

**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

**Name of Committee** Overview And Scrutiny Board

**Date of Committee** 4th November

**Report Title** Six monthly Performance Report

**Summary** To receive information about the performance of the Overview and Scrutiny function during the first six months of 2009/10.

**For further information please contact:** Michelle McHugh  
Overview and Scrutiny Manager  
Tel: 01926 412144  
michellemchugh@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 Appleton, Chair of OSB
- Cabinet Member  Cllr Farnell, Leader
- Chief Executive  .....
- Legal  Sarah Duxbury, Corporate Legal Services Manager
- Finance  .....
- Other Strategic Directors  .....
- District Councils  .....
- Health Authority  .....
- Police  .....

Other Bodies/Individuals  Jane Pollard, Democratic Services Manager

**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  .....

## Agenda No

### Overview And Scrutiny Board - 4th November.

#### Six monthly Performance Report

#### Report of the Strategic Director for Customers, Workforce and Governance

##### Recommendation

The Overview and Scrutiny Board is recommended to:

- i) consider and comment on the performance of the Overview and Scrutiny function during the first six months of 2009/10
- ii) identify areas for improvement and issues to take forward.

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The performance of the Overview and Scrutiny function has been measured through an agreed Performance Management Framework for the function since 2007. The Performance Management Framework aims to assess the effectiveness of the Overview and Scrutiny (O+S) function by monitoring key performance information, including the level of O+S recommendations agreed by the Cabinet and partners, the quality of O+S recommendations, the implementation of O+S recommendations and associated outcomes, and engagement in Overview and Scrutiny by partners, officers and members of the public.
- 1.2 The Performance Management Framework for Overview and Scrutiny comprises of two elements.
  - i) A self evaluation tool for members to use as a mechanism of self reflection and improvement. A copy of the self- evaluation tool can be found in the Overview and Scrutiny Toolkit – [www.warwickshire.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/scrutiny)
  - ii) A number of performance indicators designed to provide a holistic view of the performance of the Overview and Scrutiny function. The Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group reviewed and updated this section of the Performance Management Framework in 2008, including the introduction of a number of new performance indicators. The indicators included in the Performance Management Framework are outlined below:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Critical Friend Challenge</b>                        | <p>a) % of non-review recommendations made to Cabinet accepted</p> <p>b) % of review recommendations made to the Cabinet accepted</p> <p>c) % of recommendations made to partner organisations accepted</p> <p>d) % of Portfolio Holder reports to OSC's undertaken</p>  |
| <b>Involving Partners</b>                               | <p>e) No. of external partners contributing to Overview and Scrutiny</p> <p>f) No. of external partners and partnerships subject to scrutiny</p>   |
| <b>Reflecting the Concerns of Members of the Public</b> | <p>g) No. of citizens and community groups involved in Overview and Scrutiny</p> <p>h) No. of public questions</p>   |
| <b>Communication</b>                                    | <p>i) No. of press releases issued by WCC in relation to the work of Scrutiny</p> <p>j) No. of hits on scrutiny web pages</p>  |
| <b>Demonstrable Impact upon Public Services</b>         | <p>k) % of recommendations that are "quality" recommendations. Quality recommendations are defined by falling into a least one of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations that aim to make a difference to local people</li> <li>▪ Recommendations that aim to change / develop policy in order to improve services</li> <li>▪ Recommendations that aim to identify savings whilst maintaining / improving service quality</li> <li>▪ Recommendations that aim to narrow the gap</li> </ul> <p>i) % of topics on scrutiny work programmes that are linked to Corporate Priorities and LAA priorities.</p> |

## 2. Summary of Performance 2009/10

2.1 Current performance against the indicators contained in the Performance Management Framework is outlined in the table attached as Appendix A. In reviewing current performance, the following should be noted:

- a) A large number of the indicators outlined above are new for 2009/10, therefore there is no historic or baseline data.
- b) The June elections meant that the process for developing and agreeing OSC work programmes was undertaken later in the year than normal, thereby creating a slight delay in the commencement of the OSC work programmes and in-depth scrutiny reviews. This is inevitably reflected in the reporting of some of the performance information, with low

performance being directly attributable to the work of Overview and Scrutiny only starting in September.

- 2.2 Key issues from the performance data worth highlighting are outlined below.
- 2.3 Adopting a more focussed approach to the development of OSC work programmes for 2009/10 has resulted in 78% of items on OSC's work programmes being linked to the Corporate Priorities and LAA targets. This figure is based on the work programmes that were agreed by the Board at its meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September and therefore provides a snap shot picture at this point in time. Another snap shot picture of the percentage of items on OSC work programmes that relate to Corporate Priorities and LAA targets will be undertaken 6 months into the work programmes (March 2010).
- 2.4 Currently 100% of Portfolio Holder reports to OSC's have been undertaken. However, this figure only relates to the July round of OSC meetings where Portfolio Holders were required to outline to key challenges for 2009/10. At its meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> September the Board decided that each Portfolio Holder be requested to provide an update on their work at each OSC meeting relevant to their portfolio. Due to timings of the September round of OSC meetings, this request was not able to be implemented for all OSC's in September. Therefore, the September round of meetings has not been included in the performance reporting for this indicator.
- 2.5 The percentage of OSC review recommendations accepted by Cabinet is currently at 84%. This figure relates to in-depth reviews that were completed and considered by Cabinet prior to the June elections, including
- Winter Deaths and Fuel Poverty (Health OSC joint review with Coventry and Solihull)
  - Review of Falls Prevention (Health OSC and Adult and Community Services OSC)
  - End of Life Care (Health OSC)
  - Flooding in Bedworth (Nuneaton and Bedworth Local Area Scrutiny)
  - Transport in Rugby (Rugby Local Area Scrutiny)
  - Financial Well-Being (Community Protection OSC)
- 2.6 The percentage of recommendations accepted that are then implemented generally increases over a long period of time. This is largely attributable to two major factors a) the timing of the review and b) the scales of the task to be undertaken. As many recommendations relate to service reconfiguration, implementation will not happen over night. Therefore, the percentage of recommendations implemented continues to increase several years after the recommendations have been accepted.

DAVID CARTER  
Strategic Director for  
Customers, Workforce and  
Governance

Shire Hall  
Warwick, 28 September 2009

## Appendix A

| Indicator  | Objective   | 2006/07 Performance | 2007/08 Performance               | 2008/09 Performance | 2009/10 Target        | 2009/10 Performance |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| % of non review recommendations made to Cabinet accepted   | To ensure that recommendations from OSC's are relevant, researched and evidence based so as to help improve the performance and quality of services | N/A                 | N/A                               | 85%<br>(11 rec's)   | -                     | -                   |
| % of review recommendations made to Cabinet accepted   | To ensure that recommendations from OSC's are relevant, researched and evidence based so as to help improve the performance and quality of services | 95%<br>(45 rec's)   | 73.5% <sup>1</sup><br>(180 rec's) | 96.6%<br>(85 rec's) | 80%                   | 83%<br>(63 rec's)   |
| % of recommendations accepted by external partners   | To ensure that recommendations from OSC's accord to the aspirations of partners   | N/A                 | 42 rec's                          | 92%<br>(52 rec's)   | -                     | 62%<br>(16 rec's)   |
| % of recommendations made by OSC's that have been successfully implemented                         | To ensure that the work and the recommendation of OSC's are implemented and lead to service improvements  | 71%                 | 54%                               | 23%                 | -                     | 15%                 |
| % of recommendations that are quality recommendations  | To ensure recommendations made by OSC's are add value to the delivery of public services  | N/A                 | N/A                               | 76%                 | -                     | 77%                 |
| % of Portfolio Holder performance reports to OSC undertaken  | To ensure OSC's hold Portfolio Holders to account for their performance   | N/A                 | N/A                               | N/A                 | Baseline setting year | 100% <sup>2</sup>   |
| % of topics on scrutiny work programmes that are linked to Corporate Priorities and LAA priorities | To ensure the work undertaken by OSC's are focussed on high priority issues for WCC and our partners  | N/A                 | N/A                               | N/A                 | Baseline setting year | 78%                 |

<sup>1</sup> 92.2% of recommendations accepted if those accepted subject to budget considerations are included

<sup>2</sup> This figure only includes the July round of OSC's where Portfolio Holders presented key challenges, it does not include the September round of meetings as the request from the O+S Board to have Portfolio Holder reports at each OSC was unable to be implemented in time for all OSC's

| Indicator   | Objective   | 2006/07 Performance | 2007/08 Performance  | 2008/09 Performance  | 2009/10 Target | 2009/10 Performance                           |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--|----------------|---|
| No of external witnesses contributing to the O+S process                | To ensure that the O+S function is making best use of the knowledge and experience of experts     | N/A                 | 269 people attending committees<br><br>109 external witnesses contributing to scrutiny | 297 people attending committees<br><br>188 external witnesses contributing to scrutiny | -              | 18 people attending committees<br><br>-       |
| No of public questions  | To ensure Overview and Scrutiny is viewed by members of the public as an accountability mechanism | N/A                 | 10   | 33   | -              | 3   |
| No. of external partners and partnerships subject to scrutiny           | To provide a picture of the level of external scrutiny being undertaken                           | N/A                 | N/A  | N/A  |                | In process of developing recording mechanisms |
| No. of press releases issued by WCC in relation to the work of scrutiny | To ensure active publicity of Overview and Scrutiny work  | N/A                 | N/A  | 32   | N/A            | 8   |
| No. of hits on the scrutiny web pages                                   | To provide a picture of the level of interest in Overview and Scrutiny                            | N/A                 | N/A  |  |                | 44,454  |