

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11 AND STRATEGIC WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12**

*To:* **County Council**

*Date:* **18th October 2011**

*From:* **Overview and Scrutiny Management Group**

*Electoral division(s):* **All**

*Forward Plan ref:* **N/A** *Key decision:* **No**

*Purpose:* **To report on the activities of the Council's Scrutiny Committees in 2010/11, and to outline the Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Committees' strategic work programme for 2011/12.**

*Recommendation:* **The Council is invited to discuss the Scrutiny committees' work in 2010/11, and agree the strategic work programmes for the Overview and Scrutiny Committees for 2011/12.**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contact</i></b>	
Name:	Ian Lambert	Name:	Councillor Shona Johnstone
Post:	Scrutiny and Improvement Manager	Portfolio:	Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Management Group
Email:	ian.lambert@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	<a href="mailto:shona.johnstone@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">shona.johnstone@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	01223 727918	Tel:	01223 699173

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The Council's Constitution (paragraph 6.04 (c)) states that 'Scrutiny Committees must report annually to full Council on their workings and make recommendations for future work programmes and amended working methods if appropriate'. This paper details the work of all Overview & Scrutiny Committees in a high-level, strategic format, as well as providing each Committee's strategic work programme for the coming year.
- 1.2 On 17th May 2011, the Council agreed to broaden the remit of Scrutiny Committees to encompass an 'Overview' role with immediate effect.
- 1.3 Since May the five existing Scrutiny Committees have been renamed to reflect both the new "Overview" responsibilities and the new Cabinet portfolios to which they relate. This report therefore provides the annual report for the five Scrutiny Committees that existed prior to 17th May, and the Strategic Work Programmes for the five current Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

## **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **Role and purpose of Overview and Scrutiny**

- 2.1 Scrutiny's role and purpose is to improve the delivery of public services through providing challenge both to the Cabinet and to external organisations where there are issues of public concern, through acting as a community leader and championing the concerns of the public.
- 2.2 Since May 2011 this role has been expanded to include "Overview". "Overview" in the Cambridgeshire County Council context means the ability for Overview and Scrutiny Members to review and provide "critical friend" challenge to the executive (Cabinet and/or senior officers) in respect of policies, procedures or services that are in development but have yet to be formally agreed by Cabinet.
- 2.3 Cabinet may request that Overview and Scrutiny provide overview (or indeed scrutiny) of specific areas where they believe such overview (or scrutiny) would be likely to result in improvement. However, while the Overview and Scrutiny function is likely to consider such requests, the independence of the function means that it reserves the right to refuse any such request.
- 2.4 Overview and Scrutiny Members may also independently develop policy proposals.
- 2.5 This "overview" will be conducted in accordance with the Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules and will normally be conducted in public.

2.6 The five Overview and Scrutiny Committees are:

- Children and Young People (CYP) Overview & Scrutiny Committee
- Resources and Performance (RP) O&S Committee
- Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure (EGCI) O&S Committee
- Adult, Wellbeing and Health (AWH) O&S Committee
- Safer and Stronger Communities (SSC) O&S Committee

2.7 2010/11 saw the realignment and streamlining of partnership activity within Cambridgeshire. With no Local Area Agreement and no Cambridgeshire Together Board there was also deemed to be no further need for the Joint Accountability Committee. The Scrutiny and Improvement Team continue to work with Scrutiny Managers from across Cambridgeshire to enhance partnership working and joint scrutiny.

### **The vision for Scrutiny**

2.8 The vision for Cambridgeshire's Overview and Scrutiny Committees continues to include a commitment to:

- Exercise an enhanced community role, with Committees taking an outwardly focussed view through investigating more topics which are of interest or concern to the general public.
- Actively seek the views of stakeholders and service users.
- Be flexible and responsive, demonstrating the ability to react quickly to issues.
- Actively work to scrutinise health services on behalf of the local population.
- Seek to champion the Council's obligation to support diversity and provide services in such a way so that they are accessible to diverse groups of citizens.

2.9 In the year ahead Overview and Scrutiny will seek to:

- Be aligned to Council priorities and service delivery principles;
- Act as a tool to help drive performance and efficiency;
- Be increasingly externally focussed, looking in particular at the work of partnerships and their impact on Cambridgeshire;
- Play an effective role in the strong governance of the organisation by remaining alert and responsive to internal concerns, raising challenge and holding to account where appropriate;
- Work as efficiently and effectively as possible through joint scrutiny arrangements, where appropriate.

- 2.10 All Overview and Scrutiny work will continue to address inequities in access to services, and seek to ensure that people who experience social or economic disadvantage have access to appropriate services.

### **3.0 THE FUTURE OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

- 3.1 In addition to the move to an Overview and Scrutiny function there are a number of other national and local drivers that will help to shape the future priorities for the function in the future.

#### **Efficiency / Value for Money**

- 3.2 The financial pressures on Cambridgeshire's public services are well documented. Decision makers will have to make tough choices about priority services which will lead to significant reductions or even decommissioning in some cases. There will also be major initiatives to redesign or transform the ways in which services are delivered.
- 3.3 The impact of these decisions will be significant and will leave a lasting legacy. The O&S role is therefore more important than ever in improving the quality of decision making by influencing and shaping decisions and holding those responsible to account. In many ways, meeting this challenge will involve building upon and intensifying ongoing O&S of the Integrated Planning Process. For example, SMG could decide to focus on examining the impact of potential or agreed service changes from the perspective of key stakeholders, particularly service users, so that O&S can make evidence based recommendations to decision makers.

#### **Joint Working**

- 3.4 The Council O&S function can be viewed as part of a 'web of accountability', as there are groups within several organisations which are involved in promoting good governance across the area, such as Town, Parish, City and District Councils, Police and Fire Authorities and Local Involvement Networks.
- 3.5 The O&S function has already developed linkages nationally (including representation at the Centre for Public Scrutiny), regionally (e.g. an officer regional network) and locally (e.g. cross Authority Member Led reviews). However, there is scope to develop this work in order to maximise the value for money from collective O&S resources and their outputs, for example, by agreeing joint work programmes.
- 3.6 Tangible examples include joint pieces of scrutiny work with both district councils (Educational Attainment) and with Peterborough City Council (Domestic Violence) as well as joint training events and the inclusion of Peterborough City Council colleagues on the Cambridgeshire scrutiny officers network.

## **Partnership O&S**

- 3.7 Councillors have a community leadership role which entails taking a broad interest in all services relevant to their constituents. This has been understood by O&S for several years and there are numerous examples of investigations into issues outside the sole remit of the County Council. Nonetheless, there is a balance to be struck in determining O&S's focus in future, which SMG will need to consider.

## **Localism**

- 3.8 The Coalition Governments' Localism Bill is currently making its way through Parliament. A key objective of the Bill is to devolve power to the local level so that people have a greater say over services. O&S can respond to this approach in several ways, for example, by stimulating greater public involvement in the O&S process and by reviewing issues of concern raised by the public.

## **Self Regulation**

- 3.9 The Coalition Government aims to reduce the pressure of external inspection regimes on Local Authorities, for example by removing National Indicator targets and the Comprehensive Area Assessment. Instead, the new emphasis is on local people holding Local Authorities to account for the delivery of services that match their needs and requirements. O&S Members are ideally placed to examine whether these new performance arrangements are fully aligned with community expectations. O&S investigations could also be triggered by under performance, in order to provide constructive recommendations for improvement. O&S itself will also be part of the Council's approach to self regulation.

## **Police and Crime Panels**

- 3.10 The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill includes proposals to abolish Police Authorities and create Police Commissioners with the power to appoint and dismiss Chief Constables, set local police objectives and budgets. Accountability will be provided in the form of Police and Crime Panels, comprised of Councillors and co-optees. It will be important for the Council's 'crime and disorder' O&S responsibilities, currently exercised by the Safer and Stronger Communities O&S Committee, to be coordinated with the new Police and Crime Panels.

## **Health and Wellbeing Boards**

- 3.11 The Health and Social Care Bill includes provisions requiring Local Authorities to establish Health and Wellbeing Boards to co-ordinate commissioning across NHS (including new GP cluster arrangements), social care and public health services. This represents a major shake

up of health and social care arrangements that have a bearing on the Council's Health and Adult Social Care and Children and Young People O&S arrangements, potentially adding significantly to their workloads.

#### **4.0 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT GROUP (O&SMG) ACTIVITY**

4.1 The work of the O&SMG (formerly SMG) has largely concentrated on two key issues:

- The O&S function's response to the drivers for change identified above and the move to Overview;
- Overview and Scrutiny of the Integrated Plan

##### Responses to Change

4.2 On 17th May 2011, the Council agreed to broaden the remit of Scrutiny Committees to encompass an 'Overview' role with immediate effect. It was recognised that further work was required to identify how the new Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Committees would operate in practice and the Council commissioned the renamed Overview and Scrutiny Management Group (O&SMG) to undertake a review, to focus on:

- The operating principles to govern O&S arrangements
- The O&S procedure rules
- The Constitutional changes associated with the above.

A cross party Review Group including O&S Committee Chairmen, opposition group leaders and independent Members held three workshops to consider the future role of Overview and Scrutiny given the drivers identified in Section 3 above and to make recommendations to Council. This work is the subject of a separate report being considered by the County Council today.

##### Overview and Scrutiny of the Integrated Plan

4.3 At its meeting of 3rd September 2010 Scrutiny Management Group (SMG) considered a proposal for the effective engagement of scrutiny in the Integrated Planning Process (IPP). SMG endorsed this proposal and agreed to recommend it to each of the five Scrutiny Committees. SMG also decided that it would convene a task and finish Scrutiny "Visioning Group". The role of this group was:

**“to consider, challenge and offer recommendations in respect of the strategic changes to the role, shape and priorities of the County Council which are being considered as part of the Integrated Planning process.”**

- 4.4 The Members of the Visioning Group developed a series of key messages for Cabinet/Strategic Management Team to consider. It is recognised that some of the messages will also be covered by elements of the IP scrutiny work undertaken by the task and finish groups of the Scrutiny Committees.
- 4.5 These key messages related to Commissioning, Prevention, Localism and Collaboration. They were presented by the Chairman of SMG to an informal meeting of Cabinet where they considered as part of the development of the overall IP.
- 4.6 A similar "Visioning Group" has been established to take a strategic approach to the Overview and Scrutiny of the 2012/13 IP.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ACTIVITY**

### **5.0 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (CYP OSC)**

- 5.1 The CYP OSC has moved its attention to children and young people's issues more generally, rather than focusing specifically on the CYPS Executive Directorate of the County Council. The Committee continues to prioritise child poverty issues.
- 5.2 This year's work has taken place in the context of a move to overview and scrutiny, which has involved a greater emphasis on policy development prior to Cabinet decision. This development has led to the commissioning of several pieces of overview work, on subjects including:
  - School Organisation Plan
  - Placement Strategy
  - Special Educational Needs (SEN) Strategy
- 5.3 Member led reviews have focussed on educational attainment in Fenland, which has traditionally been lower than that of the rest of the county, and children and young people's services in new communities. The Fenland educational attainment review was undertaken as a joint project with Fenland District Council scrutiny and the New Communities review involved a member from South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 5.4 The Committee is also involved in ongoing overview and scrutiny of developing proposals around the library service and the Cambridgeshire Future Transport project.
- 5.5 Rapporteurs – or subject champions – have also been appointed by the Committee to specialise on the following topics of interest to the Committee:

- Academies / free schools
- Financial health of schools
- Munro review outcomes in Cambridgeshire
- Field review outcomes in Cambridgeshire
- Early years provision

## **Safeguarding**

- 5.6 The authority and its partners' efforts in relation to the safeguarding of children and young people is a significant focal point for the committee.
- 5.7 Specific work undertaken to scrutinise safeguarding measures include continued monitoring of the Integrated Children's System (ICS), which is the main database used to record details of children and young people at risk.
- 5.8 Over two meetings the committee tracked issues with the system including the cost of updates from Capita, staff attitudes towards and buy-in to the system, and the IT training needs of staff, many of whom were unfamiliar with the operation of the system and IT processes more generally. The rationalisation and simplification of the Looked After Children Exemplars of the ICS was also considered.
- 5.9 The Safeguarding and Looked After Children Action Plan, which arose following an Ofsted inspection, has also been tracked by the Committee with a view to driving improvement.
- 5.10 Monitoring the implementation of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) by the entire children's workforce has also been a major concern of the Committee. CAF is intended to be a single process used by all agencies to ensure that a single framework is used to address the needs of vulnerable children and young people.
- 5.11 However, the task of implementing CAF county-wide is significant, and the Committee have attempted to support the process through the provision of critical friend challenge.
- 5.12 For the second time, the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) Chair attended the Committee to present the LSCB's annual report. Committee members constructively challenged the Board on its work and paid particular attention to the subject of Serious Case Reviews and the lessons and actions arising from them.



## **Other matters of concern to the Committee**

- 5.13 Coalition government policy in relation to children and young people's services has been a matter of great interest to the Committee. Shortly after the general election the Committee received an update from the Executive Director: CYPS on the latest developments in this regard. This prompted overview and scrutiny work on child poverty (following the release of the Field Review) and, most recently, work on the developing SEN Strategy.
- 5.14 As with previous years, the Committee has taken an interest in the anti-bullying efforts of the council and its partners. The relevant CYPS Area Manager and several young people joined the Committee to discuss the council's response. This was timed to coincide with National Anti-Bullying Week, and helped to raise awareness of this important issue.
- 5.15 IP scrutiny was undertaken in February, with the proposals for CYPS being subjected to the critical friend challenge of the Committee.
- 5.16 The progress of the St. Neots Learning Partnership - a federation of Longsands and Ernulf Academies – has also been of interest to the Committee following the call-in in February 2010 of a Cabinet decision to support the then proposals for the federation.
- 5.17 In September 2011, one academic year on, the Committee revisited the issue of the federation by holding its meeting at Ernulf Academy. A Task and Finish Group of the Committee had visited the Academy a week before the full Committee met, where they met with the Executive Principal and his management team, pupils, staff members and Governors.
- 5.18 The meeting of the full Committee at Ernulf was an opportunity for the entire membership to meet in public to receive the report of the Task and Finish Group, to hear directly from pupils and to question the Chair of Governors, the Executive Principal and his management team and staff members.
- 5.19 The scrutiny of the federation was undertaken successfully and the Committee wishes to extend thanks to the St. Neots Learning Partnership for supporting the scrutiny process. Thanks are also extended to the county council members, officers and partners that have contributed to a year of successful overview and scrutiny.

### **Work programme**

- Anti-bullying
- Supporting Families Consultation

- Attainment (GCSE)
- IP Scrutiny
- Children's Trust future arrangements, including link to Health & Wellbeing Board
- Ofsted inspection of contact, referral and assessment action plan

## **6.0. CORPORATE ISSUES/ RESOURCE AND PERFORMANCE O&S COMMITTEE**

- 6.1 The Resources and Performance O&S Committee primarily focuses on the Council's corporate functions and their role in helping the Council to provide services that offer good value for money.
- 6.2 Since the beginning of the 2010/11 financial year, the Committee has examined a wide range of issues including:
- Implications of central Government decisions on the Council's finances
  - Integrated Planning proposals from the Cabinet and the Liberal Democrat Group
  - Local Government Shared Services (LGSS)
  - Property management, particularly regarding the County Farms Estate
  - Procurement and contract management across the Council
  - Distribution of Communications resources across the Council
  - Strategic Performance management
  - Cabinet vision and priorities, following the formation of the current Cabinet

### Implications of Central Government decisions on the Council's Finances

- 6.3 The Committee examined the potential implications on the Council of the Coalition Government's Manifesto and Emergency Budget. Members were advised that £6.3 million would need to be saved during 2010/11 in addition to the savings already agreed in the IP. The Committee therefore considered how the Council could meet this savings requirement through staff restructuring, reviewing staff pay, transformation of services and increased partnership working through the 'Making Cambridgeshire Count' initiative.
- 6.4 The Committee decided to submit a report to Cabinet to recommend that:
- 1) A review be conducted about the implications of opting out of the national negotiation process for non-schools based Local

Government Employees, as this would enable the Council to determine rates of pay for these employees

- 2) A review should be conducted about the feasibility of reducing salaries of higher paid employees
  - 3) There should be improved communication across all Council services about the support for fundamental redesign, or transformation of Council services
- 6.5 Cabinet decided not to support recommendation 1 at this time, although agreed to keep this issue under review. Recommendation 2 was not supported. Recommendation 3 was agreed.

#### Integrated Planning Process

- 6.6 The Committee undertook detailed examination of the Administration IP proposals in formal Committee sessions and through informal meeting between Committee Members and Corporate Directors, in order to influence the IP during its development. The results of these meetings, and the examination of the Liberal Democrat proposals were reported to full Council in February 2011.

#### Local Government Shared Services (LGSS)

- 6.7 The Committee has kept a watching brief on LGSS since its inception, in recognition of its potential to deliver significant 'back office' savings to the Council. This year was no different as the Committee established a Member led review group to scrutinise the business case for the formal establishment of the LGSS partnership. This review was conducted jointly with Members from Northamptonshire County Council, which proved to be an effective means of pooling scrutiny expertise to provide challenge to the business case.
- 6.8 The Committee initiated the Member led review following in depth scrutiny of the Outline Business Case in April 2010. The discussion focussed on governance models, costs and savings projections, legal issues and risks associated with the formation of the partnership. This provided the basis for further questioning by the Member led review group which resulted in a report to Cabinet in July 2010. In summary, this concluded that there was a sound business case for establishing the LGSS partnership, but that a number of checks and balances needed to be introduced to ensure adequate accountability of the LGSS partnership to Cabinet and Scrutiny.
- 6.9 Cabinet endorsed these recommendations.
- 6.10 More recently, the Committee, and its equivalent at Northamptonshire County Council, have formed a sub group, comprising Members from both Committees, to lead O&S of the LGSS Joint Committee. The sub group has met once and will shortly agree a full work programme for the forthcoming year.

## Property Management

- 6.11 The Committee reviewed progress with the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) Programme and the Making Assets Count (MAC) project in July 2010, March 2011 and July 2011. BUPA is focussed on the Council's property portfolio, whilst MAC is designed to make better use of all public sector property assets across Cambridgeshire. There are therefore close relationships between the two initiatives.
- 6.12 Whilst the Committee recognised the potential benefits of BUPA to the Council, particularly in terms of generating receipts from the sale of surplus assets, Members did have some concerns regarding the:
- Costs of the programme, and the assumptions behind the projected savings, as they were based on current market values. The Committee felt that the programme was not viable without a turnaround in the market
  - Pace of the programme. Members felt that the programme should be curtailed until market conditions improved
  - Programme objectives. Members felt that there was a need to define and tightly focus the objectives of the programme
  - Business Case. Members felt that there were too many estimates in the reports they received, in terms of savings and costs.
- 6.13 The Committee made the following comments about the MAC project:
- Members were supportive of the objectives of the project, and felt that its scope should be expanded to include the investment estate (such as the County Farms Estate) as well as operational assets
  - Members were less supportive of the idea of a joint property company, pooling all partners' assets. Concern was expressed that tensions could arise for example over profit-sharing, if the company disposed of a high-value asset that had previously belonged to a single partner. However, the Committee were prepared to reconsider more detailed proposals about this idea utilising their new 'overview' role
  - Members agreed that the MAC initiative should seek to maximise opportunities arising from planned housing and growth, for example making representations through the planning process for land belonging to the Council and other partners to be allocated for development. It was noted that other bodies such as the Church and Cambridge University were taking a very effective, very long-term approach to land sales, which the County Council and its public sector partners could emulate.

## County Farms Estate Review

- 6.14 Following scrutiny of the BUPA programme, the Committee decided to focus on the County Farms Estate (CFE), to assess its performance in

recent years and future viability. This resulted in a report to Cabinet in May 2011. In summary, Members found that:

- The CFE is a well managed asset which has consistently achieved its objectives and has strong prospects for the future. They found that the CFE offers excellent value for money and supplies a regular and significant income stream for the Council.

6.15 The Committee recommended that Cabinet support the following:

- Retain the Estate
- Financial Returns Must be the Top Priority During the Current Economic Situation
- Encourage Purchase of Land
- Ensure Proceeds from the Estate Continue to Support Council Services

6.16 Cabinet agreed to retain the Estate, and supported most aspects of the other recommendations.

#### Procurement and Contract Management

6.17 The Council spends in excess of £300 m per annum on goods, services and works, so small percentage savings in this area can reap significant rewards. The Committee therefore commissioned a Member Led Review which issued its findings to Cabinet in June 2010.

6.18 In essence, Members noted some strengths across the Council, but felt that procurement lacked strategic direction and needed to be reinvigorated. The eleven recommendations were grouped under three key headings which Members felt needed to be addressed from the outset as part of the new Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) partnership with Northamptonshire County Council. These headings were: leadership arrangements; skills development and deployment; systems and processes.

6.19 Cabinet responded positively to the recommendations, and the Committee followed up on progress in May 2011 and found that whilst there had been delays in some areas, largely due to the implementation of LGSS, it was encouraging that the recommendations had been incorporated into a new procurement strategy for the Authority, and that significant savings were expected from the adoption of the 'category management' approach, which had been a key recommendation.

#### Distribution of Communications resources across the Council

6.20 The Committee received reports in September and December 2010 about a communications review that had been initiated. The Committee noted that significant progress had been made in

rationalising publications, and thereby reduce costs, and that officers were examining the balance between corporate communications staff and those employed in other service areas.

- 6.21 The Committee felt that the review was necessary and felt that communications resources should be 'centralised' (i.e. retained in the corporate centre of the Council). They requested further updates about the review, which is still in progress. This is therefore a topic that the Committee is likely to return to in the near future.

#### Strategic Performance Management

- 6.22 This has been a key topic for the Committee since its adoption of the 'overview' role. Members felt that the Council's performance management arrangements needed significant revision, and provided guidance to officers on how to modernise the top level performance measures managed by Cabinet.

- 6.23 This resulted in a series of proposals to Cabinet in September 2011:

- Cabinet should monitor a small number of indicators that are described in Plain English (10 – 15 indicators overall was suggested as an ideal amount)
- The majority of indicators should be tailored to the Council's own services
- Indicators should reflect those areas of most interest to residents, focusing on satisfaction, treatment and outcomes
- Indicators should be quantitative wherever possible
- Red (used in the Red / Amber / Green system) should be consistently applied and calibrated to reflect real problems
- Performance reporting should not be an end in itself
- Performance measures have two main audiences, internal and external
- Measures should be simple and easy to understand
- Measures for an external audience should focus on outcomes and issues the public had an interest in, and should be an opportunity to improve communications with residents
- Cambridgeshire should focus primarily on its own performance rather than comparison with neighbours.

- 6.24 Cabinet supported these proposals.

#### Cabinet Vision and Priorities

- 6.25 In September 2011, the Committee invited the new Leader of the Council, and the Chief Executive, to answer questions about the Cabinet's vision and priorities. Committee Members commented on a variety of issues, including:

- The 'Open for Business' slogan. Some Members felt that all areas of the country would advocate this approach. The same Members also felt that the Council itself should not be thought of as a business, particularly with regard to taking risks
- The application of 'localism'. There were some concerns raised that this could entail power being devolved to other organisations, such as Parish Councils, without the devolution of necessary resources
- The costs of borrowing. Members had some concerns about the prospect of increasing borrowing (e.g. for superfast broadband) due to the costs of servicing this additional debt
- The business case for the superfast broadband project. Members agreed that they would like to be involved in this project as it develops

6.26 The Committee agreed that they would invite the Leader and Chief Executive to another meeting in six months time.

Resources and Performance Committee's Work Programme for 2011/12

6.27 The Committee has agreed to focus on the following topics during the remainder of 2011/12:

- LGSS
- The Council's approach to service transformation
- Zero Based Budgeting
- The Invest to Transform Fund
- Integrated Planning Proposals
- The Council's input into partnership arrangements (e.g. Making Cambridgeshire Count)
- Pension Fund Management
- Council Vision and Priorities - with Councillor Clarke and the Chief Executive

**7.0 ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE O&S COMMITTEE**

7.1 The Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure O&S Committee focuses on the services provided by the Council's Environment Services Directorate.

7.2 Since the beginning of the 2010/11 financial year, the Committee has focussed on the following topics:

- Integrated Planning proposals for Environment Services
- Flood Risk Management
- Climate Change and Environment Strategy
- Cambridgeshire Guided Busway

- Cambridgeshire Horizons
- Highways (contract with Atkins and a Member Led Review regarding highways maintenance)
- Street lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI)
- Approved Traders Scheme
- Wind Farm Developments on the County Farms Estate

#### Integrated Planning Process

- 7.3 The Committee undertook detailed examination of the Administration's IP proposals in formal Committee sessions and through informal meetings between Committee Members and Service Directors, in order to influence the IP during its development. The results of these meetings were reported to full Council in February 2011.

#### Flood Risk Management

- 7.4 The Council is a 'Lead Local Flood Authority' and is required to report actions that have been taken to manage flood risk to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). There is also a requirement upon the Council to ensure that these actions are scrutinised annually, and this role is performed by the Committee.
- 7.5 The Council's status as a Lead Local Flood Authority is a relatively recent change, and the Committee first scrutinised progress in April 2010. At that point Members felt that the Council was ahead of most other areas in terms of the governance arrangements that had been setup, but they felt that the Council lacked the necessary skills and resources to deliver against the new responsibilities.
- 7.6 The Committee reviewed progress again in May 2011, this time focusing on Surface Water Management Plans and the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment. Members again highlighted funding as a key barrier to further development, leading to the following recommendation to Cabinet (which was agreed):

*The Committee believes that water management is a serious, strategic issue that requires long term planning and funding commitments from all statutory bodies and third parties. Sources of funding need to be identified as a priority, for example through:*

- *Responsible management of developers through bonds and developer contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy*
- *Tax Increment Financing*
- *Match funding from Government*



## Climate Change and Environment Strategy

- 7.7 The Committee reviewed progress in implementing the Climate Change and Environment Strategy in July 2010. Members also raised queries about the potential costs to the Council arising from the Carbon Reduction Commitment.
- 7.8 The discussion focussed on the need to change the culture of the organisation so that energy efficiency became ingrained in day to day working.
- 7.9 The Committee decided to issue the following recommendations to Cabinet:
- 1) Bring the Carbon Management and Climate Change plans together
  - 2) Appoint an Executive Director to champion the strategy across the organisation
  - 3) Transfer the £2m efficiency fund to the Executive Director Champion
- 7.10 The second recommendation was accepted. The first and third recommendations were rejected.

## Cambridgeshire Guided Busway

- 7.11 The Committee debated the issues associated with the late opening of the Busway and disputes with the contractor.

## Cambridgeshire Horizons

- 7.12 In recent years, the Committee had undertaken an annual review of Cambridgeshire Horizons' role in promoting and coordinating the development of new settlements across the county. As it had been agreed that funding for Cambridgeshire Horizons would cease, the focus of the discussion was on ensuring that successor arrangements were in place.
- 7.13 The Chairman advised that the Committee:
- was pleased with the delivery that Horizons had undertaken over the last six years, and the number of notable achievements;
  - noted the impact of the economic downturn and the related reduction in housing completions;
  - noted particular initiatives on affordable housing, new ways to fund infrastructure, and the Quality Panel, and the Committee was keen that these were retained in some way;
  - agreed that affordable housing was key for business to flourish in the county;

- looked forward to the County Council receiving a proportion of funding to promote growth within the county;
- was particularly keen to encourage initiatives such as the Quality Panel and activities promoting a low carbon economy, and initiatives which embedded a good quality of life;
- supported the declared focus of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for environmentally sustainable economic growth in the county, providing a suitable environment for world class employers and employees;
- was keen to ensure that the work of the LEP was scrutinised, which was an area for the Scrutiny Management Group to examine;
- asked the County Council to support Horizons' good work on Affordable Housing

### Highways Contract

- 7.14 The Scrutiny Committee undertakes an annual review of the performance of the Highways Service Contract, which the County Council developed in partnership with Atkins, to form Cambridgeshire Highways in 2006.
- 7.15 The Committee had previously made several recommendations, which had been accepted, including the need to improve benchmarking of costs, investigate high costs and reduce carbon emissions.
- 7.16 In September 2011, the Committee added the following recommendations:
- greater Member involvement in contract negotiation arrangements
  - benchmarking needs to be improved, although it was recognised work was already underway
  - the specification for repairs and new works should use the right materials in the first instance

### Highways Maintenance Review

- 7.17 During Scrutiny of the Integrated Plan 2010/11, Members found that funding levels for highways maintenance was likely to result in deterioration across all roads and footpaths for the foreseeable future. The Committee therefore setup a group to examine the potential to reverse this trend.
- 7.18 The group developed an interim report which was supported by the Committee in September 2011. Members recommended to Cabinet that<sup>1</sup>:
- A long term, realistic highways maintenance strategy should be developed

---

<sup>1</sup> This list represents some of the key recommendations within the report.

- There should be a greater focus on 'asset management' approaches rather than repairing the worst first. However, there should be a short term ring fenced fund to tackle 'red issues'
- There should be a review of Highways funding (as much of the notional allocation from Government had been spent on other services)
- Costs could be reduced through greater collaboration with other Local Authorities, e.g. through LGSS
- A communications strategy should be developed to manage public expectations in the event that the asset management approach is adopted

### Street Lighting PFI

7.19 The group conducted a short review of the business case for the street lighting PFI, which has subsequently been agreed. The group were supportive of the contract, but made three recommendations to Cabinet in January 2011:

- 1) That the street lighting policy (i.e. the number of columns to be replaced and serviced under the contract) should be agreed prior to the contract, as it would be difficult to reduce numbers after commencement of the contract.
- 2) That Internal Audit should review the inflation assumptions for the life of the contract (2.5%) as Members felt that this was a low inflation figure. The consequences of under estimating this figure would be higher than budgeted costs.
- 3) The nature of the funding from Government is that the Council will, in effect, receive a surplus in the early years, but this will be offset by higher costs in the later years. Cabinet were therefore recommended to retain the surplus in order to pay the costs in later years.

7.20 Cabinet noted the first recommendation and rejected the second and third recommendations.

### Approved Traders Scheme

7.21 The Committee reviewed proposals from the Trading Standards service to establish a web based 'approved traders' scheme which would highlight to the public a wide range of businesses that the Council felt able to endorse.

7.22 The Committee were initially sceptical about the scheme, as many Members felt that Trading Standards should focus on tackling rogue trading rather than endorsing good businesses. However, after further deliberation the Committee agreed:

- 1) that the Trading Standards Service should look to establish an approved trader scheme as set out in the report;

- 2) that the [www.buywithconfidence.gov.uk](http://www.buywithconfidence.gov.uk) scheme should be the preferred scheme;
- 3) that the launch and marketing of the scheme were operational matters for officers to determine;
- 4) that the scheme should have a simple message, e.g. “this is where the Head of Trading Standards would prefer to shop”.

#### Wind Farm Developments on the County Farms Estate

- 7.23 In September 2011, the Cabinet agreed to defer the development of wind farms on the County Farms Estate. This decision was called in by three Members of the Committee and considered later that same month.
- 7.24 The Committee heard from the Members who had called in the decision, a County Farms tenant who had invested in feasibility studies for a wind turbine on his holding, a Local Member and the Leader of the Council.
- 7.25 The Committee voted in favour of referring the decision back to Cabinet because they felt that the deferral of all wind farm development was unduly restrictive. Members therefore recommended that Cabinet should judge wind farm proposals on a case by case basis, and that guidance should be developed to support this process.
- 7.26 At the time of writing, the Committee's report has not been considered by Cabinet.

#### Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Committee's Work Programme for 2011/12

- 7.27 The Committee has agreed to focus on the following topics during the remainder of 2011/12:
- Integrated Planning proposals for Environment Services
  - The Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
  - Park and Ride contract
  - Waste PFI Contract Management
  - Cambridge Transport Strategy and Market Town Strategy
  - Options for Implementing the duties of Sustainable Drainage System Approving Body
  - Heavy Commercial Vehicle Management Strategy
  - New Communities (e.g. Northstowe)
  - Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative follow up
  - Winter Maintenance service
  - Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (reviewing implementation and legal issues)

## **8.0 ADULTS, WELLBEING AND HEALTH O&S COMMITTEE**

### **Introduction**

- 8.1 In all its work, including in its recommendations, the Committee has sought to give particular attention to:
- Identifying where resources can be used most effectively to achieve positive outcomes, including through partnership working between the health service, County and District Councils.
  - Addressing geographical inequities in access to services
  - Ensuring that service users, including those who experience social or economic disadvantage, have access to appropriate services, and that their views are taken into account in service developments.
  - Promoting improvements in quality of service and in effective use of resources in adult social care.
  - Working collaboratively with Cambridgeshire Local Involvement Network, district councils and other agencies on issues of common concern
- 8.2 District Council co-opted members made a major contribution to the work of the Committee, including member-led reviews, other task and finish groups and liaison with NHS organisations.

### **Adult Social Care and Integrated Services**

- 8.3 The Committee maintained a strong focus on Adult Social Care, with particular emphasis on the effectiveness of partnership working to provide integrated health and social care services for older people.
- 8.4 Members conducted a major review of dementia services, which focused on local implementation of Objective 4 of the 2009 National Dementia Strategy, 'Easy access to care, support and advice after diagnosis'. This had been locally identified as an area requiring significant work, where intervention could have a positive impact on the quality of life of the person with dementia and their carer, and be cost effective. The review group included co-opted representatives of Cambridgeshire Local Involvement Network (LINK).
- 8.5 Recommendations, which were informed by interviews with carers, users, GPs and other health and social care professionals, were agreed by Cabinet and NHS bodies in September 2011. They focused on ways of improving access to information and support at diagnosis and throughout all stages of the condition, effective interagency working to ensure people consistently received co-ordinated services, support for GPs in responding to patients with dementia, and training for residential and community based care staff.
- 8.6 Linked to this review, the Committee considered a progress report on provision of training for care home staff in November 2010.

- 8.7 The Committee will follow up NHS and County Council implementation of the review recommendations during 2011/12.
- 8.8 The Committee has reviewed Adult Social Care performance against its Annual Performance Assessment and Action Plan at regular intervals throughout the year, with a focus on exception reporting. Areas of challenge have included the steps being taken through inter-agency working to reduce delayed discharge; care arrangements post-discharge; the rate of implementation of self-directed support and of reviews of existing users and carers, including mental health service users, and waiting times for assessment.
- 8.9 Management of the older people's pooled budget has been an ongoing concern. In April 2010, following the overspend in the 2009/10 Older People's pooled budget, the Committee held a single-issue meeting to examine what weaknesses in the management and financial monitoring of the pooled budget arrangements had been identified, and how these were being dealt with. The Committee considered what progress had been made with the management and monitoring arrangements in July 2010.
- 8.10 Members considered the issues arising from a projected overspend on the 2010/11 pooled budget in September 2010.
- 8.11 In September 2010, the Committee examined plans for alternative provision for the users of three older people's day centres in Fulbourn, St Neots and Toft that were being closed by the provider agency.

### **County Council Integrated Plan**

- 8.12 The Committee considered those aspects of the Councils Integrated Plan that related to Adult Support Services, including integrated health and social care. Members examined in depth the plans for a joint Council and NHS review of block contracts for older people's day provision. Recommendations related to the importance of a clear vision and plan for the future of day services, based on principles of personalisation and choice; understanding variations in unit cost and level of usage, transport provision, provision for people with dementia, and effective contract management.
- 8.13 Members were very concerned at the potential negative impact of the budget reductions on service users and carers, particularly the reduction in the RAS (resource allocation system) figure for new users, and the risk to the viability and quality of service of independent providers. They questioned the deliverability of the savings within the timescale proposed, particularly in relation to the pace of reablement, the lack of an alternative plan, and the potential impact on service users, and the NHS, if the savings were not achieved.

- 8.14 In view of this, the Committee recommended the setting up of effective arrangements for monitoring the impact of the budget decisions.
- 8.15 The Committee is regularly reviewing progress against the integrated plan objectives for 2011/12, in relation to savings, transformation and service performance, including information on the impact on service users, and how this is being obtained.

## **Health**

### **National Developments**

- 8.16 Responding to the changes to the health service proposed in the 'Equity and Excellence' White Paper of July 2010, and subsequent legislation, was a major area of the Committee's work.
- 8.17 The Committee responded directly to the White Paper consultation, and contributed to the Council's response. Key issues included retaining the independence of scrutiny from the executive function; the capacity, effectiveness and public accountability of GP consortia, including being subject to scrutiny; ensuring GP consortia, local government and other agencies work together; ensuring equity of healthcare provision; and a clear statutory framework and powers for the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- 8.18 Members met with individual GP commissioning clusters throughout the County, to discuss common issues and the role of scrutiny, and made links with the GP Senate. GP Senate leads now take part in discussion of specific scrutiny issues.
- 8.19 The Committee took part in a Centre for Public Scrutiny project during July and August 2011 which provided consultancy support for members to establish their relationship with the emerging shadow Health and Wellbeing Board. The Committee will take this forward in the coming year.
- 8.20 Over the past year, the Committee has held information seminars on GP commissioning and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

### **Healthcare in Cambridgeshire**

- 8.21 The Committee responded to proposals for changes to Older People's Mental Health services in Huntingdonshire and Fenland, recommending that both inpatient care and the proposed shift to more community based provision was properly resourced and sustainable, that there was adequate day and respite provision, and effective transport arrangements for people to access it. Members succeeded in increasing the level of funding set aside for travel costs for Cambridgeshire residents visiting relatives who were inpatients in Peterborough.

- 8.22 In March 2011, the Committee examined the emerging themes for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) plans for the provision of mental health services for 2011-14, following this up by dialogue with CPFT and NHS Cambridgeshire about emerging proposals for mental health services in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Formal scrutiny of the proposals, jointly with Peterborough City Council Overview and Scrutiny members, will take place in late 2011.
- 8.23 Throughout the year, through ongoing dialogue with NHS Cambridgeshire and Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, the Committee has monitored issues arising from the proposed franchise of the management of Hinchingsbrooke hospital, the quality and sustainability of services at the hospital, and the continued delay in the Government decision on the franchise award. This will be taken forward in 2011/12
- 8.24 The Committee examined NHS Cambridgeshire plans for 2011/12, alongside its consideration of the County Council integrated plan, highlighting concerns about the deliverability of the plan, and the implications of the move to GP-led commissioning for continuity of care.
- 8.25 The Committee responded to NHS Cambridgeshire's pharmaceutical needs assessment, recommending that further work be done to identify gaps in the provision and accessibility of pharmacy services. It called for an action plan to address this, which would take account of the availability of public transport, and ensure that services currently provided by pharmacies were better publicised.
- 8.26 Members examined plans for changes to neonatal intensive care services, highlighting the importance of access to transport to visit babies in hospital, information and support for families, bereavement support, and support for vulnerable mothers and babies. This will be followed up in late 2011/early 2012.
- 8.27 Members took part in initial discussions on outline proposals for stroke services for Huntingdonshire residents, and will respond to the public consultation currently being undertaken
- 8.28 The Committee considered the implications of cuts in nursing staffing at Addenbrooke's Hospital, and examined interim plans for dermatology services at Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, and initial plans for the longer term redesign of the dermatology service across the County.
- 8.29 The Committee reviewed progress in implementing changes to continuing care and inpatient rehabilitation in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, highlighting the demand on the rehabilitation service from people with complex needs, and the lack of local neuro-rehabilitation.



- 8.30 Members followed up the outcomes of its 2009 review of access to healthcare for people with learning disabilities, and the implementation of changes to health services in South Fenland
- 8.31 Committee representatives have met regularly with officers of NHS Cambridgeshire, Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust, CPFT, and local managers of the East of England Ambulance Trust to share information and plans and explore issues in an informal setting. There is regular liaison with Cambridgeshire LINK.

### **Work programme for 2011/12**

- 8.32 The committee will focus on the following topics during the remainder of 2011/12

### **Overarching/Strategic Issues**

1. Adult Social Care: Reviewing progress against the Integrated Plan 2011/12, with particular reference to:
  - a) achievement of performance and outcome based targets
  - b) the impact on service users and carers
  - c) the budgetary position
2. Adult Social care: Integrated Plan 2012/13
3. NHS Cambridgeshire – Position and emerging plans for the Financial Year 2011/12 and 2012/13

### **Responding to health and social care changes**

4. Development of Overview and Scrutiny of the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board
5. Developing relationships with and scrutiny of emerging clinical commissioning consortia
6. Developing relationship with emerging local Healthwatch

### **Specific Services**

7. Mental Health: Proposed Service Changes 2011-14
8. Scrutiny review of Dementia Services: Follow up implementation of NHS and County Council implementation of recommendations
9. Adult Social Care: Review of home care services
10. Hinchingsbrooke Hospital: Franchise and future plans

11. Future of acute stroke services for Huntingdonshire residents
12. Reconfiguration of neonatal intensive care services
13. NHS/County Council review of day centres for older people

## **9.0 SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES O&S COMMITTEE**

- 9.1 The newly formed SSC OSC has enjoyed a successful first year. The Committee has pioneered a way of working more focussed upon non-committee based work. To meet this objective, the Committee meets formally four times per year and commissions a greater quantity of task and finish group and member led review work.
- 9.2 The Committee made a major early impact with very successful reviews of Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and the training of professionals dealing with alcohol misusers. The IOM review was a particularly strong piece of external scrutiny, focussing almost exclusively on agencies other than the county council, predominantly in the field of criminal justice.
- 9.3 The alcohol misuse review focused on a core function of the county council's Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT), and represented a strong example of internal scrutiny of the council's services.
- 9.4 The latest member led review commissioned by the Committee is on the subject of Domestic Abuse, and is a joint endeavour undertaken in partnership with scrutiny members from Huntingdonshire and Fenland District Councils. An interim report of the review has been issued, and was met with a very positive response from Cabinet. A final report of the review group will be issued in the New Year.
- 9.5 The Committee has appointed rapporteurs, or subject champions, to the following subjects:
  - Localism
  - Libraries and the Library Service Review
  - Integrated Offender Management
- 9.6 Rapporteurs will specialise in these subjects and will become the Committee's experts on them.
- 9.7 The Committee has taken a particular interest in the developing proposals for the Library Service, having provided ongoing scrutiny and, most recently, overview of the latest proposals put before Cabinet. This is an area of policy that the Committee will continue to take an active interest in, both through full-Committee and task and finish group work.

- 9.8 The Localism Agenda and its implementation are the other main areas of interest for the Committee in terms of County Council business. A combination of overview and scrutiny of the localism pilots and projects will together be the Committee's contribution to the programme.
- 9.9 Due to the major role of the voluntary and community sector in the Localism Agenda, the Committee was particularly interested in the development of the Third Sector forum, which had promised to provide a coherent voice for the sector. The Committee will continue to monitor developments around this and wider relationships with the non-statutory sector.
- 9.10 Major areas of external scrutiny include a new focus upon the work of the Constabulary, which manifested itself on work on rural crime and, most lately, the force's Operation Redesign. Both sessions involved representatives of the Constabulary attending the Committee to give account on these important subjects.

### **Work programme**

- Library Service
  - Constabulary's Operation Redesign
  - IP Scrutiny
  - Localism projects / pilots
- 9.11 IP scrutiny was undertaken in February, with the proposals for Community Engagement Directorate being subjected to the critical friend challenge of the Committee

## **10.0 EVALUATING THE PERFORMANCE OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY.**

- 10.1 There is a need to monitor the performance of the Scrutiny and Improvement function to ensure that it is effectively supporting elected members in their accountability and improvement role.
- 10.2 There is a general move within the local government sector towards greater self determination in the management of performance and the improvement of services.
- 10.3 With regard to the above, O&SMG have agreed to use a sector-developed method to evaluate the effectiveness of the authority's Scrutiny and Improvement function.

## **Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) Self Evaluation Framework (SEF)**

- 10.4 The SEF provides a framework for the assessment of scrutiny functions. The framework is based on the CfPS 'Four Principles of Effective Scrutiny', which are widely accepted across the sector; they are:
- Critical friend challenge
  - Reflecting the public voice
  - Leading and owning the process
  - Making an impact

### **Using the SEF to performance manage Scrutiny and Improvement**

- 10.5 The four principles can provide the cornerstones of the Scrutiny and Improvement function performance management framework. Practically, this would involve:
- Overview and Scrutiny Management Group (OSMG) performing a bi-annual (twice yearly) self evaluation against the four principles of effective scrutiny. To facilitate this, the CfPS proposes a set of questions to be addressed under each principle.
  - Stakeholders – of which four distinct groups have been identified – can also be asked to assess Scrutiny and Improvement's performance using the SEF. It is proposed that this should take place annually. The four stakeholder groups are:
    - The wider scrutiny committee membership (O&SMG comprises scrutiny chairs only)
    - Cabinet
    - Strategic Management Team
    - Council partners – the NHS will always be included due to the statutory health scrutiny role
  - Individual service users attending scrutiny committees or committee working groups, or individuals attending to be scrutinized on a one-off basis, will be asked to complete an evaluation form.
- 10.6 Self evaluation by SMG, and evaluation by stakeholders, would each result in a score of 1-10 being assigned to questions within each respective principle of effective scrutiny. A score of 5 would be the benchmark. Averaging these scores would give an overall score for each principle, allowing trends, direction of travel, etc. to be observed.
- 10.7 The exercise would be repeated for the other three principles of effective scrutiny. Scrutiny members / SMG could decide to prioritise a specific principle one year, or they may decide to accord equal

importance to all four principles. Numeral targets could be set for each of the four principles.

10.8 A copy of the self-evaluation form is attached at **Appendix A**.

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
Reports and minutes of the Council's Scrutiny Committees 2010/11 and O&S Committees 2011/12	Room 220 Shire Hall Cambridge

**Evaluation of Governance and Scrutiny**  
**APPENDIX A**

Relevant service plan objective/s	SEF question	SMG self-score (1-10)	Commentary / evidence
<p>Effective Scrutiny of the current IP</p> <p>Scrutiny embedded in development of the forthcoming Integrated Plan to ensure timely and effective engagement</p>	<p align="center"><b>Critical friend challenge</b></p>	<p>Has scrutiny provided an effective challenge to the Executive?</p>	
		<p>Has scrutiny had an impact on the work of the executive?</p>	
		<p>Has scrutiny routinely challenged the authority's corporate strategy and budget?</p>	
<p>Improved Scrutiny practice</p> <p>Broaden involvement of interested parties in Scrutiny Committees /</p>		<p>Have external partners been involved in scrutiny and how substantively were they engaged?</p>	

reviews  Commission others to undertake Scrutiny Improved Scrutiny practice				
Effective Scrutiny member engagement within the organisation		Has scrutiny worked effectively with the executive and senior management?		
Broaden involvement of interested parties in Scrutiny Committees / reviews	<b>Reflecting the public voice</b>	Has the work of scrutiny been informed by the public?		
		Has scrutiny made itself accessible to the public?		
Ensure that the impact of Scrutiny is well understood (thus		How well has scrutiny communicated?		

perpetuating a strong Scrutiny culture)				
Improved topic selection and joint scrutiny reviews		Has scrutiny made itself relevant to the public and other organisations outside local government?		
Effective Scrutiny member engagement within the organisation	<b>Leading and owning the process</b>	Has scrutiny operated with political impartiality?		
		Has scrutiny had ownership of its own work programme?		
Scrutiny makes a demonstrable contribution to improving public services		Do scrutiny members consider that they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role?		
Effective Scrutiny member engagement within the organisation		Is there a constructive working partnership with officers including support arrangements for scrutiny?		
Effective team engagement				



within the organisation				
Maximising the benefits of team working		Has scrutiny support resource been deployed efficiently and effectively?		
Scrutiny provides assessment of the Council's self regulation mechanisms  Scrutiny makes an effective contribution to self regulation  Contribute to Localism Pilots	<b>Making an impact</b>	Has the scrutiny workload coordinated and integrated with corporate processes?		
Effective Scrutiny of the current IP  Scrutiny makes a demonstrable contribution to		What evidence is there to show that scrutiny has contributed to improvement?		

<p>improving public services</p> <p>Scrutiny makes an effective contribution to sector led improvement</p> <p>Scrutiny makes an effective contribution to self regulation</p>				
<p>Maximising the benefits of team working</p> <p>Improved topic selection and joint scrutiny reviews</p>		<p>How well is information required by scrutiny managed?</p>		