



Telford & Wrekin
COUNCIL

Addenbrooke House Ironmasters Way Telford TF3 4NT

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Date	Wednesday, 4 November 2015	Time	6.00pm
Venue	Meeting Room G3/G4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT		

Enquiries Regarding this Agenda:

Democratic Services	Deborah Moseley	01952 383215
Media Enquiries	Corporate Communications	01952 382406
Lead Officer	Fiona Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist	01952 383113

Committee Membership: Councillors S A W Reynolds (Chair), S Bentley, A J Burford, N A M England, V A Fletcher, E J Greenaway, K R Guy and J M Seymour

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Declarations of Interest**
- 3. Minutes** Appendix A
To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on 10 July 2015.
- 4. Holding the Executive to Account (Session 1)**
Councillor Kuldip Sahota, Leader of Telford & Wrekin Council, will attend for this item. Members of the Customer Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee are invited to attend for this item.
- 5. Holding the Executive to Account (Session 2)**
Councillor Paul Watling, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families will attend for this item. Members of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee are invited to attend for this item.
- 6. Review of Scrutiny Co-optees** Appendix B
(To Follow)
To update Scrutiny Management Board on the Review of Co-optees and request that the Board endorse the appointment of Co-optees as recommended by the Scrutiny Committee Chairs.

Continued ...

... Continued

7. **Scrutiny Work Programme Interim Update**
To update Scrutiny Management Board on the delivery of the 2015/16 Scrutiny Work Programme.
8. **Chairs' Updates**

Appendix C

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Wednesday, 4 November 2015 at 6.00pm in Meeting Room G4, Addenbrook House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT

PRESENT: Councillors S A W Reynolds (Chair), S Bentley, A Burford, N A M England, V A Fletcher, J M Seymour.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor K Sahota, Leader Telford & Wrekin Council; Councillor P Watling, Cabinet Member Children, Young People & Family Services; R Partington, Managing Director; L Johnston, Director Children Services.

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors S Barnes, J Francis, J Pinter, P Scott and Scrutiny Co-optee Mr S Rayner; F Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist; S Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

SMB-07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs. K Guy and J Greenaway

SMB-08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. S Bentley said he would declare an interest in item 5 should the need arise.

SMB-09 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on 27 March 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

SMB-10 HOLDING THE EXECUTIVE TO ACCOUNT: QUESTIONS TO THE LEADER CLLR. KULDIP SAHOTA

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited those present to introduce themselves. The purpose of the Holding to Account sessions was for scrutiny members to hold Cabinet members to account for their strategic role and also to extend the range of scrutiny by giving members an opportunity to ask questions about issues not covered in the Committees work programmes.

Cllr. Sahota and the Managing Director (MD) were present for this item. The Chair opened the questions by asking Cllr. Sahota what, as Leader, he felt he had achieved in the first six months of this administration. Cllr. Sahota replied that after the election he had paused to take stock of what the public were saying and the commitments in the administration's manifesto to consider the way forward. He felt a good start had been made over the last 6 months and highlighted the following key achievements:

- Development of the Local Plan was well underway and the final public phase of consultation had ended. The number of planned new homes had been reduced from 26,500 brought forward from the previous plan to 15,500 because of the number of people concerned about the level of proposed development.
- The Green Guarantee in the Local Plan committed to protect at least 150 green spaces and more would be done if possible
- Job Junctions were going well and youth unemployment was reducing
- In relation to the government's devolution agenda an application had been made in October for non-constituent membership of the West Midlands Combined Authority.

Members then questioned Cllr. Sahota further:

- The Chair asked Cllr. Sahota what he thought the key challenges would be for the Council over the next 4 years and if there were any matters that he would like to bring to the attention of scrutiny. Cllr. Sahota replied that the next 3-4 years would see further funding cuts and reshaping of the Council. Senior management had already been cut by 50%, on-going savings of £80m per year had been made and staffing levels reduced but they needed to be honest with the electorate that the administration would be looking at the budget and how to make the organisation leaner and keener.
- The Chair asked what sort of organisation the Council would be at the end of the administration and what success would look like. Cllr. Sahota replied that public satisfaction was key but further cuts of £110m were needed over the next three years which was a lot of money and frontline services would be affected. The Council had managed well so far but the public would now start to see the impact of the cuts. He did not want to make cuts but if the money was not coming in, they had to do something. The future would see a smaller, more efficient Council with officers doing more with less resource.
- The Chair asked if the budget cuts meant the Council would be in a position of only being able to deliver statutory services. Cllr. Sahota replied that he had asked the Managing Director to look at the position The MD commented that it was not as simple as looking at statutory and non-statutory services. There were challenges around adult social care and conversations were taking place around the country about what the system could look like with less money. The challenge was to reduce the demand for services and for people to take greater responsibility for themselves. This was a challenge for the whole country as the shape of public services changes. Funding cuts meant that spending in the borough had already reduced by £1,500 per household per year and the massive scale of the cuts meant that the Council needed to be realistic and people would notice the change.
- There were questions from several Councillors about the governance arrangements for the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) and the role of scrutiny by non-constituent members. Cllr. Sahota replied that the application had only been made in August. Seven West Midlands authorities had applied for constituent status and Telford & Wrekin had applied for non-constituent status. The governance arrangements still needed to be worked out and were not yet

clear even for the 7 constituent members but that if Telford & Wrekin had not applied by then joining later was very unlikely and could have been a lost opportunity to influence decisions. Telford and Wrekin has the benefit of 400 acres of 'ready-to-go' commercial land – more than anywhere else in the West Midlands – and as a non-constituent member would be able to pick up on investment enquiries in a way that would not be possible if the authority was not at the table. It was stressed that as a non-constituent member Telford & Wrekin would not be transferring any powers to the WMCA and the WMCA would not be making any decisions for Telford & Wrekin. In terms of scrutiny the idea was that there would be a joint scrutiny committee of constituent members which would include elected members and co-optees. In response to further questions the MD clarified it was possible for an authority to apply for non-constituent membership of more than one Combined Authority and that the need to explain CAs, and non-constituent membership, to members of the public had been recognised nationally.

- Cllr. Seymour asked what the cost of non-constituent membership was. Cllr. Sahota replied that the cost for this year was £10k and then £25k annually.
- Cllr. Bentley said that he welcomed the introduction of the Local Plan and the reduction in housing numbers. He clarified for the record that the housing figures inherited from the Core Strategy referred to by Cllr. Sahota at the start of the meeting had not been set by the previous administration but had been set nationally. He said 15,500 new homes was about right but felt that evidence in the consultation report indicated the number could have been reduced further to 12,000.
- Cllr. N England asked Cllr. Sahota about the LEP decision making process, whether he felt it was transparent and if he thought that Telford & Wrekin got a fair deal from funding flowing through the LEP, for example from the £17m Growth Point fund. Cllr. Sahota explained that there is a business-led Board which included the Leaders of the three authorities within the LEP, the chairs of the business board in each authority area and other specialists such as finance officers. The Board is responsible for developing a Strategic Economic Plan which follows government guidelines and sets out the economic and employment priorities for the LEP area. Each authority submits bids for funding to deliver outcomes against the priorities in the strategy. Telford & Wrekin had been successful in securing £19m project funding from the Growth Point fund.
- The Chair asked about the impact of Individual Electoral Registration (IER) and whether there were any plans to increase enrolment to prevent voters falling off and not having a voice in elections. Cllr. Sahota replied that there were around 123,000 on the electoral register which in terms of numbers was up by around 700 under IER although the numbers did not take account of population growth. Under IER each person needs to register individually rather than as a household. There was a concern that young people may not be registering and there was a need to reach out to them, for example through colleges. Government grant was based on the number of voters so it was important that everyone registered. Officers had done a lot over the past few months to contact and engage people but some voters had not responded in spite of receiving 5 or 6 letters. The Chair

asked if the new IER system had made it harder for people to register and Cllr. Sahota said in his view it had been easier when one person registered everyone in the household including young people. If individuals did not register straightaway there was a risk that they may not get round to it at all.

- Cllr. Francis asked why potential investors would be attracted to Telford and Wrekin when there were a lot of derelict properties and brown-field sites in Wolverhampton. The Managing Director replied that brownfield sites could be much more costly to develop, for example decontamination costs, and Telford could offer un-developed land.
- Cllr. Francis asked Cllr. Sahota's view on compulsory voting and he replied he was not in favour and people should have – as they do – the right not to vote.
- Cllr. Burford asked what the Council's view was on the restructuring of hospital services. Cllr. Sahota replied that he was an elected representative of the people and people wanted to see A&E and acute services in Telford especially the Women & Children's services. He was in favour of keeping services in Telford and would fight to keep them here. This had been a pledge in the administration's manifesto.

There were no further questions and the Chair thanked Cllr. Sahota and the Managing Director for attending.

SMB-11 HOLDING THE EXECUTIVE TO ACCOUNT: CLLR. PAUL WATLING, CABINET MEMBER CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES

Cllr. Watling and the Director of Children & Family Services were present for this item. The Chair opened the questions by asking Cllr. Watling what his main achievements as Cabinet Member had been in the first six months of the administration. In reply Cllr. Watling highlighted the following:

- A big achievement was the embedding of the systems at Family Connect. Over the last two weeks Cllr. Watling had attended two of the twice-daily multi-agency triage sessions to see the process in action and how data is triangulated. Family Connect was hugely important to the way services are accessed and delivered. He had initially had concerns about the risks and needed to be convinced that services would not be damaged but had been assured by officers and the experience of other authorities that it was the right approach. Now he felt the system was better in Telford & Wrekin than elsewhere. The triage system enabled solutions to be found through a multi-agency approach and he was pleased that a MASH (Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub) would be developed within Family Connect to deal with the more complex children's cases. Quality Assurance systems developed over the previous four years had been embedded as had an integrated toolkit. The issue before had been the large number of cases referred to safeguarding which were not safeguarding issues but had taken up the time and resources of the safeguarding team. Now, information is reviewed at Family Connect so that cases are referred appropriately and only

cases meeting the threshold are referred to safeguarding. The other agencies involved in Family Connect were all aware of the threshold. He felt that the service was really moving forward.

- Phase 1 of Strengthening Families had been completed and there had been good feedback from the government. Phase 2, the outcomes framework, was being developed and embedded and the authority would be paid on outcomes. Cllr. Watling supported this approach of intensive family support.
- The Early Help Strategy was in place. The Early Help Board had been established and would report to the Health & Wellbeing Board. The relationship with education was important.
- The changes to the SEND process had been navigated and young people were in the process of moving from statements to EHC plans. The process had been made clearer for parents. The Department for Education had visited and feedback was that Telford & Wrekin was on track and things were going well which was not a position mirrored across the country and Cllr. Watling said he was proud of the officers responsible.

Members then questioned Cllr. Watling further:

- The Chair asked what challenges the service faced and if there were any concerns that Cllr. Watling would like to bring to scrutiny's attention. Cllr. Watling replied that three weeks ago he had attended the worst budget meeting ever to look at next year's budget. The budget had been cut by £2.6m. Spending had already been cut to the marrow and it was difficult to see how some services could continue. It would be more difficult to fund preventative work to reduce demand for statutory services. Cllr. Watling said he was now really concerned, and that it would be difficult to balance the budget without affecting statutory services. He could not guarantee that the cuts would not affect statutory services next year or in following years. The challenge was how to do it; how to protect the most vulnerable children and young people and what other ways could be found of doing it. He recognised that the authority had some really good officers. They would not be able to continue all universal services for example locality services and would need to talk to partners and local communities about how they could deliver services alongside the statutory services provided by the Council. Cllr. Watling assured members that there would be no cuts to frontline children's safeguarding. The corporate team (including Cabinet Members, Managing Director, Director, Assistant Directors and Finance officers) met every six weeks to monitor and manage the budget against the Cost Reduction Plan and this was the hardest year he had ever known.
- The Chair said she was reassured to hear there would be no cuts to the children's safeguarding budget but she was concerned about the cuts and wanted to know what the service would look like at the end of the administration and what success would look like. Cllr. Watling said he had faith in the community and that they would step up to work with the Council. He said this was a crisis and the cuts inflicted were the hardest ever. The Chair of the Local

Government Association's Children & Families Board had shared his concerns about the cuts. He felt that everyone should lobby their local MP and others, and he would welcome support from all members in doing this. It was getting to the point where it was harder and harder to deliver preventative services.

- Cllr. Bentley agreed that protecting vulnerable children was a priority and it was incumbent on Members to ensure that safeguarding has money. He asked if the Cabinet member was prepared to work with other political groups to do this, for example by cutting the Community Pride fund. Cllr. Watling replied that he would always talk to anyone and he had set up the cross-party Corporate Parenting group because it did not matter which party members belonged to, they were all corporate parents and it was positive that there were no longer political discussions about vulnerable children at full Council meetings.
- Cllr. Francis asked, when academies were out of local authority control, why the Telford Co-operative Multi-Academy Trust (TCMAT) had been set up. Cllr. Watling replied that the model had been chosen by the schools and made it quite clear that the Council had not chosen the model. The four schools had come together and the Council had worked with them as a partner. On the point of academies being outside local authority control, Cllr. Watling said he would love to have the power to convince the Department for Education, Education Funding Agency, school governing bodies etc. to change, but he did not. Cllr. Watling had agreed with the schools' decision to set up the TCMAT because he believed co-operation in education worked better than competition. He believed that Telford and Wrekin was lucky in the relationships that schools have with each other and that a new sponsor had been appointed for the three schools.
- Cllr. Barnes said that the DfE and EFA had described the Council's relationship with the TCMAT as 'unusual' and he asked for Cllr. Watling's comments on this. Cllr. Watling replied that he was not aware of the comment and asked Cllr. Barnes to email the relevant document to him. Cllr. Barnes explained that he had seen the comment in a Trustees report on the website and would forward the report to Cllr. Watling for his response. He further congratulated Cllr. Watling on Family Connect; the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee had visited and thought the service was excellent.
- Cllr. Bentley asked if Cllr. Watling would agree that the TCMAT had been an unmitigated disaster and Cllr. Watling responded saying that the schools had had disappointing results. It had become clear that the Directors did not have the capacity to deal with the issues and that was why they had gone to the Regional Schools Commissioner.
- Cllr. Reynolds asked for clarification on the role of local authorities in commissioning and monitoring academies. Cllr. Watling explained that local authorities are responsible for standards but without having any powers. Telford & Wrekin tries to work closely with academies to support them but if they do not buy into the Council's school improvement service it was difficult to do anything. The Director explained that the authority Quality Assures all schools – maintained and academies – but schools could use other providers for support. The QA

methodology had worked well with primary schools and was now being used with secondary schools, and had been tested by Ofsted. Once the QA process has been completed, if a school decides not to co-operate they are written to in accordance with a clear protocol and if there is no response the Council talks to the Regional School Commissioner and Ofsted. The relationship with the Regional Schools Commissioner was developing. Some academies buy-in to the Council's School Improvement service but some academy trusts have their own providers. The Director was confident that the Council's service was good quality and many schools in the borough buy-in.

- Cllr. England asked about the relationship with the CAT (the new sponsor) and if Cllr. Watling was confident going forward. Cllr. Watling replied that he was positive about the direction of the schools. He Community Academies Trust (CAT) had taken over the three schools. He had met Philip Hamilton the Executive Head of the CAT and he was only interested in making the schools centres of community education such as the outstanding Polesworth School in Staffordshire which was run by the CAT. Cllr. Watling expressed his hope that this would progress and be positive for the schools. A Fujitsu Tablet Academy had opened in the Park School (the old Lakeside school) which would help raise aspirations in the community and he was pleased that Philip Hamilton had taken this on board. He was as comfortable as he could be with any academy process.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked more about local authority powers to intervene and at what stage the Regional School Co-ordinator would be brought in. Cllr. Watling replied if there were any concerns they would take action to provide support and challenge. The Director informed members that the School Improvement Quality Assurance Protocol was in place. The Protocol had been amended to include all schools and not just maintained. A copy of the Protocol could be provided after the meeting.
- Cllr. Fletcher said that presumably they had worked in partnership with the schools and asked what results they had had. Cllr. Watling responded that schools have school improvement partners and the Council had a QA role. It was easier if the school used the Council's own school improvement service and harder to intervene if the school was using their own school improvement partner. There had been huge improvement in primary outcomes over the last five years which was positive and good for the secondary schools but the secondaries were in a different place. Nearly all the primary schools buy into the Council's school improvement service and they were trying to sell the service to secondary schools and further afield outside the borough. The Director added that annual assessments would be carried out and a report with the relevant data prepared for all schools and the process would be included in the Protocol.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked if this would create an awareness of the progress of all children at the end of each term and year. Cllr. Watling replied that each school had its own system for monitoring pupil progress. The Director said that schools were in charge of the process and the Council had a QA role but would have high expectations that schools would report on progress.

- Cllr. Fletcher asked if academies reported to the authority if there were any issues and Cllr. Watling said they did not and issues would be reported to the Governors and Academy Trust as the accountable bodies.
- Cllr. Barnes asked if there was a risk of the primary schools becoming academies – he noted that most of the schools in the CAT were primary. Cllr. Watling replied that academies were here to stay and not going away. There were 7 or 8 different types of school in Telford and Wrekin – maintained, converter academies, sponsored academies, City Technology College etc. – and there is huge diversity within the borough. The service had to adapt to not being the local education authority but to working as a partner with a clear QA role. It was important to offer the right support. There was good evidence from the primary schools about the offer that needs to be shared with the secondary schools.
- The Chair asked about the 2015 exam results. Cllr. Watling tabled a summary of provisional GCSE results. Results were still being appealed and could change but there was a positive story with an upward trajectory although not as good as it could be. There had been a change to the marking system which meant that nationally there had been a 5% drop in attainment levels. The Chair said she knew of cases where results had been challenged and the grade had improved after re-marking and it was always worth challenging.
- Cllr. Seymour reflected on the costs associated with children in care, especially the cost of out of borough residential placements, and asked if the trend in numbers was rising and if so how this was being addressed. Cllr. Watling did not have the figures to hand but almost £1m had been saved on residential placements by working with families to look at the educational needs and best interest of young people and to develop local provision so that parents have a choice. The Council had partnered with HLC to develop specialist autism provision at Queensway School. The Director confirmed that number of children in residential care was down substantially and that more children were being placed with internal foster carers than agency carers. The internal carers were cheaper and better quality. Commissioners were negotiating on quality residential placements as an invest-to-save and were looking at how to do more. Cllr. Watling added that young people with complex needs were more difficult to place in Telford and Wrekin and they were looking at developing sustainable foster care provision locally for young people with the most complex needs. He said it had been a joy meeting the foster carers and hearing their stories.

There were no further questions and the Chair thanked Cllr. Watling and the Director for attending.

SMB-12 REVIEW OF SCRUTINY CO-OPTees

The Scrutiny Officer gave an overview of report on the review of non-statutory co-optees circulated as Appendix B. The report summarised the recruitment process, the number of applications received and appointments made to date. Interviews were still on-going. It was clarified for Cllr. Fletcher that the provision to appoint up to 2 Town and Parish Councillors to the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee

would be included within the total of four co-optees allowed by the Terms of Reference.

RESOLVED

- **That the Board note the contents of the report**
- **That the Board endorse the appointment of co-optees recommended by the Scrutiny Chairs set out in section 6 of the report**
- **That discretion be given to Scrutiny Chairs to make further appointments for confirmation by the Scrutiny Committees and reported back to the Board**

SMB-13 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME INTERIM UPDATE

The Scrutiny Group Specialist summarised the report on the scrutiny work programme circulated as Appendix C which showed that work was on-track in terms of the number of meetings and the timetable for the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee's review of CSE.

There was a discussion about the dates of the remaining Scrutiny Management Board meetings and the Cabinet members the Board would like to invite to the Holding to Account sessions. It was agreed that the January meeting should not go ahead as it clashed with the budget scrutiny and a new date should be found during February or March. It was agreed that Cllrs. Liz Clare and Shaun Davies would be invited to the February/March meeting and Cllrs. Richard Overton and Arnold England would be invited to the May meeting. It was agreed that this would be an opportunity to ask Cllr. Overton questions about Section 106 and the CIL which had been referred to the Board as a cross-cutting issue by the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee.

There was a discussion about the Scrutiny Suggestion Forms received from members of the public. The suggestions largely related to a planning application which had yet to be decided by the Planning Committee. The Board agreed that the suggestions were not appropriate for scrutiny as it is not within the role of local government scrutiny to consider issues relating to individual planning applications. However, it was noted that one of the issues set out by the Local Government Ombudsman that scrutiny may consider in relation to planning was the number of complaints received by the Council about decisions on planning applications, what the outcomes were and how the Council has used them to improve its services. At the end of the discussion it was agreed that the people making the scrutiny suggestions would be notified that the suggestions would not be considered by scrutiny for the reason discussed, that it was not the role of scrutiny to consider matters relating to individual planning applications, but that they would be provided with details of the complaints procedure for planning matters and that a report on the complaints received relating to planning, as set out by the LGO, would be requested to come back to the Board as part of the Holding to Account Session with Cllr. Overton next year.

RESOLVED

- That the Scrutiny Suggestions be dealt with as agreed during the discussion
- That Cabinet Members be invited to future meetings as agreed during the discussion

SMB-13 CHAIRS' UPDATES

There were no updates provided further to the matters discussed during the previous item.

The meeting ended at 8.10pm

Chairman:

Date:

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Friday, 10 July 2015 at 10.30am in Meeting Room G4, Addenbrook House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT

PRESENT: Councillors S A W Reynolds (Chair), S Bentley, A Burford, N A M England, V A Fletcher, E J Greenaway, K R Guy and J M Seymour.

ALSO PRESENT: F Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist; S Jones, Scrutiny Officer; D Moseley, Scrutiny Officer.

SMB-01 ELECTION OF A VICE-CHAIR

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited those present to introduce themselves.

The Chair sought views from Members as to the appointment of a Vice Chair. In the past, on the rare occasions on which the Chair had not been able to attend, a Chair had been elected at the meeting. Cllr. Bentley said he would like to nominate Cllr. Seymour, but the Chair said she first wanted to establish a view as to whether a Vice-Chair was needed. Cllr. Guy said he was happy to continue with the previous arrangements. Other Members were in agreement and Cllr. Bentley said he was happy to concur with the majority.

RESOLVED – that a Vice-Chair not be appointed.

SMB-02 MINUTES

The Chair asked Cllr. Guy as the only other Member who had been present if he agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 27 March were an accurate record of the meeting, and Cllr. Guy confirmed that they were.

Cllr. Seymour noted from the minutes of the discussion about the Meals on Wheels service that Good Neighbour Service had still not been developed and she requested a report to be brought to the next meeting on the Board. Cllr. Fletcher said that she had heard the contracted provider of the Community Meals service had been charging users and she requested a report on performance of the contract and the charging model. The Scrutiny Group Specialist said that she would make an initial enquiry and that Members could discuss this further during the discussion on the work programme.

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on 27 March 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

SMB-03 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

SMB-04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

SMB-05 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Chair invited the Scrutiny Group Specialist to provide an introduction to the report on the Scrutiny Work Programme attached as Appendix C.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist explained that the report set out the end of year position from the previous Scrutiny Management Board work programme. The usual call for suggestions for the work programme at the start of the municipal year had not happened because of the number of issues carried over and the fact that the on-going CSE review would make up around half of this year's the work programme. The report set out the work that could be supported in terms of the number of meetings per committee which was a crude measure but enabled the Board to allocate resources across the Committees and for Members to decide their work programme. In the past Committees had held a meeting to agree the work programme but it was suggested that this could be done by email so that meeting time was focussed on scrutiny work rather than discussing the work programme.

Cllr. Guy referred Members to page 3 of the report which showed 30 meetings had been estimated for the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee review of CSE. A clear decision had been taken last year to carry out the review and it was essential that it was done properly. Evidence had already been taken from senior managers of relevant agencies, except for the West Midlands Ambulance Service, Shropshire Doctors Co-operative Ltd, South Staffordshire & Shropshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust and the Crown Prosecution Service who were due to attend an inquiry day on 21 July. The Committee would then move to taking evidence from front-line staff, volunteers and any other relevant witnesses to get a view from the ground and, importantly, would hear from victims of CSE and their families. He apologised that the review would take up so much time but if the Council was to do this work then it needed to be done properly and adequately resourced. The evidence taking was due to be completed by January 2016 which may free up officer time as the review moved into the report writing stage, but it would take up a significant amount of officer time for the first year of the work programme. He asked other Scrutiny Committees to be sympathetic while work concentrated on CSE so the Committee could do a thorough job looking at the local picture linked to the national picture.

The Chair suggested that the Board could look at a two year work programme recognising that CSE would take a lot of time during the first year so the Committees could prioritise their work over a longer period.

Cllr. Fletcher asked whether the national Goddard review of historic cases of child sexual abuse would play into the CSE review and Cllr. Guy replied that it would. Cllr. Seymour agreed that the CSE review should take priority as a one-off piece of work but she felt that resources needed to be made available to address other important issues on the work programme otherwise it would undermine the scrutiny function. Cllr. Guy said he had discussed resources with the Managing Director and Assistant

Director and he had secured funding for two extra days officer time until the end of December to be reviewed again in September.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist said that based on estimated capacity for the year there would be approximately 18 meetings left over to allocate to the other Committees. If the funding for the extra officer time was extended it would increase capacity but they did not want to over-commit on that basis and plan work that could not then be delivered. The CSE review had taken months to set up and organise and was due to be completed in May. There was a risk of overrun but this was not advisable because information could become out of date if the review carried on.

Cllr. Bentley asked for clarification of the Board's remit in regard to the work programme. The Chair replied that the Board determined the allocation of resources between Committees and could recommend priorities for the work programme. She said that the Committees needed to be flexible and could hold informal or Member-led meetings to do more work and careful scoping would help focus on priorities.

Cllr. Bentley said that scrutiny should consider the issues which have the greatest impact on the community. He took comments on board about the CSE review needing to stick to the completion date but he felt there needed to be on-going work. Cllr. Guy agreed that there needed to be on-going monitoring but the review had a specific focus on how agencies work together and co-ordination between partners such as the police, GPs, the Council etc. Scrutiny had been criticised in the past for only talking to senior managers and they would be talking to front-line staff and victims.

Cllr. Bentley asked if the Committee had come up against obstacles with sharing information because of Data Protection legislation and Cllr. Guy said that according to senior managers there was a good system for sharing information but they would be testing the assertion out with frontline staff.

Cllr. Burford felt it was crucial for the CSE review to reach a conclusion and for on-going monitoring. He noted that the CSE review created a pressure point this year but felt there was scope for the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee and the Joint Health & Overview Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) to do more in one meeting and to do more joint working. He did not disagree with the headings listed and he was confident that they could be managed so that the CSE review could be prioritised for support.

Cllr. Seymour said that housing was a key issue and she suggested the Housing Allocations Policy and Tenancy Strategy should be a priority for scrutiny as well as the relationship with Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). These were important issues which needed to be looked at and Cllr. Seymour was concerned that they could be neglected. The Chair explained that the previous Scrutiny Management Board had met with RSLs last November and had made a number of recommendations which had gone to Cabinet in March. Cllr. Seymour said it was important to follow up on this work and she expressed concern that the Customer, Community and Partnership Scrutiny Committee had been allocated fewer meetings than other Committees.

Cllr. Guy asked Members whether they thought the number of Scrutiny Management Board meetings could be reduced. The Chair said she would like the Board to meet again before Christmas but suggested there was scope to reduce the number of meetings to 4 or 5 but she would like 'half-termly' progress reports. Cllr. England suggested there should be a minimum of 3 meetings – an initial meeting and mid-year and end of year reports. Cllr. Fletcher said there had been a very good Member briefing on CSE and these sessions were a good way for Members to be kept up to date. She suggested that a report should be requested from the commissioning officer on the Meals on Wheels service now that it had been in place for a year, including feedback from users and the CVS. She said the service could save people's lives by volunteers finding people who have collapsed at home. The Scrutiny Group Specialist noted that the Health & Adult Care and JHOSC work programme would be dominated by the Future Fit (hospital reconfiguration) consultation but a report could be provided for the Committee to decide whether any further work needed to be included in the work programme. An initial enquiry would be made to the service.

Cllr. Fletcher suggested that if the number of meetings were reduced, the Board could convene an informal meeting to consider any urgent matters arising.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist noted that previous Scrutiny Management Boards had brought issues to the Board for scrutiny and she suggested that if Members wished to reduce the number of meetings the Board could pass these items to the Scrutiny Committees and focus on its management role and on holding the Executive to account which was an important scrutiny function and could fill gaps in the work programme.

Cllr. Seymour agreed that the Scrutiny Management Board meetings should be reduced in favour of the Scrutiny Committees but noted that responsibility for scrutiny of Flood & Water Management had been re-allocated from the Board to the Customer, Community and Partnership Scrutiny Committee and as she did not know what was happening in this area to know if this was a priority.

On this basis the Chair proposed that the Scrutiny Management Board should be allocated a further 4 meetings for the year and that the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee should be allocated 30 meetings for the CSE review and this was agreed by the other Members.

Following a discussion about the number of Scrutiny Management Board Meetings it was agreed that it would be planned that there would be 3 Board meetings during 2015/16. A fourth meeting would be held in reserve.

Cllr. Bentley asked Cllr. Guy as Chair of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee whether he was confident that the CSE review would be completed on time or whether there was a possibility it would be extended. Cllr. Guy responded that the timescale was tight but a comprehensive plan was in place to keep the review on track. The main risk of slippage was the meetings with victims or their families and the Committee would be flexible to meet their needs. He remarked that the statutory bodies had been very responsive and the Committee had spoken to top managers from key agencies. Cllr. Fletcher said that safeguarding victims was

paramount. The Scrutiny Group Specialist explained that a wide range of groups were involved in the review including vulnerable people and survivors. There were robust process in place for consulting with vulnerable people and the process had to be signed-off before meetings could take place. The process required a lot of additional work and Members were being asked not to hold meetings during August to allow the work to be planned.

Cllr. Fletcher said there was a need to be careful about language and describing people as 'victims' and Cllr. Guy said the Committee had discussed this already.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist pointed out that the number of meetings proposed in the report included meetings which had already happened as they had displaced work on the CSE review which had consequently fallen about 2 weeks behind and the time needed to be made up.

Cllr Guy gave his apologies and left the meeting at this point.

The Chair suggested that the 6 meetings allocated to the Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committee for scrutiny of the budget proposals could potentially be reduced to 4; the timetable had become more compressed with later settlements and the Committee could use informal meetings to decide which issues to look at and which Cabinet members to call in, but members of the Committee would need to support this approach.

Cllr. Burford suggested that joint scrutiny of the adult care budget by the Health & Adult Care and Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committees would save 2 meetings. The Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee had already had one meeting and Cllr. Burford envisaged needing 2 meetings in the autumn but no more than 2 or 3 from January to May by bringing items together onto one agenda to reduce the overall number of meetings from 8 to 5. The Scrutiny Group Specialist reminded Members that the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee would include meetings of the JHOSC and Cllr. Burford said he would rather keep the meetings allocated to the JHOSC and reduce the allocation to the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee. Cllr. Seymour agreed that work on the adult care budget could be joined up with Finance and Enterprise and she said that more work needed to be joined up between committees.

Cllr. Burford asked Cllr. Fletcher if she thought it was reasonable to reduce the number of Health & Adult Care scrutiny meetings from 8 to 5 and she thought it was. In the past issues such as the Quality Accounts had been considered outside formal meetings to agree comments and Members could work more at home to use up less meeting time.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist summarised the allocations discussed so far as 30 meetings for the Children & Young People CSE review, 3 meetings for the Scrutiny Management Board (2 remaining plus 1 additional meeting if required) and 4 meetings for the Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committee totalling 39 meetings which would leave 9 meetings between the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee and the Customer, Community and Partnership committees.

Cllr. Bentley asked for clarification about how many meetings needed to be allocated as the report showed the total number of meetings as 59. The Scrutiny Group Specialist explained that the report set out the number of meetings that would be required to cover all the items in the work programme but the actual number of recommended meetings that could be supported was estimated at 48 and it was up to the Members to decide what to do with them. Cllr. Bentley asked how this had been arrived at when there had been 50 meetings in previous years with less resource and the Scrutiny Group Specialist said it had been adjusted down slightly to take account of the extra work involved in the CSE review which would take up the 2 extra days of officer time per week and would involve everyone in the team.

Cllr. Seymour asked whether the JHOSC meetings organised and hosted by Shropshire were counted and the Scrutiny Group Specialist replied that they were because there was still a lot of work to do even if Telford was not hosting the meeting; the work was not just passed on to officers in Shropshire.

Cllr. Seymour was concerned that if the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee had 6 meetings it would only leave 3 for the Customer, Community & Partnership committee which was less than the other committees and she asked Cllr. N England as the Chair for his view on this.

Cllr. England considered the list of items for the Committee and noted that the Committee had already had one meeting to look at the Bus Subsidy Policy and consultation on the Local Plan.

Cllr. Seymour asked if other Members felt that Flood & Water Management was a key issue. The Scrutiny Officer, S Jones, said that reports had been brought to the Board and other Scrutiny Committees in the past and Members had been assured that the Council was ahead of the game on this issue and no key concerns had been flagged up by scrutiny. It had been 2 years since the last update to the Board. Cllr. Fletcher said work had been done with parishes on this. Drawing on his previous experience as a past Chair of the Strategic Flood Board, Cllr. Bentley agreed that this was an area where Telford & Wrekin Council was leading the way nationally and felt that this issue could be de-prioritised. The Scrutiny Group Specialist suggested this could be moved to the second year of a 2 year work programme.

Cllr. Seymour noted that scrutiny of the Local Enterprise Partnership was in the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee work programme and asked about scrutiny powers. The Scrutiny Group Specialist explained there was a Marches Enterprise Joint Committee, which is a formal joint committee of the three local authority leaders, and decisions of the Joint Committee are subject to scrutiny by the three local authority scrutiny committees which can act individually to call-in decisions of the Joint Committee. This power had been exercised recently by Herefordshire.

Cllr. N England put forward a suggestion for the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee to review performance of the waste services contract, possibly with the Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committee to look at the costs.

The Chair suggested scrutiny of the Welfare Reforms could be done jointly with Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committee.

Cllr. Bentley said that it should be left to each Scrutiny Committee to decide what they wanted to do. He felt that 48 meetings a year was easily achievable and there should be flexibility for the Committees to decide between themselves how to use the unallocated 9 meetings.

Cllr. Burford agreed with the need to set meetings so that the work programme was not overloaded. If other meetings were needed they could be arranged as Member-led meetings. He asked other Scrutiny Chairs to make sure they stuck to the numbers agreed.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist summarised the allocations discussed so far as Scrutiny Management Board (3 plus 1 additional meeting if required 4), Children & Young People (30), Health & Adult Care and JHOSC (6), Finance & Enterprise (4), Customer, Community & Partnership (3). She added that no provision had been made for Call-in.

Cllr. Bentley remarked that the Council had diminished support for scrutiny over the last few years so that scrutiny had less of an impact. He suggested the Board could make a recommendation to Council to increase resources for scrutiny.

The Chair replied that resources did not always have to be officers and that members could do more. Cllr. Greenaway noted that she had been involved in a lot of scrutiny work which had not involved officers and Cllr. Bentley agreed that sometimes officer support was only needed to clarify legalities.

RESOLVED – that support for scrutiny meetings be allocated as follows:
Scrutiny Management Board (3 plus 1 additional meeting if required)
Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee (30)
Health & Adult Care and JHOSC Scrutiny Committee (6)
Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committee (4)
Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee (3)

Cllr. Bentley gave his apologies for the remainder of the meeting and left the meeting.

SMB-06 SCRUTINY HANDBOOK

The Chair asked members to consider the proposed changes to the Scrutiny Handbook, circulated as Appendix B, to bring it up to date.

Members suggested a number of changes and corrections which would be made by the Scrutiny Team and the document re-circulated for approval. The following key points were discussed:

- Members considered a suggestion from Cllr. Seymour to reconsider the name of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee. She felt the name was too long and suggested 'Housing & Communities' would pick up the

Committee's specific remit which members of the public would be able to identify with but was broad enough to encompass other areas of work. Cllr. England replied that the work the Committee did was more important than its name and the Chair considered that the use of "communities" in the title encompassed the housing element. Cllr England considered that over the years a number of Committees had long names and were generally referred to by acronyms.

- Cllr. Fletcher sought clarification on the process for changing the name of a committee and whether it would need to go to the Council's Constitution Committee to make a recommendation to Full Council. The Scrutiny Officer replied that as long as the minimum requirements set out in the Council's Constitution were met, the Scrutiny Management Board may make changes after consultation with the Scrutiny Assembly.
- Members agreed that the sections relating to the number and type of co-optee vacancies on each committee needed to be clarified and it was agreed that a summary table would be included in the Handbook.
- The Scrutiny Group Specialist sought views on whether the recruitment process on the Policy for Co-opting Scrutiny Members needed to be changed for the forthcoming review of co-optees. Co-optees had been contacted to make them aware of the review and the majority had expressed an interest in being reconsidered. The existing process was robust and included interviews by Chairs which would be time consuming and would need to be built in. The recruitment process would apply to all co-optees other than the statutory co-optees on the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee and co-optees nominated by organisations with standing representation such as Healthwatch and the Senior Citizen's Forum on the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee. Members agreed that the recruitment process would remain unchanged for the review and that confirming co-opted members of the JHOSC should be prioritised.
- There was a discussion about the proposed change to the time period for contacting co-optees about non-attendance from six months to 2 meetings in a row without apology. On balance Members agreed this was about right although some judgement would be needed so that attendance was linked to contribution as co-optees could make a valuable contribution and there may be genuine reasons for non-attendance. It was also suggested that the relevant Scrutiny Chair may contact the co-optee about non-attendance.
- The Scrutiny Group Specialist sought views on establishing a requirement for co-optees to have an email address as this was the main method of communication and would become increasingly important as the Council moved towards paperless meetings. Members agreed this was a reasonable requirement but so that no-one was excluded other email arrangements could be explored, for instance in the case of Town and Parish Council representatives, the relevant Clerk's email address could be used..

RESOLVED – that the changes to the Scrutiny Handbook agreed at the meeting be made by the Scrutiny Team and re-circulated to members for approval.

The meeting ended at 12.15pm

Chairman:

Date:

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 4 NOVEMBER 2015

REVIEW OF NON-STATUTORY SCRUTINY CO-OPTEEES

REPORT OF SCRUTINY TEAM

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to update the Scrutiny Management Board on the outcome of the review of non-statutory scrutiny co-optees and the recommended appointments to date.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Scrutiny Management Board note the report
- 2.2 That the Scrutiny Management Board endorse the appointment of co-optees set out in section 6 and under the terms set out in section 7
- 2.3 That the Scrutiny Management Board agree that further appointments be agreed by Scrutiny Chairs and confirmed by the Scrutiny Committees. Further appointments will be reported back to the Board.

3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Local Government Act 2000 makes provision for the co-option of non-elected members to Overview and Scrutiny Committees to bring additional expertise and skills to scrutiny work and to increase public engagement with scrutiny.
- 3.2 Co-optees have either statutory or non-statutory roles. The Local Government Act 2000 requires the co-option of representatives of Church of England and Roman Catholic diocese (where they maintain schools in the local authority area) and of Primary and Secondary Parent Governors to Children and Young People Scrutiny Committees. These statutory co-optees have voting rights on education matters.
- 3.3 The Local Government Act 2000 also give discretion to local authorities to put in place a scheme to appoint voting co-optees to sit on overview and scrutiny committees. In Telford & Wrekin the three co-opted members of the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee who also sit on the Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Joint HOSC) have been granted voting rights by Full Council on matters relating to the reconfiguration of health services in Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin.

- 3.4 All other scrutiny co-optees in Telford & Wrekin are non-statutory and do not have voting rights. Places may be allocated to an individual or to a designated representative of a key stakeholder organisation.
- 3.2 The Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Committees make provision for the appointment co-optees up to 50% of the number of elected Members except the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee which may appoint up to, but not exceeding, the number of elected members to allow for the four statutory co-optees. In 2012 the Scrutiny Management Board agreed that provision would be made for the co-option of up to two Town and Parish Councillors to each Scrutiny Committee within the overall number of co-optee positions. The number of co-optee positions is summarised below.

	Elected members	Total co-optee positions*	Statutory co-optee positions	Non-statutory co-optee positions	Positions allocated to a designated organisation	Remaining non-statutory co-optee positions
Children & Young People	8	8	4	4	1 (Primary Head)	3
Customer, Community & Partnership	8	4	0	4	0	4
Finance & Enterprise	8	4	0	4	0	4
Health & Adult Care	8	4	0	4	2 (Senior Citizen's Forum, Healthwatch)	2

*This is the maximum number of places provided for under the existing Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Committees. It is not a requirement that all the positions are filled. Scrutiny Committees may exercise discretion to increase the number of co-optees, as standing or time-limited members, where the addition would significantly enhance the ability to scrutinise matters under scrutiny

4.0 REVIEW OF NON-STATUTORY CO-OPTEEES

- 4.1 In June 2015 the Lead Scrutiny Member decided the start of the new administration was an opportune time to review the non-statutory co-optee arrangements which had not been reviewed for several years and it was right to open the opportunity to members of the public to get involved with scrutiny work.
- 4.2 On 10 July 2015 the Scrutiny Management Board considered a review of non-statutory co-optees and agreed that:
- A full recruitment process should be carried out using the Policy for Co-opting Scrutiny Members in the Scrutiny Handbook

- Co-optees nominated by the Senior Citizens' Forum and Healthwatch would continue to sit on the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee and Joint HOSC
- Attendance would be monitored and co-optees missing two consecutive formal committee meetings without sending apologies would be contacted by the Scrutiny Chair or Scrutiny Team to establish their interest in continuing their membership
- Due to the amount of work carried out by email it would become a requirement for co-opted members to have a personal email account and access to a computer so that they can play a full role in all scrutiny work.

4.3 In September the Senior Citizens' Forum and Healthwatch confirmed the co-opted members of the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee and Joint HOSC.

4.4 In September the Chair of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee agreed that one place would continue to be designated to a Primary Head nominated by the Primary Heads' Forum Executive Committee, and that a named substitute would be able to attend meetings in the nominated co-optee's absence.

4.5 A recruitment campaign for all other non-statutory co-optees was carried out during September and October. The key stages of the process and timetable are summarised below.

Activity	Details	Date
Campaign launch	A full application pack was available to download from the website via a friendly URL. Applicants could apply on line or via a Freepost address.	7 September (launch) - 2 October (closing date)
On-going promotion	Promotional activity (supported by Corporate Communications, Community Engagement and Business Support) included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contacting all previous scrutiny co-optees • Press release • Email to all Members to raise awareness • Article and link to website in Staff News • Inviting nominations from Town and Parish Councils • Website, Twitter, Facebook • Promotion to partner organisations (including the Senior Citizen's Forum, Clinical Commissioning Group, Telford Business Board and other business networks, Telford Safeguarding 	7 September - 2 October

	<p>Children Board, Council for Voluntary Services)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the Community Panel (where approved) • Council's community contacts 	
Candidate shortlisting	Scrutiny Chairs considered all the applications for their Committee to identify suitable candidates. Application forms were anonymised and a scoring system was used to assess candidates against the job description and person specification.	5 October – 12 October
Candidate interviews and selection	Scrutiny Chairs contacted the shortlisted candidates to discuss their suitability and interest in more detail and to decide which candidates should be offered a position. Selected candidates were contacted to establish if they wished to accept a position.	12 October – 30 October
Endorsement of appointments	Scrutiny Chairs have authority to make appointments to their own Scrutiny. However the Scrutiny Management Board has responsibility for oversight of scrutiny functions and structures and has been asked to endorse the appointments recommended by the Scrutiny Chairs.	4 November
Candidate feedback and inductions	All applicants will be contacted to confirm the decisions of the Scrutiny Chairs once endorsed by the Scrutiny Management Board. Feedback will be provided to unsuccessful candidates on request. Successful candidates will be invited to an induction and will join the relevant Committee with immediate effect.	From 4 November

5.0 APPLICATIONS

5.1 A total of 12 applications were received. One candidate expressed an interest in more than one Scrutiny Committee (Health and Adult Care and Children & Young People) but on the basis of relevant experience was considered for the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee, and there was one application from an organisation (Shropshire Partners in Care) requesting a place on the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee. Three Town and Parish Councils confirmed their support for nominations. The breakdown of applications by Committee is shown below.

Scrutiny Committee	Number of applications
Children & Young People	3 (plus Primary Head)
Customer, Community & Partnership	4
Finance & Enterprise	2
Health & Adult Care	3 (plus SCF/Healthwatch)
Total	12

6.0 APPOINTMENTS

- 6.1 The Scrutiny Chairs recommend the appointment of co-optees to the Scrutiny Committees as follows:

Scrutiny Committee	Co-optees
Children & Young People	Sandra Osman (Primary Head) Others to be confirmed
Customer, Community & Partnership	To be confirmed
Finance & Enterprise	To be confirmed
Health & Adult Care	Jean Gulliver Rajash Mehta* Barry Parnaby (Healthwatch)* Dag Saunders (Senior Citizen's Forum)*

*Co-optees appointed to the Joint HOSC with voting rights as determined by Full Council.

7.0 TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

- 7.1 Appointments will be for a term of two years with one month's notice of termination on either side.
- 7.2 Co-opted members are not paid but are entitled to claim an annual taxable allowance of £260 to cover travel and out of pocket expenses.
- 7.3 Co-opted members are expected to sign the Council's Code of Conduct and, where relevant, the Council Register of Interests.
- 7.4 Appointments are subject to agreement with the Council's Code of Conduct.

8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Co-optee vacancies are open to applications from all residents regardless of age, gender, religion or disability. Personal details were removed from forms during the screening process.

9.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There is budgetary provision for the payment of the annual allowance co-opted members are entitled to claim. There are no other direct financial implications arising from this report.

10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000 a local authority may put in place a scheme to appoint voting co-optees to sit on overview and scrutiny committees. The requirements as set out in the 2000 Act in respect of statutory and non-statutory co-optees are set out in detail within the body of this report.
- 10.2 The general scrutiny functions and powers and specific role of Scrutiny Committees are set out in the Council Constitution within the "Scrutiny Rules". Co-optees should follow the Scrutiny Rules and associated procedural rules which apply to all scrutiny meetings, including but not limited to Council Rules on Motions without notice, Points of Order, and Personal Explanation and Conduct.
- 10.3 Co-optees, in light of their position or standing within the community or a particular organisation, and having declared all personal interests in the Council Register of Interests, should always be mindful of potential conflicts of interest in respect of matters that they may be dealing with in their role as a member of a scrutiny committee. Any conflict of interest should be avoided in the first instance or declared at the earliest opportunity to the Chair of the relevant scrutiny committee.

11.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 There are no significant environmental implications arising from the appointment of the co-optees. Co-optees receive printed papers for formal committee meetings but efforts are made to encourage all scrutiny members to work electronically. The environmental implications of issues under scrutiny are considered as part of a scrutiny review.

12.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 There are no direct ward implications arising from the appointment of the scrutiny co-optees. Scrutiny's role is to consider policies on a borough-wide basis and any specific ward implications would be considered as part of a scrutiny review.

Report prepared by:
Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Officer: 01952 383114

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD - 4 NOVEMBER 2015

SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME INTERIM UPDATE

REPORT OF SCRUTINY TEAM

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide a half-yearly progress update on delivery of the Scrutiny Work Programme to enable the Board to monitor performance and agree any actions arising from the report.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Scrutiny Management Board note the report and agree any actions deemed necessary arising from the report.

3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 Following the Borough elections in May 2015, Members were appointed to the Scrutiny Management Board and Scrutiny Committees (as below) at Annual Council on 21 May 2015 in line with the overall political balance of the Council:
- Scrutiny Management Board (Chair Cllr. Shirley Reynolds)
 - Children & Young People (Chair Cllr. Kevin Guy)
 - Customer, Community & Partnership (Chair Cllr. Nathan England)
 - Finance & Enterprise (Chair Cllr. Shirley Reynolds)
 - Health & Adult Care (Chair Cllr. Andrew Burford)
- 3.2 The scrutiny structure was streamlined to reduce the number of Committees from five to four. The changes were within the framework of the Council's Constitution and did not require amendment to the Constitution.
- 3.3 The Scrutiny Handbook sets out the process for agreeing an annual work programme based on the municipal year. The Scrutiny Management Board is responsible for overseeing delivery of the work programme, allocating resources across committees and making recommendations about the priorities for scrutiny. The Scrutiny Committees decide the items to scrutinise during the year paying regard to the allocated resources and the Board's recommendations.
- 3.4 The Scrutiny Management Board met on 10 July 2015 to consider the priorities for 2015/16 and agreed the following:
- That due to the amount of work carried over from the previous year a full review of the work programme would not be carried out this year
 - That the Scrutiny Committees could agree a 2 year work programme to allow scope to include more issues by planning over a longer period

- That the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee review of Multi-agency Working against Child Sexual Exploitation would be prioritised for resources during 2015/16
- A benchmark of 48 meetings across the whole scrutiny work programme for 2015/16 and the allocation of resources for each Committee
- Recommendations for the Scrutiny Committees on high and low priorities
- That the Board would continue its role in Holding the Executive to account
- To carry out a review of non-statutory scrutiny co-optees using the process set out in the Scrutiny Handbook
- Changes to the Scrutiny Handbook arising from and update review

4.0 DELIVERY OF THE WORK PROGRAMME

4.1 The table below summarises work to date expressed as the number of scrutiny meetings held compared to the annual benchmark.

Summary of meetings 21 May – 4 November 2015

Committee	Formal committee	Working group	Total ytd	Benchmark 2015/16
Scrutiny Management Board	2	0	2	3 (+ 1)
Children & Young People	1	14	15	30
Customer, Community & Partnership	1	2 (one joint)	3	3
Finance & Enterprise	2 (joint)*	0	1	4
Health & Adult Care and Joint HOSC	2 (one joint)	1	3	6
Total	6	17	23	47

*Joint meetings of the Finance and Enterprise Scrutiny Committee have not been included in the total to avoid double counting of meetings.

5.0 ISSUES CONSIDERED AND OUTCOMES

5.1 The table below shows the issues considered by scrutiny and the outcomes.

Issues and outcomes 21 May – 4 November 2015

Issue	Scrutiny Committee	Outcomes
Multi-agency working against CSE	Children & Young People	Evidence gathering for in-depth review including: Meeting with 16 organisations / individuals Online consultation run from 31 st September – 1 st November
Bus Subsidy Policy	Customer, Community & Partnership	Feedback submitted to Cabinet and service area
Local Plan engagement strategy	Customer, Community & Partnership	Suggestions made to service area to include in the consultation plan
Housing Allocations Policy and Tenancy Strategy	Customer, Community & Partnership	Comments submitted as part of the consultation
Council Tax Support scheme proposals	Customer, Community & Partnership / Finance & Enterprise	Scrutiny of options considered and feedback submitted as part of the consultation

Consultation on future of Castle Lodge (in-patient mental health)	Health & Adult Care	Response submitted to CCG Board
Adult Care budget and savings	Health & Adult Care / Finance & Enterprise	On-going role of budget monitoring
Hospital discharge – the commissioning strategy to address delayed transfers of care	Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Update report to be provided by NHS Commissioners, Providers and Adult Services end of October 2015.
Future Fit – draft consultation process	Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Assurance regarding current provision of services at SaTH
Holding the Executive to Account: Cllr. Kuldip Sahota Cllr. Paul Watling	Scrutiny Management Board	Cabinet members held to account

6.0 MEMBER DEVELOPMENT

- 6.1 The induction for Scrutiny Members was held on 13th May 2015.
- 6.2 As part of the Scrutiny Review of CSE training was also provided for members on Listening Skills in preparation for meetings with victims / survivors of CSE and the parents / carers of victims / survivors of CSE. The first part of this session was open for all members to attend.

7.0 REGIONAL AND NATIONAL SCRUTINY NETWORKS

- 7.1 The West Midlands Overview and Scrutiny Network is chaired by Cllr. Peter Hughes from Sandwell Council. Members of the Scrutiny Team have attended the meetings with have focussed on:
- 17th July - Update from the Centre for Public Scrutiny and future of the West midlands Network
 - 23rd October - Scrutiny Training and an update on the West Midlands Combined Authority, including scrutiny arrangements.
- 7.2 The West Midlands Regional Health Scrutiny Chairs and Officers Forum was held on the 7th October 2015. The chair of the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee attended this meeting and agreed to attend the Centre for Public Scrutiny as the West Midland representative for the Healthy Accountability Forum on the 2nd November.

8.0 REVIEW OF SCRUTINY CO-OPTEEES

- 8.1 The scrutiny review of co-optees has been completed and will be reported to the Board under a separate agenda item.

9.0 REQUESTS FOR URGENT DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN

- 9.1 The Chair of the Customer, Community and Partnership Scrutiny Committee considered an application for and urgent decision not subject to call in in relation to

the decision whether to seek Non-Constituent membership of the emerging West Midlands Combined Authority. This decision was considered at the Cabinet meeting on the 8th October 2015. The request was approved as the deadline for seeking non-constituent membership of the West Midlands Combined Authority was the 13th October 2015 which meant that the call-in process could not be completed in time.

10.0 SCRUTINY SUGGESTIONS

10.1 6 Scrutiny Suggestions have been received. A summary of suggestions is set out below:

Scrutiny Suggestion	Issue Raised
Form e-111060	Planning Application TWC/2015/0566 Request to scrutinise the planning application process for this application.
Form e-111071	The representation at a planning meeting when an application is disputed and the ward member has a conflict of interest.
Form e-111073	Land adjacent to 4 Tunnel Cottages, Aqueduct Lane, Stirchley, TELFORD
Form e-111080	I would like scrutiny to look at a planning application number TWC/2015/0566 "Land adjacent 4 Tunnel Cottages, Aqueduct Lane, Stirchley, Telford"
Form e-111100	Planning application TWC/2015/0566
Form e-111171	The process whereby the authority seeks planning permission for its own land or projects or those of an associated organisation where there are objections raised.

10.2 When considering the scrutiny suggestions members are advised that it is not within the remit of the Scrutiny Committees to consider the decisions of the Council's regulatory committees. Where a ward member has a conflict of interest there is provision for residents to be represented by another member from that ward (where there are 2 or more elected members for that ward) or a neighbouring ward.

11.0 SCRUTINY TEAM

11.1 The support to deliver the scrutiny work programme is provided through the Scrutiny Team:

- Scrutiny Group Speciality 0.8 fte
- Scrutiny Officer 1.0fte
- Scrutiny Officer 0.4 fte (until end of December 2015)

12.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 Scrutiny Committees consider the equal opportunities implications for the issues within their work programmes.

13.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 Scrutiny has a role in ensuring that local government is effective and accountable. This includes undertaking reviews and challenging and monitoring performance. The cost of additional resources to support the Review of Multi-Agency Working Against Child Sexual Exploitation is being met from within existing resources.
- 13.2 Scrutiny also plays an important part of the budget consultation process which is reflected in the work programme over the period Dec- Feb and is a key piece of work which feeds into the Council's overall budget strategy. The financial implications of any recommendations made by Scrutiny should be considered as part of reports as relevant.

14.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 14.1 The Council is under a legal requirement to provide an overview and scrutiny function in accordance with provisions at section 9 of the Local Government Act 2000 (as amended) and associated legislation. Government guidance states that Overview and Scrutiny Committees should have flexibility to determine most of their workplan and that the Council adopts mechanisms for coordinating that work.
- 14.2 The procedure followed in paragraph 9.1 of this report is undertaken in accordance with the provisions set out in the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012.
- 14.3 The proposals for discussion by the Board in this report contribute towards complying with both the statutory requirements and government guidance.

15.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 15.1 Environmental issues that are scrutinised will fall within the remit of the Customer, Community and Partnership Scrutiny Committee and will be undertaken within the resources available to this Committee.

16.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS

- 16.1 There are no direct ward implications resulting from this report

Report prepared by:

Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Officer: 01952 383114

Fiona Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist: 01952 383113