work programme to include the Community Infrastructure Levy and the Waste Management Procurement.			
Community Infrastructure Levy – policy development		Oct 2012	Adoption of the CIL was referred to scrutiny by Council and must be	Matters referred by Council must be included in the work programme.

Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
			included in the work programme.	
Waste Management Services Procurement	B&F		Scrutiny Management Board recommended that scrutiny should be involved throughout the procurement process. Timetable suggested in report for Call-in meeting. Details to be confirmed.	This item should be included in the work programme.
Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) – policy development		Sept 2012		
<p>How to attract the maximum number of new jobs to Telford & Wrekin. The economy is flat lining, unemployment is up, and social problems are increasing. More jobs are needed to improve the economy of the Borough, which will benefit everyone including the Council.</p> <p>Scrutiny could help identify best practice by other Councils in attracting jobs. This would help the Council's plans to boost our economy.</p>				
<p>Town & District Centres Cleansing Standards. To review the cleansing standards and to assess areas for improvement within Town and district centres</p>				
<p>CPE / Car Park Management / Southwater multi story car park management To review progress on CPE</p>				
Travellers – lack of service to serve notice to quit on unlawful encampments at weekends.			Policy on sites for travellers – are there enough pitches in T&W/ If not should additional sites be identified?	

	Lead Scrutiny Committee and suggestion	Links to	When	Comments	Recommendation
	Highway and Transport Capital Programme Asset Management To review medium term investment requirements.		Immediate		
	Housing and Choose Your Home <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of properties on Choose your Home • Opportunities for non-traditional affordable homes • Provision of one-bedroomed properties/supported housing for care leavers • How the Council and RLSs could work better together • Potential for direct ownership of Council houses 	CYP	Autumn	Potential link to CYP committee – issues for care leavers	
	Gated Alley Ways – this was not completed and there were several issues regarding who had ownership of opening the gates etc.				
	Un-adopted areas – to look areas that were not adopted and try and do something about this as it would cover environmental issues i.e. mowing, tree felling and maintenance, road sweeping, drain clearing, lighting, road signage, road lines, pothole repairs etc.				