



---

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

---

## **AGENDA**

- 12. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AND SCRUTINY PANELS WORK PROGRAMME (PAGES 1 - 44)**

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Report for:</b>	<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</b>	<b>Item number</b>	
--------------------	--	--------------------	--

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Work Programme 2014/15</b>
---------------	---

<b>Report authorised by :</b>	<b>Cllr Gideon Bull, Chair, Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</b>
-------------------------------	---

<b>Lead Officer:</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Ward(s) affected:</b> ALL	<b>Report for Key/Non Key Decision:</b>
---------------------------------	---

## 1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1. This report outlines the Centre for Public Scrutiny review carried out in July 2014, which made a number of recommendations for scrutiny in Haringey.

1.2. This report also outlines the indicative scrutiny work programme for 2014/15 for approval by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

## 2. Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 N/A

## 3. Recommendations

3.1. That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee considers the recommendations made by the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

3.2. That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee discuss and agree the remits for the OSC and its four Panels.

3.3. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agree the Membership of the four Scrutiny Panels.

3.4. That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee discuss and agree their work programme for 2014/15 based on the list of possible areas in the attached report.

3.5. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee approve the list of possible areas for the Panels to scrutinise in 2014/15. (These lists will then be discussed by each of the Panels to ensure that the work programme for each Panel is manageable and a final work programme will be agreed by OSC at its next meeting.)

#### **4. Other options considered**

4.1 Not applicable.

#### **5. Background information**

5.1 The Overview & Scrutiny Committee is required to produce and agree a plan of work that it intends to carry out in the forthcoming Municipal Year 2014/15.

5.3 The Centre for Public Scrutiny has supported Overview & Scrutiny in developing its work programme for 2014/15. In developing the work programme it is intended that suggested items for possible scrutiny in the year ahead:

- Complement the priorities and work of the Council and its partners;
- Reflect the concerns of local communities; and,
- Identifies those issues where scrutiny can add value and have most impact.

5.5 As outlined in the Council Constitution (Part 4, Section G, and 1.2 OSC Terms of Reference) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for approving the work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Panels in order to ensure that time is effectively and efficiently utilised. Therefore:

- Any scoping reports for project work to be undertaken by Scrutiny Panels will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at a future meeting;
- Any additions to the work programme outlined in this report will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to commencement.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee should maintain an active oversight of the work programme of each of the Panels.

5.6 As outlined in the OSC protocol the OSC is responsible for establishing 4 standing scrutiny panels and determine the remit of each Panel:

- “The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall establish 4 standing Scrutiny Review Panels, to examine designated public services.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall determine the terms of reference of each Scrutiny Review Panel. If there is any overlap between the business of the Panels, it is the responsibility of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to resolve this issue.

- *Areas which are not covered by the 4 standing Scrutiny Review Panels shall be the responsibility of the main Overview and Scrutiny Committee.<sup>1</sup>*

## **6. Comments of the Chief Financial Officer and Financial Implications**

6.1. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations set out in this report. Should any of the work undertaken by panels generate recommendations with financial implications; these will be highlighted at that time.

## **7. Head of Legal Services and Legal Implications Comments of the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance and legal implications**

7.1. The Assistant Director of Corporate Governance has been consulted on the contents of this report.

7.2. As indicated above and in accordance with the Council's Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme and the appointment of Scrutiny Review Panels (to assist with the scrutiny functions) falls within the remit of Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

7.3. The Centre for Public Scrutiny Review Report recommends changes to the Protocol covering Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Council's Constitution provides that "The Protocol can be amended by the written agreement of the Leaders of the Political Groups on the Council".

## **8. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments**

8.1. Overview and scrutiny has a strong community engagement role and aims to regularly involve local stakeholders, including residents, in its work. It undertakes this in a number of ways;

- It seeks and articulates the views of members of the local community and their representatives on issues of local concern. It also provides a means of bringing these to the attention of decision makers and incorporate them into policies and strategies;
- It identifies and engages with hard to reach groups;
- It helps to develop consensus by seeking to reconcile differing views and developing a shared view of the way forward;
- the evidence generated by scrutiny helps to identify the kind of services wanted by local people;
- It promotes openness and transparency; all meetings are held in public and documents are available to local people.

## **9. Head of Procurement Comments**

9.1 N/A

---

<sup>1</sup> OSC protocol, Section 3

## **10. Policy Implications**

- 10.1 It is intended that the work of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and its Panels will contribute and add value to the work of the Council and its partners in meeting locally agreed priorities.

## **11. Use of Appendices**

**Appendix A** – Centre for Public Scrutiny Review Report

**Appendix B** – Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels  
Membership and remit

**Appendix C** – Scrutiny Cafe full list of suggested areas:

- Children & Young People
- Health, Wellbeing & Safety
- Opportunity, Community & Sustainability
- Better Council

## **12. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels**  
**2014/15**

**1. Review undertaken by the Centre for Public Scrutiny**

1.1. The Centre for Public Scrutiny was commissioned by Haringey Council to carry out a brief review of overview and scrutiny and make recommendations on potential topics for the scrutiny work programme for 2014-15. Four specific questions were addressed by the review:

- a) What has worked well/not so well over the past two years?
- b) Given the existing challenges and priorities in the borough, what issues should the scrutiny panels consider as part of their work programme for 2014/15 and what should the consequent number of panels be?
- c) Are there any changes that could be made to the existing Overview and Scrutiny Protocol which could improve the effectiveness of O&S?
- d) Is there anything we can learn from O&S structural redevelopment in other boroughs?

1.2. Based on the questions outlined above the Centre for Public Scrutiny made a number of recommendations about the way in which Scrutiny in Haringey operates. *The Overview and Scrutiny is asked to consider these recommendations.*

	<b>CfPS Recommendation</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1.	There should be an opportunity later in the year for senior officers, cabinet and the OSC to have a discussion – which may benefit from external facilitation – about the medium to long-term approach to scrutiny, how it can engage constructively with the big programmes and plans of the council, and what it needs from the rest of the council to be most effective.	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet usually meet twice per year – once to discuss the work programme and once to discuss the budget ahead of budget scrutiny. There is Senior Officer attendance at the meetings.</p> <p>Given that OSC is due to set its work programme shortly it may wish to give a view on whether this could be incorporated into a meeting between OSC and Cabinet following the recess.</p> <p>OSC may also wish to consider whether they think this should be built on by way of a session</p>

		<p>at the end of the municipal year. This could provide an opportunity for all parties to reflect on scrutiny in 2014/15 and to make improvements to how all parties work together.</p>
2.	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be proactive in managing and overseeing the workload of the panels, and should adopt a more rigorous approach to deciding whether topics can be added to the work programme.</p>	<p>Part 4, Section G, paragraph 1.2 of the Constitution states that the terms of reference of OSC include:  <i>“To approve a programme of future overview and scrutiny work so as to ensure that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee’s and Scrutiny Review Panels’ time is effectively and efficiently utilised”</i></p> <p>In practice the following takes place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OSC approves the work programme of the Panels at the beginning of the year.</li> <li>• Minutes from Panel meetings are reported back to OSC and OSC are asked to agree any recommendations which the Panel has made.</li> <li>• Scoping reports for Scrutiny projects are agreed by OSC.</li> </ul> <p>It would be beneficial for the OSC as a whole to maintain more of an overview of the work programme of the Panels. This could be done by including the Panel forward plans along with the Panel minutes. The Panel Chairs could also highlight any emerging issues to ensure that OSC is fully informed.</p>
3.	<p>An OSC meeting in June / July each year should look at the MTFP and determine the key questions to be asked by panels during their budget scrutiny sessions, focusing on risk, assumptions, areas of over or under-spending and comparing expenditure to performance. Panels should have access to advice from finance officers to assist in challenging departmental budgets, and should set aside time distinct from the formal scrutiny meetings to improve their understanding of the figures and ask questions of clarification so that their scrutiny questions can be better informed.</p>	<p>Paragraph 8.3 of the protocol currently includes a suggested timeline for budget scrutiny:</p> <p><b><i>“To allow the OSC to scrutinise the budget in advance of it formally being set and convey those recommendations to the Cabinet, the following timescale is suggested:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Scrutiny Review Panel Meetings: May to November</b>        Each Scrutiny Review Panel shall undertake budget scrutiny in their respective areas, to be overseen by the lead member referred to in paragraph 9.2. Between May and November, this shall involve scrutinising the 3-year Medium</li> </ul>



		<p>Term Financial Plan approved at the budget-setting full Council meeting in February.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Cabinet report on the new 3-year Medium Term Financial Plan to members of the OSC: December</b> The Cabinet shall release their report on the new 3-year Medium Term Financial Plan to members of the OSC, following their meeting to agree the proposals in December.</li> <li>▪ <b>Scrutiny Review Panel Meetings: January</b> Overseen by the lead member referred to in paragraph 9.2, each Scrutiny Review Panel shall hold a meeting following the release of the December Cabinet report on the new 3-year Medium Term Financial Plan. Each Panel shall consider the proposals in this report, for their respective areas, in addition to their budget scrutiny already carried out. The Scrutiny Review Panels may request that the Cabinet Member for Finance and Sustainability and/or Senior Officers attend these meetings to answer questions.</li> <li>▪ <b>OSC Meeting: January</b> Each Scrutiny Review Panel shall submit their final budget scrutiny report to the OSC meeting in January containing their recommendations/proposal in respect of the budget for ratification by the OSC.</li> <li>▪ <b>Cabinet Meeting: February</b> The recommendations from the Budget Scrutiny process, ratified by the OSC, shall be fed back to Cabinet. As part of the budget setting process, the Cabinet will clearly set out its response to the recommendations/ proposals made by the OSC in relation to the budget.</li> </ul> <p>In practice there are two OSC/Cabinet meetings per year, one of which is meant to discuss areas for possible focus during the budget scrutiny process, however this meeting did not take place in 2013.</p> <p>A budget scrutiny training session is run every year for Members of OSC and its Panels on the budget setting process, and the role of scrutiny within this process.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The Assistant Director of Finance currently supports the budget scrutiny process.</p> <p>Part 4, Section G, Paragraph 7.4 of the constitution states that          “The Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Review process will be drawn from among the opposition party Councillors sitting on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.”</p> <p>Therefore Cllr Connor may wish to arrange meetings with relevant Finance Officers in September in order to discuss the budget scrutiny process for 2014.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Scrutiny should use performance data more effectively to drive the focus of their scrutiny inquiries. Haringey should consider offering some member skills development in this area and the CfPS-Grant Thornton offer (attached at Appendix 2) may be one option to consider.</p>	<p>There may be a number of areas which Members feel that additional training would be helpful in assisting them to develop as Scrutiny Members.</p> <p>A deeper understanding of performance data (along with other data sources) may prove beneficial to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The CfPS report mentions that there may be an opportunity to receive some performance training either pro-bono or at a reduced rate.</p> <p>OSC may wish to consider whether they would like the option of performance data training explored. The OSC may also wish to consider whether there are other areas they feel some additional training and support would be beneficial.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>The list of topics generated through this review should be further tested, developed and prioritized at the session on 30 July, and then further scoping should be done once the final list is agreed at the formal OSC meeting on 31 July.</p>	<p>This has already been taken forward in the event held on 30th July, which was facilitated by the CfPS.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Consideration should be given to using different approaches and public involvement should be sought in all reviews. The remits of the OSC and Panels should be amended to reflect the new agreed work programme once finalised.</p>	<p>Members of the public are involved in all scrutiny projects which are undertaken. The approach to their involvement varies depending on the project which is undertaken. Examples have included focus groups, surveys (on-line and paper), attendance at meetings, written submissions and Members &amp; Officers attending voluntary and community groups.</p> <p>OSC may wish to consider how members of the public can be involved in scrutiny project</p>

		updates, so that the these reflect their views on whether services have improved.
7.	The Protocol should be amended as set out in Section 4, including the development and use of Chair role profiles (if not already in use).	The Constitution (Part 3, Section C, Paragraph 3(m)) states “there is a Protocol outside this Constitution setting out how the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is to operate. The Protocol shall be applied in a manner consistent with the Committee Procedure Rules in Part 4 and any issue on procedure at the meeting shall be subject to the ruling of the Chair. <i>The Protocol can be amended by the written agreement of the Leaders of the Political Groups on the Council.</i>
8.	In discussing the future role, purpose and function of Overview and Scrutiny in Haringey, the Council should take account of trends and lessons in other boroughs, in particular the benefits to be gained from a leaner structure and from scrutiny focusing more on its contribution to members’ outward-facing community champion role.	Scrutiny will continue to monitor and benchmark its performance in light of best practice elsewhere.

1.3. The full report can be found at Appendix A

## **2. Overview & Scrutiny 2014/15: Work Programme**

2.1. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee is required to produce and agree an annual plan of work.

2.2. The following report outlines the work programmes for the main Overview & Scrutiny Committee as well as scrutiny panels. It is intended that this will provide a preliminary guide to the work of all these scrutiny bodies throughout 2014/15.

## **3. The role and function of scrutiny bodies**

3.1. Within the Overview & Scrutiny structure, there is one overarching Overview and Scrutiny Committee and four scrutiny panels. Scrutiny panels will have responsibility for scrutinising their own discrete areas of work. The OSC is responsible for establishing 4 standing scrutiny panels and determining the remit of each Panel.

3.2. The four proposed Scrutiny Panels are:

- Children & Young People
- Adults & Health
- Environment & Community Safety
- Housing & Regeneration

3.3. The proposed remit of the four Panels and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are outlined in Appendix B, and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to agree these remits.

3.4. All scrutiny bodies will perform similar scrutiny roles within their area of responsibility, which will include:

- Holding the Cabinet and other local decision making bodies to account (e.g. Cabinet Question and Answer sessions);
- Performance monitoring;
- Assisting in the development or review of policies; and
- Budget scrutiny.

#### **4. Development of the scrutiny work programme 2014/15**

4.1. It is important that the work of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels assists the Council and its partners in meeting agreed local priorities. In this context, the work of scrutiny bodies should complement (and not duplicate) any work being undertaken elsewhere to help achieve local priorities.

4.2. In determining the issues to be considered by scrutiny bodies, priority should also be given to those areas where the scrutiny process has potential to add value<sup>2</sup> to the work of the Council or its partners through making achievable recommendations for improvement.

4.3. Occasionally events occur which may necessitate an urgent report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Scrutiny Panel. Whilst such reports cannot be planned, there is a need to allocate sufficient time within the scrutiny work programme for consideration of unforeseen events or topical issues as and when they arise.

#### **5. The work programme for Overview & Scrutiny 2014/15**

5.1. The Scrutiny protocol indicates that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee shall meet 6 times per annum, one meeting which is dedicated to budget scrutiny. Ordinarily, Scrutiny Panels shall meet 5 times each year, one of which is dedicated to scrutinising the budget in their areas of responsibility.

5.2. Taking into consideration the Centre for Public Scrutiny review and the Scrutiny Cafe suggestions, the following provides an outline of issues which have been identified for inclusion within the various work programmes of scrutiny bodies. At this stage, many of the following are proposals and will need to be scoped and agreed in consultation

---

<sup>2</sup> For example through public engagement, stakeholder involvement or non party political scrutiny (political consensus).

with Cabinet Member, Senior Officers and partners prior to commencement of any scrutiny work.

5.3. The full list of suggested areas from the Scrutiny Cafe work programme are listed in Appendix C.

5.4. Members should consider the following questions when scoping pieces of work:

- a) What influence can scrutiny have in this area?
- b) How can scrutiny add value to this area?
- c) What outcomes are we hoping to achieve by looking at this area?
- d) Is there anything already being done in this area?
- e) How can we ensure that the views and experiences of residents is heard?
- f) Is this a borough wide issue?
- g) Is this area most suitable for an in-depth project, a short piece of work or a one off report?

5.5. Members may wish to identify approximately three areas of performance and budget in their areas to focus on for 2014/15.

### **Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

- Job Support Market e.g. how are we supporting young people to ensure they are ready for work?
- Customer Service transformation project including the digitalisation and channel shift.
- Budget Monitoring
- Performance Monitoring
- Benefit collection policy
- St Ann's redevelopment
- Enhancing community resilience
- Community cohesion

### **Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel**

- Access to good quality primary care
- CAMHS Transition – between tiers and children to adult services
- Integration – hospital discharge and locality working
- Older People service offer
- Role with Health and Wellbeing Board
- Care Act
- Health Visitors and midwife access and numbers

### **Children and Young Peoples Scrutiny Panel**

- Prevention of youth offending
- Prevention of STIs and teenage pregnancy – in secondary schools
- Prevention of substance abuse– in secondary schools
- Childhood obesity e.g. best practice from other Local Authorities
- Ofsted Inspection Delivery Plan
- Role of academy sponsors

### **Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel**

- Delivery of regeneration social benefits
- Support to tenants in the private rented sector
- Housing Services unification corporate programme
- Energy efficiency of homes

### **Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel**

- Domestic violence
- Street cleansing and waste management
- Streetscene and liveability
- Prevention of anti social behaviour

5.6. A more detailed work programme, based on the above list and detailing issues to be covered within the timetable of each scrutiny body will be produced in discussion with the Chair and membership of relevant scrutiny Panels.

5.7. As outlined in the Council Constitution (Part 4, Section G, 1.2 OSC Terms of Reference) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for approving the work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Panels to ensure that time is effectively and efficiently utilised. Therefore:

- Any scoping reports for project work to be undertaken by Scrutiny Panels will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at a future meeting;
- Any additions to the work programme outlines in this report will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to commencement.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee should maintain an active oversight of the work programme of each of the Panels.

## **6. Cabinet Member Involvement**

6.1. Cabinet Members will be invited to attend the relevant Committee *or* Panel(s) to answer questions from their portfolio area. Cabinet

Members may be accompanied and assisted by any officers as they wish.

6.2. Cabinet Members will attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and/or the relevant Scrutiny Panel twice per year for Cabinet Member questions, and once for Budget Scrutiny.

## **7. Budget Scrutiny**

7.1. Part 4, Section G, Paragraph 7.4 of the constitution states that "*The Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Review process will be drawn from among the opposition party Councillors sitting on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.*"

7.2. The budget will be scrutinised by each Scrutiny Review Panel in their respective areas and subsequent reports produced from their deliberations shall go to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for approval before being referred to the Cabinet to be considered as part of its budget setting process. The areas of the budget which are not covered by the scrutiny panels shall also be considered by the main Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

## **8. Representations from Area Chairs**

8.1. As outlined in the Overview and Scrutiny Protocol there shall be a standing item on OSC meeting agendas to receive feedback from Area Committees. Area Committee Chairs shall also be able to attend OSC meetings, and ask questions.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Haringey Review of Overview & Scrutiny



## Report July 2014

---

### 1. Introduction and Summary of Recommendations

1.1. CfPS was commissioned by Haringey Council to carry out a very brief review of overview and scrutiny and make recommendations on potential topics for the scrutiny work programme for 2014-15. There were 4 specific questions to be addressed by the review:

- a) What has worked well/not so well over the past two years?
- b) Given the existing challenges and priorities in the borough, what issues should the scrutiny panels consider as part of their work programme for 2014/15 and what should the consequent number of panels be?
- c) Are there any changes that could be made to the existing Overview and Scrutiny Protocol which could improve the effectiveness of O&S?
- d) Is there anything we can learn from O&S structural redevelopment in other boroughs?

1.2. I would like to thank all the members and officers who assisted with the review and who gave their time to answer questions. No interviewee will be quoted or identified as responsible for any specific comments and I was grateful for the frank and also constructive way in which everyone approached the discussions. Particular thanks to Melanie Ponomarenko for working with us to find slots for the interviews at very short notice.

1.3. We make seven recommendations:

1. There should be an opportunity later in the year for senior officers, cabinet and the OSC to have a discussion – which may benefit from external facilitation – about the medium to long-term approach to scrutiny, how it can engage constructively with the big programmes and plans of the council, and what it needs from the rest of the council to be most effective.
2. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be proactive in managing and overseeing the workload of the panels, and should adopt a more rigorous approach to deciding whether topics can be added to the work programme.
3. An OSC meeting in June / July each year should look at the MTFP and determine the key questions to be asked by panels during their budget scrutiny sessions, focusing on risk, assumptions, areas of over or under-spending and comparing expenditure to performance. Panels should have access to advice from finance officers to assist in challenging departmental budgets, and should set aside time distinct from the formal

scrutiny meetings to improve their understanding of the figures and ask questions of clarification so that their scrutiny questions can be better informed.

4. Scrutiny should use performance data more effectively to drive the focus of their scrutiny inquiries. Haringey should consider offering some member skills development in this area and the CfPS-Grant Thornton offer (attached at Appendix 2) may be one option to consider.
5. The list of topics generated through this review should be further tested, developed and prioritized at the session on 30 July, and then further scoping should be done once the final list is agreed at the formal OSC meeting on 31 July. Consideration should be given to using different approaches and public involvement should be sought in all reviews. The remits of the OSC and Panels should be amended to reflect the new agreed work programme once finalised.
6. The Protocol should be amended as set out in Section 4, including the development and use of Chair role profiles (if not already in use).
7. In discussing the future role, purpose and function of Overview and Scrutiny in Haringey, the Council should take account of trends and lessons in other boroughs, in particular the benefits to be gained from a leaner structure and from scrutiny focusing more on its contribution to members' outward-facing community champion role.

## **2. What has worked well / not so well over the past two years?**

2.1. A number of pieces of scrutiny work were cited as having been constructive and had a positive impact on the council, partners or residents. These included:

- Mental health reviews which were felt to have been well-received and seen as constructive by the Mental Health Trust.
- A review of learning disabilities which was mentioned by a few people.
- Some environmental reviews, for example on public engagement in planning which had looked at best practice elsewhere and helped mollify residents who were angry with council, and a review of environmental enforcement.
- A review which had included looking at the future of area forums, where the cabinet member had been able to use scrutiny to develop the policy and had worked well with them to develop recommendations that were constructive.
- Reviews from a few years ago on betting shops and post office closures which were felt to be good examples of scrutiny picking up on issues that were important to the community and not inwardly focused on council services.

- The work across North London by the Joint Health OSC was felt to be positive and to involve members in working well with health partners – although we have not been able to test this perception with health partners themselves.
- 2.2. However, the strong message from a number of people was that scrutiny is not as well-connected into the core work of the authority as it could be, and its contribution to the big issues facing the borough is too often limited or not focused on the right questions. There is good will on all sides for improving this, and a strong opportunity is felt to exist with the election of a large number of new members to refresh the approach, building on what has worked well but refocusing and working in different ways. In reflecting back this message to the council, the intention is not to criticize anyone involved, but rather to highlight the obvious point that any system can benefit from review and renewal every now and again.
- 2.3. A key issue that was flagged up by several of the people spoken to was that there is a poor collective ownership of the purpose and role of scrutiny in Haringey. This was felt to be simply a reflection of the degree of change at corporate level, with a busy programme that has not permitted discussion about the potential contribution of overview and scrutiny to the forward agenda of the council and borough. There was appreciation of the positive and open approach of several senior officers, cabinet members and departments who have welcomed and engaged scrutiny in their work, but an acknowledgement that engagement varied, and was overly dependent on individual personalities to work (or not). There is a desire amongst officers and members to collectively agree the core purpose and role of democratic scrutiny and challenge in Haringey and to integrate and systematise its contribution to the rest of the council's work.

**Recommendation 1:**

There should be an opportunity later in the year for senior officers, cabinet and the OSC to have a discussion – which may benefit from external facilitation – about the medium to long-term approach to scrutiny, how it can engage constructively with the big programmes and plans of the council, and what it needs from the rest of the council to be most effective.

- 2.4. A further issue seems to have been an uneven workload amongst the existing four panels, and a lack of oversight of the work programme for scrutiny over the year, which had resulted in one panel in particular being very active, although it was acknowledged that this had generated some positive outcomes on issues of importance to the community. There is concern about the overall scrutiny workload and its impact on the small – and valued – team of scrutiny officers. Perhaps more importantly than the size of the work programme is a concern that there is a lack of transparency about how it is arrived at, and whether the interests of individual members are driving the choice of

---

topics at the expense of a more collectively shared agenda about what are the big issues facing the borough and council, and where scrutiny can most usefully add value.

2.5. We feel that this is a symptom of scrutiny's relative disconnectedness from the rest of the council and will be helped by the recommendation above. We say more about workload and panels in the next section, but there needs to be stronger oversight and management of the programme by the OSC, and willingness by members to prioritise and match ambitions to resources. The former use of feasibility studies to decide whether to carry out a scrutiny review was referred to as having been useful in assessing whether the proposed piece of work would be valuable, and this could be revisited. We attach at Appendix 1 the "Scrutiny in one page" approach to determining whether a scrutiny project should be agreed, developed by Gloucestershire, which may be useful.

**Recommendation 2:**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be proactive in managing and overseeing the workload of the panels, and should adopt a more rigorous approach to deciding whether topics can be added to the work programme.

2.6. Budget scrutiny was also acknowledged to be an area which Haringey – in common with many others – had not yet managed to get right. There is felt to be a lack of clarity about its role and purpose, despite this being set out in some detail in the O&S Protocol (Section 8). The process set out there seems to be a reasonable one – and one which is used in a number of councils – but we would suggest a more directive approach by the OSC to the panels to ensure their scrutiny of the budget and financial plans in their areas is focused on the right questions and on challenging risks, assumptions, value for money and the degree to which the budget enables the stated priorities of the council to be delivered. This will help avoid the temptation to try and scrutinize the budget line-by-line which can lead to a focus on small items of expenditure at the expense of big risks, assumptions and plans.

**Recommendation 3:**

An OSC meeting in June / July should look at the MTFP and determine the key questions to be asked by panels during their budget scrutiny sessions, focusing on risk, assumptions, areas of over or under-spending and comparing expenditure to performance. Panels should have access to advice from finance officers to assist in challenging departmental budgets, and should set aside time distinct from the formal scrutiny meetings to improve their understanding of the figures and ask questions of clarification so that their scrutiny questions can be better informed.

2.7. This needs to go alongside better use of financial and performance information and data by scrutiny. The council is improving its corporate use of data and information, with a view to making this more transparent for the public, and this needs to flow through into how members access and use data to inform their challenge of performance, for example identifying the key performance indicators which panels and the OSC wish to monitor over the year, and using this data to inform the choice of areas for deeper scrutiny.

2.8. We believe that members would benefit from some specific skills training in use of performance data and information to develop their approach to performance management which was also acknowledged to be weak. CfPS is developing an offer in partnership with Grant Thornton around member development in these areas and would be happy to offer Haringey access to this on a pro bono or reduced cost basis as the offer is still in pilot form.

#### **Recommendation 4:**

Scrutiny should use performance data more effectively to drive the focus of their scrutiny inquiries. Haringey should consider offering some member skills development in this area and the CfPS-Grant Thornton offer (attached at Appendix 2) may be one option to consider.

### **3. What issues should the scrutiny panels consider for their work programme for 2014-15?**

3.1. The members and officers with whom we spoke had a number of suggestions for good topics for scrutiny for the coming year and the full list is attached as Appendix 3 for completeness, which demonstrates that there was a strong measure of agreement from interviewees about the priorities. Obviously we were not able to speak to a large number of people in the time available, and the previous approach involving a survey of members / partners / the public has not been possible this year for a variety of reasons. However, there is considerable appetite for some work on which scrutiny can get started as soon as possible. Accordingly we suggest below a 'starter for ten' on an initial work programme, which should be tested and then further developed, prioritised, refined and some scoping begun at the planned workshop on 30<sup>th</sup> July with a wider group of members.

3.2. These topics are currently very broad-brush and there was a strong view expressed that it would be important to think about different ways of 'doing' scrutiny – not just through long, in-depth reviews – for example through one-off performance reports and challenge panels or 'single day' evidence sessions. The scoping and prioritising 'scrutiny on one page' approach suggested earlier could help refine the topics and choose the most appropriate format and approach. It is important that this is done rigorously as part of the scoping exercise and that an appropriately focused scope for each piece of work is

identified, in consultation with officers and cabinet members so that scrutiny's contribution can be as constructive and relevant as possible.

### **OSC**

- Budget strategy / impact of cuts / impact of welfare reform (latter could be another take on community resilience)
- Customer services / online services / channel shift (could be part of community engagement in service transformation)

### **Children's**

- Haringey 54,000 – contract with Impower
- Children's social care – Implementing Munro and safely bringing down numbers of children in care
- Looking at comparisons between academies and community schools
- CAMHS, including support at transition from children's to adults mental health services

### **Adults and Health**

- Adults social care and health integration
- Access to health services, tackling obesity
- Early help and prevention work - could be cross cutting, depends on area of focus
- Care homes – holding external providers to account where don't have formal powers of scrutiny – develop approach to doing this

### **Communities and Environment**

- Enhancing community resilience – different ways of working with community to co-create new ways of working and delivering services
- Community engagement in service transformation (could be linked to one above)
- Streetscene and liveability
- Street cleansing and waste management (could form part of the one above, depending on scope)

### **Housing and Regeneration**

- Private sector housing regulation and landlord licensing – develop a Haringey approach
- Regeneration – land sales, Housing Associations' compliance with planning conditions to support regeneration
- Regeneration – development of new housing products – what is a distinctive Haringey approach, what are different products available?

#### **Recommendation 5:**

The list of topics generated through this review should be further tested, developed and prioritized at the session on 30 July, and then further scoping should be done once the final list is agreed at the formal OSC meeting on 31 July. Consideration should be given to using

---

different approaches and public involvement should be sought in all reviews. The remits of the OSC and Panels should be amended to reflect the new agreed work programme once finalised.

- 3.3. Everyone I spoke to agreed that form should follow function and that the most important thing was for the structure to be evidence-based and to follow the agreed choices of topics and themes. There was no desire to return to a fully flexible task and finish way of working as it was felt that having standing panels enabled expertise to be built up amongst members. However, clearly the remits of the panels need to respond to the issues that the council collectively feels are currently the most important rather than staying frozen in their original composition. I have carefully considered the proposal for a fifth panel but do not feel it is necessary in order to have a panel that can give adequate attention to regeneration issues.
- 3.4. Virtually everyone agreed with the proposal that regeneration was such a major and important issue for Haringey it should form part of some in-depth panel work rather than being added on to the OSC remit. However there was very limited support for the idea of an extra panel and considerable concern about the potential impact on work load – both member and officer. The scrutiny officer team is dedicated and hard-working but it is important that members do not inadvertently abuse that commitment; it is hard for officers to say no to members, however good the working relationship.
- 3.5. Managing workload, however many panels there are, is accepted as absolutely vital to ensuring scrutiny's effectiveness, and I was encouraged that members are alive to the risks inherent in having more formal entities that require servicing and can create work simply by the fact of their existence. However, there are some big issues that have been suggested for the work programme and if they are to be carried out effectively they will need to be properly resourced, both by members and by officers. Trying to do too much on limited resources will limit their impact.
- 3.6. It would be possible to divide up the list of topics in a variety of different ways. For example there is an argument for combining communities and regeneration rather than housing and regeneration. To some extent this will depend on the ultimate focus decided for any scrutiny work on regeneration, which is obviously a very broad topic. From what interviewees said, it seemed to me that the focus which was of most interest was around housing, land and development, rather than the community development aspect of regeneration. However, there was considerable interest in the idea of community engagement and resilience, which is obviously another angle on regeneration. The scoping work will be vital to help resolve this. On balance it is my view that the topics that have been suggested by members and officers – once further refined and prioritised – can be effectively managed and delivered in some combination of remits for four panels and the OSC. The workshop on the 30 July will contribute to refining and prioritizing and lead to the final work programme to be agreed on 31 July by the OSC,



---

and the final panel structure should flow from that, taking into account the issues around deliverability and workload flagged up during this review and the requirement for cross-party consensus on the final structure.

#### **4. Are there any changes that should be made to the existing O&S Protocol which could improve its effectiveness?**

- 4.1. The main feedback I got from interviewees about the Protocol is that they do not use it. It is felt to be out of date and not very helpful. Therefore additional or amended processes have been developed on an ad hoc basis, without reference to the Protocol itself. One example of this is that the Council has occasionally convened a joint meeting of the OSC and Cabinet to build the relationship and collaboration between the two, but there is nothing on this in the section in the Protocol on the process for Cabinet involvement.
- 4.2. More generally it is my view that the Protocol is not enabling enough and in some places inadvertently restricts how scrutiny might work and develop. For example the Aims of the OSC in section 2 are all about council performance and services, and 3.6 states that the Scrutiny Panels are intended to “examine designated public services”. This contradicts 3.1 under Responsibilities which correctly highlights that the power of overview and scrutiny is to consider any *issue* affecting the authority’s area or residents’ wellbeing – not limited to council or other public services. Increasingly crucial services are not provided by public sector bodies, for example housing associations or care home providers, but interviewees themselves acknowledged that some of the best work in the past had been projects like the reviews of betting shops and post office closures as these were responding to a big issue for the public not being focused on council service minutiae.
- 4.3. Similarly, 7.2 states that “any partner, member or service user may suggest an item for scrutiny” and “the OSC shall have regard to all such suggestions”. It would send a much stronger signal about the intention of scrutiny to engage proactively with partners and service users if this was worded in a more proactive way, such as “the OSC will actively seek suggestions from partners, members and service users to contribute to the development of its work programme”. This would also help focus overview and scrutiny outwards beyond the activities of the Cabinet and Council.
- 4.4. The Protocol could do more to enhance the transparency of how scrutiny operates, for example through incorporating the earlier recommendation around development of the work programme to involve clear criteria for prioritizing and agreeing whether an item should be included in the work programme. It is also unclear from the Protocol what the criteria are for determining membership of the OSC and how the allocation of particular Panel chair positions to particular members is determined, other than that they must be members of the OSC. Given every OSC member is likely to become a chair of a Panel, it is important that they understand the skills required from a Scrutiny Chair and those



---

appointing them are able to demonstrate why they are the best person for that role. A role profile for a Scrutiny Chair could usefully be appended to the Protocol and a set of principles and characteristics of good scrutiny up front would help set the tone and expectations for those involved in the function. Having looked on the website I could not find any role profiles for Scrutiny and this should be developed if they do not exist. CfPS can provide examples.

- 4.5. If the other recommendations made in this report are adopted, the Protocol should also be amended to reflect these, for example the addition of an OSC meeting at the start of the budget scrutiny timescale set out in 8.3, to determine the focus for budget scrutiny by the Panels.

**Recommendation 6:**

The Protocol should be amended as set out in Section 4, including the development and adoption of Chair role profiles (if not already in use).

**5. What can we learn from structural developments in other boroughs?**

- 5.1. There was considerable interest expressed by many in looking outwards and learning more from what others are doing, and a feeling that O&S in Haringey had perhaps become too insular and set in a single way of doing scrutiny over the years. Broadly (according to the evidence from the most recent CfPS Annual Survey of Overview and Scrutiny in Local Government, published last week):
- Officer support is declining, down to an average of fewer than two per council, its lowest level since 2004. London is comparatively well-resourced still with an average of 2.65, making Haringey slightly over the average with a team of three officers.
  - More councils are moving to a system where scrutiny is supported by officers who also have traditional democratic services / committee responsibilities, away from the dedicated scrutiny officer resource which Haringey still has, although it is still the most common form of support in London. This type of dedicated, specialist support does correlate with being more effective on some of the measures of effectiveness that we use.
  - Size of committee does not appear to impact on effectiveness, but having fewer committees *does* appear to be linked to being more effective on the measures of effectiveness that we use. Anecdotally we think there is a trend towards fewer committees.

- 
- Ensuring there is a proper system for monitoring and evaluating impact eg through tracking progress with implementing recommendations also appears to correlate with more effectiveness, although not on all measures.
  - Those councils where scrutiny of external partners is considered an important role for scrutiny (ie not focusing solely on cabinet reports and policies / decisions but seeing councilors fulfilling their role as democratic representatives of the place and using scrutiny therefore to challenge and hold to account others who deliver services in the place), tend to feel more positive about scrutiny and that it has more value. Seeing scrutiny as a vehicle for this outward-facing, community champion role of councillors was suggested by some of our interviewees and may be worth considering as part of the future role and purpose of scrutiny discussions that are proposed.

5.2. Not drawn from our survey, but there is anecdotal evidence that some boroughs are moving away from having an overarching coordinating Overview and Scrutiny Committee altogether, and instead are convening more informal meetings of panel or subject committee scrutiny Chairs and Vice-Chairs to review progress with the work plan and ensure coordination and collaboration where required. One London borough has adopted an interesting model where the chair of this meeting, which in their borough takes place biannually and jointly with the Cabinet, is the civic Mayor. This is in their capacity as the impartial 'conscience' or 'convenor' of the whole council, and is also apparently intended to help make the role more substantive and less purely ceremonial.

**Recommendation 7:**

In discussing the future role, purpose and function of Overview and Scrutiny in Haringey, the Council should take account of trends and lessons in other boroughs, in particular the benefits to be gained from a leaner structure and from scrutiny focusing more on its contribution to members' outward-facing community champion role.

**6. Conclusion**

There is a great deal of scope for scrutiny in Haringey to play a much greater role in contributing to the forward strategic agenda of the council, and an opportunity for members, including the large number newly elected to the council in May, to refresh the council's approach to scrutiny, building on what has worked well in the past. It will require the function to be better connected with the rest of the council's corporate and service improvement and development work, and to become more outward-focused on issues that matter to the community.

At a time when resources are stretched and all councils and local public services are facing major socio-economic, demographic and other challenges, scrutiny's work programme must be focused on the priorities and issues where it can best help meet these challenges in the most effective way. Members will have more impact by focusing in depth on a few issues and doing it

---

well than by trying to cover too wide a range which will make it harder to find something new or meaningful to add within the resources and time available. There is clearly good will for taking scrutiny to another level and by taking time to reflect on what scrutiny's contribution should be I am confident that Haringey will be able to achieve this.

Jessica Crowe, Centre for Public Scrutiny  
14 July 2014

# Haringey Review of Overview & Scrutiny

---

## Appendix 1

### Gloucestershire: Scrutiny in One Page

Gloucestershire has developed a simple, one-page strategy to test any request for a new scrutiny review or task and finish group.

It asks the following questions:

1. Is there public demand or need for the review, giving scrutiny a powerful mandate to demand change from policy-makers and service providers?
2. Is there a genuine opportunity to influence policy and practice - ie, will recommendations have a chance of making a difference?
3. Is there a clear focus for the review, recognising that going deep and narrow can have more impact than broad but shallow?
4. Have we thought about the most effective format and approach to the review, ensuring it is tailored to the particular subject?

Gloucestershire argues that if other authorities only carried out scrutiny reviews that met these principles, there might be less scrutiny but it would probably be better scrutiny.

# Haringey Review of Overview & Scrutiny

APPENDICES 14/7/2014

## Appendix 2



## Effective Governance Programme

(Draft Scope □ July 2014)

## Scope for CfPS Grant Thornton Member Development

### Overall concept

A joint offering to review member-level governance arrangements and provide skills development opportunities for local authority members, in order to support the leader and the chief executive in establishing effective governance arrangements.

CfPS are at the forefront of developments in governance and scrutiny in local government and are highly influential in the sector. Grant Thornton provide extensive experience of financial management and governance in local authorities, from many years of working with an extensive audit and advisory client base.

### Introduction

May 2014 local council elections have taken place with significant changes to membership, and to administrations at many local authorities. New leaders, cabinet and committee members, portfolio holders and general members will be coming in with varying degrees of experience. Many new leaders will be keen to establish (or re-establish) effective governance arrangements.

Council members face a significant financial challenge at their organisations as funding for local government has been subject to significant cuts, with more to come, with many facing a financial tipping point in 2015/16. Many authorities are undertaking major transformation and other significant projects, in order to address this situation. In order to be successfully managed, the challenges and the solutions require strong governance and scrutiny on the part of members.

There is a steady stream of new members and new appointments to governance roles resulting from council elections or following council AGMs each year. Local authority governance can also benefit from developing the skills of existing and experienced members. Therefore the need for support is on going.

The general level of effective governance provided by members under the normal local authority arrangements has some disadvantages when compared to typical arrangements in other parts of the public sector. For example:

- the Non-exec Chair and non-executive director type of arrangement seen in the NHS has the benefit of being able to appoint members on the basis of the complementary skills and experience they bring collectively, and;
- The advantage of the independent board of governors or trustees type of arrangement, as seen at major Charities and not-for-profit organisations, is the non-political independence they bring.

Local government is different to other parts of the public sector, with the key driver being local democratic representation and legitimacy on the part of the members. The opportunity therefore, lies in helping local authorities to develop governance arrangements that build on some of the strengths this

provides, for example, the representation of local priorities, and to overcome some of the challenges, for example, how to balance political debate with the need for decisive and timely action and willingness to consider new policies and strategies in an objective and non-partisan way.

### **Benefits**

There are a number of potential benefits to local authorities and to individual members who establish effective governance and scrutiny arrangements:

- Members are able to more effectively and proportionately hold management to account, with a better understanding of the basic financial and other principles behind council decisions.
- Members can ensure that they fully understand the potential consequences of decisions, for which they are accountable.
- The risk of significant errors in decision making or of a failure to identify and address emerging risks, that may be politically damaging, is significantly reduced.
- Representation and protection of the public interest is increased.
- All members, particularly those with ambitions within the organisation, or for wider political office, can take the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment and develop their skills.
- The council can demonstrate to the public that it is committed to strong and transparent governance.

### **Barriers**

There are also some barriers to overcome, that may limit the attractiveness of the offering, which the benefits described above should help address:

- Members' motivations may be narrowly political and this can override the motivation for good governance and even good decision making.
- Members may be resistant to the threat of disproportionate challenge and scrutiny
- Management may be resistant to the threat of disproportionate challenge and scrutiny
- Disproportionately intensive governance arrangements may incur additional costs and cause delay to key projects or even contribute to decision paralysis.
- The resultant increased opportunity for public scrutiny may also incur costs and cause delay in implementing key projects.

It is likely therefore that the direct sponsorship and support of the leader as well as the chief executive, will be needed to make the offering viable . It will also be important to have the support of the Audit Committee Chair and key executive directors.

### **The nature of the offering**

The proposed offering can be split into two distinct areas, a review of current governance arrangements to identify development areas and a member skills development programme. These elements are designed to work together as a package or as independent modules. The package can be tailored and built up following an initial needs assessment process and discussion with the leader and chief executive.

### **Review of current governance arrangements**

This area of the work is intended to provide assurance to the local authority, that the Committee structure, agendas and process provide an effective platform for governance, scrutiny and decision making, and highlight any areas of risk or that require development.

Often councils will recognise an issue with their governance or with the quality of member scrutiny and decision-making when it is flagged up briefly by their auditor or via a Peer Challenge. There may be a need for further in-depth analysis of exactly where the weakness may lie – for example, is it about member skills and confidence, is it to do with political, personal or member-officer relationships, an issue with the wider corporate culture or with systems and structures.

Each of these developmental areas requires a different kind of support, and the presenting problem may not in fact be the one that needs treatment. For example it may appear to be a developmental need in member skills which councils might seek to address through member training, but underlying this might be a more fundamental cultural and relationship related issue. If this is not addressed, member training is unlikely to be effective on its own. CfPS Accountability Works for You framework provides a methodology for asking in-depth questions about an organisation's accountability, transparency and involvement arrangements to draw out exactly where the problems lie. Our review would:

- Use the Accountability Works for You framework as a starting point to design the interview questions, tailored to the brief provided by the client.
- Draw on our respective skills and experience of different aspects of governance to provide a balanced and experienced team of interviewers.
- Review key documentation, processes and agenda papers, again using respective skills and expertise in finance, audit and corporate governance (GT), overview and scrutiny, democratic services and council constitutions (CfPS).
- Produce an holistic set of recommendations covering all relevant areas of governance that may need improvement, including the potential to draw on the three elements of the member development offer outlined below.

The benefits of this approach to the council concerned are that diagnosis and follow-up improvement support will be done by the same team, ensuring that the offer more accurately meets member and organisational needs and is properly targeted to resolve the underlying problem.

The output will be in the form of a short report and/or slide presentation.

### **Member skills development**

This area of the work could be designed to follow a review of arrangement as described above, or would be used independently to address known developmental issues identified from other sources. The developmental programme is divided into three modules, that can be tailored to fit the specific needs of the Council.

#### ***Module 1 – for all members***

Induction and top-up training for members.

- Definitions – governance & scrutiny
- Statutory powers & remit of members



- Principles of good governance (overview, scrutiny, behaviours and challenge) – e.g. Nolan Principles
- Understanding local government finance
- Understanding risk
- How to ask a good question
- What to look for (evidence and assurance)

### ***Module 2 – for Committee members and Portfolio Holders***

More advanced skills for those in specific governance roles or those aspiring to this.

- Chairing skills (advanced hints and tips)
- Establishing/managing consensus
- Listening & communicating (e.g. provided by GT talent team)
- Project governance
- Leading overview and scrutiny reviews
- Engaging with external partners and stakeholders
- Commissioning, prioritising and scoping scrutiny reviews
- The characteristics of good information and using data to inform effective challenge
- Individualised skills for corporate Scrutiny Chair or Portfolio roles.

### ***Module 3 – for Leaders & Committee Chairs***

Tailored support to help leaders improve governance to help drive change and deliver political objectives.

- Reviewing and improving governance processes and structures
- Establishing clear political and managerial accountability and responsibility
- Building and managing political consensus
- The composition and membership of governance bodies
- Appointing individuals to the right roles
- Ensuring effective performance management and delivery of outcomes
- Being proactive about transparency and making it manageable
- Understanding, involving and getting value from members, partners and other stakeholders

### **Format for skills development**

We recognise that traditional short, slide based presentations will not be an attractive package for skills development. Therefore we propose to tailor the offering along the following options:

- At least two presenter/ facilitators (e.g. GT and CfPS)
- Bring in speakers from other Councils (identified as good practice)
- Sessions to be at least half day (or multiple part day sessions)
- CfPS input key to political credibility
- GT input will be finance focused, but using our wider experience – e.g. project management and risk.
- Seminar format and/or facilitated round table discussion
- practical exercises and role play [similar to the approach GT took to UGA].
- 'Board to board' style challenge sessions similar to that undertaken as part of FT assessment.
- Analysis of existing arrangements using CfPS Accountability Works for You framework as basis for engagement via Module 3 (see below)
- Accessing members is not easy, so weekend delivery should be considered.
- Should include both introductory sessions and follow up sessions to re-enforce the messages.
- Supporting collateral

# Haringey Review of Overview & Scrutiny

The Centre for Public Scrutiny is a charity (1136243) and company limited by guarantee (5133443). Our vision is for transparent, inclusive and accountable public services which lead to better outcomes for citizens and communities. CfPS promotes the value of these principles and supports their practical application to underpin governance at both national and local level.

## Expert, Practical, Innovative

- Independent expert analysis of good governance, scrutiny and accountability in public services
- High quality practical support that helps those who commission, deliver and scrutinise public services become more accountable, transparent and inclusive towards the communities they serve
- Innovative governance approaches that help communities, service users and beneficiaries and those who commission and deliver public services co-create better outcomes together

[www.cfps.org.uk](http://www.cfps.org.uk)

© 2014 Grant Thornton UK LLP. All rights reserved.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales: No.OC307742. Registered office: Grant Thornton House, Melton Street, Euston Square, London NW1 2EP. A list of members is available from our registered office. Grant Thornton UK LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions. Please see [grant-thornton.co.uk](http://grant-thornton.co.uk) for further details.

This proposal is made by Grant Thornton UK LLP and is in all respects subject to the negotiation, agreement and signing of a specific contract/letter of engagement.

The client names quoted within this proposal are disclosed on a confidential basis. All information in this proposal is released strictly for the purpose of this process and must not be disclosed to any other parties without express consent from Grant Thornton UK LLP

**[grant-thornton.co.uk](http://grant-thornton.co.uk)**

# Haringey Review of Overview & Scrutiny

---

## Appendix 3

### List of all work programme topics suggested by interviewees

- Integration of health and social care
- CAMHS
- Housing – private sector housing, tenants support.
- Universal credit and wider welfare reform – how prepared council is, how prepared community is.
- Mental health – CAMHS especially child to adult transition
- Waste management street sweeping
- Housing, land sales, social housing and regeneration
- Managing cuts
- Are any of the 4 programmes being looked at by scrutiny because they are transformation progs – fundamental to council's savings plans and future operation.
- Regeneration is important, also issues around health.
- Community resilience – could decide what element of this to focus on. Eg different ways of working and working with community, existing groups, eg different ways of doing parks management
- Access to health services, tackling obesity
- Customer services - Channel shift and on-line services
- All three areas could involve new public engagement and involvement
- If do choose regeneration – need to decide what aspect of this they want to look at, eg is there a distinctive Haringey approach, if about housing, could investigate different housing products – get a different take and perspective.
- Community resilience
- Supporting parks
- Tackling childhood obesity
- Creating a high skills economy
- Post-16 education
- On-line services

- Mental health and children. Wants to ensure scrutiny panel produces something that can have an impact and help improve things.
- Munro report implementation
- Housing associations' compliance with planning permission conditions, management practices – engaging with external partners even where no formal powers
- Landlord licensing – get an evidence base for it, investigate IT, legal provisions – scrutiny could investigate details of what would work in Haringey
- Children – looking at academies and community schools comparisons, ensuring using all the authority's powers
- Care homes – ditto re looking at external providers on behalf of residents
- Scrutiny fulfilling role of looking at a range of providers as part of democratic representative role, facilitating council's role as enabler.
- Community engagement – new ways of engaging residents and getting them more self-reliance, more community resilience
- Early help and prevention work - could be cross cutting
- Haringey 54,000 – contract with Impower, also safely bringing down numbers of children in care
- Adults social care and health integration
- Budget – strategy
- Service transformation – how are residents being involved
- Streetscene and liveability
- Housing regulation

This page is intentionally left blank

## **APPENDIX C – Scrutiny Cafe**

### **Scrutiny Cafe – Children & Young People**

#### **Priorities**

- NEETS and Pre-NEETS – the relationship between school exclusions, attainment, youth offending.
- Employment for young people – support for young people with barriers in transition from school to work
- Employment – taking advantage of regeneration opportunities and supporting young people into work.
- Child obesity
- Transition from young people to adults – particularly disabled children – how is this supported?
- OFSTED report – to look at the content and any issues that have been raised – this could guide the work programme.

#### **Discussion**

- Childhood obesity
- Comparison between academies and community schools
- Employment opportunities for Looked After Children and how the Council is supporting this
- Housing / Accommodation for LAC
- Access to sports clubs and activities
- Young carers
- Transition from childrens to adults issues
- Linking employment opportunities for young people with regeneration and investment
- Youth democracy – engaging young people – what we do and how do we do it
- Youth offending and Pupil Referral Unit
- Pre-N.E.E.T. (14-17yo) and support from schools / Council
- Cross over with health, wellbeing and safety
- Prevention? Early years? Partnership working?
- Absence of scrutiny and commissioning relationships with JSNA, expenditure or outcomes
- There needs to be better understanding of disabled young people who attend college. Some children need a lot more support.
- Early help and prevention – emotional wellbeing and early years attainment
- Children with disabilities and how are they supported through schooling
- School funding – are we getting vfm?

## **Scrutiny Cafe – Health, Wellbeing and Safety**

### **Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel**

#### **Priorities for in-depth**

- Access to good quality primary care
- CAMHS Transition – between tiers and children to adult services
- Integration – hospital discharge and locality working
- Older People

#### **Priorities for one off**

- JSNA
- Care Act
- Health Visitors and midwife access and numbers

#### **Safety (likely to be under the OSC)**

- Domestic violence – 1 in 3 reported serious crimes/impact on child's mental health
- Prevention of substance abuse – schools link
- Private rented sector – quality & safety/proactiveness

#### **CAMHS**

- Seamless transition is currently patchy and is the source of a lot of complaints to Healthwatch Haringey.
- What are the barriers to a seamless transition between child and adult services?
- What are the barriers to a seamless transition between Tiers e.g. from Tier 3 to Tier 4?
- How can the transition be improved?

#### **Mental Health**

- There are a disproportionate number of young black men in the mental health system, along with an over representation of BME communities overall.
- What is being done around early intervention?
- What is being done to address the use of A&E as an access point to mental health services?
- Link between mental health and community safety and the implementation of the Bradley report ([n.b a Mental Health & Community Safety project was undertaken in 13/14 by the Communities Scrutiny Panel. The Bradley report was referenced in this piece of work](#))

#### **Access to Primary Care**



- How do we ensure access to good quality Primary Care across the whole of the borough and for all parts of the community?
- There are issues with the quality of care and access to care.
- Are there enough GP practices operating for our population?
- Healthwatch Haringey have done a piece of work on access to primary care in the East of the borough. They are taking this to the HWB in September and can also bring to the A&HSP in order to help scope any work being done in this area.
- Referral process in primary care e.g. being referred and then having to go back to GPs to be referred to the next stage can be cumbersome and result in poorer health outcomes due to the delays.
- Lack of Health Visitors and midwives, particularly in the East of the borough.
- This is a keen concern for residents.

### **Integration**

- Integrated care – locality working
- Integration – locality working/link with access to primary care access/how is it working for and with service users?/integration around communities/what are the barriers to further integration – this has an impact on the quality of care people receive/link with hospital discharge & staying at home
- Hospital Discharge and care at home and staying at home – could do some case studies. Public Health are doing a small project on this. Could link with integration and locality working around GP surgeries.

### **Older People**

- Hospital discharge and staying at home – community asset building/link with integration and locality working/winter planning
- Older People offer – what is lacking?/ What is our offer?/how can we improve it?/ there is a high utilisation of services amongst older people/isolation link/hospital discharge link/district nurses
- Isolation – link with Domiciliary care contracts/how do we measure isolation?

### **JSNA/Commissioning**

- Commissioning – Is the money following the JSNA and HWB priorities? Are the outcomes being achieved?
- JSNA done robustly? Data correct? 'Joint' with all partners?
- Health needs of new communities

### **Care Act**

- Availability of information regarding care agencies, community resources etc
- Carers – how are we implementing the right for them to receive services?

### **Teenage pregnancy and STI reduction**

- Teenage pregnancy and STI reduction – link with gender equality/control of own sexual health/what is best practice/how are we commissioning?/budget element/approach in schools

### **Prevention**

- Prevention and enablement
- Prevention – health and fitness
- Prevention triggers – BME & MH, engagement, parental MH impact, early support

### **Obesity and licensing**

- Link to home happiness/fast food outlets/Waltham Forest/promotion of healthy options/distance from schools.

### **Alcohol and licensing**

- PH issue/licensing and regs restrictions/'saturation' – Islington.

### **Care Home accountability**

- Need to be mindful about not duplicating CQC
- Public accountability aspect

### **General comments on Scrutiny process**

- Need to ensure we have service user voice
- Focus on outcomes rather than process
- Outcomes need to relate to the problem
- What did the £ actually achieve?
- What is/was the benefit to the community?
- Joint AHSP & CYP to look at some aspects?
- Equality needs to be a strand through everything

## **Scrutiny Cafe - Better Council**

### **Priority**

**Job support market** - How effective is the local job support market? How are local agencies working together to support people back to work including adult with mental health? Developing local skills and capacity to access job market and bid for local contracts. What can be learnt from successful approaches of other local authorities? What can be learnt and shared across agencies? Job readiness what are schools and colleges doing? Can we create a 'Local Deal' for Haringey?

### **Other issues**

**Budget** - The Council is facing £70m shortfall over the next 3 years, to what extent is the community aware of this and are able to feedback into the process of making savings? How can the budget process consult and involve the community more? More developed process of informing local community and feeding back their comments and suggestions needed. What has been the impact of the cuts since 2010?

**Digitalisation and channel shift** – how is this being implemented, does it work for all groups such as the elderly, multicultural groups, low income groups. How is this being addressed within Customer Services Transformation Project?

**Community engagement** – how does the Council engage with local communities? Is it involving hard to reach and activate communities? To what extent do our communities understand the Council, its services and how to access them? How do we get young people engaged?

**Customer Services** - To what extent are they helping communities to find solutions to their problems? To what extent are they meeting the expectations of local communities?

**ASB** - what are we doing about it and how effective are we in tackling this problem?

- Street cleansing and waste management
- Streetscene and liveability

## **Scrutiny Cafe - Opportunity, community and sustainability**

### **Priorities**

- How can the Council ensure that local –once in a lifetime - regeneration projects deliver key social benefits for the local community e.g. job opportunities for local people, apprenticeships for young people, social infrastructure. Are procurement processes effective in delivering social value (local jobs, training, apprenticeships) – what is the policy and approach of the Council? Are S106 and Community infrastructure levy effective in resourcing local infrastructure? Are we getting the best deal out of local developers? Are local SMEs having access to regeneration contracts?
- Enhancing community resilience – different ways of working with community to co-create new ways of working and delivering services. What role can the Council play in promoting community resilience e.g. what approaches can council take to building social capacity and infrastructure? Can we use small grants schemes to stimulate community capacity building? Possible example of community resilience is the discharge of older people, volunteering and support for elderly people to live independently in the community.
- How can the Council support tenants in the private rented sector, particularly in relation to rogue landlords, poor letting agencies, tenants rights (health and safety, tenancy agreements etc).

### **Partnerships**

- Collaborative working among local agencies is key to the delivery of Haringey wide goals, yet it is not clear how effective local partnerships are in delivering on key objectives.

### **Regeneration**

- How energy efficient are homes in Haringey (both private and social), what resources or grants are available to help improve the energy efficiency of local homes. In relation to social rented sector, what impact will a cap on HRA borrowing have on making homes more energy efficient and in general making them more decent.
- Regeneration – development of new housing products – what is a distinctive Haringey approach, what are different products available?

### **Community Cohesion**

- To what extent will regeneration alleviate existing social problems? How should existing social needs of the indigenous population be addressed alongside the needs and expectations of incomers?

### **Housing**

- Corporate programme - scrutiny of plans to unify and improve housing services

**Community safety**

How effective are youth offending services in preventing young people from being involved in crime?

What approach is being taken by local police to improve relationships between police and young people, particularly in relation to stop and search?

**Process of scrutiny**

Process of scrutiny could be improved - reports should be different and distinctive and not just follow Cabinet style format (which were felt to be turgid and inaccessible).

This page is intentionally left blank