

## AGENDA ITEM

### REPORT TO EXECUTIVE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

26 MARCH 2013

### REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF LAW AND DEMOCRACY

## SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME – SELECTION OF IN DEPTH SCRUTINY REVIEWS

### SUMMARY

The report presents proposals for the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2013/14.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Executive Scrutiny Committee is asked to review the suggested topics, identify the priorities for in depth review and allocate reviews to Select Committees.

### WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13

1. In 2012/13 it was agreed that the Scrutiny work programme should consist of a combination of the following elements:
  - **In depth topic based reviews** – Based on Member and Officer Suggestions.
  - **Support for the Value for Money Programme** – This included new reviews of any outstanding service areas or follow up work emanating from earlier EIT reviews which were identified for further investigation. Experience from earlier EIT reviews confirmed that Select Committees are able to add most value to the process where there is a public facing dimension to the work undertaken.
  - **A Framework for Local and Self-Regulation** – Select Committees received yearly performance information relating to the portfolio areas within the remit of the Committee. The framework would ensure that important issues of local concern such as dignity in health and social care were addressed, utilising enhanced scrutiny powers to scrutinise all commissioners and providers.
  - **Health Scrutiny** – In depth topic based reviews on health issues, overview of local NHS transitional arrangements, continued updates on Momentum and other issues (e.g. statutory consultations, Quality Accounts etc.)
  - **Crime and Disorder Scrutiny** – Continued development of the role with reference to the Police Reform.
2. The current programme is summarised below:

Select Committee	Review	Date Reporting to Cabinet
Arts, Leisure & Culture	- Marketing of Stockton's Visitor Offer	April 2013
Adult Services and Health	- EIT Learning Disability - EIT Mental Health - Domiciliary Care	Jan 2013 July 2012 TBC
Children & Young People	- Quality and sufficiency of Childcare - Child Placements and Foster Care	February 2013 TBC
Environment	- Affordable Warmth	February 2013
Housing & Community Safety	- Tobacco Control - Performance of Housing Providers	April 2013 TBC
Corporate and Social Inclusion	- Energy Supply - Impact of Welfare Reforms	February 2013 TBC
Regeneration and Transport	- Long Term Abandoned Properties - Employability/NEETs/Quality of Training	February 2013 TBC

3. In addition, Corporate and Social Inclusion Select Committee carried out a task and finish review of subscriptions to outside bodies, following a request from Cabinet, which reported in September 2012. A request from Cabinet was also made to undertake a task and finish review of community safety and security services was agreed by Executive Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 25 September. This review will be carried out by Environment Select Committee beginning in January 2013; the aim is to complete this work within the current year.

#### **OUTSTANDING TOPICS FROM THE CURRENT YEAR**

4. Several Select Committees were assigned a second review in the 2012/13 work programme, and due to timescales these have not yet commenced. It is proposed that these are dealt with as follows:

**Adult Services & Health - Domiciliary Care Review** – This review was agreed for 2012/13 but not yet reviewed due to EIT review pressures.

The topic was suggested by ASH Select Committee. The Committee raised the issue of quality of home care arrangements in the Borough (across all providers). Members were keen to investigate the quality of care provided, time spent with clients, and client feedback. It was also thought important to ensure that individual needs are being addressed (for example deaf clients) and that commissioned services were not one size fits all.

This service area comprises a major part of the on-going 'big ticket' review of Adult Services.

Domiciliary care providers have been re-tendered during 2012/13 to achieve value for money, and the proposed scrutiny review was to follow on from this local re-tendering,

and also work that both the CQC and Stockton Link were undertaking on home care at the national and local level. It is therefore proposed that this review is undertaken following the completion of the current EIT Mental Health Review.

**Children & Young People - Child Placements and Foster Care** – It is proposed that this review is not now undertaken by the Select Committee as work is being undertaken by the Children’s Programme Board.

**Housing & Community Safety - Performance of Housing Providers** - It is proposed that this review is included within the 2013/14 work programme.

Also, following a referral from full Council, the Housing and Community Safety Select Committee will be considering the issue of investment in tobacco companies by the Teesside Pension Fund as part of their current review.

**Regeneration & Transport - Employability/NEETs/Quality of Training** – It is proposed that this review is incorporated within the proposed review of Further Education.

## **SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR 2013/14**

### ***PICK System***

5. Topics have been sought from Members and Officers on a standard pro forma in line with previous practice and other public bodies on the Local Strategic Partnership have also been invited to make suggestions. In addition, members of the public are able to suggest an issue for scrutiny at any time during the year.
6. Justification of proposals is presented based on public interest, impact, performance and efficiency issues and context. This PICK system approach allows a score to be given to each suggestion to help with prioritisation of topics. It should be stressed that the score is a tool to aid prioritisation and is not binding in any way.
7. All of the suggestions received are summarised in the schedule set out in **Appendix 1** and given a PICK score. Each suggestion is cross referenced with supporting information. A pro forma for each suggestion is included at **Appendix 3**. An explanation of the PICK scoring method is attached at **Appendix 4**.

## **OTHER WORK**

### ***Performance Monitoring***

8. In addition to the in depth review work, Select Committees will continue to receive the usual action plans and progress reports in respect of the reviews which have concluded. The annual overview meetings will also be held in the new Municipal year. In addition, the relevant Select Committees will be receiving quarterly performance reports on adult social care, children’s services and results of the recent Ofsted inspection which will be looking at performance but also readiness for forthcoming inspections.

### ***Health***

9. Adult Services and Health Select Committee continues to be responsible for receiving statutory and non-statutory health consultations and briefings. It is therefore important to build in a degree of capacity within the programme to deal with other emerging issues. It is likely that, next year, there will be consultation relating to the Momentum project and the transferring of hospital services between sites in the interim period before the new hospital opens.

10. The Adult Services and Health Select Committee were due receive a report on the effectiveness of drug treatment programme and this will be carried over into next year.
11. The Tees Valley Joint Health Scrutiny Committee continues to meet to scrutinise issues and NHS services which are provided across the Tees Valley sub region and it is also proposed that local Directors of Public Health are invited to provide suggestions for the forthcoming year. Stockton will be taking over the responsibility for providing administrative and scrutiny support for this Joint Committee during 2013/14.

### ***Value for Money Programme***

12. Work is on-going as part of the Council's Value for Money Programme to identify efficiency savings in relation to "big ticket" items; it is proposed that Executive Scrutiny Committee receive quarterly progress reports in relation to these areas.

### ***Joint Scrutiny – Cleveland Fire Authority***

13. CFA, as part of meeting its budget requirements, is considering alternative delivery models, including potentially creating a Social Enterprise to deliver fire and rescue services on a commissioned basis.
14. A task and finish group of scrutiny Members met on 17 July to look at the initial proposals from the Fire Authority and Members received a presentation on proposed alternative delivery models from Ian Hayton. It was noted that the on-going assurance process to evaluate whether a social enterprise was feasible was scheduled to end around March 2013 and that once this was confirmed full consultation would take place with all parties, including Stockton Council. The task and finish group agreed that the proposals would be reviewed again when the Fire Authority had undertaken further work and was ready to consult with all its stakeholders.
15. It is suggested that this is undertaken by sub regional joint scrutiny, made up of chair and vice chair of relevant Local Authorities Scrutiny Committees.

### ***Police and Crime Panel***

16. In addition to the Council's Select Committees, the newly established Police and Crime Panel will carry out a scrutiny role holding the Police and Crime Commissioner to account. This may involve undertaking additional work in the form of investigation into PCC decisions, expanding their understanding of policing priorities and community safety issues as well as working with others to establish and identify areas / issues of interest / concern. There also needs to be effective liaison between the Panel and the OSCs.

### **COMMENTS FROM SCRUTINY LIAISON FORUM**

17. Scrutiny Liaison Forum met on 12 March 2013 to consider the topic suggestions received and prioritise accordingly. Comments from the Forum are set out below:
  - It was considered that updates on Railway Crossings and Speed Camera Initiative would best be considered at a Members' Policy Update rather than as an in depth scrutiny review
  - It was suggested that Careers Advice could be incorporated within the Further Education review but that evidence gathering on this issue would need to be phased towards the end of the scrutiny investigation in view of other work which was currently underway
  - GP waiting times was closely related to access to emergency health services and these issues would all need to be considered together

- Consider moving Domiciliary Care from ASH Select Committee to another committee in view of workload pressures on that Committee

Taking into account the comments from Scrutiny Liaison Forum, a potential work programme is suggested at **Appendix 2**.

## **FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

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

## **RISK ASSESSMENT**

19. The selection of appropriate topics for review can help to support service improvement; the selection of inappropriate topics will lead to the waste of 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](mailto:margaret.waggott@stockton.gov.uk)

**Name of Contact Officer:** Judy Trainer  
**Telephone No:** 01642 528158  
**Email Address:** [judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

<u>Background Papers:</u>	None
<u>Ward(s) and Ward Councillors:</u>	Not Ward Specific
<u>Property Implications:</u>	None

## SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14

Topic No.	Suggested Topic	Public Interest	Impact	Council Efficiency & Performance	Keep in Context	Total	Weighted Total	Comments
1,2	Welfare Reform/ Financial Inclusion	3	3	2	3	11	2.6	
3	Child Poverty	3	3	2	3	11	2.6	
4, 5	Access to Emergency/ Urgent Health Services/ GP Waiting Times	3	3	2	3	11	2.6	
6	Domiciliary Care	3	3	1	3	10	2.2	Outstanding Topic from 12/13
7	Further Education	2	2	2	3	9	2.2	It is proposed that this is combined with the outstanding review work on Employability/ NEETs/ Quality of Training
8	Use of Demographic Information	1	2	2	3	8	2	
9	Speed Camera Initiative	2	1	2	3	8	2	Suggested topic for a Members Policy Update
10	Performance of Housing Providers	3	3	1	1	8	1.8	Outstanding Topic from 12/13
11	NEPO	1	2	2	3	8	1.8	
12	Railway Crossings	2	2	1	2	7	1.6	Suggested topic for a Members Policy Update
13	Careers Advice	2	2	1	2	7	1.6	It is proposed that this is combined with the outstanding review work on Employability/ NEETs/ Quality of Training
14	Social Marketing	1	1	2	2	6	1.6	
15	Area Panels	1	1	2	2	6	1.6	
16	Consultancy and Contracts	1	1	2	2	6	1.6	
17	Highways	2	2	1	1	6	1.4	
18	Bus Lanes	1	2	1	2	6	1.4	

19	Charging Policies	1	1	2	0	4	1.2	
20	Governance	1	1	1	1	4	1	

### Potential 2013/14 Work Programme

Select Committee	Potential Topics
Arts, Leisure and Culture	Child Poverty
Adult Services and Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domiciliary Care</li> <li>• Access to Emergency/Urgent Health Services/ GP Waiting Times</li> </ul>
Children and Young People	Further Education (Employability, NEETs, Quality of Training, careers advice)
Corporate and Social Inclusion	NEPO
Environment	Performance of Housing Providers
Housing and Community Safety	Welfare Reform/ Financial Inclusion
Regeneration and Transport	Use of Demographic Information



**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p><b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b></p> <p><b>Implementation of welfare reform and how this is impacting on the local community</b></p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p><b>Public interest justification:</b></p> <p>This issue will have direct impact on those affected by the reforms.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>This issue will have an impact on the social and economic well-being of the area.</p>	
<p><b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b></p>	
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p>	
<p><b>Signed:</b> Julie Nixon <span style="float: right;"><b>Date:</b> January 2013</span></p>	
<p>Please return to:</p> <p>Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158</p>	
<p align="center">Office Use:</p>	
<p>Pick score:</p>	<p>Considered by SLF:</p>

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Impact of Welfare Reform**

This may already be picked up elsewhere as there are so many changes with potentially a huge impact on the Council/residents. These include:

1. The impact of the “Extra Room Tax” and the effectiveness of the Discretionary Housing Payment budget to help meet those most affected/vulnerable by such “reforms”.

Concerns are likely impact of increased demands on Housing Options and their ability to cope, the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand as tenants downsize/seek cheaper accommodation, the impact on RSLs. Concerns also that the DHP budget is completely inadequate to assist all those likely to need it.

2. The transfer of much of the Social Fund to the Council in April. Again concerns about the adequacy of the budget to meet demand. Also because there has been very little guidance provided to Councils the delivery model adopted by Stockton would probably benefit from a comprehensive review after a period of being in place. [see letter below]

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Implications in respect of welfare reform on health, community safety, homelessness etc makes this of general public interest.

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

As above. Welfare Reform is likely to have unintended consequences in respect of demands on the Council and other organisations e.g. the Police, Harbour etc.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

Because all this is either a new responsibility for the Council or else will see demands on services not seen previously there will inevitably be areas of organisational development/lessons learned/impact established etc.

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

Welfare Reform is worthy of review in its own right so the above can feed into that possibly.

**Signed:** Cllr Nelson

**Date:** January 2013

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01642 528158

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

Dear colleague

Earlier this year, we wrote to you, following the Government's decision to transfer responsibility and support for our users to local authorities in England, and the devolved administrations in Scotland and Wales.

We told you that we were planning to meet with all key stakeholders to talk to them about this transfer review programme. These meetings have now taken place and have helped us shape the programme that we would now like to deliver to you.

Initially, we would like to invite three representatives from your authority to attend one of the following meetings:

26 February	-	Nottingham
27 February	-	London
28 February	-	London
5 March	-	Birmingham
5 March	-	York
5 March	-	Southampton
6 March	-	Lancaster
6 March	-	London
12 March	-	Newcastle
12 March	-	Exeter
13 March	-	Bristol
14 March	-	Manchester

The meetings will start no earlier than 10.00 am and finish no later than 4.00 pm.

The meetings will give your authority the opportunity to review the proposals in detail and to consider the practical implications that the transfer programme will have for your department.

Given the nature of the meeting, we expect the staff that attend would be those that have a crucial role in the transfer programme and might include Heads of Service, finance and direct payments support staff. We would also like to discuss the potential for the setting up of specific project teams of leads within your department to support the planning and management of ILF users through the transfer within your Authority.

Given the importance of supporting all ILF users through the transfer we are very keen that all Local Authorities attend a meeting in order to

discuss the requirements of the transfer and ensure we can provide you with the relevant information to help in your planning to take over the funding of our users from April 2015.

Please register your attendance for the meeting by email to [LATeam@ifl.org.uk](mailto:LATeam@ifl.org.uk) no later than 11 February 2013. We will then contact you to confirm your place and to provide you with more information about the agenda for the day.

Please contact us if you have any questions. Our email is shown above or our phone number is 0115 9450 769.

Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jesse Harris', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jesse Harris  
Strategy and Social Work Director

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

The Welfare Reform Act introduces new rules for the size of accommodation that Housing Benefit, and then Universal Credit, will cover for working age tenants renting in the social sector. This will bring them in line with the private rented sector.

From April 2013 all current and future working age tenants renting from a local authority, housing association or other registered social landlord will receive housing support based on the need of their household.

The size criteria allows one bedroom for each person or couple living as part of the household with the following exceptions:

- children under 16 of the same gender are expected to share
- children under 10 are expected to share regardless of gender
- a disabled tenant or partner who needs a non-resident overnight carer will be allowed an extra room.

This means those tenants whose accommodation is larger than they need may lose part of their Housing Benefit:

- those with one spare bedroom will lose 14 per cent of their Housing Benefit
- those with two or more spare bedrooms will lose 25 per cent.

How is this going to affect Stockton residents?

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

This issue will have direct impact on those affected by the reforms.

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

This issue will have an impact on the social and economic well-being of the area.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

Not known

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

Impact of Welfare Reform to be undertaken by CSI Select Committee.

**Signed:** Corporate and Social Inclusion Select Committee

**Date:** 22 January 2013

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01642 528158

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Financial inclusion and support for those in poverty**

- what support is available in the Borough via council, Third sector
- Is SBC supporting organisations such as Tees Credit Union sufficiently
- How effective are SBC's own services in supporting those in financial difficulty, and poverty? What more can be done with limited resources? (eg benefits advice/take-up services, social care, enforcement and detection of illegal financial services such as illegal loan sharks, identification of those most in need)
- growing financial exclusion through reasons including benefits/welfare cuts, fuel/food poverty, unemployment (especially young people) etc - situation and impact analysis and policy to target and deliver support

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

- increased unemployment and NEETs
- impact of welfare reform/benefits cuts
- impact on economy and families/individuals/communities
- need to assess and respond to poverty
- need to ensure specific third sector organisations tackling these issues are prioritised and are delivering quality services
- ensure SBC services are effective, targeted and efficient

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:  
Financial exclusion impacts on all areas of Council policy and objectives**

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

Family poverty framework does not provide any actual policy or solutions

Advice services within SBC and third sector (Eg SDAIS, Five Lamps) should be reviewed as are SBC funded

Cross agency and SBC department working groups, eg benefits impact, do not involve members and are therefore not examined or scrutinised as other services and delivery of policy are



**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

No. Single topic reviews on causes and responses to related issues are examined but the overall and specific support and policy on financial inclusion, alternative financial support (eg credit unions), illegal activity and council focus have not been addressed

**Signed:** Cllr David Rose

**Date:** January 2013

**Please return to:**

**Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD**

**Email:** [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

**Tel:** 01642 528158

**Office Use:**

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
<b>Child Poverty</b>	
To understand child poverty in Stockton and identify what steps local action can/should be taken.	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
Area of public concern/ media interest.	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
Direct impact.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
Not know.	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
The North East Child Poverty commission has undertaken recent research for the north east which dispels many myths about child poverty. The opportunity exists to gain a greater understanding of child poverty in Stockton and what steps can be taken locally.	
<b>Signed:</b> Nigel Cooke	<b>Date:</b> 23.2.13
Please return to:	
Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD	
Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Accident + Emergency / Walk In Centre provision/ GP Waiting Times**

- To seek to explore more about current performance across local A and E/ minor injury and illness services;
- The impact of GP-led walk-in centres (Tithebarn in Stockton) and the effect (including financial) on demand on the local NHS, including on local A and E admissions.

Past reports to the Committee have indicated that demand for walk-in centres was higher than expected and they could be seen to be 'generating demand'; also consider the impact of GP waiting times

- To understand the impact of the closure of Hartlepool A and E (Aug 2011) on the North Tees NHS Foundation Trust as a whole, the establishment of the urgent care centre in Hartlepool, and consequent effect on North Tees;
- To review 2012-13 winter pressures and their effect on the Trust, and to understand how the national picture of increased A and E attendances, and ambulance handover delays is impacting locally.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

North Tees A and E recently featured on BBC1 Inside Out programme that considered urgent and emergency care across the north east. A doctor at North Tees who was interviewed described the current pressure on the unit as meaning "there are more patients arriving than you can safely manage".

There has also been recent press coverage in relation to pressure on A and E in the Tees area, particularly focussing on Ambulance hand over times at James Cook Hospital. Nationally it has been reported that overall attendances showing increasing waiting times (over 4 hour limit), and increased ambulance

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

Safe, accessible and sustainable urgent and emergency care is an important part of the health services provided in any area.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

Recent figures have indicated that between 2010-11 and 2011-12 attendances at North Tees Trust 'A and E' services as a whole have fallen by 8245, and have risen at South Tees

by 2053 in the same period.

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

The ASH Select Committee's scheduled meetings to discuss North Tees Trust's Quality Account (next one due 26 February) provide an opportunity to raise issues regarding the quality of its services (quality in the NHS is defined as comprising the following: patient safety, clinical effectiveness and patient experience).

In relation to the location of walk-in centres, this is linked to the ongoing development of the community facilities element of the Momentum programme, and the Committee continues to receive reports on progress. [Next stage consultation in the Momentum programme is due to take place in the summer but this will be focussing on the best way of providing critical care and acute medicine in the interim period before a new hospital is built.]

As part of the ongoing overview of Momentum, Members of ASH Select Committee have requested to visit the One Life Centre in Hartlepool, which includes a combined minor injuries unit/GP walk-in centre (together with a range of other services that used to be based in hospital).

**Signed:** Cllr Javed / ASH Select Committee

**Date:** 14 January 2013

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Quality of home care services**

The Committee would like to explore the issue of the quality of care provided through adult social care providers.

The Committee in particular have raised the issue of quality of home care arrangements in the Borough (across all providers). Members are keen to investigate the quality of care provided, time spent with clients, and client feedback. It is also important to ensure that individual needs are being addressed (for example deaf clients) and that commissioned services are not one size fits all.

The Committee is keen to ensure that reduced cost does not lead to compromised quality.

The mechanism for addressing concerns raised by clients, or through other sources, should be examined. This should also include how such issues are reported (including to Members), and what feedback arrangements are in place.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK  
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Quality of adult social care is a high profile issue. Quality and dignity issues in general have been the subject of recent media coverage (for example Winterbourne View).

Home care in particular is also of interest to several external organisations (see below).

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

High quality adult care services are essential to health and wellbeing of many in the local population.

In many cases home care providers may represent the only form of social contact for clients. It is also important that clients and the Council receive value for money and quality assurance from the services it commissions.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

The Council uses the Quality Standards Framework in order to monitor quality, and links to Adult Safeguarding procedures.

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

A national thematic review of home care has been launched by the Care Quality Commission. This will cover 250 providers and will start in April 2012. This follows a

report published by the Equality and Human Rights Commission which raised concerns about the quality and commissioning of home care provision. A local review would be a source of information for the national CQC work.

Stockton LiNk are in the process of completing a report on its own review of local domiciliary care provision. This report is due to be available mid-December. The work includes a survey of providers to determine their induction, training and supervision arrangements. A number of providers have not responded. [Further update on this to follow.]

**Signed:** Adult Services and Health Select Committee      **Date:** 28 November 2011

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Further Education**

The changing landscape faced by FE and Skills sector is of key concern, and it is essential that FE equips young people with the skills that businesses in the borough need. Continuing reports of a skills gap needs to be scrutinised in terms of what the FE establishments are doing in terms of understanding what skills are required. Education Maintenance Allowance changes need to be examined in terms of impact on students and outcomes.

Key lines of enquiry could also include:

What views do Ofsted hold regarding provision in Stockton?

What do role numbers tell us?

Can we be certain that provision is meeting students and business's needs?

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Ensuring a skilled workforce which meets the needs of current /prospective businesses in the area, and that education and training is focused on reducing unemployment.

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

Employment supports the economic wellbeing of the individual, the local economy, and is also accepted as benefitting health and social inclusion.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

The 2012/13 work programme assigned Regeneration & Transport Select Committee a second review topic regarding employability/NEETs/quality of training, which they will begin following completion of their review of abandoned properties. While the scope of the review had not been prepared, it is anticipated that the review concentrate on the support available for those in education/training.

The 2011 Woolfe Report stated that training should link directly to employment.

**Signed:** CMT

**Date:** January 2013

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section

Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01642 528158

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:



**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Availability, Quality and Use of Demographic Information**

While some initiatives and schemes that the Council receives funding for requires these to be based on LSOA and IMD areas, there may be a number of locally-based initiatives and interventions where the information which the Council holds on residents could be used more effectively or where new data sources or research is required.

The proposed review would investigate what information is collected on residents and how it is then used to target initiatives and interventions. This may include:

- Reviewing existing information held within data sets such as census, IMD/LSOA data, benefits recipients, housing, health, standard demographics and ward profiles
- Considering additional data and analysis that is available or is required and how this can be used in delivering core services and specific funding streams
- Looking at how initiatives can be targeting by methods other than geographical location - recognising that ward boundaries are sometimes 'false' in terms of socio demographics
- Consider how such information has been used in previous policy decisions and the need in specific policy areas (eg public health, community protection, financial inclusion) going forward

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Is SBC best targeting services to achieve outcomes such as protecting the most vulnerable, vfm.

Ensuring all agencies that hold data on residents are sharing information and working together effectively,

Many funding and resource allocations are based on existing data, eg geographical, poverty indicators etc particularly based on wards.

It is vital, with diminishing public funding to target families, neighbourhoods, individuals, streets etc most in need for all interventions, eg financial and social inclusion, health, community cohesion.

Some of the most deprived/vulnerable can be transient and therefore cannot be classed according to the benefits they receive; better use of information that we hold and/or gather may help to identify those in need of interventions.

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

Using information that we hold more effectively would ensure that resources are targeted to those that would gain the most benefit, thereby ensuring the best value for money.

Direct interventions, such as the troubled families programme, need more sophisticated intelligence and targeting of resources.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

Some decisions are taken based on - usually robust - data such as revised early years/sure start strategies.

Others based on government-defined criteria, eg CESP.

With the Localism Act and 'agenda' and rolling - up of area based grants and RSG etc then councils can sometimes have more influence over where/how funding is allocated and targeted. We need to be as informed as possible in making these decisions.

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

No.

**Signed:** Cllr David Rose

**Date:** January 2013

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
Review of Cleveland Speed Camera Initiative.	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
There is concern nationally that speed camera operations are not having the desired impact on road safety and that the practices employed are not providing the deterrent originally envisaged.	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
All road safety measures need to be analysed to determine the most appropriate are available and tailored to suit individual communities needs.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
The performance and operational performance of the camera initiative introduced some years ago is not transparent as it covers the whole of the Cleveland Police Force area. A review of the operation would be of benefit to members in understanding how the initiative has progressed since its inception.	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
<b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton	<b>Date:</b> January 2013
Please return to:  Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD  Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Performance of Registered Providers following SSVT & LSVT.**

Have promises been kept as made in offer documents?  
How will current economic climate affect the promises made and what, if any changes will need to be made to the original offer?

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Tenants voted for stock transfer on basis of promises made. Need to check those promises kept. Particular concerns around those in sheltered housing who become disabled and how their needs are being met. How might changes to Supporting People funding affect services provided? How will changes to housing funding affect tenants?

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

All tenants who were involved in stock transfer are affected. Where promises have not, or cannot be kept the council should have a role to play in formulating policies & practices to lessen the effects

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

Personal knowledge of poor performance by one Registered Provider, constant complaints from residents, meetings with council officers to no avail, comment by external partner as to failings of same registered provider.  
General feeling of slipping of standards by other Registered Provider, backed up by talking to other councillors and officers.

Subject brought forward by committee meeting of Housing & Community Safety Scrutiny Committee

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

None known

**Signed:** Cllr Julia Cherrett

**Date:** November 2011

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
Review of Regional (NEPO) and local procurement procedures.	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
The need for the authority to ensure that procurement procedures are robust and cost effective.	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
Improved cost effectiveness and compliance with standing orders and good practice.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
A new structure was introduced some three years ago there is a need to examine the effectiveness of the changes to determine if they are still fit for purpose and producing the required efficiency savings.	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
<b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton	<b>Date:</b> January 2013
Please return to:  Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD  Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Safety of Railway Crossing Points**

The safety and general management of railway crossing points (both vehicular and pedestrian).  
Likely to include liaison with Network Rail and British Transport Police, as well as Cleveland Police and the Council's Technical Services and Community Protection Services.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Concerns expressed in relation to a range of locations

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

Concerns have been expressed about the safety of pedestrians, road users, and train staff and passengers.  
In addition, railway crossing points and lines are sometimes the focus of anti-social behaviour.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

No known data.

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

None known.

**Signed:** Corporate and Social Inclusion Select Committee

**Date:** 22 January 2013

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
<b>Review of Career Advice Service in Schools.</b>	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
A need to understand the current level of career advice and its suitability in today's economic environment. Who provides it and is it consistent across all educational establishments.	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
Any improvements could have a significant impact on childrens wellbeing and the economic performance of individuals and industry and commerce in the region.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
Not that I am aware of.	
<b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton	<b>Date:</b> January 2013
Please return to:  Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD  Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:



**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Social Marketing**

The Review could include:

- effectiveness in driving behaviour change amongst residents for educational, environmental, health etc objectives
- knowledge/capability (techniques, strategy, approaches outside of 'standard' communications)
- commissioning experience (research, social marketing campaign strategy and delivery)
- track record
- future plans - including environment related – are there issues in terms of Public Health remit or will this be 'outsourced'?
- marketing/communications in general including key messages and communications strategy

this is particularly significant as the council takes on public health responsibilities to ensure we have the capacity, skills and channels/behavioural marketing strategies for 2013.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

Encourage better understanding of behaviours across the varied demographics of our resident population in the borough

Improve health, environmental performance, education, aspirations, ASB etc

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

Deliver improvements to quality of life and reduce inequalities by focussed and targeted social marketing to drive specific behavioural change amongst target resident cohorts, geographic areas and demographic profiles

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

Marketing of the borough and visitor economy are unrelated to how we support behaviour change amongst residents

**Signed:** Cllr David Rose

**Date:** January 2013

**Please return to:**

**Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD**

**Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)**

**Tel: 01642 528158**

**Office Use:**

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
Area Panels – cost and benefits SBC and the local third sector	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
Do area panels provide value for money Work with the third sector (interface) is very little (apart from handing out annual budgets).	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
Develop a more worthwhile partnership with third sector in the borough. Fund on a value for money basis only.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
Not good	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
Signed: Cllr Gibson <span style="float: right;">Date: 10/01/13</span>	
Please return to:  Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD  Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
<b>Review of Consultancy and Outsourced Contracts in all Departments.</b>	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
Members of the public have commented on the significant use of consultancy contracts in the authority.	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
To understand the full extent of consultancy and use of external contracting in the authority and determining if it is the most appropriate and cost effective use of resources.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
Could identify efficiencies that generate in-house provision and cost effectiveness.	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
<b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton	<b>Date:</b> January 2013
Please return to:  Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD  Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

**Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?**

**Highways**

The need for a western bypass for Stockton.

To move the traffic from the town, so separating the public from the vehicle.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.  
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER  
INFORMATION.

**Public interest justification:**

The passing of planning permission for thousands of new homes in the area, without putting in place an infrastructure.

**Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:**

This ticks in a positive way all three of these matters.

**Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:**

From my inquiry, very little.

**Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):**

None.

**Signed:** Andrew Stephenson

**Date:** 21.12.12

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b>	
<b>Review of Bus Lane operations and investigation of “No Car” Lanes.</b>	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
<b>Public interest justification:</b>	
Sunderland has introduced a unique “No Car” lane system. In view of reduction in bus operations particularly in Town Centres on an evening and night time such an innovation in stockton may help the taxi trade and give a cost reduction to customers.	
<b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b>	
There should be an improvement in economic performance of public transport.	
<b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b>	
<b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b>	
<b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton	<b>Date:</b> January 2013
Please return to:	
Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD	
Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p><b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b></p> <p><b>Review of Charging Policies e.g. Preston Park.</b></p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p><b>Public interest justification:</b></p> <p>To identify if current charging practices are economic and maximising the potential income streams for the facility in question.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>Possible improved income generation.</p>	
<p><b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b></p>	
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p>	
<p><b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton <span style="float: right;"><b>Date:</b> January 2013</span></p>	
<p>Please return to:</p> <p>Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158</p>	
<p align="center">Office Use:</p>	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME  
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p><b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b></p> <p><b>Review of Governance Structures, Member Numbers and Ward Boundaries.</b></p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p><b>Public interest justification:</b></p> <p>The public are disinterested in the democratic process, a review of the governance arrangements would determine if the current structure and working format are suitable for the changing environment in local government.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>Public representation and management of the authority are crucial to ensure that we offer the optimum level of services and that they are appropriate and cost effective giving good value for money to our tax payers. The local government landscape is changing and we need to challenge our current democratic structure.</p>	
<p><b>Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:</b></p>	
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p>	
<p><b>Signed:</b> Cllr Lupton</p>	<p><b>Date:</b> January 2013</p>
<p>Please return to:</p> <p>Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158</p>	
<p>Office Use:</p>	
<p>Pick score:</p>	<p>Considered by SLF:</p>



## **PICK Priority Setting**

### **P for Public Interest**

Members' representative roles are an essential feature of Scrutiny. They are the eyes and ears of the public, ensuring that the policies, practice and services delivered to the people of the District, by both the Council and external organisations, are meeting local needs and to an acceptable standard. The concerns of local people should therefore influence the issues chosen for scrutiny. This could include current issues. For example, dignity is consistently cited as a high priority for service users (e.g. Mid Staffordshire Enquiry, care in Winterbourne hospital) and scrutiny committees are well placed to influence the agenda locally and drive forward better quality services). Members themselves will have a good knowledge of local issues and concerns. Surgeries, Parish Councils, Residents Associations and Community Groups are all sources of resident's views. Consultation and Surveys undertaken by the Council and others can also provide a wealth of information.

### **I for Impact**

Scrutiny is about making a difference to the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area. Not all issues of concern will have equal impact on the well-being of the community. This should be considered when deciding the programme of work, giving priority to the big issues that have most impact. To maximise impact, particularly when scrutinising external activity, attention should also be given to how the committee could influence policy and practice. Sharing the proposed programme of reviews with Members, officer and key partners will assist this process.

### **C for Council Performance**

Scrutiny is about improving performance and ensuring the Council's customers are served well. With the abolition of external inspection regimes, scrutiny has an even more important role to play in self regulation. Members will need good quality information to identify areas where the Council, and other external organisations, are performing poorly. Areas where performance has dropped should be our priority. As well as driving up Council performance, scrutiny also has an important role in scrutinising the efficiency and value for money of Council services and organizational development.

### **K for Keep in Context**

To avoid duplication or wasted effort priorities should take account of what else is happening in the areas being considered. Is there another review happening or planned? Is the service about to be inspected by an external body? Are there major legislative or policy initiatives already resulting in change? If these circumstances exist Members may decide to link up with other approaches or defer a decision until the outcomes are known or conclude that the other approaches will address the issues. Reference should also be made to proposed programmes of work in the Council's plans and strategies

## PICK Scoring System

- **P**ublic Interest: the concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen

Score	Measure
0	no public interest
1	low public interest
2	medium public interest
3	high public interest

- **I**mpact: priority should be given to the issues which make the biggest difference to the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area

Score	Measure
0	no impact
1	low impact
2	medium impact
3	high impact

- **C**ouncil Performance and efficiency: priority should be given to the areas in which the Council, and other agencies, are not performing well or proposals which will support the current Efficiency, Improvement and Transformation Programme.

Score	Measure
0	'Green' on or above target performance
1	'Amber',
2	low performance 'Red'

- **K**eep in Context: work programmes must take account of what else is happening in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort.

Score	Measure
0	Already dealt with/ no priority
1	Longer term aspiration or plan
2	Need for review acknowledged and worked planned elsewhere
3	Need for review acknowledged

Each topic will be scored under each category as indicated above. Where a category is not applicable, no score will be given.

## Weighting

Public Interest	Score x0.2
Impact	Score x0.2
Council Performance and Efficiency	Score x0.4
Keep in Context	Score x0.2