

# **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

## **Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Not applicable
Relevant Head of Service	Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services
Non-Key Decision	

### **1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

This report outlines the suggestions that were made by members of the Council on the subject of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme during a Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event in July 2010. The suggestions were proposed during a series of interactive group sessions. This report summarises the main proposals received during the event and requests that members of the Committee agree final arrangements for the following areas of the Scrutiny Work Programme during the year: the delivery of Portfolio Holder Annual Reports at meetings of the Committee; public engagement with scrutiny; and suitable topics for review in 2010/11.

### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that**

- 1) subject to any amendments, the Portfolio Holder Annual Report Process be aligned with one of the four suggestions proposed during the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event (as detailed in Appendix 2);**
- 2) the suggestions regarding public engagement that were made during the course of the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event be noted;**
- 3) any of the topics proposed during the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event, (as detailed in Appendix 4), that are considered suitable for further scrutiny be added to the Committee's Work Programme; and**
- 4) the report be noted.**

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event took place on 26th July 2010. The aim of the event was to provide members with an opportunity to consider and approve items suitable for inclusion on the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme in 2010/11. The event also provided Councillors with an opportunity to consider actions that could be taken to improve elements of the scrutiny process that had been identified as weaknesses in previous years.
- 3.2 During the course of the event a number of presentations on the subject of Overview and Scrutiny were delivered and members participated in three interactive group activities which were designed to enable members to propose constructive amendments to the Committee's Work Programme. The Portfolio Holder Annual Report process, which is a key accountability mechanism utilised by Overview and Scrutiny in Redditch, public engagement with scrutiny, and suitable topics for policy review work were considered in turn during the group activities.
- 3.3 All Councillors, including members of both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Executive Committee as well as members of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Councillor pool were invited to attend the event and participated in the interactive sessions.
- 3.4 A number of suggestions were made by members during the group activities which are detailed in this report. Members were informed that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would consider these proposals during the following Committee meeting and would determine which proposals should be implemented during the year.

### **4. KEY ISSUES**

#### **4.1 Portfolio Holder Annual Reports**

- 4.1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has received annual reports from each of the Council's six Portfolio Holders since 2007. This is one of the main processes whereby the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can hold the Executive Committee to account and corresponds with scrutiny practices at other local authorities.
- 4.1.2 The Portfolio Holder Annual Report process has evolved over the past three years. In 2007/08 the Overview and Scrutiny Committee invited each Portfolio Holder to deliver a presentation outlining the services within the

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

remit of their portfolio. These reports represented a useful introduction to the work of the Portfolio Holders but were considered to have had limited impact on the accountability of the Executive Committee.

- 4.1.3 During the subsequent two years Members proposed questions for the consideration of the Portfolio Holders prior to the attendance of each Portfolio Holder at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This introduced greater rigour to the process as the Portfolio Holders were interviewed about the performance of the services within the remit of their Portfolio. However, there were also a number of weaknesses including: the fact that some Portfolio Holders were asked the same questions in consecutive years; and there was limited exploration of the aspirations, strengths and weaknesses of relevant services. There was consensus amongst all members by the end of 2009/10 that the process needed to be developed further.
- 4.1.4 Amendments to the Portfolio Holder Annual Report process need to take into account the specific role and responsibilities of the Portfolio Holders. In Redditch Portfolio Holders do not have individual decision making powers as decisions are taken collectively by the Executive Committee or at meetings of the Council. Instead, the Portfolio Holder should: be a spokesperson for the services within the remit of their portfolio; be familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the services within their remit; be tracking the performance of the services within their remit; and be raising issues for consideration at Executive Committee meetings where there is cause for concern or celebration.
- 4.1.5 During the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event members participated in an interactive group session that was designed to elicit ideas about suitable arrangements for the Portfolio Holder Annual Report process in 2010/11. As part of this process members considered three models operating in other parts of the country. (Appendix 1). Members were also encouraged to be creative and to suggest alternative arrangements they felt could be more appropriate for circumstances in Redditch.
- 4.1.6 Four potential Portfolio Holder Annual Report processes were proposed by members for the consideration of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Appendix 2). Members are invited to consider each model and to approve one system for implementation during 2010/11.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

### **4.2 Public Engagement with Scrutiny**

- 4.2.1 The Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS), a national body providing support and guidance relating to Overview and Scrutiny, suggests that one of the key principles of scrutiny should be “to enable the voice and concerns of the public and its communities.” (CfPS website, 2010). This principle can be interpreted in various ways but does suggest that the public should be engaged in the scrutiny process.
- 4.2.2 In Redditch, public attendance at Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings has been limited, there have been few enquiries from members of the public about scrutiny and no subjects have been proposed for scrutiny by the public. This limited public engagement with the scrutiny process is, however, not peculiar to Redditch and has tended to be a problem across the country.
- 4.2.3 In recent years public engagement with and awareness of scrutiny has been improving in Redditch. The local newspapers have featured articles focussing on policy review work which has generated interest amongst relevant stakeholders including local residents. Members of the public have also been consulted over scrutiny proposals for relevant reviews. As such hundreds of residents were interviewed during a review of the town’s district centres and approximately 1,650 residents were consulted during a review of the Redditch Neighbourhood Groups. The commendation that was received by members for the Neighbourhood Groups review in the CfPS Good Scrutiny Awards 2010 has also been widely promoted.
- 4.2.4 Members concluded in the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report for 2009/10 that more should be done to engage the public with Overview and Scrutiny. The interactive session focussing on public engagement aimed to address this objective. Members discussed a series of questions which were designed to elicit suggestions about ways in which the scrutiny process could more effectively engage with and enable the voice of local residents. A number of points were made by members on this subject which should inform the scrutiny process in the year ahead. (Appendix 3).

### **4.3 Topics for Scrutiny**

- 4.3.1 Overview and Scrutiny should involve the consideration of services, activities and actions which are, have or may impact on the local community. This can include: scrutiny of services that are delivered by the Council; scrutiny of services delivered by other public sector organisations;

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

scrutiny of services delivered by private sector organisations; and scrutiny of the work of local partnerships.

- 4.3.2 A range of issues have been reviewed as part of the Overview and Scrutiny process in previous years. Lengthy policy reviews have addressed a variety of issues including the Council's fees and charges setting process; civil parking enforcement in the town and the Redditch Partnership.
- 4.3.3 Scrutiny also involves: short sharp reviews at the Committee level; scrutiny of issues listed on the Council's Forward Plan prior to a decision having been made; and monitoring the implementation of recommendations that were made through the scrutiny process. Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can also be allocated responsibility for reviewing an issue and report their findings back to the Committee for further consideration.
- 4.3.4 The third interactive session was designed to encourage members to consider suitable topics for scrutiny in 2010/11. A number of subjects were proposed by members (Appendix 4). Members were not asked to propose the terms of reference. Instead, it was suggested that the Committee would consider all suggestions and then request the provision of more detailed terms of reference for subjects considered suitable for inclusion on the Committee's Work Programme.
- 4.3.5 Members considered a number of factors when proposing items for scrutiny. The current context within local government both locally and nationally was addressed. In particular, it was noted that shared services; the Worcestershire Enhanced Two Tier (WETT) services; budget restraints; and cuts to public services were all likely to have implications for both the Council and scrutiny during the year.
- 4.3.6 Consideration was also given to the Council's priorities as a guide to the types of subjects that might be selected when identifying topics for scrutiny. As such, members were encouraged to consider topics relating to Redditch having an enterprising community; being safe; being cleaner and greener; and Redditch Borough Council as a well managed organisation.
- 4.3.7 There was similarly recognition that the issues for which Redditch had been allocated a red flag in the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA), health inequalities and educational attainment, were suitable for scrutiny. Members concurred that whilst the CAA process was no longer in

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

operation those issues remained problematic. Therefore, action to address these problems by all relevant partner organisations remained important.

4.3.8 Finally, members noted that a number of priorities had been identified by residents consulted during the We are Redditch event, which was organised by the Redditch Partnership in January 2010. These subject areas, education and employment, were also recognised as important issues that might be suitable for further review.

4.3.9 Any suggested items considered potentially suitable for a Task and Finish review would require terms of reference. These would need to be detailed in a completed scrutiny scoping document and would be considered at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee where a final decision as to whether to launch the review would be made.

### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications to this report. However, there is the potential that during the course of policy review work during the year Members will approve recommendations which could have potential financial implications for both the Council and the Council's partner organisations.

### **6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no legal implications to this report.

### **7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct policy implications to this report. However, it is likely that various recommendations will be reported through Overview and Scrutiny during the year that will have implications for Council policy.

### **8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

The Council's priorities were considered by Members when proposing topics for scrutiny. Any reviews that are linked to the Council's priorities this year should help to improve fulfilment of the Council's objectives.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

**9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY  
CONSIDERATIONS**

There are no risk management or health and safety implications to this report.

**10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications for the Council's customers. However, Members have attempted to propose a number of topics for review which correspond with priorities identified by local residents. Furthermore, there is the potential that members could approve recommendations which will impact on the services received by customers.

**11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct equalities or diversity implications.

**12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET  
MANAGEMENT**

There are no direct value for money, procurement or asset management implications.

**13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY**

There are no direct climate change, carbon or biodiversity implications. However, members have proposed a number of topics for review which correspond with the Council's priorities, including the aspiration for Redditch to be clean and green.

**14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

The Council is in the process of employing an additional member of staff to support the Overview and Scrutiny process in Redditch. This will increase the number of serving Overview and Scrutiny Support Officers to two full time members of staff and should enable Officers to support an enhanced Scrutiny Work Programme in 2010/11. However, Members should be mindful of the amount of work that can be realistically provided by two members of staff when selecting topics for scrutiny.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

### **15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The Portfolio Holder Annual Report process is one of the key scrutiny arrangements utilised in Redditch to hold the Executive Committee to account. Subject to the final decision that is made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on this matter, any amendments to the Portfolio Holder Annual Reports process could have implications for performance monitoring of the services that are represented by each Portfolio Holder.

### **16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998**

There are no direct community safety implications. However, Members have proposed a number of topics for review which correspond with the Council's priorities, including the aspiration for Redditch to be safe. These issues, if approved by the Committee, might be suitable for further consideration by the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.

### **17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications for health inequalities contained in this report. However, Members have proposed a number of topics for review which correspond with the issues for which Redditch was accorded a red flag in the CAA process, including health inequalities.

### **18. LESSONS LEARNT**

No lessons have been learnt during the production of this report.

### **19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

The community and other relevant stakeholders were not engaged during the course of the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event. However, one of the key sessions of the event focused on actions that could be undertaken to improve public engagement in the Overview and Scrutiny process in Redditch. Further information about the conclusions members reached regarding community engagement in the scrutiny process are detailed in Appendix 4.



**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

**20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT**

Portfolio Holder	The Portfolio Holders for Community Leadership and Partnership and for Corporate Resources both participated in the event.
Chief Executive	No
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	No
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	No.
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	No.
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	No.
Head of Service	Yes (see below).
Head of Resources	No.
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes – the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services attended and participated in the event.
Corporate Procurement Team	No.

**21. WARDS AFFECTED**

There is no specific ward relevance.

# **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

## **22. APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1 - Portfolio Holder Annual Reports – Options Discussed During the Interactive Session.
- Appendix 2 - Portfolio Holder Annual Reports – Members' Suggestions.
- Appendix 3 - Public Engagement with Scrutiny – Members' Suggestions.
- Appendix 4 - Proposed Topics for Scrutiny

## **23. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) website, <http://www.cfps.org.uk/about-us/>

## **24. KEY**

- CAA - Comprehensive Area Assessment
- CfPS - Centre For Public Scrutiny

## **AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Jess Bayley, Overview and Scrutiny Support Officer  
E Mail: [jess.bayley@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto:jess.bayley@redditchbc.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01527) 64252 Extn: 3268

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

4th August 2010

---

**Appendix 1: Portfolio Holder Annual Reports – Options Discussed During  
the Interactive Session**

**OPTION 1: PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO THE COUNCIL'S CORE  
OBJECTIVES (MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL)**

In Milton Keynes each Portfolio Holder delivers an annual report assessing the performance of their services in relation to the Council's core objectives. The following three areas are addressed to each Portfolio Holder in turn and each Portfolio Holder is provided a maximum of 15 minutes to deliver their answers:

- 1) Please provide an overview of the achievements that have been made within your portfolio and how they have advanced the Council's priorities.
- 2) What do you plan to achieve over the next year and how this will enhance Council Priorities?
- 3) If you could achieve just three things over the next year what would they be and how would they enhance Council Priorities?

**OPTION 2: QUESTION TIME SESSIONS (GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL)**

In Gloucester four scheduled member scrutiny question time sessions take place each year (so it is not possible for all Portfolio Holders to be interviewed in a given year). None of these sessions deal with any other business. Scrutiny Members are provided with documentation relating to each portfolio and are informed about forthcoming items within their remit scheduled on the Forward Plan. Portfolio Holders are required to deliver an introductory statement about their Portfolio. Scrutiny Members then propose questions based around four themes:

- 1) Putting Gloucester on the map.
- 2) A thriving twenty-first century.
- 3) A city with strong and cohesive communities.
- 4) The city is a top performing organisation.

**OPTION 3: QUESTIONS AND TRAFFIC LIGHT PERFORMANCE  
MONITORING MODEL: ADUR DISTRICT AND WORTHING BOROUGH  
COUNCILS**

At Adur District and Worthing Borough Councils Members brainstorm questions for the consideration of the Portfolio Holders in advance of the annual report.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

Performance reports using a traffic light system to indicate performance within the Portfolio Holder's remit are presented for discussion with the Portfolio Holder.

**OPTION 4: NONE OF THE ABOVE**

Members are invited to propose alternative, innovative arrangements for Portfolio Holder Reports suitable for Redditch Borough Council that may not yet have been explored by other Councils.

# **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

## **Appendix 2: Portfolio Holder Annual Reports – Members’ Suggestions**

During the course of the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning event Members considered a number of optional models that could be introduced to improve the Portfolio Holder Annual Report process in Redditch (Appendix A). Members considered these options in three groups, which comprised representatives from all the political parties represented on the Council and members representing the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Executive Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny membership pool.

The following suggestions were provided by Members regarding the preferred arrangements for the delivery of Portfolio Holder Annual Reports. (These have been listed in no particular order).

### **Suggestion 1): Overview and Scrutiny should use elements of options 1 – 3 for the Portfolio Holder Annual report process.**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would receive a performance report, using the traffic light system, focussing on the performance of the services within the remit of the Portfolio Holder at a meeting before the annual report was due to take place. Based on the information provided in this report the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would ask the Portfolio Holder to provide the following:

- a) an overview of their portfolio;
- b) an outline of the achievements made by services within their portfolio remit;
- c) further information about how relevant services were or would be performing in relation to the Council’s priorities;
- d) details about future aspirations for relevant services; and
- e) identification of areas of concern.

### **Suggestion 2) Question and answer session**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would propose questions for the consideration of the Portfolio Holder in advance of the meeting. The Portfolio Holders would have sight of these questions in advance of the meeting. These questions would focus on:

- a) the achievements of services within the remit of the Portfolio Holder;
- b) areas of concern;
- c) strengths; and
- d) weaknesses.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

### Suggestion 3) Portfolio Holder Annual Reports to full Council

The Portfolio Holders would be required to deliver an Annual Report at consecutive meetings of full Council rather than at meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This approach would comprise the following arrangements:

- a) each Portfolio Holder would be required to deliver a thirty minute presentation at a Council meeting;
- b) the Portfolio Holder would need to provide a written report for this item three weeks before the Council meeting;
- c) members of the Overview and Scrutiny pool would be allowed to submit questions for the consideration of the Portfolio Holder up to two weeks in advance of the Council meeting; and
- d) representatives of the Council's partner organisations would be invited to attend the meeting and would have an opportunity to ask the Portfolio Holders questions. This would help to develop their familiarity with the duties of the Portfolio Holders.

### Suggestion 4) Portfolio Holders Delivering Two Reports Each Year

The Portfolio Holders could be asked to deliver two, slightly different reports during the course of the year. This system would operate in the following manner:

- a) During the first half of the year the Portfolio Holder would be invited to present a written report covering:
  - i) how relevant services had performed to date;
  - ii) what improvements could be made to service delivery; and
  - iii) any key issues or actions, including ways that scrutiny could help relevant services, that the Portfolio Holder wished to report for the consideration of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- b) Based on the information provided in this report the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would ask the Portfolio Holder a number of questions.
- c) The Portfolio Holder would deliver an interim written report in the second half of the year covering:

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

- i) any changes that might have occurred since the previous report was delivered;
- ii) any improvements to service delivery that may have occurred; and
- iii) any deterioration in service delivery that may have occurred.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

### **Appendix 3: Public Engagement with Scrutiny – Members’ Suggestions**

During the course of the Scrutiny Work Programme Planning Event Members considered the limited public engagement and familiarity with the scrutiny process. A number of questions were posed to generate further discussion about ways to improve public engagement with Overview and Scrutiny.

Members reviewed this subject and the four questions that had been raised in three groups, which comprised representatives from all the political parties represented on the Council and members representing the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Executive Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny membership pool.

Answers are provided to these questions, together with additional points that were made by Members, in no particular order.

#### 1) Why is Overview and Scrutiny important to local people?

Members suggested that Overview and Scrutiny had an important role to play in communicating the decisions that were being taken to the public. On the basis of the information provided residents could then choose whether or not to engage with the Council and the Council’s partner organisations.

Moreover, scrutiny was viewed as being important because it was reviewing and holding to account the decisions that would affect people’s lives.

However, a number of members suggested that the importance of scrutiny varied according to the subject. Whilst many residents might be interested in particular topics the majority would not be interested in many standard scrutiny matters.

It was suggested that therefore choice of topic to scrutinise was an essential element of the process in terms of generating public interest and participation.

A number of Members contended that the wrong question had been asked. They suggested that a more pertinent question would be “is Overview and Scrutiny important to the public?” or “why should Overview and Scrutiny be important to the public?”

The following issues were identified as being of particular interest to local residents:



## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

- a) clean streets;
- b) education;
- c) health; and
- d) green spaces.

It was also noted that limited public engagement and familiarity with Overview and Scrutiny was a problem globally, not just in Redditch.

2) How do people know what is being scrutinised?

Members noted that minutes from meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were published on the Council's website, providing information for the consideration of the public.

3) What can we do to make the scrutiny process clearer to people?

Members suggested that the terminology used for Overview and Scrutiny, even the name of the process, meant nothing to the public. The terminology used to communicate the work of Overview and Scrutiny therefore needed careful consideration.

The suggestion was made that existing communications tools needed to be utilised to educate residents about the role of Overview and Scrutiny and the work of scrutiny members.

A further suggestion was made that public speaking sessions could be introduced as a standard part of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting process. This would provide residents with an opportunity to make a contribution if they so wished and had been used by other local authorities.

Members suggested that the level of public engagement and familiarity with the process might increase if scrutiny meetings were held at a variety of locations within the Borough. These 'external' meetings could be held at relevant locations for particular subjects. Meetings could continue to take place at the Town Hall for matters which might be expected to generate less public interest.

The role of the various communications tools available to help communicate the work of scrutiny was also discussed. It was suggested that letters written by Councillors to the local newspapers could help to advertise the work of scrutiny.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

Social networking was a tool which had been infrequently used by Councillors to date. However, social networking could increasingly be utilised to engage with a wide audience of residents from a variety of age groups. The Council had both a Facebook and a Twitter page which were not being used to communicate the work of scrutiny.

The Redditch Borough Council website could also be utilised to communicate scrutiny work. However, unlike the Facebook and Twitter sites the local authority's website was regarded as being very focussed upon the work of the Council and might therefore not attract the attention of a diverse range of residents.

There were a number of social groups and consultation forums in Redditch which could engage with scrutiny. However, Members suggested that this engagement would need to be carefully managed so that particular groups were only consulted over relevant items of business.

4) What key messages should be communicated in relation to scrutiny?

One key message was suggested to promote the scrutiny process to local residents:

We are here as your representatives to scrutinise decisions.

# **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

## **Appendix 4: Proposed Topics for Scrutiny**

The following issues were proposed and have been listed below in no particular order. The name of the Councillor who requested the review has been provided where available to enable the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to identify the lead Members proposing the item when developing terms of reference for the review.

1) **Alcohol and Teenage Pregnancy – Councillors A Clayton and Gandy**

The review would address the high levels of teenage pregnancy within the Borough; the review would assess the correlation between excessive alcohol consumption and teenage pregnancy; current education provision concerning the links between the two issues; the services provided to deter both teenage pregnancy and alcohol abuse amongst young people; and the actions that could be undertaken to address teenage pregnancy rates within the Borough.

2) **Budget Scrutiny**

(No name attached but proposed by the 'Yellow Group'; – Councillors Banks, Braley, Hartnett and Thomas).

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is due to meet with relevant Officers on 16th August to discuss arrangements for budget scrutiny in further detail. It is expected that the Chair will report the outcome of this meeting for the consideration of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee later in August.

3) **Civil Parking Enforcement**

(No name attached but proposed by the 'Yellow Group' – Councillors Banks, Braley, Hartnett and Thomas).

This item is already the subject of ongoing monitoring by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. (Please view the Committee's Work Programme for further information).

4) **Health of Young People – Councillor Banks**

This review would explore the various factors contributing to health inequalities amongst groups of younger people living in the Borough. Members would review various interconnected issues including: smoking; alcohol; and drugs. They would also consider the social factors impacting on health inequalities.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

- 5) Educational Attainment – Young People  
(No name attached but proposed by the ‘Red Group’ – Councillors Hill, Norton, Quinney, Shurmer and Vickery).

This review could encompass an assessment of ways to promote existing educational opportunities and both actions and amendments to services that could be undertaken to improve educational attainment levels in the Borough.

- 6) Educating People about Landscaping Works in Redditch – Councillor Gandy

There is some concern that residents are not aware of the work undertaken by the Landscaping team in Redditch, particularly in wooded areas. This lack of familiarity with the process has an impact on perceptions of the Council and Council services.

- 7) Employment and the Economy – Apprentices  
(No name attached but proposed by the ‘Yellow Group’ – Councillors Banks, Braley, Hartnett and Thomas).

This review could involve monitoring the impact of the review of jobs and the economy that was undertaken in 2005/06; reviewing the current position of apprentices; and the contribution apprentice schemes could make to addressing youth unemployment in the Borough.

- 8) Engaging the Public in Scrutiny – Councillor R King

This review would involve Members assessing how Councillors should seek to engage residents in the scrutiny process.

- 9) Health Inequalities  
(No name attached but proposed by the ‘Red Group’ – Councillors Hill, Norton, Quinney, Shurmer and Vickery).

A health inequalities review could assess any of the following matters: poor diets; teenage pregnancy; or smoking. It is possible that due to the links between many of these factors that there could be a single review of these issues. Alternatively, it might be appropriate to review each aspect in isolation.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

10) The Local Area Agreement (LAA)

(No name attached but proposed by the 'Yellow Group' – Councillors Banks, Braley, Hartnett and Thomas).

A scoping document containing terms of reference for a review of the LAA is currently due to be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee following completion of the review of the Redditch Local Strategic Partnership. However, the recommendations that are being presented by the LSP Task and Finish Group during the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 4th August may amend this situation.

11) The Local Economy – Councillor M Chalk

The review would focus specifically on actions that could be taken to encourage more businesses to be established or relocate to the Borough. This review would involve determining what factors attract businesses to be located in a particular area; and identifying the actions that have been taken in other parts of the country by local authorities and partner organisations to encourage businesses to be based in particular locations.

12) North Worcestershire Economic Development Unit

(No name attached but proposed by the 'Yellow Group' – Councillors Banks, Braley, Hartnett and Thomas).

13) The Police – Councillor Braley

Depending on the intended terms of reference for this review it is possible that this item would be suitable for consideration by the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel. The Panel is due to consider the Police White Paper 'Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People' during their next meeting.

14) Promoting Redditch

(No name attached but proposed by the 'Red Group' – Councillors Hill, Norton, Quinney, Shurmer and Vickery).

This review would address: whether enough work is being undertaken to promote Redditch; what are the negative elements of the Borough; what are the positive aspects of the Borough; the accessibility of positive activities and opportunities in the Borough; the appearance of the town and Borough; and what the Council is currently doing to promote the positive aspects associated with the Borough.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

**4th August 2010**

---

- 15) Tackling Fears and Perceptions of Crime and Disorder Within the Borough – Councillor A Clayton

This issue would need to be referred for the consideration of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.

- 16) Volunteer Carers  
(No name attached but proposed by the 'Yellow Group' – Councillors Banks, Braley, Hartnett and Thomas).

The intention would be to review: the services volunteer carers provide; the different types of carers; how they are identified; and the services available to support carers.

- 13) Work Experience Opportunities for Young People – Councillor Gandy

Young people classified as NEETS (Not in Education, Employment or Training) have suggested that they would have benefited from having earlier opportunities to undertake work experience and to become familiar with different types of occupation. A review of this subject would assess current work experience arrangements; the suitable age for initiating work experience for young people; and how work experience within the Borough could be improved.