

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

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	27th January 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	Better Deal for Residents Review Standing Review Scope
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Alex Dewsnap Divisional Director, Partnership Development and Performance
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member area:</b>	Cllr Jerry Miles, Corporate Effectiveness Policy Lead Member Cllr Tony Ferrari, Corporate Effectiveness Performance Lead Member
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Enclosures:</b>	Appendix One: Scope for Better Deal for Residents Standing Scrutiny Review

## **Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations**

This report accompanies the scope for the Standing Review of the Better Deal for Residents

**Recommendations:**

Councillors are asked to:

- Consider and agree the scope for the standing review.

## **Section 2 – Report**

### **Background**

The council needs to find significant savings over the next three years. Whereas in the past, it might have been feasible to reduce spending on a service-by-service basis, the extent of the savings required means that many services will no longer be viable if cuts are delivered in this way. As a result the council has embarked on a programme to fundamentally transform the organisation and its structures and to broker a new relationship with residents. The Better Deal for Residents programme is the means by which the council hopes to make these changes. The programme comprises a range of projects designed to deliver major service reconfiguration. It is the purpose of this scrutiny review to provide additional accountability for the programme and ensure that the programme is properly project managed and that the impact on residents is fully understood.

### **Financial Implications**

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

### **Performance Issues**

There are no specific performance issues associated with this review as it is designed to monitor the implementation of the Better Deal for Residents programme.

### **Environmental Impact**

There are no environmental impact issues associated with this review.

### **Risk Management Implications**

The successful delivery of the work of this standing review will support the management of risk by providing additional accountability and ensuring that the full impact of projects is understood.

### **Equalities implications**

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? Yes ( )      No (  )

It is the aim of this review to provide additional accountability to this major transformation programme. As such it is the programme itself which will be subject to equalities impact assessment.

### **Corporate Priorities**

This review will contribute to the delivery of the following *draft* 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
- A Town Centre to be proud of: changing Harrow for the better

### **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

# **APPENDIX ONE: BETTER DEAL FOR RESIDENTS PROGRAMME STANDING REVIEW - DRAFT SCOPE**

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY-COMMITTEE**

**NOVEMBER 2010**

**VERSION NUMBER – 4**

### **VERSION HISTORY**

**Initial draft**

**Version 2** considered at review group meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> November

**Version 3** amended after further discussions with the Chairman 23<sup>rd</sup> November

**Version 4** final version agreed by the review group on 16<sup>th</sup> December

1	<b>SUBJECT</b>	Better Deal for Residents Programme
2	<b>COMMITTEE</b>	Overview and Scrutiny committee
3	<b>REVIEW GROUP</b>	<p><b>Councillors</b>            Cllr Nana Asante            Cllr Chana            Cllr Ann Gate            Cllr Macleod-Cullinane            Cllr Osborn            Cllr Phillips            Cllr Krishna Suresh            Cllr Wright (Chairman)</p> <p><b>Co-optees</b>            Rita Jourdan            Hema Mistry            Elizabeth Hugo            Linda Robinson            Abigail Matsika            Seamus English</p>
4	<b>AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES</b>	<p>To consider the content of the Better Deal for Residents programme in terms of ambition, relevance, appropriateness</p> <p>To ensure effective project management processes are in place for the programme</p> <p>To consider the impact of the programme on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Council – is it achieving the outcomes envisaged – linked to the effectiveness of project management processes</li> <li>• residents               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ what impact are the changes having and how are these being mitigated – Better Together/Big Society,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how far do residents understand/appreciate the need for significant change are their opinions being taken into account, are they being actively engaged/convinced in the delivery of change</li> <li>● partners – are we working more efficiently with partners to deliver change, what is the impact on their services</li> <li>● managers – how well are they being supported in delivering change whilst at the same time being subject to that change</li> </ul>
5	<b>MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW</b>	<p>Review is able to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Programme delivers real change in service delivery</li> <li>● Programme delivers anticipated savings</li> <li>● Programme delivers change in residents'/service users' attitude to service delivery and responsibilities</li> </ul>
6	<b>SCOPE</b>	The content of the Better Deal for Residents Programme
7	<b>SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)</b>	
8	<b>REVIEW SPONSOR</b>	Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive
9	<b>ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER</b>	From relevant service area
10	<b>SUPPORT OFFICER</b>	Service Manager Scrutiny
11	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT</b>	From within Scrutiny Team
12	<b>EXTERNAL INPUT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Residents</li> <li>● Partner organisations</li> <li>● Service users</li> </ul>
13	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consideration of the detail of the programme</li> <li>● Investigation of the effectiveness of the performance management of the programme to ensure best practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ examination of a number of cases studies with relevant project directors</li> <li>○ consideration of the overall PMO performance management process</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Regular updates on progress – to include achievement of anticipated savings</li> <li>● Parallel investigation of the impact of the programme on residents and partners (including voluntary sector)</li> <li>● Investigation of particular areas under the 3<sup>rd</sup> priority 'Building on the community spirit of residents to be more involved in the future of the Borough'</li> </ul>

14	<b>EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS</b>	It is anticipated that the Better Deal for Residents programme will deliver significant change in the way the council organises itself to deliver services to local people. Harrow is an extremely diverse borough and the organisation cannot make assumptions about service needs of the population. As such changes to services and changing the expectations and behaviours of our residents will need to reflect the differing needs and experiences of the population. The council must be able to assure itself that adverse equalities implications for staff or on residents are identified and where possible, mitigated. The review will monitor this.
15	<b>ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS</b>	
16	<b>SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS</b>	This could be a component of the project in so far as the Better Together stream is implemented.
17	<b>TIMESCALE</b>	Ongoing
18	<b>RESOURCE COMMITMENTS</b>	The project will be delivered from within the existing scrutiny budget
19	<b>REPORT AUTHOR</b>	Lynne Margetts
20	<b>REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS</b>	<p>Quarterly reports on progress to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee  Interim report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November 2011</p> <p>Outline of final formal reporting process:  To Service Director           [ ]    TBC  To Portfolio Holder           [ ]    TBC  To CMT                            [ ]    TBC  To Cabinet                       [ ]    TBC</p>
21	<b>FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)</b>	TBC