

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Overview And Scrutiny Board

Date of Committee 5th October 2010

Report Title Proposals for Task and Finish Groups

Summary The Board is asked to consider the topics it would wish to commission as task and finish groups and to appoint the Chair and members of those groups.

For further information please contact: Jane Pollard
Democratic Services
Manager
Tel: 01926 412565
janepollard@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 Councillors Chris Saint, Les Caborn, Mike Doody, June Tandy, John Whitehouse
- Cabinet Member For information Councillors: Colin Hayfield, Peter Butlin, Martin Heatley.
- Chief Executive
- Legal Jane Pollard
- Finance
- Other Strategic Directors David Clarke, Strategic Director of Resources, Monica Fogarty Assistant Chief Executive
- 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

Agenda No

Overview and Scrutiny Board - 5th October 2010.

Proposals for Task and Finish Groups 2010-11

Report of the Strategic Director Customers, Workforce and Governance

Recommendation

That the Overview and Scrutiny Board

- (1) Considers the proposals for task and finish groups
- (2) Decides which groups it wishes to commission and appoints the members and chairs of those groups.

1. Background

1.1 At its meeting on 21 July 2010 the Board commissioned 3 task and finish groups and approved the continuance of an in-depth review which was already in progress under the previous programme i.e.

- Rugby A&E Services Consultation
- Ante Natal and Post Natal Services for Teenage Parents
- Communication with the Public and Financial Accountability
- Public Service Reform

1.2 The scopes of the latter 2 groups have been developed since the meeting for the Board to consider and approve the allocation of resources as this will impact on the resources available for other task and finish groups.

1.3 There are a further 11 proposals for task and finish groups coming from the committees and from the issues identified by the Board at its meeting on 21 July 2010. An additional item has been raised by Councillor Whitehouse Chair of the Communities OSC since the meeting of the Committee. All 16 of the commissioned and proposed task and finish groups are listed in the summary report at Appendix A and a copy of the agreed/proposed scopes are attached.

1.4 A chart mapping the proposals against available resources is attached as Appendix B. The Board needs to prioritise the task and finish groups as it is not be possible to accommodate all the proposals within the suggested time-frames.

1.5 The Overview and Scrutiny Strategy sets out the following criteria for deciding whether to undertake a scrutiny review

- Does this issue have a potential impact for significant section(s) of the population?
- Is it a matter of general public concern?
- Is the issue to be reviewed a key deliverable of a strategic and/or partnership plan?
- Is it a key performance area where the Council needs to improve?
- Is there a legislative requirement to undertake the review?

Secondly to ensure that reviews add value/ make a difference

- Are there adequate resources available to do the activity well?
- Is the overview and scrutiny activity timely?
- Is there a clear objective for scrutinising this topic?
- Is there evidence to support the need for overview and scrutiny?
- What are the likely benefits to the council and its customers?
- Are we likely to achieve a desired outcome?
- What are the potential risks?

Reasons to reject Items for overview and scrutiny might include

- An issue is being examined elsewhere - e.g. by the cabinet, working group, officer group, other body
- An issue was dealt with less than 2 years ago
- New legislation or guidance is expected within the next year
- There is no scope for overview and scrutiny to add value/ make a difference

2. Proposals made by the Board

2.1 The Board originally had a long list of 14 possible issues. 2 were commissioned as task and finish groups at the last meeting. There was a lot of overlap between the topics suggested and Appendix A incorporates 5 proposals covering 6 of the suggested topics. (ICT new ways of working has been incorporated with One Front Door and Leaner Processes). It has not been possible within the time available to scope all of the suggestions.

2.2 The remaining 6 topics were discussed at an agenda management session with the Chair of the Board and the Chairs of the Children and Young People and Communities OSCs on 1 September 2010. Comments on these suggested topics are set out below.

(a) **Rationalisation of Property Estate and one front door.** There were differences of opinion about the urgency around this issue and the need for a review at this time. Therefore the Chair has asked for a report on progress with the Property Review which will be considered elsewhere on the agenda

at this meeting and assist members in determining whether a review might be appropriate at this time.

(b) **Effective Partnerships** – There is currently a great deal of uncertainty relating to central governments requirements upon local public services and their expectation of partnership structures. The recently published white papers outlining fundamental changes to the NHS and Police along with the uncertain future of Local Area Agreements, Local Strategic Partnerships and the National Indicator Set and the abolition of CAA and the Place Survey provide a great deal of opportunities as well as challenges to the way in which partnership working is structured and delivers outcomes in Warwickshire. Therefore this proposal is considered to be premature as the shape of future partnerships is not yet known and more information is awaited from government.

(c) **Shared Services** – Doubt was expressed about the timeliness of this review in advance of the comprehensive spending review. In addition the shared services agenda was to a certain extent overtaken by Total place initiative. The sub-regional programme is at an early stage and the transformation programme is in the midst of setting up more strategic work streams. Currently most shared services are at the operational level rather than a strategic level. The Chair has therefore asked for a position statement on where we are with shared services to be reported to the November 2010 meeting of the Board.

(d) **Workforce planning and down sizing.** At the time of writing more information is needed before a scope can be developed and advise on the best time to undertake a review.

(e) **Transformation 2013** – this programme covers many aspects of the topics above, it is a vast area and would duplicate to a large extent many aspects of the other proposals. The programme has just been reconfigured and currently 10 work streams are being developed. This may be a suitable topic at a later date for scrutiny in terms of checking what progress has been made. This could be by a task and finish group or report to the Board.

(f) **Total place.** The Children and Young People OSC will be reviewing the outcomes of the total place pilot at its meeting in October 2010. Total place as a 'badge' has disappeared and the new government talks in terms of place based budgeting. How the two concepts differ if at all is still up in the air. There is a sub-regional programme for which money has been allocated but the partners are in the midst of agreeing what should be included in that programme.

3. Additional Suggestion for Proposed Task and Finish Group

Included in Appendix A (item 16) is a further proposal for a task and finish group from Councillor Whitehouse the Chair of Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee following a decision of Cabinet on 9th September regarding the arrangements for agreeing the specification of the contracts for

the future provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC). The contract specification needs to be agreed by the 1 November 2010 includes

- i) Number and location of HWRC's
- ii) Facilities and services at each HWRC
- iii) Opening days and times
- iv) Changes in policies

DAVID CARTER
Strategic Director Customers,
Workforce and Governance
Shire Hall
Warwick
8 September 2010

Task and Finish Groups – Summary Report

Appendix A

Topic	Timescale	Progress	Comments
Commissioned Task and Finish Groups			
1. Rugby A&E Services consultation	Adult Social Care & Health OSC 12.10.2010	On schedule to report to OSC on 12.10.2010	Select committee style event
2. Ante Natal and Post Natal Services for Teenage Parents	Adult Social Care & Health OSC 8.12.2010	On schedule to report to OSC on 8.12.2010	Joint review In depth review
3. Communication with the public and financial accountability	End of October Possible interim report to OSB 10.11.10 and full report 12.1.2010	Meeting on 16.08.2010 finalised scope and determined future evidence requirements	Scope and allocation of resource needs agreement of Board
4. Public Service Reform	TBC at next meeting	Meeting on 27.07.2010 to identify preliminary information requirements Next meeting is on the 16.09.2010 evidence session and to finalise proposed scope.	Joint review Scope and allocation of resources needs agreement of Board
Proposals from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees			
Topic	Timescale	Methodology/Comments	
5. Adult Social Care Low Level Prevention Services	Adult Social Care & Health OSC Feb 2011 –May 2011 –report to June OSC	In-depth review	
6. Delayed Hospital Discharges and Reablement	Adult Social Care & Health OSC is considering 16.09.10 Dec 2011 –March 2011	In-depth review	
7. Alcohol Control – review of licensing across the county	Communities OSC Nov to Feb 2011	In-depth review	
8. Skills Agenda and Adult Learning	Communities OSC Oct to Jan 2011 No particular time drivers – could be later	In-depth review	
9. Supporting the local economy	Communities OSC Oct to Jan 2011 No particular time drivers could be later	In-depth review	
10. Post 16 Transport	Children & Young People OSC Feb-Mar 2011	Single issue inquiry (select committee style)	

Proposals from the Overview & Scrutiny Board		
Topic	Timescale	Methodology/Comments
11. One Front Door and Leaner Processes and e-delivery and e-communications	Sooner rather than later Oct-Dec	This would pick up ICT contributions to new ways of working. The Group could identify 2 or 3 service areas where we have large numbers of customer transactions and assess how effective our channel management is and whether we are making the best use of IT in delivering service improvements.
12. Big Society	Sooner is preferred Oct –Dec or Mar-April 2011	Select committee style
13. Services for All –How do we ensure we deliver to hard to reach groups?	Oct to Dec – but could be later	Who are the hard to reach groups – what strategies/methods are we using to reach them –how do ensure they are not disproportionately affected by spending cuts? Couple of roundtables with possible series of focus groups with ‘hard to reach groups’ to gather evidence.
14. The future for Performance Management and Business Planning	Phase 1 – October – November 2010 Phase 2 Business Planning –March – April 2011	Phase 1 Performance Management Couple of roundtables –one internally focussed and I focussed on partnerships. Phase 2 Methodology TBC
15. Locality Working	Jan- April 2011	How could we improve the integrated delivery of local services? Could pick a locality area or areas based on community forum areas and look at how services are configured and integrated within those localities. Potential Joint review In depth review
Additional Proposal from Chair of Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee		
16. Household Waste Recycling Centres	October 2010	Single issue meeting

Task and Finish Groups	Days per month									
	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June
Ante Natal and Post Natal Services for Teenage parents	6	6	6	6	8.12.2010					
Rugby A&E Consultation	5.5	0								
Communication with the public and financial accountability	10	12	10	10	12.01.2010					
Public Service Reform	8	8	8	8	12.01.2010					
Adult Social Care Low Level Prevention						11.5	11.5	11.5	11.5	ASC&H
Delayed Hospital Discharges and reablement				6	15	15	15	15	15	ASC&H
Alcohol Control -Review of Licensing across the county			11	11	11	11				Com OSC
Skills Agenda and Adult Learning		11	11	11	11		Com OSC	11	11	11
Supporting the local economy		13	13	13	13		Com OSC	13	13	13
Post 16 Transport						10	10			CYP OSC
One Front Door and leaner processes		5	10	10	12.01.2010					
Big Society		6	5	5	12.01.2010		8	8		OSB
Services for all -Hard to Reach Groups		10	10	10	12.01.2010					
Performance Management		5	10	5	12.01.2010		10	10		OSB
Locality Working						11	11	11	11	OSB
Household Waste Recycling		3								Com OSC 3.11.2010

July

Aug

Sept

11

Com OSC

13

Com OSC

Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	NHS Warwickshire –Consultation on future of Accident & Emergency Services at St Cross Hospital Rugby
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	Cllr Dave Shilton (Chair), Cllr Richard Dodd, Cllr Carolyn Robbins, Cllr Helen Walton, Cllr Clare Watson, Cllr Sally.Bragg. Cllr Jerry Roodhouse- Warwickshire LINK representative.
Key Officer Contact	Paul Maubach NHS Warwickshire & Carl Holland UHCW
Scrutiny Officer Support	Alwin McGibbon
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Bob Stevens
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	N/A
Timing Issues	NHS Warwickshire is planning to carry out a public consultation on the future Accident & Emergency Services at St Cross Hospital Rugby from July to end date 6 October 2010). NHS Warwickshire is obliged to consult the Adult Social Care and Health OSC where a proposal involves a potential substantial change or variation in the provision of health services. The Committee will need to respond within the consultation deadline if its views are to be taken into account in formulating future proposals. Draft reports for member bodies are usually required 4-3 weeks before the meeting to allow for consultation. Final reports 2 weeks before the meeting as reports have to be published at least 5 clear working days before the meeting..
Resources	Resources to support the review –a provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 50 to 60 hours or 8-10 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes 3 meetings with members i.e. to plan the review, an evidence session of some form and a final meeting to review the evidence and develop the recommendations. Time estimates do not include any site visits or best practice visits but do include arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	This is part of the statutory role of a Health OSC.
Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)	To formulate a draft response to the consultation for the consideration of the Adult Social Care and Health OSC at its meeting on 16 th September 2010 to enable the OSC to make formal recommendations to NHS Warwickshire..

<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the proposed options outlined in the Consultation document • Review the consultation process • Level and type of Urgent Care being provided at Rugby • Calibre of cover • HR – level of training provided for urgent care staff • Capacity of UHCW to meet needs of people in Rugby • Ambulance Service – to consider impact of new arrangements at UHCW • Out of Hours – GP’s capacity to meet the patient requirements at Rugby <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acute Care resources e.g. theatres, equipment • Personal issues • Car Parks • Concerns over visiting, travelling times, treatment times
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To have sustainable and appropriate accident and emergency health services for people in Rugby.
<p>Specify Evidence Sources (Background information and documents to look at)</p>	<p>Information from Spatial Strategy – expected increase in housing/population Attendances to UHCW A & E by postcode Admissions from Rugby A & E – where were they admitted UHCW or St Cross Capacity at A & E UHCW Best Practice identified elsewhere</p>
<p>Specify Witnesses/Experts (Who to see and when)</p>	<p>University Hospitals Coventry & Warwickshire (UHCW) NHS Warwickshire (PCT) West Midlands Ambulance Service GPs - Out of Hours (OOHs) If possible a representative from a University, Kings Fund to discuss Best Practice elsewhere</p>
<p>Possible Co-Options (Would the review benefit from any co-options e.g. community or voluntary sector representatives?)</p>	<p>None identified.</p>

Specify Site Visits (Where and when)		Visit to A & E Department at Hospital of St Cross, Rugby Visit to Walk-In Centre Loughborough Community Hospital	
Consultation with Stakeholders (Who should we consult?)		Friends of Hospital of St Cross Warwickshire Local Involvement Network - LINK Warwickshire Community and Voluntary Action - WCAVA Warwickshire Race Equality Partnership - WREP	
Level of Publicity (What level is appropriate and what method should be used?)		Raise awareness of WCC Select Committee Meeting at Rugby Borough Council	
Barriers/Dangers/Risks (Identify any weaknesses or potential pitfalls)		Lose focus/scope too big Miss the obvious Raise expectations to unreasonable levels Sustainability of any new initiatives proposed	
Projected Start Date	27/07/2010	Draft Report Deadline	14 th September 2010
Meeting Frequency	3 or 4 weeks	Projected Completion Date	12 th October 2010
Meetings Dates		27 th August 2010	
Committee Reporting Date		Adult Social Care and Health OSC 12 th October 2010	
Cabinet Reporting Date		N/A	
When to Evaluate Impact			
Methods for Tracking and Evaluating			

Scrutiny Review Terms of Reference

<p>Review Topic (Name of review)</p>	<p>Joint Review of Antenatal and Postnatal Services for Teenage Parents in Warwickshire</p>
<p>Panel</p>	<p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>Councillor Carolyn Robbins Councillor Angela Warner</p> <p>Rugby Borough Council</p> <p>Councillor Noreen New Councillor Claire Watson</p> <p>Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council</p> <p>Councillor Don Navarro Councillor Tom Wilson</p>
<p>Key Officer Contact</p>	<p>Kathy Siddle – Respect Yourself Campaign Coordinator Tel: 01926 742500 E-mail: kathysiddle@warwickshire.gov.uk</p>
<p>Scrutiny Officer Support</p>	<p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>Paul Williams – Overview and Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01926 418196 E-mail: paulwilliamscl@warwickshire.gov.uk</p> <p>Rugby Borough Council</p> <p>Paul Ansell – Scrutiny and Policy Officer Tel: 01788 533591 E-mail: Paul.Ansell@rugby.gov.uk</p> <p>Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council</p> <p>Shirley Round, Principal Democratic Services Officer (Overview & Scrutiny) Tel 02476 376563 E-mail: shirley.round@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk</p>
<p>Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)</p>	<p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>Councillor Bob Stevens Councillor Heather Timms</p> <p>Rugby Borough Council</p> <p>Councillor Leigh Hunt</p> <p>Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council</p> <p>Councillor Ian Lloyd</p>

<p>Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets</p>	
<p>Rationale</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A general concern over possible inequality of access to services for teenage parents. 2. The need to narrow the gaps between communities and individuals. 3. A feeling that there is a need amongst members to develop a greater understanding of the challenges facing teenage parents in accessing services. 4. Being a teenage parent can have a significant negative impact on the unit. 5. Teenage parents and their children frequently experience poor health outcomes.
<p>Objectives of Review</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development of an understanding of the experience of teenage parents. 2. An understanding of the services for teenage parents that guidance and legislation state are required. 3. A appreciation of the extent and quality of the services available to teenage parents across Warwickshire 4. The development of a series of recommendations that will reduce inequalities of access to services by teenage parents. 5. The development of a series of recommendations that will result in an improvement in the level and quality of services available to teenage parents. 6. Recommendations that will result in an increase in the proportion of teenage parents accessing the services they want and require.
<p>Scope of the Topic</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teenage mothers aged between 13 and 19 2. Teenage fathers aged between 13 and 19 3. The review will cover the whole of Warwickshire 4. The review will focus principally on health services. 5. The review will be mindful of whether teenage parents from black and minority ethnic communities face particular issues. <p>The review will not include teenage parents in custody</p> <p>Teenage conception rates may be considered as part of the context for the review but will not be examined in detail.</p>

<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of the review on time and in budget. 2. The development of a series of robust and realistic recommendations that are endorsed by the appropriate executives. 3. the development of a series of recommendations and learning points that can be fed into the CFPS toolkit 4. That all panel members, support officers and witnesses consider the review to have been well run and worthwhile 5. The establishment of a framework of best practice from across the country that can be applied as appropriate in Warwickshire
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased access by teenage parents to services 2. Improvements in health and prosperity of teenage parents and their children across the whole of Warwickshire. 3. Increased satisfaction levels amongst teenage parents of the information and services they receive.
<p>Specify Evidence Sources (Background information and documents to look at)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respect Yourself Campaign self-assessment toolkit 2. Results of the two Bigmouth consultation exercises 3. Government documents eg (DH, DCSF) 4. George Eliot Hospital data 5. Comprehensive Assessment Framework data 6 National Support Team (examples of best practice). 7. Data from Warwickshire Observatory and Respect Yourself Campaign 8. Warwickshire Guidance for School age Parents
<p>Specify Witnesses/Experts (Who to see and when)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Young Parents Forums/Groups 2. Local authority officers – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect Yourself Campaign • Health Inequalities (Nun and Bed) • Health Inequalities (WCC) • Family Information Service • Connexions (Integrated Youth Service) • Early Intervention Service (Natalie Parsons) • Children’s Centre Lead Manager 3. Health Economy – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS Warwickshire • Health Visitors • George Eliot Hospital (Midwives)

Specify Site Visits		1. Possible visits to Children's Centres 2. Possible visit to Young Parent's Forums	
Level of Publicity		To be considered as review progresses	
Barriers/Dangers/Risks (Identify any weaknesses or potential pitfalls)		1. Time constraints 2. Straying away from terms of reference	
Projected Start Date	7.6.10	Draft Report Deadline	
Meeting Frequency	As req'd	Projected Completion Date	End November 2010
Meetings Dates		First meeting 21.6.10	
Committee Reporting Date			
Cabinet Reporting Date			
When to Evaluate Impact		12 months from completion	
Methods for Tracking and Evaluating			

Scrutiny Review Outline – Terms of Reference

Review Topic	Review of Communication with the Public and Financial Accountability
Panel Members	Councillor Tim Naylor (Chair) Councillor Carol Fox Councillor Julie Jackson Councillor Clive Rickhards Councillor Angela Warner
Key Officer Contacts	Virginia Rennie – Group Accountant, Resources Directorate (X2239) Rebecca Davidson - Communications Officer - Customers, Workforce and Governance Directorate (X6643)
Scrutiny Officer Support	Paul Williams Overview and Scrutiny Officer E-mail paulwilliamscl@warwickshire.gov.uk Tel 01926 418196
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Councillor Colin Hayfield Councillor Martin Heatley
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	All Corporate Priorities of the Council
Resources Required for Review	The review will take four months and will require – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 250 hours of Scrutiny Officer time (Approx. 42 days) • Five panel meetings • No site visits • No best practice visits outside of county identified

<p>Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)</p>	<p>Warwickshire County Council is, like all local authorities, facing a period of severe financial hardship. Over the next four years the average that the public sector will have to save is around 25% of its current expenditure in real terms. For Warwickshire County Council the figure is nearer a 35% reduction in central government funding. Therefore, even with the council tax increases around the rate of inflation the result will inevitably result in cuts in staffing and services.</p> <p>In order to address the challenge the Council will have to achieve a number of outcomes all of which are interrelated. It will have to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider how it engages with the public, partners and other stakeholders in a mature dialogue regarding service reconfiguration. • Manage the way in which messages concerning cuts and service reconfiguration are conveyed to employees and members of the County Council. • Operate its financial systems and processes in a way that is timely, transparent, understandable and useful to officers, members and stakeholders, but which use less resource than at present and that expenditure is properly controlled. <p>With the achievement of all these outcomes it will be possible to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify with the public the reason behind the need for the inevitable changes to services. • Manage people’s expectations of the services they will receive in the future. • Develop internal mechanisms that ensure good financial support for the organisation including ways of presenting information in a timely, clear and concise way.
<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<p>An appreciation by members and officers of,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale and complexity of the issue to be addressed. • The importance of managing the issues. • Good or best practice in other local authorities.
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p>The review will seek to address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement by Warwickshire County Council with stakeholders over service cuts. • Financial accountability within the County Council. <p>The review will not seek to address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way in which partners (eg other local authorities) engage with stakeholders or ensure financial accountability. (They may however, learn from this review).

<p>Process for Review</p>	<p>Stage 1 Focus on dialogue with stakeholders on financial issues, service reconfiguration and accountability.</p> <p>Stage 2 Examination of system of financial accountability with Warwickshire County Council examining the flow of information between levels of management and between officers and members.</p> <p>Note – These stages need not necessarily consecutive. It may be necessary to run them concurrently given the timescale of the review.</p>
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<p>A clear and concise report that sets out the basis of the review, the review process, the learning points identified and the task and finish group’s conclusions.</p> <p>A series of recommendations for action to be agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Board and implemented by appropriate officers and elected members.</p>
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<p>Stage 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness by internal and external stakeholders of the reasons for service reductions. • Confidence amongst stakeholders that Warwickshire County Council is addressing the issue of reduced resources in an effective manner. <p>Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding amongst elected members of the processes undertaken around service reconfiguration and financial management. • Minimal budget variances
<p>Specify Evidence Sources (Background information and documents to look at)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples from other public bodies eg “Tough Choices” (West Lothian Council), LGA. • Examples from the private sector • HM Treasury Spending Challenge • £500m pathfinder authorities

Specify Witnesses/Experts (Who to see and when)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Directors/Heads of Service/other relevant officers • Elected Members • WCC Communications Section • Unions • Service delivery partners eg Chamber of Commerce 	
Possible Co-Options (Would the review benefit from any co-options e.g. community or voluntary sector representatives?)		None identified	
Specify Site Visits (Where and when)		None required	
Consultation with Stakeholders (Who should we consult?)		None (The outcome of the review will involve extensive consultation with stakeholders)	
Level of Publicity (What level is appropriate and what method should be used?)		None (The outcome of the review will involve the use of publicity)	
Barriers/Dangers/Risks (Identify any weaknesses or potential pitfalls)		<p>Lack of commitment by members/officers to review</p> <p>Reluctance to share information</p> <p>Time pressure</p>	
Projected Start Date	27.7.10	Draft Report Deadline	
Meeting Frequency		Projected Completion Date	End October 2010
Meetings Dates		TBA	
Committee Reporting Date		TBA	
Cabinet Reporting Date			
When to Evaluate Impact		12 months	
Methods for Tracking and Evaluating		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff survey • Citizens' Panel • Member Survey • SDLT 	

Draft Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Public Service Reform
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	Cllr John Ross (Chair) ,Janet Smith - PCT , Clive Parsons - Police Authority, Councillor Roodhouse, Councillor Fowler, Councillor Tooth
Key Officer Contacts	Monica Fogarty (Partnerships), Bob Hooper (Children & Young People), Gill Jowers (Adult Social Care), Paul Maubach (PCT), Rachel Pearce (PCT) Oliver Winters (Police Authority), Andy Parker (Police Service)
Scrutiny Officer Support	Jane Pollard Don Hiatt.
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Izzi Seccombe; Cllr Bob Stevens; Cllr Heather Timms; Cllr Richard Hobbs:
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Potentially all depending on the focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising educational attainment and improving the lives of children, young people and families • Maximising independence for older people and people with disabilities • Developing sustainable places and communities • Protecting the community and making Warwickshire a safer places to live
Timing Issues	The government agenda is moving at a fast pace. The aim is to make some recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Board by January 2011.
Resources	This review is likely to take around 5 months to complete i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Board. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support depending on the actual methodology used by the review is between 240 to 264 hours or 40-44 days (15 days already taken up at time of writing – averaging out at 8 days per month). This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions and follow up meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	The government has issued a number of draft structural reform plans which will change the shape of local public services in Warwickshire. These are to be followed by legislation as appropriate. Alongside these are specific White papers and associated consultations. There is a need for the Council to ensure it understands the implications and the opportunities arising out of the proposed changes to help it better prepare to meet the challenges ahead.

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To assess the future implications and opportunities for public services in Warwickshire arising from the central proposals relating to Schools, Health, Adult Social Care, the Police Authority, and the Police Service. ➤ To identify what plans the relevant public service agencies either singly or in partnership have in place to address the proposed changes and what issues require further work or could benefit from a partnership approach, and where proposals for one service may impact on others. ➤ To identify if there are barriers to progress and what may be necessary to overcome them and if there areas of duplication or lessons we can learn from each other. ➤ To understand the financial cost of the public service to local people and the opportunities within the change programmes to reduce those costs, secure value for money, maintain quality and improve outcomes for local people in Warwickshire.
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <p>The future role and impact on local government, other public agencies, and the community and voluntary sectors in relation to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools • Health • Adult Social Care • Police Authority • Police Service
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear picture of the future shape of public services in Warwickshire relating to schools, health, adult social care and the police and their future governance arrangements. • Identifies any outstanding issues which need to be addressed to turn the picture into reality • Recommendations which seek to minimise duplication where it exists, encourages partnership working where beneficial and seeks to break down any barriers to progress. • A review which shares lessons learnt and any innovative approaches to common issues faced by the relevant public services • Identifies the costs of support services for public services in Warwickshire and ideally establishes unit costs. • Identifies the opportunities within the change programmes to secure value for money, maintains quality and benefits for the public.
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear vision of the future for relevant public services in Warwickshire shared by partners. • A clear strategy for delivering and communicating the vision • Communication of the vision to the public, staff and other stakeholders • Joint planning and working between partners. • Risks identified and plans in place to address significant risks

Specify Evidence Sources (Background information and documents to look at)		Draft Structural Reform Plans from Department of Communities and Local Government, Department of Health, Home Office, Schools System. NHS White paper: Liberating the NHS; NHS Consultations – Transparent Outcomes, Commissioning for patients; Local Democratic Legitimacy in Health, Regulating Healthcare providers. Consultation on School Funding 2011-12: Introducing a Pupil Premium. Policing in the 21st century: reconnecting police and the people.	
Specify Witnesses/Experts (Who to see and when)			
Possible Co-Options (Would the review benefit from any co-options e.g. community or voluntary sector representatives?)		None identified	
Specify Site Visits (Where and when)			
Consultation with Stakeholders (Who should we consult?)		Police Authority, Police Service, Primary Care Trust, GPs, Community and Voluntary Sectors, County Council Directorates/Services Children and Young People, Adult Social Care, Partnerships and Performance Unit, Community Safety Partnership.	
Level of Publicity (What level is appropriate and what method should be used?)			
Barriers/Dangers/Risks (Identify any weaknesses or potential pitfalls)		Lose focus/scope too big Miss the obvious Raise expectations to unreasonable levels Sustainability of any new initiatives proposed	
Projected Start Date	27.07.2010	Final Report Deadline	21.12.2010
Meeting Frequency	Monthly	Projected Completion Date	Mid –December 2010
Meetings Dates		27.07.2010; 16.09.2010; 3.11.2010; 30.11.2010; Meetings in December to be confirmed.	
Committee Reporting Date		Overview and Scrutiny Board 12.01.2011	
Cabinet Reporting Date		27.01.2011 or 17.02.2011	
When to Evaluate Impact			
Methods for Tracking and Evaluating			

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Adult Social Care Low Level Prevention Services
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	TBA
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Izzi Seccombe; Adult Social Care Cllr Bob Stevens, Health
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	<p>Corporate Priority 2 – Maximising independence for adults and older people with disabilities more choice and control in their life, the right help at the right time, easy access to information, advice, support and advocacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting people to remain at home living independently • Increasing the numbers of people accessing housing related support services, disabled facilities grants, aids and adaptations to support independent living. • Decrease ongoing home care packages due to the introduction of prevention and early intervention including reablement • Development and Implementation of the prevention strategy • Increase in the percentage of people in receipt of telecare and expansion of service available • Narrowing the gaps and sustainable affordable services fit for the future. <p>NI 124 – People with a long-term condition supported to be independent and in control of their condition NI 141 – Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living NI 139 – The extent to which older people receive the support they need to live independently</p>
Timing Issues	<p>There are a number of streams of work currently underway which will determine when it is most appropriate to commence this review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In January 2010, Cabinet approved the commencement of the reconfiguration of voluntary sector and day care services into the community hub model. This included some low level support services. The draft programme agreed by Cabinet indicates major work being undertaken this financial year in re-tendering and re-modelling of services. ▪ Warwickshire Strategic Housing and Support Partnership are now taking a lead on the developing the telecare strategy as part of the partnership approach. There should be an agreement on the new telecare model over the next 2-3 months with a rollout of the new approach during the second part of the year. <p>Taking this into consideration it is thought that if commissioned the review should be targeted towards the last quarter of the current financial year.</p>
Type of Review	In depth review

<p>Resource Estimate</p>	<p>This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 3-4 months to complete the review i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee. This is potentially a complex review and again the level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 252 to 276 hours or 42-46 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions, evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, 2 local site visits (a best practice visit outside the county is not included) it includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.</p>
<p>Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)</p>	<p>The Council has set its Fair Access to Care threshold at the substantial and critical levels. Cabinet is being asked to confirm these thresholds on 22 July 2010 and to support a stricter and more consistent application of the guidance which has been refreshed by government.</p> <p>People falling below these thresholds do not have access to publicly funded mainstream social care support, or residential services. The Council has previously agreed a well-being threshold for people who fall within the moderate and low bands of the FACS criteria. This aimed to provide people with that 'little bit of help' to access alternative support services, equipment, information and advice with the aim of reducing to reducing or delaying the need for people to come into the social care system.</p> <p>The recent government budget shows a probable reduction of 25% in available funds for adult social care services. However, demographic changes show rise of 43% in the population of older people in Warwickshire by 2025 from 94,200 to 134,500. Life expectancy is on the increase.</p> <p>Keeping people out of the social care system or delaying their need to enter the system will be a key component of any strategy adopted by the council to meet the twin challenges of budgetary constraints and demographic growth whilst at the same time trying to meet people's expectations and providing sustainable services in the future.</p> <p>Outturn performance for 2009/10 comments on two key areas for improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30.5% of older people believe that they receive the support they need to live independently. 2009 Warwickshire Partnership Place Survey While performance is low for this indicator, the benchmarking comparison puts WCC in the upper middle quartile against all other England authorities, but lower middle compared to all Shire Counties and our comparator group. This is in part a perception measure. A publicity campaign is being developed with corporate communications to improve public perception before this information is collected by the Place survey in 2010. ▪ The development and expansion in growth of telecare services is slower than we had hoped but the enhanced Warwickshire Strategic Housing and Support Partnership are now taking a lead on the developing the strategy as part of the partnership approach. There should be an agreement on the new telecare model over the next 2-3 months with a rollout of the new approach during the second part of the year.

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To establish whether the well-being threshold is working as intended, whether it needs to be renewed or refreshed to meet the changing context 2) To identify those services currently within the scope of low level prevention services i.e. what is the current offer? 3) To identify whether there are inequalities in provision across the county , differential waiting/assessment times or gaps in provision and any plans to address any issues and any affordable options to improve consistency. 4) To ascertain whether there are other services provided by ourselves or partners that should fall within the scope i.e. can we improve the offer? 5) To identify whether there are areas where improved working with partners could improve the offer or its affordability. 6) To identify whether there could be improvements in access to aids, adaptations, and telecare to better support a prevention strategy. 7) To establish current progress on the implementation of the prevention strategy and the community hub model. 8) To promote public confidence in people's abilities to manage their own care needs without recourse to the social care system 9) Ultimately to secure better outcomes for people, more choice and control and reduce the need to rely on the social care system and remain independent for longer 10) To make recommendations for improvements which are both affordable and sustainable and maximise the use of available public service funding
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHILLIS • Telecare, Aids and Adaptations, Housing related support services <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Universal services
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results from future survey's • Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognisable improvements in the provision of services • Raising profile of the prevention agenda with our partners • Reassure public/promote confidence
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<p>See above</p>

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Delayed Hospital Discharges and Reablement Services
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	TBA
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Izzi Seccombe; Adult Social Care Cllr Bob Stevens, Health
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	<p>Corporate Priority 2 – Maximising independence for adults and older people with disabilities more choice and control in their life, the right help at the right time, easy access to information, advice, support and advocacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting people to remain at home living independently • Decrease ongoing home care packages due to the introduction of prevention and early intervention including reablement • Narrowing the gaps and sustainable affordable services fit for the future.
Timing Issues	<p>Reablement services are currently being rolled out across the County, the services are currently operational in 2 areas (Nuneaton and Stratford). During the roll out process the referral criteria has been extended to include hospital discharge. It is likely to be a few months before information about reablement of hospital discharge patients can be provided. Therefore, it is thought that January 2011 would be an appropriate time for the review to commence. This will enable the review to consider the impact the new way of working has had on hospital discharge.</p>
Type of Review	In depth review
Resource Estimate	<p>This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 3-4 months to complete the review i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee. This is potentially a complex review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 288 to 312 hours or 48-52 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions, evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations and between 4-5 local site visits (a best practice visit outside the county is not included). The resource estimate includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.</p>

Rationale

(Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)

The recent government budget shows a probable reduction of 25% in available funds for adult social care services.

Demographic changes show rise of 43% in the population of older people in Warwickshire by 2025 from 94,200 to 134,500 with a significant rise in people over 85. Life expectancy is on the increase.

The longer people remain in hospital the more dependant they become (particular problem for those with dementia who may not recover their independence at all) the more difficult to rehabilitate back to independent living and a consequent increase in pressure on adult social care services.

The ability of the PCT to redeploy funding to more community based services is inhibited whilst funding being used to maintain people in expensive hospital facilities for unnecessary lengths of time.

Getting people out of hospital and back into independent living at the earliest opportunity is cost effective for both health and adult social care services and a better outcome for the individual.

Outturn performance for 2009/10 comments on two key areas for improvement

We have missed our target to reduce the number of **delays of transferring patients from hospital to care**. This is an important partnership issue because although social care delays remain very low, delays that are the responsibility of the NHS make up over three quarters of the outturn for this indicator. Positive work has been undertaken with acute hospital trusts to identify and resolve delays across the health and social care system; both at an operational and strategic level such as transforming community based services. This is an important measure because it can impact on some of the most vulnerable and frail people in the County, who are caught up in the complex issues involved.

We also need to continue to rollout the '**Reablement**' service across the County. The service is designed to help people to regain the skills and confidence they need to live independently at home, particularly after an illness or spell in hospital. We will need to work with colleagues in the PCT to ensure the service forms part of a single or coordinated intermediate care service.

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To identify the factors which cause delays in discharging people from hospital and the effectiveness of any plans/actions which have been taken to address the issues. 2) To assess how well the Warwickshire Joint Hospital Discharge Protocol is working and identify any differential performance between hospitals serving Warwickshire. 3) To identify the barriers to improvement in hospital discharge arrangements and the affordable options or solutions which would enable improved outcomes for people 4) To assess the impact reablement services has had on hospital discharges. 5) To identify whether there are inequalities across the county, differential waiting/assessment times or gaps in provision. 6) To identify the current provision and options for providing 'out of hospital' convalescent facilities and any alternative affordable options 7) To identify whether there are areas where improved working with partners could improve the outcomes for people and reduce demands on resources. 8) To reduce the number of delayed discharges from hospital
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognisable improvements in the provision of services • Reduction in number of delayed hospital discharges
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Alcohol Control – Review of Licensing across the County
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA – It is recommended that this is undertaken as a partnership review
Key Officer Contact	TBA
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Richard Hobbs, Community Safety
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Protecting the community and making Warwickshire a safer place to live NI 15 Most Serious violent crime rate NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and the police NI 120 All age all cause mortality NI 139 Alcohol related hospital admissions
Timing Issues	See section on other work being undertaken. The review will take approx 3-4 months to complete (up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to Committee).
Type of Review	In depth review
Resource Estimate	A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 240 to 264 hours or 40-44 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions, evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations and a best practice visit. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	It is widely recognised that excessive alcohol consumption can lead to number of problematic issues, including poor physical and mental health, violent crime, domestic abuse, risky behaviour and accidents, and anti-social behaviour. Nationally, in 2009/10 there were almost one million alcohol related violent crimes. A fifth of all violent incidents took place in or near a pub or club, and almost two-thirds at night or in the evening. There are 6.6 million alcohol related attendances at Accident and Emergency departments per year, costing £645 million. Additionally, 1.2 million ambulance call outs each year are in relation to alcohol related incidents, costing £372 million. Overall, alcohol related crime and disorder is estimated to cost the taxpayer between £8 billion and £13 billion per year. Licensing policies and practices are essential to ensure the effective control and regulation of alcohol, in order to reduce negative impacts on individuals, communities and public services.

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To review the effectiveness of licensing policies and practices across the County ▪ To identify examples of best practice locally and nationally ▪ To identify opportunities for partnership working ▪ To identify how a common approach can be achieved across the county, particularly in relation to any changes resulting from current Government consultation
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Licensing policy and practice ▪ Licensing enforcement ▪ Public Houses ▪ Retail sales <p><u>Exclude</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact of excessive alcohol consumption – health, crime and disorder etc ▪ Services and support to address to excessive alcohol consumption and its associated problems
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognisable improvements in the control of alcohol across the County, ▪ Recognisable improvements in violent crime, anti-social behaviour and alcohol related hospital admissions.

<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<p><u>Nationally</u></p> <p>The Government is currently consulting around proposed changes to the current licensing framework, which seeks to give more power and flexibility to local authorities and the police to address local issues. The consultation period ends on 8th September. It would seem sensible to delay the commencement of the review until the outcome of the consultation is known, so that the review can consider how any changes can be implemented in Warwickshire.</p> <p><u>Locally</u></p> <p>Warwickshire Safer Communities Partnership (WSCP) has been discussing licensing policies and practices across the county. A sub-group of WSCP, the Drug and Alcohol Management Group (DAMG) has been tasked with exploring the current position in the County and identifying how licensing activity can be better co-ordinated across the County. The DAMG is expected to report back to WSCP in October. Again it seems sensible to delay the commencement of the review until the WSCP has considered the outcomes of DAMG work.</p> <p>Licensing is a Strategic Aim within the Warwickshire Alcohol Implementation Plan, which includes a number of actions to ensure licensing practices protect young people and effectively address irresponsible premises.</p> <p>Licensing has been suggested as a potential Scrutiny review within Nuneaton and Bedworth BC, following any changes to licensing framework following current government consultation.</p>
---	---

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Skills Agenda and Adult Learning
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	TBA
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Alan Cockburn, Environment and Economy Cllr Izzi Seccombe, Adult Social Care
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	<p>Maximising independence for older people and people with disabilities Developing sustainable places and communities</p> <p>NI 141 Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living NI 163 Working age population qualified to at least Level 2 or higher NI 163a Working age population qualified to at least Level 2 or higher, narrowing the gap between the north of the county and the rest of Warwickshire) NI 165 Working age population qualified to at least Level 4 or higher NI 165a Working age population qualified to at least Level 4 or higher, narrowing the gap between South East and Warwickshire average.</p>
Timing Issues	It is estimated that this review would take between 3 -4 months to complete (having an agreed final report ready for submission to the committee)
Type of Review	In depth review
Resource Estimate	This is potentially a complex review and again the level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 240 to 264 hours or 40-44 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions, evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations. This includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	Improving skill levels amongst residents is central to strengthening the local economy, narrowing inequality gaps, improving the quality of life of residents, enhancing independence and developing and maintaining sustainable communities. With the current challenging financial climate and high unemployment, it is fundamentally important to ensure the provision of appropriate skills and learning opportunities. Between April 2008 and June 2010, the number of people claiming job seekers allowance in Warwickshire has increased by 72.4%. (April 2008, 5,621 claimants, June 2010, 9,268 claimants). The skills agenda is a cross cutting issue, involving a number of different County Council teams and external organisations, therefore it is important to ensure that a co-ordinated approach is achieved.

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To ensure that the skills agenda is joined up across the Council and partners ▪ To ensure that the skills agenda and adult learning is meeting the needs of Warwickshire residents and local businesses ▪ To consider the barriers and challenges individuals face in accessing learning and skills courses ▪ To identify any gaps in provision
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adult Learning ▪ Basic Skills ▪ Job Centre Plus <p><u>Exclude</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Educational Attainment and Skills agenda for young people, 14-19 agenda ▪ WCC’s training and development and workforce planning
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognisable improvement in skill levels across the county ▪ Recognisable improvement in working age people on out of work benefits, number of vulnerable people achieving independent living, skills levels of the working age population and average earnings of employees in the area.
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<p>The Environment and Economy Directorate are planning an internal review of the skills agenda, however timescales for this review have yet to be determined.</p>

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Supporting the Local Economy
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	TBA
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Alan Cockburn, Environment and Economy
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Developing sustainable places and communities NI 171 - VAT registration rate NI 171a – VAT registration rate Nuneaton and Bedworth
Timing Issues	It is estimated that this review would take between 3 -4 months to complete (having an agreed final report ready for submission to the committee) Whilst regional structures associated with economic development are changing (see below), this should not necessarily delay the start of this review.
Type of Review	In depth review
Resource Estimate	This is potentially a complex review and again the level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 288 to 312 hours or 48-52 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 4 evidence sessions, evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, between 4-5 local site visits and a best practice visit. This includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.

<p>Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)</p>	<p>Given the current challenging economic climate and high unemployment, the local economy is a central concern for local residents and businesses. WCC has a key role to play in supporting the local economy; supporting existing businesses to survive and also stimulating the local economy by encouraging and supporting new businesses to develop and small businesses to expand. New and small businesses make a valuable contribution to the local economy, creating wealth, meetings gaps in the market and providing employment opportunities. Within the context of likely reduced public sector employment, creating employment opportunities within the private sector is crucial. Therefore, it is vitally important to ensure that WCC is proactively and innovatively providing support that meets the needs of local businesses and new emerging businesses.</p> <p>The coalition government is changing how it provides support to the economy. RDA's and Business Link have been dissolved and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) will be introduced to drive economic development and enterprise locally. The deadline for LEP proposals in the 6th September and it is anticipated that LEP for our sub-region will be in place by April 2011. It is important to consider how WCC can best engage with the LEP in order to ensure effective support to the local economy. It will be important that the review feeds into work undertaken in relation to developing LEP.</p>
<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To scrutinise how WCC is working to minimise the impact of the current economic climate on local businesses ▪ To scrutinise how WCC is working to stimulate the local economy ▪ To scrutinise the support available to new and small businesses and in light of changing policy context, review how support should be provided in the future ▪ To establish how WCC is marketing the county as an attractive location for businesses ▪ To examine how the Council responds to market failures ▪ To examine whether existing policies, strategies and procedures provide sufficient flexibility for the Council to undertake its role as a strategic enabler of economic development ▪ To identify best practice from other local authorities taking the lead to support economic development ▪ To engage with representatives from local businesses, to establish the needs of local businesses ▪ To identifying the support required by local businesses and consider how this support can be provided within the changing context surrounding economic development and the challenges surrounding public finance.
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support offered by County Council and key partners (including District and Borough Councils, Connect Midlands, Coventry and Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce, Business Link, Warwick University, Coventry University) <p><u>Exclude</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unemployment ▪ Skills agenda

<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognisable improvements in the support available to local businesses ▪ Recognisable improvements in the local economy ▪ Increase the overall wealth of the county and its residents
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Post 16 Transport
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	Nick Williams, Kevin McGovern
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Heather Timms
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Raising educational attainment and improving the lives of children, young people and families
Timing Issues	Start no earlier than January 2011 to take account of issues arising from the Government Spending Review
Type of Review	Select committee style
Resource Estimate	This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 1-2 months to complete the review i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee,. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 90 to 120 hours or 15 -20 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, select committee, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	The medium term savings plan agreed as part of the 2010/11 revenue budget resolutions assumes savings over 3 years of £1.3M [£379000 in 2010/11, £550,000 in 2011/12 and £371,000 in 2012/13]. The Children Young People and families OSC received a report on 23 June 2010 on the policy changes necessary to achieve the savings target. Concern was expressed about the impact on the education and achievement of children and young people, particularly in rural areas, and the consequent impact on providers. The focus of the review is to assess the impact of the changes already made, whether further changes would be required to respond to the Spending Review and the potential impact on the education and achievement of children and young people.
Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Have the proposed changes to Post 16 Transport been implemented ➤ Are further changes proposed ➤ Identify any impact of changes already made on the attainment/education children and young people ➤ Whether the proposed savings agreed as part of the 2010/11 budget are on track ➤ Consider proposals for the future funding of the service. ➤ What are the options for achieving any savings targets ➤ How do the options impact on the education and attainment of children and young people ➤ Assess the implications and impact of any future service changes

<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented •
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savings targets achieved • No discernable adverse impact on the education and attainment of children and young people.
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	One Front Door and Leaner Processes including e-delivery and e-communications and the contribution of ICT to new ways of working
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	Kushal Birla, Tonino Cuiffini,
Scrutiny Support	TBC
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Heatley, Cllr Hayfield, Cllr Butlin
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Potentially all corporate priorities
Timing Issues	Sooner rather than later
Type of Review	2/3 roundtables and possible workshop for members on systems thinking. Shadowing particular processes to understand the customer experience.
Resource Estimate	This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 2-3 months to complete the review i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee,. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 20-25 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, workshop, 2/3 roundtables, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.

<p>Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)</p>	<p>Public Spending cuts mean that the Council needs to ensure the processes underpinning the delivery of services are as cost effective as possible. It needs to challenge traditional ways of providing services and explore different and more economic ways of delivering services.</p> <p>The One Front Door programme is, at this stage, essentially a strategic re-design of access facilities for the public and is likely to result in identifying the location of face to face access facilities and the need for channel migration. In terms of telephone contact and e-delivery the re-design will provide the basis for improved “leaner” access and delivery processes, but these will need to be developed on a service by service basis (although there will be some consistent underlying principles). E-delivery and e-communications development will be central to delivering the benefits potential made possible through the design stage of the project. E-delivery and e-communications developments are, however, already being pursued in some of the ICT supported projects e.g. Free School Meals, Highways Contact Process Improvements.</p> <p>It is suggested that members pick two or three areas where we have a large number of customer interactions and then look at the approach of the Council to channel management and its use of ICT to see what lessons can be learnt.</p>
<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<p>Do we understand the existing process? (As-is) Are there any non-value added steps in the process? Do we understand what customers value in the process and how are we delivering this? Is it delivering the intended benefits / outcomes? What are the opportunities for E-delivery / E-communications? (can the process be simplified [become leaner]) What are the trends for the service we are looking at? (capacity of existing service/ process) What affordable options are there for improvement? How do we sell the new offering to the public?</p>
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements

<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated strategies • Recognisable improvements in the delivery of services and/or cost effectiveness of services
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work has been carried out for the One Front Door programme examining current access channels used by the public, mosaic profiling and access preferences by different demographic groups for locality areas within Warwickshire, and WCC building mapping and evaluation. ○ Partner organisations have provided details of their properties for the Rationalisation programme and these are being aggregated and mapped by the Observatory. Details of WCC properties such as condition, costs, tenure etc have been produced by Property Services ○ Amongst others, ICT is contributing to the following improvement projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New Financial Systems ○ Implementation of New Committee Reporting Processes/Systems ○ Highways Contact Processes Implementation ○ Disabled Facilities Grants Process Improvement ○ Adult Services Transformation Programme ○ Central/Local Print Process Improvements ○ Free School Meals Process Improvements <p><i>Timescales</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An interim One Front Door report was taken to the programme board on 14 July with recommendations for the next steps. ○ Plans are being prepared for the next phase of the project ○ ICT Projects are at varying stages of completion and timescales vary accordingly.

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	The Big Society
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	Kate Nash & Nick Gower Johnson
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Colin Hayfield and potentially others depending on the focus
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	<p>Potentially all depending on the focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising educational attainment and improving the lives of children, young people and families • Maximising independence for older people and people with disabilities • Developing sustainable places and communities • Protecting the community and making Warwickshire a safer places to live
Timing Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be helpful for the Review to take place sooner rather than later to assist in the development of the Council's approach to this key policy strand of the new coalition government
Type of Review	On balance a Select Committee style approach would be preferable as this would give members of the Review Group the opportunity to hear first hand from a selection of local people, community activists, representatives of 3 rd Sector organisations and relevant officers.
Resource Estimate	This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 1-2 months to complete i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to the board. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 90 to 120 hours or 15 -20 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, a select committee style evidence session, and follow up meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.

Rationale
(Key issues and/or
reason for doing the
review)

- The Big Society was launched by the Prime Minister on the 19th July 2010. It aims to address the findings of a Citizenship Survey which found that *“Only a minority of people feel that they can influence local decisions or have engaged in some form of civic participation in the last year.”* As such The Big Society aims to give more power and responsibility to communities.
- The Building the Big Society document outlines five areas that the Coalition will prioritise in order to take the Big Society forward:
 - Giving communities more power
 - Encourage people to take an active role in their communities
 - Transferring power from central to local government
 - Supporting co-ops, mutuals, charities and social enterprises
 - Publishing government data.
- Voluntary Sector - The government believes that centrally driven, top-down government strips away the sense of ownership and responsibility from people who use public services and disempowers the employees who run them. To address this they have said that they will support the creation and expansion of mutuals, cooperatives, charities and social enterprises so that they can have a much greater involvement in running public services.
- A proposed Communities First Fund will be set up to target the most disadvantaged areas in the country, providing start up funds to support the creation of neighbourhood groups. They will also give public sector workers the right to form employee-owned cooperatives, to take over the services they deliver. A Big Society Bank will be established through the funds from dormant bank accounts, which is intended to provide finance for neighbourhood groups, charities, social enterprises and nongovernmental groups.
- Sutton, Liverpool, Windsor & Maidenhead and Eden Valley will pilot the initiative receiving help to set up a range of projects.
- Warwickshire needs to take on the Big Society concept and collectively agree what this might look like for Warwickshire.
- It will be of critical importance to ensure that the Review Group identifies long standing areas of the Council’s policy and delivery which already contribute substantially to the key policy areas expressed by government. The enquiry should consider whether and if so how the Big Society can be delivered within the context of ‘smaller government’ and reducing public sector resources.
- The enquiry should also consider the contribution of the faith sector to the objectives of the Big Society and how the Council can exercise its community leadership role to maximise its contribution
- There is already a substantial number of community activists and volunteers in the county. The Review should hear from a group of them to find out how they are currently supported and whether the current methods of support are appropriate and / or as effective as they might be
- The Council cannot on its own assist the delivery of the Big Society. The enquiry should identify the current and foreseeable approaches of key partners and identify the scope for joined up strategy and activity
- The scope of the big society concept is vast. Suggested focus for the T&F Group are highlighted below:

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying the most appropriate ways in which the Council, across its Directorates, can support the Big Society Identifying the current relevant activities of the Council and considering whether these remain appropriate Identifying the most appropriate range of support for volunteers and community activists Identifying the links and dependencies between a number of existing activities and approaches – especially the roll out of Locality Working Establish how the council and its partners could build social capital to achieve ‘big society’ Identify services that could potentially benefit from community involvement
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations accepted and implemented
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of current contributions of the Council to the establishment of the Big Society Identification of the most appropriate ways in which the Council and its partners can continue to support the establishment of the Big Society Identification of the current and future contributions of public sector partners and ways in which our combined efforts can produce maximum results Recommendation of the essential requirements to be included in any new policy of the Council relating to the Big Society Recommendation of a whole Council approach to the support of the Big Society Full inclusion and participation of citizens, and other stakeholders in the review and their endorsement if its findings
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a Warwickshire level work is being taken forward through a collaborative enquiry model to assess the impact of the Big Society concept upon Warwickshire County Council. This forms part of the work being led through the Transformation 2013 Group. Three collaborative enquires have been established: Big Society (underway and work led by Kate Nash / Nick Gower Johnson), Public Health (work to be led by Monica Fogarty) and Early Intervention (underway and work led by Elizabeth Featherstone / Nick Gower Johnson) There is a Coventry and Warwickshire voluntary/independent sector conference on the Big Society 19th October 2010.

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Services for all - How do we ensure we deliver to hard to reach groups?
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	Kushal Birla, Nick Gower-Johnson
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Potentially all corporate priorities are engaged
Timing Issues	October to December with view to reporting to Overview and Scrutiny Board on 12.01.2010.
Type of Review	Couple of roundtables with 2/3 focus groups with some hard to reach groups to gather evidence, a planning session and session to develop conclusions and recommendations
Resource Estimate	This review if commissioned is likely to take 3 months to complete i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee. The level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 25-30 days. This assumes a review planning meeting, 2 roundtables, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, and 2/3 facilitated focus groups. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	<p>When facing significant cuts in public spending there is a risk that the re-design of public services will adversely affect some people more than others. We need to ensure that as far as possible we don't widen the inequality gaps and create further inequalities in our efforts to streamline processes. Hard to reach groups can often comprise vulnerable people and it is suggested that this review assesses what plans we have to safeguard the needs of these individuals when looking at service re-design, how well we are co-ordinating our efforts, avoiding duplication and sharing information and best practice across the organisation and with partners.</p> <p>A person (or community) can be described as hard to reach if they are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. unaware of services provided by WCC or other service providers in the county, or 2. is unable to take advantage of services provided by WCC or other service providers in the county, or 3. is reluctant to take advantage of services provided by WCC or other service providers in the county. <p>The review will concentrate on those hard to reach groups which also include vulnerable people.</p>

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<p>Development of a clearer understanding of who WCCs and its partners harder to reach groups are, Development of a clear understanding of the challenges facing them and what barriers result in them being harder to reach and how these can be overcome Development of a clearer understanding of the plethora of work underway in specific service areas to engage with harder to reach groups and how best practice from this work can be shared and duplication minimised How do we ensure that our plans for service redesign incorporate the needs of these groups? What evidence is our Equality Impact Assessments programme highlighting in terms of groups that seem to be under-represented and in what areas of work? Does the council and its partners have a consistent approach to equality impact assessments? What steps are we taking to ensure they are not disproportionately disadvantaged in any public spending cuts? What framework/approach should we use in prioritising/targeting future interventions to maximise investment?</p>
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented with a view to improvement
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The needs of hard to reach groups are taken account of in service re-design • Equality and diversity impact assessments on proposals for changes in service do not indicate a disproportionate effect on hard to reach groups • We have robust mechanisms for sharing information, best practice and minimising duplication

Other Work Being Undertaken

(What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)

There is a diverse range of work undertaken by the authority into learning more about these specific communities and their needs through consultation work as well as demographic and social research and projects such as Customer Insight.

There are initiatives and projects being implemented and developed to advertise and promote the services in a number of ways that make it easier for hard to reach groups to find out about the services and therefore potentially be better informed and equipped to use them.

For example, AHCS have worked hard in the past year to address the issue of hidden and hard to reach carers. As a major theme in the last year and building on National Carers Week, they adopted a brand, designed by carers, for carers, which showed carers as a hidden group. Using this brand the image was placed on a public bus which travelled the length and breadth of the County. This was combined with the use of life size posters and a leaflet drop in all free newspapers in areas which corresponded with the location of the bus. This activity resulted in a month on month increase in the number of people accessing the carers website. This approach has led to new carers becoming engaged in the implementation of the carers strategy and accessing support services.

As part of the review of locality working, a number of suggestions were put forward as to how a more representative access and attendance at Community Forums could be achieved.

The Warwickshire Localities online forum pilot supports Locality Working and Community Forums by providing an online space for the public to share their views when they want, not when public meetings are scheduled. This provides greater flexibility and choice about how citizens engage in local decision making and is also expected to be a key tool for engaging hard to reach groups who may not currently engage through 'traditional' channels.

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	The Future of Performance Management and Business Planning
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	Monica Fogarty, Tricia Morrison
Scrutiny support	TBC
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Farnell, Cllr Hayfield
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Potentially all Corporate Priorities
Timing Issues	Phase 1 – Performance Management – October to November – report to Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting 12.1.2010 Phase 2 – Business Planning – March to April – report to Overview and Scrutiny Board May 2011
Type of Review	Phase 1 – couple of roundtables – one internally focused and one partnership focused with a planning session and session to consider findings, conclusions and recommendations. 2/3 local visits to other organisations to explore approaches if necessary. Phase 2 – TBD – Phase 1 to make proposals about most appropriate methodology but minimum of 20 days.
Resource Estimate	This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 3 months to complete the review i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee. The level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 15-20 days. This assumes a review planning meeting, 2 roundtables, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, 2 facilitated local site visits. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.

Rationale

(Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)

The Performance Management landscape has changed dramatically with the new Coalition Government. Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) has been abolished and the Audit Commission with it. Statutory Local Area Agreements (LAAs) with their 35 targets linked to the National Indicators will come to an end in March 2011. The national Place Survey has been scrapped. And the National Indicator set looks likely to go the same way or at the very least be drastically pruned down to a minimal number.

The new Secretary of State, Eric Pickles, has announced that his priorities are: "Localism, localism, localism". So now, how local authorities organise to deliver and performance manage their services will be essentially up to them - with minimal reporting up to Government. There will however be a clear expectation that local councils are accountable to local citizens and service users. Instead of organising performance management around meeting central Government requirements, it is up to councils to performance manage their services in a way that is suitable and appropriate to their own local circumstances and preferences.

Phase 1

WCC's Performance Management Framework will be completely refreshed to reflect changed government policy regarding:

- The partnerships agenda (expected abolishment of LAAs)
- External inspection and regulation (abolition of CAA)
- The abolition of the Place Survey and anticipated end of National Indicators
- "Localism, localism, localism"
- Increased accountability and transparency
- Increased focus on value for money

The increased freedoms and flexibilities will mean that we have the opportunity to create a PM Framework that is right for Warwickshire and reflects its pressures and priorities - hence the proposed timing of the review. Work to refresh the performance management framework will start in August/September and culminate in agreed measures implemented from 1st April 2011.

The Performance Management Framework will start to be refreshed in September, but realistically the timescales will depend on the announcement of further government policy. We would work to implement a new framework from April 2011.

Phase 2

The new approach to business planning will be for 2012 - 15 and the 2012 budget. The Council will need to ensure that its business planning framework is fit for purpose and that for the financial year 2012 and onwards it has a robust framework that aligns priorities with resources. Discussions need to start early in March/April 2011 to ensure arrangements are in place well in advance of the 2012 budget round.

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<p>Phase 1 Identify what information we collect at the moment and intend to continue to collect? Identify what information we need to be able to assess our performance from the perspective of the public, councillors, the organisation and our partners? What should we be measuring and do we have the systems in place to do so? What should our key performance indicators be? How do we ensure performance information drives improvement?</p> <p>Phase 2 What do our business planning processes need to look like in order to ensure we match resources with priorities? How do we ensure our business planning processes drives improvement by utilising performance information and financial information effectively? How do we ensure our processes provide a robust system for managing risks and taking advantage of opportunities?</p>
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on performance are meaningful, understandable to the public and councillors and timely • Effective use of performance information to drive improvement • Streamlined and responsive business planning process in place which enables the Council to respond to new challenges effectively • Councillors, the public, partners and the organisation has a clear picture of our performance
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A discussion paper is being drawn up for consideration by SDLT. The intention is to gain an initial steer from SDLT of our approach to Business Planning and Performance Management for 2011-14. • The rationalisation of performance indicators is an area of work that will be undertaken as part of a wider review of WCCs performance management framework. • All performance indicators will be reviewed as part of our annual review and refresh process and the business planning cycle. This process will start around September/October and will culminate in an agreed set of measures included in each Directorate Business Plan for implementation from 1st April 2011. • SDLT and Members will all have a role to play in the development, scrutiny and eventual agreement of the final basket of performance indicators.

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Locality Working
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	Partnership Scrutiny
Key Officer Contact	Nick Gower-Johnson
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Hayfield
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Potentially all corporate priorities are engaged
Timing Issues	No particular timing requirements
Type of Review	<p>As well as taking a broad overview across the county say through a couple of roundtables/evidence sessions at county level. This review could look at 2/3 localities based on community forum areas and examine in more detail how public services are developing in those areas and hold local evidence sessions in those areas.</p> <p>We should seek some geographical balance across this sample and also consider looking discretely at issues arising in urban, and rural areas. One of the areas selected should comprise a set of communities affected by multiple issues of disadvantage / deprivation.</p> <p>We should ensure that this review deliberately considers matters from the perspective of communities and citizens rather than the agencies that serve them</p>

<p>Resource Estimate</p>	<p>This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 3-4 months to complete i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee. This is potentially a complex review and again the level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 252 to 264 hours or 42-44 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 4/5 evidence sessions (including sessions in the 2/3 localities), evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, it includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.</p> <p>In planning and scoping the review and in order to ensure efficiencies, we should be very careful not to repeat work recently completed in respect of the Review of Locality Working undertaken by Nick Gower Johnson. The report has been widely distributed for comment and many comments and suggestions have been received, the overwhelming majority of which are constructive and helpful.</p> <p>A comprehensive improvement plan will result from the Review of Locality Working and this work should not be scrutinised or repeated.</p>
<p>Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)</p>	<p>Work is already underway in relation to the role, operation and effectiveness of community forums and area committees.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that any scrutiny review should explore locality working in the broader sense in terms of a) Establishing an approach to shaping the delivery of services that are locally relevant & locally sensitive and b) Should focus on ways in which our Locality Working arrangements can and should support communities and citizens to take control of the key issues that affect them and c) Should explore ways in which the costs of resourcing the work can be shared more equitably across the Public and 3rd Sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localisation is primarily about tailoring services to meet local needs; about improving access to services; engaging and empowering the community to be fully involved in providing solutions and improving confidence. In progressing towards localisation we will need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identify at which level our services are best delivered; - decide with partners the extent to which they are prepared to be part of a 'coalition' to take this forward; - consider how shifts in power to a local level can be facilitated by councillors and officers and how this impacts on our organisational structures, skills and culture - review how we deliver services with the intention of reducing accommodation numbers through modern flexible and IT developments

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the effectiveness of the localities strategy? • Identify factors/barriers that prevent localisation? • What progress has been made to deliver against this vision of localisation? • How is the localisation agenda being developed and driven across directorates and partners and is there consistency? • To what extent are service/transformation developments governed by the localities agenda? • To identify ways in which Locality Working can and should support communities to take greater control • To identify improved arrangements for resourcing locality working collaboratively across the public and 3rd Sectors
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-ordinated approach to the delivery of services in localities • Service delivery models are appropriate/adapted to take account of the different needs of localities • Recognisable improvements in delivery of services and/or cost effectiveness of services • Improved arrangements for citizens and communities to take greater control over issues affecting their communities

Other Work Being Undertaken

(What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)

Current activity

Operation and effectiveness of community forums and area committees

- A localities review has been conducted and a final report circulated for comment in advance of it being considered by the Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership Group later this month. Once the recommendations included within the review have been agreed by the Partnership, this will be considered formally by each partner organisation. WCC Cabinet will be considering the recommendations from the review on 14th October.
- The review is primarily concerned with the effectiveness of community forums however, there are some recommendations regarding wider localisation considerations. Suggestions are made that consideration should be given to the transfer of some functions from area committee to community forums, but the review has not sought to provide comprehensive proposals regarding the future role of area committees.
- A Scrutiny review proposed in respect of the Big Society – currently in its formative stages
- The Scrutiny Review currently being undertaken in respect of Public Engagement
- Currently, work is being carried out regarding partnership structures and ways of working, and the future role of Area Committees

Wider locality working

- The localities review does cover wider considerations regarding neighbourhood management but this is not the primary focus on the report and therefore is not detailed.

Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

Review Topic (Name of review)	Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Provision
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	TBA
Key Officer Contact	TBA
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Cockburn, Environment and Economy
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Developing sustainable places and communities NI 191 Residual Household Waste per Household
Timing Issues	The Portfolio Holder / Leader decision regarding the specification of the contract needs to happen prior to 1 st November 2010, therefore if commissioned the single issue meeting will need to take place within October. This review will constitute a single meeting, with findings and recommendations reported to the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes for Communities OSC. The Chair of Communities OSC will report recommendations to the Portfolio Holder and Leader prior to the decision being made.
Type of Review	Single meeting – roundtable discussion
Resource Estimate	This is proposed as a short, sharp scrutiny exercise. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 2-3 days, or 12-18 hours. This includes the preparation for a single issue meeting, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses, one single issue meeting, liaising with members to agree recommendations and writing and submitting a report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	In November 2011 the current contract for six of the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) will end. This offers an opportunity to introduce a new focussed contract to improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies. On the 9 th September 2010, Cabinet referred the decision making regarding the specification of the contract to Cllr Cockburn as Portfolio Holder and Cllr Farnell as Leader. This includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Number and location of HWRC's ii) Facilities and services at each HWRC iii) Opening days and times iv) Changes in policies

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<p>The objectives of the single issue meeting will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To scrutinise the process undertaken in reaching the decision regarding the specification of the contract 2) To consider whether the proposed contract specification meets the current and future needs of Warwickshire residents 3) To consider whether the proposed contract will improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies 4) To make recommendations to Portfolio Holder and Leader in relation to the above.
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract specification for Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement process • Implementation of contract • Waste / recycling strategy
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements • A contract specification which is fit for purpose to meet the current and future needs of Warwickshire residents, improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in recycling at the HWRC's • A more cost effective service
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	