

**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?

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities: identifying needs; ensuring responsive and effective services and improving outcomes

Children with SEND are a key priority vulnerable group identified in the Council Plan and Children and Young People's Plan.

The issues are multi-faceted and complex: ranging from the effectiveness of identification, and overall needs assessment, to the provision of support (which includes roles for the Council, schools, the Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS providers, early years providers, the VCSE, and families) and in seeking to ensure better outcomes.

The new proposed national funding formula for early years and for schools is likely to result in reduced funding, and therefore some choices and options on future provision need to be considered.

SEND has been identified as an area for the Health and Wellbeing Board to pursue joint commissioning approaches (for example for therapies). There is therefore potential for new models of delivery, with an increasing focus on early identification and intervention.

SEND is now subject to an Ofsted/CQC inspection process for the area (ie not just the Council's services, or education: this will also cover the quality of social care and health provision) by 2020.

A review would explore:

- Data, trends and needs assessment to understand the changing pattern of needs and implications for future commissioning;
- How effective the Council and partners are at identifying SEND early
- Current provision and support, including multi-agency working; early years provision and support; school based provision and support to 25. This would also review the current proposals for the review of Additionally Resourced provision at schools
- Outcomes for children, young people and families

The outcome from a review would be a set of priorities to influence the future redesign of services, with an emphasis on early identification and intervention.

**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:

Support for children with special educational needs and / or disabilities and their parents / carers remains a significant high profile issue. The reforms introduced in 2014 resulted in a major change to the way SEND is identified how support is provided as well as a greater focus on outcomes. The system remains complex and any changes are controversial and difficult require careful planning to implement.

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

Around 16-18% of all children will experience some form of SEND in their childhoods, with around 2.6% of all children requiring more specialist support through an Education Health and Care Plan (previously statements)

The Council has a significant direct responsibility for many aspects of the SEND process. It is also increasingly playing an important role in influencing the actions of others, such as through a focus on joint commissioning and c-production

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

The majority of education provision for SEND is funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant (High Needs Block). However, this funding is likely to be reduced in future years as a result of national funding formula changes, and will require some decisions on spend which will increasingly be difficult. Health and social care budgets are also stretched.

The review will also directly provide evidence of oversight, challenge and scrutiny of this area in preparation for a forthcoming SEND inspection by Ofsted. The outcomes and learning points from the recent inspection in Hartlepool will form part of the basis of the review given that the same Clinical Commissioning Group was also involved. Learning from other areas will also be considered, with the potential to visit areas of good practice.

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

There are no other reviews in this area.

The national policy direction was effectively set by the Children and Families Act 2014.

Changes to the way schools funding systems work also established the High Needs Block which funds the majority of provision for SEND.

National funding formula for schools will have a direct impact as this will result in changes to the funding available locally through the High Needs Block

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

The review is particularly focuses on:

Protecting the vulnerable through targeted intervention

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

1. Oversight from members on the effectiveness of our approach, in advance of an Ofsted SEND Local Area Inspection;
2. An assessment of options and choices to reshape services in the context of reducing funding and an increasing emphasis on early intervention and improving outcomes
3. Recommendations for the Health and Wellbeing Board on joint commissioning

Signed: Martin Gray

Date: 14 December 2016

**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?

Cemeteries: Management of Memorials – Memorial Inspections & Grave Personalisation Policy (Re-assessment)

Background

Stockton Council ceased approval of fixed, permanent kerb-sets on all graves in 1969, following the adoption of the then much preferred lawn graves, where no items were permitted to be placed on the actual grassed part of the grave. Approximately 15 years ago, however, the Council recognised that some families needed to tend and care for their family graves by the placing of personal items, which reflected the personality and character of their loved ones.

The Council also acknowledged and fully understood its duties under health and safety legislation to ensure that neither its own employees, nor the public, were exposed to risk from potentially dangerous memorials, when visiting the Borough's cemeteries and closed churchyards.

In 2007, the Environment Select Committee carried out an extensive review of the Management of Memorials, which made recommendations to improve memorial safety inspections on existing headstones, introduce robust control measures over memorial masons and initiate checks on new headstones at point of instillation. The Committee also recommended extending the Council's Cemetery Regulations to allow personalisation of purchased graves by appropriate planting of an area at the head of the grave no larger than 25% of the grassed area, with guidance being drawn up.

During the review, the Committee consulted extensively with cemetery staff, cemetery visitors, funeral directors, monumental masons and faith groups.

The new policy was implemented in a sensitive way, over a five year period. Since the introduction of Council policy, however, it has yet to be assessed/scrutinised for how it is being managed, how it is being received by bereaved families, visitors and cemetery users and whether any amendments or additional choices are required to meet with public opinion.

Public interest justification:

Public interest is shown regarding what is an acceptable amount of grave personalisation and memorialisation. This can affect everyone who chooses burial as their funeral option or a visitor to one of the cemeteries under the control and management of Stockton Borough.

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

Additional memorialisation and the practices of planting and placing unauthorised items and kerbing/edging on the full grave space presents problems for those working in or visiting the Council's cemeteries, particularly in the lawn sections, which have no pathways between rows of graves.

Difficulties experienced in carrying coffins for burial, access problems for visitors with mobility problems and the impact of unauthorised memorials on the maintenance of cemetery grounds in terms of efficiency, quality of maintenance and ability to excavate graves unhindered.

The controversial aspect of enforcement of the Grave Personalisation Policy remains an extremely sensitive and delicate issue. Bereaved families, particularly recently bereaved,

can become extremely distressed and emotional when they are unable or feel they are unable to personalise and memorialise their family grave in their own special way. Likewise, those families who have chosen a lawn grave and whose preference is to have an orderly, tidy and well-maintained grave for their loved one feel this is jeopardised and penalised by the fact that the Council is not fully enforcing the policy.

Appropriate choices for the bereaved, together with the correct and sensible management of approved and unauthorised memorialisation can provide long-term control.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Whilst the inspection and safety of memorials and control measures for memorial masons within cemeteries has greatly improved since the introduction of the Council policy, criticism of maintenance and access particularly for the excavation of graves, together with the Council's approach to the 'light touch' enforcement of non-compliance cases to the Grave Personalisation Policy, both for and against, is still receiving criticism.

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

Excavation of graves and cemetery maintenance is undertaken by our Cemeteries Maintenance Staff, who are part of the wider Grounds Maintenance Service.

Although the most recent CFYA review required revenue savings of £325K from grounds maintenance, with effect from April 2017, we have left current staffing levels in this area as we are operating to minimum staffing levels following a reduction of 2 FTE in the previous CFYA management review in 2014.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

Developing strong and healthy communities: Development and delivery of the Council's Environmental Policy and strategies that contributed to the overall Green Vision.

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

To have a publicly accepted approach to grave personalisation and memorialisation that creates greater choice and meets the needs of all bereaved families, whilst ensuring that funeral directors, coffin bearers and mourners can walk safely and easily to graveside for funerals; families and those visitors with mobility problems have easy access and the management and maintenance of the cemetery is unrestricted. Also, items placed on a grave are easier to remove at the time of a second burial or burial in an adjacent grave.

Signed: CEX

Date: 20 December 2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk
Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Security in Preston Park

Preston Park and Museum is a successful leisure and heritage attraction. Following investment in recent years the Park and Museum have become increasingly popular.

The huge pressures of numbers of visitors to Preston Park and the Museum continue to challenge us with a growing need to manage the public's use of the space, to control car parking, to deal with competition for the use of spaces, and to address the upkeep of the attraction as thousands of people visit every day. Pressure on river access is also an issue.

The Park has also suffered from incidents of vandalism and anti-social behaviour in recent months and these threaten the viability of the attraction and the satisfaction of visitors.

There are numerous points of access to the park, both informal and formal, including rights of way and cycle paths. Clearing the 110 acre site at dusk and closing all points of access is not achievable with current resources.

Steps have already been taken to improve CCTV and other means of tackling antisocial behaviour in Preston Park, however this would warrant an in-depth review in order to look into the possible causes and solutions.

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:

Preston Hall Museum, situated in the Park, is the primary means of delivering the Council's heritage work attracts c.150,000 visitors per annum.

The Park itself is a popular leisure attraction, and is increasingly used for people to access the River Tees, with rowers, open water swimmers, paddle boarders, anglers, and powered craft all seeking to get onto (or into) the Tees from Preston Park. The Park attracts an estimated 800,000 visits per year.

ASB within the park and the movement of people through adjoining residential streets to and from the Park has an impact on the safety, or perception of safety of people and property in the surrounding area.

The safety of children and vulnerable adults using the park, including those taking part in ASB, is a concern for the general public and the Council.

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

Reducing instances of ASB in this area would improve the feelings of community safety, for local residents and visitors.

A successful and well managed Preston Park has been shown to have wide benefits for the local community and Borough in terms of an improved environment, leisure space, and

heritage attraction. It will be important to maintain the quality of the site.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Preston Park itself is performing well. There is also the potential to attract significant Heritage Lottery investment in Preston Park; this presents a challenge as we evaluate the extent to which that might reduce our costs or increase our income potential as well as delivering an improved attraction for customers.

The costs of repairs arising from ASB and insurance for features and buildings in the Park is rising and significant. ASB undermines our ability to guarantee the life expectancy of new features and so makes contributions from third parties less likely.

Anti-Social behavior is an important issue for the Safer Stockton Partnership, and Stockton Council's ASB team. A multi-agency approach is taken to tackle this issue across the whole Borough. ASB was a top priority for respondents to the 2013 community safety consultation with 61% listing as their top priority (Borough-wide).

There is an identified issue regarding incidents in recent months in the Preston Park locality.

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

None identified.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

All four are potentially relevant, as follows:

- **Protecting the vulnerable through targeted intervention** (ensuring vulnerable people are not affected by community safety issues linked to Preston Park)
- **Promoting equality of opportunity through targeted intervention**, (ensuring there is sufficient diversionary activity)
- **Developing strong and healthy communities** (ensuring Preston Park remains an attractive leisure destination)
- **Creating economic prosperity** across the Borough (ensuring Preston park remains a key part of the Borough's sense of place and attractiveness to visitors)

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

A report that outlines the specific causes of ASB in this location, and possible solutions/measures to take.

Signed: Reuben Kench, Director of Culture, Leisure and Events
Date: November 2016

**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?

Disabled Parking

Abuse of the Blue Badge scheme in Stockton Borough. (Nationally disabled parking badge prosecutions have risen by 84% in a year, new figures from Dept of Transport revealed in January 2016.)

Location of disabled car parking bays in car parks need to be reviewed along with safe access routes from car parks to facilities.

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:

Blue Badges are for use by the disabled person only but this can be abused by drivers when they are not transporting the disabled person. This can subsequently impact on cars that are carrying a disabled person.

The location of disabled bays should be closest to the end destination and the location of these should be reviewed to ensure this is wherever possible achieved and safe routes are available from the car park to local facilities.

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

Will provide easier access for disabled people to reach all areas (town centres, leisure facilities) enjoyed by people without disabilities. Work with third party car park owners to attempt to ensure that similar standards are operated in all car parks across the borough.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Enforcement Services to challenge (fine?) people contravening the legislation. (Blue badge misuse attracts a fine of up to £1,000 plus any additional penalty for a related parking offence.)

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

None

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

Protecting the vulnerable through targeted intervention

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Reduced abuse of the Blue Badge Scheme

Improved location of disable parking spaces

Signed: Councillor Clough

Date: 6.12.16

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk
Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Sickness Absence

Sickness absence continues to be a challenging issue for the Council.

Initial analysis shows that the target for 2016-17 may not be met. This is a national trend and actual levels continue to be relatively good when measured against regional and public sector averages.

However this is a continuing challenge and is an issue which affects all 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:

Reducing sickness absence increases the efficiency of the Local Authority, and improves its ability to provide local services.

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

Effective sickness absence management should ensure that employees are supported to improve their individual wellbeing.

Reduced sickness absence will improve the ability of the Council to undertake all aspects of its role in improving the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the Borough, as this is an issue that can affect all sections of the workforce.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Initial analysis of the first 6 months of this year indicate that the annual corporate target of 7.6 days average per FTE may not be met.

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

None identified.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

– **Promoting equality of opportunity through targeted intervention**, (in relation to tackling health inequalities, meeting the skills gap and improving access to job opportunities),

- **Creating economic prosperity** across the Borough (in relation to the number of people able to work)

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

The review could include the following:

- an analysis of the Council's performance;
- an understanding of the underlying reasons;
- a review of the measures taken to reduce sickness absence and their effectiveness;
- consideration of suggestions for improvement;

with the ultimate aim of contributing towards a reduction in sickness absence (which would be measured by subsequent monitoring reports).

Signed: People Select Committee

Date: 7 November 2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Consolidation of Thirteen Group

Following the 'consolidation' of Tristar Homes Limited within a single Registered Housing Provider (Thirteen Group) to explore the impact (if any) of this change:

- On the delivery of services to tenants within the Borough
- Ongoing liaison and contact with SBC at both an operational level (including appropriate ward members) and at strategic level
- Thirteen's commitment post consolidation to continue to be the Councils 'partner of choice' (i.e. how their significant forward investment programme aligns and supports the Councils broader economic and regeneration priorities).

**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 Thirteen Group (once consolidated) will be largest registered housing provider within the Tees Valley.

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

The Thirteen Group through both their day to day delivery of housing services and their broader investment plans will play a significant role (as noted above) in supporting the Council in delivering its social, economic and regeneration activities.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

The delivery of much needed new affordable housing within the Borough for specific needs groups will indirectly support pressures on Council budgets (such as social and adult social care).

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

No other reviews are ongoing.

The operating environment for Registered Housing Providers has changed significantly over recent years - financial pressures due to the (i) a cut in social rents by 1% per year for the next four years / (b) the proposed introduction of 'voluntary right to buy' for all housing association tenants; and (c) the proposal to limit the amount of rent payable to the Local Housing Allowance Cap.

In response to these financial pressures Thirteen (like other RP's) need to achieve greater efficiencies to mitigate lost income and unlock financial capacity within the Group to be able to both continue to deliver quality services to its tenants and deliver additional affordable housing units.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

This review could potentially support aspects of all 4 policy principles

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Reassurance that following consolidation:

- Both operational (including ward member contact) and strategic relationships with the Council have been maintained
- Opportunities for Thirteens significant investment potential within the Borough continue
- That the Council fully understand the financial investment power that Thirteen Group have available and we fully capitalise on this within the Borough

Signed: SMT

Date: Dec 16

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

Select Committee Work Programme Suggested Review – Pro Forma

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>Digital Optimisation</p> <p>By channelling visitors away from expensive phone and face to face interactions and towards more lean and efficient user friendly digital services so local authorities can serve more customers whilst significantly reducing costs.</p> <p>The aim of the review would be to assess how well the Council is progressing in this area and in particular navigation and reduction in jargon, tailoring to meet visitor's needs, personalisation of service and are services performing to expected standards.</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>Public interest justification:</p> <p>Increasing digital services provides better customer service and experience, offering a 24x7 service. This provides progress and feedback which avoids the need for the user to contact services for an update diminishing customer experience. Track services bought from the Council or services sourced or reported.</p>
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>Digital exclusion is a legitimate concern and traditional channels still need to be provided to ensure that customers not online are not excluded from services.</p>
<p>Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:</p> <p>It is estimated that the costs of online transactions (£0.15) are 57 times cheaper than face to face (£8.62) and 18 times cheaper than telephone transactions (£2.83) (<i>The Socitm Digital Efficiency report</i>). As Councils have tens or hundreds of thousands of customer interactions every year, shifting just 50% could result in significant savings.</p>
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p>
<p>Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Creating economic prosperity across the Borough
<p>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</p> <p>To ensure that the Council is carrying out an appropriate action plan and reviewing the current online process and is focussing on quick wins and understanding longer term actions.</p> <p>To examine and learn from best practice in other Councils.</p>

Signed: Cllr Gillian Corr and Chris Clough

Date: December 2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

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?

Better Care Fund: admission avoidance and delayed discharge management

The purpose of the Better Care Fund (BCF) is to promote integrated services and joint working across health and social care.

The BCF requires Clinical Commissioning Groups and local authorities in all areas to pool budgets and to agree an integrated plan for how they will use their Better Care Fund allocation. Key aims of the Fund are to ensure more co-ordinated care, reductions in avoidable admissions, and timely discharge from hospital.

The Stockton BCF consists of two main schemes (Multi-Disciplinary Service, and Dementia Pathways) and five enablers (7 Day Working, Joint Assessments, Digital Health, Narrowing Health Inequalities, ICT Systems and Data Sharing).

The review could consider the following key areas/lines of enquiry:

1. Multi Disciplinary Service (MDS);
 - Total number of people seen since inception
 - Analysis of impact in relation to avoidable admission to acute care by % of total caseload
 - Impact upon reduction in readmissions (% of total caseload)
 - Analysis of impact in relation to avoidable admission to care home / nursing care by % of total caseload.
 - Total investment and cost per case analysis re. value for money
2. Numbers of people where discharge has been expedited supported by 7 day services as a % of total numbers of people supported by the services
3. Progress re ICT shared access and data sharing agreements between health and social care systems (including target date for completion, and progress on the single care record).
4. Single Point of Access for community health and social care services (including target date for roll out, also include bed bureau to provide alternative care dispositions and avoid admissions)
5. Analysis of the health and social care needs of the local community in Stockton to shape future integrated services:
 - How is the BCF supporting integrated care delivery on the ground that enables action focussed seamless care that supports people to remain where they live?
 - What are the next steps to shape an integrated health and social care workforce? What might this look like?
 - What outcomes is this model expected to deliver?
 - What additional capacity is this work expected to deliver?
 - Numbers (%) of GP admissions avoided

**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 performance of the local and national NHS and social care is of intense public and media interest.

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

The local BCF plan aims to improve social and economic wellbeing (in addition to core health and care needs). This includes work to ensure relevant clients of the MDS can receive welfare advice through work with voluntary sector partners.

One line of enquiry could be an analysis of impact upon health and lifestyle choices in terms of reduction in dependency upon services (as one example)?.

Council/local performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

The performance of the Stockton BCF is reported through to the Health and Wellbeing Board. The latest report in December 2016 (covering **Q2 2016-17**) showed progress against the high level national and locally defined metrics was on target for the majority of indicators but not in relation to Non-Elective Admissions or Delayed Transfers of Care.

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

No similar reviews identified.

The BCF is closely performance managed through national reporting, with updates received at the Health and Wellbeing Board. BCF funded service developments, and their impact, are at a relatively early stage, and so this would not be a priority for review at this stage.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

Developing strong and healthy communities through the provision of mainstream and preventive services that are available to all those who choose to access them.

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

The review could determine whether:

BCF demonstrates delivery of increased capacity within health and social care services to meet the rising demand of need, for example in frail older people

BCF schemes so far demonstrate value for money in terms of impact upon:

- Avoiding admission to hospital where there is an appropriate alternative
- Providing increased options for care and support using an integrated workforce/resource model
- Supporting timely discharge from hospital 7 days per week
- Transfer of care is well supported and of good quality measured by the individual

Signed: North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust

Date: 12 December 2016

**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?

Defibrillators

To provide defibrillators in leisure, sports and certain other public facilities so that there is somewhere a local defibrillator can be installed accessible 24 hours a day, and to make provision for training persons to operate defibrillators.

**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:

Nationally twelve young people die each week of a cardiac arrest, and 28,000 people will die this year.

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

A defibrillator can greatly increase survival rates from cardiac arrest, by almost as much as 80%. A defibrillator needs a shockable heart rhythm, if too much time elapses the chance of survival decreases rapidly. If a heart is not started within four minutes of cardiac arrest, a person's chances of living are reduced by almost 80%.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Defibrillators are available in Stockton but are not accessible 24 hours.

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

None

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

Developing strong and healthy communities through the provision of mainstream and preventive services that are available to all those who choose to access them.

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Accessible defibrillators with trained staff

Signed: CEX

Date: 6.12.16

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

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?

Gambling

To undertake an investigation into the scope and effect of gambling in Stockton Borough.

The Council has limited data on the scope of local gambling activity, aside from the location of licensed premises. Significant gambling activity now takes place online, outside of the environment and control of licensable premises.

There is a mixed approach to licensing gambling operations: broadly speaking the Council is responsible for the licensing of premises and the Gambling Commission licenses the operators.

The review could consider the availability of information on local gambling activity, the types of activity, the licensing regime, and the relationships with local economic activity, health and wellbeing, and community safety.

This could include problem gambling, risk factors, and the services/initiatives in place to provide 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:

National data shows that 47% of adults participated in at least one form of gambling in past 4 weeks - 31% when National Lottery is excluded. 16% participated in 'at least one form of online gambling in past 4 weeks' (2016 data)

In 2016, around 1 in 6 children under 16 participated in a gambling activity in the last week – this has been consistent since 2012.

Premises with a gambling license are highly visible in some high street/shopping locations.

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

Gambling has an impact across several factors affecting the Borough's development and wellbeing, including: location of betting shops, impact on financial security/inclusion, health and wellbeing, and community safety.

Problem gambling is potentially of great harm to individuals and families, and survey data from 2012 suggests that the prevalence of problem gambling is 0.6%.

Problem gambling prevalence was highest among those aged 16-24 (2.4%) and lowest among those aged 75 and over (0.4%). Men were more likely than women to be classified as a problem gambler (1% compared with 0.2%). Those from Black/Black British backgrounds emerged as a key group at risk of gambling-related harm.

(All data from Gambling Commission)

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

As noted, the Council does not have in-depth data on the scope of gambling activity in the Borough.

The Licensing function is responsible for issuing and reviewing licenses for gambling premises.

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

No local reviews identified.

Fixed odds betting terminals (FOBTs) are electronic machines that play a variety of games, including roulette. Each machine accepts bets for amounts up to a pre-set maximum and pays out according to fixed odds on the simulated outcomes of games.

Since the Gambling Act 2005 came into force in September 2007, they have been classified as 'B2 gaming machines', and restricted to betting shops, tracks and casinos. Prior to the Act there were no restrictions in relation to where these were placed.

There has been criticism has focused on the addictive potential of FOBTs, and their role in "problem gambling".

The evidence on the exact role of FOBTs in problem gambling is inconclusive, but the Government has recently ordered a review of the maximum stakes and prizes used in gaming machines, and the allocation of machines in licensed premises under the Gambling Act 2015, and also, across the industry as a whole, social responsibility measures to minimise the risk of gambling related harm. A consultation closed on 4 December 2016 and the Government is now considering proposals.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

The potential review would cover all four principles:

- **Protecting the vulnerable through targeted intervention**, (including protection of the vulnerable; prevention/alleviation of financial insecurity)
- **Promoting equality of opportunity through targeted intervention** (including identification and prevention of health inequalities)
- **Developing strong and healthy communities** (including promotion of health and wellbeing)
- **Creating economic prosperity** across the Borough (understanding the financial and economic impact of local gambling premises)

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Production of a comprehensive overview of the local situation in relation to gambling activity and how it affects the local community.

This could provide an evidence base for future interventions by the Council and partner agencies.

Signed: Cllr Jim Beall

Date: 9 December 2016

Member of the LGA Safer and Stronger Communities Board with responsibility for Licensing

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?

Review the cost, effectiveness and efficiency of the current provision and monitoring of CCTV cameras. CCTV cameras are an important element in the management of crime, anti-social behaviour and environmental issues e.g. fly tipping.

There are several concerns:

1. **The Cost.** The cost of supplying one camera and monitoring often prohibits the use of CCTV. For example: £17,000 to cover the cost of installing one camera and 12 months monitoring (Tilery). The cost increases if there is a requirement to purchase a column to place the camera on e.g. Column 10m with power £1000 (Middleton Walk). Ward Councillors are often asked to use their Community Participation budget to fund CCTV, this is not going to be available from 2017.
2. **Reliance on other agencies to fund the cost of monitoring e.g. Thirteen Group.** When they withdraw this funding, the cameras are removed resulting in an increase in criminal and anti-social behaviour e.g. the removal of the camera at Parkfield has led to an increase in drug dealing and the tipping of drug paraphilia, including used needles.
3. **Modern technology.** Technology is advancing to make cameras and monitoring more effective e.g. alerts can be sent to mobile phones rather than paying for the camera to be monitored. This may not be suitable for all uses of CCTV cameras but may be used effectively for fly tipping as it relies on sensors. Cameras are becoming more sophisticated and cheaper e.g. £320 per camera (Tilery and Portrack). This does not include the monitoring but stores data for 28 days and therefore the recording can be reviewed post incident.
4. **Reduction in criminal, anti-social behaviour and fly tipping.** There is evidence that the presence of cameras reduces incidents of the above behaviours and when they are not available there is an increase in unacceptable behaviour. If cameras are more cost effective, we can purchase more and increase the safety of residents and businesses. From Residents Meetings and Ward Surgeries, we know some residents are reluctant to report crime or anti-social behaviour because of fear of reprisals. CCTV cameras are another way of managing behaviour not totally reliant on people reporting in.
5. **There are reported concerns about the safety of visitors to the Town Centre as evidenced by the BID Board Members.** Town safety is one of the priorities for the new BID Manager, Karen Hindmarsh and the Board Members. To increase the safety of visitors to the Town we need to increase the safety in the residential areas close to the Town e.g. Hartington Road, Trinity Gardens, Dixon Street etc. This will apply to other Town Centres e.g. Billingham, Thornaby and Yarm.
6. **Reduction in Policing.** CCTV cameras cannot replace effective Policing but we are aware that there are financial reductions to the Police and less Police Officers and PCSOs available e.g. no longer are there named Officers for each Ward impacting on their availability and effectiveness. We must work smarter and use other methods to 'police' effectively.

Outcomes:

- A) Reduce the cost and increase the use of cameras
- B) Use up-to-date technology to increase effectiveness.
- C) Improve the safety of residents, communities and businesses.
- D) Improve the safety of visitors to Stockton Town Centre and the confidence of businesses.

**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:

Public safety is a major issue expressed by residents, communities and businesses. Concerns expressed are: physical and sexual violence, hate crime, verbal abuse, spitting, threats, criminal damage, fire setting, theft, drug and alcohol use etc. These are not minor incidents and at every Residents Meeting and Ward Surgery (Stockton Town Centre), these issues are raised. People are fearful to report and often say they don't know who to report concerns to e.g. is it the Police or ASB. People often say they no longer report because 'nothing happens'. People say that the Police are not visible and this increases their feelings of fear and insecurity.

Fly tipping is also an issue and the tipping of drug paraphernalia e.g. one elderly lady picked up 59 used needles in Middleton Walk.

The safety of visitors to Stockton Town Centre has been identified as an issue by the BID Board and this is a priority for them.

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

There has been significant investment in Stockton e.g. the Town Centre, Preston Park at Eaglescliffe, Billingham Town Centre and Library. We need to protect this investment and ensure that the area continues to attract visitors, business and shoppers. The local economy needs to grow but people report that they do not feel safe visiting Stockton. This is evidenced by the BID Board and is one of their priorities.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

The current cost of installing and monitoring cameras precludes the wide use of cameras. There is a reliance on Ward Councillors Community Participation Budget which will not be available. Also, a reliance on outside agencies funding the monitoring of CCTV cameras. Other agencies are experiencing financial pressures and there have been examples of them withdrawing this funding e.g. Thirteen withdrew the financial support to monitor the camera at Parkfield and it has been removed.

There is new and modern technology which means that more sophisticated methods of monitoring can be purchased cheaper e.g. the cost of one camera and monitoring at Portrack and Tilery was quoted by SBC at £17,000, individual cameras were bought for £300. This does not cover the cost of monitoring but stores data for 28 days, if a crime of ASB is reported the camera can be reviewed.

There are cameras that alert hand held devices e.g. phones, which means that ASB Officers can be alerted to incidents as they occur. Officers do not need to be office based to get this information.

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

I am not aware of other reviews in this area and when I spoke to Councillor, Steve Nelson, Cabinet Member for Community Safety he did not inform me of any reviews currently being undertaken.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

This area of scrutiny relates to two out of the four principles:

Developing strong and healthy communities – CCTV is a universal service that can be targeted in certain areas but its purpose is to identify, record and prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and fly tipping. Community safety has been identified by residents as a major issue and this has also been highlighted by the BID Board.

Creating economic prosperity – there has been significant investment in the Borough e.g. Stockton and Billingham Town Centres, Preston Park etc. There is also planned investment e.g. Hilton Hotel at Northshore and the Leisure Centre at Ingleby Barwick. There are new Housing Developments and the planned over 55 years' village. The Combined Tees Authority is about bringing business into the area and creating jobs. The BID is about bringing visitors to the area. We need to ensure that Stockton Borough is a safe place to visit and to invest in. The BID Board have identified public safety is a major factor preventing people using the Town Centre.

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

1. Increased public safety.
2. Reduction in crime, ASB and fly tipping
3. Reduction in the costs of funding CCTV.
4. More effective use of modern technology

Signed:

Di Hewitt

Date:

14th Dec. 2016.

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

**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 educational role of the Council

In the context of the Government's policy agenda, and a focus on the three roles:

- School places
- An effective school led improvement system
- Championing the needs of the most vulnerable

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 availability and quality of education provision is a high priority for parents and residents.

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

The availability and quality of educational provision has a direct impact on the opportunities for children and young people to achieve their full potential and contribute to their local communities as responsible citizens shaping their lives and their futures.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

The Council's Cabinet will consider reports in January and April on this issue. The timescales for establishing a clear future role have been accelerated due to the changes in Education Services Grant funding and therefore will not be compatible with a review timescale.

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

Cabinet will receive options for consideration at its meeting in April 2017.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

- **Protecting the vulnerable through targeted intervention**, particularly those people in our communities who are subject to, or at risk of harm, people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless and those who are financially excluded or whose circumstances make them vulnerable.

- **Promoting equality of opportunity through targeted intervention**, specifically in relation to tackling health inequalities, meeting the skills gap and improving access to job opportunities, tackling fuel poverty, improving education and training opportunities, access to affordable housing and financial and digital inclusion.
- **Developing strong and healthy communities** through the provision of mainstream and preventive services that are available to all those who choose to access them.
- **Creating economic prosperity** across the Borough

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Clarity in understanding the Council's role and how it can continue to shape and have an influence in this important area.

Signed: Office/ Committee/ Cllr Carol Clark

Date: December 2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Food Hygiene

In view of a recent issue raised with respect to food and hygiene standards in private eating houses and food takeaway establishments I would like to scrutinise how they are licensed and inspected.
What is the timescale of inspections?
What legal action is taken on reoffenders of such properties?
I would like to see more enforcement on properties selling takeaway food.

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:
It is important that residents feel confident that the places they go to eat or purchase takeaway foods are safe, in the light of several well publicised incidents where there has been numerous cases of food poisoning. Businesses are not currently obliged to display their food hygiene rating and so that may decrease public confidence in the robustness of the inspection system.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:
Improved environmental health when guaranteeing hygiene levels. It may encourage businesses to work to achieve higher ratings if they are more visible to the public.

Council performance and efficiency in this area (including organisation development) if known:
The council carry out regular inspections and have a reporting service for customers who have concerned. There have been recent prosecutions of businesses who have contravened food safety regulations.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):
This should be considered in the wider context of reviews taking place on Early Interventions, particularly as it impacts on childhood health and obesity.

Signed: Councillor Brown **Date:** 20 December 2016

Please return to:

Judy Trainer
Scrutiny Section
Democratic Services

Municipal Buildings
Church Road
Stockton on Tees
TS18 1LD

Email: Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk
Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Breastfeeding

There is a sum of money that was set aside for breastfeeding support programmes in the budget for public health. How is this money being used since the disbanding of the Volunteer Breastfeeding Peer Supporter Programme? Is this money being used to effectively increase breastfeeding initiation and continuation rates?

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:

It is important we can justify expenditure to show it has a positive and measurable impact on the lives of residents in the Borough. Increasing uptake and duration of breastfeeding can make a positive impact on the health of our residents, particularly in our more deprived areas.

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

Breastfeeding is the biologically normal way to feed babies. According to extensive research carried out by UNICEF and WHO, artificial feeding of babies can increase the risk of childhood obesity, childhood diseases such as asthma, otitis media, bronchiolitis and gastroenteritis, as well as increasing the risk of necrotising enterocolitis in premature babies, a potentially fatal condition. Not breastfeeding also increases the risk of a mother developing osteoporosis, breast and ovarian cancer in later life and this risk also extends to her non breastfed child.

Millions of pounds are spent each year across the country treating these conditions. As breastfeeding rates are much lower than national average in Stockton, it follows the costs of treating these conditions will be higher in our area.

Stockton also has some of the worse health inequalities and breastfeeding has been demonstrated as helping to even out inequalities due to socioeconomic status.

Breastfeeding is a natural 'safety net' against the worst effects of poverty ... Exclusive breastfeeding goes a long way toward cancelling out the health difference between being born into poverty and being born into affluence ... It is almost as if breastfeeding takes the infant out of poverty for those first few months in order to give the child a fairer start in life and compensate for the injustice of the world into which it was born.

- James P Grant, Executive Director of UNICEF (1980-1995)

Supporting breastfeeding will help Stockton Borough Council to fulfil its goal of improving health inequalities.

Evidence to support the above statements can be found at UNICEF UK Baby Friendly Initiative, www.unicef.org.uk/babyfriendly/what-is-baby-friendly/the-benefits-of-breastfeeding.

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

In 2015, SBC signed up to the NCT provided 'Breastfeeding Welcome' Scheme. This scheme aimed to make businesses aware of their statutory obligations under the 2010 Equality Act and to reassure mothers, who may not be aware of their rights under the law, that they are always welcome to breastfeed their baby in the most comfortable way possible, wherever they may be in Stockton. This was a successful endeavour and many businesses in the borough signed up for the scheme.

It would be helpful to revisit the scheme and get feedback from business users and breastfeeding mothers to see what impact the scheme has had and whether it needs to be refreshed.

There is data from Public Health available on breastfeeding initiation rates and the six weeks' rates. However there is no data routinely collected beyond this point, despite WHO recommendations that babies are breastfeed exclusively for at least 6 months, with complimentary foods provided after 6 months alongside breastfeeding, which can be continued to two years and beyond. This is something that could be looked at in terms of measuring the success of breastfeeding support services.

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

Breastfeeding support is provided as part of the 'A Fairer Start' Scheme. Data pertaining to breastfeeding from this scheme could be included as part of this review, as well as any learning that may be used in a wider context.

Signed: Sonia Bailey

Date: 16/12/16

Please return to:

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

Email: Judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Consultation

To consider how the Council consults and engages with residents on changes to services.

As the Council moves forward into planning for even deeper cuts to services it is imperative that residents become more aware of the requirement for cuts and engaged in dealing with the changes that these cuts will inevitably bring. The Council should avoid the perceptions that consultation is merely 'a tick box exercise'; that 'decisions have already been made' and that answers to questions asked at consultation meetings are 'defensive arguments' as to why the Council's proposals are being made.

To consider these it is proposed that a review of recent consultations with residents is undertaken to assess how the Council's message on the purpose of the consultation is communicated; how it engages with stakeholders; how it informs and engages with local councillors and thereafter how it presents the options to residents and genuinely and transparently seeks their opinions and suggestions which can then be included in the final decision making process.

In addition to consider how other authorities are undertaking consultations; how current costs of consultation can be reduced; what the current involvement of local councillors is and whether this can be increased and whether residents and service users feel that their concerns are understood and have been taken on board.

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:

Improved customer relations and engagement with Stockton residents.

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

Informed decision making.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Better use of scarce resource; how current costs of consultation can be reduced.

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

None

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

- **Developing strong and healthy communities** through the provision of mainstream and preventive services that are available to all those who choose to access them.

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Reducing consultation costs whilst improving engagement with Stockton residents.

Signed: David and Norma Wilburn

Date: December 2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk

Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

14-19 strategy, planning, offer and ways of working

This would assist in the development of new approaches and potentially new provision. It would also provide an opportunity to ensure that the Council and partners are well placed to exploit the opportunities of the Tees Valley Combined Authority and devolution. Areas of focus might include:

- NEETs
- Apprenticeships
- Careers guidance in schools
- Alternative provision

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, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

The majority of activity in this area is delivered by schools working with other providers, and therefore whilst this is an area of interest, the impact on performance measure other than NEET, and on financial savings is not significant.

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

The Children and Young People Select Committee has previously carried out a review of Employment and Education which considered these issues.

Although a review of this subject has previously been carried out, it might be timely for further review in the light of opportunities emanating from devolution. At this stage it is suggested that this be deferred until a future date which would provide the opportunity for reviewing the impact of the Combined Authority's emerging programme in this area.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

- **Promoting equality of opportunity through targeted intervention**, specifically in relation to tackling health inequalities, meeting the skills gap and improving access to job opportunities, tackling fuel poverty, improving education and training opportunities,

access to affordable housing and financial and digital inclusion.

- **Developing strong and healthy communities** through the provision of mainstream and preventive services that are available to all those who choose to access them.
- **Creating economic prosperity** across the Borough

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

To ensure that Stockton is maximising opportunities for new provision.

Signed: Officer/ Cllr Carol Clark

Date: December 2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk
Tel: 01642 528158

Suggested Review – Pro Forma

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

Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Sector

A review with regards to the Voluntary ,Community and Social Enterprise Sector delivery within Stockton having regards to :

1. Value for money in respect of investment by SBC into the Sector (Internal and External)
2. Outsourcing of SBC functions to the sector
3. Third Sector potential to increase external inward investment into the Borough

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:

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

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Scope to increase external inward investment into the Borough.

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

A review has just been completed.

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

- **Developing strong and healthy communities** through the provision of mainstream and preventive services that are available to all those who choose to access them.

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

The outcome of a review of this nature could set in place a three to five year strategic development plan for SBC and the third Sector.

Signed: Kevin Pitt (Catalyst)

Date: December 2016

Please return to:

Judy Trainer
Scrutiny Section
Democratic Services
Municipal Buildings

Church Road
Stockton on Tees
TS18 1LD

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk
Tel: 01642 528158

**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?

Grant Administration

To consider the various grants the Council administers and see if there is a case for having them dealt with in a more co-ordinated customer focussed way. These include DHP, 13a Council Tax Support, Back on Track, Section 17 Social Services Payments. I understand there is a Government proposal for a new grant to assist with those affected by the extension of LHA awards.

There are currently four different application forms/processes for accessing these pots. This means that customers find themselves having to reapply where a more appropriate pot is identified. This is the antithesis of the "tell us once" approach. The Committee could explore the option for having a single application form and a single application process.

In addition to improving the customer journey there seems to be potential savings for the Council e.g. core funded s17 payments are being made that could be met/prioritised under Government funded grants. There may also be time/staff resource savings with a more joined up approach.

It may also be appropriate to see if awards are appropriate in all cases and if refusals are justified e.g. by looking at some random anonymised cases.

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:

To improve the customer journey and ensure the appropriate funds are accessed. To make savings to council funds that can be used instead to provide other services.

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

Customers likely to access the above sources of funding are often the most socio-economically and health deprived and so the proposal corresponds with the Council's power of well-being and the Council priority of targeting resources at the most vulnerable.

Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:

Possible staff/time savings. A more efficient approach by eliminating duplication. Possible savings by ensuring use of Government funded pots is maximised first and that use of core Council funded pots are used as a last not a first resort.

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

Not aware of any

Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)

Supports all four

What would you want the outcome of the review to be?

Improved processes/better customer experience/staff and financial savings/better targeting of scarce resources

Signed: Steve Nelson

Date: 12/12/2016

Please return to:

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

Email: judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk
Tel: 01642 528158