

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

AGENDA

DATE: Tuesday 28 February 2012

TIME: 7.30 pm

VENUE: Committee Rooms 1&2
Harrow Civic Centre

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 4)

Chairman: Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors:

Sue Anderson	Kam Chana
Ann Gate	Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Sachin Shah	Paul Osborn (VC)
Victoria Silver	Stephen Wright

Representatives of Voluntary Aided Sector: Mrs J Rammelt/Reverend P Reece
Representatives of Parent Governors: Mrs A Khan/1 Vacancy

(Note: Where there is a matter relating to the Council's education functions, the "church" and parent governor representatives have attendance, speaking and voting rights. They are entitled to speak but not vote on any other matter.)

Reserve Members:

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Nana Asante | 1. Chris Mote |
| 2. Varsha Parmar | 2. Tony Ferrari |
| 3. Krishna Suresh | 3. Christine Bednell |
| 4. Sasi Suresh | 4. Susan Hall |
| 5. Krishna James | |

Contact: Alison Atherton, Senior Professional - Democratic Services
Tel: 020 8424 1266 E-mail: alison.atherton@harrow.gov.uk

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Committee;
- (b) all other Members present.

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 10)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2011 and of the Special meeting held on 31 January 2012 be taken as read and signed correct records.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive questions (if any) from local residents/organisations under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17.

5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15.

6. DEPUTATIONS

To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16.

7. REFERENCES FROM COUNCIL/CABINET

(if any).

8. STRATEGIC APPROACH TO THE FUTURE PROVISION OF THE LIBRARY AND SPORTS SERVICE (Pages 11 - 18)

Report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.

9. SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN - SCOPE (Pages 19 - 26)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.

10. PROJECT SCOPE - PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR HOUSING REVIEW (To Follow)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.

11. REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE (Pages 27 - 42)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.

12. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (Pages 43 - 48)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance.

13. REPORT FROM SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBERS (Pages 49 - 60)

Report of the Scrutiny Lead Members is attached.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Which the Chairman has decided is urgent and cannot otherwise be dealt with.

AGENDA - PART II

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

13 DECEMBER 2011

Chairman:	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
Councillors:	* Sue Anderson * Tony Ferrari (2) * Ann Gate * Barry Macleod-Cullinane	* Paul Osborn * Sachin Shah * Victoria Silver * Stephen Wright
Voting Co-opted:	(Voluntary Aided) † Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece	(Parent Governors) * Mrs A Khan
In attendance: (Councillors)	David Perry	Minute 216

- * Denotes Member present
- (2) Denote category of Reserve Members
- † Denotes apologies received

210. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Kam Chana

Reserve Member

Councillor Tony Ferrari

211. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 9 – Strategic Overview of Voluntary Sector Support and Update on Implementation of Third Sector Strategy

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a personal interest in that she was a Member of the Grants Advisory Panel. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Ann Gate declared a personal interest in that her husband was a trustee of Harrow Association of Voluntary Service (HAVS). She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon unless the interest became prejudicial and she would then leave the room.

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest in that he was employed by London Councils. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Sachin Shah declared a personal interest in that he worked in the Third Sector but not for one of the organisations mentioned in the report. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 10 –Senior Management Restructure Proposals Challenge Panel Report

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal and prejudicial interest in that he was a member of the Chief Officers' Employment Panel. He would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 12 – Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents – Quarterly Report

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a personal interest in that he had been the relevant Portfolio Holder at the time of the reablement pilot. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 13 – Report of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee Chair

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he had received hospitality from Capita. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

212. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2011 and of the Special meeting held on 24 November 2011 be taken as read and signed as correct records.

213. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 17, 15 and 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

214. References from Council/Cabinet

There were none.

RESOLVED ITEMS

215. West London Waste Plan: Pre-Submission Consultation document

Members received a report of the Corporate Director of Place Shaping which presented the results of the consultation held in February and March 2011 on the West London Waste Plan (WLWP) Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document. The report introduced the next version of the Plan – the Pre-Submission document – proposed for publication for public consultation in January 2012.

The officer outlined the content of the report and reminded Members that the West London Waste Plan Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document had been considered by the Committee on 2 November 2010 and had subsequently been approved by Cabinet for publication for public consultation. The report outlined the arrangements that had been made to involve the public and key stakeholder in that stage of the consultation and the main concerns that had been raised. These included the four objections to the proposed Council Depot site in terms of the impact on the residential amenity and access.

The officer advised that the Pre-Submission documents had been amended to take account of the consultation responses, the findings by the consultants in terms of the detailed Site Delivery Assessment, a Sustainability Appraisal and Equalities Impact Assessment. He reported the main changes to the draft Plan and the timetable for the preparation of the WLWP.

A Member questioned the economies of scale that could be derived from the proposed Plan in terms of recyclables and waste going to landfill, suggesting that a specific site deal with all recyclables or land fill and expressed concern that the report did not address this issue. The officer advised that there were two elements to this; the Council's policy and planning functions and the Council's function as a waste authority. He advised that the West London Municipal Waste Strategy provided the detail to which the Member referred and was an operational document whilst the West London Waste Plan enabled the allocation of sites and was a policy document. The distinction was key. Another Member stated that it would be helpful to consider both of the afore-mentioned documents at the same time.

In response to the comments, the officer advised that the West London Waste Authority and the technical group that supported them had been involved in the preparation of the WLWP and did not wish the Council to pre-judge which facilities would be on which site. The WLWA had received eight bids to divert waste from landfill. The Council could assess but not be seen to be prejudicial.

A Member questioned whether the facilities could be expanded by the use of Colnbrook rather than building a new facility. He expressed the view that the Depot was poorly served in terms of road linkages and that it would therefore be sensible to keep the import of waste to a minimum. He added that the Major Developments Panel had been considering sites for development and that there was a perception that there appeared to be a lack of joined up thinking between this report and the proposals under consideration by that Panel. The officer responded that consideration was being given to the expansion of Colnbrook and he acknowledged that waste might still need to be treated outside of Harrow. There was, however, an assumption that waste would also be imported for treatment but this did not necessarily mean a significant increase in the number of road trips that would need to be made. A new waste facility on the Depot site would enable the Council to modernise the Civic Amenity Site. In terms of the MDP, the officer added there were policies for the Depot within the Area Action Plan (AAP).

Members made a number of other comments and asked questions as follows:

- A Member questioned how white electrical waste would be dealt with. The officer undertook to look into this and to advise the Member accordingly.
- A Member sought clarification on paragraph 3.8 of the draft Plan in terms of the source of agricultural waste and its composition. The officer undertook to establish the position on this aspect of the Plan.
- A Member expressed the view that paragraph 7.1.2 of the draft Plan was inadequate as it did not state who was responsible and who would manage this aspect. The officer took these comments on board.
- Inclusion of the timescales setting out when the Plan would be coming 'on stream' would be helpful.

The Chair thanked the officer his presentation and responses.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the comments of the Committee be forwarded to Cabinet.

216. Strategic overview of Voluntary Sector support and update on implementation of Third Sector Strategy

The Chair welcomed the Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services and the Divisional Director of Cultural Services to the meeting. The Portfolio Holder introduced the report which provided an overview of Council support to the Voluntary Sector and an update on the implementation of the Third Sector Strategy.

The Divisional Director of Community and Cultural Services outlined the background to the report, the current situation, the way in which each of the three objectives of the Third Sector Strategy had been delivered to date, some of the highlights and work for the future. Both the Divisional Director

and Portfolio Holder offered to provide the Committee with an annual update on the Strategy.

During the discussion on this item Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- A Member stated that whilst transparency in the grants process was important he was concerned about the scoring of the applications. Scoring removed judgement and he was not convinced that was helpful as had been seen with the Shopmobility application earlier that year. He added that it may be that those organisations that completed the application form well that received a grant and suggested that maybe a more common sense approach should be taken. The Divisional Director acknowledged the difficulties but advised that as applications requested funding for triple the amount available in the budget there needed to be a clear and transparent process in place. The grants process was reviewed annually and, following the most recent review, this year's application focused on outcomes and the need the organisations had identified. The Portfolio Holder added that there was cross party evaluation of the applications and that there was a fine balance in terms of judgement.
- The London Councils Grants Scheme was not mentioned in the report and a Member expressed concern that the Council viewed this as free money. The strategy should include reference as to how the repatriation of London Council funding would be dealt with. Another Member advised that London Councils had agreed the budget that day and that a reduction in the budget to £11.5m had been recommended. Two thirds of London Boroughs would be required to agree this by 31 January 2012. The Divisional Director advised that the London Councils funding tended to be targeted disproportionately to inner London Boroughs. She undertook to take the comments on board.
- A Member sought clarification on the phased transition to commissioning and how it worked in practice. The Divisional Director advised that work was currently underway and officers were looking to identify the first pilot(s) in consultation with the Voluntary and Community Sector which would begin with a workshop at the end of January 2012. There would be a report to Cabinet in March 2012.
- A Member questioned how support could be given fairly and suggested that discretionary rate relief could be considered. The Divisional Director responded that consistency and transparency of support was important and that Finance was currently doing consultation on discretionary rate relief. Another Member stated that he had been unable to find any reference to this consultation on the Council's website and emphasised the need for the website to be up to date.
- A Member questioned how much money the voluntary sector brought into the borough and was advised that it would be suggested to the voluntary service representatives that they might want to consider this.

There were 600 organisations in Harrow, of which 38 were funded by the Council through the Main Grants Programme.

- In response to a Member's comment that an analysis should be done of organisations viability and longevity, the Divisional Director advised that a financial review of those organisations applying for funding was carried out before any grant was given.
- Referring to objective 3, a Member sought clarification on the longer term funding arrangements. The Divisional Director advised that commissioning would give organisations more certainty for a 3 year period whereas the grants process was annual.
- A Member questioned whether any analysis was done on the overall external funding streams lost by organisations in the current financial climate. The Divisional Director advised that the grants process was competitive and officers could not determine who would apply. Sixty organisations had attended the workshops run by the Council to offer assistance with the process. She added that some external funding organisations, such as the Heritage Lottery fund, had more (not less) funding available.
- A Member stated that the Association of London Government, the predecessor of London Councils, had funded some organisations year after year and he questioned how the Council could ensure that organisations/groups did not automatically receive funding for historical reasons. The Divisional Director stated that it was a competitive process and some organisations that were funded previously had not been this year. The Portfolio Holder added that workshop sessions had aimed to improve the skills of those completing the application form and that whilst large organisations did receive the most funding, there was a separate budget this year for smaller organisations. He acknowledged the Member's comments about the need for an increased budget in this area.
- In response to a Member's question in relation to the transformation fund, the Interim Director of Finance advised that the Council was in a forecast over spend position. In terms of general new bids there was £470,000 remaining and, in relation to the restructure, £1m, but that this would not be the case at year end. In terms of commissioning, she added that the Council's resources should be allocated in accordance with the priorities and by what the Council was trying to achieve.
- In response to a Member's question as to whether unsuccessful applicants were provided with details of other potential sources of funding, the Divisional Director advised that the Council had an External Funding Officer who sent regular emails to voluntary service organisations. Regular workshops were also held by the Community Development Team and there would be a workshop targeting sports organisations with input from the Big Lottery Fund and Sport England in January 2012.

The Chair thanked the Portfolio Holder and officer for their attendance and the responses provided.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the progress against the action plan for the Third Sector Strategy and current developments regarding Council support to the Voluntary Sector be noted;
- (2) the proposed updated actions set out at Appendix 4 to the report of the Divisional Director of Community and Culture be noted.

217. Senior Management Restructure Proposals Challenge Panel Report

The Committee received report from the scrutiny challenge panel which had considered the Senior Management Re-Structure proposals.

In considering the report of the panel, Members expressed differing views as to the extent to which the panel's comments had been taken on board in the report that was due to be considered by Cabinet on 15 December 2011 with particular reference to the Section 151 Officer and competition for posts. A Member stated that whilst he was happy with the report he was concerned at having a Section 151 Officer in post that had not been interviewed and appointed by Members. He also suggested that the report be forwarded to the Chief Officer's Employment Panel for consideration. In response, the Chair of the panel advised that this had not been a finding of the panel.

During the discussion on this item, Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- A Member expressed the view that whilst he was pleased to see that there would be a review of the structure in 18 months, he was concerned about the contradiction in terms of the post of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise in that he/she would be appointed for a period of 2 years.
- A Member voiced his concerns about the potential for legal challenge and stated that some of the proposals did not appear to have been thought through. The potential consequences should the Council not want post holders to continue in their role in 18 months required consideration. No evidence had been provided to the panel as to how the structure had been devised.
- A Member stated there would always be problems when a structure was based around existing post holders and that the clear driving force behind the re structure was reducing redundancy costs. The Section 151 Officer should be 'free' to look at finances as a whole and whether that individual had a place on the Corporate Board was a separate issue. The Interim Director of Finance advised that the new structure had not been created around existing post holders but instead to take

the organisation forward. In terms of the future Section 151 Officer there would be an open invitation for the post holder to attend the Corporate Strategy Board and he/she would receive all the papers. The post holder would also have regular meetings with the Chief Executive.

- A Member stated that over 90% of Section 151 Officers were on the Corporate Board and had a direct link to the Chief Executive. There were issues in terms of overloading this post holder and Director of Resources. Another Member stated that the Section 151 Officer was the officer that the Council would rely on in a crisis and it made no sense that this individual was not included on the Corporate Board.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report of the challenge panel and comments of the Committee be referred to Cabinet for consideration;
(2) the report of the challenge panel be referred to the Chief Officers' Employment Panel for consideration.

218. Report from the Debt Recovery Challenge Panel

Members received a report of the Debt Recovery Challenge Panel which outlined the review's observations and findings with regards to the Council's debt recovery processes.

The Chair of the Panel introduced the report and stated that, in his view, a balance had been struck between the officer view and resident and service perspective. He stated that the Council did, in many ways, deal well with debt recovery but expressed concern that no assessment of vulnerability was carried out. In terms of the most serious cases of debt, it was necessary to deal with them with consideration and thought.

A Member expressed concern that the step by step debt recovery process was not documented and as Councillors were a representative of their residents, serious cases of debt should be brought to their attention to enable them to assist. It might also be helpful to have a database of those that were in debt to the Council. The Chair of the panel responded that there was a large report that did document the process but that had not been appended to the challenge panel report. He reported that, in terms of numbers, there were approximately 1,000 bailiff visits per ward per annum and therefore the process had to recognise the numbers and therefore any intervention would need to be towards the end of the process. The officer added that whilst the process documents had been considered by the panel and the lead Members in preparing for the panel, their focus had been on the need for a greater flexibility in the application in the very few circumstances in which very vulnerable residents needed to be identified.

Other Members expressed the view that the debt recovery processes in place should be robust enough that councillors should not need to get involved. If they were to get involved, there would be Data Protection Act issues and whether all three ward councillors should be involved would also be a consideration. The Interim Director of Finance endorsed this sentiment and

stated that there were agencies in the community that could assist residents in dealing with debt and the Council could act as a signpost to assistance.

In discussing the report, the following comments were also made:

- Members suggested that consideration should be given to involving ward councillors and/or the portfolio holder at the final stage of the debt recovery process.
- The Council should become better at signposting residents to assistance.
- During the previous Administration there had been useful, regular meetings between the portfolio holder, Director of Legal and Governance and the Divisional Director of Audit and Risk to discuss and act as a check on the most serious cases of debt.
- A Member suggested that the debt collection process across the Council appeared to be fragmented and that he felt that the panel should investigate this. The Interim Director of Finance agreed that there was some fragmentation and that as in her statutory role she needed to have an overarching view of debt, she already had a piece of work in progress in this area which she was happy to discuss with Scrutiny. An officer suggested that the challenge panel be re-convened when this work had been completed and other relevant officers be invited to attend in order to consider the Interim Director of Finance's findings. The Committee endorsed this suggestion.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the findings and recommendations of the Debt Recovery challenge panel be noted and be referred to Cabinet for consideration;
- (2) the possible integration of debt recovery processes be further examined by this challenge panel once the current work led by the Interim Director of Finance had been completed.

219. Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents - Quarterly Report

The Committee received a report which provided a quarterly update on the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents consideration of project management and the VERTO system and the Re-abling Focused Care project. The Chair of the review outlined the projects and stated that a successful project would save money.

A Member expressed the view that it was unclear what the significant reductions in project management being proposed in the draft budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy were and that it was unclear what the impact of the reductions in project management might be. The impact of this required consideration. The Interim Director of Finance advised that the

proposals covered a three year period and tied in with the transformation programme not having the same throughput. Individual projects would have in built project management and VERTO should assist efficiency. Each proposal built in to the budget was accompanied by an assessment of implications. The Member stated that, in his view, more projects should be coming forward.

RESOLVED: That the findings of the scrutiny review be noted and referred to Cabinet for consideration.

220. Report of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee Chair

Members received the report of the Chair of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee which provided a summary of issues to be taken forward following meeting on 22 November 2011.

A Member questioned where the information that had been promised to the Sub-Committee was and stressed the need to receive information in a timely fashion. The Chair undertook to chase it up.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

221. Report from Scrutiny Lead Members

The Committee received the report which outlined the details of work of the Scrutiny Lead Members for Adult Health and Social Care and Children and Young People.

A Member expressed concern in terms of children looked after and stated that as corporate parents, this be prioritised to the top of the list of work.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the actions proposed be agreed.

222. Termination of Meeting

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At 9.58 pm to continue until 10.05 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.35 pm, closed at 9.59 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chairman

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
AND SCRUTINY SUB-
COMMITTEES**

Date of Meeting:	28 th February 2012
Subject:	Strategic Approach to the future provision of library and leisure services
Responsible Officer:	Paul Najsarek Corporate Director Community, Health & Well Being
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	None

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

FOR INFORMATION

This report sets out information for Scrutiny Members on the strategic approach to the future provision of library and leisure services.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Introductory paragraph

In January 2012, Cabinet approved the delegation of authority to the relevant Corporate Directors in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Community & Cultural Services and for Property and Major Contracts to explore the commissioning of leisure and library services in collaboration with partner boroughs (currently Ealing and Brent for leisure management and Ealing for library services) subject to further final approval of the service delivery options by Cabinet. This report gives information on the strategic background to this decision and the next steps.

2.2 Background

2.2.1 Harrow Council has been considering, along with other neighbouring boroughs and with West London Alliance partners in particular, how local authority services may be commissioned or delivered in partnership to offer efficiencies e.g. in management overheads or through economies of scale. Some joint delivery is already in place, for example Brent and Harrow trading standards services, and other possibilities are under consideration, such as joint delivery of Barnet and Harrow legal services. Harrow is one of the authorities in the joint West London commissioning of adult care services.

2.2.2 Across the country and in London, there are now a number of different models for delivering cultural services. For example, Slough Borough Council has contracted Essex County Council to deliver its library service. Hounslow has tendered all of its cultural services to a contractor consortium with John Laing PLC delivering the library, arts, parks and heritage services and Fusion providing leisure management. Redbridge have set up a separate cultural trust to deliver all of their cultural services. Croydon and Wandsworth are currently undertaking joint procurement for their library service.

2.2.3 Other local authorities are investigating or are already in partnership re shared service delivery of one or more of their respective cultural services across boroughs. Examples in London include Bexley and Bromley sharing library services; Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster merging all service delivery including cultural services; and Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham looking at similar models .

2.3 Current situation

2.3.1 A cross-borough group of senior officers from Brent, Ealing and Harrow have been considering the potential of delivering cultural services jointly and identifying what models could deliver any such joint services. This Strategic Board consists of Corporate Directors responsible for these services from all three boroughs and the relevant third tier officers (Divisional Director, Assistant Director etc). In addition, Brent has provided initial legal advice on procurement and governance models for the project, Harrow has provided the procurement lead and Ealing provide project coordination and business plan

development. Portfolio Holders have been briefed jointly across the boroughs and separately within each of the boroughs.

2.3.2 At an early stage, it was identified that it would not be possible to include arts and heritage services across the three boroughs due to the fact that these services were at different stages of development and there were existing plans in some of the partner authorities for different service delivery models which were already progressing. It was decided to concentrate on libraries and leisure, where there could be synergies, for example in leisure management contract dates, which would support a feasibility study into the potential for partnership arrangements. The current project therefore concentrates on the provision of library and leisure management services

2.3.3 A working group of relevant officers from across the boroughs, reporting to the Board, conducted a feasibility review into the services, identifying budgets and costs, delivery models, assets, staffing and other resources and developed an outline business plan. This identified a number of potential saving areas such as shared procurement costs, joint management fee overheads, reduced support services and staffing costs, potential VAT advantages, shared client side/management arrangements and economies of scale for contractors. The plan is based on analysis of this comprehensive data with a 10-year business model. Early and later soft market testing indicated there was interest in this approach from potential providers.

2.3.4 In January 2012, Harrow, Ealing and Brent's respective Cabinets approved delegated authority to proceed to tender for libraries and leisure services across more than one borough, subject to further approvals as necessary by each respective Cabinet; to be delivered as single or multi-service packages as follows:

- Leisure
- *or* Libraries
- *or* Libraries & Leisure combined

Brent have identified that they do not wish their library service to be part of any joint arrangements but will be part of any joint commissioning of leisure services.

2.3.5 A joint meeting of HR, finance, procurement, legal, communications and service managers across the three boroughs has met to review service specifications and potential shared service options (such as clienting) to take the project to the next stage. Harrow is providing joint procurement and legal support to the project, Ealing is leading on finance, communications and project support. In addition, each borough is setting up its own internal working groups to review the project and identify local impacts and issues.

2.3.6 Over 2,000 residents took part in the Let's Talk 2 consultation in the summer of 2011 on Harrow's cultural services offer. Further consultation with residents and with affected staff on the specification and delivery of services and an analysis of customer data to further inform the needs analysis for services will be required as part of the process.

2.3.7 A further report will be brought back to Cabinet in June with the results of the consultation and Equalities Impact Assessment and to seek Cabinet approval for the next stage of any tender process.

2.4 Why a change is needed

2.4.1 A number of transformational changes have already improved the delivery of library and leisure services in Harrow. For example, the introduction of self-service in libraries has resulted in efficiency savings of £1.14 million per annum whilst delivering a take-up of an average of 95% self-service by library customers. A new leisure contract is delivering increased usage of Harrow's leisure facilities (such as an 11% increase in pre-paid memberships in the first 2 quarters of 2011/12 compared to the same period in 2010/11) whilst reducing cost to the Council.

2.4.2 However, the option to continue delivering in the same way as currently is not a viable one as all Council services are required to make further savings to meet the Council's overall target of £31.4million from 2012/13 – 2014/15. In addition, there are contractual issues that need to be addressed in order to deliver services for the future. The leisure management contract will expire at the end of April 2013 and therefore the Council needs to plan now for whatever service delivery model will be put in place for 1st May 2013.

2.4.3 It becomes critical therefore that the above potential for savings feature in the service requirements over the contract period, currently envisaged as 5 years for libraries and 10 years for leisure. Any contractual arrangements will also need to allow for variations to take account of changes to each borough's needs and developments e.g. the sites in the contract and also include provision for each borough's specialisms in terms of meeting residents' needs.

2.4.4 Delivering services through a joint procurement could deliver efficiency savings and service improvements as above to protect the long-term sustainability of the service offer.

2.5 Implications of the Recommendation

2.5.1 Considerations

- **Resources, costs**

This would be a major transformation project requiring an initial investment of £50,000 for Harrow to support the development of formal options, acquire professional help and guidance to take the proposals forward to tender stage and to contract implementation/client management redesign if options are approved. Significant officer time will also be required in each of the three boroughs to deliver the project.

- **Staffing/workforce**

Staff may be affected by potential TUPE situation or shared service options as part of the outcome of procurement. A full consultation with trade unions and staff will be conducted as part of the next phase of this project and HR

support will be required for this process. Any proposed changes would be managed through the Council's 'Protocol for Managing Organisational Change'.

- **Equalities impact**

Equality performance measures which are required from the service providers will need to be considered as part of the procurement process to ensure compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty.

- **Legal comments**

- i) The council must provide a comprehensive and efficient library service and has discretionary powers to provide arts, heritage, sports and leisure, and music services. The council can choose to provide all or any of these services through contractual arrangements with any third party provider, including trusts or NPDOS.
- ii) Legal will advise on the procurement and on the contractual and governance arrangements for the project as required and will ensure full compliance with public procurement rules and other relevant legislation.
- iii) The cultural services in scope in this report are part B Services under EU public procurement rules and so are not subject to the full application of the rules. However they must be advertised appropriately to ensure transparency, equality and fairness and the council must act in a transparent, non-discriminatory and fair way throughout the commissioning and procurement processes.
- iv) The leisure sites are under lease to the current provider. Any future contractual arrangements need to take into account the leasehold arrangements and buildings repair and maintenance responsibilities to allow for potential changes to the Council's asset base. This will be addressed in future proposals to Cabinet as outlined elsewhere in this report.

2.6 Financial Implications

2.6.1 This project is scheduled to deliver £200,000 in 2013/14 as part of the Council's MTFs process. A one-off revenue budget of £150,000 to support the delivery of all of the Future of Cultural Services in Harrow review has been approved for 2012/13 as part of the MTFs process.

2.6.2 Any procurement option needs to ensure that protections and options are built into contractual arrangements to allow for each borough to specify its own strategic direction for services without incurring financial or other risks for the partners. In addition, each borough will need to consider whether any other existing services or contractual arrangements could be impacted by the procurement of these services, such as facilities management or other support services, before any final decisions are approved to ensure minimum financial exposure for the council as a whole.

2.6.2 Any contract procurement will need to take account of the draft Commercial Master Plan in terms of maximising efficiency savings whilst

enabling the Council to determine its asset planning future for strategic sites to bring maximum benefit realisation to the Council.

2.7 Performance Issues

2.7.1 Client side arrangements for monitoring and reporting performance will be assessed and included in the report to be brought to Cabinet for approval in June 2012. Any new contractual arrangements for the delivery of cultural services will include performance indicators against the specification, reflecting the differing needs of the respective boroughs and where appropriate, incentivisation to ensure delivery above targets.

2.7.2 In addition to the “cashable” benefits, there are a number of key performance improvements that Harrow will require which include:

- *Community Involvement.* The key non-financial benefit of trust status, for example, would be increased community involvement in the running of services. For example, there could be an opportunity for the community to become involved through Board membership of a trust.
- *Improved Customer Choice.* With services delivered across more than one borough, there could be increased sophistication in provision
- *Increased access to grant funding.* External organisations such as Trusts or NPDOs have better access to external funding from bodies such as the Big Lottery
- *Increased volunteering opportunities or apprenticeships.* Facilities run by trusts, for example, should be able to access volunteers or provide apprenticeship arrangements and this could be built into any contractual specification
- *Higher participation rates.* Jointly commissioning services would allow for joint marketing and promotions to general and specific groups and wider access to a range of facilities.
- *Staff empowerment.* A trust or social enterprise, for example, would offer staff the opportunity to be more involved in the running of services and to be more entrepreneurial
- *Partnership Working.* There are a number of examples where external providers such as trusts have successfully implemented co-design of delivery, for example, improved partnership with local health bodies, resulting in improved outcomes for local residents.

2.8 Environmental Impact

Any tender process will require potential providers to identify sustainability policies for reduced energy consumption and better energy management.

2.9 Risk Management Implications

The project is reviewed as part of the Council's Transformation Programme Board. A risk register is in place for the joint project between the three boroughs and further risk management will be put in place for Harrow specifically.

2.10 Equalities Implications

An initial Equalities Impact Assessment has been prepared for these proposals and the Cabinet report in January outlined some of the concerns. A detailed Equalities Impact Assessment will be prepared as these proposals are developed (including through public and staff consultation) to assess the full impact and possible mitigation before approval of the next stage by Cabinet in June 2012.

Corporate Priorities

This report incorporates the following corporate priorities:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe.
- United and involved communities: A Council that listens and leads.
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need.

by identifying the future of library and leisure services in the borough which can contribute to the health and well-being of people who are most in need, for example by providing free access to ICT such as email, the internet and office software, and through subsidised sports and leisure facilities that can be targeted at young and older people or those on a range of welfare benefits.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Roger Hampson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 16 February 2012		
Name: Stephen Dorrian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 16 February 2012		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Marianne Locke Divisional Director Community & Culture x6530

Background Papers:

Cabinet Report: Future of Cultural Services in Harrow January 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
AND SCRUTINY SUB-
COMMITTEES**

Date of Meeting:	28 February 2012
Subject:	Scrutiny Review of Children's Safeguarding
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap Divisional Director, Partnership Development and Performance
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	Adult Health and Social Care - Councillor Ann Gate Councillor Vina Mithani Children and Young People - Councillor Christine Bednell Councillor Krishna James
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Scope for Scrutiny Review of Children's Safeguarding

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the scope for the scrutiny review on children's safeguarding.

Recommendations:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

- Consider and agree the scope for the scrutiny review on children's safeguarding.

Section 2 – Report

Background

A review to look at the safeguarding children's arrangements in the borough was decided on following agreement from the Scrutiny Leadership Group on the need to urgently consider the arrangements in place in the borough and ensure that they are sufficiently robust. The need to address whether all the appropriate services, procedures and individuals are in place was brought to the attention of the Scrutiny Leadership by the Chair of the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee who had been duly alerted by the Corporate Director for Children's Services. The Corporate Director for Children's Services raised a number of concerns regarding progress on some of the recommendations that came out of the NHS London Safeguarding Children Improvement Team visit to the Harrow Health Community in October 2010.

The main objective of the review will be to address whether partners and the council's arrangements in place provide reasonable assurance and confidence that children at risk of significant harm in Harrow are suitably safeguarded.

The review could begin by assessing what procedures are currently in place, what developments and progress is underway and where any gaps need to be met amongst the various organisations involved in safeguarding children's services in the borough.

The scope and exact focus of the review will be refined and amended accordingly once a review group is formed. The review will be a light-touch scrutiny review that is hoped will get underway once the scope has been cleared.

Equalities Impact

As included in the scope, the review will consider during the course of its work, how equality implications have been taken into account in current policy and practice and consider the possible implications of any changes it recommends.

In carrying out the review, the review group will also need to consider its own practices and how it can facilitate all relevant stakeholders in the borough to have their voices heard.

Financial Implications

The costs of delivering this project will be met from within existing resources.

Performance Issues

There are no performance issues specifically associated with this report.

Environmental Impact

There is no specific environmental impact associated to this report.

Risk Management Implications

There are none specific to this report.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? No

Corporate Priorities

The review relates to the following Corporate Priorities 2011/12:

- United and involved communities: a council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not applicable.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Fola Irikefe, Scrutiny Officer, 020 8420 9389

Background Papers: Appendix A: Scope for Safeguarding Children Review

This page is intentionally left blank

HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 2012

SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN - DRAFT SCOPE

1	SUBJECT	Safeguarding Children
2	COMMITTEE	Health and Social Care Scrutiny Sub-Committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	<p>Councillors: <i>Yet to be determined.</i></p> <p>Co-optees: <i>Yet to be determined.</i></p> <p><i>Chairing arrangements are subject to confirmation by the review group at its first meeting once it has been established.</i></p>
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To assess how much progress has been in the borough in terms of ensuring robust safeguarding children arrangements since the NHS London Safeguarding Children Improvement Team visit in 2010. ▪ To review and assess progress against action plans developed to address some of the recommendations arising from the review. ▪ To ensure some of the key issues highlighted by NHS London’s review that has a major impact upon practice such as clarity on organisational policies and procedures, staffing and workforce issues, training and development, supervision are being adequately addressed. ▪ To gain an understanding of the role of key lead individuals and organisations in monitoring and ensuring robust and effective safeguarding arrangements in the borough. ▪ To ensure organisations in the borough are working effectively in partnership to safeguard children in Harrow. ▪ To identify and address any gaps in services provision that may hinder the effectiveness of children’s safeguarding arrangements. ▪ To consider what else could be done to ensure that the safeguarding needs of children in Harrow

		are met through the identification of good practice in other boroughs.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To gain clarity and understanding of the various organisations, individuals, policies and arrangements in place to support safeguarding children arrangements ▪ To identify any obstacles to effective safeguarding, and to make recommendations for action as appropriate ▪ To engage successfully and openly with partner organisations ▪ To reach an overall conclusion on whether the Council and its partners are doing/ have plans in place to ensure everything they reasonably can do to prevent any serious incidents in the borough. ▪ Development of realistic and constructive recommendations to support successful multi-agency partnership working to deliver robust, safe and effective services.
6	SCOPE	<p>The scope of the review will focus on the progress of the recommendations and the follow up and developments since the NHS London Safeguarding Improvement Team visit to the Harrow Health Community in October 2010.</p> <p>The overall objective is to review whether partners and the council's arrangements in place provide reasonable assurance and confidence that children at risk of significant harm in Harrow are suitably safeguarded. The exact focus of the review will be refined following initial meetings/ correspondence with partners and consultation and discussion amongst the review group.</p>
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	<p>This review relates to the following Corporate Priorities 2011/12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ United and involved communities: a council that listens and leads ▪ Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Catherine Doran, Corporate Director Children's Services
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Fola Irikefe, Scrutiny Officer
11	ADMINISTRATIVE	Scrutiny Team

	SUPPORT	
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	<p>The input of the following may be gauged through the course of the review:</p> <p>Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff involved in the delivery of safeguarding children’s services in the health sector and also the local authority ▪ Relevant corporate director(s) ▪ Relevant portfolio holder(s) ▪ Harrow Local Children’s Safeguarding Board ▪ Residents and members of the public ▪ Staff within other children’s settings e.g. children’s centres, youth centres <p>Partner agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NHS Harrow ▪ North West London Hospitals Trust ▪ Central North West London Mental Health Trust ▪ Integrated Care Organisation ▪ Clinical Commissioning Board ▪ GP’s ▪ Compass ▪ Schools and Academies ▪ Harrow Police ▪ Interest groups (including residents groups, disability groups, business groups etc) <p>Experts/advisers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Representative interest groups ▪ Care Quality Commission ▪ Centre for Public Scrutiny ▪ Academic experts ▪ Public policy think tanks
13	METHODOLOGY	<p>The review could gather evidence using a range of methods including written evidence, oral evidence, research, focus groups, presentations, evidence from key officers and managers (both internal and external), inspections, site visits, expert witnesses, public meetings etc.</p> <p>The review will be a light touch review taking evidence at a number of meetings.</p> <p>Suggested stages for the review are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify current policies/practices through initial briefings ▪ Identify current position in terms of the implementation of policies and practices and action plans arising from NHS London’s review. ▪ Examine how performance and implementation matches policies

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify issues arising and what gaps need to be met ▪ Determine how to support the development of constructive policies and procedures.
14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	<p>The review will consider during the course of its work, how equality implications have been taken into account in current policy and practice and consider the possible implications of any changes it recommends.</p> <p>In carrying out the review, the review group will also need to consider its own practices and how it can facilitate relevant stakeholders in the borough to have their voices heard.</p>
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	Success will depend upon the ability and willingness of officers, partners and stakeholders (as relevant) to participate and contribute fully in this review.
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	The review will have regard to the possible community safety implications of any recommended changes to policy or practice.
17	TIMESCALE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping – February 2012 ▪ Initial desktop research – February/ March 2012 ▪ Evidence gathering and review group meeting/s – March 2012 onwards ▪ Final report to O&S for onward transmission to Cabinet – to be confirmed
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	To be met from existing scrutiny budget. No significant additional expenditure is anticipated.
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Fola Irikefe, as advised by the review group.
20	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Outline of formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Corporate Director [✓] throughout the course of the review and when developing recommendations</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [✓] as a witness in the review and when developing recommendations</p> <p>To CSB [✓] to be confirmed</p> <p>To O&S [✓] to be confirmed</p> <p>To Cabinet [✓] to be confirmed</p>
21	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)	6 month review by the Performance and Finance Scrutiny sub-committee.

Contact: Fola Irikefe, Scrutiny Officer, fola.irikeye@harrow.gov.uk, 020 8420 9389.

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Date of Meeting:	28 February 2012
Subject:	Report of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee Chair
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director, Partnership, Development and Performance
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	All areas
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	<i>Minutes of the sub-committee meeting held on 2 February 2012</i>

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

Recommendations:

That the report of the Performance and Finance sub-committee chair be noted.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

This report provides a summary of issues to be taken forward by the Performance and Finance scrutiny sub-committee following the meeting held on 2 February 2012. The minutes of the meeting are attached.

Issues identified for further follow-up

Agenda item 8: Chair's report

As detailed below, updates will be sought on the indicators listed at the next chair's briefing, to be held on 27 February 2012. The full comments and appendices are available at:

<http://www2.harrow.gov.uk/documents/s95389/PF%20chairs%20report%2002-02-12%20Final.pdf>

Key: HG = high green; LG = low green; A = amber; LR = low red; HR = high red

Indicator	Comments and action to be taken
NI 32 repeat incidents of domestic violence HR <i>(Selected Q3, 2010/11)</i>	Monitoring at chair's briefing to continue. ACTION: Future updates to include the number of individuals as well as the number of repeat referrals.
NI 40 number of drug users in effective treatment LG <i>(Selected Q3, 2010/11)</i>	No further monitoring required at this stage. Performance is now on target.
Termly rate of fixed term exclusions as a % of Harrow school population [local measure] HR <i>(Selected Q3, 2010/11)</i>	Monitoring at Chair's briefing to continue.
BV 8 - % of undisputed invoices paid within 30 working days HR [also % of SAP purchase orders raised before invoice date LR] <i>(Selected Q3, 2010/11)</i>	Monitoring at the Chair's briefing to continue ACTION: Director of Finance to provide an update to the next Chair's briefing.
NI 195c – Improved cleanliness – graffiti HR <i>(Selected Q4, 2010/11)</i>	Monitoring at the Chair's briefing to continue.
NI 125 – Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation G <i>(Selected Q4, 2010/11)</i>	Monitoring at the Chair's briefing to continue. This indicator is no longer on the Corporate Scorecard.
How well informed do residents feel (Involvement Tracker) NO SURVEY Q2 <i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i>	Monitoring at the Chair's briefing to continue.

Indicator	Comments and action to be taken
<p>Number of trained neighbourhood champions HR</p> <p><i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i></p>	<p>Monitoring at the Chair's briefing to continue.</p>
<p>Children Looked After:</p> <p>- Numbers of children with child protection plan for over two years [local measure] LG <i>(Selected Q3, 2010/11)</i></p> <p>- % sessions absent from school amongst school age CLA in the school year to date A <i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i></p> <p>- Rate of fixed term exclusions as a % of the Harrow CLA population HR <i>(Selected Q4, 2010/11)</i></p>	<p>See item 4 of the original P&F report.</p> <p>Monitoring at Chair's briefing to continue.</p>
<p>Total number accepted as homeless and in priority need HR</p> <p><i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i></p>	<p>Monitoring at Chair's briefing to continue, along with the suite of other related homelessness indicators. See original report for further information.</p>
<p>Council adaptations: average time from assessment to completion of work (weeks) HG</p> <p><i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i></p>	<p>No further monitoring required at this stage. The Chair had requested further information:</p> <p><u>Referrals received pre-April 2011 (from OT assessment to completion of works):</u> Maximum wait: 120.6 weeks (844 days) Minimum wait: 16.7 weeks (117 days) Average wait: 49 weeks</p> <p><u>Referrals received post April 2011 (from OT assessment to completion of works):</u> Maximum wait: 31 weeks (217 days) Minimum wait: 4.1 weeks (29 days) Average wait: 19 weeks</p> <p>Taken together the average wait is 42 weeks for works completed in 2011/12 (as at the end of November 2011).</p>
<p>Housing voids: number of empty properties going over 25 days (excludes time taken for major works) HG</p> <p><i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i></p>	<p>No further monitoring required at this stage.</p>
<p>Total debt collected in quarter as a % of total debt raised HR</p> <p><i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i></p>	<p>To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.</p> <p>ACTION: Further information was requested on the amount of debt overdue as well as further information on what the indicator is intended to measure.</p>

Indicator	Comments and action to be taken
% forecast variation from net budget HR <i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing. ACTION: Further information was requested on trends in forecast variation on net budget.
Rent arrears: - Current rent arrears as % of rent roll HR - Overall current tenants' rent arrears A <i>(Selected Q1, 2011/12)</i>	No further monitoring required at this stage. Further information requested at the last meeting is attached as Appendix 2.
Newly selected indicators	
- Residential burglaries HR - Serious acquisitive crime LR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing. ACTION: The Chair requested details of partnership plans in place to address performance in these areas.
Improved street and environmental cleanliness: - NI195a – litter LG - NI195b – detritus HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.
Termly rate of permanent exclusions as % of Harrow school population HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.
Homelessness: - Total number accepted as homeless and in priority need HR - NI156 - Number of households living in temporary accommodation HG - Number of households we assist with housing in the private rented sector HR - Number of cases where priority action is taken to prevent homelessness HG <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing as a suite of indicators.
Visits to museums – number of physical visits HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing. ACTION: Further information was requested on plans in place.
Processing of major planning applications in accordance with statutory timescales or Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) [local measure] HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.
Processing of householder planning applications within 6 weeks HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.

Indicator	Comments and action to be taken
Workforce IPAD in last 12 months HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.
IT customer (internal) complaints HR <i>(Selected Q2, 2011/12)</i>	To monitor at the next Chair's briefing.
For annual review	
% pupils achieving 5+ A*-C including English and maths GCSEs for White British pupils eligible for FSM (free school meals) [Annual]	Members requested details of the size of the cohort, which was 82 pupils. To monitor annually.
NI 101 – Looked after children achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent at Key Stage 4, including English and maths [Annual]	<i>Last reviewed on Annual Scorecard 2010/11.</i>
NI 107 - % pupils achieving L4 or above in both English and maths at Key Stage 2 for BME groups [Annual]	<i>Last reviewed on Annual Scorecard 2010/11.</i>

Agenda item 9: Revenue and Capital Monitoring for Quarter 2 as at 31 December 2012

The Quarter 3 report will be reviewed by the chair and vice-chair at their next briefing.

Agenda item 11: Update on the review of the Council's Use of Performance Information

A further update will be combined with the first progress report against Phase 2 of the review, when programmed.

Agenda item 13: Leisure Management Contract Performance May-December 2011

The sub-committee requested that a further update be provided in six months.

Other matters identified outside committee

Children Looked After: Education and Attendance

A meeting was held on 18 January 2012, attended by the chair and vice-chair, vice-chair of O&S and the Children's Scrutiny Lead Members to consider performance in this area. A note of this meeting is included in the Lead Members' Report, found elsewhere on this agenda.

Agenda planning for the next meeting of the sub committee – 27 March 2012

Scrutiny Members are requested to notify the Scrutiny Officer if there are matters that they would like the chair and vice-chair to investigate or to consider adding to the agenda.

Provisional items are:

- P&F chair's report
- Revenue and capital monitoring (Q3)
- Scrutiny annual report – draft P&F sub-committee section

The chair's briefing for this meeting will be held on Monday 27 February 2012.

Financial Implications

There are none specific to this report.

Performance Issues

There are none specific to this report.

Environmental Impact

There are none specific to this report.

Risk Management Implications

There are none specific to this report.

Corporate Priorities

The work of the sub-committee addresses all of the Council's corporate priorities.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not required for this report.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer, 020 8420 9203,
heather.smith@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Strategic Performance Report for Quarter 2 (Cabinet, 15 December 2011):
<http://www2.harrow.gov.uk/documents/s94002/Strategic%20Performance%20Q2.pdf>

PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES

2 FEBRUARY 2012

Chairman: * Councillor Sue Anderson

Councillors: * Tony Ferrari * Jerry Miles
* Barry Macleod-Cullinane * Varsha Parmar

In attendance: Thaya Idaikkadar Minute 71
(Councillors) David Perry Minute 71

* Denotes Member present

61. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

62. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

63. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

64. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting.

65. References from Council and Other Committees/Panels

None received.

RECOMMENDED ITEMS

66. Chair's Report

The Sub-Committee received a report that set out issues considered by the Chair since the last meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Referring to the update on indicators selected for further monitoring at the previous meeting, specifically the 'housing voids', a Member queried why the report stated that no further monitoring of this issue was required. The Chair responded that the length of time taken for empty Council properties to return back into use had been cause for concern, however, this situation was now in hand. Further information on the number of voids was included in the appendix to the report.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

67. Revenue and Capital Monitoring Report for Quarter 2

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Interim Director of Finance, which had been previously considered at Cabinet on 15 December 2011. The report set out the Council's revenue and capital monitoring position for Quarter 2 as at 30 September 2011. The Interim Director stated that this report had been superseded by the Quarter 3 report which was just about to be considered by Cabinet and which covered the period up to 31 December 2011 and she would be referring to this later report.

The Interim Director stated that:

- she was pleased to inform Members that the overall forecast position was now a revenue underspend of £190,000 compared to a forecast overspend at Quarter 2 of £1.566 million. This was partly due to a virement of £300,000 from a specific reserve for homelessness, but nevertheless the swing was a very positive outcome and demonstrated the impact the Spending Protocol was having;
- an underspend of at least £1.4 million was now being targeted and there were still some risks in some areas of the budget and therefore the Spending Protocol would continue to operate until the year end;
- there was also a significant underspend in the capital programme amounting to approximately £16 million due to projects being rephased. However rather than the usual methodology of Directorates requesting carry-forwards, Directorates had been asked to re-bid for these projects in the new capital programme for 2012/13,

therefore there was effectively a one-off saving of this amount of capital spend.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

68. Access Harrow - Customer Service Performance

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Divisional Director for Business Transformation and Customer Service which set out information on Access Harrow performance, included details of popular service requests and levels of avoidable contact.

An officer stated that Access Harrow used both the SAP CRM (Customer Relationship Management) and Cisco telephony systems to capture and manage data relating to Harrow residents and their contact with Council. The report highlighted the level of performance sustained by Access Harrow over Quarter 3, the most common enquiries handled and the areas of higher avoidable contact.

The officer stated that avoidable contact focused on unnecessary contact made by the customer. He added that the reasons behind the high levels of avoidable contact figures could be as follows:

- where the caller was progress-chasing;
- where the Council had not delivered a service as expected;
- where information provided by the Council had been unclear.

The officer added that the following measures had been implemented in response to the above and to improve Contact Avoidance:

- the supply of information through cheaper channels, for example, the introduction of a payment line or 'auto-attendants', the use of other artificial intelligence means, the promotion of the 'My Harrow Services Account', pro-active messaging, and managing customer expectations;
- analysis of CRM data had shown that a large proportion of customer telephone calls to the Parking Team related to parking tickets, and the automated phone message had therefore been adapted to take this information into account;
- a brief explanatory covering letter had been included with the Housing Benefits letter sent to residents and had led to a 40% reduction in calls regarding Housing Benefits;
- an increase in the levels of staffing at periods of high demand through the multi-skilling of staff;
- the webpage relating to fly tipping now allowed residents to see what had already been reported and provided updates on progress;

- data was collated on a monthly basis and both he and the Team Leaders met regularly to discuss further strategy with the relevant Service Managers.

A Member questioned why the percentage of phone calls answered within 30 seconds was lower for enquiries relating to Council Tax and Housing Benefits than any of the other categories listed. The officer responded that twelve months ago this figure had been 20% lower. He added that Access Harrow dealt with a high volume of calls relating to these two areas, where the initial call may take longer to deal with in order to resolve the issue and prevent further enquiries, and which meant the queues for these service areas were longer. However, Harrow's record was good when benchmarked against other neighbouring authorities. The telephone system let callers know where they were in the queue and an expected answer time, which allowed them to choose whether to hold on or call back later. Three Kier staff were now part of Access Harrow, which enabled better response to those customers who were progress-chasing about repairs.

A Member sought clarification as to whether additional staffing and resources had been identified to deal with the new service areas which had recently joined Access Harrow. The officer responded that staff also transferred with the service and relevant data (volume, reason and failure demand) would be collected and analysed over the next six months. This would be reported to the Sub-Committee in Quarter 4.

A Member stated that the data failed to give information about non-avoidable contact and asked what processes were in place for evaluating and dealing with these, in particular where information from calls could provide intelligence that would inform improvements to service delivery. The officer responded that in the case of a non-avoidable call, for example, when a resident required a plumber, officers worked to reduce the level of demand, which was call avoidance rather than avoidable contact. He stated that calls related to plumbing repairs were often seasonal. He added that information was relayed to the relevant service delivery team who discussed how to prevent these in the future and that officers were looking to make this process more robust.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

69. Update on Review of the Council's Use of Performance Information Phase 1

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance which provided an update against the implementation of the recommendations made in phase 1 of the Scrutiny Review.

The Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance stated that the recommendations of Phase 1 of the Review had been considered by Cabinet in April 2011 and the responses agreed. Directorates had reported on progress through Improvement Boards during the Quarter 2 reporting cycle. The next report on progress against agreed actions would address

both Phases 1 and 2. He added that not all the actions set out in the report had been completed and officers were consulting Scrutiny and Executive Members on specific aspects.

A Member queried if the indicators relating to Licensing had been added yet. The Divisional Director responded that these would be picked up in the next round of improvement boards.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report be noted;
- (2) that a further update be combined with the first progress report against Phase 2 of the Review, when programmed.

70. Progress Report - Response to recommendations made by the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents Programme - Interim Report, Project Management

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Business Transformation and Customer Services which provided an update against the recommendations made by the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents Programme in June 2011 and responses made to Cabinet in July 2011.

An officer stated that the Project Management Office (PMO) had:

- put a robust project management process in place;
- offered dedicated support to project managers;
- developed a new project management framework, with a new online tool to help officers manage their projects;
- offered Corporate training in this area and commissioned Prince 2 training;
- implemented lessons learnt from Phase 2 of the Transformation Programme.

The officer added that the Standing Scrutiny Review had contributed to raising the profile of the Project Management initiative and she would welcome additional feedback from the Sub-Committee.

A Member requested clarification as to the link between project management and projects that had budget savings built into them and questioned whether the system would automatically flag up any projects that were in danger of going off track. The officer responded that savings and benefits were tracked through the Transformation Programme and that the Transformation Board reviewed progress, risk-management and its impact on savings and identified areas for improvement.

The Interim Director of Finance added that the link between the two areas was evolving. Some significant savings that were built into the Budget may not be reflected in some Transformation Projects. Officers were working closely with PMO colleagues to track any significant savings programmes.

A Member queried whether there was any regular reporting and monitoring mechanism in place to evaluate these projects. The officer responded that a monthly progress report was submitted to the Transformation Board regarding each project.

The Interim Director of Finance stated that this reporting process was evolving and that not all projects were currently linked to the Budget. Officers were evaluating any projects with savings of over £250k on an informal basis, and that although these had been reported to the Corporate Strategy Board, this data was not yet in the public domain. However, officers would be willing to share this information with Members of the Sub-Committee at future meetings.

A Member stated that recommendation 10 of the summary of progress, which dealt with additional points of political oversight, reporting and challenge should be built into the project management criteria, was lacking in clarity and transparency and that this should be highlighted. The Divisional Director of Partnership Development and Performance responded that this would be taken forward and officers would request the relevant Portfolio Holders to feedback to the Leader.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee asked how many projects were currently going through this process. An officer responded that there were currently approximately 25 to 30 projects, with more likely to be added at the next phase. Most projects were planned over three years. The PMO might not be aware of any small projects within Directorates, however, the Commissioning Panel process and the VERTO system would help to enhance the overall process and increase the visibility of smaller projects in the future.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

RESOLVED ITEMS

71. INFORMATION REPORT - Leisure Management Contract Performance May - December 2011

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment setting out information on the performance of the new leisure management contract for the period May to December 2011.

The Divisional Director of Community and Culture stated that:

- the handover process from the previous to the new contractor, Greenwich Leisure Ltd (GLL) had been successful, without any loss of service to the public;

- officers and contractors had established a strong working partnership and a more robust client team was now in place;
- regular monitoring visits were undertaken and the relevant Portfolio Holders were updated on a suite of performance indicators;
- under the new contract, the number of customers had increased as had the number of visits by customers;
- there had been a number of other improvements such as staff training, new promotions and membership schemes, repairs and investment in Harrow Leisure Centre (HLC);
- the recent increase in the number of complaints could be attributed to the increased numbers of visitors, however, a robust system of complaint monitoring was in place;
- there had been some unforeseen financial implications, such as increased utilities costs.

A Member questioned what level of support had been given to the staff at HLC during the change of contractor. The Divisional Director responded that most staff had been transferred over to GLL under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) TUPE, the previous centre manager was still in post, and additional staff had been hired.

A Member asked the following questions with regard to evaluating the performance of the GLL contract:

- what benchmarking was being used to evaluate the performance of the contract and whether more robust targets should be set;
- how the contract was performing in terms of income generation in comparison to private sports clubs and whether increased membership of HLC was due to a decrease in membership of private sports clubs, and therefore a seasonal blip caused by the recession;
- the financial implications of any necessary major repairs to the leisure centre in the future, particularly in view of its asbestos content and the age of the building.

The Divisional Director responded that a full asbestos and building survey had been carried out recently. The Leisure Centre was one of four major development sites identified in Harrow for re-development. It had been part of the 'Heart of Harrow' consultation. Officers had not compared the Leisure Centre to private sports clubs, however, this data would be included as part of the monitoring of the contract over the next six months. The 'Active People' survey had shown that more residents in Harrow were becoming active and the contract with GLL stipulated that membership should be maintained and increased. She added that GLL were currently exceeding their monthly sales

targets and that their targets might need to be raised. She added that the Police had confirmed that crime rates at the HLC were reducing.

The Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services made the following points about the GLL contract:

- joining rates were competitive and surveys captured information about new members;
- he wanted to see real benefits for Harrow residents;
- the next update report about the performance of the contract should evaluate if expectations and targets were sufficiently high.

A Member sought clarification as to the financial implications of building maintenance costs being shared between the Council and GLL and what incentives, if any, had been built into the leisure contract. The Divisional Director stated that:

- there was £100k set aside annually for essential repairs. The Council had paid for repairs to a leak that had been in existence for some time;
- the current contract was on a fixed fee open-book basis whereby all income surplus to costs accrued back to the Council;
- GLL had been set income targets, and the recent increase in the number of customers and the number of visits, the implementation of new programmes and sales targets indicated that incentives were in operation.

A Member stated that the figures in the report relating to visits and membership suggested that the previous contract had been significantly under-performing and that officers should be looking into ways of reducing operating costs. The Divisional Director responded that as the GLL contract had been agreed for 2 years and was currently only in its first six months of operation. GLL had introduced self-service machines and were considering the introduction of online bookings. Officers had requested further benchmarking data, including equalities monitoring, which would provide a clearer indication of how the contract was performing. The fixed management fee meant that if GLL's costs were reduced then the Council would reap the benefit by way of increased profits.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee stated that in her view a two-hour training session on customer service for staff at HLC was not sufficient, asked if further staff training was planned and if an NVQ was available in this area of work. The Divisional Director stated that positive comments about staff had been received and the number of complaints relating to them had also reduced.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report be noted;
- (2) a further report be submitted to the sub-committee in six months' time.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.15 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR SUE ANDERSON
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Date:	28 th February 2012
Subject:	Scrutiny Work Programme Update
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap Divisional Director, Partnership Development and Performance
Scrutiny Lead	All
Member area:	
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	None

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report updates members of the Overview and Scrutiny committee of progress on the 2011/12 work programme.

Recommendations:

Councillors are recommended to:

- I. Consider the content of the update
- II. Approve and comment on action being taken – in particular, agree the scheduling of the Safeguarding Children project

Section 2 – Report

Introduction

This report updates members of the Overview and Scrutiny committee on the delivery of the scrutiny work programme.

In designing its work programme, the Overview and Scrutiny committee acknowledged the need to build flexibility into the programme in order to respond swiftly to particularly pressing needs and issues. The council and partners are facing significant challenges and if scrutiny is to effectively champion the needs of local people then it is critical that councillors are able to consider issues as they arise. As such, the committee did not publish an annual work programme but rather has built flexibility into its programme in order to be a more responsive service.

This report provides members of the Overview and Scrutiny committee with an update on the projects which are currently underway.

Current Projects

Standing Review of the Better Deal for Residents

The first phase of this project, which focussed on the project management process used across the council, has completed and its recommendations were broadly accepted by Cabinet and have been implemented.

The second phase of the project is considering the impact of the programme on local people and whether or not the programme is achieving its ambitions. To support its work it has been agreed that regular information regarding new projects will be provided to the review group from the VERTO system. Since commencing its second phase, the review has considered

- the potential of the VERTO system
- the outcomes from 'Reabling Focussed Care' project
- the outcomes from the 'Concessionary Travel' project

Subsequent review meetings have scheduled consideration of the outcomes from the Libraries and Public Realm projects.

Regular reports are being submitted to both the Overview and Scrutiny committee and, where necessary, to Cabinet.

Standing Review of the Budget

This review is considering the policy environment in which budgetary and financial decisions are being made. The first three meetings of the group have considered capital funding and the Housing Revenue Account in the context of self financing. The review has agreed to consider the following over the coming months:

- Further consideration of the HRA
- Management of major contract renewal
- Business Rate Retention Scheme
- Strategic use of capital funds to develop the 'place'

- Localisation of Council Tax Benefit
- Fees and Charges
- Localism

Regular reports are being submitted to both the Overview and Scrutiny committee and, where necessary, to Cabinet.

Engaging Young People Review

The final report from this project is being drafted and is due to be presented to 15th March meeting of the committee.

Debt Recovery Challenge Panel

The first phase of this project is completed and a response from officers will be discussed at Cabinet on 8th March. The review was able to make a number of recommendations with regard to the identification and approach to vulnerable debtors. However, the panel also felt there may be scope for a greater centralisation of debt recovery processes in order to make the process more streamlined and efficient. Insufficient time was available to the panel to pursue this part of the project. The panel was advised that the Interim Director of Finance has herself commissioned work to consider the potential for further centralisation of the functions and as such the panel will reconvene when this work is available to consider its recommendations.

Private Sector Housing

The Overview and Scrutiny committee has agreed to include this project in its work programme in order to assess the capacity and quality of private rented housing in the borough. The first meeting of the project took place on 14th February and a draft scope for the project is included elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

Customer care

The Overview and Scrutiny committee has agreed to include this project in its work programme in order to assess the quality of the customer journey through the council. The scoping meeting of the project is likely to take place towards the end of February, it is anticipated that field work will begin in the spring.

Safeguarding Children

The Corporate Director of Children's Services has approached scrutiny requesting an investigation of the effectiveness of Children's Safeguarding services. In the wake of the death of 'Baby P', NHS London surveyed all London Boroughs/health providers to assess their performance against a number of key issues. The subsequent report into Harrow has identified a number of issues and the scrutiny lead councillors for children and young people and adult health and social care, together with the scrutiny leadership wish to assess progress against the subsequent recommendations. Overview and Scrutiny committee's endorsement for this is sought. A draft scope for the project is included elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

Completed projects

The Snow Clearance and second phase of the Performance Management reviews have completed and been reported to the Overview and Scrutiny committee and Cabinet since the last report.

Anticipated projects

Ealing NW London Hospitals Merger – potential Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Health and Social Care scrutiny sub-committee considered this issue on 7th February. Following an informal joint meeting of the three boroughs with commissioners it became apparent that there is a different view emerging across the area. It has been agreed that each will submit their own independent response to proposals to the Senior Responsible Officer for the project by 20th February. It can then be included in the Full Business Case which will go to NHS Brent and Harrow's board meeting on 29th March. The Health and Social Care sub will finalise the response at its meeting on 19th April.

NW London Commissioning Plan – 'Shaping a Healthier Future'

NHS NW London is also preparing to consult on their strategic commissioning plan 'Shaping a Healthier Future'. On 7th February, the Health and Social Care scrutiny sub-committee agreed, in principle, to join a JOSC when set up with the other eight West London boroughs in the cluster to consider the implications of the proposals. This would be subject to the agreement of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Full Council.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report as all projects will be delivered from within the existing scrutiny budget.

Performance Issues

It is anticipated that all of the current projects will contribute to improved performance.

Environmental Impact

There are no environmental impacts associated with this report.

Risk Management Implications

There are no risk management implications associated with this report.

Equalities implications

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? No

The projects outlined in this report are investigating various components of service delivery and each project incorporates the consideration of equalities issues. However, where proposals for change are made, it will be the responsibility of the relevant service area to undertake equalities assessment if proposals are endorsed.

Corporate Priorities

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
- Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not required for this report.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny, 020 8420 9387

Background Papers:

None

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Date:	28 February 2012
Subject:	Scrutiny Lead Member Report
Responsible Officer:	Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director, Partnership Development and Performance
Scrutiny Lead Member area:	All
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Reports from the Scrutiny Lead Members

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

The report accompanies the reports from the Scrutiny Lead Members.

Recommendations:

The Committee is requested to consider the reports from the Scrutiny Lead Members and agree the actions proposed therein.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

This report outlines details of the work of the Scrutiny Lead Members for Corporate Effectiveness and Sustainable Development and Enterprise. The report also includes the note of a meeting of the Children and Young People's leads, the chairman of the Performance and Finance committee and the Vice Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny committee which considered the educational achievements and attendance of children looked after.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report

Performance Issues

There are no performance issues associated with this report.

Environmental Impact

There is no environmental impact associated with this report

Risk Management Implications

There are no risks associated with this report.

Equalities implications

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? No

This report outlines the activities of the scrutiny lead councillors; it makes no proposals to change service delivery.

Corporate Priorities

The Scrutiny Lead Members' responsibilities cover all areas of the council's activity.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Not required for this report.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background

Papers

Contact: Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny, 020 8420 9387, lynne.margetts@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers: None

SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBERS' REPORT: **CORPORATE EFFECTIVENESS**

Lead Members: Councillors Jerry Miles and Tony Ferrari

The lead members met on 16th January 2012.

Attendees

- Councillor Jerry Miles, Scrutiny Policy Lead Member
- Councillor Tony Ferrari, Scrutiny Performance Lead Member
- Julie Alderson, Interim Corporate Director, Finance
- Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive
- Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny

Customer Contact

All customer contact is now routed via Access Harrow apart from Children's Safeguarding services. The Integrated Targeted Services project has introduced a triage system for children's services front desk which stands outside of this model. Discussions are taking place regarding rolling out the Access Harrow technology to the service but there is no business case for this as it will not deliver any further cost reductions.

The Adults Services helpline, CSO in Adults, planning and registrars have all been incorporated into Access Harrow over the summer, this is expected to deliver a saving of £1m by taking 30% out of all of the teams. Cllr Ferrari queried whether the motivation was the reduction of 30% or whether the realignment of functions has delivered this. Tom clarified that a blueprint had been developed and telephony had been installed to help assess the demand. However he commented that the 30% savings had been achieved with improved management of the team and that further productivity improvements were expected via cross-skilling and CRM, the use of the telephony system means that there is tighter management control over performance and staff can be supported to improve their performance across the board in order to deliver the savings. He confirmed that the 30% saving has been taken out of the budgets. He also advised that analysis of the peaks and troughs of demand has meant a more strategic use of resources is being achieved, though this is still to be done across the services which have just been brought into Access Harrow.

Tom advised that Access Harrow is largely hitting the 90% target:

Target	December Performance
90% of calls answers in 30seconds	93%
Less than 5% of calls abandoned	3%
80% of calls resolved at point of first contact	90%

However, Tom also acknowledged that December was actually a quieter month for Access Harrow-52,000 calls compared with 65,000 calls in November.

Cllr Ferrari commented that whilst the performance of Access Harrow is commendable, he feels there is something missing in the Council's customer service 'jigsaw'. He feels that the feedback loop to services may not be as effective as it should be and is concerned that having taken the access issues away from services, we have also taken away responsibility and interest in proactively addressing issues. He feels that the council should be using information to fix the fundamental problems which residents call about in order to pre-empt their calls. Tom felt that this should be addressed by the analysis of 'avoidable contact' and agreed to provide the

corporate effectiveness leads with further advice as to the definition of avoidable contact. He also felt that this is being done and cited a number of examples where intelligence has been used to fix problems promptly and for the future – e.g. analysis of calls during the snow disruption showed that residents' key concern was the impact on refuse collection and that information on the web site would help with this and, thus, reduce calls. Cllr Ferrari remains concerned that the council undertaken sufficient, and sufficiently detailed analysis of service by service contact.

Cllr Ferrari also commented that the target should be 'call reduction' not just avoidable contact and he felt that the cost per call could go up as the only calls the council receives are the most complex. He feels that there are some management issues in this, the Director of Customer Service and Business Transformation is incentivised to maximise calls. Tom refuted this, it is clear that there must be a 26% reduction in costs and therefore calls must be reduced and migrated to other channels.

Human Resources

Tom advised that there are upward pressures on sickness absence, though the number are volatile. He commented that there is a lack of consistency in sickness management though the process is clearly defined.

Appraisals compliance is slightly down, predominantly in Community and Environment where the 'start of year' appraisals were not completed because of the public realm reorganisation.

The new resourcing contract for agency staff is now in place and this means that all agency staff must be recruited via this contract.

Tom advised that both Chief Executive's and Housing Departments had received silver Investors in People accreditation.

Performance

Performance on BV8 – payment of undisputed invoices – is down in respect of invoices to large organisations, though the council is making prompt payment in respect of small, local companies. Julie commented that in her view, large companies should not be paid promptly and the councillors agreed with this approach.

The council is anticipating a large Ofsted inspection later this year.

There is still no means of benchmarking customer satisfaction in the absence of the place survey.

A permanent Borough Emergency Command and Control room has been set up.

My Harrow account has been re-launched.

The upgrade from Groupwise/Novell to Outlook is planned for April/May

Finance

At periods 6 and 7 the council had been anticipating an overspend but this has now been resolved and a small underspend is anticipated from the projections in period 8. Julie commented that this reversal is due in part as a result of the spending protocol and some use of contingency and reserves. There remain risks in terms of the outturn from the delivery of savings, particularly in adults' services.

Julie advised, that following a number of representations from scrutiny councillors, she is now monitoring performance of savings proposals on a monthly basis

A significant underspend is also anticipated on the capital budget. Julie is discouraging the anticipation of rollover of budgets not spent in year and, via the new capital budget assessment process is urging that unspent budgets are re-considered under this process – of £16m underspent in year, £13m is part of the bids for next year. This means that the capital budget is set to decrease. The 12/13 budget is prepared, along with indicative budgets for the following two years, which have been pitched at sustainable level of financing costs.

Transformation Priority Initiatives Fund has been used prudently in anticipation of potential overspends and to support the redundancy bill going forward. There is £1/2m remaining in this fund and a further £400k in the contingencies fund.

For Action

- Tom to provide information with regard to the determination of 'avoidable contact'
- The areas to continue to be monitored

Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Corporate Effectiveness Leads will take place on 7th March

CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER: EDUCATION AND ATTENDANCE

18 January 2012

Attendees:

- Councillor Sue Anderson, Chair, Performance and Finance (P&F) Scrutiny sub-committee
- Councillor Paul Osborn, Vice-Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Councillor Christine Bednell, Children's Scrutiny Lead Member
- Councillor Krishna James, Children's Scrutiny Lead Member
- Gail Hancock, Divisional Director, Safeguarding and Family Support
- Catherine Halsall, Virtual Headteacher
- David Harrington, Service Manager, Service Performance
- Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer

Apologies:

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane, Vice-Chair, Performance and Finance Scrutiny sub-committee

NOTES

1. Welcome and introductions

Councillor Anderson chaired the meeting and welcomed officers and Members. In the course of the introductions, Councillor Bednell advised that she is the vice-chair of the Corporate Parenting Panel. Councillor James advised that she is chair of the School Placement Admissions Panel.

The Divisional Director welcomed the opportunity to meet with Members, which was timely given the recent changes in Children's Services. The new operating model (NOM) had now reached the implementation phase, with go-live scheduled for next month. The Virtual Headteacher is the permanent Head for all children looked after (CLA) by the council. She will be taking the lead on co-ordinating activities.

2. Children looked after – attendance

The Service Manager, Service Performance introduced a paper on attendance at school. The Department for Education (DfE) has introduced a new methodology for the reporting of Children Looked After (CLA) attendance. Data is returned in arrears; 2009/10 data was released in December 2011.

DfE uses the unique pupil number (UPN) to calculate absence, so this excludes pupils without a school place. CLA sometimes miss school *before* a place has been allocated to them. The council is therefore focusing on those who miss 25 days of schools regardless of whether or not they are on roll. There is now no national comparator data for this indicator; when it was last published in 2009 the England average was 12%, with Harrow at 20%.

Local monitoring is more robust, as it focuses on the percentage of sessions missed, thereby enabling the absence to be shown as it builds up, allowing appropriate action to be taken.

3. Children looked after – exclusions

No CLA have been permanently excluded since 2009/10. There have been six fixed term exclusions in the first three months of the 2011/12 school year. For exclusions, there is no clear pattern with regard to whether CLA are attending school either in-borough or out-of-borough.

4. Children looked after – achievement

In 2010/11, ten of the Year 11 cohort of 19 CLA took GCSE exams. Of the nine who did not take exams, six were at special schools, one was in hospital due to serious mental illness and two were missing from care. Key Stage 2 performance was broadly similar.

Members were advised that some CLA have taken 'A' levels and gone on to university, and that information on achievement was provided in more detail to the Corporate Parenting Panel. Such achievement was also recognised at the CLA achievement awards.

A Member commented that it would be helpful to see the progress of CLA throughout and expressed concern that CLA could suffer poverty of aspiration. The Divisional Director stressed that her service knows all CLA individually; they are in significant need, face challenging circumstances and there are clear reasons why the results are as they are.

The Service Manager added that the difference between CLA achievement and statistical neighbours/the England average could not be fully explained, but that the rate of CLA per population was low, at half the national average. This was partly due to preventative work, but was also affected by family make-up, local high aspirations, and good local schools.

A high proportion of Harrow's CLA population are teenagers, coming into care at a late stage. A Member agreed that this made it more difficult to have impact.

The Virtual Headteacher commented that the Year 11 cohort is too small to make many meaningful statistical statements; 5% represented one child. The key question is what the starting point is; was the Year 11 performance what was *expected* given the start point? A Member commented that this was similar to the concept of 'added value'. This was something the Virtual Headteacher hoped to look at in future; was university expected or did it represent a huge move forward for the child in question? Other achievements such as vocational qualifications or apprenticeship also needed to be reflected. A Member commented that he regarded attendance as a proxy; the Virtual Headteacher agreed that attendance did affect grades. The factor with greatest impact on attendance is the stability of the care placement. Placement moves could significantly affect attendance.

With regard to Personal Education Plans (PEPs), about 70% were completed and up to date. While this needed to be improved, the Virtual Headteacher stressed the importance of the quality of the PEP as well as its completion. A good PEP should include basic information about the child, their educational history (ideally from pre-school onwards), their school record (such as teacher assessment), target setting and details of resources and support to achieve those targets. It should also be monitored and regularly reviewed.

5. Future plans

A Member sought further detail on future plans to address performance. The Divisional Director advised that over the past three years there had been three part-time virtual headteachers who had committed one day a week to the role alongside serving as heads of their own schools. While there had been some achievement and lessons learned, it was felt that a step-change was required to improve the level of challenge provided. By making the Virtual Headteacher post into a part-time role held by one person the intention is to start operating the service like a school in its own right. As such, the Virtual

Headteacher's new team includes a PEP co-ordinator, a dedicated CLA education welfare officer (EWO), a Connexions personal adviser and a school nurse practitioner. The Virtual Headteacher is in the process of undertaking a six week review and devising an action plan.

A Member enquired whether the council had any information on the educational achievement of children after adoption and was advised that while the Local Authority has no role after successful adoption some national research would have been undertaken. The Divisional Director added that most of Harrow's CLA are in the older age bracket, mainly because the council has been so successful in adopting younger children; the most successful adoptions take place between the ages of birth to seven.

The Service Manager commented that targets were set for individual CLA but that the council was not now required to submit any information to DfE. There were opportunities for a better understanding of the cohort.

The Divisional Director concluded that the Virtual Headteacher would be reporting on her preliminary plan to the Corporate Parenting Panel along with a performance scorecard for Members' consideration.

A Member advised that he considered that attendance by session was of the most interest to Members, in addition to the "25 days missed" target. He also expressed interest in the numbers without a school place as well as the average wait and longest wait. On the latter, the Divisional Director responded that the provision of a school place was not totally within the council's gift. The Virtual Headteacher added that problems were more likely to arise where a child required a place outside of the usual entry points; there was still some work to be done to win 'hearts and minds'. With regard to sessions missed, the 'Welfare Call' telephone system enables the tracking of daily attendance and provides a cumulative attendance report per child. This was important because missed sessions could very quickly accumulate. Changes such as the co-location of Children's Services staff on the second floor of the Civic Centre would help facilitate closer working between teams.

With regard to visiting out-of-borough schools attended by CLA, the Virtual Headteacher stressed that her early thought had been that the purpose of a visit would be partly to do with establishing the presence of the service and to demonstrate that support is available. A Member added that the essence was that the service was able to access information and input at the earliest possible stage. Half of the CLA cohort is schooled in-borough, with the other half out-of-borough; the majority of out-of-borough CLA is schooled in neighbouring boroughs, with only 20-30 further afield. Those further away are generally attending residential special education. The council has a policy of only placing children in institutions rated 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted.

6. Next steps

It was agreed that the scrutiny Members be provided with the quarterly report to the Corporate Parenting Panel, including performance monitoring. Monthly monitoring information was also requested.

SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBER REPORT
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ENTERPRISE

NOTE OF THE SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBER BRIEFING
24 JANUARY 2012

Lead Members: Councillors Anderson and Wright

PLACE SHAPING BRIEFING – PROPERTY AND DISPOSAL

Attendees

- Councillor Sue Anderson, Scrutiny Performance Lead, SDE
- Councillor Stephen Wright, Scrutiny Policy Lead, SDE
- Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar, Property and Major Contracts Portfolio Holder
- Andrew Trehern, Corporate Director, Place Shaping
- Phil Loveland-Cooper, Head of Corporate Estate
- Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer

Introduction

The briefing had been arranged to allow further discussion of the Place Shaping Service Plan 2011-14, with specific focus on property and disposals.

Place Shaping Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16

The Corporate Director presented the Place Shaping Capital Programme to Members. The Corporate Director advised that town centre development is to be supported through planning gain; in effect s106 agreements will be replaced by Harrow's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which will help to capture resource to help the town centre to keep pace with delivery of the Heart of Harrow.

The programme also reflected emerging change regarding capital expenditure. Up until 2009, the capital programme had been used relatively freely; as a result of accounting rule changes, and the Council's own need to reduce capital expenditure the programme had been scaled back.

Members and officers discussed specific projects within the programme.

Civic Centre Consolidation

This is a three year programme, which commenced in 2011/12. It is cash limited to £2.5m. It will lead to Children's Services staff being based on the second floor, as well as further Access Harrow adjustments to enable the re-location of the Pinner Road reception. Additional plans include improvements to the lower ground floor such as improved shower facilities and storage for personal belongings (for example motorcycle helmets).

It is intended that the majority of the Council's office space will be provided in Civic 1 by the end of March 2014. The investment currently undertaken means that Civic Centre has a ten year shelf life from April 2011.

Civic Centre Site Development

A Master Plan is being developed for the entire site of c. 11 acres, with the intention to create a plan which is capable of phased development, with the northern half of the site being developed first. One of the significant challenges will be the reduction of parking by as much as 50%.

The Civic Centre site is being taken forward as part of the development of the 'four strategic sites' programme (Civic Centre, Gayton Road, Greenhill Car Park and Byron).

Evaluation of the development of the four sites is to be undertaken along with consideration of the most appropriate delivery model. For example, each site could be developed individually or as part of a joint venture.

Feasibility exercises for the Civic Centre site, show, for example, that the site had high public transport accessibility. Plans for a large scale food store, for example, have been discounted; while there would be a high commercial return, the planning context would be very challenging.

The 'four strategic sites' programme will include the re-provisioning of the leisure centre and additional cultural facilities in the centre of Harrow, though the latter is not without commercial challenges.

Mobile and flexible working

A facilitator of future substantial office footprint reductions will be e-enabled flexible working. Detailed proposals are being developed for consideration by Cabinet. A briefing for scrutiny has been arranged for 22 February.

With regard to parking, there will be consultation on parking charges for all. The intention will be to eventually reach a rate that discourages daytime parking

Capital and revenue resources will be required to implement the change to flexible working. The project has been costed over 10 years, and would require £7.3m revenue and capital for a benefit of £10.2m. There is a challenging savings target from year 2.

Staff would adopt one of three broad types: fully flexible, 50% office/50% flexible and 100% office based. The likely desk ratio would be ten people to five or six desks.

Adopting e-enabled flexible working would then facilitate co-location with other public services in the longer term.

Land acquisition

This had been included in the 2011/12 plan as there was potential for the Council to acquire sites adjacent to key strategic sites to create a more comprehensive development solution to achieve a greater capital return. It is understood that the capital resource allocation will be managed in a flexible way and utilised in response to market opportunities. It is further intended that that the payback period will be relatively short as it is linked to site development contracts.

Pinner Park Farm

The Council has been in discussions for considerable time with the 'tenant farmer' in connection with the agricultural lease for the site. A rent review is underway. The administration is keen to develop a city farm for educational and cultural purposes. Pinner Park Farm is a possible site. The site is a key strategic site for Harrow. There are also decaying listed buildings on site for which the Council has some responsibility as landlord. The site is also in the Green Belt and has good accessibility.

Disposals

For 2011/12 there is a disposals cash target of £11.79m. This has been reduced to £7.254m as a result of the decision to defer the disposal of Amner Lodge and car park subsequent to the issuing of a planning consent.

Members and officers discussed advantages and disadvantages of disposals. Capital receipts can be used to pay off borrowing or finance capital expenditure. As part of the revenue budget process a capital receipt target is agreed annually. The benefit of disposal is not felt until the following financial year when the revenue impact is realised.

The Council is required to restate the value of its assets annually for the General Fund (GF) and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). There is a rolling 5 year programme of review for the GF and the reviewed 'slice' is applied. If capital expenditure alters the value of assets this is also reflected.

The Council's property assets are valued at £1.6bn. Stock resource accounting means that a factor is applied to reflect that HRA stock is occupied by secure tenants.

Housing

The Council's target is to deliver c. 6,000 homes by 2026. The Core Strategy contains plans for the delivery of 6-7,000 homes.

Responsibility for delivering affordable housing is held by the planning authority. The Core Strategy (in conformity with the London Plan) has an overall target for supply, including the proportion that should be affordable. The affordable proportion target is 40%, but viability is dependent on individual sites. Where developers are also required to contribute to infrastructure the proportion has been around 30%.

The infrastructure development plan also highlights the need for amenity space and facilities such as schools; development cannot be considered in isolation.

The Council must also balance commercial return with the Council's community leadership role. The following examples were discussed:

- Stanmore – part of the benefit to the Council was in cash, part in the nomination rights on social housing, as well as enhancement of the district centre (for example the addition of a premium retailer and so on);
- Mill Farm – while there was no capital receipt, the benefit was that the Council secured nomination rights, additional housing units and modern new homes;
- Buckingham Road – staff working at the site were transferred to the Civic Centre or to Neighbourhood Resource Centres. This freed up the site, allowing housing to be provided. It also reduced revenue requirements, produced a capital receipt and reduced the repairs and maintenance required.

Academies

Assets have been transferred to academies on a long lease (125 years). The assets will continue to be re-valued annually on the anniversary of the transfer date (1 August 2011).

Next steps

A briefing on the mobile and flexible working project has been arranged for 22 February 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank