

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 10th October, 2012
6.00 - 7.04 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Duncan Smith (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Barbara Driver, Colin Hay, Helena McCloskey and Diane Hibbert
Also in attendance:	Councillor Penny Hall, Councillors, Councillor Jon Walklett, Councillor Steve Jordan, Councillor Peter Jeffries and Grahame Lewis

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Teakle and Councillor Wall (Councillor Jacky Fletcher was attending as his substitute).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting of the 16 July 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS

None received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

None.

6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED

Councillor Penny Hall updated members on her attendance at the Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group held on 4 October at Shire Hall. A summary of the matters raised had been circulated to members at the meeting.

Councillor Sudbury circulated a written update regarding her attendance at the Gloucestershire Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee at Shire Hall on 18 September 2012.

Councillor McCloskey updated members on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel and it was noted that an October update had been circulated to all members. An induction programme was in progress for the members of the panel and the two newly appointed independent members. At their meeting on 26 November, the panel would have their first opportunity to meet with the newly elected Police Commissioner.

7. SCRUTINY PROCEDURES AND GUIDES

The Democratic Services Manager introduced the scrutiny guides which had been designed by Democratic Services to provide more information on overview and scrutiny and would be available on the council's website and via the intranet. They contained an overall introduction to overview and scrutiny and there were specific sections for the public, members and officers who were going to be involved in some way. The public guide explained how members of the public could get involved by asking a question, being invited to be a co-optee on a task group or being a witness at a meeting. The section for councillors explained how they could nominate a topic for scrutiny and the final section for officers explained the process if they are called to assist in a scrutiny review. The guides would considerably enhance the information on scrutiny available on the website and she invited members comments before their publication.

Resolved that the scrutiny guides be endorsed and made available on the website

8. GENERAL UPDATE ON SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS

The chair referred members to the summary which had been circulated with the agenda. This listed all the current and potential scrutiny task groups and provided a brief summary of each. He did not intend to go through this in detail and there were no further questions raised by the committee.

A draft terms of reference for a proposed UBICO review had been circulated. These had been circulated to all the members of the task group for comment and they were due to hold their first meeting on 17 October 2012. Councillor Fletcher, as a member of the working group, was satisfied with the terms of reference and regretted that she would have to give her apologies for the first meeting.

A draft terms of reference for a proposed youth services review had been circulated. These had been discussed at the last meeting of the scrutiny task group in September. Councillor Driver, as a member of the group, said she was happy to accept the terms of reference. Councillor Fletcher highlighted the excellent work that was being done by CCP and Richard Gibson in her ward and anything that can be done to encourage young people to participate in such projects should be encouraged. As there were no other comments the terms of reference were agreed.

Resolved that the terms of reference for the scrutiny task groups UBICO and Youth Services be agreed.

9. REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY TASK GROUP - EVENT MANAGEMENT

The chair welcomed Councillor Penny Hall, as chair of the working group, to introduce the final report of the working group. He emphasised that the role of this committee was to ensure that the task group had met their original terms of reference and that they were generally happy with the work that had been done and could endorse the recommendations.

Councillor Hall said this was an important report, firstly because it was the first scrutiny task group to report to this committee but more importantly because it was a review which was breaking new ground in its recommendations. The ambition of the working group was to set up an events advisory group which

could make decisions on whether an event should go ahead and enable consultation with ward councillors and the public during this process. The group were made aware that these type of advisory groups existed in other councils and in particular at Gloucester City and they had considered a protocol used elsewhere. At a meeting in July, they were advised by officers that they could not support the protocol as it duplicated processes already in place and further legal advice made it clear that the events advisory group would not be in a position to make any recommendations or have any legal standing. Councillor Hall acknowledged that further work needed to be done to understand this position and she was meeting with the solicitor from One Legal tomorrow to question the legal advice. She would welcome any advice from the committee at this stage on how to take this review forward.

Other members of the working group agreed that this was a very important piece of work but in their opinion it was not ready to go to Cabinet and should not be rushed. They welcomed any process which would enable ward councillors to be more aware of events coming up but were disappointed if the advisory group could not have any teeth.

They praised the work of the chair and the excellent support for this review from officers, particularly those in Democratic Services who had worked hard to keep this review on track.

The executive director, Grahame Lewis, spoke as sponsor of this task group. He explained that the covering report for Cabinet was designed to set out the implications for Cabinet when making their decision on the recommendations. The implications set out were based on legal advice and for that reason the officers could not support the third recommendation. In his view, the police were very keen on these types of advisory groups and indeed a Safety Advisory group operated at Cheltenham Racecourse very successfully.

Other members of the committee suggested that the task group should do further work in understanding how other councils could operate such a group within legal boundaries.

The chair commended the task group for their work and felt they had produced a robust report but acknowledged they needed more time to complete the review. He suggested that the task group could carry out further work and bring back their final report to the next meeting of this committee on 26 November. He suggested that the committee may wish to consider forwarding the recommendations to Council before going to Cabinet for approval so that a wider group of members could discuss the recommendations and give their views. The working group may also want to consider whether any constitutional changes may be required to support their recommendations as these would need to be approved by Council.

Resolved that the task group do further work with a view to bringing back their final report and recommendations to the next meeting of the O&S committee on 26 November.

10. REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY TASK GROUP - ICT REVIEW

In the absence of the chair of the working group, the Democratic Services Manager gave a brief introduction to the work of the scrutiny task group. She emphasised that throughout the course of the review, the task group had

worked very closely with officers from ICT and those involved in the commissioning review and the Cabinet Member had also had the opportunity to comment. As a result, officers were fully supportive of the recommendations.

Councillor Walklett, as the Cabinet Member responsible for ICT, was invited to give his view. He commended the work of the task group who in a very short space of time had studied a considerable amount of paperwork and got to grips with a lot of detailed information. He concurred with their views and acknowledged their recommendations.

He referred to section 9.2 of the report which referred to a Cabinet Member Working group to support the ICT commissioning review. He had invited nominations by the group leaders and directly with members but sadly as only two members had come forward he had decided that it would not be effective to run a working group with such a small number. He suggested that during the course of the review, some members of the working group had been particularly interested in members ICT and he would be happy to look for opportunities for Councillors Wheeler and Chard to continue to input to this issue, working with Democratic Services and ICT. It had been agreed that the business case for the ICT review would go to the budget scrutiny working group and a meeting was being arranged in November for this purpose before the report went to Cabinet. The working group had also raised the issue of Cheltenham Festivals and the viability of continued support from the council's ICT services. He was pleased to report that he had already taken action on this and an amicable agreement had been reached whereby the festivals would set up their own ICT services separate from the council.

The chair invited members to consider the next steps.

Councillor Smith declared an interest at this point as he worked for a company which was setting up an external ICT service for a local authority. He suggested that the council should be looking to buy in ICT services rather than ongoing significant capital expenditure in ICT infrastructure. He cautioned the Cabinet in taking advice from officers who were currently involved in providing ICT services as it may be difficult for them to give an unbiased view. He urged the Cabinet Member to challenge any assumptions very carefully.

The Cabinet Member said that four options were being considered including outsourcing and sharing with another provider. He believed that capital investment was necessary to ensure sustainability of ICT and there was evidence to support that ICT services could be provided more cheaply by sharing the service with another partner. On that basis, a shared service was his current preference. He also added that he was satisfied that the new people were being brought into ICT who could offer a fresh viewpoint. The report on the business options and the corresponding business cases would be presented to Cabinet on 13 December 2012.

Councillor Colin Hay, who had arrived late at the meeting at 6.50 pm, was invited by the chair to add any comments as chair of the working group. Councillor Hay highlighted the issues raised in the report regarding the lack of investment in the infrastructure and the importance of role of the Senior Leadership Team where it was acknowledged that there had been a gap for a period of time.

Members commented that it was a very good report. Although they might welcome comments from Council, they agreed given the urgency that they should endorse the recommendations for forwarding to Cabinet on 16 October 2012.

Resolved that

- 1. the recommendations of the scrutiny task group ICT review be endorsed and forwarded to the next meeting of Cabinet**
- 2. Councillor Hay has further discussions with the working group and the Cabinet Member to consider whether there was an ongoing role for the task group in carrying out further scrutiny of key stages in the ICT commissioning review and/or driving the delivery of members ICT.**

11. SCRUTINY WORKPLAN

The committee noted the workplan which had been circulated with the agenda. The chair invited members to advise the Democratic Services Manager if there were any topics they wish to be considered for inclusion in the workplan.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Date of next meeting: 26 November 2012.

Duncan Smith
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Information Note

Update from Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group 4 October 2012

Attended by Cllr Penny Hall and Rosalind Reeves from Cheltenham Borough Council

1. Changes to O&S structures across Gloucestershire

- At the county, scrutiny resource now integrated into Democratic Services but still officer support for O&S. They have reviewed their structure and are reducing no of committees by two and integrating Performance and Budget into the main O&S Committee.
- Stroud potentially moving away from Cabinet structure so may have no O&S committees in the future

2. Reviews shared that may be of interest

- GO Shared service review in the Forest have looked at implementation and savings and are recommending that the review is adjourned for a year when the savings will be revisited
Cotswold also planning to look at GO savings/targets
- Glos County won overall award at Centre for Public Scrutiny for their work on the Severn Estuary
- UBICO review planned at Cheltenham – Tewkesbury expressed an interest in this and Cotswold planning to review as well
- Grass cutting – Glos City in the middle of a review as well as Cheltenham
- Petitions on badgers referred to O&S at the county

3. Public v private meetings and scrutiny governance

To be scheduled for the next meeting. Forest have had some challenges about some advice scrutiny has received in a private meeting.

4. Update on Police and Crime Panel.

Group received an update and a briefing has now been sent to all councillors.

Main concern was short length of time (1 week), the panel will have to scrutinise the police budget and seeking to engage the commissioner earlier.

5. Update from Keith Rog, Head of Marketing and Development Glos First

Presentation mainly focussed on high level visions and aims and a series of numbers e.g. no of apprentices etc but without any targets it was difficult for the group to apply any scrutiny and members felt this was not the right forum for that.

Members concerned that districts were not well represented in the new structure and felt there had been some gaps in communication. Keith highlighted the difference in the organisation now funding had been cut and resources were reduced from 50 to 19. They had to rely on the public sector representatives on the Board to disseminate information to their colleagues.

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, Tel No: 01242 774937

Email: Rosalind.reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 2

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Report from the Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee
September 2012

1. Winter Planning

The committee received a briefing explaining the process involved in planning for winter. It is important to note that this is a partnership approach, with NHS Gloucestershire (NHSG) undertaking the coordinating role. The plan supports the management of increased pressures on demand or impacts on capacity usually experienced over the winter period throughout the health and social care community.

Key aspects of the plan include looking at whether there is sufficient capacity in the system; are the infection control measures robust; are the links to nursing homes in place? Part of this planning process involves a review of the previous plan and understanding what worked well and what did not. Members were informed that the particular issue coming out of last winter was that the escalation procedure was not producing the necessary outcomes, and this has therefore been addressed for this winter.

The plan has to be formally submitted to the Strategic Health Authority (SHA), and needs to be in place by the beginning of November 2012. The committee has asked to see the final approved plan for information.

2. Health and Wellbeing Strategy (HWBS)

The HWBS has been developed by the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB). The priorities identified in the HWBS have been informed by the data and information from the Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA). Action plans to address these priorities will be developed following feedback from key stakeholders including the public. The HWBS also references the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP).

The HWBS looks forward over a twenty year period as it can take some time for some changes to be effective. The priorities areas are for the next three years and have been grouped into four life course stages: -

- ⇒ **Starting well** – with a focus on pregnancy and early years to give every child the best start in life
- ⇒ **Developing Well** – a focus on children and young people maximising their capabilities and control over their own lives
- ⇒ **Living and Working Well** – a focus on promoting healthy lifestyles; equitable access to ill-health preventative services; healthy and sustainable physical environments; building social networks and communities and access to good employment opportunities
- ⇒ **Ageing Well** – promoting independence, physical and mental health and wellbeing post-retirement.

The committee welcomed the direction of travel described in the HWBS. The strategy is out for consultation until the 12 December 2012 and committee members encourage everyone to engage with this exercise. The committee will wish to have a view of the final draft following the close of the consultation.

3. Transfer of Community Services

The engagement exercise to gather the staff and public view of this matter is still underway and will not finish until 3 October 2012. The committee has asked to see the consultation outcome report.

The NHSG Board is holding an extraordinary meeting on Monday 15 October to make a decision on the way forward for community services.

The committee will continue to closely monitor the progress of this issue.

4. Qtr1 Adult Care Performance

The committee noted the concerns highlighted in the report regarding the pressures in Learning Disability relating to the issue of 'ordinary residence' and agreed that it would need to continue to closely monitor this area.

Given the joint work (with Budget and Performance OSC) relating to external care packages the committee also questioned the predicted overspend of £1.6m. The committee acknowledged the work that is being undertaken to address this issue but will be continuing to closely monitor this issue.

Adult safeguarding referrals are reported to have increased from 6.83% at the end of year to 10.65% in June (against a target of 12%). This is seen as a good thing. It brings the council into line with other local authorities in the south west and shows that people understand these issues more. The committee was concerned as to whether there was the capacity to respond to this number of referrals. We were informed that these referrals are treated as a priority and that this did have an impact on lower priority work. It is clear that the council needs to ensure that it is learning from these referrals and identifying if there are particular trends. The committee will monitor this issue closely.

5. NHSG CEO and Performance Reports

The numbers of people receiving support through telehealth has increased, and all GP practices are now referring patients. It is anticipated that this approach to healthcare will generate savings, but the committee was reassured to hear from NHSG that a main driver here is that of quality of care. The recent patient survey also demonstrates that this system is well received. Members were informed that there is still work to do in this area with regard to supporting people with dementia.

The committee was informed that performance against A & E targets at the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) were reported to be at 98% at the end of August 2012. OSMC will recall that Monitor intervened at the GHNHSFT due to underperformance in this area. The Trust has to report back to Monitor next month. The significant factor will be whether the Trust can demonstrate that it can sustain this improved performance. The committee welcomed this improvement and hope that the Trust is able to sustain this level of performance.

Members were pleased to hear that NHSG is about to undertake a survey at the two A & Es in the county and will be asking people why they chose to attend A & E as opposed to the other available options. The committee has requested to see the outcome of this survey.

NHSG have refreshed their performance report making it much more straightforward to understand. Those issues that are currently showing as being RED include: -

⇒ At least 90% of Trauma and Orthopaedic admitted through referral to treat (RTT) pathways should be treated within 18 Weeks – The Trust has had a persistent backlog of 200 to 300 patients. NHSG has been working with the Trust on this matter and mitigating actions to address this situation have been put in place. At its meeting in November the committee will be looking to see if these actions have begun to make a difference.

Cllr Stephen McMillan
Chairman