

Leader Decision Making Session

Agenda

Friday 4 February 2011

A Leader Decision Making Session will be held in Committee Room 1 at Shire Hall, Warwick on **Friday 4 February 2011 at 12.00 noon**

The agenda will be:

1. General

(1) Members' Disclosures of Personal and Prejudicial Interests.

Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the item (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a prejudicial interest the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of a district or borough council is classed as a personal interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.

(2) Minutes of the meeting held on 6 January 2011

Minutes enclosed.

2. Warwickshire County Council Response to the DCLG on consultation on the proposed single Data Set

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive to follow.

3. Any other items

Any other items that the decision maker considers is urgent.

JIM GRAHAM
Chief Executive
Warwickshire County Council
January 2011

Councillor Alan Farnell (Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet)
cllfarnell@warwickshire.gov.uk

General Enquiries: Please contact Janet Purcell, Executive & Member Support Manager
Tel 01926 413716 or email: janetpurcell@warwickshire.gov.uk

Minutes of Leader Decision Making Session held on 6 January 2011

Present: Councillor Alan Farnell (Decision maker)

Officers: Jane Pollard -Democratic Services Manager

1. General

(1) Members Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

None

(2) Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2010

Resolved

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2010 be agreed as a correct record.

2. Warwickshire County Council submission to the CLG Inquiry into the Audit and Inspection of Local Authorities

The Leader considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive and was satisfied that the proposed response was appropriate.

Resolved

That the draft Warwickshire County Council submission to the CLG select committee inquiry into the Audit and Inspection of Local Authorities is approved.

3 Any Other Business

None

.....
Leader

The meeting rose at 12.04 pm

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Leaders Decision Making Session

Date of Committee 4th February 2011

Report Title Warwickshire County Council Submission to the CLG on the Single Data Set

Summary This paper outlines WCC response to the CLG consultation on the proposed draft single Data Set

For further information please contact: Monica Fogarty Assistant Chief Executive Tel: 01926 412514 monicafogarty@warwickshire.gov.uk
Elizabeth Abbott Performance & Improvement Officer Tel: 01926 412805 elizabethabbott@warwickshire.gov.uk

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework? No.

Background papers None

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- Details to be specified

- Other Committees
- Local Member(s) N/A
- Other Elected Members Cllr June Tandy, Cllr Jerry Roodhouse
- Cabinet Member Cllr Alan Farnell, Cllr Bob Stevens
- Chief Executive
- Legal Jane Pollard
- Finance
- Other Strategic Directors
- District Councils
- Health Authority
- Police

Other Bodies/Individuals

FINAL DECISION YES

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:

Details to be specified

Further consideration by
this Committee

To Council

To Cabinet

To an O & S Committee

To an Area Committee

Further Consultation

Leaders Decision Making Session - 4th February 2011

**Warwickshire County Council Submission to the CLG on the
Proposed Single Data Set**

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive

Recommendation

That the Leader approves the draft Warwickshire County Council submission to the Department of Communities & Local Government (CLG) on the proposed Single Data List (Appendix B)

1.0 Background

- 1.1. In October 2010, the Rt Hon Eric Pickles MP, Secretary of State for CLG, announced that Central Government would be establishing a single transparent list of every piece of data that central government requires from local authorities.
- 1.2. The purpose of the single data list is to catalogue all the data collections we make with a view to reviewing and reducing their number where appropriate to do so. By eliminating duplication and unnecessary collections the list will facilitate transparency, enable the public to have a clear idea of what data central government collects from local government and what should be available to them.

2.0 Consultation Process

- 2.1. On the 23rd December, following consultation with all government departments, CLG published the proposed Single Data List for consultation with local authorities. As part of this consultation process we have been invited to comment on the draft list and provide feedback covering specific requests on retention, inclusion or deletion of data collections, on general topics and on the list as a whole.
- 2.2. In the future the Single Data List will be expanded to include data collection requests made by other public bodies outside central government as and when they become available.

3.0. Difference between the Single Data List and the National Indicator list

- 3.1. The Single Data List is simply a catalogue of all central government data requirements for local government and is not the list of measures we are expected to collect. Its purpose is to aid transparency of local councils and not for the performance management of local councils. The list will also facilitate the control of the volume of data central government asks of local government.
- 3.2. The National Indicator (NI) set by comparison was set up to aid the performance management of local authorities by central government and consisted of processed indicators rather than pure data requirements. The NI set is now defunct.

4.0. Clarification about the use of the data collections to inform old National Indicators

- 4.1. The NI set in its current form no longer exists and we are now no longer required by the CLG to enter performance results into the National Hub.
- 4.2. Where the data collection purpose has been solely to provide information for the purpose of calculating the old National Indicators, these collections have now ceased and are not included in the single data list.
- 4.3. As the purpose of the data list is not to measure performance but to indicate the volume of pure data collected, it is difficult to quantify how many have been used previously to calculate the old National Indicators.
- 4.4. We are undertaking further analysis of the individual collections to determine the total number of indicators we are still required to collect which will be reported to the Corporate Performance Group. Examples of these include Principal (A) roads where maintenance should be considered (old NI 168) which will be collected from the single data list collection – “Road Condition Data” and Bus services running on time (old NI 178) which will be collected from the single data list collection “local bus and light rail punctuality”. In both cases, the Department of Transport has yet to set up data collection arrangements.

5.0. Summary of the Single Data List

- 5.1. The information overleaf presents the number of collections that WCC currently submits to Central Government categorised by the rationale behind its collection; 7 separate categories exist.

5.2. Main Reasons for Collecting the Data

| Main Reason | Explanation | No. Collections that WCC Returns |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Departmental Indicators | To enable central government to be held to account by the public | 14 |
| Local Accountability | To be made public by all local authorities to support local accountability | 16 |
| National Interest | To protect the national interest, where local accountability is insufficient | 24 |
| National Level statistics | For aggregation into national level statistics | 11 |
| EU/ Int. legal obligations | To fulfil legal obligations under European/ International law and directives | 3 |
| Administration of funding | To support effective administration of funding | 59 |
| Total number of collections | | 90* |
| * of the total, 7 are new collections and are under the following categories: | | |
| | Administration of funding | 2 |
| | Departmental indicators | 2 |
| | National Interest | 2 |
| | Local Accountability | 1 |

5.3. Of the total number of collections for WCC, 16 collections are to be made public by all local authorities to support local accountability. Further clarification is expected from CLG as to the nature of the publication.

5.4. A list of the collections and the rationale for collecting them is at **Appendix A**.

6.0. Warwickshire County Council Submission

6.1. Appendix B presents Warwickshire Council's Submission on the proposed Single Data List. Our response incorporates feedback from all relevant service areas. We have included in our response a number of general observations, a flavour of which is outlined below.

6.2. Overall, the latest version of the Single Data List captures all of the current requests we receive to meet our statutory responsibilities and we have not identified any omissions. However, we welcome the opportunity to review the list on an annual basis to ensure that it is up to date and the collections listed are still relevant.

6.3. We would welcome the opportunity to have an open dialogue with CLG in order to have a shared understanding of the wider information burden on local authorities not only in terms of the time and resources required to collect the data in the Single Data list but also the emerging proposals from the Local Government Improvement Board for a shared set of metrics measuring cost productivity and customer satisfaction.

- 6.4.** We would welcome more feedback from CLG about their understanding of local accountability as there is an argument that suggests that the local authority should be in a position to determine what information is required in order to ensure local accountability rather than for this to be pre-determined.
- 6.5.** There is also some concern about the lack of clarity as to how the local accountability data collections will be published in order to be more accountable. It is unclear whether as from the 1st April 2011, there will be an additional requirement to publish existing data sets that are returned to the relevant government departments in a different format.

Monica Fogarty
Assistant Chief Executive

Shire Hall
Warwick
31 January 2011

Appendix A: A list of the collections and the rationale for collecting them

NB. Those highlighted in bold are the new proposed collections

Local Accountability: To be made public by all local authorities to support local accountability

| |
|--|
| Admissions: Parental Preferences met following secondary school applications |
| Admissions: report to the School Adjudicator |
| Capturing Regulatory Information on a Local Level (CRILL) |
| Carers Survey |
| Children in Need Census |
| Children Looked After (CLA) (SSDA903) |
| Data Transparency - numerical information |
| Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) Return |
| Emissions from Local Authority own estate and operations (former NI 185) - UNDER REVIEW |
| Grant Funded Services (GFS1) return - UNDER REVIEW |
| Mental Health Guardianship (SSDA702) return |
| Missing from Care and Home - UNDER REVIEW |
| National Minimum Data Set – Social Care (NMDS-SC) workforce data |
| Personal Social Services Staffing (SSDS001) return - UNDER REVIEW |
| Speed camera inventory |
| Young people within the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody - UNDER REVIEW |

Departmental Indicators: To enable central government to be held to account by the public

| |
|--|
| Abuse of Vulnerable Adults (AVA) return |
| Adult Social Care Combined Activity Return (ASC-CAR) |
| Adult Social Care Survey (ASCS) |
| Flood and coastal erosion risk management and sustainable drainage systems |
| Key Stage assessment data |
| LA self assessment in relation to Contingency Planning/Capability for disease outbreak, Business Compliance with Animal Health legislation and Intelligence Sharing. |
| Local bus and light rail punctuality |
| Local nature conservation/biodiversity |
| Personal Social Services Expenditure (PSSEX1) return |
| Referrals, Assessments and Packages of Care (RAP) |
| Revenue Account budget (RA) |
| Revenue Summary (RS) |
| Smart & Integrated Ticketing - UNDER CONSIDERATION |
| Special Educational Needs Statement Completion |

National Interest: To protect the national interest, where local accountability is insufficient

| |
|--|
| Business Improvement Districts (BID) Revenue Account |
| Business Improvement Districts Outturn (BIDO) |
| Capital Outturn Return (COR) 1/2 |
| Capital Outturn Return (COR) 3 |
| Capital Outturn Return (COR) 4 |
| Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) |
| Child Death Review Panels |
| Children's Centres |
| CPS1/2 General Development Control statistical returns |

| |
|---|
| Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) |
| Family Intervention Project (FIP) monitoring |
| NEET 16-18 Year-Olds |
| Parental Responsibility (Attendance and Behaviour) [PRAB] |
| Private Fostering (PF1) |
| Register of deaf or hard of hearing people (SSDA910) - UNDER REVIEW |
| Revenue Account Specific and Special Grants (SG) |
| Revenue Grants (RG) |
| Revenue Outturn (RO) |
| Safeguarding – new information needs arising from Professor Munro’s review |
| Secure Children’s Homes (SA1) |
| Special Educational Needs – new information needs arising from the Green Paper |
| Supporting People Client Records and Outcomes |
| Supporting People Local System data |
| Trading Services Return (TSR) |

Administration of funding: To support effective administration of funding

| |
|---|
| Alternative Provision Census |
| Capital Forecast Return (CFR) |
| Capital Outturn Return (COR) 5: supplementary return |
| Capital Payments and Receipts (CPR1 to CPR 4) |
| Chief Finance Officer Sign-Off Statements |
| Childcare and Early Years Providers Survey |
| Children’s Centres – new collection to support a Payment by Results regime |
| Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR) |
| Early Years Census |
| Extension of nursery funding to 2 year-olds |
| Highway inventory data |
| Music Grant - use of |
| National Fraud Initiative (NFI) |
| Pupil Referral Unit Census |
| Road Lengths Survey |
| School Capacity |
| School Census |
| School Workforce Census |
| School Workforce Census - LA level |
| Section 251 financial return |
| Standards Fund monitoring |
| Teacher Pension Contributions |

National Level Statistics: For aggregation into national level statistics

| |
|---|
| Capital Estimates Return (CER) |
| Parish council boundaries |
| Public rights of way |
| Quarterly Borrowing and Lending Inquiry |
| Quarterly Public Sector Employment Survey - local authority data collection |
| Quarterly Return of Wages and Salaries (QRW) |
| Register of blind and partially sighted people (SSDA902) |
| Road condition data |
| School Admissions Appeals |
| School Exclusion Appeals |
| Teacher Pension Service |

EU/Int. Legal obligations: To fulfil legal obligations under European/ International law & directives

| |
|---|
| Incidents under the Environmental Damage Regulations 2009 |
| WasteDataFlow - LA waste management statistics. |
| Weights and measures enforcement (section 70) |

Appendix B Warwickshire Council Submission to the proposed Single Data List

| | |
|----------|--|
| 1 | <p>Specific requests about inclusion, retention or deletion of data collections.</p> <p><u>Inclusion</u> There are no data collections that we would like to see included on the Single Data List that are not already included.</p> <p><u>Retention with a review of content or collection frequency</u> Supporting People Data Collections – We would question the validity of keeping and collecting the amount of data required given the reduction in the supporting people grants. Whilst we are not proposing the deletion of this data set we may wish to review the amount of data collected.</p> <p>Capital returns Generally it is difficult to understand how these collections aid the administration of funding. We would question the requirement to provide a forecast return as well as four quarterly returns and propose instead that a mid-year return suffice.</p> <p>Children in Need Census – This data collection takes approximately 2 months to complete and whilst we are provided with the outputs from this collection, in the existing format they are not useful and would therefore welcome a review of how the output could be made more useful.</p> <p>Children Looked After – The complexity in collecting the data makes this collection difficult to understand. However, we would not want to see the collection dropped but would welcome a review on its content</p> <p>Safeguarding (New Collection) – as the results of the Munro review are not yet available, there is concern about the extra demands placed on resources to provide this additional information.</p> <p>Key Stage Assessment Data – The Single Data List does not reflect the amount of work required to produce this data collection as it covers more than one key stage and detailed information has to be provided down to each child.</p> <p>School Census – There is a huge burden on schools to collect this data. Whilst the information is useful, given the amount of time and resources required to collect it, we would question the need to produce it on a termly basis.</p> <p>Waste information will continue to be input into WasteDataFlow by Districts / Boroughs / County and DEFRA should be able to extract the required statistics. The only concern is that it may not be easy to identify tonnage of “fly tipped” waste and we would question the value of knowing this.</p> <p><u>Deletion</u></p> <p>Business Improvement Districts This is no longer covered by WCC and as such we will not be able to report on this at a County level.</p> <p>Bus punctuality indicator This indicator is costly to collect and its value has been questioned.</p> |
|----------|--|

CRILL – Care Quality Commission has now stopped producing the LARL that was fed by CRILL (Capturing Regulation Information at a Local Level). We therefore question the need to continue with the data collection in its existing format.

Revenue Grants – With the reduction in the number of revenue grants received by the authority, it is difficult to see a rationale for a separate return and as they are audited by the government department, the spend information is already available.

ELGAR The 'data to be collected for Enhanced Local Government Accrual Reporting' otherwise known as ELGAR is an additional burden announced this year. This is a report for actual spend for each quarter on an accruals basis and at present do not have the system in place to produce these reports. We would welcome clarity with regards to the usefulness of this collection both for central and local government. This does add to our list of returns and it is not clear what has been removed to compensate.

Traded Services return – With Local Authorities having a general power of competence it is not clear as to the benefit central government would derive from the monitoring of trading activity as this level (the costs of services are collected through other data sets).

Capital Forecast Return. We would welcome the deletion of this collection as we find it of little value. It is due in January and is merely a forecast for the following year's spend and financing which is then subject to change as a result of priority changes etc.

Section 251 – This data collection is complex and difficult to understand and we therefore question the necessity for central monitoring. The distribution of resources for children's services should be decided locally without the need for central monitoring, certainly for parts 3 and 4 of the return.

2 General Topics

As a general comment on Central Government finance returns, we would welcome the issue dates to be later than present in order to assure accuracy prior to the publicised release date and therefore reduce the burden of repeat requests for completion. Known issues include lack of notification of delays in issuing returns and validations in the forms not working.

We would welcome more feedback from CLG about their understanding of local accountability. The local authority should be in a position to determine what information is required in order to ensure local accountability rather than this to be pre determined.

Local accountability information submitted to central government in the interest of improving local accountability. We would welcome greater clarification on the main reasons for collecting the information in particular around local accountability. There is need to ensure the ability to determine at a local level

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>what information is required in order to be held locally accountable by local communities.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to how this information will be published in order to be more accountable. It is unclear whether as from the 1st April, there will be an additional requirement to publish existing data sets that are returned to the relevant government departments in a different format.</p> |
| 3 | List as a whole |
| | <p>The latest version of the Single Data List currently appears to capture all the required amount of information to meet our statutory responsibilities and we have not identified any omissions. However, we welcome the opportunity to review the list on an annual basis to ensure that it is up to date and the collections listed are still relevant.</p> <p>In the current list, there are 7 new data collections the additional burden this places on the local authority is unclear at this time.</p> <p>We recognise the purpose of the Single Data List is to a) aid transparency and b) facilitate the control of the volume of data central government asks of local government.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to have an open dialogue with CLG in order to have a shared understanding of the wider information burden on local authorities not only in terms of the time and resources required to collect the data in the Single Data list but also the emerging proposals from the Local Government Improvement Board for a shared set of metrics measuring cost productivity and customer satisfaction.</p> <p>Whilst the removal of the NI set has been welcomed in allowing us the freedom to develop more locally accountable performance measures, we are concerned that the new single data list does not provide the complete picture from a partnership and local area perspective and we would also welcome a fuller picture of the data requirements placed on partners in a “geographical area”.</p> <p>There is some concern that the single data list will be repeated by other Central Government Departments for other partner agencies such as the Police and as a result, there is the potential risk for duplication, recreating silos and an overall increase in central government data demand and burden across the public sector. We would like to see the principle of collect once, use multiple times adopted.</p> |