

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO EXECUTIVE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

23 JANUARY 2007

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF LAW AND DEMOCRACY

SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

SUMMARY

The report presents suggestions received from Members and officers for the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2007/08 and advises the Committee of the outcome of discussions at Scrutiny Liaison Committee on 12 January 2007.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Executive Scrutiny Committee are asked to endorse the priorities for review.

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR 2007/08

1. Members had expressed a desire to complete the process for setting a work programme before the end of the municipal year in order to avoid delays in scrutiny work commencing after the elections. If necessary, the draft programme could be reviewed and amended following the Annual Meeting. The following timescale was approved:

- Chair of Executive Scrutiny Committee to write to all Members for ideas - October
- Select Committees meet to discuss ideas – October/November (Item on Select Committee agendas)
- CMT – December
- Corporate Director/Head of Service Briefings with Cabinet Members – December
- Scrutiny Liaison Forum – 12 January 2007
- Executive Scrutiny Committee – 20 February 2007

2. All of the suggestions received are summarised in the schedule set out an Appendix 1. Each suggestion is cross referenced with supporting information by a reference number.

SCRUTINY LIAISON FORUM

3. The Scrutiny Liaison Forum reviewed the list of suggested topics and is recommending the following topics for the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2007/08 (in priority order):

Adults Leisure and Culture

- River Based Leisure Facilities
- Services for Young People in between Childhood and Adulthood

(In respect of the suggestion for a review of Disabled People into Employment, the Forum asked officers to give further consideration to this issue as a potential wider review of employment)

Corporate Policy

- Community Sector (Stockton Voluntary Development Sector)
- Theatre Subsidy

Children and Young People

- School Organisation Plan
- Corporate Parenting

Environment and Regeneration

- Cemeteries and Memorials: Phase II
- Waste Collection Service – Comprehensive Review of Recycling

(Vermin Control – It was suggested that a short piece of work could be carried out by Task and Finish Group)

Health

- Alcoholism
- Hearing Aids Waiting Lists/ Delays on Referrals to Audiology

Members also requested that information be provided to the Committee on:

- Lack of employment for newly qualified health professionals
- Ritilin

Housing and Community Safety

- Neighbourhood Enforcement Service
- Homelessness for Young People (incorporating accommodation for care leavers)

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4. There will be staffing implications in order to provide the necessary support for reviews.

RISK ASSESSMENT

5. The selection of appropriate topics for review can help to support service improvement; the selection of inappropriate topics will lead to waste officer and Member time and resources.

Director of Law and Democracy

Name of Contact Officer: Margaret Waggott

Telephone No: 01642 527064

Email Address: margaret.waggott@stockton.gov.uk

Name of Contact Officer: Judy Trainer
Telephone No: 01642 528158
Email Address: Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Background Papers: None
Ward(s) and Ward Councillors: Not Ward Specific
Property Implications: None

Scrutiny Work Programme 2007/08

	Outstanding SLF Topics	New Topics Identified	External Scrutiny	Suggested By	Identified from Scrutiny Reviews
Adults, Leisure and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> River Based Leisure Facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further review of aids and adaptations (monitoring of previous review) (1) 	✓	CM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welfare Benefits (2) 		SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adult Education (3) 		SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disabled People into Employment (4) 	✓	SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services for Young People in between Childhood and Adulthood (5) 	✓	CM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theatre Subsidy (6) 		O	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leisure Trust (7) 		O	
Corporate Policy	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Community Centres/ Community Development (8) 	✓	IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stockton Voluntary Development Agency and associated community sector (9) 	✓	IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure and operation of the LSP (10) 	✓	IM	
Children and Young People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obesity (not recommended) Education Attainment of Looked After Children (not recommended) Youth Matters Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary School Meals (11) 		SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Careers Advice (currently provided by Connexions but will become Council service in April 2007) (12) 		SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodation for Care Leavers (13) 	✓	IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Schools for the Future (14) 		IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate Parenting (15) 		O	
Environment and Regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concessionary Fares Cemeteries & Memorials (Phase II: The Management of Memorials (Next Review)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vermin Control (Rat/Pigeon Infestation) (16) 		IM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of Redcar and Cleveland alternate weekly recycling and refuse collection (Waste review)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regeneration/Reducing unemployment/ Support for new businesses/town centre regeneration (17) 	✓	IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste Collection Service/ Comprehensive Review of Recycling (18) 		O	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Winter Maintenance (19) 		O	

	Outstanding SLF Topics	New Topics Identified	External Scrutiny	Suggested By	Identified from Scrutiny Reviews
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child and Adolescent Mental Health (not recommended) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to Drug Treatment and rehabilitation Services (20) 	✓	IM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ritilin (Educational Inclusion Review – Increased prescriptions of drug administered to young people suffering from attention deficit difficulties and over activity. No centralised register or Ritilin prescription and schools are not routinely notified)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alcoholism (21) 	✓	SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hospital Parking (22) 	✓	SC	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of employment for newly qualified health professionals (23) 	✓	IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hearing Aids/Waiting List/Delays in referrals to Audiology (24) 	✓	IM/CM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Huntercombe House/ Respite Care (25) 	✓	IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domiciliary Care (26) 	✓	O	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct Payments (27) 		O	
Housing and Community Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing – Support for Homeless and New Tenants Community Wardens/ Anti Social Behaviour Enforcement Traveller Provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASB/Housing Enforcement Issues (28) 		IM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resourcing of the Neighbourhood Enforcement Services (from ASB review)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Decent Homes Work (29) 		IM	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbourhood Enforcement Service (30) 		O	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to Affordable Housing (31) 	✓	O	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homelessness for Young People (32) 		O	

Key:

- CM** – Cabinet Member
- SC** – Select Committee
- IM** – Individual Member
- O** - Officer

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Review of Aids and Adaptations

What are the issues/concerns?

**Monitoring of previous review of Aids and Adaptations.
Concerns that situation has worsened.**

(A BVPI measures the % of items of equipment and minor adaptations delivered within 7 working days. In 05/06 our performance was 75% which represents 'good' 4 band performance in the 5 band national performance framework, although is relatively low for our comparator group of similar authorities. Performance in 06/07 at the end of October was 77.4%, representing some improvement on the previous year towards an ambitious target of 85%.

The length of time waiting for major adaptations is also measured, although this is not a BVPI. Performance had deteriorated from 35 to 39 weeks in 05/06 (35.8 weeks national average) but at the end of September 2006 had improved to 30.6 weeks.)

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

Signed: A Cains

Date:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Welfare Benefits

What are the issues/concerns?

- **Is the service effective and efficient**
- **Is it in correct place in Council's structure**
- **Subsidy to Stockton District Advice and Information Service.**

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

Signed: ALCS Select Committee

Date:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Adult Education</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Details to follow</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p>
<p>Signed: _____ Date: _____</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Disabled people into employment

What are the issues/concerns?

- **Council as employer; Councillor as enabler; Council as community leader**
- **Are policies up to date (HR and Social Services)**

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

Meaningful employment for people with disabilities.

Signed: ALCS Select Committee

Date:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Audit of Services to Young People in “Transition” eg between Childhood and Adulthood.</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Parents of children with physical or learning disabilities report a reduction in services once the child moves into Adult Services.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Point out the facts to Health Partners and Social Care.• Encourage improvement in services for service users in “transition”.
<p>Signed: A Cains Date: 30/11/06</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Support for community centres – particularly those owned by, but not run by, Stockton Council</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Support appears to be very patchy, according to which community centre it is. Also it is not co-ordinated across the Council, with different advice from different departments at time.</p> <p>My fear is that if some of these problems are not sorted out soon there will be media headlines about something going wrong.</p> <p>What would happen if we were “inspected” by an outside organisation? I doubt if we would be awarded “excellent” status.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <p>A better and more effective service to the community.</p> <p>A more corporate and co-ordinated approach in line with Council objectives and policies.</p> <p>Avoidance of adverse publicity.</p>
<p>Signed: S Fletcher</p> <p>Date: 20/11/06</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Community development, especially support for community centres throughout the Borough.

What are the issues/concerns?

Locations and constitutions of SBC-owned community centres are a historical accident of the concurrent functions of the former Cleveland CC and SBC.

Occupiers of most community centres are voluntary associations whose instruments of government should ensure charity registration. This is fiscally efficient, but is there sufficient support for the volunteers to run these centres? Especially in view of recent Licensing, Health and Safety and Employment legislation?

More generally, is there sufficient support for community development in non-NRF areas which do not have many professional residents used to running things?

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

To minimise risks to SBC, Councillors and Volunteers.

To ensure that SBC's assets are properly utilised.

To have the means in place to try to ensure that SBC's objectives do not fail through lack of volunteers and/or their lack of competences.

To support Councillors as SBC representatives and/or in their community leadership function.

Signed: J A Fletcher

Date: 30/11/06

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

A review of the Stockton Voluntary Development Agency and associated community sector.

What are the issues/concerns?

The voluntary sector in Stockton is proposing significant restructuring and staffing reorganisation. Stockton Borough Council is a significant contributor to the financial base for these organisations in the sum of approximately £545,000. The robust governance of these third sector organisations is essential and a study of their proposals is necessary.

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

To ensure that good governance procedures and robust management processes are established to enable current financial support to be justified.

Signed: K Lupton

Date: 05.01.07

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>A review of the structure and operation of the Local Strategic Partnership.</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>The Local Strategic Partnership, introduced in recent years, requires a review to identify performance and establish clear criteria for responsibility and decision-making. Members are unclear as to the role and responsibilities due to their lack of involvement.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <p>To improve Members' understanding of the role and responsibility of the LSPs and to ensure the performance of these organisations is challenged.</p>
<p>Signed: K Lupton Date: 05.01.07</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Careers Advice</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Skills shortage (particularly in construction and engineering)• Reducing unemployment
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Closing skills gap• Providing the right advice and guidance
<p>Signed: M Rigg Date:</p>

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Building Schools For the Future (BSF)

What are the issues/concerns?

The major concern of residents within Ingleby Barwick (IB), is currently the lack of adequate provision of secondary school places within the new community of IB. Parents had to carry out an eight year campaign to eventually get a secondary school in 2000, which has 600 places. This opened in 2003. We all knew at the time that this was totally inadequate.

IB currently has 1,400 children of secondary school age, yet only one secondary school of 600 places. 800 children attend schools elsewhere within the borough, a minimum of 4 miles away and with no safe walking route to school. As the construction of the remaining 1,500 houses and with the existing primary school children already living in IB growing up, the number of secondary school children will increase by at least 100 per year. By 2010, over 1,200 out of the 1,800 secondary school children will be bussed off to schools elsewhere in the Borough.

I have asked the Council's Cabinet Member responsible for Education at least six times what the Council proposes to do about bussing off over 800 children to schools elsewhere in the Borough. Each time, I have been advised that there will be no new secondary school and no extension to the 600 place school until 2013 and that will only be about 200 places. That will still leave over 1,100 children being bussed off to school everyday - 22 full bus loads.

The above does not just affect the school education of our children, but also the community spirit of IB. Children make friends with school mates at the other schools and as a result there is an endless taxi run by parents each evening and a lack of friendship within IB. The admission zones are extremely strict with no choice at all. Parents are advised by the admissions section to put their first preference as their in zone school, which for 800 children is at least 4 miles away. If they do not and are unsuccessful in obtaining entry into the 600 place school on IB, they run the 100% risk that their child will be left to attend a school up to 12 miles away in the Borough as the in zone schools are all full. This means that the children and parents of IB have effectively NO CHOICE whatsoever.

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

The people of IB believed that **Building Schools For the Future (BSF)** initiative could help solve the problems above. Stockton Council signed up for BSF in October 2006. The principles include, a. schools big enough for the needs of their communities and b. parents are offered choices as to where they can send their children to school. When asked at Council on 18.10.06 the Cabinet Member for Education advised that these two criteria are merely for an ideal world and that the Council would not be increasing secondary school provision within Ingleby Barwick.

How can Stockton Council sign up for BSF and have no intention in addressing the problems of Ingleby Barwick? Yet other areas have schools that far exceed the needs of their community and are being 'propped up' by children from Ingleby Barwick.

Signed: R Patterson

Date: 30/11/06

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Vermin Control (Rat / Pigeon Infestation)</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase of rats/pigeons into towns• Diseases spread by rats/pigeons
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduce control measures• Public Health
<p>Signed: W Woodhead Date:</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

**Regeneration/Reducing Unemployment/Support for New Businesses/Town Centre
Regeneration**

What are the issues/concerns?

**Stockton has lower than national average employment rates and low rates of new business
start ups.**

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

**To see if there is anything more which either our officers or partners could be doing to
reverse the situation. We would look at their achievements to date and their “modus
operandi”.**

Signed: R Cains

Date:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Waste Collection Services.</p>												
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Increasing cost.</p> <p>Need to investigate the ‘carbon footprint’ – effect of a large fleet driving round, then the transportation of waste to onward markets – what is the net effect upon the environment.</p> <p>The impact upon residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate collections now for <table style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle; margin-left: 10px;"> <tr><td>waste</td><td>)</td></tr> <tr><td>green waste</td><td>)</td></tr> <tr><td>paper</td><td>)</td></tr> <tr><td>glass/tins</td><td>)</td></tr> <tr><td>plastic</td><td>)</td></tr> <tr><td>cardboard</td><td>)</td></tr> </table> <li style="margin-left: 100px;">review of the pilot scheme • Alternate weekly collections? 	waste)	green waste)	paper)	glass/tins)	plastic)	cardboard)
waste)											
green waste)											
paper)											
glass/tins)											
plastic)											
cardboard)											
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <p>An assessment of cost/benefit options</p>												
<p>Signed: N Schneider Date: 27/12/06</p>												

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Winter maintenance</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Increasing costs of road salting and gritting.</p> <p>New driver regulations – limiting number of hours by drivers.</p> <p>New best practice guidelines re: spread of salt and grit, temperature guidance.</p> <p>Policy for provision of fixed and transportable salt bins.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <p>To review and recommend new policy.</p>
<p>Signed: N Schneider Date: 27/12/06</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Access to drug treatment and rehabilitation</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>That residents cannot get the treatment which they need to become drug free.</p> <p>66% of crime is drug related and drug addiction affects everything, crime and the related costs for police, courts, prison etc. Health costs for doctors, hospitals, medicines, chemists and the cost of prescribing such medication such as methadone etc. Not only for the addicts themselves but their families who suffer marriage break-ups, stress, nervous breakdowns and in some cases suicide and attempted suicide. Housing costs and benefit costs. The list is endless.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <p>To make sure that proper treatment, which enables people to become drug free and stay that way, is provided and accessible in Stockton Borough for all those who reach the stage where they ask for and are willing to accept help.</p>
<p>Signed: J L Apedaile Date: 28/11/06</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Lack of employment for Newly Qualified Health Professionals</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Query based on “comments” from several members of the public.</p> <p>Investigation i.e requests to Colleges/Universities for information on destination of leavers (degree holders) would establish if this is a real problem.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p>
<p>Signed: J Beaumont Date:</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Delays in obtaining NHS hearing aids – this has been left out of the Government's 18 week waiting time targets.</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>There is an issue around commissioning and the PPP initiative is not used here. I have various emails from the Audiology Department at James Cook Hospital regarding this. I have a constituent who waited 39 weeks for an assessment for a hearing aid and was then told she would have a further 40 week wait to get the aid. Had it been known that she was a primary carer of a terminally ill husband then apparently she would have been given higher priority but her husband died at Easter.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p>
<p>Signed: J Roberts Date: 24/11/06</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Investigate the delay being experienced by Patients for Referral to Audiology.

What are the issues/concerns?

GPs tell me that it can be 18 months to 2 years before a patient with a hearing problem can be seen by an Audiologist and then another delay before provision of a hearing aid.

Digital Hearing Aids delay when moving from analogue.

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

Draw attention of the public to this delay and encourage Health Partners to speed up the process.

Deaf patients will experience isolation while waiting.

Signed: A Cains

Date: 30/11/06

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Huntercombe House – not sure if this falls within health scrutiny remit but the recent article in Evening Gazette does raise questions.</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <p>Huntercombe House is a privately run, 14-bed residential home providing long term and respite care for children and young people with a wide range of learning disabilities, such as autism, Aspergers Syndrome, ADHD. It is located on Norton Road in Stockton.</p> <p>A recent article in the Evening Gazette highlighted that the facility is being underused, and that families have to travel outside the region for respite care. Staff at Huntercombe House believe that this is because people do not know it exists.</p>
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p> <p>Increasing public awareness of the services provided at Huntercombe House, and ways in which to achieve this.</p> <p>Increased use of these services.</p> <p>This could be done as a short review or as part of a wider review of respite care in the Borough.</p>
<p>Signed: J Roberts Date: 22/12/06</p>

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Domiciliary Care

What are the issues/concerns?

Providing support to enable people to continue to live at home is an essential strand of activity to promote independence and to reduce reliance on access to permanent residential placements. Meeting the needs of more vulnerable groups and those with more complex needs requires the commissioning of a range of efficient and high quality specialist domiciliary services. The national Performance Assessment Framework for Adult Social Care monitors performance in this area. The Council has a target to improve performance to 100+ older people helped to live at home per 1,000 population (achieved 99 in 05/06). CSCI, the Adult Social Care inspectorate, have indicated that we should try to increase the proportion of adults with mental health needs who are helped to live at home. Our Learning Disability Action Plan has identified as a priority the need to improve independent living arrangements for those with LD. Success in these areas will impact also positively on a priority target to reduce the proportion of older people admitted to permanent residential care (this priority identified also by CSCI).

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

Increased independence of older people and adults from vulnerable groups, by making recommendations to support development of a more appropriate balance of domiciliary care services.

Signed: S Willson

Date:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Direct Payments

What are the issues/concerns?

Direct payments are a key driver for increasing service user choice and control by making payment directly to the client so they can purchase their own care arrangements. Progress in developing use of DPs is measured by a BVPI and through the national Performance Assessment Framework for Adult Social Care. There is an expectation that local authorities will extend the take-up of DPs. Progress has been made in Stockton but priority is given in service plans to further improvement. In 05/06 the proportion of DPs in Stockton (using BVPI data) was 89 adults and older people per 100,000 population aged 18+, lower than the average of 96 for similar LAs (although the national average was 81). Issues in developing use of DPs include: the need to encourage clients to accept the benefits of this approach; providing support to enable clients to make effective use of a payment; commissioning a range of services for clients to access; and managing the financial implications for the Council of increasing access to services in this way whilst sustaining some directly provided services.

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

The objective of a review would be to make recommendations about strategy for developing use of direct payments, with the aim of improving performance against our comparator groups. The outcome for service users would be to promote their independence through greater choice and control.

Signed:

S Willson

Date:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

What is your proposal for scrutiny review?

Neighbourhood Enforcement Service.

What are the issues/concerns?

This Service was newly established in April 2006, and a first annual report will be prepared by the end of May 2007, covering the 2005/06 financial year. The Service is currently funded until the end of March 2008, so a decision will need to be made by Cabinet in late 2007 on the future of the Service. Consideration of this report will provide an opportunity for challenge and added value.

Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?

Any views expressed by the Select Committee will inform the decision to be made by Cabinet later in the year. This approach to involving non-Cabinet Members in the decision-making process is likely to generate a more considered set of views than, for example, relying on an email survey.

Signed: M Batty

Date: 22/12/06

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

<p>What is your proposal for scrutiny review?</p> <p>Access to Affordable Housing</p>
<p>What are the issues/concerns?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contribution to Stockton Sub-Regional Housing Policies.• Links to Local Development Framework.
<p>Is there a clear objective/outcome for scrutinising this topic?</p>
<p>Signed: N Schneider Date:</p>

