

HARROW COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

26 OCTOBER 2010

IMPLICATIONS OF HAVS INVESTIGATION – CHALLENGE PANEL – DRAFT SCOPE

1	SUBJECT	Implications of HAVS Investigation – Challenge Panel
2	COMMITTEE	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	Cllr Nana Asante Cllr Christine Bednell Cllr Kam Chana Cllr Barry Macleod-Cullinane Cllr Jerry Miles Cllr Paul Osborn Cllr Sachin Shah
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	<p>Arising from the recent investigation into Harrow Association of Voluntary Service (HAVS), the aim of the review is to make recommendations in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The mechanisms that the Council has in place to monitor the use of public funds within voluntary sector organisations, in order to ensure that there is sufficient transparency, probity, organisational accountability and quality assurance• The role of the Council in ensuring that organisations entrusted with public funds have good governance arrangements. For example ensuring that councillors nominated as trustees or acting in an ‘ex officio’ capacity are properly equipped to fulfil the role and understand the nature of potential conflicts of interest that could arise.• The extent to which the Council should support the sector in accessing support in the area of governance, for example best practice, while respecting the independence of the sector and having regard to Compact principles• Evaluating the Council’s responsibilities in supporting local infrastructure bodies in Harrow
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project assists the Council in responding to any risks highlighted by the internal audit review.• Project group makes recommendations with regard to Council mechanisms that enable the sector to demonstrate fitness for purpose.• Project informs Better Deal for Residents programme – specifically projects consulting on and reviewing future levels of support to the voluntary and community sector from across the council.
6	SCOPE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Audit review – in particular monitoring processes, by examining the results of the review by internal audit

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for councillors acting as charitable trustees, including accountability of trustees • Consideration of the future for sector-wide infrastructure support, for later discussion with the sector, with specific emphasis on what the council's role should be with regard to determining infrastructure available to the sector and how it is provided. • The council's relationship with the sector in respect of governance – including the council's role with regard to governance, financial control, best practice and advice and support.
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	Draft corporate priority: United and involved communities – a Council that listens and leads
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Brendon Hills, Corporate Director, Community and Environment
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	<p>Management of review – Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny</p> <p>Management of service – Marianne Locke, Divisional Director Community and Cultural Services</p>
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant Director • Relevant Portfolio Holder • Internal Audit • Legal and Governance • Policy and Partnerships <p>Experts/Advisors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charity Commission – policy evidence • NAVCA – policy evidence • Local Government Improvement and Development – best practice
13	METHODOLOGY	<p>Proposed stages for the review</p> <p>Stage 1 – Scoping meeting</p> <p>Stage 2 – Review of evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings of audit review • Best practice with regarding good governance arrangements and commissioning of infrastructure groups <p>Stage 3 – Challenge panel meeting</p> <p>Stage 4 – Formulation of report and recommendations</p>

14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	The challenge panel should consider how equality implications have been taken into consideration in current policy and practice and consider the implications of any recommended changes.
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	<p>To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way in which funding policy impacts on approaches to monitoring and the proportionality of monitoring arrangements. • The role of councillors as trustees • Future of infrastructure support to the sector <p>To exclude:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the <u>council</u> as a charitable trustee • Going over old ground in terms of undertaking further work in areas already reviewed by scrutiny or by others • Specifics of the HAVS investigation
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	The challenge panel will need to have regard to any possible community safety implications arising from any recommendations.
17	TIMESCALE	<p>For completion by Christmas 2010 and to report to O&S on 27 January 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping meeting – 20 October 2010 • Review of evidence – after O&S 23 November 2010 • Challenge panel – early December 2010 • Formulation of report – mid December 2010 • [Progress review – Delivering a strengthened voluntary sector – P&F 18 January 2011] • Final report to O&S – 27 January 2011
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny Officer – policy support, research, administration, report writing • Internal Audit – carrying out audit review • Community Development– evidence • Legal and Governance – evidence • Policy and Partnerships – evidence
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer
20	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Outline of formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Service Director [x] December 2010 To Portfolio Holder [x] December 2010 To O&S [x] 27 January 2011 To Cabinet [x] 10 February 2011</p>
21	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)	Monitoring by Performance and Finance scrutiny sub-committee after 6 months and then on a 6 monthly basis by exception.