

---

**REPORT OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**


---

**MOVED FROM 9 JUNE 2009 MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2009**


---

Chairman:	* Councillor Stanley Sheinwald	
Councillors:	* Mrs Camilla Bath (2) * John Cowan (1) * Mrs Margaret Davine * B E Gate * Mitzi Green * Jerry Miles	* Mrs Vina Mithani * Narinder Singh Mudhar (5) * Christopher Noyce * Mrs Rekha Shah * Dinesh Solanki * Mark Versallion
Voting	(Voluntary Aided)	(Parent Governors)
Co-opted:	† Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	* Mr R Chauhan † Mrs D Speel

\* Denotes Member present  
(1), (2) and (5) Denote category of Reserve Members  
† Denotes apologies received

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**
**RECOMMENDATION I - Scrutiny Annual Report 2008/09**

The Committee considered its Annual Report 2008/09, which outlined the activities of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Performance and Finance and Call-In Sub-Committees over the past year. The Annual Report also set out the activities of the Lead Members for Scrutiny, detailing the outcomes of individual projects that had been undertaken and included the proposed activities for 2009/10.

The Chairman complimented the work carried out by all Members, in particular the Lead Members for Scrutiny, whose roles had been enhanced following changes in scrutiny's structure.

Having agreed a number of changes for incorporation in the final version of the Annual Report, including a reference to the prestigious "Good Scrutiny Award" presented by the Centre for Public Scrutiny to Harrow for the cross-party scrutiny review on 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector' which was carried out in partnership with voluntary and community groups, and in order to meet its obligations under the Council's Constitution to report annually on the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Committee

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to Council)

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Annual Report for 2008/09 be endorsed.

(See also Minute 561).

**RECOMMENDATION II - Scrutiny Work Programme 2009/10**

The Committee received a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance, which set out proposals for inclusion in the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2009/10 with the programme being completed by January 2010 in order to maintain the political neutrality of scrutiny in the time leading up to the May 2010 local elections (political purdah).

The Committee, having agreed and prioritised the projects for inclusion as part of its Work Programme, noted the requirements set out under the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules 12.1 and 12.3, and accordingly

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to Council)

That the Scrutiny Work Programme 2009/10 set out at Appendix 1 to these minutes be noted.

(See also Minute 562).

**PART II - MINUTES**547. **Welcome:**

The Chairman welcomed guests from the Harrow's Local Involvement Network (LINK) and the Primary Care Trust (PCT), Members and officers to the meeting. He welcomed the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance to his first meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He also welcomed back the Vice-Chairman of the Committee who thanked officers and Members for the kind messages sent to her during a recent bereavement.

The Chairman asked all those presenting reports to keep their introductions brief. He reported that item 8, Lead Member Report, would be considered at the end of the meeting.

548. **Scrutiny Award - Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector:**

The Chairman was delighted to report that Harrow Council's Scrutiny Review on 'Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector' had won a prestigious Good Scrutiny Award in the Financial Category for its work to strengthen its relationship with the community and voluntary sector. He congratulated the cross-party review team, the voluntary sector and scrutiny officers for the work carried out with regard to this review, and added that the voluntary sector, a partner in this review, were also pleased to have received this award.

The Chairman stated that the Council had faced stiff competition from Westminster and Staffordshire Councils. It was noted that Harrow was announced the winner of the award at a ceremony on 9 June 2009, at the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) Annual Conference in Nottingham, which was hosted by Baroness Sally Hamwee, Honorary President of CfPS.

The Corporate Director of Adults and Housing congratulated the review team for winning the award.

549. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Janet Mote  
Councillor Anthony Seymour  
Councillor Yogesh Teli

Reserve Member

Councillor Narinder Singh Mudhar  
Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath  
Councillor John Cowan

550. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following personal interests were declared and that all Members would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and any decision on the items. In declaring a personal interest, Councillor Mark Versallion also stated that, should his interest becoming prejudicial during the discussions on the items indicated below, he would withdraw from the meeting:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
9/10. Harrow Local Involvement Network – Annual Report/ Safeguarding Adults Annual Report	Councillor B E Gate	Married to a health professional and daughter worked at a General Practice.
	Councillor Mark Versallion	Non-Executive Director of North West London Hospitals NHS Trust.
	Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani	Worked for a Health Protection Agency.
	Councillor Stanley Sheinwald	Chair of Carers' Partnership Board.
10. Safeguarding Adults Annual Report	Councillor Dinesh Solanki	Cabinet Support Member from August 2009 to the Portfolio Holder for Adults and Housing. In the interim, he had not been

			involved in any discussion and decision relating to this item.
16.	Scrutiny Review – Extended Schools as Community Resources	) Councillor Dinesh Solanki	Daughter being educated at a school in Harrow. Governor of Park High School.
		) Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath	Governor and Vice-Chairman of Harrow High School.
		) Councillor Narinder Singh Mudhar	Governor of Harrow High School School.
		) Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani	Governor of Glebe School.
		) Councillor Mitzi Green	Governor of Kenmore Park First and Middle School.
		) Councillor B E Gate	Governor of St. Dominics College.
		) Councillor Mrs Margaret Davine	Governor of Newton Farm First and Middle School.
		) Councillor Mrs Rekha Shah	Governor of a Harrow High School in Harrow.
		) Mr Ramji Chauhan	Parent Governor of Hatch End High School.

551. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2009 and the special meeting held on 11 May 2009 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

552. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8.

553. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 9.

554. **Deputations:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10.

555. **References from Council/Cabinet:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no references from Council or Cabinet.

556. **Harrow Local Involvement Network - Annual Report:**

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the cover report and the updated and approved version of the Harrow Local Involvement Network (LINK) Annual Report had not been available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Both reports were admitted late to the agenda to allow the future plans for Harrow LINK to be considered. However, in the interim, a draft of the Annual Report had been circulated with the main agenda.

Mr Julian Maw, a member of Harrow LINK Executive, introduced the report, which set out the current working arrangements and future plans for Harrow LINK. Mr Maw described the purpose of a LINK and outlined similarities and differences with the role of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The fundamental role of Harrow LINK was to improve Health and Social Care in Harrow; it was hosted by Parkwood Healthcare (Host) and funded by central government through the Council. The LINK was independent of the Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the Council.

Members were also informed that the objective of the LINK was to bring patient and public influence to the statutory providers of health and to hold the providers to account. The purpose of the LINK was to monitor existing services and make a case for the future of health and social service provision. It was noted that the Harrow LINK was working towards establishing its work plan. It would aim to consider cross-cutting issues such as the provision of meals on wheels and discharge of patients from hospitals.

Mr Maw stated that Harrow LINK wished to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and would like to help solve issues. Harrow LINK would have a right to have its queries answered in a set time but, unlike the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, it would not be able to require officers to attend its meetings and hold them to account. Mr Maw also explained that, unfortunately, Harrow LINK did not have the resources to attend various meetings frequently and present regular reports to stakeholders.

Members were concerned about the arrangements that were in place to engage and communicate with the public; how residents and health providers could approach the LINK to discuss their problems; financing arrangements including the cost of advertising in the Council's magazine 'Harrow People' and officer support available to Harrow LINK. A Member suggested that the local press be asked to place an article on Harrow LINK and that the organisation be publicised through schools. Another Member suggested that an editorial article be placed in Harrow People Magazine.

In response, Mr Maw stated that whilst engagement with the public had been positive, attendance at public meetings was poor. LINKs did not have the remit to address individual issues but had the powers to deal with general issues raised by the public and hospitals. Two staff supported Harrow LINK, employed by Parkwood Healthcare (Host) and based at the premises occupied by the Host. The public could raise its concerns directly with the LINK and through its website.

Members were informed that the financing of LINKs was different in each borough. The money received from central government was not ring-fenced and the driver amongst many boroughs was to ring-fence less and less money. Harrow LINK was fortunate in that it did not suffer from such issues.

An officer responded to some of the concerns expressed by Members. She explained that LINK was an arms length organisation, which could scrutinise the Council and the PCT. Her key role was to manage the contract between Harrow LINK and Parkwood Healthcare (Host). She added that the Host was responsible for devising a communication plan and she undertook to look into the issue of advertising the Harrow LINK and its functions so that the wider community was aware of the organisation. The issue of the cost of advertising in Harrow People would be addressed as part of the overall communication plan. There were a number of ways in which the role of Harrow LINK could be advertised, which would ensure public engagement in the context of the communication plan.

In summing up, Mr Maw stated that the Harrow LINK Executive Committee would be meeting soon to discuss and produce its Workplan based on information and intelligence received from various communities and local organisations, including direct contact from members of the public.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the Harrow LINK Annual Report be noted;

(2) the officer report back on the development with regard to the communication plan, including how the Harrow LINK would engage with the public.

(See also Minute 550).

557. **Safeguarding Adults Annual Report 2008/09:**

The Corporate Director of Adults and Housing introduced the report, which provided an overview of the Local Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report for 2008/09. The Annual Report summarised the safeguarding activity undertaken throughout the year by the Council and its key partners, set out the statistical information which analysed the referrals received and outlined the priorities for 2009/10.

Members were asked to consider the Annual Report in the context of a number of national developments such as the 'No Secrets' guidance, which required local authorities to take a lead in developing and implementing multi-agency policies and procedures, the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006, which created the

Independent Safeguarding Authority requiring the registration of all those eligible to work with vulnerable adults or children and managing a vetting and barring system, and personalisation which would provide more choice and control for vulnerable people to organise their own personal care.

An officer provided the local context and referred to the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) inspection of safeguarding adults in the borough carried out in January 2008. She had that, since that time, a great deal of work had been carried out with a view to raising awareness and, as a result, the number of referrals had increased from 187 to 358, an increase of 48%. The Directorate would be looking at ways in which "hard to reach" groups could be engaged and encouraged to make referrals. Members were informed that public awareness was crucial, financial abuse was on the increase and training was important for staff working with vulnerable people and in dealing with referrals. In addition, quality assurance, gathering of data and the issue of under-reporting needed to be improved.

Members asked a number of questions about how care homes were safeguarded, the type of information provided to hard to reach communities, where and how information was provided to the general public, how key people in the authority could be contacted to report on elder abuse, levels of checks carried out to ascertain the quality of care homes, manner in which complaints were addressed and audit arrangements in place.

A Member also expressed concern about the recent Panorama programme and its impact on Harrow. The Corporate Director of Adults and Housing and his officers responded as follows:

- the Panorama programme had not raised any issues of significance. All matters raised had been picked up by the local press some months before the programme and were known to the Council. The Council had good monitoring procedures in place. Care UK had been put under special measures well before the airing of the Panorama programme. These measures had come to fruition and Care UK had increased its star-rating and addressed all issues required;
- care homes were inspected and regulated by the Care Quality Commission (CQC), a body that was previously known as Commission for Social Care Inspection-CSCI. The inspection body obtained views of users on an anonymous basis and issues of concern would be notified to the Council. The Council also carried out its own reviews and monitored all contracts. However, intelligence reporting was an essential element in ensuring quality care homes. Leaflets on safeguarding were provided in all care homes and these included essential information. It was intended to take information on safeguarding into the community, particularly to the Black and Minority Ethnic communities;
- individual complaints were dealt with as they arose. If a number of similar complaints were received, these were addressed in a structured manner. Both internal and external auditors were used to monitor the standard of safeguarding work being carried out and this approach had been agreed by Local Safeguarding Adults Board (LSAB);
- the LSAB had been revived and participation increased since the Corporate Director had been in post. The Board was working well, it was well attended and was considered to be one of the strongest in London;
- user satisfaction of care homes in Harrow was high.

A Member enquired if the constant changes in the regulatory body had had an impact. He asked for a break down in the number of visits carried out in care homes, how these were conducted and whether or not any prior notification was given. The same Member asked if any data was available on the number of individuals in the BME communities who did not speak English.

In response, an officer stated that the changes in the regulatory body had not been ideal but he hoped that the new regulator would provide new opportunities. CQC sat on the LSAB and the Director would be meeting with the new Relationship Manager soon. There was a risk-based approach to inspection. Inspection was also based on the star rating given to care homes and, on the whole, inspections were largely announced and a 24-hour notice was given. Those homes with 0-1 star rating were visited more frequently.

The same officer stated that the number of referrals were expected to rise year on year and, in her opinion, the personalisation agenda might also increase abuse, particularly in the community than in care homes. The data available on safeguarding vulnerable adults was not sophisticated enough and this area would be targeted with a view to making improvements in the level and type of information available.

In response to a question from a Member about Care UK, the Corporate Director and an officer explained the arrangements post externalisation of the in-house service, including details of the commencement of the contract. The Corporate Director stated that, in any organisation, the quality of management was pivotal to the services provided. As a result of an increasing number of missed calls, special measures had been put into place and the levels of monitoring increased. A clear improvement plan had helped and Care UK had achieved the targets that had been set.

In conclusion, the Corporate Director stated that it was intended to measure outcomes. He stated that the Council would be assessed against seven outcomes, which included dignity and respect. The Annual Report would also be scrutinised by the LSAB and external scrutiny would be provided by CQC.

**RESOLVED:** That the work undertaken during 2008/09 in relation to the safeguarding adults agenda be noted, including the action plan for 2009/10.

(See also Minute 550).

558. **Joint Review Report - Commissioning Services and Support for People with Learning Disabilities and Complex Needs:**

The Corporate Director of Adults and Housing introduced the report, which set out the findings of the joint review into the commissioning of services and support for people with learning disabilities and complex needs and the action plan developed by the Council in response to those findings. The Corporate Director explained the background and the work that had been undertaken since the inspection by a joint team from the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI), Mental Health Act Commission and the Healthcare Commission in January 2008. The findings of the review were that the Council's Learning Disability Team was poor. As a result, significant changes were put in place.

Members were informed that the joint review had focused broadly on the services provided directly by the Council and the Primary Care Trust (PCT) and access points such as the General Practices (GPs). A number of challenges had been identified and, for Harrow, these mirrored the picture nationally. The officer also informed Members that Harrow was the lead authority on the introduction of personal budgets.

In response to questions, the officer and Jon Ota, Director of Harrow PCT, acknowledged that a large number of adults lived in registered care homes instead of living independently. They agreed that independent living was linked to the accommodation strategy. Additionally, people with learning disabilities, had poor health outcomes. It was important that the General Practitioners were trained to undertake health action plans. The officer undertook to report back on the actual number of health action plans available. It was noted that care homes were monitored.

In response to a statement by a Member, the Corporate Director stated a great deal of progress had been made since the review and that he was confident that the actions taken would feed positively into the Care Quality Commission (CQC) report that was expected to be released in autumn 2009. The Directorate had also commissioned IPSOS MORI to carry out a survey, which would include individual interviews with people with disabilities. A total of 284 adults with a learning disability took part in the face to face survey, resulting in an extremely high response rate of 80%. Early indications were that many had noticed the difference and improvements in the services delivered. However, he was not complacent and more improvements were needed.

Members enquired about the staff turnover, the types of training available, why 85% of staff needed training, service failures and funding. In response, an officer and the representative of Harrow PCT stated that there had been some turnover in staff. This impacted adversely on both the service providers and the users. By April 2009, 75% of staff had been trained in the safeguarding of adults, which had been classified as mandatory. The funding of staff would be provided from the existing revenue budget.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the findings of the joint review be noted;

(2) the actions contained in the joint review action plan to address the recommendations of the joint review be noted;

(3) the Corporate Director of Adults and Housing report back on the actual number of health action plans available.

559. **Sustainability Review Scope and Interim Report:**

A Co-Chairman of the Sustainability Review Group Challenge Panel on the draft Climate Change Strategy introduced the report, which set out the revised scope of the review conducted and the findings and recommendations of the Panel. He stated that, in addition to the recommendations of the Panel, there were two other elements:

- the Economic Development team would hold a Summit and scrutiny would consider the findings of the Summit. A questionnaire would be conducted during the summer, at a challenge session;
- a conference would be held to discuss the issue of community sustainability at which all stakeholders would be invited.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the revisions to the scope be adopted and endorsed;

(2) the findings and recommendations of the Sustainability Review Group at Appendix 2 of the report be agreed and endorsed.

560. **Use of Resources Challenge Panel:**

The Chairman of the Use of Resources Challenge Panel introduced the report, which set out the recommendations following the use of resources self-assessment. He drew attention to the key recommendations, and thanked members and officers for their participation in the Challenge Panel.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the findings and observations of the Use of Resources Challenge Panel be noted;

(2) the following recommendations of the Challenge Panel be agreed and reported to Cabinet for consideration:

- the organisation ensures that the self assessment provides a focus for the Council's improvement process and does not become an end in itself;
- the final self assessment, incorporating the improvement priorities, should be made available to the Panel for comment ;
- the Council ensure that the improvement priorities eventually incorporated in the self assessment are grounded in a clear understanding of residents' priorities;
- whilst improvement priorities must be realistic and achievable, they must also be aspirational, and the Panel also recommends that the Council appraises itself of the improvement processes being adopted in other similar boroughs;
- the self assessment 'under sell' but 'over deliver' in terms of its content;
- the content incorporates evidence of the impact of the processes that had been included in it.

561. **Scrutiny Annual Report:**

Further to Recommendation I, an officer responded to Members' questions in relation to the changes proposed to the Scrutiny Annual Report 2008/09. She agreed to transfer parts of the section titled 'Scrutiny Member Development Programme 2008/09' to another section and agreed to list the number of review group meetings held across all reviews carried out together with the visits made to other boroughs and organisations. Members were of the view that for completeness all such information should be set out in the Annual Report so that a true picture of the work carried out by scrutiny could be gleaned by members of the public.

A Member commented that, in terms of the work carried out by the Call-In Sub-Committees, it was essential that the reasons for not upholding a Call-In were conveyed to Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the Scrutiny Annual report 2009/09 be amended prior to its submission to Council;

(2) in future, the reasons for not upholding a Call-In be conveyed to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

562. **Scrutiny Work Programme 2009/10:**

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, Members received a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance, which was admitted late to the agenda to allow Members to agree the Committee's Work Programme for 2009/10 and report it to Council. The report had not been available at the time the agenda was printed and circulated.

Further to Recommendation II, the Committee prioritised its Work Programme for 2009/10 on the basis of the advice received from an officer that some of the projects should be instigated once further information had been received from various sources. Members agreed that some of the projects should only be carried out once it was understood that they would not lead to duplication of work as similar work was underway in other areas of the Council and where it was clear that the project would add value to the work of the Council. It was also agreed that a couple of the projects ought to be carried out by the new Overview and Scrutiny Committee after the May 2010 local election. The types of reviews that ought to be carried out were also be discussed.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the items appended at Appendix 1 to these minutes be noted and included in the Work Programme, subject to the qualifications listed in column 5;

(2) the scrutiny team devise an appropriate timetable to deliver the Work Programme.

563. **Scrutiny Review - Extended Schools as Community Resources:**

The Committee received a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance, which set out the findings and recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of Extended Schools as Community Resources.

The Chairman of the Review Group explained how the light touch review had been conducted, as a result of which it had not been possible for the Group to visit all schools or clusters. The range of clusters that had been visited ranged from good to poor. Those that could not be visited were sent a questionnaire to complete and return. The Review Group had carried out a great deal of desktop work in achieving its findings.

Members were informed that the Review Group had found that extended schools added value, particularly for the vulnerable communities. The appointment of parent ambassadors was welcomed and it was hoped that the practice would spread to other schools.

Members were of the view that it was appropriate for the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee rather than the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to monitor progress of the recommendations. They also agreed that the report should be sent to Cabinet instead of the Portfolio Holder.

The Chairman of the Review Group drew attention to the recommendations of the Review Group and it was

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the report and the recommendations (set out at appendix 2 to these minutes) of the Scrutiny Review Group on Extended Schools as Community Resources be endorsed;

(2) the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee monitor progress of the recommendations and receive a report in six months' time;

(3) the report be submitted to Cabinet.

(See also Minute 550).

564. **Improving Surgical Services for Children and Young People in Hospitals:**

An officer introduced the report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance, which set out the way forward for the delivery of North West London Collaborative Programme Paediatric Initiative 'Improving Surgical Services for Children and Young People in Hospitals'. It was noted that Chelsea and Westminster NHS Foundation Trust in collaboration with Great Ormond Street and Guys and St Thomas' Hospital Foundation Trust had been selected as the preferred provider of these services. There was cross-party support to the recommendations set out in the report and it was



**RESOLVED:** That (1) the decisions made by eight North West London Health Scrutiny Chairmen and Children and Young people Scrutiny Chairmen that formal consultation on implementing the Programme was not necessary be endorsed;

(2) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorses that there should a process of on-going consultation with the public and stakeholders.

565. **Lead Member Report:**

The Committee considered a written report of the issues considered by the Scrutiny Lead Members for Adult Health and Social Care, Corporate Effectiveness and Finance and Safer and Stronger Communities on 17 April, 20 April and 6 May 2009 respectively.

The Policy Scrutiny Lead Member for Adult Health and Social Care added that since the report was written, Harrow Scrutiny's response to Healthcare for London consultation on stroke and major trauma services in London had been submitted to the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JOSC). However, the 8 June 2009 meeting of the JOSC had been cancelled.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the annual report on Safeguarding Adults be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its June 2009 meeting;

(2) it be noted that the Scrutiny Lead Members for Adult Health and Social Care had been invited to visit a new Neighbourhood Resource Centre when these had been opened and that a visit to the new Centre at Byron Road was considered to be the best option;

(3) it be noted that the Scrutiny Lead Members for Corporate Effectiveness had noted the report on the 'People from different backgrounds getting on' indicator, prepared as part of the Local Area Agreement;

(4) in relation to the topline results from the Place Survey, Councillors be provided with the unconfirmed comparative information;

(5) the results of the staff survey be provided to Councillors in order to allow them to determine whether further investigation was required;

(6) a watching brief be maintained on the implementation of the Councillor Call for Action process;

(7) a special meeting of the Scrutiny Lead members for Corporate Effectiveness and Finance be timetabled to discuss the Comprehensive Area Assessment;

(8) the Scrutiny Lead Members for Safer and Stronger Communities continue to monitor the development of the Councillor Call for Action;

(9) the Scrutiny Lead Members for Safer and Stronger Communities continue to monitor 'The Duty to Involve, Inform and Consult' which came into force in April 2009;

(10) the Scrutiny Lead Members for Safer and Stronger Communities be provided with further information on how the responsible parts of the Council and other organisations worked together to develop stronger communities;

(11) the Scrutiny Lead Members for Safer and Stronger Communities consider the implementation of the recommendations of the HearSay Review.

(See also Minute 557)

566. **Extension and Termination of Meeting:**

In accordance with the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 6.6 (ii) (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

**RESOLVED:** At 10.00 pm to continue until 10.15 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.32 pm, closed at 10.05 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR STANLEY SHEINWALD  
Chairman

APPENDIX 1SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2009/10PROJECTS 2009/10 including those CARRIED OVER FROM 2008/09

<b>Project</b>	<b>Possible detail</b>	<b>How</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 11 June 2009</b>
<b>Standing Review of the Budget</b>	Phase Two of this project is now underway. Specific strands include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the capital budget</li> <li>• Investigation of options for revenue generation</li> </ul> Shared services – in particular asset management.	This is a standing review	Ongoing	Ongoing - Review to continue
<b>Healthcare for London</b>	Harrow is represented on the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee by Cllr Mithani (Cllr Davine is reserve). The JOSOC is considering proposals from Healthcare for London regarding major trauma and stroke services.	Pan London Committee	This phase will run until summer 2009, but further work will be forthcoming as proposals are developed. The working group will therefore need to be kept in place.	Ongoing – Review to continue
<b>Healthcare for London - working group</b>	To provide support to the members of the JOSOC by identifying Harrow perspective to recommendations being made.	An informal group providing support to the representatives	The working group meets to support the Harrow JOSOC representative, if this no longer meets the working group will be suspended, but may be reconstituted to support other Healthcare for London consultations.	Ongoing – Review to continue
<b>Sustainability</b>	The scope of the review includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of the draft Climate Change Strategy</li> <li>• Support for the local business base – Small and Medium Enterprises</li> <li>• Community cohesion</li> </ul>	In-Depth Review	Spring – Autumn 2009  The Climate Change Strategy Challenge Panel met on	Ongoing – Review to continue.

Project	Possible detail	How	When	Decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 11 June 2009
	There is also a proposal to hold a roundtable discussion with partners to see how well their sustainability policies and strategies join up with the council's.		6 <sup>th</sup> May.	
<b>Transitions</b>	Concerns have been raised by councillors about how vulnerable children and young people transfer across to adults services.	Light-Touch Review	Autumn	To be conducted as a Light-Touch Review, starting in Autumn 2009.
<b>Performance of the Kier contract</b>	The performance of the Kier contract has been considered on a number of occasions by the Performance and Finance sub committee. Concerns remain and the committee is proposing a more detailed investigation	This work will focus on the minor works/housing repairs component of the contract. It will also use the outcome of the LEAN project investigation of the housing repairs service as the basis of the investigation.	To commence as soon as possible.	Conduct as a light-touch review, starting in Summer 2009. This review is considered to be a priority for 2009/10.
<b>Grants criteria</b>	Recommendation 15 of scrutiny's review 'Delivering a strengthened voluntary and community sector for Harrow' asks that proposals to review the Council's grants criteria be brought to a scrutiny challenge panel, in preparation for the 2010/11 grants application round.	Challenge Panel	22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2009	Ongoing Review to be completed during 2009.

**2009/10 - PROJECTS PENDING SUBJECT TO FURTHER DECISIONS**

Project	Possible detail	How	When	Decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 11 June 2009
<b>Communications and fear of crime</b>	The fear of crime in the borough remains high, though reducing, whilst crime levels are comparatively low. The possibility of considering how the council and partners work with local media to communicate crime data might help address this imbalance.	Challenge Panel/Light Touch Review	To be confirmed	The Place Survey looks at fear of crime. An action plan will address the findings within the survey. A Communications Plan will be developed, arising from the action plan.

Project	Possible detail	How	When	Decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 11 June 2009
				The Communications Plan to be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration before any decision about a further scrutiny review work is made.
<b>Community lettings</b>	This is residual work following the Developing a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector and Extended Schools reviews and is a further investigation of how effectively the Council supports the 3 <sup>rd</sup> sector through the availability of premises.	Any further work is dependent upon the outcome of investigation by cultural services which will be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny committee in June	To be confirmed	A report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 28 July 2009 to be considered before any decision about further scrutiny review work is made.
<b>NW London Acute Health Services Review</b>	This issue is beginning to emerge in discussions with health partners. There is no specific detail regarding proposals at this stage but it is likely to involve rationalisation of acute hospital provision. As there are few Foundation hospitals in the region (which are exempt from the review) there may be significant proposals for local health provision.	Unclear at this point in time, but councillors may leave space in the work programme to pick it up	To be confirmed	A report to O&S on 28 July to be considered before any decision about further scrutiny review work is made.
<b>Adults and Housing Transformation Programme Plan</b>	This is an issue initially raised by the Director of Adults and Housing Services and it would be appropriate to continue to provide scrutiny support to monitor the implementation of the transformation programme.	Challenge Panel	To be confirmed	To be conducted as a Challenge Panel during 2009/10, if resources allow.
<b>Housing Revenue Account</b>	The Performance and Finance sub committee investigated the performance of the Housing Revenue Account and identified concerns regarding its longer-term viability. The Director of Housing is undertaking an investigation of the issues and depending	To be confirmed	To commence Summer/Autumn	To be retained on the Work Programme for 2009/10 and is dependent upon available resources. However the Review is not considered a priority for 2009/10.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Possible detail</b>	<b>How</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 11 June 2009</b>
	upon the outcome of this work, the committee may wish to schedule a specific project later in the year			

**PROJECT PROPOSED FOR 2010/11**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Possible detail</b>	<b>How</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Decision of Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 11 June 2009</b>
<b>Young people and crime</b>	Linked to the fear of crime, young people are often perceived to be perpetrators of crime but are more often than not the victims. This piece of work can support the work around fear of crime.	Challenge panel/light touch review	To be confirmed	An important piece of work that warrants more time than may be available in the 2009/10 Work Programme.  Recommend that this project is carried forward to the 2010/11 Work Programme.

APPENDIX 2SCRUTINY REVIEW – EXTENDED SCHOOLS AS COMMUNITY RESOURCESRecommendations

Officers ensure that robust systems of support, advice and challenge are in place for all clusters to help develop the knowledge and expertise of each Cluster Co-ordinator and their lead headteacher.

Clusters Co-ordinators and headteachers be encouraged to consider the introduction of the appointment of Parent Ambassadors for hard to reach communities in their local area/cluster to look at whether such a scheme would be beneficial to the community.

That cluster groups develop a termly pro-forma for publicising activities and ensure a copy goes home with each child in the cluster. The information should also be widely available through community venues such as libraries, children's centres, health centres and relevant websites.

Other ways of communicating with the community at large should be investigated so that members of the community not directly involved with schools are aware of the services and activities available.

Elected Members who are also school governors should work to raise the profile of extended schools within the schools they govern, in their individual wards and in the community at large.

Steps should be taken to ensure that strategic working was ongoing to bring together expertise from the clusters and local authority officers together in the integration of Extended Schools and Children's Centres. As further Children's Centres were established and opened full advantage should be taken of working together.

All agencies involved in Extended Schools needed to develop an overall vision of how all schools and cluster groups develop plans for mainstreaming and in turn sustaining extended schools activities across clusters post 2011.

A challenge panel/ further review should be held in 6 months time to address the progress of the recommendations that had been put forward from the review group and to also explore the community lettings and community resources element of Extended Schools.

In line with the recommendation above, schools should be examining services they can provide to the community including making their premises available at a reasonable cost.