

Agenda



**AGENDA for a meeting of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
in THE ASHBOURNE ROOM, County Hall, Hertford on FRIDAY,
2 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 10.00AM**

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE (16) - QUORUM (4)

County Councillors (10)

J Billing, M Cowan (Vice-Chairman), C Clapper, H K Crofton, T W Hone (Chairman),
T Hutchings, A Joynes (Vice-Chairman), D E Lloyd, G McAndrew, D T F Scudder

Parent Governor Representatives (4)

[Positions currently vacant]

Church Representatives (2)

*D Morton *J Sloan

** denotes members appointed for education scrutiny matters only.*

AGENDA

AUDIO SYSTEM

The meeting room has an audio system to assist those with hearing impairment.
Anyone who wishes to use this should contact Main (front) Reception.

PART 1 (PUBLIC) AGENDA

Meetings of the Committee are open to the public (this includes the press) and attendance is welcomed. However, there may be occasions when the public are excluded from the meeting for particular items of business. Any such items are taken at the end of the public part of the meeting and are listed under "Part II ('closed') agenda".

MINUTES [SC.8]

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 15 June 2016 (attached).

Non-Education Matters

None

Issues Including Education

1. **SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS: UPDATE**
Report of the Head of Scrutiny
2. **SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2016 – 2017**
Report of the Head of Scrutiny
3. **SCRUTINY OF THE INTEGRATED PLAN PROPOSALS 2016/17 - UPDATE**
4. **OTHER PART I BUSINESS**

Such other Part I Business which, if the Chairman agrees, is of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration
5. **ITEMS FOR REPORT TO THE COUNCIL [SC.7 (2)]**

To agree items for inclusion in the Committee's report to Council (in the absence of a decision, all items will be reported).

PART II ('CLOSED') AGENDA

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

There are no items of Part II (Confidential) business on this agenda. If items are notified the Chairman will move:-

"That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the said Act and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information."

If you require a copy of any of the reports mentioned above or require further information about this agenda please contact Michelle Diprose, Democratic Services Officer, on telephone no. 01992 555566 or e-mail michelle.diprose@hertfordshire.gov.uk. Agenda documents are also available on the internet at <https://cmis.hertfordshire.gov.uk/hertfordshire/Calendarofcouncilmeetings.aspx>. Scrutiny information (including reports on scrutiny investigations) can be found at <http://www.hertsdirect.org/scrutiny>

DATE OF NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING: Thursday, 10 November 2016 at 10.00 a.m. in the Ashbourne Room, County Hall, Hertford

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS: UPDATE

Report of the Head of Scrutiny

Author: Michelle Diprose, Democratic Services Officer (Tel: 01992 555566)

1. Purpose of report

1.1 To provide the Committee with an update on:-

(a) Recommendations arising from scrutinies concluded since the Committee's last meeting, and

(b) Executive Member responses to the recommendations from topic groups received since the Committee's last meeting.

2. Summary

Topic Group Recommendations

2.1 The recommendations from the Children in Care Council Scrutiny are attached as Appendix 1(a) to the report.

Executive Member responses to scrutiny recommendations received since the last OSC meeting

2.2 The Executive Member response to the scrutiny recommendations made by the Herts Care Quality Standards Topic Group is attached as Appendix 2(a) to the report.

Monitoring of Recommendations Topic Group

2.5 The Monitoring of Recommendation's Topic Group will not meet until the 25 November 2016 owing to insufficient business. An update will be presented to the December meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

3. Recommendations

3.1 1. That the scrutiny recommendations, set out in Appendix 1(a) to the report, be noted.

2. That the Executive Member responses to scrutiny recommendations, attached as Appendix 2(a) to the report, be noted and that the Monitoring of Recommendations Topic Group be requested to consider action taken on these in due course.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Background Information

Reports of the following Topic groups:

- Children in Care Council Scrutiny
- Herts Care Quality Standards Topic Group

PLACEMENT STABILITY OF CHILDREN IN CARE COUNCIL SCRUTINY

The Recommendations of the Children in Care Council Scrutiny Topic Group are set out below:

All recommendations will be reported back to the Children in Care Council (CHICC) unless they say otherwise.

- 1.1 That the Children Looked After (CLA), Adoption and Fostering social work teams and Brokerage will make 100% of the profiles for foster carers available to young people by the end of June 2016. (Conclusion 4.1 and 4.5)
- 1.2 CLA & Adoption & Fostering Senior Managers will discuss with Leaving Care Senior Managers about the possibilities of introducing a mentoring & buddying system for young people. (Conclusion 4.2)
- 1.3 That a forum will be held at the July CHICC event where young people will be able to feed into the development of additional questions for the questionnaire given to foster carers that build improved foster carer profiles. (Conclusion 4.3)
- 1.4 CLA Teams will ensure that young people are always asked whether there is an extended family member or significant person that they would want to support them in making their views and wishes known. (Conclusion 4.4)

EXECUTIVE MEMBER RESPONSE

NAME OF TOPIC GROUP: **HERTS CARE QUALITY STANDARD**

CHAIRMAN: **RON TINDALL**

SCRUTINY OFFICER: **NATALIE ROTHERHAM**

DATE OF SCRUTINY: **25 APRIL 2016**

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: **COLETTE WYATT-LOWE**

DATE REPORT PUBLISHED: **3 May 2016**

DATE RESPONSE DUE: **4 JULY 2016**

DATE RESPONSE RETURNED: **5 July 2016**

Recommendations:

*e.g. To undertake a customer survey in xxxxx (month/year)
(Note: All abbreviations used must be set out in full the first time they are used)*

Executive Response:

*e.g. To carry out the survey in xxxxxx (month/year)
(Note: All abbreviations used must be set out in full the first time they are used)*

2.1 Members request an information note outlining the Hertfordshire Care Quality Standard targets and scoring. (3.3.3, 4.2)

How we assess the Standard

Commissioners gather information from a number of sources to judge quality:

- Information from the industry regulator – the Care Quality Commission (CQC) following their routine inspections of registered services;
- Quarterly meetings with the CQC to share concerns about quality or practice;
- Whistle-blowing, representations and complaints from people who use services, their family carers, care staff and citizens;
- Feedback from people who use services, and carers through our surveys - 'Have Your Say' and 'ASCOT' satisfaction;
- Information from independent watchdog of health and social care: Healthwatch;

- Feedback from our partners including GPs, Health Visitors and District Nurses;
- Intelligence from Environmental Health Officers and Fire Inspections;
- Regular Experian credit checks of care providers to make sure they are financially stable and sustainable;
- Operational team intelligence.

We have set up a 'Hertfordshire Standard' email address as a repository for information which can be used by all stakeholders. Any concerns can be emailed in to:
careconcerns@hertfordshire.gov.uk

Risk analysis of providers: all providers are formally risk assessed using the East of England regional contract monitoring process and forms part of the Regional Quality Monitoring Framework (QMF). This prioritises providers based on key areas of information and enables better allocation of monitoring resources.

Contract Monitoring: a schedule of contract monitoring visits is undertaken by the council using the EoE regional monitoring tool. This gives a score against outcome areas, and priorities can be given to certain standards. We can also compare our care quality with our neighbours

Methodology: it is important that evidence to show contract compliance is gathered from the correct evidence source at the correct point of the monitoring visit. For example to evidence whether induction training has been completed, the Monitoring Officers should speak with care workers to confirm that they attended, ask questions to help assess whether all the appropriate areas were covered and understood and then check

that records confirm this.

Each criterion can be:

- 1. Met in full:** The criterion is fully met, the service provider is performing to an acceptable standard with robust systems, processes and practices in place to ensure that people using the service remain safe from any significant negative impact or harm;
- 2. Met in part:** The criterion is met only in part and / or for only some of the evidence examined. An officer will also assess as part met if there is a policy in place, but no other evidence to support contract compliance. Although the service provider is performing to a reasonable standard, the systems, processes and practices in place are not robust enough to ensure that people who use services remain safe from significant negative impact or harm; or,
- 3. Not Met:** The criterion is not met and the service provider is performing to an unacceptable standard where the systems, processes and practice in place are not sufficient to ensure that people who use the service remain safe from significant negative impact or harm.

By responding to whether the provider met/part met/no met each sub-criteria, the East of England workbook automatically gives a score to each domain and an overall score that determine provider performance in each area and whether it is required actions for improvement.

Score

Excellent (95+)
Good (from 78%)
Adequate (from 65%)
Poor (< 65%)

2.2 The number of Quality Monitoring Officers should be increased. (3.3.2, 4.7

We recognise the important role the Quality Monitoring Officers (QMOs) and welcome the positive feedback from Members of the Scrutiny Topic Group. HCS reintroduced the QMO role in 2013 to add more scrutiny to the existing monitoring arrangements for homecare. Based on the positive feedback and overall outcomes of the first year of the QMO being in post a business case was developed to secure funding for an additional QMO role – HCSMB agreed this in 2015. At this time HCS is not in a position to recruit further QMOs, but the model is being reviewed to enable more visits to be achieved. Currently the average number of visits per year per QMO is approximately 250 each. The aim is to increase this target to 300 per QMO, bringing the annual total target to 600, which represents approx. 10% of the total population receiving HCS commissioned homecare. In addition to this commissioners work with homecare providers to hold occasional service user meetings, to enable commissioners to meet with groups of homecare service users and hear their views about the service they are receiving, and feedback from these meetings does inform service improvements - for example we are currently undertaking a piece of work which will focus on achieving, wherever possible, continuity of care. Whilst this does present a challenge for every package of care commissioned, it is recognised as a clear concern as service users do feedback that they are sometimes unhappy with the number of different care workers involved in providing their care. The aim is to include a new "standard" that sets out our expectations in terms of the maximum number of different carers involved in delivering an individual's care package.

The five Lead Providers for Support at Home also hold regular Advisory Board meetings within their district area and the membership of these boards is multi-agency. This includes the voluntary & community sector, Health colleagues and GPs, as

	<p>well as service users and their carers. The role of the board is to enable effective partnership working, but also to provide a forum for information about the performance of the provider to be shared and challenged where appropriate. The data shared would include the numbers of complaints.</p> <p>Within the process of analysing complaints, the Commissioning Team work together with partners, OPPD (Older People & Physical Disability) and the CCGs, to identify key themes that emerge, to enable early identification of concerns and subsequently intervene where required to either invoke the serious concerns process or to prevent escalation</p>
<p>2.3 Health & Community Services (HCS) should work with HCPA to identify ways to provide assurance regarding the quality of non-commissioned services that are accessed by self-funders. (3.2.4, 3.4.3, 4.8)</p>	<p>HCS is working in partnership with HCPS (Herts Care Providers Association) to develop a number of tools to enable HCS to have greater assurance in relation to the quality of non-commissioned provision, along with the resilience of the entire care market to ensure we are able to fulfil our statutory requirements under the Care Act 2014 to prevent provider failure.</p> <p>The theme of the September HCPA Network event is Building Provider Resilience and Contingency Planning. The event will examine a number of proposals about how non-commissioned services can share information about quality, workforce and recruitment, with HCPA to inform a more detailed picture of the overall quality of the care markets in Hertfordshire. CQC are also included in these discussions and regular meetings are already established. HCS commissioners and operational staff meet with CQC to discuss care quality and any specific concerns around care provision – this includes non-commissioned services. Where issues are identified HCPA are alerted and will carry out a support visit to those providers and offer a range of support and services, including access to training and development and peer support opportunities</p>

	<p>HCS is working with health and provider partners to review our Prevention of Provider Failure Policy and has established a multi-agency Market Quality and Resilience Programme Board that will oversee this review. The remit of this group covers the entire social care market and will include services commissioned by HCS, by the NHS, and the self-funder market. This will enable formal protocols to be put in place to share quality information about providers,</p> <p>We are in negotiations with both HCPA and the HCC Information Governance Team in relation to HCPA holding information on self-funders which can be shared with HCC should a provider be subject to any CQC sanctions or to be withdrawing from the market for other reasons, and so enabling HCS to be able to identify those people who, whilst not funded by HCS, will need care and support in the event of provider failure</p> <p>A Self-Assessment Toolkit is being developed for all care providers in partnership with HCPA and the outcomes of this will inform any specific actions that may need to be taken to target areas of concern/ further development to help raise quality across the entire care market in Herts</p>
<p>2.4 To be effective the Hertfordshire Care concerns system needs to be publicised more widely. Members to be advised of where and to whom Care concerns is promoted. (3.2.2, 3.3.4, 4.9)</p>	<p>From Thursday 2 June 2016 we are testing a new form to 'report a concern about an adult'.</p> <p>Through one single online form, customers will be able to report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General concerns they have about a care home or other care services (known as care concerns internally)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that an adult is struggling to look after themselves (making a social care referral for someone of their behalf) • Concerns that an adult is being abused or neglected (known as safeguarding internally) <p>This new setting in herfordshire.gov.uk website will provide greater exposure and easy access to the general public to report a concern. In addition, the terms of reference for internal users to maximise the information coming through Care Concerns email/website that shows trends for intelligence monitoring.</p> <p>In July the Care Concerns process will be re-launched in a more systematic way, bringing in professionals and lay people who interact with services. This will be through three key routes - public through the launch of the next generation website, care homes via HCPA, all relevant professionals through the health and social care system and Hertfordshire Safeguarding Adults Board.</p>
<p>2.5 Members would like an information note providing more detail of the complaints process. In addition, an update and breakdown of complaints should be provided to the Monitoring of Recommendations topic group when it meets in 6 months. (3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 4.2, 4.3)</p>	<p>This is being prepared in partnership with the HCC Complaints Manager and will include a full breakdown of complaints for 2015, grouped in to themes across the different care settings. A new RAG rating system for rating complaints according to severity is being scoped out and tested and the outcomes of this exercise can also be shared as part of the information note. The Information Note will be provided 1st September</p>
<p>Any other comments on the report or this scrutiny?</p>	

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
FRIDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 10.00AM

Agenda Item No.

2

SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2016 – 2017

Report of the Head of Scrutiny

Author: Michelle Diprose, Democratic Services Officer (Tel: 01992 555566)

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To provide the Committee with an updated scrutiny work programme for the period 2016 – 2017.

2. Summary

The Scrutiny Work Programme

- 2.1 A combined work programme for both Health and Overview and Scrutiny Committees, for the period 2016 – 2017, is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

- 2.2 Draft scoping documents for:

- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service
- Children Looked After
- Crime and Disorder – Scamming
- Hertfordshire Safeguarding Children Board
- Hertfordshire Waste Partnership & Recycling Review
- Public Health

are attached as Appendix 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e) and, 2(f) to this report.

Scrutiny Requests

- 2.3 A scrutiny request for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service has been received and the draft scoping document is attached as Appendix 2(a)..

3. Recommendations

- 3.1
1. That the Scrutiny Work Programme 2016-2017, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.
 2. That the outline draft scoping documents, attached as Appendix 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e) and 2(f) to the report, be noted.

4 Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Background Information

Minutes of the Committees meeting held on 15 June 2016.

[Amendments, **new entries & OSC and HSC Meetings** are shown in **bold**]

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Health Scrutiny Committee have responsibility for scrutinising all aspects of County Council and Health Services

OSC MEETINGS AND THEMES

DATE	THEME	NOTES
2 Sept 2016		Work programme Questions to be agreed for the IPP Café 2017
10 Nov 2016		Work programme
20 Dec 2016		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPP scrutiny presentation from the Director of Resources • Work programme
26 Jan 2017	IPP Café	HCC budget scrutiny
2 Feb 2017	IPP Café reconvenes	Finalises the suggestions to cabinet, information requests, scrutinies
28 Mar 2017		Work programme
21 June 2017		Work programme

HSC MEETINGS AND THEMES

DATE	THEME	NOTES
29 September 2016	1. Your Care Your Future consultation	
8 November 2016	1. Dentistry	
15 December 2016	1. Opticians	
19 January 2017		
16 March 2017		
30 March 2017		
15 June 2017		
19 July 2017		

WORK PROGRAMME

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
-------	----------	------	---------	-----------------------	-------------	----------------------	----------	-------------	------------------

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-ship	Executive Member
Hertfordshire Safeguarding Adults Board COMPLETE	OSC	TBC	13 June 2016	Charles Lambert	Nicola Cahill	Sue Darker	Roger Beeching	Graham McAndrew (c) William Wyatt-Lowe (c) Ron Tindall (lib dem) Amanda King (lab)	Colette Wyatt-Lowe (Adult Care & Health)
Discharge	HSC	1 day	Summer 2016	Charles Lambert	TBC		TBC		Colette Wyatt-Lowe (Adult Care & Health) Teresa Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
Hertfordshire Safeguarding Children's Board Neglect	OSC	1 day	10 Oct 2016	Natalie Rotherham	Nicola Cahill	Caroline Aitken	Roger Beeching	Graham McAndrew (c) Tim Hutchings(c) William Wyatt-Lowe (c) Mark Watkin (lib dem) Lynn Chesterman (lab)	Richard Roberts (Children's Services)
Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS)	OSC	1 day	14 October 2016	Natalie Rotherham	Fiona Corcoran	TBC	TBC		Colette Wyatt-Lowe(Adult Care & Health) Richard Roberts (Children's Services) Teresa

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
									Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
To identify as to whether the Council has procedures in place to prevent and deal with flooding and flood protection, supported by adequate resources.	OSC	1 day	27 Oct 2016	Charles Lambert	Theresa Baker	Simon Aries / John Rumble	Nick Hollinghurst	Roger Beeching (c) Graham McAndrew (c) Peter Ruffles (c) Lorna Kercher (Lab) Ian Reay (res (c))	Terry Douris (Highways)
Herts Waste Partnership & Recycling Review To review how well the Partnership is working and future improvements To include how the 11 Hertfordshire local authorities combine their waste related work.	OSC	2 days (not consecutive)	4 & 9 Nov 2016	Natalie Rotherham	Nicola Cahill	Duncan Jones / Simon Aries	Richard Smith	Seamus Quilty (c) Michael Muir (c) Paul Mason (c)(Res) Maureen Cook (lab)	Richard Thake (Community Safety & Waste Management)
To examine how Public Health continues to be effective in light of funding cuts to the department's budget 2015/2016 and onwards	OSC	TBC	28 Nov 2016	Charles Lambert	Theresa Baker	Jim McManus	TBC		Teresa Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
Crime & Disorder 2016 Scamming	OSC	2 days	5 & 13 Dec 2016	Natalie Rotherham	Michelle Diprose	Mike MacGregor	TBC	TBC	Colette Wyatt-Lowe (Adult Care & Health) Richard Roberts (Children's Services) Richard Thake (Community Safety & Waste Management)

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
West Herts Hospital Trust	HSC	On going	Dec 2016	Charles Lambert	Fiona Corcoran		Seamus Quilty	Anne Joynes (lab) Chris White (Lib Dem) Fiona Thomson Roger Beeching (Cons)	Colette Wyatt-Lowe (Adult Care & Health)
Children Looked After	OSC	1 day	17 January 2017	Charles Lambert	Michelle Diprose	TBC	TBC	TBC	Richard Roberts (Children's Services)
Integrated Plan Proposal 2017-2020 Scrutiny	OSC	2 days	26 Jan & 2 Feb 2017	Natalie Rotherham	Michelle Diprose	Owen Mapley / Claire Cook	Terry Hone	All OSC Members. All other Members except Executive & Deputy Members. Third Parties	Chris Hayward (Resources & Performance)
Library Services Review To examine new changes to library services (to be undertaken one year after their implementation)	OSC	1 day	20 March 2017	Charles Lambert	Fiona Corcoran	Andrew Bignell	TBC	TBC	Teresa Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
Disability support for bus users.	OSC	TBC	6 March 2017	Charles Lambert	Theresa Baker	Simon Aries	TBC		Terry Douris (Highways)
Herts for Learning (HfL) – to review its progress against its original objectives since it was established; also to include the role and impact of the governance team <i>Note: whole Committee Scrutiny</i>	OSC	TBC	2017	TBC	TBC	Andrews Simmons / Jan Paine	Terry Hone		David Williams (Enterprise, Education & Skills)
Children's Centres – follow up	OSC	TBC	Summer Agenda Pack 2016/17	TBC	TBC	Sally Orr /	TBC	TBC	Richard Roberts

Topic	HSC/OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
scrutiny to review how the new contract is working. To include the effectiveness of the new contract and whether it is improving long term outcomes for early years. Also to include the effect on the provision of the Home Visiting Service caused by the change in policy.			2017	Rotherham		Simon Newland			(Children's Services)
<p>Special Educational Needs – follow up scrutiny to review progress made on the 'journey' implementing the new legislation.</p> <p>To examine disputes with parents over the education of children with SEN, specifically the school they should attend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To examine the processes used by HCC to resolve disputes with parents of SEN when identifying a school that will best meet their child's needs. To include on outcomes and how the Council takes into account the voice of SEN and disabled children and young people; and progress made in reducing the number of out of county placements. <p>To include understanding at what stage in the process HCC Legal</p>	OSC	TBC	2017	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	David Williams (Enterprise, Education & Skills)

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
unit gets involved in such disputes.									
Crime & Disorder 2017 Domestic Abuse	OSC	TBC	Autumn 2017	Charles Lambert	TBC	Julie Chaudary (HFRS)	TBC	TBC	Colette Wyatt-Lowe(Adult Care & Health) Richard Roberts (Children's Services) Richard Thake (Community Safety & Waste Management)
Effectiveness of SERCO contracts	OSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Chris Hayward (Resources & Performance)
Secondary school place planning Looking admissions procedures, influence over academies and free schools, costs of bussing children who can't get into their local schools. To include its robustness e.g. whether new schools are coming on stream at the right time and of the right size	OSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Simon Newland	TBC	TBC	David Williams (Enterprise, Education & Skills)
Primary school place planning Looking admissions procedures, influence over academies and free schools, costs of bussing children who can't get into their local schools. To include its robustness e.g. whether new schools are coming on stream at	OSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Simon Newland	TBC	TBC	David Williams (Enterprise, Education & Skills)

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member- Ship	Executive Member
the right time and of the right size.									
To evaluate the effectiveness of the new Council website (18 months after implementation).	OSC	TBC	Autumn 2018	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Teresa Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
To undertake a scrutiny of Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service to include a review of what savings have been made to date and what further savings can be achieved	OSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Richard Thake (Community Safety & Waste Management)
To review Hertfordshire's Household Waste and Recycling Centre (HWRC's) and commercial waste facilities to ensure greater compatibility and cooperation between the public and private facilities: and to prevent the unauthorised use of the HWRC's for disposal of commercial waste clarifying the cost to the Authority	OSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Richard Thake (Community Safety & Waste Management)
To scrutinise Community Protection's preventative work with Public Health, establishing the effects and benefits	OSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Richard Thake (Community Safety & Waste Management) Teresa Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
Care Act	HSC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Colette Wyatt-Lowe (Adult Care & Health)

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
-------	----------	------	---------	-----------------------	-------------	----------------------	----------	-------------	------------------

									Teresa Heritage (Public Health, Localism & Libraries)
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Monitoring Topic Groups

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
Monitoring of Recommendations Topic Group Reviewing the implementation of both OSC and HSC topic group recommendations.	Joint	Meets every 2 - 3 months	25 Nov 2016 28 Feb 2017	Natalie Rotherham	Fiona Corcoran	N/A	Roger Beeching	Mark Mills-Bishop (c) Michael Muir (c) Mark Watkin (Lib-dem) Lorna Kercher (lab)	All Executive Members

MEMBER SEMINARS

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
The Better Care Fund COMPLETE	Joint (HSC lead)		7 June 2016	Charles Lambert	Fiona Corcoran	TBC	Seamus Quilty (Chairman of HSC)		Colette Wyatt-Lowe (Adult Care & Health)

Members Information Service	OSC		2017 after election	TBC	Michelle Diprose	TBC	Terry Hone (Chairman of OSC)		Chris Hayward (Resources & Performance)
-----------------------------	-----	--	----------------------------	------------	------------------	-----	------------------------------	--	---

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
Corporate Parenting	OSC		2017 after election	TBC	Michelle Diprose	TBC	Terry Hone (Chairman of OSC)		Richard Roberts (Children's Services)

SITE VISITS

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

OSC BRIEFING PAPERS

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member-Ship	Executive Member
Rural Estates COMPLETE	OSC	Briefing note	Due 23 June 2016	Natalie Rotherham	N/A	Angela Bucksey	N/A	N/A	Chris Hayward (Performance & Resources)
Gully Cleaning COMPLETE	OSC	Briefing Note		Charles Lambert	N/A	TBC	N/A	N/A	Terry Douris (Highways)

Topic	HSC/ OSC	Type	Date(s)	Scrutiny Lead Officer	DSO Support	Service Lead Officer	Chairman	Member- Ship	Executive Member
-------	-------------	------	---------	-----------------------------	----------------	----------------------------	----------	-----------------	---------------------

OBJECTIVE:

To examine how effectively the Transformation Board is improving services and supporting young people with mental health needs.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

1. How well is the Transformation Board delivering the Transformation Plan?
2. How well is the Transformation Board communicating with stakeholders?
3. What have been the outcomes to date of the Transformation Plan (e.g. waiting lists)?
4. How closely is the Transformation Plan aligning to the recommendations of the Review?
5. How close is the Plan on target to implement the proposed transformational change objectives around
 - early intervention and preventive services
 - capacity and capability
 - eating disorders
 - perinatal MH
 - creating a joint training programme for education colleagues and CAMHS
 - Parent/carer and service user engagement

OUTCOMES:

1. That mechanisms have been developed to share Transformation Board decisions and progress with stakeholders
2. The Transformation Board is implementing the Transformation Plan
3. There is evidence of improvements to access and waiting times for young people

CONSTRAINTS:

NONE IDENTIFIED

WITNESSES i.e individuals	EVIDENCE i.e. organisations e.g. HCS
Simon Pattison	Healthwatch
Sarvjeet Dosanjh	Users/carers
Kate Barker ENHCCG	Children's Services
Liz Biggs HVCCG	
HPFT	
Transformation Board Chair	

METHOD: 1 day Topic Group **DATES:** 14 October 2016

USER GROUP: TBC **DATE:** tbc

MEMBERSHIP: HSC volunteers Fiona Guest OR Fiona Thomson OR Maureen McKay. HCC: Ron Tindall

SCRUTINY REMIT: CAMHS

SUPPORT:

Scrutiny Officer: Natalie Rotherham

Lead Officers: Jim McManus

Democratic Services Officer: Fiona Corcoran

HCC Priorities for Action: how this item helps deliver the Priorities *delete as appropriate*

1. Opportunity To Thrive ✓
2. Opportunity To Prosper ✓
3. Opportunity To Be Healthy And Safe ✓
4. Opportunity To Take Part ✓

CfPS ACCOUNTABILITY OBJECTIVES: *delete as appropriate*

1. Transparent – opening up data, information and governance ✓
2. Inclusive – listening, understanding and changing ✓
3. Accountable – demonstrating credibility ✓

OBJECTIVE:

To investigate placement stability in Hertfordshire.

CONTEXT: In June 2016 a group of CLA undertook a short scrutiny of placement stability. OSC would like to build on the valuable work undertaken by the Children in Care Council. Issues around placements were identified that members would like to scrutinise.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

1. Why are the Hertfordshire figures for 3+ placements higher than national and regional figures?
2. What is being done to address this?
3. What is the impact on young people emotionally and educationally?
4. What support is available to carers to maintain placements?
5. How are children and young people prepared and supported to move and settle in a new placement?
6. How will progress be measured and sustained?

OUTCOMES:

That clear plans are in place to improve placement stability. That the needs and voice of both CLA and carers are a significant element of the plan.

CONSTRAINTS:

- **NONE IDENTIFIED**

WITNESSES i.e. individuals	EVIDENCE i.e. organisations e.g. HCS
Richard Roberts Executive Member Children's Services	CHICC chair plus A N Other
Marion Ingram Operations Director Specialist Services	CAMHS (specialist targeted team)
Lynn Knowles Head of Commissioning, CLA & Safeguarding	Care leavers
Sue Lowndes, Head of Fostering & Adoption/Lynn Costello Service Manager Fostering	Fostering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum rep • Foster parents x2
Felicity Evans Virtual School Head (Head of Achievement for CLA)	
Sarah Baker Head of Children Looked After Service	CLA Teams

METHOD: 1 day Topic Group

DATE: 17 Jan 2017

SITE VISIT:

DATE:

MEMBERSHIP:

SCRUTINY REMIT: CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER (CLA)

SUPPORT:

Scrutiny Officer: Charles Lambert

Lead Officers: Marion Ingram

Democratic Services Officer: Michelle Diprose

HCC Priorities for Action: how this item helps deliver the Priorities *delete as appropriate*

1. Opportunity To Thrive ✓
2. Opportunity To Prosper ✓
3. Opportunity To Be Healthy And Safe ✓
4. Opportunity To Take Part ✓

CfPS ACCOUNTABILITY OBJECTIVES: *delete as appropriate*

1. Transparent – opening up data, information and governance ✓
2. Inclusive – listening, understanding and changing ✓
3. Accountable – demonstrating credibility ✓

OBJECTIVE:

To examine how effectively Hertfordshire County Council and its partners prevent, detect and support victims of scams.

CONTEXT: The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) is the Council’s crime and disorder committee for the purposes of the Police and Justice Act 2006. The Act requires the OSC to undertake an annual scrutiny. At Hertfordshire County Council this is delegated to a topic group of elected members.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

1. How effectively does HCC currently deal with scam victims?
2. What gaps exist with regard to supporting residents?
3. How can HCC better support residents and businesses of Hertfordshire so that they do not become victims of scams?
4. How can HCC better support residents and businesses of Hertfordshire who have been victims of scams?

OUTCOME:

That the Community Protection Directorate has the information and data to make sound long term service planning decisions that contribute to the prevention and detection of ‘scam’ related crime.

CONSTRAINTS: For the purpose of the scrutiny process the definition of scam will cover

- in person at a household/business premise
- via the telephone
- via the postal service
- via electronic communications method (PC or mobile phone text)

WITNESSES i.e individuals	EVIDENCE i.e. organisations e.g. HCS
HCC Community Protection Joint Protective Services (Citizen Team)	Think Jessica!
National Trading Standards Scam Team	Action Fraud
County Community Safety Unit	
Hertfordshire Constabulary Crime Reduction and Community Safety Unit	
Health and Community Services	
Children Services (Youth Connexions)	
Age UK	

METHOD: 2 day Topic Group

DATES: 5 & 13 December 2016

MEMBERSHIP: Malcolm Cowan (chair), Tim Hutchings,

SUPPORT:

SCRUTINY REMIT: Annual Crime & Disorder 2016

Scrutiny Officer: Natalie Rotherham

Lead Officers: Mike MacGregor Community Protection Manager

Democratic Services Officer: Michelle Diprose

HCC Priorities for Action: how this item helps deliver the Priorities

1. Opportunity To Thrive ✓
2. Opportunity To Prosper ✓
3. Opportunity To Be Healthy And Safe ✓
4. Opportunity To Take Part

CfPS ACCOUNTABILITY OBJECTIVES:

1. Transparent – opening up data, information and governance ✓
2. Inclusive – listening, understanding and changing ✓
3. Accountable – demonstrating credibility ✓

OBJECTIVE:
To scrutinise the progress and performance of the Hertfordshire Safeguarding Children Board (HSCB) in 2015 - 16

- QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:**
1. Progress on Serious Case Reviews (SCR) including learning for cases such as 'Sophie'
 - What findings and recommendations have emerged from SCRs?
 - What progress has been made in address the findings and recommendations?
 - What are the ongoing challenges?
 - What further work is required?
 - Are there re-occurring themes in the SCRs?
 2. Neglect to include Children in Need and Children with Disabilities
 - Why is this a priority for HSCB?
 - What has been done to address Neglect?
 - What further work is required?
 3. Self Harm (including anorexia and social media)
 - Why is this a priority for HSCB?
 - What has been done to address Self Harm?
 - What further work is required?

Follow up from 2014/15:
At the HSCB scrutiny the topic group requested that members be updated on the:

- Outcomes of the March 2016 district/borough Housing Workshop
- Impact of the uncertainties facing HSCB (i.e. LSCB review, HSCB budget, Return Interview, NSPCC Graded Care Profile (GCP) template)
- Return Interview pilot
- National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) GCP template
- Impact of the Prevent / radicalisation work

OUTCOME:
For members to understand the work of HSCB, be confident that the statutory guidance is being met and that HSCB is providing an effective challenge to partner agencies.

CONSTRAINTS:
The scrutiny will not include a review of the progress or performance of individual agencies except as constituent members of HSCB. The scrutiny will not consider individual cases.

WITNESSES i.e. individuals	EVIDENCE from
Phil Picton, HSCB Independent Chair	HSCB Business Plan 2015-16

SCRUTINY REMIT: ANNUAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD

Caroline Aitken, HSCB Business Manager	Annual Report 2015-16
Sue Williams, Director of Family Safeguarding	
Roger Carruthers, Head of Child Protection & Statutory Review	
Keith Ibbetson, Chair of Case Review Group	
Sue Beck, Head of Service: Children & Young People Public Health	
Santokh Dulai Head of Social Care & Safeguarding HPFT	
Mary Emson, Designated Nurse ENHCCG	
Clare Hawkins Director of Quality & Governance and Chief Nurse HCT	

METHOD: 1 day Topic Group

DATE: 10 Oct 2016

MEMBERSHIP:

Roger Beeching (Chairman), Tim Hutchings, Graham McAndrew, Mark Watkin, Lynn Chesterman, William Wyatt-Lowe

SUPPORT:

Scrutiny Officer: Natalie Rotherham

Lead Officer/s: Caroline Aitken HSCB Business Manager

Democratic Services Officer: Deborah Jeffery

HCC Priorities for Action: how this item helps deliver the Priorities

1. Opportunity to get the best out of life ✓
2. Opportunity to share in Hertfordshire's strong economy
3. Opportunity to be healthy and stay safe ✓
4. Opportunity to take part

CfPS ACCOUNTABILITY OBJECTIVES:

1. Transparent – opening up data, information and governance ✓
2. Inclusive – listening, understanding and changing ✓
3. Accountable – demonstrating credibility ✓

OBJECTIVE:
 To understand the current service delivery model for waste management in Hertfordshire in the context of current and future challenges.

- CONTEXT:**
- Examination of current statutory functions and how these are divided across both tiers of local government.
 - Assess current performance levels against existing national targets as well as likely future ones.
 - Identifying current pressures

- QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:**
1. How successfully do partners work together in the management of waste?
 2. What are the challenges to more effective working within the HWP?
 3. How is performance of individual authorities monitored and managed?
 4. How is strategic direction translated into local authority action?
 5. How have cost pressures changed?
 6. What changes have taken place since the 2014 peer review?

OUTCOME/S:
 Identifying improved more efficient, cost effective and consistent service levels.

CONSTRAINTS:
 The scrutiny process will need to consider how best to accommodate evidence from the waste collection authorities.

WITNESSES i.e. individuals	EVIDENCE i.e. organisations e.g. HCS
Simon Aries Assistant Director – Transport, Waste and Environmental Management	Hertfordshire Waste Partnership
Duncan Jones Waste Partnership Development Manager	District/boroughs
Richard Thake Executive Member Community Safety & Waste Management	Industry rep
	LGA rep
	Environmental services

METHOD: 2 day Topic Group **DATES:** 4 & 9 Nov 2016

MEMBERSHIP: Michael Muir, Seamus Quilty, Richard Smith (chairman) LD member, LAB member

SUPPORT:
Scrutiny Officer: Natalie Rotherham
Lead Officers: Simon Aries, Duncan Jones
Democratic Services Officer: Nicola Cahill

SCRUTINY REMIT: HERTS WASTE PARTNERSHIP (HWP)
TOPIC GROUP

HCC Priorities for Action: how this item helps deliver the Priorities *delete as appropriate*

1. Opportunity To Thrive ✓
2. Opportunity To Prosper ✓
3. Opportunity To Be Healthy And Safe ✓
4. Opportunity To Take Part ✓

CiPS ACCOUNTABILITY OBJECTIVES: *delete as appropriate*

1. Transparent – opening up data, information and governance ✓
2. Inclusive – listening, understanding and changing ✓
3. Accountable – demonstrating credibility ✓

OBJECTIVE:
To examine how effective the Public Health Department within HCC is despite funding cuts to the department’s budget 2015/2016 and onwards

- QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:**
1. What has been done to date?
 2. What has been the impact so far?
 3. How will Public Health ensure that population outcomes are maintained?
 4. Is the prioritisation framework for deciding which budgets to reduce robust?

- OUTCOMES:**
1. Members are confident that the prioritisation framework provides sufficient strong data to inform budget and planning decisions
 2. The continuing role of partners in delivering preventive goals has been clarified.

CONSTRAINTS:
NONE IDENTIFIED

WITNESSES i.e. individuals	EVIDENCE i.e. organisations e.g. HCS
Jim McManus, Director of Public Health	HCC Community Wellbeing Team
Community Wellbeing Team	ENHCCG
	HVCCG
	HCC Children’s Services
	HCS

METHOD: 1 day Topic Group **DATE:** 28 Nov 2016

MEMBERSHIP: HSC volunteers Dave Hewitt and Fiona Thomson

SUPPORT:
Scrutiny Officer: Charles Lambert
Lead Officers: Jim McManus
Democratic Services Officer: Theresa Baker

- HCC Priorities for Action: how this item helps deliver the Priorities** *delete as appropriate*
1. Opportunity To Thrive ✓
 2. Opportunity To Prosper ✓
 3. Opportunity To Be Healthy And Safe ✓
 4. Opportunity To Take Part

- CfPS ACCOUNTABILITY OBJECTIVES:** *delete as appropriate*
1. Transparent – opening up data, information and governance ✓

SCRUTINY REMIT: PUBLIC HEALTH

2. Inclusive – listening, understanding and changing	✓
3. Accountable – demonstrating credibility	✓

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
FRIDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 10.00AM

Agenda Item No.

3

**SCRUTINY OF THE INTEGRATED PLAN PROPOSALS 2017/18 AND
FUTURE YEARS**

Report of the Head of Scrutiny

Author: Natalie Rotherham, Scrutiny Officer (Tel: 01992 555300)
Michelle Diprose, Democratic Services Officer (Tel: 01992 555566)

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To provide Members with the format for the Committee's scrutiny of the Integrated Plan (IP) proposals 2017/18 and future years and to seek the Committee's approval of the single pack approach (attached as Appendices 1 and 2 to the report).

2. Summary

- 2.1 As agreed by the Committee in April 2016, the Committee will adopt a similar process as was undertaken for its scrutiny of the IP earlier this year, with a few refinements to reflect the feedback received on the scrutiny from both Members and officers. The primary difference (agreed by the Committee in June 2016) will be that members will receive one set of IP papers for both scrutiny and panels.

2.2 Tuesday 20 December 2016

The Chief Finance Officer will attend the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting on 20 December 2016 to provide Members with an authority wide presentation covering resources, pressures, and key issues in advance of the Committee's scrutiny. The Portfolio holder for Resources & Performance attends this Committee meeting.

2.3 Thursday 26 January 2017

- 2.3.1 In advance of the Committee, member groups will meet earlier at 8.15 a.m. to agree with the IPP Group Chair the approach to the Group's work including any key lines of enquiry, specific questions and particular areas of focus. The Committee meeting will start at 9.00 a.m. in the Council Chamber. Members will receive an introduction to the scrutiny; a summary by the Scrutiny Officer of the format for the Committee's scrutiny; and an oral report from the Chief Finance Officer, who will provide the Committee with the context within which

the integrated plan proposals have been prepared. The Committee will then adjourn to gather its evidence. Members (including non-committee Members who attend) will be allocated to one of four groups, each based in a separate room. Each Member Group will focus on two portfolio areas: one in the morning and a second in the afternoon. The Groups will gather evidence on the strategic direction and financial consequences outlined in the IP papers. Evidence from Portfolios will address the following areas:

Key Objectives for the portfolio over the period for 2017/18 – 2019/20

- Key pressures and challenges facing the portfolio 2017/18 – 2019/20
- Key projects/programmes that the portfolio will deliver 2017/18 – 2019/20
- Benchmarking and other information used in setting Strategic Direction and assessing service outcomes
- Key Savings proposals and impact
- The key risks, mitigations and resilience plans

2.3.2 Each Member Group will have a Chairman and a graduate management trainee. Together they will ensure that the Group covers its investigation of the portfolio area thoroughly in the time allocated. An outline of the responsibilities for each role is attached as Appendices 3 and 4 to the report

2.3.3 The Council's service areas will be divided into 8 groups with a different Chairman for each session. The Groups will be based on the portfolios of Executive Members:-

- Adult Care & Health
- Children's Services
- Community Safety & Waste Management
- Enterprise, Education & Skills
- Environment, Planning & Transport
- Highways
- Public Health & Localism
- Resources & Performance

2.3.4 Each of these will be supported by the relevant Executive Member, a chief/senior service officer and a senior finance officer.

2.3.5 Each Member Group will also be provided with a pro-forma to collate the information gathered. An example is attached as Appendix 5 to the report.

2.3.6 A mid-morning and mid-afternoon break for all participants will be built into the programme.

2.3.7 At the end of the evidence gathering process the session will close with the Committee reconvening at 10.00am on Thursday, 2 February 2017.

2.3.8 In the intervening period the Scrutiny Officer and the Democratic Services Officer will meet with graduates, subsequent to which they will prepare a draft report for the Committee to consider when it reconvenes on 2 February 2017. (It is anticipated that this report will be circulated to Members by the close of play 27 January 2017).

2.4 Thursday, 2 February 2017

2.4.1 The Committee will reconvene at 10.00 a.m. on Thursday, 2 February 2017 in the Council Chamber. Members will be asked to agree their Suggestions to Cabinet.

2.4.2 The Committee's suggestions will then be reported to Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 20 February 2017. Cabinet will make recommendations to the Council on 21 February 2017, when the Council's Integrated Plan 2017/18 and future years will be agreed.

2.4.3 Responses to any requests for information and scrutinies proposed as a result of the IPP scrutiny will be considered by the Committee at its meeting on 28 March 2017.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1
1. That the Committee approves the proposals for its scrutiny of the integrated plan 2017/18 and future years set out in the report.
 2. That the single IP Pack approach, be agreed (attached as Appendices 1 and 2 to the report).

Background Information

Agenda, reports and minutes, Overview & Scrutiny Committee, April 2015

Agenda, reports and minutes, Overview & Scrutiny Committee, June 2015

Agenda, reports and minutes, Overview & Scrutiny Committee, September 2015

Agenda, reports and minutes, Overview & Scrutiny Committee, December 2015

Minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee June 2016

Resources & Performance Portfolio

Strategic Direction: to provide centralised support services to the Council's departments, and front line services (Registration, Coroners, Citizenship)

Scope - (outline key services provided)

- Provides leadership on organisational transformation
 - Supports partnership working
 - Promotes and supports improved use of technology and property assets.
- Includes: HR – supports XX managers and XX employees
 Property – manage X sites
 Finance – support XX budget holders managing budgets of £xx revenue and £xx Capital
 Technology & Improvement
 Shared Managed Services
 Assurance Services
 Statutory & Democratic Services

Summary of budget

16/17

17/18
forecast18/19
forecast

Net Budget (Revenue)

*NB for some portfolios
may need to show budgets
for key services, not total portfolio*

Summary of Key Priorities and Programmes

- Project 1
- Project 2
- Etc – headings for key items in section 1 and 3

Summary of Key Savings Proposals

- Saving 1
- Saving 2
- Etc –key items in section 5

Key Risks in achieving IP proposals

Key items from section 6

Capital Programme

Key Capital Schemes:

Capital Strategy: to generate optimum return from capital assets including revenue income streams and capital receipts

INTEGRATED PLAN

PART B - STRATEGIC DIRECTION AND FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES

XX Portfolio

Section 1: Future Strategic Direction

- **Key Objectives for the portfolio over the period 2017/18 – 2019/20**
- **Key pressures and challenges facing the portfolio for 2017/18 – 2019/20**
- **Key projects/programmes that the portfolio will deliver 2017/18 – 2019/20**
- **Benchmarking and other information used in setting Strategic Direction and assessing service outcomes**
- **Key Savings proposals and impact**
- **Key Risks, mitigation and resilience plans**

Section 2: Revenue Budget Information

- **Key Budget Movements:**
 - **Technical Adjustments**
 - **Exceptional Inflation**
 - **Pressures**
 - **Savings**
- **Revenue Budget by Objective Area**

Section 3: Capital Programme

XX Portfolio: Future Strategic Direction

1 What are the key priorities for the portfolio over the period 2017/18 – 2019/20?

- Use bullet point format where possible. The document should give a clear, succinct summary of key issues, with examples where appropriate.

2 What are the key pressures and challenges facing your portfolio for 2017/18 – 2019/20?

- Include graphs to show demographic etc trends
- Include any mitigations the service have in place to deal with these (reference to section 6, if covered there)

3 What are the key projects/programmes that the portfolio will deliver 2017/18 – 2019/20?

How the portfolio will meet key objectives / deal with key pressures and challenges.

To include details of :

- a. Changes to Core Service Delivery : Key projects to **'run the business'** with an ongoing emphasis on delivering efficiencies and improvement
- b. Service-specific transformation initiatives: Key projects to **'change the business'** (under the Transformation agenda)
- c. Key projects / programmes that will contribute to supporting **HCC's cross-cutting Transformation programmes** i.e:
 - Making the most of our property and office and service accommodation
 - Increasing commercial opportunities
 - Supporting the right approaches to prevention and demand management
 - Using outcome driven technology to respond to fast-changing digital opportunities
 - Having a high performing, engaged, and committed workforce
 - Developing and enabling SmartWorkers throughout the organisation
- d. Key collaborations (both with external partners and cross departmental work within HCC) – including the financial and other benefits of delivering these

4 How has the portfolio reviewed its effectiveness / value for money in delivering service outcomes?

Include details of any benchmarking, peer reviews, assessment of preventative work; pilot projects etc. These need to be key data sets/comparator information for the service. Include comparators for prior years where possible.

This section may include key graphs.

- 5 What are the key savings proposals that have been identified to meet the budget gap 2017/18 to 2019/20; what additional actions will need to be taken to achieve these, and what are the potential impacts?**

These may be summarised and reference back to detailed proposals in section 3

- 6 What are the key risks in delivering projects and programmes for this portfolio, and what mitigations are in place? What steps are being taken to ensure resilience?**

This section should include reference to workforce planning.

IPP GROUP CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

This is the most significant scrutiny event on our work programme.

To ensure the smooth running of the group previous experience suggests the following is helpful

- Encourage the group to have read the relevant portfolio papers **in advance** of the meeting
- Encourage the group to debate the issues
- Ensure that all members are actively engaged
- Members can ask additional questions; however, please remember that your focus should be on the portfolio you are scrutinising, other groups will address different areas of the Authority's work
- If you believe a theme has been fully addressed you don't need to explore it further
- Encourage members to keep questions brief and to the point. Long questions often let witnesses off the hook and you can be taken down an irrelevant, if interesting, by-way
- Concentrate on those areas where the evidence is sketchy or less convincing
- The focus is strategic not local. If you believe a member question is too parochial ask them to address it outside the meeting
- You will be identifying
 - Suggestions to Cabinet
 - proposals for future scrutiny
 - Information Requests
- You are not expected to provide exhaustive responses to the above. In the past some groups have identified no suggestions for Cabinet which is fine
- You will also be answering the Post Settlement adjustments to the Integrated Plan (2017-18)
- OSC Dec 2016 have identified additional areas they would like scrutiny members to explore **TBC**

GRADUATE SUPPORT

- You will be supported by a graduate trainee
- S/he is not the Group's clerk
- Their job is to keep track of what is happening, help you manage the time and note any Suggestions to Cabinet etc.
- The graduate will forward the Group's proposed future Scrutiny, Information Requests and Suggestions to Cabinet to the scrutiny officers to inform the draft report which OSC will debate on the 2 Feb. 2017
- When the IPP papers are published the graduate will identify any themes, inconsistencies or areas for further consideration. It is recommended that you share this with your group in advance of the meeting. You should agree key lines of enquiry, who will lead and any additional questions
- It is helpful to meet your graduate and agree your preferred approach.

BRIEFINGS

IPP GROUP CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

- 20 Dec 2016 OSC IIP update from Director of Resources and the Executive Member
- 18 Jan 2017
 - Graduate, IPP Group Chair, Executive Member briefing

GRADUATE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

This is the most significant scrutiny event on our work programme.

GRADUATE SUPPORT

- You are not the Group's clerk
- You will support the Chair of the IPP Group
- Your job is to keep track of what is happening, help the chair manage the time and note any Suggestions to Cabinet etc.
- At the meeting you will be identifying
 - Suggestions to Cabinet
 - Proposals for future scrutiny
 - Information Requests
 - You are not expected to provide exhaustive responses to the above. In the past some groups have identified no Suggestions for Cabinet which is fine
 - You will also be answering the Post Settlement adjustments to the Integrated Plan (2017 -18)
- You will forward the Group's proposed future Scrutiny, Information Requests and Suggestions to Cabinet to the Scrutiny Officers to inform the draft report which OSC will debate on the 2 Feb. 2017
- When the IPP papers are published your job will be to identify
 - Themes
 - Areas not addressed
 - Areas fully addressed and not needing further exploration
 - Inconsistencies
 - Areas for further consideration
- You should arrange a meeting with the IPP group chair to
 - discuss your findings
 - agree approach
 - agree key lines of enquiry
 - clarify the support they need
 - draft any additional questions

To ensure the smooth running of the IPP Group the Chair

- will expect that the group will have read the relevant portfolio papers **in advance** of the meeting
- Members can ask additional questions. However, their focus should be on the portfolio being scrutinising. The other Groups will address different areas of the Authority's work
- The Chair should encourage members to keep questions brief and to the point. Long questions often let witnesses off the hook and you can be taken down an irrelevant, if interesting, by-way
- The focus is strategic not local. If you believe the member question is too parochial point this out to the chair who will ask the member to address it outside the meeting

GRADUATE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- OSC Dec 2016 have identified additional areas they would like scrutiny members to explore **TBC**

BRIEFINGS

- 14 Dec 2016 graduate briefing
- 20 Dec 2016 OSC IIP update from Director of Resources and the Executive Member
- 18 Jan 2017
 - Graduate briefing x 1 hour, followed by
 - Graduate, IPP group chair, executive member briefing

IPP SCRUTINY CAFÉ

- **26 Jan** You will need to allow the whole day for the IPP Scrutiny plus part of the evening to ensure all the Suggestions etc. are discussed and recorded
 - the IPP Scrutiny runs 8.45am – 4.30pm
 - wash-up session 4.30pm – 7.00pm
- **2 Feb** OSC reconvenes at 10am to debate the draft report. The committee usually concludes around 1.00pm. You will be expected to attend.

PORTFOLIO TEMPLATE
SCRUTINY OF THE INTEGRATED PLAN 2017/18 – 2019/20

PORTFOLIO: e.g. Adult Care & Health; Children’s Services; Community Safety & Waste Management; Enterprise, Education & Skills; Environment, Planning and Transport; Highways; Public Health &, Localism; Resources and Performance *delete as appropriate*

Note: *Each box expands for the required text*

NOTES:

Summary of the key themes, concerns that inform the text below

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CABINET:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

RISK & RESILIENCE IMPACTS

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

PROPOSED SCRUTINIES

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

INFORMATION REQUESTS

- 1.
- 2.

**PORTFOLIO TEMPLATE
 SCRUTINY OF THE INTEGRATED PLAN 2017/18 – 2019/20**

3.

**KEY QUESTIONS
 HEADINGS TBC**

RESPONSE TO POST SETTLEMENT ADJUSTMENTS 2017/18		
<i>Policy Choices</i>		
1.		YES / NO / NOTE
<i>Efficiency Savings</i>		
2.		YES / NO / NOTE
<i>Use of Reserves</i>		
3.		YES / NO / NOTE
NOTES		

**OSC Dec 2016 have identified the following additional areas for the IPP
 Scrutiny groups to explore**