

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Overview And Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group

Date of Committee 7 July 2008

Report Title Joint Scrutiny of the Local Area Agreement

Summary This report advises the Group of a specific piece of joint scrutiny which has been commissioned by the Public Service Board. It is expected to report its findings in September 2008. That the Group nominates 2/3 members to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Manager to develop a model for LAA scrutiny to put forward to the Public Service Board in September 2008

For further information please contact: Jane Pollard
Overview and Scrutiny Manager
Tel: 01926 412565
janepollard@warwickshire.gov.uk

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

Background papers

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-

Details to be specified

- Other Committees
- Local Member(s) N/A
- Other Elected Members Cllr Richard Grant
- Cabinet Member
- Chief Executive Jim Graham
- Legal Sarah Duxbury
- Finance
- Other Chief Officers David Carter
- 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 3

Overview And Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group - 7 July 2008.

Joint Scrutiny of the Local Area Agreement

Report of the Strategic Director of Performance and Development

Recommendation

- (1) That the Group nominates 2/3 members to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Manager over the summer to develop a model for LAA scrutiny to put forward to the Public Service Board in September 2008

Introduction

1. In 2007-08 the Group agreed to let allow the arrangements for the Local Area Agreement an opportunity to settle down for 6-12 months before conducting any in depth scrutiny. The Public Service Board was asked to consider whether there were particular issues following receipt of performance reports during this interim period. The Group agreed a framework for assessing the effectiveness of partnerships in November 2007. Particular elements of the framework could be used dependent on the issue alongside the following preferred models i.e.

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Any joint body established to scrutinise the LAA could use the framework as a tool to assess the LAA Blocks	Discussions regarding the establishment of such a body and the appropriate scrutiny tools will be considered as part of the LAA governance review	The remit of this body would be focussed on the LAA and would not include other partnerships
OSCs could use the framework to scrutinise a selection of partnerships that fall within their remit	Ensures a consistent approach Can be implemented within current structures Involves all scrutiny members	Would require an analysis of all partnerships to ascertain which OSC would be appropriate Duplication may arise Scrutiny of partnerships may overburden work programmes

The framework is attached for ease of reference as an appendix to this report.

2. During 2007-08 the Committees began to receive regular performance reports, the first 6 months in December 2007, followed by Q3 in March 2008 and Q4 in June/July cycle of committees. In addition the Committees have been consulted on the new priorities for the LAA and their associated targets.
3. Council on 13 March 2008 considered the allocations of the Area Based Grant and decided as part of the arrangements that

'A rigorous joint scrutiny exercise should be carried out in respect of all work funded by ABG in readiness for the 2009/10 budget round in order to more clearly identify the outcomes achieved through the deployment of these resources.'

The Proposed Joint Scrutiny

4. The Public Service Board at its meeting on the on 15 May 2008 commissioned a joint scrutiny review in accordance with the Council's recommendation with the following outline terms of reference.

a) The exercise is undertaken by a small group made up elected members/ those in governance positions who carry out a scrutiny role and are from organisations which are members of the Board. The group should be made up of:

*2 representatives nominated by the County Council
 2 representatives nominated by the District: Borough Councils
 2 representatives from organisations which are members of the Board but from non local authority organisations (e.g. Police Authority, LSC, CWIC, WALC or the Primary Care Trust)*

b) The group is supported by an officer group which should include nominees from the County Council's Strategic Directors for Resources and Performance & Development (to reflect the Council's status as accountable body for the LAA/ ABG and to bring in skills and experience relating to finance, scrutiny and performance management) plus up to two nominees from partner organisations that are members of the Board.

c) The group should be established rapidly and complete its tasks by the end of September 2008.

d) The exercise gives those in receipt of ABG in 2008/9 the opportunity (LAA Theme / by Theme) to:

*Make clear the purposes of the former funding stream
 Describe the citizen outcomes achieved through the current use of resources
 Describe the contribution of the work funded to ABG to the new LAA and other local priorities including Narrowing the Gap(s)
 Outline the consequences to the LAA and other priorities of partial or complete disinvestment from the services currently funded*

e) The group should consider the availability of resources other than ABG to support / enhance the work (including resources from partners outside the CC)

f) The group could consider identifying those elements of ABG which on the one hand relate to LAA outcomes/ partnership activity and on the other hand those which relate to core functions of the County Council which are single agency and bear no relationship to partnership / LAA activit

5. The proposed members of the Joint Panel are

Councillor Les Smith - North Warwickshire Borough Council
Councillor Jane Knight/Bob Crowther - Warwick District Council
Ian Francis - Police Authority
Vaughan Owen - WALC
Councillor June Tandy - County Council
Councillor Chris Davis - County Council

6. The Joint Panel will be supported by an officer group composed of the following

WCC - Virginia Rennie and Jane Pollard

DCs/BCs - Ian Davis (RBC) and Richard Warne / Simon Donaghy (both NBBC) + possibly John Dubber (WDC)

Other bodies - Anne Garner (PCT)

7. The details of the arrangements are being worked up and availability confirmed. It is hoped to schedule the meetings with the theme groups in the last two weeks of July, leaving August for report writing and any follow up work with a view to finalising the report in September 2008. The PSB have asked for a report on proposals for future joint scrutiny of the LAA at the same time.

Conclusion

8. At its last meeting on 30 April 2008 the Group included 'Local Area Agreement –Effectiveness, Value for Money and Priorities' (including quarterly performance reports) within its core work programme for 2008-09. The Group was to consider further effective mechanisms for holding the public service Board to account at this meeting.

9. This particular scrutiny review will provide some useful experience of joint scrutiny. It would be helpful if the Group could nominate 2/3 members to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Manager over the summer to develop a model for LAA scrutiny to put forward to the Public Service Board in September 2008.

DAVID CARTER
Strategic Director of
Performance and
Development

Shire Hall
Warwick

20 June 2008

1. Leadership - *Partners are mutually accountable, share risks and rewards fairly, and support each other*

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
1.1	The partnership has a purpose which is set out clearly for service users and stakeholders to understand	The partnership has a purpose which is conveyed to users and stakeholders but it is not clear / easy to understand	The partnership has a purpose but it is not conveyed to users and stakeholders and is not clear / easy to understand	The purpose of the partnership is not set out	
1.2	The partnership has a vision that is clear, ambitious and achievable	The partnership has a clear vision which is achievable, however the vision could be more ambitious	The partnership has a vision however the achievement of it is questionable	The partnership does not have a clear vision	
1.3	All partners have a shared understanding of the outcomes the partnership expects to achieve and there is widespread ownership within the partner organisations	The majority of partners share an understanding of the outcomes the partnership expects to achieve	There is inconsistency in the partners understanding of the outcomes the partnership expects to achieve	Each partner has a different understanding of the outcomes the partnership expects to achieve and there is a lack of ownership within the partner organisations.	
1.4	The partnership is heavily focussed upon added value through collaboration	The partnership works towards added value through collaboration	There is an awareness of the added value of collaboration, but there is no evidence to suggest that is a fundamental focus of the partnership	There is no focus upon added value through collaboration	
1.5	The partnership clearly contributes to Warwickshire County Councils vision and objectives	The partnership contributes to a number of Warwickshire County Councils objectives	It is unclear how the partnership will contribute to Warwickshire County Councils objectives	The partnership does not contribute to Warwickshire County Councils vision and objectives	

2. Governance *The partnership has clear, transparent and appropriate governance arrangements*

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
2.1	The membership of the partnership is clearly both representative of the views of the organisations they represent and appropriate for the agreed purpose and objectives of the partnership. All members with the right skills and experience who can make decisions and commit the organisations they represent	The membership of the partnership is mostly representative of the views of the organisations they represent and appropriate for the agreed purpose and objectives of the partnership. And the majority of members have the right skills and experience and can make decisions and commit the organisations they represent	The membership of the partnership is in some ways unrepresentative of the views of the organisations they represent and inappropriate for the agreed purpose and objectives of the partnership. Only a minority of members have the right skills and experience and can make decisions and commit the organisations they represent	The membership of the partnership is unrepresentative and inappropriate for the agreed purpose and objectives of the partnership, and does not include members with the right skills and experience who can make decisions and commit the organisations they represent	
2.2	The partnership has an agreed set of values and standard of conduct, including an agreed mechanism for dealing with conflicts of interests and resolving disputes among partners, which has been agreed by all members	The partnership has a set of values and standard of conduct, including an agreed mechanism for dealing with conflicts of interest and resolving disputes among partners, which has been agreed by the majority of members	The partnership has a set of values and standard of conduct, but it is not clear whether all members are signed up to these	The partnership does not have a set of values and standard of conduct.	
2.3	There is an effective system and processes to ensure that the partnership is accountable to the individual partners, external stakeholders, service users and the public. And this system and process is transparently and consistently used.	There is a system and process in place to ensure the partnership is accountable to individual partners, external stakeholders and service users.	There are systems and processes in place to ensure the partnership is accountable to individual partners and external stakeholders.	There are no systems or processes in place to ensure the partnership is held to account.	
2.4	Decision making processes are clearly defined, effective and understood by all those involved and consistently and transparently applied. Processes include an agreed approach to involving key players relevant to the business of the partnership in the decision making process	Decision making processes are clear and understood by all those involved 2	Decision making processes are set out, but these are not understood by all partners and are therefore inconsistently employed	There are no clear decision making processes	

2. Governance *The partnership has clear, transparent and appropriate governance arrangements*

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
2.5	The Partnership has a structured board or other decision making forum	The partnership has a board but it is not well structured	It is not clear whether there is a decision making board	The partnership does not have a structured board or other decision making forum	
2.6	The partnership has a clear and agreed method for recording partnership decisions in writing	The partnership has a method for recording partnership decisions, but these methods are not cleared or agreed	The partnership has a method for recording partnership decisions, but it is not followed	The partnership does not have a method for recording partnership decisions in writing	
2.7	There are planned and effective processes for input and feedback from relevant public / service users / stakeholders which feed into the role and purpose of the partnership. Including the opportunity to make suggestions / complaints about what the partnership does.	Input and feedback from relevant public /service users / stakeholder has informed the development of the partnership and there is evidence that it will continue to do so.	Input and feedback has informed the development of the partnership, but it is unclear how this will contribute to the partnership in a continuous way	Input and feedback from relevant public / service users / stakeholders does not inform the partnership, Or It is not clear whether input and feedback from relevant public / service users / stakeholders has contributed to the development of the partnership or it will shape the future development of the partnership	
2.8	There are clear and effective mechanisms for reporting back from the partnership to organisations involved and these are consistently used by all partners.	There are clear and effective mechanisms for reporting back from the partnership to organisations involved and the majority of partners use them	There are mechanisms for reporting back from the partnership to organisations involved, but these are not consistently employed by all partners	There are ineffective mechanisms for reporting back from the partnership to organisations involved Or There are no mechanisms for reporting back from the partnership to organisations involved	
2.9	The partnership ensures that public / service users / stakeholders are regularly kept informed about the activities of the partnership through established mechanisms of communication	The partnership has kept public/ service users/stakeholders regularly informed about the activities of the partnership, but established methods of communication have not been developed	The partnership has kept public/ service users / stakeholders informed about the activities of the partnership but this has been on an ad-hoc basis with no established mechanisms	Public/service users/stakeholders are not informed about the activities of the partnership	

2.Governance *The partnership has clear, transparent and appropriate governance arrangements*

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
2.10	There is a clear process for effective and timely reporting back on partnership working to Councillors and this is consistently employed	Councillors do receive regular feedback regarding partnership working, but a clear and consistent process has not been established	There is a process for reporting back on partnership working to Councillors, however it is inconsistently used	There is no process for reporting back on partnership working to Councillors	
2.11	The partnership has an agreed mechanism for terminating the partnership / partners to leave the partnership, which includes dealing with the reallocation of resources as necessary	The partnership has a mechanism in place for terminating the partnership which includes dealing with the reallocation of resources as necessary	The partnership has a mechanism in place for terminating the partnership / partners leaving the partnership, but does not address the reallocation of resources.	The partnership does not have a mechanism for terminating the partnership / partners to leave the partnership	
2.12	The partnership has appropriate and effective arrangements in place for monitoring and managing risk, these are understood by all partners	There are appropriate arrangements in place for monitoring and managing risk	The partnership has arrangements in place for monitoring and managing risk, however these arrangements need to be reviewed	The partnership does not have arrangements in place for monitoring and managing risk	

3. Learning- Partners continuously seek to improve what they do in the partnership

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
3.1	All the partners within the partnership continuously seek improvements in activities and ways of working for the benefit of the partnership, actively disseminating knowledge and best practice	The majority of partners within the partnership seek improvements in activities and ways of working for the benefit of the partnership	A small number of partners within the partnership seek improvements in activities and ways of working for the benefit of the partnership	Partners do not seek improvements and do not encourage learning	
3.2	The partnership is periodically and meaningfully reviewed, with changes / improvements being made where necessary	The partnership has been reviewed since its creation, with changes / improvements made	The partnership has been reviewed, but it is unclear whether the review led to any changes / improvements	The partnership has not been reviewed	
3.3	Partners have made changes in order to achieve shared goals	Partners are willing to make changes to achieve shared goals	It appears that some partners are more willing to make changes to achieve shared goals than others	It is clear that partners are not willing to make changes to achieve shared goals	
3.4	The partnership has successfully engaged with potential users of services to understand their needs and there is evidence that this has added value to the work of the partnership	The partnership has successfully engaged with potential users of services to understand their needs	The partnership attempts to reach and understand the needs of potential users of services	The partnership does not attempt to reach and understand the needs of potential service users	
3.5	The partnership provides a training and induction programme for members	The partnership provides a useful information pack	The partnership signposts it members to where they can access useful information	The partnership does not provide a training and induction programme for members, and does not provide useful information or signpost members to such information	
3.6	The partnership makes use of appropriate specialist sources and networks and regularly seeks expert advice where necessary	The partnership makes use of specialist sources and sometimes takes expert advice	The partnership just makes use of appropriate specialist sources	The partnership does not make use of appropriate specialist sources and networks and is not willing to take expert advice	
3.7	The partnership considers skills gap when appointing new members and uses this information to develop training programmes for members	The partnership considers the skills gap and sometimes develops training programmes for members	The partnership considers skills gaps	The partnership does not consider skills gaps when appointing new members	

4. Managing Performance - Partners put in place necessary practices and resources, and manage change effectively

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
4.1	Partners roles, responsibilities and contributions are clearly defined and accepted by all partners	There is a good understanding of the roles, responsibilities and contributions of each of the partners	There is a basic awareness surrounding partners roles, responsibilities and contributions	There is no definition regarding partners roles, responsibilities and contributions	
4.2	Sound methodologies have been used to set objectives, targets milestones and performance indicators and plans for achieving these are based on plausible actions and are owned by those responsible. Progress against the plan is monitored and scrutinised by the Partnership Board.	Objectives, targets, milestones and performance indicators have been set and robust action plans have been produced, which are regularly monitored by the Partnership Board.	Objectives, targets, milestones and performance indicators have been set and clear action plans have been produced	Objectives, targets, milestones and performance indicators have been set, but no action plans have been produced. Or Objectives, targets, milestones and performance indicators have not been set	
4.3	There are clear and effective lines of responsibility for partnership performance, accepted by all partners	There are lines of responsibility for partnership performance, but they are not clear and effective	There are lines of responsibility for partnership performance, however there is confusion surrounding this process	There are no clear lines of responsibility for partnership performance	
4.4	There is a clear and effective process to check that all partners are effectively delivering agreed actions, with mechanisms in place to take any action where appropriate	There is a process in place to check that all partners are delivering agreed actions	There is a process in place to check that all partners are delivering agreed actions, however it is not clear whether this process is consistently used	There is no process to check that all partners are delivering agreed actions & monitoring of partners progress is not undertaken	
4.5	The partnership can demonstrate good progress on all targets set	The partnership can demonstrate good progress on the majority of targets set	The partnership can only demonstrate good progress against a small number of targets set	There is no evidence that the partnership is making progress against the targets set	
4.6	The partnership can clearly demonstrate that it is delivering improvements to quality of life	The partnership can demonstrate some improvements to quality of life	There is limited evidence to suggest any improvements to quality of life	There is no evidence that the partnership is delivering improvements to quality of life	

4. Managing Performance - Partners put in place necessary practices and resources, and manage change effectively

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
4.7	The partnership has clearly defined approach to re-prioritising activities in the light of past performance and community drivers	The partnership has re-prioritised its activities in the light of past performance and community drivers, however a clearly defined approach to this has not been established	The partnership has a defined approach to re-prioritisation, however this is not linked to past performance and community drivers	The partnership does not have an approach to re-prioritising activities in the light of past performance and community drivers	
4.8	The partnership effectively relates its work to other partnerships and organisations, avoiding duplication of effort and encouraging a holistic approach	There is evidence that the partnership has related some of its work to other partnerships and organisations	The partnership attempts to relate its work to other partnerships and organisations	The partnership does not relate its work to other partnership and organisations	
4.9	The partnership ensures that actions and targets are replicated in partner service plans where necessary to ensure delivery	Actions and targets are replicated in most partner service plans where necessary to ensure delivery	Some actions and targets are replicated in some partners service plans, but this is ad hoc	The partnership does not ensure that actions and targets are replicated in partner service plans	

5. Efficiency - Processes and procedures are efficient and effective

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
5.1	There are clearly defined and effective agenda management and administration support arrangements, which are consistently employed	There are effective agenda management and administration arrangements	There is an ineffective agenda management and administration support arrangements	There are no agenda management and administration support arrangements	
5.2	The partnership has an effective format for meetings and general communication which is agreed by all members and consistently employed	The partnership has an agreed format for meetings and general communication	There is a standard format for meetings and general communication, however this seems to be inconsistently employed	There is no agreed format for meetings and general communication	
5.3	Clear and effective information sharing protocols have been developed and implemented to inform the planning and management processes. Including how confidential information within the partnership should be treated	Clear information sharing protocols are in place to inform the planning and management processes	Information sharing protocols are in place to inform the planning and management processes, however they are inconsistently used	There are no information sharing protocols in place	

6. Resources – *The Partnership uses the resources of partners to maximum effect*

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
6.1	There is transparency in the financial resources each partner brings to the partnership	There is transparency in the financial resources of the majority of the partners	There is transparency in the financial resources of some of the partners	It is not clear what financial resources each partner brings to the partnership	
6.2	The partnership agreement clearly and effectively addresses funding, cost sharing and budgetary issues	The partnership agreement outlines an approach to funding, cost sharing and budgetary issues	The partnership agreement mentions funding, cost sharing and budgetary issues but fails to address these adequately	The partnership agreement does not address funding, cost sharing and budgetary issues	
6.3	Resources allocated are adequate to achieving partnership goals	Resources allocated are adequate to achieving the majority of the partnership goals	It is unclear whether resources allocated are adequate to achieve the partnership goals	There are inadequate resources to meet the partnership goals	
6.4	Information about the partnership's spending activities and results are available to the public and widely publicised	Information about the partnerships spending activities and results are available to the public, but are not widely publicised	Ad-hoc information relating to the partnerships spending activities and results are available to the public	Information about the partnerships spending activities and results are not available to the public.	
6.5	There is a universal understanding of the non-financial resources, talents and strengths each partner brings to the partnership and these resources, talents and strengths are fully utilised.	There is a good understanding of the non-financial resources, talents and strengths each partner brings to the partnership	There is an awareness of the non-financial resources, talents and strengths each partner brings to the partnership	There is a lack of awareness concerning the non-financial resources, talents and strengths each partner brings to the partnership	
6.7	The partnership has developed sound financial management systems. Including systems in place for approving, monitoring and reporting on the budget	The partnership has adequate financial management systems	The partnership has inadequate financial management systems in place	There are no financial management systems in place	

7. Trust – *Partners are mutually accountable, share risks and rewards fairly and support each other*

	3	2	1	0	Key Evidence
7.1	All partners are mutually accountable for their contributions, sharing responsibility for the success of the partnership	A large majority of the partnership takes responsibility for the success of the partnership. These tend to be the larger partners	It is unclear whether accountability and responsibility is equally shared among partners	There is an unequal balance of accountability and responsibility among partners	
7.2	The partnership has an excellent, supportive working relationships between partners	The partnership has good working relationships between partners	The partnership has reasonable working relationships between partners	Relationship between the partners has broken down	
7.3	All partners understand and respect differences amongst partners	The majority of partners understand and respect the differences amongst partners	There is a basic understanding among some partners regarding the differences amongst partners	There is a lack of awareness regarding the differences amongst partners	
7.4	All partners have an equal say in decision making and positively contribute in making decisions	All partners have an equal say in decision making, and the majority of partners positively contribute in making decisions	Contributions to decision making is mixed	Only a small number of partners contribute to decision making Or Partners do not have an equal say in decision making	
7.5	The partnership has developed a degree of trust which enables the partnership to challenge the performance of individual partners in delivering activities for which they are responsible	The partnership has developed a degree of trust which has enabled some challenges to the performance of individual partners in delivering activities for which they are responsible	There is evidence of the partnership developing trust but this has not yet lead to challenges regarding the performance of individual partners in delivering activities for which they are responsible	The partnership has not developed a culture of trust between partners that allows the partnership to challenge the performance of individual partners	