

HARROW COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

23 NOVEMBER 2010

REVIEW OF COUNCIL'S USE OF PERFORMANCE INFORMATION – DRAFT SCOPE

1	SUBJECT	Council's Use of Performance Information
2	COMMITTEE	Overview and Scrutiny committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	Councillors Cllr Sue Anderson Cllr Nana Asante Cllr Kam Chana Cllr Susan Hall Cllr Jerry Miles Cllr Chris Mote Cllr Paul Osborn (chairman) Cllr Bill Phillips Cllr Stephen Wright Co-optees Hema Mistry Julian Maw Roger Smith Abigail Matsika Seamus English
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	To support the Council to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the abolition of national performance framework and to devise a local framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• which enables councillors and managers to gather, analyse and utilise information on performance and value for money in order to support the delivery of local – resident – priorities and informing service planning• which reflects the reality of the local outcomes• which enables timely decisions to be made regarding performance• which facilitates public reporting/accountability.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	The project is able to support the development of a local performance framework.
6	SCOPE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• To include the setting, measuring and ongoing management of existing LAA priorities• To consider the effective utilisation and presentation of currently collected data• To ensure that the performance framework facilitates monitoring of borough priorities,• Development of a performance management culture

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost effectiveness of the process • To consider how customer requirements for data are met, where the customers are decision-makers (portfolio holders and partners), ward councillors, managers/officers, scrutiny (including LINK/HealthWatch) and residents.
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	Draft priority 'United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads'.
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	For the review: Lynne Margetts, Service Manager Scrutiny For the service: Alex Dewsnap, Divisional Director Partnerships Development and Performance
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	From within the scrutiny team
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	From within the scrutiny team
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services Portfolio Holder • Assistant Chief Executive • Divisional Director Partnership Development and Performance • Harrow Strategic Partnership (HSP) • Best practice boroughs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wandsworth ○ Westminster ○ Kensington and Chelsea ○ Camden ○ Hammersmith and Fulham ○ Merton (nearest neighbour) • Local Government Improvement and Development/Centre for Public Scrutiny • London Councils • Officers, including High Performing Harrow.
13	METHODOLOGY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the legislative scope for the development of a local framework • Analysis of currently collected data and Government proposals for the future of these data sets, including who uses the data • Discussion with councillors (in the review group) with regard to the kind of performance information they would find helpful. • Consideration of the principles which should govern the development of a local framework – timely, accessible, integration of scrutiny processes, cost effectiveness • Discussion with other high performing boroughs regarding options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wandsworth ○ Westminster ○ Kensington and Chelsea ○ Camden

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hammersmith and Fulham ○ Merton ○ London Councils ● Discussion with technical experts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Centre for Public Scrutiny ● Discussion with officers including High Performing Harrow ● Discussion with relevant portfolio holder plus wider discussion with other portfolio holders (past and present) about their requirements ● Discussion with HSP partners ● Resident involvement – focus groups drawn from the council's residents' panel to understand their use of data and their interests.
14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	The development of an effective local performance framework must ensure that the specific demographic characteristics of the borough can be identified and the needs of our diverse community can be met effectively.
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Possible risks associated with choosing not to continue to collect data ● Changing policy environment – for example forthcoming changes affecting health sector and the impact on partnership working with council.
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	There are none specific to the review at this stage.
17	TIMESCALE	<p>Stage 1 – to make recommendations for the streamlining of current arrangements (including Place Survey) – to report to O&S 27 January 2010</p> <p>Stage 2 – future performance management framework – to report to O&S – July 2011 (date TBC).</p>
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	Scrutiny Officer
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Heather Smith, Scrutiny Officer
20	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Outline of formal reporting process:</p> <p>Stage 1</p> <p>To Service Director [x] January 2011</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [x] January 2011</p> <p>To CSB [tbc] If required</p> <p>To O&S [x] 27 January 2011</p> <p>To Cabinet [x] 10 February 2011</p> <p>Stage 2 – TBC</p> <p>To Service Director [x] June/July 2011</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [x] June/July 2011</p> <p>To CSB [tbc] If required</p> <p>To O&S [x] Date TBC</p> <p>To Cabinet [x] Date TBC</p>

21	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)	Monitoring by the Performance and Finance scrutiny sub-committee after six months and then on a by exception basis.
----	---	---