



## SCRUTINY BOARD (HEALTH )

---

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on  
Tuesday, 30th June, 2009 at 10.00 am

*(A pre-meeting will be held for ALL Members of the Board at 9.30 a.m.)*

---

### MEMBERSHIP

#### Councillors

J Chapman - Weetwood;  
D Congreve - Beeston and Holbeck;  
M Dobson (Chair) - Garforth and Swillington;  
J Illingworth - Kirkstall;  
M Iqbal - City and Hunslet;  
G Kirkland - Otley and Yeadon;  
A Lamb - Wetherby;  
G Latty - Guiseley and Rawdon;  
L Rhodes-Clayton - Hyde Park and Woodhouse;  
C Townsley - Horsforth;  
L Yeadon - Kirkstall;

---

**Agenda compiled by:**  
**Maria Lipzith**  
**Governance Services**  
**Civic Hall**  
**LEEDS LS1 1UR**  
**Telephone No: 247 4353**

**Principal Scrutiny Advisor:**  
**Steven Courtney**  
**Tel: 247 4707**

# A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p><b>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</b></p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25* of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded).</p> <p>(* In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, notice of an appeal must be received in writing by the Chief Democratic Services Officer at least 24 hours before the meeting).</p>	
2			<p><b>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</b></p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:-</p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p><b>LATE ITEMS</b></p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes.)</p>	
4			<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>To declare any personal / prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81 (3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence.</p>	
6			<p><b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28TH APRIL 2009</b></p> <p>To receive and approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009.</p>	1 - 4
7			<p><b>CO-OPTED MEMBERS</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the appointment of Co-opted Members.</p>	5 - 10
8			<p><b>LEGISLATION AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on proposed changes to the Council's Constitution in relation to Scrutiny.</p>	11 - 32

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
9			<p><b>INPUT INTO THE WORK PROGRAMME 2009/2010 - SOURCES OF WORK AND ESTABLISHING THE BOARD'S PRIORITIES</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on various inputs to inform the development of the Scrutiny Board's work programme for 2009/2010.</p>	33 - 48
10			<p><b>KPMG AUDIT REPORT</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on a scrutiny review by KPMG as at May 2009.</p>	49 - 88
11			<p><b>LEEDS LOCAL INVOLVEMENT NETWORK (LINK) - ANNUAL REPORT</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the first annual report of Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK).</p>	89 - 90
12			<p><b>DETERMINING THE WORK PROGRAMME 2009/2010</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development to identify the Scrutiny Board's priorities and determine its work programme for 2009/2010.</p>	91 - 134
13			<p><b>DATE &amp; TIME OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Tuesday, 28<sup>th</sup> July 2009 at 10.00 a.m. (Pre-Meeting at 9.30 a.m.)</p>	

## SCRUTINY BOARD (HEALTH )

TUESDAY, 28TH APRIL, 2009

**PRESENT:** Councillor P Grahame in the Chair

Councillors A Blackburn, J Chapman,  
D Congreve, M Iqbal, G Kirkland, A Lamb,  
G Latty, A McKenna, J Monaghan and  
L Yeadon

**CO\_OPTEEs** E Mack

### 86 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Illingworth.

### 87 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2009, be confirmed as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillor Iqbal and E Mack under those present.

### 88 Mental Health Provision

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development reminded the Board of their request to have an item to discuss a range of issues relating to mental health. Accordingly officers from Leeds Partnership Foundation NHS Trust had been invited to engage with Members in a general question and answer session around mental health issues.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting:

- Debbie Ward, Associate Director Specialist Services and Lead Associate Director
- Gary Hostick, Associate Director Older People's Services
- Lynn Parkinson – Associate Director Adult's Services

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Closure of hospital wards for mental health patients across the city. It was reported that redesigned services had provided more opportunity to provide care in community settings. Services, including those developed under the POPPs programme, had provided more support at home and other alternate care to hospital admission.
- Issues relating to dementia – diagnosis, treatment of and other service provision.

Draft minutes to be approved at the next meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Health)

- How to access Leeds Partnership Foundation NHS Trust services.
- Provision for young people – it was reported that there was specialist provision for children and young people and NHS partners worked in close conjunction with Education Leeds where necessary.
- Provision at the Becklin Centre and the Mount.
- Developing future provision and community engagement in the consultation process.
- The increased need for services due to people living longer.
- How to access care from home.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **89 Hospital Discharges**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report regarding the Board's Inquiry into Hospital Discharges. This session of the Inquiry was to consider a report of Leeds Partnership Foundation NHS Trust (LPFT).

It was reported that LPFT's main provision was through hospital admissions, but there was an emphasis on ensuring that patients did not remain in hospital longer than necessary. In response to concerns that patients may be discharged without appropriate care packages, it was reported that a patient's discharge plan was commenced upon admission and that this should take care of any further care requirements. Other issues discussed that affected discharges included a patient's choice for after care when discharged and attention was brought to the number of delayed discharges which had shown a recent decline in numbers.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **90 GP-Led Health Centre**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development reminded the Board of the recent Inquiry into the provision of a GP-led Health Centre in Burmantofts.

The Chair welcomed Doctor Damien Riley, NHS Leeds to the meeting.

In response to Member's comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- There had been 128 new patients registered at the centre and 368 people had accessed the walk-in service.
- Patients had been asked where they had come from and usage times had been monitored. The service had been used outside normal GP opening hours and on a weekend and patients had visited from as far as Morley.
- In response to a question regarding provision of Sexual Health services, it was reported that there had been a shift to the use of

specialist clinics and also direct provision of treatments from pharmacies.

- Further issues discussed included improvements to the building, problems with car parking and when it was anticipated that there would be a need to employ more GP's at the centre. It was reported that the average number of patients registered to each GP was 1,700 and this was acknowledged as a longer term concern for the centre.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted
- (2) That a further progress report be brought to the Board in six months.

**91 Improving Young People's Sexual Health**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development outlined the draft final report following the Board's Inquiry into Improving Sexual Health for Young People. Members were invited to comment on the draft report.

In brief summary, the following issues were discussed:

- Sex education and at what age this should be introduced.
- Comparisons across different religious and cultural groups and their differing views on sex education.
- Availability of sexual health advice and care at walk in centres and at Contraceptive and Sexual Health Clinics..

**RESOLVED –** That subject to the minor amendments discussed, the draft report be agreed.

**92 Health Proposals Working Group**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development gave the Board an update of the Health Proposals Working Group and detailed minutes of its last meeting.

Discussion took place regarding the current format of the group and how to improve Elected Member attendance. It was suggested that the Group could meet on the same day as the Board.

**RESOLVED –** That the report be noted.

**93 Annual Report**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a copy of the Board's draft Annual Report. The Board's report would form part of the composite report which would be submitted to Full Council.

**RESOLVED** – That the Board’s contribution to the composite report be agreed.

**94 Recommendation Tracking**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development detailed progress made on previous recommendations made by the Board. The Board was asked to decide which items no longer required monitoring as indicated in the report.

**RESOLVED** – That the tracking stages as outlined in the report on the Board’s previous recommendations be agreed.



## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

**Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Date: 30 June 2009**

**Subject: Appointment of Co-opted Members**

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p>    <div style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; vertical-align: middle;"></div> Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)
---

### 1.0 Purpose of the report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Scrutiny Board's formal consideration for the appointment of co-opted members to the Board.

### 2.0 Background

2.1 For a number of years the Council's Constitution has made provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards. For those Scrutiny Boards where co-opted members have previously been appointed, such arrangements have tended to be reviewed on an annual basis, usually at the beginning of a new municipal year. However, the appointment of co-opted members has not been considered consistently across all Scrutiny Boards.

#### Leeds City Council Scrutiny Review (May 2009)

2.2 As part of their 2008/09 Audit and Inspection Plan, KPMG (the Council's external auditors) carried out a review of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function. The outcome of that review is presented elsewhere on the agenda, however a specific aspect relates to the appointment of co-opted members to Scrutiny Boards.

2.3 The relevant extract and associated recommendation from the KPMG report is detailed below:

*Having attended Scrutiny meetings at LCC that had both co-opted Members on the Board and no co-opted Members there appeared to be a greater level of participation by all when the Boards contained co-opted Members. In addition the contribution made by the co-opted Members was very valuable as these Members were able to draw upon their experiences and provide a different perspective.*

*Currently the constitution of LCC does allow all Scrutiny Boards to have co-opted members it is just something that is not widely exercised. This is almost the opposite at Bristol City Council where there are a large number of Scrutiny Boards with co-opted Members. The Scrutiny Support Unit has however been proactive in this area and have recently taken a paper to the Scrutiny Advisory Group highlighting the benefits of having co-opted Members on Scrutiny Boards.*

### **Recommendation Six**

Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.

- 2.4 In response to this recommendation, it was agreed that each Scrutiny Board would be formally asked to consider the potential involvement of co-opted members throughout the year.

## **3.0 Arrangements for appointing co-opted members**

### General arrangements

- 3.1 It is widely recognised that in some circumstances, in particular where there is some specialist knowledge or skill, co-opted members can significantly aid the work Scrutiny Boards. This is currently reflected in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards) of the Council's Constitution, which outlines the options available to Scrutiny Boards in relation to appointing co-opted members. In general terms, Scrutiny Boards can appoint:
- Up to five non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council ; and/or,
  - Up to two non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that relates to the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry.

### Specific arrangements

- 3.2 In the majority of cases the appointment of co-opted members is optional and is determined by the relevant Scrutiny Board, however, there are some particular legislative exceptions. Such cases are also set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards) of the Council's Constitution and summarised below:

### *Education Representatives*

- 3.3 In addition to elected Members appointed by Council, the Local Government Act 2000 states that the relevant Scrutiny Board dealing with education matters shall include in its membership the following voting representatives in accordance with statutory requirements:
- One Church of England diocese representative<sup>1</sup>
  - One Roman Catholic diocese representative<sup>1</sup>
  - Three parent governor representatives<sup>2</sup>

Where the Scrutiny Board deals with other non-educational matters the co-opted members may participate in any discussion but shall not be entitled to vote on those matters.

<sup>1</sup> Article 6 states this appointment shall be for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council

<sup>2</sup> Article 6 states these appointments shall be for a four-year term of office

### *Crime and Disorder Representatives*

- 3.4 In accordance with the requirements of the Police and Justice Act 2006, the Council has designated the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) to act as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.5 The overall implications of this designation are detailed elsewhere on the agenda, however there are specific powers relating to the appointment of additional members detailed in Article 6. In this regard the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) may co-opt additional members to serve on the Board, providing they are:
- An employee, officer or member of a responsible authority<sup>3</sup> or of a co-operating person or body<sup>4</sup>; and,
  - Not an Executive Member
- 3.6 The Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) may limit the co-opted member's participation to those matters where the Scrutiny Board is acting as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.7 As Leeds does not have a formal scheme to allow a co-opted member to have voting rights, any co-opted member will not have voting rights and the Board may withdraw the co-opted membership at any time.

### **4.0 Issue to consider when seeking to appoint co-opted members**

- 4.1 Currently, there is no overarching national guidance or criteria that should be considered when seeking to appoint co-opted members. As a result, there is a plethora of methods employed within Councils for the appointment of co-optees to Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Scrutiny Boards). For example, some Councils use "job descriptions", some carry out formal interviews and some advertise for co-optees in the local press, with individuals completing a simple application form which is then considered by Members.
- 4.2 In considering or seeking the appointment of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards may find it useful to consider that co-opted members should:
- Add value to the work of the Scrutiny Board and/or specific inquiry, by having some specialist skill or knowledge
  - Be considered as representatives of wider groups of people. For example, service user representatives, voluntary or community groups etc.
  - Not be seen as a replacement to professional advice from officers;
  - Be mindful about the extent of any potential conflicts of interest;
- 4.3 Despite the lack of any national guidance, what is clear is that any process for appointing co-opted members should be open, effective and carried out in a manner which seeks to strengthen the work of Scrutiny Boards.
- 4.4 In addition, when considering the issue of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards should also be mindful of the role of expert witnesses and seeking information /

---

<sup>3</sup> These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies, as detailed in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 5. In Leeds, *Safer Leeds* is the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, therefore the 'responsible authorities' are those bodies represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive.

<sup>4</sup> People or bodies with whom the responsible authorities have a duty to co-operate as set out in the Police and Justice Act 2006, Section 19(2)(b).

evidence from a variety of different sources to help fulfill the objectives of the work programme and/or a specific inquiry.

## **5.0 Scrutiny Board (Health)**

5.1 During 2008/09, Scrutiny Board (Health) made the following non-voting co-opted appointments:

- A representative of Leeds Voice (Health Forum) – Mr. Eddie Mack
- A representative of Touchstone – Ms Samoud Saqfelhait

5.2 The term of office for these appointments has now come to an end and the nominating bodies have been advised accordingly. In addition, should the Scrutiny Board (Health) decide to appoint co-opted members for 2009/10, the nominating bodies have also been asked to indicate whether or not they would wish the Board to consider re-appointing representatives from their organisation. The Board will be advised of any response received at the meeting.

### Leeds Local Involvement Networks (LINK)

5.3 Furthermore, this year the Scrutiny Board is advised to consider the role of the new Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK). Further details about the LINK are set out later in the Board's agenda. In summary, the LINK will act as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums, but with an extended remit covering social care. Run by local people and groups, the role of a LINK is to promote involvement; to find out what people like and dislike about local services; monitor the care provided by services; and use LINK powers to hold services to account.

5.4 Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the local LINK has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken.

5.5 Locally, in August 2008, the Shaw Trust was appointed as the host organisation to support the work of the Leeds LINK. Since that time it has been working with the LINK Preparatory Group to get a wide range of people and organisations involved in the LINK. In addition, an Interim Steering Group (the membership of which was drawn from the LINK Preparatory Group) was established to act as a provisional decision-making body, pending the establishment of a formal steering group following appropriate elections.

5.6 Leeds' LINK is set for an official launch on 9 June 2009. This will include the formal opening of the election process to establish a LINK Steering Group (also referred to as the 'core group'). It is anticipated that the LINK Steering Group will be in place in August 2009, but until that time the Interim Steering Group will continue to act as the decision-making body.

### Leeds LINK – Annual Report

5.7 LINKs are accountable to the public and to the Secretary of State for Health. As such, every year all LINKs are required to publish an annual report, which will also be sent to the Care Quality Commission, to relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Scrutiny Boards), Primary Care Trusts (NHS Leeds) and the Strategic Health Authoritys (NHS Yorkshire and the Humber).

- 5.8 The Annual Report (2008/09) for the Leeds LINK, covering the period 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009, is currently being prepared and will be agreed by the Interim Steering Group. The deadline for the completion of the Annual Report (2008/09) is 30 June 2009 and, in line with the requirements of legislation, will be made available to the Scrutiny Board as soon as practicable.

Leeds LINK representatives as co-opted members

- 5.9 Given the role and function of LINKs, the relationship between the Leeds LINK and the Council's Scrutiny Boards will be key. The Board may therefore wish to give consideration to seeking nominations from Leeds LINK for representatives to act as non-voting co-opted members on the Board this year.
- 5.10 The Board may also wish to consider a similar approach if/when seeking to identify any non-voting co-opted members for the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry (as indicated in paragraph 3.1 above).

**6.0 Recommendation**

- 6.1 In line with the options available outlined in this report, Members are asked to consider the appointment of co-opted members to the Scrutiny Board.

**Background Papers**

- The Council's Constitution
- Police and Justice Act 2006
- KPMG Scrutiny Review May 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

**Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Date: 30 June 2009**

**Subject: Constitutional Amendments**

---

### Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

### Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

## 1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides the Board with information and guidance reflecting recent amendments of the Council's Constitution, as agreed by Council on 21 May 2009, which directly relate to and/or impact on the work of Scrutiny Boards.

## 2.0 Background

2.1 The Local Government Act 2000 introduced new models of governance and decision-making arrangements for local authorities in England and Wales. This included putting in place executive arrangements for decision-making through a smaller, more prominent, number of local Councillors (the Executive Board). Within the new arrangements, the overview and scrutiny function was established to hold the Executive Board to account for its decisions and to contribute to evidence-based policy development across the Council.

2.2 Through a number of legislative changes, for example the Health and Social Care Act 2001 which introduced local health scrutiny, the role and responsibilities of overview and scrutiny have expanded significantly; with the function now responsible for investigating the delivery of services provided by a wide range of public, private and third-sector partners.

2.3 This report seeks to reflect on recent legislative changes, its impact on the scrutiny function and the subsequent amendments to the Council's Constitution, through changes to both the Scrutiny Board Procedural Rules and supportive guidance notes.

### 3.0 Constitutional amendments

- 3.1 Two recent Acts of Parliament, namely the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Police and Justice Act 2006, have had a direct impact on the scrutiny function and required amendments to the Council's Constitution. Such amendments were agreed at the Council meeting in May 2009 and summarised below.

#### Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) Provisions

- 3.2 The Local Government Act 2000 included provisions to allow Elected Members to raise matters for consideration by the Council's Scrutiny Boards. This was reflected in the Council's Constitution, Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 12 which made provision for dealing with such requests.
- 3.3 To supplement and strengthen the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000, the Government recently enacted provisions at Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Referred to as 'Councillor Call for Action', these provisions give Councillors the opportunity to ask for discussions at Scrutiny Boards where *local* problems have arisen and where other methods of resolution have been exhausted.
- 3.4 Specific guidance on the process for administering a CCfA is set out in Annex 1 of the attached Guidance Note: *Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters*.

#### Arrangements for the Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder Functions and Local Crime and Disorder Matters

- 3.5 The Police and Justice Act 2006 extends the remit of local authorities to scrutinise crime and disorder functions<sup>1</sup>, with Part 3 of the Act stating that every local authority shall ensure it has a 'Crime and Disorder Committee' to fulfill this role. At the Council meeting in May 2009, the Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board was assigned to undertake this role.
- 3.6 Overall, in its capacity as a crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) has powers to:
- (a) Review or scrutinise decisions made (or action taken), in connection with the discharge of crime and disorder functions by the 'responsible authorities'<sup>2</sup>;
  - (b) Review or scrutinise any Member referred local crime and disorder matter;
  - (c) Make reports and/or recommendations to the Council or the Executive;
  - (d) Call an officer from a responsible authority to attend its meetings in order to answer questions or otherwise to provide information and to respond to reports or recommendations made by the Scrutiny Board;
  - (e) Co-opt additional members to serve on the committee, either with or without voting rights<sup>3</sup>

These additional powers are reflected in the revised terms of reference for the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods).

---

<sup>1</sup> Set out in Sections 19, 20 and 21 of the Police and Justice Act 2006

<sup>2</sup> These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies, as detailed in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 5. In Leeds, *Safer Leeds* is the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, therefore the 'responsible authorities' are those bodies represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive

<sup>3</sup> Details are set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards: Co-opted Members)



- 3.7 Alongside the additional scrutiny powers, in its capacity as the Council's crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) *must* meet at least once each year to fulfill its role in relation to the responsible authorities.
- 3.8 The Police and Justice Act 2006 also makes provision for elected members to refer local crime and disorder matters to the Council's designated Crime and Disorder Committee.
- 3.9 For this purpose, local crime and disorder matters should be considered to encompass all community safety issues that affect all or part of the ward for which the member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area, including:
- Antisocial behaviour;
  - Other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment;
  - The misuse of drugs, alcohol or other substances
- 3.10 While the Police and Justice Act 2006 clearly provides separate provision for the referral of local crime and disorder matters, in practice the principles and processes involved are essentially the same as for any Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral, however any crime and disorder referrals will be considered by the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods), in its capacity as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.11 Specific guidance on the process for administering a *Local Crime and Disorder referral* is set out in Annex 2 of the attached Guidance Note: *Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters*.

#### Local Involvement Networks (LINKS)

- 3.12 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave a duty to all 150 local authorities in England with social services responsibilities, to enable the formation of a Local Involvement Network (LINK), to act as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums (PPIF) but with an extended remit covering social care.
- 3.13 Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the local LINK has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken.
- 3.14 Specific guidance on the process for administering a *Health and Social Care referral* is set out in Annex 3 of the attached Guidance Note: *Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters*.

#### Responding to inquiry report and recommendations

- 3.15 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 also places a duty on the Council or Executive to consider and respond to any Scrutiny Board report and/or recommendations within two months of receipt of the report/recommendations. In referring any report / recommendations, a Scrutiny Board can require the Council or Executive to:
- Consider its report or recommendations;

- Respond, outlining any proposed action;
- Publish the response (if the Scrutiny Board has published its report and/or recommendations);
- Provide a copy of the response to the referring Member, where the matter originated from a “Councillor Call for Action”.

3.16 Where a Scrutiny Board sends its report or recommendations to another body, the body in question will also be asked to send its response to the Scrutiny Board within two months<sup>4</sup>, setting out:

- The views of the body
- Details of any action already taken in response to the recommendations;
- Proposed action and timescales; or
- Any reasons for inaction.

#### **4.0 Other legislative changes**

##### Scrutiny of Partners

- 4.1 Since its inception, it has been widely regarded as good practice for Scrutiny Boards to consider evidence/ information from a variety of sources, including partner and/or other outside organisations. The ability for Scrutiny Boards to require information from some outside organisations (relevant partners) is already covered in other legislation (i.e. NHS Act 2006 at Section 44 relating to Local NHS bodies for Health Scrutiny and section 20(5) of the Police and Justice Act 2006 for Crime and Disorder issues). However, with Scrutiny Boards having limited powers to require outside bodies to provide information, any requests for information have tended to be reliant on the cooperation or good will of the organisation involved.
- 4.2 However, Section 121 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 places a requirement on certain partner organisations<sup>5</sup> to provide information to a relevant scrutiny committee when requested to do so.
- 4.3 While the information will relate to the partners responsibility for the delivery of LAA improvement targets, the Secretary of State has still to make regulations covering exactly what information relevant partner authorities must provide, and/or may not disclose to Scrutiny Boards. Clarity is also required on a number of issues including timescales and whether partners will be compelled to attend Scrutiny Board meetings or simply provide the information requested. Once issued, such regulations are likely to require further amendment(s) to the Council’s Constitution and associated guidance notes.

#### **5.0 Recommendations**

- 5.1 In fulfilling the role and function of the Scrutiny Board, Members are requested to note the amendments to the Council’s Constitution outlined in the report.
- 5.2 Members are also requested to note the likely changes resulting from the Secretary of State regulations regarding the provision of information from partner authorities.

---

<sup>4</sup> For NHS bodies this time limit is 28 days (the Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committee Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations 2002. Where a Scrutiny Board has sent a report to a partnership the partnership is not required under these Rules to provide a response. Any partnership not otherwise required to provide a response will be invited to do so.

<sup>5</sup> Set out in Part 5, Chapter 1 (Section 104).

## **6.0 Background Paper**

The Council's Constitution

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

Police and Justice Act 2006

This page is intentionally left blank

## GUIDANCE NOTE

### REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY, INCLUDING COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (CCfA), LOCAL CRIME AND DISORDER MATTERS AND HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE MATTERS

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Local Government Act 2000 introduced new models of governance and decision-making arrangements for local authorities in England and Wales. This included putting in place executive arrangements for decision-making through a smaller, more prominent, number of local councillors (the Executive Board). The overview and scrutiny function was established to hold the Executive Board to account for its decisions and to contribute to evidence-based policy development in the council.
- 1.2. In recent years, the role and responsibilities of overview and scrutiny have expanded significantly, with the function now responsible for investigating the delivery of services provided by a wide range of public, private and third-sector partners. Scrutiny's unique remit and enhanced public profile means that it can be the focus of many requests and suggestions for detailed investigations/inquiries.
- 1.3. Currently, there are a number of avenues for making a request for scrutiny, some of which are specifically set out in legislation. The Council's Constitution, through its Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, makes provision for dealing with requests for scrutiny from a number of different sources and/or relating to different areas, including:
  - The Executive or Council;
  - Members of a Scrutiny Board;
  - Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA);
  - Local Crime and Disorder Matters;
  - Health and Social Care Matters;
  - Other sources, such as individual Members of Council, community groups and individual members of the public.
- 1.4. This guidance note seeks to provide general advice for Scrutiny Boards and Officers dealing with requests for scrutiny, along with more specific advice on:
  - Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA)<sup>1</sup>;
  - Local Crime and Disorder Matters<sup>2</sup>;
  - Health and Social Care Matters;

#### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Scrutiny's unique remit means that it is often in an excellent position to examine the links between organisations and see where working collaboratively could deliver enhanced services for local people. As such, Scrutiny Boards are often well placed to:
  - Use a variety of tools to identify areas for review;

---

<sup>1</sup> As set out in Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

<sup>2</sup> As set out in Section 19 of the Police and Criminal Justice Act 2006

- Obtain all the information required to identify any shortcomings in specific areas;
  - Discuss matters of concern with those both in receipt of services and those responsible for service delivery;
  - Produce reports and make appropriate recommendations for improvement.
- 2.2. As such, where areas for improvement have been identified and/or where matters remain unresolved, the ability to give an issue wider consideration by referring it to one or more of the Council's Scrutiny Boards should be regarded as a useful additional tool.

### **3. REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY**

#### General requests for scrutiny

- 3.1. Requests for scrutiny can emerge from a variety of sources and/or relate to a range of different areas (as set out in paragraph 1.3).
- 3.2. In broad terms, the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules provide details of how requests for scrutiny from different sources should be administered. This can be summarised as follows:
- All requests for scrutiny received will be added to the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the relevant Scrutiny Board;
  - Interested parties will be notified of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where a request for scrutiny will be considered;
  - At that meeting, the Scrutiny Board will determine whether or not to undertake a specific inquiry.
- 3.3. When deciding whether or not to undertake a scrutiny inquiry, a Scrutiny Board may usefully wish to consider and confirm whether:
- The matter raised relates The Board has considered a similar issue recently, and if so whether the circumstances and/or evidence has changed significantly.
  - The matter raised relates solely to an individual and is being or should be pursued via the Council's and/or other existing complaints procedure.
  - A similar or related issue is already included on the Board's current work programme, as it may be more appropriate to link the request for scrutiny to an existing work item.
  - The matter might more usefully be considered and referred to an alternative Scrutiny Board (i.e. as part of another inquiry and/or Scrutiny Board work programme).
  - The matter raised is of sufficient significance and has the potential for scrutiny to produce realistic recommendations that could be implemented and lead to tangible improvements.
- 3.4. Where a Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a request for scrutiny, the Scrutiny Board will also consider:
- How the request meets the inquiry selection criteria;

- The impact on the Board's current work programme;
  - The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
  - The level of resources required to carry out the work.
- 3.5. The decision whether or not to further investigate matters raised by a request for scrutiny is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.
- 3.6. Notification of the Scrutiny Board's decision (i.e. whether or not to investigate the matter(s) raised) will be provided based on the source of the original request, as follows:
- The Executive or Council – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision;
  - Members of a Scrutiny Board – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision;
  - Individual Members of Council – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision, followed by a letter on behalf of the Scrutiny Board.
  - Community groups and individual members of the public – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision, followed by a letter on behalf of the Scrutiny Board.
- 3.7. Where a Scrutiny Board decides not to investigate the matter(s) raised, the notification provided will include the reason(s) for that decision.
- 3.8. Where a Scrutiny Board decides to investigate the matter(s) raised, the notification provided will include an outline of the agreed actions with an indicative timetable. Notification of any significant deviation from this timetable will subsequently be provided.
- 3.9. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the Council or the Executive Board will be made publically available and provided to the relevant parties as soon as practicable<sup>3</sup>.

#### Specific requests for scrutiny

- 3.10. Guidance on specific types of requests for scrutiny are attached to this guidance note as follows:
- Annex 1 – Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA);
  - Annex 2 – Local Crime and Disorder Matters;
  - Annex 3 – Health and Social Care Matters;

---

<sup>3</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

## REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY: COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (CCfA)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Resolving concerns of the local community is an important element of a local councillor's role, and frequently these are resolved via a network of contacts within the organisation. However, where matters remain unresolved, the ability to give an issue wider consideration by referring it to an Overview and Scrutiny Board should be regarded as a useful additional tool.
- 1.2. In this regard, the Government has recently introduced provisions at Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 referred to as 'Councillor Call for Action', to allow Councillors the opportunity to ask for discussions at Scrutiny Boards where *local* problems have arisen and other methods of resolution have been exhausted and failed to deliver an appropriate outcome.
- 1.3. This part of the guidance note relates to the process for administering a *Councillor Call for Action* (CCfA)<sup>4</sup> and aims to provide guidance and assistance for Members, Scrutiny Boards and Officers in the management and consideration of such requests.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Under the provisions set out in Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, a local member may raise a matter which relates to the discharge of any function of the authority that affects all or part of the ward for which the member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area, subject to the following exclusions,:
  - a matter which is a local crime and disorder matter within the meaning of section 19 of the Police and Criminal Justice Act 2006<sup>5</sup>;
  - individual complaints concerning personal grievances or commercial issues<sup>6</sup>;
  - any matter relating to a planning decision<sup>6</sup>;
  - any matter relating to a licensing decision<sup>6</sup>;
  - any matter relating to an individual or entity where a right of recourse, review or appeal already exists<sup>6</sup>;
  - any matter which is vexatious, discriminatory or not reasonable to be included on the agenda for, or to be discussed at, a Scrutiny Board meeting<sup>6</sup>;
  - any other matters specified in an order made by the Secretary of State from time to time.

<sup>4</sup> As set out in Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

<sup>5</sup> Guidance on *Arrangements for the Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder Functions and Local Crime and Disorder Matters* is provided in Annex B of this guidance note.

<sup>6</sup> The Overview and Scrutiny (Reference by Councillors) (Excluded Matters) (England) Order 2008 defines an 'excluded matter' and came into force on 1 April 2009.



- 2.2. There is also provision for any matter to be referred to Overview and Scrutiny that consists of an allegation of systematic failure within the Council, notwithstanding the fact that the allegation specifies matters which would otherwise be excluded.
- 2.3. Best practice guidance on Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) has been published by the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the Improvement and Development Agency<sup>7</sup>. Whilst this guidance is not prescriptive it provides case study examples of good practice and local authorities that piloted CCfA arrangements. The key points emphasised in the guidance include:
- CCfA is a means of last resort and should be aimed at seeking resolution where other techniques have failed;
  - senior level officer and Member commitment to resolving issues is necessary for maximum effort;
  - any local CCfA guidance to be light touch;
  - the CCfA process should be developed through a consultation process involving Members and other local partners;
  - CCfA is designed to assist Members in dealing with local ward issues – problems which affect the whole Council area should be dealt with in another way;
  - Members will need to discuss what exactly will constitute the successful resolution of the issue;
  - the forum for discussion is less important than the fact that the issue should be discussed together in its entirety.

### **3. COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION – THE LOCAL PROCESS**

#### Steps to be taken prior to making a Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral

- 3.1. The CCfA should be considered as a mechanism of last resort, where all other methods of resolution have been exhausted and failed to deliver an appropriate outcome.
- 3.2. In using the CCfA provisions, a ward member (the referring Member) must have regard to the guidance issued by the Secretary of State, outlined in 2.1 above, paying particular attention to those matters deemed to be excluded.
- 3.3. Prior to referring a CCfA to a Scrutiny Board, the referring Member must have made reasonable attempts to resolve the matter using all mechanisms and resources available to them as a ward councillor.
- 3.4. As a minimum, it is expected that the referring Member will have satisfied themselves that the issue is not an excluded matter and will have made reasonable attempts to resolve the matter by approaching one or more of the following:
- the relevant Director(s) and/or Chief Officer(s)
  - the relevant Executive Board member(s)
  - any relevant partnership bodies or local groups

---

<sup>7</sup> Available from the Publications section of the Centre for Public Scrutiny website: [www.cfps.org.uk](http://www.cfps.org.uk)

### Making a Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral

- 3.5. Any CCfA request should be made in writing to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and be accompanied with supporting evidence, including details of any meetings and/or discussions that have taken place in an attempt to resolve the matter, along with any associated conclusions.
- 3.6. The purpose of providing such supporting evidence is to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted. As such, in providing any supporting evidence the referring Member should seek to demonstrate that:
  - All relevant internal routes of resolution have been followed, with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
  - The matter should not be pursued via the Council's complaints procedure.
  - All relevant partner organisations have been informed of the matter (for example, through formal letters written on behalf of constituents), with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
- 3.7. Where the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development deems that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that other methods of resolution have been exhausted then the request will be deemed invalid. In such circumstances, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will notify the referring Member in writing within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made.
- 3.8. Where a CCfA request has been deemed invalid, the referring Member shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development. Any such appeals shall be made in writing to the Chief Democratic Services Officer within 5 working days of the original notification provided by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.
- 3.9. On receipt of such an appeal, the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall provide notification of the judgement made in relation to the CCfA request within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made. Such notification will be made in writing and provided to the referring Member and the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.
- 3.10. The decision of the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall be final and there will be no further right of appeal.

### Prior to the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.11. Any valid CCfA request received will be included on the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Board. This shall include all supporting evidence<sup>8</sup> provided to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted.

---

<sup>8</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

- 3.12. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development shall notify the referring Member of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where the request shall be considered.
- 3.13. At the discretion of the relevant Scrutiny Board Chair, the relevant member of the Executive Board, Area Committee Chair and/or appropriate officer will be invited to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting where a CCfA request is being considered.
- 3.14. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in reaching a decision on a CCfA request, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite other organisation(s) and/or individual(s) to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting.

During the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.15. All CCfA requests will to be looked at on their individual merits and on the basis of the evidence provided. The referring Member will be entitled to address the meeting of the Scrutiny Board when a CCfA request is being considered.
- 3.16. In considering whether or not to investigate the matter raised, the Scrutiny Board will have regard to:
- any powers which the referring Member may exercise in relation to the matter under consideration (i.e. exercise of functions by local councillors under local delegated decision-making arrangements);
  - any representations made by the referring Member as to why the matter should be investigated.
- 3.17. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in deciding whether or not to investigate the matter(s) raised, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite comments from any other organisation(s) or individual(s) deemed suitable.
- 3.18. When deciding whether or not to further investigate the CCfA, the Scrutiny Board may usefully wish to consider and confirm whether:
- There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that:
    - All reasonable attempts have been made to resolve the matter by the referring Member.
    - The matter raised is not being progressed and all relevant service areas or partner organisations have been informed and allowed sufficient time to resolve the matter.
  - The matter is being or should be pursued via the Council's complaints procedure.
  - The Board has considered a similar issue recently, and if so whether the circumstances and/or evidence has changed significantly.
  - A similar or related issue is already included on the Board's current work programme, as it may be more appropriate to link the CCfA request to an existing work item.
  - The matter might more usefully be considered and referred to an alternative Scrutiny Board (i.e. as part of another inquiry and/or Scrutiny Board work programme).

- The matter referred has the potential for scrutiny to produce realistic recommendations that could be implemented and lead to improvements for anyone living or working in the referring Member's ward.
- 3.19. Where a Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a CCfA, the Scrutiny Board will also consider:
- How the referral meets the inquiry selection criteria;
  - The impact on the Board's current work programme;
  - The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
  - The level of resources required to carry out the work.
- 3.20. The decision whether or not to further investigate the matter(s) raised is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.

After the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.21. Where a Scrutiny Board has considered a CCfA request, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will provide written notification of the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations to the referring Member, within 5 working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.
- 3.22. Where a Scrutiny Board decides not to investigate the matter raised, this notification will include the reason(s) for that decision.
- 3.23. Where a Scrutiny Board decides to further investigate the matter(s) raised, this notification will include an outline of the agreed actions with an indicative timetable. The referring Member will be subsequently notified of any significant deviation from this timetable.
- 3.24. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the Council or the Executive Board will be provided to the referring Member as soon as practicable<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

## REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY: LOCAL CRIME AND DISORDER MATTERS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Provisions in the Police and Justice Act 2006, namely Section 19, 20 and 21, extend the remit of local authorities to scrutinise crime and disorder functions. As a result, the Council has been required to designate a Scrutiny Board to act as the Council's 'Crime and Disorder Committee'. The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board has been assigned to fulfil this role.
- 1.2. Overall, in its capacity as a crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board has powers to:
- (a) Review or scrutinise decisions made (or action taken), in connection with the discharge of crime and disorder functions by the 'responsible authorities'<sup>10</sup>;
  - (b) Review or scrutinise any Member referred local crime and disorder matter;
  - (c) Make reports and/or recommendations to the Council or the Executive;
  - (d) Call an officer from a responsible authority to attend its meetings in order to answer questions or otherwise to provide information and to respond to reports or recommendations made by the Scrutiny Board;
  - (e) Co-opt additional members to serve on the committee, either with or without voting rights<sup>11</sup>
- 1.3. In addition, the Scrutiny Board must meet to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, by the responsible authorities at least once a year.
- 1.4. This part of the guidance note relates to the process for administering a *Local Crime and Disorder referral* and aims to provide guidance and assistance for Members, Scrutiny Boards and Officers in the management and consideration of such requests.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The Police and Justice Act 2006 makes provision for elected members to refer local crime and disorder matters to the Council's designated Crime and Disorder Committee. Local crime and disorder matters should be considered to encompass all community safety issues that affect all or part of the ward for which the member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area including:
- Antisocial behaviour;
  - Other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment;
  - The misuse of drugs, alcohol or other substances

<sup>10</sup> These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies, as detailed in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 5. In Leeds, *Safer Leeds* is the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, therefore the 'responsible authorities' are those bodies represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive

<sup>11</sup> Details are set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards: Co-opted Members)

- 2.2. While the Police and Justice Act 2006 makes separate provision for the referral of local crime and disorder matter, in practice the principles and processes involved are essentially the same as for any Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral.

### **3. LOCAL CRIME AND DISORDER REFERRALS – THE LOCAL PROCESS**

#### Steps to be taken prior to making a local crime and disorder referral

- 3.1. A local crime and disorder referral should be considered as a mechanism of last resort, where all other methods of resolution have been exhausted and failed to deliver an appropriate outcome.
- 3.2. Prior to a referring a local crime and disorder matter to the Crime and Disorder Committee, the referring Member must have made reasonable attempts to resolve the matter using all mechanisms and resources available to them as a ward councillor. As a minimum, it is expected that the referring Member will attempted to resolve the matter by approaching the 'responsible authorities' represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive.

#### Making a local crime and disorder referral

- 3.3. Any local crime and disorder referral should be made in writing to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and be accompanied with supporting evidence, including details of any meetings and/or discussions that have taken place in an attempt to resolve the matter, along with any associated conclusions.
- 3.4. The purpose of providing such supporting evidence is to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted. As such, in providing any supporting evidence the referring Member should seek to demonstrate that:
- All relevant internal routes of resolution have been followed, with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
  - The matter should not be pursued via an existing complaints procedure.
  - Relevant responsible authorities have been informed of the matter (for example, through formal letters written on behalf of constituents), with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
- 3.5. Where the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development deems that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that other methods of resolution have been exhausted then the referral will be deemed invalid. In such circumstances, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will notify the referring Member in writing within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made.
- 3.6. Where a local crime and disorder referral has been deemed invalid, the referring Member shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development. Any such appeals shall be made in writing to the Chief Democratic Services Officer within 5 working days of the original notification provided by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.

- 3.7. On receipt of such an appeal, the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall provide notification of the judgement made in relation to the local crime and disorder referral within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made. Such notification will be made in writing and provided to the referring Member and the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.
- 3.8. The decision of the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall be final and there will be no further right of appeal.

#### Prior to the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.9. Any valid local crime and disorder referral received will be included on the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Board. This shall include all supporting evidence<sup>12</sup> provided to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted.
- 3.10. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development shall notify the referring Member of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where the request shall be considered.
- 3.11. Where a local crime and disorder referral is being considered, the appropriate representative(s) from the relevant 'responsible authorities' represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive will be invited to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting.
- 3.12. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in reaching a decision on a local crime and disorder referral, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite other organisation(s) and/or individual(s) to attend the Scrutiny Board meeting.

#### During the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.13. All local crime and disorder referrals will to be looked at on their individual merits and on the basis of the evidence provided. The referring Member will be entitled to address the meeting of the Scrutiny Board when a local crime and disorder referral, raised by that Councillor, is being considered.
- 3.14. In considering whether or not to investigate the matter(s) raised, the Scrutiny Board will have regard to:
- any powers which the referring Member may exercise in relation to the matter under consideration (i.e. exercise of functions by local councillors under local delegated decision-making arrangements);
  - any representations made by the referring Member as to why the matter should be investigated.
- 3.15. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in deciding whether or not to further investigate the matter(s) raised, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may choose to invite comments from any other organisation(s) or individual(s) deemed suitable.

---

<sup>12</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

3.16. When deciding whether or not to further investigate the local crime and disorder referral, the Scrutiny Board may usefully wish to consider and confirm whether:

- There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that:
  - All reasonable attempts have been made to resolve the matter by the referring Member.
  - The matter raised is not being progressed and all relevant service areas or partner organisations have been informed and allowed sufficient time to resolve the matter.
- The matter is being or should be pursued via an existing complaints procedure.
- The Board has considered a similar issue recently, and if so whether the circumstances and/or evidence has changed significantly.
- A similar or related issue is already included on the Board's current work programme, as it may be more appropriate to link the local crime and disorder referral to an existing work item.
- The matter referred has the potential for scrutiny to produce realistic recommendations that could be implemented and lead to improvements for anyone living or working in the referring Member's ward.

3.17. Where the Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a referral, the Scrutiny Board will also consider:

- How the referral meets the inquiry selection criteria;
- The impact on the Board's current work programme;
- The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
- The level of resources required to carry out the work.

3.18. The decision whether or not to further investigate the matter(s) raised is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.

#### After the Scrutiny Board meeting

3.19. Where the Scrutiny Board has considered a local crime and disorder referral, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will provide written notification of the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations to the referring Member, within 5 working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.

3.20. Where the Scrutiny Board decides not to investigate the matter(s) raised, this notification will include the reason(s) for that decision.

3.21. Where the Scrutiny Board decides to further investigate the matter(s) raised, this notification will include an outline of the agreed actions with an indicative timetable. The referring Member will subsequently be notified of any significant deviation from this timetable.

3.22. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the Council or the Executive Board will be provided to the referring Member as soon as practicable<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.



## REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY: HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE MATTERS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave a duty to all 150 local authorities in England with social services responsibilities, to enable the formation of a Local Involvement Network (LINK). In summary, the LINK will act as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums (PPIF) but with an extended remit covering social care.
- 1.2. Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the local LINK has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken.
- 1.3. This part of the guidance note relates to the process for administering a *Health and Social Care referral* and aims to provide guidance and assistance for Members, Scrutiny Boards and Officers in the management and consideration of such requests.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. LINKs have been set up to give communities a stronger voice in how their health and social care services are delivered. Run by local people and groups, the role of a LINK is to promote involvement, to find out what people like and dislike about local services, monitor the care provided by services and use LINK powers to hold services to account.
- 2.2. Given the role and function of LINKs, the relation between the LINK and the Council's Scrutiny Boards will be key and more detailed information on this relationship is provided in a separate guidance note.
- 2.3. An important function of the LINK is the ability to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about the progress of any agreed actions.

### 3. HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE REFERRALS – THE LOCAL PROCESS

#### Steps to be taken prior to making a health or social care referral

- 3.1. Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Local Involvement Networks Regulations 2008, the local LINK has the right to refer any matter relating to the planning, provision and operation of health or social care services to the relevant Scrutiny Board.
- 3.2. This should not detract from the aspiration for relevant Scrutiny Boards to work closely with the LINK to ensure that knowledge about work programme items and emerging issues is regularly shared.

- 3.3. Any formal referral of such matters should be considered as a mechanism of last resort and occur in instances where the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner has failed to provide a satisfactory response to a report/ recommendations produced by the LINK within 20 working days.

#### Making a health or social care referral

- 3.4. Any health or social care referral should be made in writing to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and be accompanied with supporting evidence, which outlines the rationale for the referral and demonstrates that the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner has been given sufficient time to respond to the issue(s) raised.

#### Prior to the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.5. On receipt of a health or social care referral, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will ensure the matter, together with all the supporting evidence<sup>14</sup> provided by the LINK, is included on the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Board.
- 3.6. On behalf of the relevant Scrutiny Board, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development shall acknowledge receipt of any health or social care referral within 20 working days of its receipt. Within this acknowledgement, details of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where the referral shall be considered will also be provided.
- 3.7. Where a health or social care referral is being considered, an appropriate representative from the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner will be invited to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting.

#### During the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.8. All health or social care referrals will to be looked at on their individual merits and on the basis of the evidence provided. Representatives from the LINK will be entitled to address the meeting of the Scrutiny Board where such a referral is being considered.
- 3.9. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in deciding whether or not to act on the referral, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite comments from any other organisation(s) or individual(s) deemed suitable.
- 3.10. When deciding whether or not to act on the health or social care referral, the Scrutiny Board will consider the impact of any proposed action. In particular, where a Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a referral, the Scrutiny Board will consider:
- How the referral meets the inquiry selection criteria;
  - The impact on the Board's current work programme;
  - The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
  - The level of resources required to carry out the work.

---

<sup>14</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information

3.11. The decision whether or not to act on the referral is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.

After the Scrutiny Board meeting

3.12. Where a Scrutiny Board has considered a health or social care referral, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will provide written notification of the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations to the LINK, within 5 working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.

3.13. Where a Scrutiny Board decides not to act on the referral, this notification will include the reason(s) for that decision.

3.14. Where a Scrutiny Board decides to act on the referral, this notification will include an outline of the proposed actions and an indicative timetable. The LINK will subsequently be notified of any significant deviation from this timetable.

3.15. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner will be provided to the LINK as soon as practicable<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

**Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Date: 30 June 2009**

**Subject: Input to the Work Programme 2009/10 – Sources of Work and  
Establishing the Board's Priorities**

---

### Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

### Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity   
Community Cohesion   
Narrowing the Gap

---

## 1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides information and guidance to assist the Board develop its work programme for 2009/10.

## 2.0 Background

2.1 For reference and/ or information purposes, a copy of the Board's terms of reference is attached at Appendix 1.

2.2 In addition, relevant information from the following key sources have been extracted appropriate to this Board's responsibilities and attached (Appendix 2) to this report to assist Members in developing the Board's work programme for 2009/10:

- Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 -2011 – Executive Summary
- Leeds' Director of Public Health Annual Report (2007-2008) (extract) – recommendations for action to reduce health inequalities
- List of scrutiny inquiries relevant to the Board's portfolio undertaken since 2003

2.3 Once agreed, the Scrutiny Board's work programme should be considered as a live document that will evolve over time to reflect any changing and/or emerging issues identified throughout the year. As such, other sources of work will continue to be 'requests for scrutiny' and corporate referrals.

## 3.0 Health and Well- Being Partnership Plan (2009 – 2012)

- 2.1 In February 2009, the Scrutiny Board (Health) considered the draft Health and Well-Being Partnership Plan (2009 – 2012), which builds on the partnership priorities previously consulted on and agreed in the Leeds Strategic Plan. The final draft of the plan was presented to the Executive Board in May 2009 and is scheduled to be presented to Council for final approval.
- 2.2 The Health and Well-Being Partnership Plan (2009 – 2012), identifies four main strategic objectives. These are:
- Reducing Health Inequalities
  - Improving Quality of Life
  - Enhanced Safety and Support for Vulnerable People
  - Inclusive Communities
- 2.3 The Plan also identified the following agreed improvement priorities for health and wellbeing:
- Reduce premature mortality in the most deprived areas
  - Reduction in the number of people who smoke
  - Reduce alcohol related harm
  - Reduce rate of increase in obesity and raise physical activity for all
  - Reduce teenage conception and improve sexual health.
  - Improve the assessment and care management of children, families and vulnerable adults.
  - Improve psychological, mental health, and learning disability services for those who need it
  - Increase the number of vulnerable people helped to live at home
  - Increase the proportion of people in receipt of community services enjoying choice and control over their daily lives
  - Improve safeguarding arrangements for vulnerable children and adults through better information, recognition and response to risk
- 2.4 In considering the draft Health and Well-Being Partnership Plan (2009 – 2012), the previous Scrutiny Board made the following observations:
- The improvement priorities identified should act as the foundation for the Health Scrutiny Board's future work programme;
  - The actions template for 2009 – 2012 provides the Health Scrutiny Board with a key performance management tool;
  - The success of the Plan depends on the ability of the Council to act as 'one' and to successfully work with our partners, particularly through the Healthy Leeds Partnership.
  - The implementation of the Plan should not be seen as the sole preserve of health professionals but the responsibility of all directorates. In this regard it would not be inappropriate for the Health Scrutiny Board to request to see officers from other Directorates when looking at performance outcomes and holding officers to account.
- 2.5 Members are specifically asked to consider the agreed improvement priorities for health and wellbeing and the observations of the previous Board in determining the work programme for 2009/10, detailed elsewhere on the agenda.

### 3.0 Guidance

- 3.1 Over the last few years of Scrutiny Board work, experience has shown that the process is more effective if the Board seeks to minimise the number of substantial inquiries running at any one time.
- 3.2 This view is echoed within the findings of the recent KPMG external report on the Scrutiny function in Leeds, which is discussed elsewhere in this agenda. The Board is advised to consider the benefits of single item agendas (excluding miscellaneous information and minutes) in order to focus on all the relevant evidence and complete an inquiry in a shorter period of time. There are various mechanisms available to assist the Board in concluding inquiries quickly, such as working groups and site visits.
- 3.3 The agreed Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny which sits within the Council's Constitution states;

*The responsibility of those setting scrutiny work programmes is, therefore, to ensure that items of work come from a strategic approach as well as a need to challenge service performance and respond to issues of high public interest.*

*It is recognised that Scrutiny Boards have a 'watching brief' role. In addition information is required for members' own development process, particularly as membership of the Boards is changed annually.*

*However, it is also recognised that agendas are often filled up with reports for this purpose, which takes up time for both officers and Members. Where Scrutiny Boards wish to ask questions at a general or more strategic level and/or be updated on issues already considered in detail, the facility of Members' Questions – where a verbal exchange replaces written reports - should be used.*

*It is expected that where ever possible prior notification is given of the likely questions to be asked”.*

- 3.4 Over recent years the Children's Services Board in particular has developed the approach of devoting one meeting per quarter to performance management and 'horizon scanning' issues. This includes discussing with Executive Members and officers relevant issues, and is acknowledged within the KPMG report as good practice.

### 4.0 Work programming

- 4.1 To assist the Scrutiny Board and contribute to the discussions about the Board's work programme for 2009/10, the following have been invited to attend the meeting:
- Councillor Peter Harrand, Executive Member for Adult Health and Social Care;
  - The Director of Adult Social Services (or nominee);
  - The Chief Executive of NHS Leeds (or nominee);
  - Leeds Director of Public Health (NHS Leeds) (or nominee);
  - The Chief Executive of Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust (LTHT) (or nominee);
  - The Chief Executive of Leeds Partnerships Foundation NHS Trust (LPFT) (or nominee).

4.2 Following discussions and detailed elsewhere on the agenda, the Board will be asked to determine an outline work programme that prioritises the issues to be investigated.

## **5.0 Recommendations**

5.1 Members are requested to use the attached information and the discussion with those present at the meeting to develop its work programme.

## **6.0 Background Papers**

The Council's Constitution

Council Business Plan 2008 – 2011

Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 – 2011

Leeds Health and Well-Being Partnership Plan (2009 – 2012) (draft)



## Scrutiny Board (Health)<sup>1</sup>

### Terms of Reference

1. To review any matter relating to the planning, provision and operation of health services in relation to:
  - arrangements made by local NHS bodies<sup>2</sup> and the authority to secure hospital and community health and health related services to the inhabitants of the authority's area;
  - the provision of such services to those inhabitants;
  - the provision of family health services (Primary Care Trust), personal medical services personal dental services, pharmacy and NHS ophthalmic services;
  - the public health arrangements in the area including arrangements by local NHS bodies for the surveillance of, and response to, outbreaks of communicable disease or the provision of specialist health promotion services;
  - the planning of health and health related services by local NHS bodies and the authority, including plans made in co-operation with partners for setting out a strategy for improving both the health of the local population and the provision of health care to that population;
  - the arrangements made by local NHS bodies and the authority for consulting and involving patients and the public under the duty placed on them by Section 11 of the Health and Social Care Act 2001;
  - any proposals for a substantial development or variation of health services within the authority's area.
2. To consider such proposals as are referred to it by local NHS bodies and the authority and to report back the result of its considerations to the referring body and others as appropriate.
3. To review how and to what effect health policy is being implemented, and health improvement achieved, by the authority and local NHS bodies and to make reports and recommendations as appropriate.
4. To receive representations from Area Committees or relevant groups of interest and to report to the authority and local NHS Bodies as appropriate.
5. In relation to matters in respect of which a local NHS body consults more than one scrutiny committee within its area, or in relation to matters which a number of West Yorkshire Metropolitan Councils elect to jointly scrutinise a function or service provided by the NHS body, to:
  - (i) nominate Members to a joint committee, such nominations to reflect the political balance of the Board;
  - (ii) delegate its scrutiny functions to another local authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committees Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations 2002 as amended.

<sup>2</sup> In Leeds this means the Primary Care Trust (NHS Leeds), the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, the Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust and NHS Yorkshire and the Humber

This page is intentionally left blank

# Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011

## Executive Summary

### About the Leeds Strategic Plan

The Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011 sets out the strategic outcomes – the real changes we want to see in people's lives and the city by 2011, and improvement priorities – the key areas where we want to focus our efforts over the next three years. Clear targets have been set to measure the progress we will make over the next three years. The contents of the Plan are aligned with the eight themes in the Vision for Leeds 2004 to 2020, the sustainable community strategy for Leeds. The Leeds Strategic plan can be seen as the delivery plan for the Vision for Leeds.

Working in partnership through the Leeds Initiative, Leeds' local strategic partnership, the Council and its key partners have agreed, following extensive consultation with councillors, stakeholder groups and the public across the city, a single shared set of outcomes and priorities for the city.

The targets in the Leeds Strategic Plan have been selected after thorough study of the prospects, opportunities and challenges facing Leeds and agreed with partners in the city and with central government. The Leeds Strategic Plan is also the Local Area Agreement for Leeds, a formal agreement with central government about how to improve outcomes on our shared priorities..

At the heart of the Leeds Strategic Plan is our ambition to transform the quality of life in Leeds to see:

- people happy, healthy, safe, successful and free from the effects of poverty;
- our young people equipped to contribute to their own and the city's future well being and prosperity;
- local people engaged in decisions about their neighbourhood and community and help shape local services;
- neighbourhoods that are inclusive, varied and vibrant offering housing options and quality facilities and free from harassment and crime;
- an environment that is clean, green, attractive and above all, sustainable; and
- a city-region that is prosperous, innovative and distinctive enabling individuals and businesses to achieve their economic potential.

Our long and successful record of partnership working is a sure foundation for the delivery of these ambitious targets for Leeds. Leeds is one of only three authorities nationally to have been awarded Beacon status for the quality of partnership working and, as a Beacon authority, we will help other authorities all over the country develop effective partnerships to represent local wishes and meet local needs.

### How we will deliver this plan

Leeds City Council will play a key role engaging the public and other stakeholders to shape the contents of the Leeds Strategic Plan, managing performance and reporting progress to local people. The Leeds Strategic Plan is a partnership plan and Leeds Initiative and its groups, including the Strategy Group which brings together the major public sector partners in the city as well as key representatives from the business and voluntary, community and faith sectors, will monitor and manage progress and keep the contents of the Plan relevant to the needs of Leeds. Each partner will also integrate the targets and priorities in this Plan into their work plans. Leeds City Council has produced a Business Plan to support its contribution to the Leeds Strategic Plan.



Working in partnership through the Leeds Initiative



Strategic Outcomes The real changes we want to see		Improvement Priorities – our key focus for the next three years	
<b>Culture</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased participation in cultural opportunities through engaging with all our communities.</li> <li>• Enhanced cultural opportunities through encouraging investment and development of high quality facilities of national and international significance.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable more people to become involved in sport and culture by providing better quality and wider ranging activities and facilities.</li> <li>• Facilitate the delivery of major cultural schemes of international significance.</li> </ul>
<b>Enterprise and the Economy</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased entrepreneurship and innovation through effective support to achieve the full potential of people, business and the economy.</li> <li>• Increased international competitiveness through marketing and investment in high quality infrastructure and physical assets, particularly in the city centre.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase innovation and entrepreneurial activity across the city</li> <li>• Facilitate the delivery of major developments in the city centre to enhance the economy and support local employment</li> <li>• Increase international communications, marketing and business support activities to promote the city and attract investment.</li> </ul>
<b>Learning</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An enhanced workforce that will meet future challenges through fulfilling individual and economic potential and investing in learning facilities.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance the skill level of the workforce to fulfil individual and economic potential</li> <li>• Improve learning outcomes for all 16 year olds, with a focus on narrowing the achievement gap.</li> <li>• Improve learning outcomes and skill levels for 19 year olds.</li> <li>• Increase the proportion of vulnerable groups engaged in education, training or employment.</li> <li>• Improve participation and early learning outcomes for all children, with a focus on families in deprived areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Transport</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased accessibility and connectivity through investment in a high quality transport system and through influencing others and changing behaviours</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver and facilitate a range of transport proposals for an enhanced transport system, including cycling and walking.</li> <li>• Improve the quality, use and accessibility of public transport services in Leeds.</li> <li>• Improve the condition of the streets and transport infrastructure by carrying out a major programme of maintenance and improvements.</li> <li>• Improve road safety for all our users, especially motor cyclists, pedal cyclists and pedestrians.</li> </ul>
<b>Environment</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced ecological footprint through responding to environmental and climate change and influencing others.</li> <li>• Cleaner, greener and more attractive city through effective environmental management and changed behaviours.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the amount of waste reused and recycled and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.</li> <li>• Reduce emissions from public sector buildings, operations and service delivery, and encourage others to do so.</li> <li>• Undertake actions to improve our resilience to current and future climate change.</li> <li>• Address neighbourhood problem sites; improve cleanliness and access to and quality of green spaces.</li> <li>• Improve the quality and sustainability of the built and natural environment.</li> </ul>

Strategic Outcomes The real changes we want to see	Improvement Priorities – our key focus for the next three years
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced health inequalities through the promotion of healthy life choices and improved access to services.</li> <li>• Improved quality of life through maximising the potential of vulnerable people by promoting independence, dignity and respect.</li> <li>• Enhanced safety and support for vulnerable people through preventative and protective action to minimise risks and maximise wellbeing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce premature mortality in the most deprived areas.</li> <li>• Reduction in the number of people who smoke.</li> <li>• Reduce rate of increase in obesity and raise physical activity for all.</li> <li>• Reduce teenage conception and improve sexual health.</li> <li>• Improve the assessment and care management of children, families and vulnerable adults.</li> <li>• Improved psychological, mental health, and learning disability services for those who need it.</li> <li>• Increase the number of vulnerable people helped to live at home.</li> <li>• Increase the proportion of people in receipt of community services enjoying choice and control over their daily lives.</li> <li>• Improve safeguarding arrangements for vulnerable children and adults through better information, recognition and response to risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Thriving Places</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved quality of life through mixed neighbourhoods offering good housing options and better access to services and activities.</li> <li>• Reduced crime and fear of crime through prevention, detection, offender management and changed behaviours.</li> <li>• Increased economic activity through targeted support to reduce worklessness and poverty.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of “decent homes”.</li> <li>• Increase the number of affordable homes.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of homeless people.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of people who are not able to adequately heat their homes.</li> <li>• Increase financial inclusion in deprived areas.</li> <li>• Create safer environments by tackling crime</li> <li>• Improve lives by reducing the harm caused by substance misuse</li> <li>• Reduce offending by managing offending behaviour better</li> <li>• Reduce bullying and harassment.</li> <li>• Reduce worklessness across the city with a focus on deprived areas.</li> <li>• Reduce the number of children in poverty.</li> <li>• Develop extended services, using sites across the city, to improve support to children, families and communities</li> </ul>
<b>Harmonious Communities</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More inclusive, varied and vibrant communities through empowering people to contribute to decision making and delivering local services.</li> <li>• Improved community cohesion and integration through meaningful involvement and valuing equality and diversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An increased number of local people engaged in activities to meet community needs and improve the quality of life for local residents.</li> <li>• An increase in the number of local people that are empowered to have a greater voice and influence over local decision making and a greater role in public service delivery.</li> <li>• Enable a robust and vibrant voluntary, community and faith sector to facilitate community activity and directly deliver services.</li> <li>• An increased sense of belonging and pride in local neighbourhoods that help to build cohesive communities.</li> </ul>

## Partners who have helped to draw up this Plan

Arts Council  
Education Leeds  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Health and Safety Executive  
Highways Agency  
Jobcentre Plus  
Learning and Skills Council  
Leeds chamber of Commerce and Industry  
Leeds Colleges  
Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust  
Leeds Primary Care Trust  
Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust  
Leeds Voice  
Museums, Libraries, Archives Yorkshire  
Natural England  
Re'new  
Sport England  
West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service  
West Yorkshire Metro  
West Yorkshire Police  
West Yorkshire Police Authority  
West Yorkshire Probation Service  
Yorkshire Forward  
Youth Offending Service

For enquiries about the Leeds Strategic Plan or to obtain a copy of the plan please:

Email: [leedsstrategicplan@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:leedsstrategicplan@leeds.gov.uk)

Telephone: **0113 224 346 2**

Visit our website: [www.leedsstrategicplan.org.uk](http://www.leedsstrategicplan.org.uk)

Write to:  
**Leeds Strategic Plan  
Planning, Policy and  
Improvement  
2nd Floor East  
Civic Hall  
Leeds LS1 1UR**

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please phone: **0113 224 346 2** and state the name of your language. We will then put you on hold while we contact an interpreter. We can assist with any language and there is no charge for interpretation.

An audio cassette of the Leeds Strategic Plan can also be obtained by contacting us via one of the methods above.



Working in partnership through the [Leeds Initiative](#)



**Extract from Leeds' the Director of Public Health Annual Report (2007-2008)**  
**Recommendations for action to reduce health inequalities**

	Action needed	By Whom:			
		Leeds PCT	LCC	Leeds Initiative	PBC*
1	Demonstrate how the set of new national performance indicators and the new Local Area Agreement and Local Area Delivery Plans are being used to target action on health inequalities		✓	✓	
2	Demonstrate how the new operating framework and the NHS 'vital signs' are being used to target action on health inequalities	✓			✓
3	Continue using the most deprived SOAs as the basis of a geographic focus for action	✓	✓	✓	✓
4	Work together, using the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, to agree on the most vulnerable and disadvantaged population groups within the city	✓	✓	✓	✓
5	Ensure that the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment reflects health inequalities at local level and that this is embedded into commissioning, service planning and decision making	✓	✓		✓
6	Ensure that there is an understanding of the health inequalities between practice populations and that priority is given to action in commissioning plans				✓
7	Incorporate action on the high impact changes on life expectancy and infant mortality in a targeted systematic way in the more deprived communities	✓	✓	✓	✓
8	Prioritise tackling vascular disease and smoking related illness in order to help achieve the national 2010 health inequalities target on life expectancy <sup>1</sup>	✓			✓
9	As commissioners, ensure that service providers have the incentives to meet the needs of the more disadvantaged populations	✓	✓		✓
10	Provide incentives and support for people to look after their own health	✓	✓		✓

\* Practice based commissioners

<sup>1</sup> Prioritising vascular disease and smoking-related illness means:

- ensuring that prevention and treatment services for cancer and coronary heart disease (CHD) reach those in greatest need or with poorest health outcomes, including disadvantaged groups and ethnic groups with high prevalence; for CHD, in particular, reducing high blood pressure and increasing prescription of statins to reduce blood cholesterol
- increasing smoking cessation interventions
- reducing excess winter deaths, particularly those related to long term respiratory conditions by linking proactive treatments to weather forecasting and increasing influenza immunisation.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Scrutiny Board (Health)

### Previous Inquiries

Date	Scrutiny Board	Report Title	Full report/ statement	Recommendation tracking <sup>1</sup> / status
Apr-09	Health	<i>Improving Sexual Health among Young People</i>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 recommendations: Report to Executive Board scheduled – 22 July 2009.</li> <li>• Formal response: Due Sept. 2009</li> <li>• Progress updates:</li> </ul>
May-08	Health & Adult Social Care	<i>Localisation of Health &amp; Social Care services</i>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: Sept. 2008</li> <li>• Progress updates: April 2009</li> <li>• Monitoring continuing on 4 recommendations.</li> </ul>
Apr-08	Health & Adult Social Care	<i>Teenage Pregnancy</i>	Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 recommendations.</li> <li>• Informed the Scrutiny Inquiry: <i>Improving Sexual Health among Young People</i>.</li> <li>• No further monitoring.</li> </ul>
Apr-08	Health & Adult Social Care	<i>Obesity in Leeds</i>	Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific recommendations</li> <li>• Suggested that the matter be included in the Health Scrutiny Board's work programme for 2008/9.</li> </ul>
Nov-07	Health & Adult Social Care	<i>NHS dental contract in Leeds – 1 year on</i>	Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response – February 2008.</li> <li>• No further monitoring.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Formal tracking of recommendations was first introduced in December 2006

Date	Scrutiny Board	Report Title	Full report/ statement	Recommendation tracking <sup>1</sup> / status
Jul-07	Health & Adult Social Care	<b><i>Community development in health &amp; wellbeing</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: Oct. 2007</li> <li>• Progress updates: Mar. 2008 and April 2009</li> <li>• Monitoring continuing on 3 recommendations.</li> </ul>
May-07	Overview & Scrutiny	<b><i>Narrowing the gap</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response:</li> <li>• Progress updates: Sept. 2007</li> </ul>
May-07	Health & Adult Social Care	<b><i>NHS Dental Contract</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: July 2007</li> <li>• Progress updates: Sept. 2007 and Dec. 2007</li> </ul>
Apr-06	Scrutiny Commission	<b><i>Avoiding alcohol misuse</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: July 2006 (OSC)</li> <li>• Progress updates: Jan. 2007 (OSC) and April 2007 (W/G)</li> </ul>
Apr-06	Health & Wellbeing	<b><i>Childhood obesity prevention &amp; management</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: July 2006</li> <li>• Progress updates: Feb. 2007 and Dec. 2007</li> </ul>
Apr-06	Health & Wellbeing	<b><i>Older People's Mental Health Services</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: July 2006</li> </ul>
May-05	Social Care	<b><i>Delayed Hospital Discharges</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: Sept. 2005</li> <li>• Progress updates: Feb. 2006</li> </ul>
May-05	Health	<b><i>MRSA</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: July 2005</li> </ul>
May-05	Health	<b><i>Sexual Health in Leeds</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: Sept. 2005</li> <li>• Progress updates: Feb. 2006</li> </ul>

Date	Scrutiny Board	Report Title	Full report/ statement	Recommendation tracking <sup>1</sup> / status
May-05	Health	<b><i>Smoking in Public Places</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: July 2005</li> <li>• Progress updates: Oct. 2005 and Nov. 2005</li> </ul>
Apr-04	Health	<b><i>Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: September 2004</li> </ul>
Dec-03	Health	<b><i>NHS Dentistry</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response: March 2004</li> <li>• Progress updates: Nov. 2004 and Sept. 2005</li> </ul>
Oct-03	Health	<b><i>Influencing Health Determinants</i></b>	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 recommendations.</li> <li>• Formal response:</li> <li>• Progress updates:</li> </ul>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

**Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Date: 30 June 2009**

**Subject: KPMG – SCRUTINY REVIEW – MAY 2009**

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

### 1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report presents the findings of the recent KPMG external audit review of the Scrutiny function in Leeds. (Appendix 1). The report also details management's response to the reviews recommendations.

### 2.0 Introduction

2.1 The objective of the KPMG review was to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in addressing the improvements areas identified by the Corporate Assessment in early 2008.

### 3.0 Background Information

3.1 As part of their 2008/09 Audit and Inspection Plan, it was agreed that KPMG would carry out a review of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function. The audit objective was to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in the improvement areas identified by the Corporate Assessment, specifically:

- The extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision;
- The extent to which the skills of the Members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfillment of their role;
- How scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards;
- The extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions;

- The design of the Call-In arrangements in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment' report;
- The extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements;
- The extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards;
- The extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council; and
- The extent to which Scrutiny provides effective challenge and adds value to the Council.

## **4.0 Main Issues**

### 4.1 The key findings of the review are set out below:

The recognition that in light of the recent Corporate Assessment the Council has been in the process of continuing to strengthen its Scrutiny function and that a number of aspects of good practice were identified, such as:

- Professional relationships have been developed between the Scrutiny Board Chairs and the Principal Scrutiny Advisors;
- A wide range of training tools are used in providing training resources for Scrutiny Board Members;
- Personal development plans are available for all Members which assist in the identification of individual training needs; and
- Inquiry selection criteria forms are used to determine whether full scrutiny Inquiries items will be added to the work programme of the Scrutiny Boards.

### 4.2 The key learning points were as follows:

That whilst the Council continues to develop its Scrutiny function it should ensure that the following areas are strengthened:

- An overall vision for the Scrutiny function should be developed, documented and published;
- The trust between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to be maintained and developed in order to reinforce the importance of joint working;
- The relationship between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to continue to develop and political views need to be kept separate from the Scrutiny function;
- There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide to not undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so as to prevent any misunderstandings arising;
- The Scrutiny Boards Procedure Rules Guidance Notes should be strengthened to incorporate that the Scrutiny Boards strive for enhanced lines of internal communication; add value to the Council through the Scrutiny reviews undertaken and incorporate innovation into the approach for challenging the way the Council operates;

- The process of selecting Scrutiny Chairs should be reviewed and a 'job specification' introduced;
- Scrutiny Boards should review whether co-opted Members should be invited to join in their Board;
- All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item so that Scrutiny Boards can scan the horizon to identify any emerging issues;
- The efficiency of Scrutiny Board meetings needs to be improved. To achieve this timed or single item agendas should be encouraged where appropriate and pre-meetings used more effectively;
- Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon;
- Reports of Members attendance at Scrutiny meetings should be made to each of the political groups. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political party to take appropriate action to address this;
- Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and highlight if they feel this should direct any area of their annual work programme;
- Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery; and
- The Scrutiny annual report should be strengthened to clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition its format should be standardised to clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings and to clearly display the outcomes of the previous years recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

4.3 These recommendations will be reported to all Scrutiny Boards for consideration. The Scrutiny Advisory Group will play a role in monitoring the implementation of the recommendations

4.4 In line with the Council's protocol for receiving external audit reports, the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee will also receive the audit report and may chose to refer particular issues to other committees, including Scrutiny Boards, for further detailed consideration. However, it was considered appropriate to bring the report to the first meeting of the Board as some of the recommendations refer to the running of Scrutiny Board meetings.

## **5.0 Recommendations**

5.1 Members are asked to consider the review's recommendations and accompanying management response and refer any comments to the Scrutiny Advisory Group.

### Background Papers

KPMG Scrutiny Review May 2009

This page is intentionally left blank





INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT AND HEALTHCARE

# Leeds City Council

## Scrutiny Review

### May 2009

AUDIT

AUDIT ■ TAX ■ ADVISORY

# Contents

1	Executive summary	2
2	Introduction	5
3	Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships	7
4	The vision and resources for scrutiny	11
5	Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles	13
6	Development of Scrutiny work programmes	16
7	Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards	18
8	Call-In arrangements	20
9	Service delivery, service improvements and added value of scrutiny	22
10	Policy development	24
11	Performance Management	26
	Appendix 1 – Recommendations and action plan	28

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any officer or Member acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. The Audit Commission has issued a document entitled *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies*. This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. We draw your attention to this document.

External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body's own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Adrian Lythgo, who is the engagement director to the Authority, telephone 0113 231 3054, email [adrian.lythgo@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:adrian.lythgo@kpmg.co.uk) who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact Trevor Rees on 0161 246 4000, email [trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk), who is the national contact partner for all of KPMG's work with the Audit Commission. After this, if you still are dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access the Audit Commission's complaints procedure. Put your complaint in writing to the Complaints Team, Westward House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS34 8SU or by e mail to: [complaints@audit-commission.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@audit-commission.gov.uk). Their telephone number is 0844 798 3131, textphone (minicom) 020 7630 0421.

# 1 Executive summary

## 1.1 Introduction

Scrutiny Boards are often referred to as the Council “watchdogs” by the press aiming to ensure that Council Tax payers get the best out of their public services. For Scrutiny Boards to provide this service they should have at least two components:

- Ongoing and retrospective consideration of decisions previously taken by the Executive; and
- Forward looking contributions to policy and improvement across the Council.

This review has focused on the ability for the Scrutiny function at Leeds City Council (LCC) to challenge the Council both in terms of ongoing and retrospective consideration of decisions and forward looking contributions to policy and improvement. We have also reviewed the scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards and the information available to Members of the Boards in carrying out their work and drawing their conclusions.

## 1.2 Key findings

We recognise that in light of the recent Corporate Assessment the Council has been in the process of continuing to strengthen its Scrutiny function and during our review we identified a number of aspects of good practice across the Council, such as:

- Professional relationships have been developed between the Scrutiny Board Chairs and the Principal Scrutiny Advisors;
- A wide range of training tools are used in providing training resources for Scrutiny Board Members;
- Personal development plans are available for all Members which assist in the identification of individual training needs; and
- Inquiry selection criteria forms are used to determine whether full scrutiny inquiries items will be added to the work programme of the Scrutiny Boards.

Whilst the Council continues to develop its Scrutiny function further and reflect best practice it should ensure that the following areas are strengthened:

- An overall vision for the Scrutiny function should be developed, documented and published;
- The trust between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to be maintained and developed in order to reinforce the importance of joint working;
- The relationship between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to continue to develop and political views need to be kept separate from the Scrutiny function;
- There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide to not undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so as to prevent any misunderstandings arising;

# 1 Executive summary continued

- The Scrutiny Boards Procedure Rules Guidance Notes should be strengthened to incorporate that the Scrutiny Boards strive for enhanced lines of internal communication; add value to the Council through the Scrutiny reviews undertaken and incorporate innovation into the approach for challenging the way the Council operates;
- The process of selecting Scrutiny Chairs should be reviewed and a 'job specification' introduced;
- Scrutiny Boards should review whether co-opted Members should be invited to join in their Board;
- All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item so that Scrutiny Boards can scan the horizon to identify any emerging issues;
- The efficiency of Scrutiny Board meetings needs to be improved. To achieve this timed or single item agendas should be encouraged where appropriate and pre-meetings used more effectively;
- Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon;
- Reports of Members attendance at Scrutiny meetings should be made to each of the political groups. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political party to take appropriate action to address this;
- Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and highlight if they feel this should direct any area of their annual work programme;
- Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery; and
- The Scrutiny annual report should be strengthened to clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition its format should be standardised to clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings and to clearly display the outcomes of the previous years recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

# 1 Executive summary continued

---

## 1.3 Way forward

We will discuss the findings of the review with Officers and Members to agree an action plan to address the key issues going forward.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Background

The current constitutions of Local Authorities give selected Councillors an important role in scrutinising the decisions of the Executive. The role of Scrutiny at LCC has evolved over the years and the Council now have established seven Scrutiny Boards whose responsibilities are to examine the decisions, policies and overall performance of the Council, making recommendations for improvement where necessary. The seven Scrutiny Boards cover:

- Adult Social Care;
- Central and Corporate Functions;
- Children’s Services;
- City and Regional Partnerships;
- City Development;
- Environment and Neighbourhoods; and
- Health.

The Scrutiny Boards are often referred to as the Council “watchdogs”, and are made up of Councillors from all political parties and some include Co-opted Members from outside the Council. Legislation requires that to ensure independence there are no Executive Members on any of the Scrutiny Boards.

### 2.2 Objectives and scope of our review

Our objective is to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in the improvement areas identified by the Corporate Assessment. We specifically focused upon:

- The scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards, their independence and the relationship with the Council’s leadership and the Executive Board;
- The extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision;



## 2. Introduction continued

---

- The extent to which the skills of the Members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfilment of their role;
- How scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards;
- The extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions;
- The design of the Call-In arrangements in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment' report;
- The extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements;
- The extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards;
- The extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council; and
- The extent to which Scrutiny provides effective challenge and adds value to the Council.

### 2.3 Audit approach

Our approach has been to:

- Review key documents;
- Interview key contacts;
- Observe scrutiny meetings;
- Share best practice; and
- Provide constructive challenge and support.

### 2.4 Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all those staff at the Council who have supported this review.

## 3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships

### 3.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards, their independence and the relationship with the Council's leadership and the Executive Board.

### 3.2 Scope and role of Scrutiny Boards

Each of the seven Scrutiny Boards have their own terms of reference which all outline the functions of the Boards. Within their terms of reference, all Scrutiny Boards state they will:

- Review or scrutinise the exercise of any function of the Council, Executive or any other matter;
- Make reports or recommendations to Council or the Executive either in connection with the exercise of any function of the Council, Executive or on any matter affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- Receive and review external audit and inspection reports;
- Act as the appropriate Scrutiny Board in relation to the Executive's initial proposals for a plan or strategy within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- Review corporate performance indicators; and
- Exercise the right to Call-In decisions made but not yet implemented by the Executive.

In addition all Scrutiny Boards may assist the Council and the Executive in the development and review of policies.

Having compared the terms of reference of the Scrutiny Boards at LCC with those of other Local Authorities it is evident that at LCC these are set within the legal framework whereas at other Authorities they also detail roles outside of this framework.

The softer roles referred to within other Local Authorities terms of reference include being innovative in the approach to Scrutiny; adding value through the reviews completed; striving for greater public involvement in Scrutiny; and improving communication within the Council and wider community. Whilst the role around engaging with the public is expressed within other documentation at LCC there is potential to enhance the procedural notes further by explicitly outlining additional functions / activities that Scrutiny could undertake.



## 3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

### Recommendation One

The Council should review the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Guidance Notes and add that the Scrutiny Boards will:

- Be innovative in their approach to challenging the way the Council operates;
- Add value to the Council through the reviews they do; and
- Strive to improve communication channels within the Council and the wider community.

### 3.3 Independence of the Scrutiny Boards and wider relationships

By law no Members of scrutiny boards may be from the Council's Executive Board. However to ensure that an effective Scrutiny function is in place it is essential that a two way relationship is developed between the Executive Board and the Scrutiny Boards. In essence the relationship between the Executive Board Member and the Chair of the Scrutiny Board will impact on how issues are raised and dealt with.

A number of the Scrutiny Chairs feel that relationships with other Members and Officers is a continually evolving process and needs to continue to develop. Executive Board Members also acknowledge that whilst relationships have improved with Scrutiny Chairs there is still further work to be done.

As a result of the need to continue to develop the relationships between Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Board Members and Officers there is an acknowledgment that Scrutiny is not as effective as it could be at LCC and all political groups appear accepting of this.

Some Scrutiny Chairs feel that the role of Scrutiny is under valued by some of the Executive Board and as a result Scrutiny has not been as successful as it could be. Whilst some Executive Board Members felt that Scrutiny has added value to the Council, a couple were unable to give any specific examples of this. Scrutiny Chairs feel that they have tried various techniques to engage with Executive Members including inviting them to meetings; asking for assistance to develop work programmes; having regular update meetings; and sharing Scrutiny recommendations although still there is a recognised need to continue to engage further.

## 3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

### Recommendation Two

The Council should publish and distribute local and national examples of where Scrutiny has added value and impact within the Annual Report. This should be seen by full Council and Officers. This will continue to convey the message that by engaging fully with Scrutiny the Council as a whole will benefit through improved public services.

The need to further develop the relationships between some Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers is clearly highlighted by a quote from one Scrutiny Chair "Executive Members will punish Officers for co-operating too fully with Scrutiny requests."

The 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' was devised to address the subtleties and nuances required to establish successful and robust Scrutiny. This should be re-distributed to facilitate professional working relationships and should be introduced on an Annual basis within the Members induction programme.

### Recommendation Three

The Council should raise the profile of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' and should encourage further engagement between the Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers. On an annual basis this document should also be included within the Members induction programme.

### 3.4 Public engagement

From the Scrutiny Board meetings attended it was noted that attendance by members of the public is poor. Advertising of Scrutiny Board meetings is principally done on the Council's internet site and if a Scrutiny meeting is to be held outside of the Civic centre then fliers will be produced to leave at the place of the new venue. In addition the Scrutiny Support Unit has a mailing list to communicate with people who have previously attended meetings. The Council should consider whether it may be appropriate to try and encourage greater public engagement and as part of this they could look at different methods of advertising their Scrutiny Board meetings.

In order to encourage greater engagement with members of the public and other partners the Council should consider having single item agendas. There have been a number of occurrences within some of the Scrutiny Boards where agenda items have been given disproportionate amounts of time and as a result attendees have been left waiting sometimes not being able to present their given agenda item.

### 3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

#### Recommendation Four

Single item agendas should be introduced for Scrutiny Board meetings to improve their efficiency.

In addition to encourage greater engagement with the public, witnesses and co-optees the Council should remind Members that Scrutiny Board meetings are not the appropriate forum to raise political views as there is a risk that by doing so these individuals may feel alienated.

#### Recommendation Five

Scrutiny Members should be reminded that Scrutiny Board meetings are not a forum to voice personal political views.

#### 3.5 Co-opted Members

Having attended Scrutiny meetings at LCC that had both co-opted Members on the Board and no co-opted Members there appeared to be a greater level of participation by all when the Boards contained co-opted Members. In addition the contribution made by the co-opted Members was very valuable as these Members were able to draw upon their experiences and provide a different perspective.

Currently the constitution of LCC does allow all Scrutiny Boards to have co-opted members it is just something that is not widely exercised. This is almost the opposite at Bristol City Council where there are a large number of Scrutiny Boards with co-opted Members. The Scrutiny Support Unit has however been proactive in this area and have recently taken a paper to the Scrutiny Advisory Group highlighting the benefits of having co-opted Members on Scrutiny Boards.

#### Recommendation Six

Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.

## 4 The vision and resources for scrutiny

### 4.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision.

### 4.2 Vision for effective Scrutiny

By having an overall vision, aim or objective for a particular function it can serve to provide a clearer understanding of that function and demonstrate the added value that that function can bring.

From the documentation reviewed relating to Scrutiny at LCC there was no reference to what the Council see as their vision for Scrutiny. Following discussions with the Scrutiny Board Chairs, it was also clear that they each had their own personal visions for Scrutiny with there being no overarching Council wide vision. The visions from speaking to various Scrutiny Board Chairs included “holding the executive to account”; “getting involved in pre-policy decisions”; and “improving services for members of the public”.

### Recommendation Seven

The Council should ascertain what their overall vision is for the Scrutiny function, formally document this and then publicise it, potentially within the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule Guidance Notes.

### 4.3 Resources for effective Scrutiny

Whilst there is no overall vision as to the role of Scrutiny at LCC all Officers and Members interviewed felt that the financial resources available to the Scrutiny function were adequate to enable it to fulfil its role. The actual expenditure relating to the Scrutiny support function totalled £574,312 in 2007-08; £585,247 in 2006-07; and £503,875 in 2005-06.

One area of concern that was raised by a Scrutiny Board Chair related to whether members of the Scrutiny Boards fully understand the totality of issues being discussed. Whilst the Scrutiny Boards have access to independent research facilities this

## 4 The vision and resources for scrutiny continued

Member felt that these were predominately internet based and did not allow for specialist expertise to always be obtained on a particular topic area. The Scrutiny Support Unit does however provide a newspaper clipping service for Scrutiny Board Chairs which enables Members to gain further information relating to topic areas and facilitates some horizon scanning to be undertaken and potential emerging issues identified. In addition the Scrutiny Support Unit keep track of up and coming legislation, current consultations, departmental forward plans, publications by pressures, quangos and national bodies and attend numerous seminars and conferences and report back on all of these.

In addition there are a number of web based forums which Scrutiny Members are encouraged to access to gain further information or identify emerging issues. There has also been a Regional Chairs Forum although Members from LCC have not accessed this facility.

### Recommendation Eight

Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon and it will enable further horizon scanning of emerging issues to be undertaken.



## 5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles

### 5.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the skills of the members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfilment of their role.

### 5.2 Matching of members skills against the requirements of their role

The Scrutiny Boards are composed of elected Members who are selected to represent the political balance of the Council. As a result each political group has its own method of selection for appointing Chairs and Members to the Scrutiny Boards. However there is no formal matching undertaken by any of the political groups of the skills of Chairs and Members and the skill requirements of a particular Board. Given that there is no formal matching there is a risk that the most suitable candidate in terms of skills, experiences or even interest in the subject matter is not appointed as a Chair or Member of a Scrutiny Board.

### 5.3 Attendance

The table below highlights the percentage of members for each of the Scrutiny Boards that have attended 50% or less of the Scrutiny Board meetings in the time period 1 June 2008 – 19 March 2009:

Scrutiny Board	Percentage of members who have attended 50% or less of the meetings held between 1 June 2008 – 19 March 2009
Adult Social Care	23%
Central and Corporate	14%
Children's Services	27%
City Development	8%
City and Regional Partnerships	17%
Environment and Neighbourhoods	40%
Health	36%

## 5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles continued

This table clearly highlights that there are a large number of Scrutiny Board Members who are not attending meetings on a regular basis. In addition not only is there a poor attendance rate by some but there are other Members who are either late or who leave meetings early. Poor attendance rates, arriving late or leaving meetings early does not enable all Members to fully engage in the Scrutiny process.

Currently the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development sends reports to the Scrutiny Board Chairs and group Whips highlighting attendance rates for their Members. There is now a need for this to also be sent to each of the political groups for them to take action. For Scrutiny to be seen as effective across the Council it is paramount that Members who sit on each of the Boards attend and contribute to as many meetings as possible.

### Recommendation Nine

Regular reports should be made to the political parties highlighting the attendance rates for their Members. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political group to take appropriate action to address this. Alternatively the number of members on Scrutiny Boards could be reduced if there are too many competing demands on Members' time.

It is recognised by some Executive and Scrutiny Members that the Scrutiny function at LCC could be strengthened. Having attended a number of Scrutiny meetings it has been evident that the chairing styles of the Boards does differ and this can lead to there being a lack of clarity over what information the Board actually requires; to agenda items being given disproportionate amounts of time; and the engagement with other partners and members of the public being weak. The Council should therefore look closely at the methods used in appointing Scrutiny Chairs. Due to the differences previously highlighted in the selection methods employed by each of the political groups there is a risk that the Members appointed as Chairs of the Scrutiny Boards are not the most suitable. The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.

### Recommendation Ten

The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.

## 5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles continued

---

There appears to be a range of methods used within the Local Government sector in terms of appointing individuals as Chairs of Scrutiny. These methods include:

- An informal process of nomination, dealt with by each political group and endorsed by full Council;
- Having job specifications, against which each political party appoints the most suitable candidate; and
- Using job specifications for the leader of each political party to formally interview candidates against.



## 6 Development of Scrutiny work programmes

### 6.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses how scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards.

### 6.2 Development of Scrutiny work programmes

The first meeting of the year for Scrutiny Boards is held in June where the work programmes for the year are developed. Work programmes are developed having had access to a wide range of information including key performance indicators, external audit and inspections reports and financial data etc. Work programmes are not finalised documents as they are seen to evolve throughout the year.

As work programmes are evolving documents and to ensure that all Members continually identify new areas for inclusion in the work programme each Scrutiny Board should have a standing agenda item which allows for real time monitoring of issues, so that any emerging issues can be identified. This will enable any current issues to be added where appropriate to the work programme and will facilitate the Scrutiny Board being perceived to be having greater impact by continually scanning the horizon for potential issues.

#### Recommendation Eleven

All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item.

For a detailed inquiry area to be added to the work programme it will be considered against the Council's 'inquiry selection criteria' and the Scrutiny Board will consult with the relevant Director and Executive Member. The ultimate decision of whether to add an inquiry area to the work programme lies with the Scrutiny Board.

The Council also have a 'request for scrutiny' form that anyone can complete and submit to the relevant Scrutiny Board, this is subject to the same selection criteria above.

## 6 Development of Scrutiny work programmes continued

---

At one of the Scrutiny Board meetings attended there was debate about whether or not to add a particular inquiry area to the work programme. Whilst Members of the board spent a considerable amount of time debating whether or not to add this to their work programme it was incorrectly pointed out that this had not been discussed with either the relevant Director or Executive Member. It was therefore decided to move this agenda item to the next meeting. This action was not actually required and could potentially lead to alienation of Members, partners and members of the public if meetings are not conducted in an efficient manner. By ensuring that all Scrutiny boards hold effective pre-meetings this will help to ensure that similar situations are limited.

## 7 Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards

### 7.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions.

### 7.2 Quality / Quantity of information

There is a general feeling amongst the Scrutiny Board Members that the quality of information they receive to enable them to reach appropriate decisions is to a high standard. This is felt to be facilitated by the strong relationships that the Scrutiny Board Members have developed with their Principal Scrutiny Advisors.

Across all Council meetings, not just Scrutiny, there is a trend for very large agenda packs. The risk of having such large agenda packs is that people do not get sufficient time to read the contents fully. Having reviewed all Scrutiny agenda packs for March 2009 there are only two with less than one hundred pages and there are four Scrutiny Boards with agenda packs greater than one hundred and fifty pages. The quantity of information that is presented and the number of agenda items may be a contributing factor as to why the contribution within some Scrutiny Board meetings of some Members is limited. The Council should consider whether the agenda packs could be limited in size as this could potentially lead to greater engagement by both Members and other attendees.

At one of the Children's Services Scrutiny Board meetings however, some Members felt that insufficient information was presented to decide if to go ahead and hold an inquiry hence adding an item to their work programme. As a consequence the agenda item had to be carried forward to the next meeting.

All Scrutiny Boards should ensure that they use their pre-meetings more effectively as this should be the forum for Members to voice concerns over the sufficiency of information presented. Chairs should ensure that at pre-meetings all Members are focused upon the forth coming meeting and they should ensure all Members identify which agenda item they will lead on. By having more focused pre-meetings this should lead to more efficient Scrutiny Board meetings.

## 7 Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards continued

### Recommendation Twelve

Scrutiny pre-meetings should be more effectively used. They should be a forum to provide real focus in advance of the Scrutiny meeting.

## 8 Call-In arrangements

### 8.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the design of the Call-In arrangements specifically in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment'.

### 8.2 Call In arrangements

Within the Local Government Act 2000 there is a requirement that Overview and Scrutiny Committees are given the power to recommend that a decision made but not implemented be reconsidered, 'Called In'. As 'Calling In' of a decision can lead to a period of delay before a decision is implemented it was envisaged that this mechanism is used sparingly.

The recent Corporate Assessment made the following observations in relation to Call in arrangements:

*".... Call-In arrangements need to be reviewed to support a fair and effective approach.... Call In arrangements are considered ineffective by many Councillors as two political parties have to agree which has resulted in few Call Ins in recent years."*

Following this observation the Council approved changes to its constitution in May 2008. Call In arrangements must now be signed by:

- Two Non Executive elected Members (who are not from the same political party); or
- Any five Non Executive elected Members.

Following the changes implemented above another review of the Call In arrangements was undertaken in October 2008 and the following arrangements implemented:

- Scrutiny Board Members should no longer be signatories to Call Ins which they will hear;
- A substitute Member is entitled to attend the Scrutiny Board meeting where the Call In is received in place of a regular Member; and
- Call in meetings can be adjourned up to a maximum of five working days to allow information not available at the time but considered crucial by the Scrutiny Board in order to reach a decision.

## 8 Call-In arrangements continued

As a consequence of these changes there has been an increase in the number of Call Ins received, which now appear in line with the level of Call Ins at other Local Authorities. These changes have also led to the view that Call Ins are becoming increasingly more effective.

One of the decisions recently Called In was at the City Development Scrutiny Board and related to a decision made around cemeteries and crematoria fees. Whilst this decision was released for implementation, it was noted that under the Officer Delegation, the decision had been implemented before the Call In period had expired. Internal Audit at the Council have recently highlighted this issue and included a recommendation within one of their reports.

### Recommendation Thirteen

The Scrutiny Support Unit should remind Officers of the processes that need to be adhered to relating to Call Ins.

## 9 Service delivery, service improvements and added value of Scrutiny

### 9.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements and the extent to which Scrutiny adds value to the Council.

### 9.2 Service delivery and service improvements

Historically Scrutiny Boards have had no comprehensive system for tracking the implementation of recommendations. Hence it has not always been clear to demonstrate service delivery or improvements following recommendations made. To address this the Council have recently implemented a formal tracking system so that Scrutiny Boards can monitor the implementation of their recommendations in a more systematic way.

In addition on an annual basis a report is produced of the work undertaken by the Council's Scrutiny Boards. This highlights in detail the areas of focus of each Board and highlights some of the recommendations made. This could be further strengthened by outlining the service benefits of these recommendations as a demonstration of the impact Scrutiny can have.

#### Recommendation Fourteen

Within the Scrutiny annual report each Scrutiny Board should clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the impact of their recommendations and the outcomes recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

Whilst not having had a formalised monitoring system in place for a long period of time, the Council is still able to highlight a wide range of examples of where the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in service delivery or improvements. A selection of examples are highlighted below:

- In November 2005 the Children's Services Scrutiny Board established a Young People's Scrutiny Forum to carry out scrutiny on topics chosen by the young people themselves. In their second year the Young People's Scrutiny Forum reviewed transport arrangements in Leeds for Young People and a local campaign has been launched for free bus travel for young people.



## 9 Service delivery, service improvements and added value of Scrutiny continued

- The Children's Services Scrutiny Board have been involved in steering the Council's approach to the development of Trust Schools to enable a proactive strategic approach to maximise the potential that Trust Schools might have in improving outcomes for children in deprived communities.
- The Scrutiny Boards also provide an important function to ensure that all parties have their views heard and comprehensively reflected. This has recently been evidenced where staff at a local school agreed to call off strike action after it was decided that Scrutiny would undertake an inquiry into a school based issue.
- The Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards have previously been acknowledged as being instrumental in improving the negotiations and working relationships between the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust and the LGI Kidney Patients Association.
- Some of the funding awarded by the Centre for Public Scrutiny has been used to achieve one of the objectives of the Healthy Leeds Partnership's 'Health and Wellbeing Plan' which was to establish a Community Development Network for Leeds.
- Following a recommendation made by the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards being implemented, for a representative from the Council's Development Department to become a member of the Leeds Childhood Obesity Strategy Group, it is recognised that they have played an active part in developing the action plan for tackling childhood obesity.
- The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board have been involved in an inquiry into the Council's own CO2 emissions. From reviewing this it is highly commendable to see the Board had factored into their inquiry future legislative changes relating to the Carbon Reduction Commitment.

All of the examples highlighted above have been identified by Scrutiny Members. None of the Executive Members interviewed were able to say when questioned any areas where Scrutiny has added value or where Scrutiny recommendations had lead to service improvements. When asked as to why the Executive Members felt this was the case, some stated that they felt Scrutiny had become "cosy" and the enquiries held were "not very challenging". Some Executive Members felt that Scrutiny recommendations were ones that predominately had been generated by Officers themselves. Having reviewed a large number of Scrutiny recommendations this does not always appear to be the case although it does highlight the need for all Scrutiny Members to ensure they act with professional scepticism in all they do.



# 10 Policy development

## 10.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards.

## 10.2 Policy development

Policy development can take the form of being involved in the development of a new policy area or can involve suggesting modifications to previous policies. Across the Council there are examples that a number of Scrutiny Boards are involved in some form of policy development, even if at the out set the area of review was not badged as policy development. Whilst there is still room for improvement in ensuring all Scrutiny Boards are more involved in policy development there is a consensus that there is a shift in the right direction and increasingly more work is being done in this area. From a review of the 2007/08 annual report which categorises the different types of work that the seven Scrutiny Boards have been involved in, it is clear to see that 33% of their total work in 2007/08 involved some form of policy review or development compared to 24% in 2006/07.

There are however, a number of Scrutiny Board Members who feel that they would like to be more involved in policy development. Following discussions with both Scrutiny Chairs and Executive Members there are a small number of inconsistencies in how the role of Scrutiny in policy development is viewed. From the feedback we received some Scrutiny Chairs do feel bypassed in policy development. Some Executive Members however felt that despite providing direction to Scrutiny Boards in terms of useful areas of work and policy development that they would like Scrutiny to get involved in, this is often ignored. During our review, however, we found limited evidence of this. In addition Executive Members stated that no rationale was provided as to why these areas were not felt to be priorities for the Scrutiny Boards.

### Recommendation Fifteen

There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so to prevent any misunderstandings arising.

## 10 Policy development continued

From a review of this years and prior years' work programmes it is evident that one example of where the Culture and Leisure Scrutiny Board (as it was previously called) could have been more involved in policy development was in regards to the proposals to establish a Sports Trust. The Board did however identify this as a potential area of work although following discussions decided against taking this forward.

There are a number of examples however of where the Scrutiny Boards have been able to demonstrate involvement in policy development. Examples include:

- The Children's Services Scrutiny Board where they have been actively involved in policy development relating to the services for 8 – 13 year olds; the development of an inclusion Strategy; and the education and training provision in Leeds for 14 – 19 year olds;
- The City Development Scrutiny Board have commented on a number of ongoing plans and strategies which has included the Local Development Framework;
- The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board have been involved in an inquiry into housing lettings which examined the Council's current housing lettings policy; and
- The Health Scrutiny Board have recently commenced an inquiry looking at teenage pregnancy and sexual health.

The Council's Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report is an excellent forum to highlight the examples of where the Scrutiny Boards have been involved in policy development or service enhancements. However other than in the introductory section - 'Work of the Boards' which shows the different types of work Scrutiny has been involved in, and the Children's Services section which shows the areas where they have been involved in the review of existing policy and the development of new policy, the remaining report sections make it difficult to identify which areas of work relate to policy development or review. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development is looking to make changes to the 2008/09 Annual Report to make the identification of policy development work streams easier.

### Recommendation Sixteen

Templates for the layout of the Annual Report should be provided to Scrutiny Chairs so to increase the consistency and to enable greater comparability between the work of each of the Boards. Within the Annual Report each Scrutiny Board should clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings.

# 11 Performance Management

## 11.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council.

## 11.2 The role of performance management within Scrutiny

At the start of the year when the work programmes for the Scrutiny Boards are developed (June) performance management information is shared with each Board to enable this to shape the direction of their work.

Performance management information is then presented on a quarterly basis to enable the Board to challenge the information and ask questions where appropriate to either the Executive Member, a corporate performance management Officer or the relevant Services Director. This should then provide some assurance that adequate progress is being made and where this is not the case provides a mechanism to challenge performance further.

Concern was raised by one Scrutiny Board Member that consistent poor performance against a particular key performance indicator (KPI) is not identified by Officers as being a potential area where the Scrutiny Board can provide insight and add value to the Council. Some Members, however have to take greater ownership and accountability here and not rely upon others to direct their work programmes but should feel empowered to proactively identify this themselves.

### Recommendation Seventeen

Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and use this to direct any area of their annual work programme.

Some Scrutiny Board Members also raised concern that whilst they are presented with data relating to KPIs on an exception basis they often do not fully understand the impact of this. Some organisations actually present information relating to what the impact is on the organisation of not achieving a particular KPI, this may be something the Council should consider for particular KPIs that have had historical poor performance.

# 11 Performance Management continued

## Recommendation Eighteen

Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery. This may help identify areas where the Council could involve Scrutiny Boards further.

There are good examples however of where some Scrutiny Boards are clearly using performance information to shape their work programmes. The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board are one such board which have identified areas where performance was not meeting the required targets and used this to request more detailed information which lead to an inquiry being undertaken.

### 11.3 Performance Management of Scrutiny

Within the Scrutiny Annual Report there is detail provided of the work that is undertaken by each of the seven Scrutiny Boards. Each Scrutiny Board provides a brief summary of the work they have undertaken and the recommendations raised however it is difficult given the current format of the report to monitor the actual outcomes. Each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the outcomes of the recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable. This will ensure that the impact of Scrutiny is clearly identifiable. This is to be incorporated into the 2009/10 Annual Report.

# Recommendations and action plan

***	<b>Significant residual risk</b> **	<b>Some residual risk</b> *	<b>Little residual risk</b> *	<b>Little residual risk</b>
	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Responsibility and timescale</b>
1	<p>The Council should review the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Guidance Notes and add that the Scrutiny Boards will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be innovative in their approach to challenging the way the Council operates;</li> <li>• Add value to the Council through the reviews they do; and</li> <li>• Strive to improve communication channels within the Council and the wider community.</li> </ul>	*	Agree.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development September 2009
2	<p>The Council should publish and distribute local and national examples of where Scrutiny has added value and impact within the Annual Report. This should be seen by full Council and Officers. This will continue to convey the message that by engaging fully with Scrutiny the Council as a whole will benefit through improved public services.</p>	***	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The Annual report is already presented to full council.</p> <p>A number of scrutiny case studies have featured in national toolkits and studies. In addition some scrutiny reviews were featured in the 'Picture of Leeds' series produced for the CPA in 2007.</p> <p>We will look at strengthening this aspect by incorporating such messages into our overall 'communications strategy'.</p>	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development September 2009



# Recommendations and action plan

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	Little residual risk	
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	
3	The Council should raise the profile of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' and should encourage further engagement between the Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers. On an annual basis this document should also be included within the Members induction programme.	***	Agree. The development of a Council vision for scrutiny (recommendation 7) will be a good tool to develop this engagement further. The 'Memorandum of Understanding' will be refreshed and re-circulated annually.	Responsibility and timescale Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards
4	Single item agendas should be introduced for Scrutiny Board meetings to improve their efficiency.	**	Agree. Scrutiny Boards will be encouraged to focus on single item agendas wherever possible and appropriate when developing their work programmes.	Scrutiny Chairs/Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards
5	Scrutiny Members should be reminded that Scrutiny Board meetings are not a forum to voice personal political views	**	Agree. This will first take place at the June meeting, but Group whips will be reminded via the publication of this report. We accept that whilst party politics should be left at the door, Members will rightly be influenced by their political views but will make recommendations based on evidence.	Scrutiny Chairs/Group Whips/Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards

## Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	* Management response	Little residual risk Responsibility and timescale
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale
6	Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.	**	Agree. This will be a formal item on the June Scrutiny Board meeting agendas.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009
7	The Council should ascertain what their overall vision is for the Scrutiny function, formally document this and then publicise it, potentially within the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule Guidance Notes.	*	Agree. We would suggest that the CfPS five principles of scrutiny are used as a starting point. This will require sign up by the Leaders and should involve a wide range of stakeholders.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Administration Leaders/Scrutiny Chairs October 2009
8	Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon and it will enable further horizon scanning of emerging issues to be undertaken.	*	Agree. Members will be reminded of these resources on an annual basis at the start of the municipal year, as well as on an ongoing basis.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards

## Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	* Management response	Little residual risk Responsibility and timescale
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale
9	Regular reports should be made to the political parties highlighting the attendance rates for their Members. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political group to take appropriate action to address this. Alternatively the number of members on Scrutiny Boards could be reduced if there are too many competing demands on Members' time.	**	Agree. We currently do this to political groups.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Group Whips Ongoing
10	The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.	**	We shall be introducing 'job specifications' as part of our bid to achieve 'CharterPlus' for Member Development. Whilst the competencies required for the role will be made available to the political groups, the groups need to consider the requirements for the role within the context of national party rules.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development October 2009 Political Groups



## Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk *	Little residual risk	
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	
			Responsibility and timescale	
11	All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item.	*	Agree. All Scrutiny Boards have a standing item where they review their work programme, and receive the Forward Plan and Executive Board minutes to assist them in any reprioritisation of work. This is required by the Council's constitution. All Scrutiny Boards also have the facility to engage in general discussions with the appropriate Executive Member and Director about service issues. We would not envisage this being a standing item but a facility available to Scrutiny Boards when appropriate.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development Ongoing
12	Scrutiny pre-meetings should be more effectively used. They should be a forum to provide real focus in advance of the Scrutiny meeting.	**	Agree. We believe that there is scope to improve on the current use of pre-meetings.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Scrutiny Chairs June 2009 onwards
13	The Scrutiny Support Unit should remind Officers of the processes that need to be adhered to relating to Call Ins.	*	Agree. We will work with colleagues in Governance Services to ensure officers across the council are aware of the stages and timescales involved in the decision-making process, particularly in relation to the call-in requirements.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/Head of Governance Services September 2009

## Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk *	Little residual risk	
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	
			Responsibility and timescale	
14	<p>Within the Scrutiny annual report each Scrutiny Board should clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the impact of their recommendations and the outcomes recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.</p>	**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This will be introduced for the 2009/10 Annual Report.</p> <p>The progress of recommendations will relate mainly to those recommendations made the previous year. We will use our existing recommendation tracking system to provide this information.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2010</p>
15	<p>There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so to prevent any misunderstandings arising.</p>	**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The success of this will depend on the relationship between Scrutiny and Executive Board Members. The work programme setting meeting in June will be crucial for this to be a success.</p> <p>The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules already require the Board to provide an explanation where it turns down a suggestion from the Executive Board.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards</p>

## Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk	**	Some residual risk	*	Little residual risk
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response		Responsibility and timescale
16	Templates for the layout of the Annual Report should be provided to Scrutiny Chairs so to increase the consistency and to enable greater comparability between the work of each of the Boards. Within the Annual Report each Scrutiny Board should clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings.	**	Agree. This will be introduced for the 2009/10 Annual Report. The use of categories of work has been introduced for the 2008/09 annual report	*	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2010
17	Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and use this to direct any area of their annual work programme.	**	Agree. A training session, facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny will take place in June and the messages reinforced throughout the year.		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2009 onwards
18	Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery. This may help identify areas where the Council could involve Scrutiny Boards further.	**	Agree. This will be fed into the quarterly performance monitoring reports received by all Scrutiny Boards		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and Head of Policy, Planning and Improvement October 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

**Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Date: 30 June 2009**

**Subject: Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK) – Annual Report (2008/09)**

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p>          <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 20px; display: inline-block; margin-right: 10px;"></div> Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)
---

### 1.0 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Scrutiny Board (Health) with the 2008/09 Annual Report of Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK). This will be the first annual report produced by Leeds LINK.
- 1.2 In presenting the LINK's Annual Report (2008/09), it is intended that this will:
- Continue to raise awareness of the role and work of Leeds' LINK (both publicly and among members of the Scrutiny Board (Health));
  - Provide members with more detail of what Leeds' LINK has done during its first year, alongside any future plans; and,
  - Provide an opportunity for a general discussion between the Scrutiny Board (Health) and representative members of Leeds' LINK, including any work programme issues.

### 2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave a duty to all 150 local authorities in England with social services responsibilities, to enable the formation of a Local Involvement Network (LINK).
- 2.2 The LINK will act as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums, but with an extended remit covering social care. Run by local people and groups, the role of a LINK is to promote involvement; to find out what people like and dislike about local services; monitor the care provided by services; and use LINK powers to hold services to account. In summary, this will be achieved by:
- Asking local people what they think about local health and social care services, and providing a chance to suggest ideas to help improve services;

- Investigating specific issues of concern to the community;
- Using powers to hold providers and commissioners to account and get results;
- Asking for information and get an answer in a specified amount of time;
- Using authorised representatives to 'enter and view' premises to see if services are working well;
- Making reports and recommendations and receive a response;

2.3 Under the provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the LINK also has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken

### **3.0 Leeds' Local Involvement Network (LINK)**

3.1 Locally, in August 2008, the Shaw Trust was appointed as the host organisation to support the work of the Leeds' LINK. Since that time it has been working with the LINK Preparatory Group to get a wide range of people and organisations involved in the LINK. In addition, an Interim Steering Group (the membership of which was drawn from the LINK Preparatory Group) was established to act as a provisional decision-making body, pending the establishment of a formal steering group (the 'core group') following appropriate elections.

3.2 The LINK was formally launched on 9 June 2009. Immediately after the launch, the election process to establish the 'core group' commenced. Following nominations, the actual election period will take place during July 2009, with the announcement of the 'core group' expected in early August 2009. Until that time the Interim Steering Group will continue to act as the decision-making body.

#### Annual Report

3.3 LINKs are accountable to the public and to the Secretary of State for Health. As such, every year all LINKs are required to publish an annual report, which will also be sent to the Care Quality Commission, to relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Scrutiny Boards), Primary Care Trusts (NHS Leeds) and the Strategic Health Authority (NHS Yorkshire and the Humber).

3.4 The Annual Report (2008/09) for the Leeds' LINK, covering the period 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009, is currently being prepared and will be agreed by the Interim Steering Group. The deadline for the completion of the Annual Report (2008/09) is 30 June 2009. A copy of the Annual Report (2008/09) is attached at Appendix 1 (to follow).

3.5 Representatives from Leeds' LINK (the Interim Steering Group) have been invited to attend the meeting to both present the Annual Report and discuss any pertinent issues with the Scrutiny Board (Health).

### **4.0 Recommendation**

4.1 Members of the Scrutiny Board (Health) are asked to consider Leeds' LINK's 2008/09 Annual Report and the discussion at the meeting, and:

- Determine any matters that will inform the Board's future work programme;
- Identify any issues that may impact/ influence the Board's longer term relationship with Leeds' LINK.

### **5.0 Background Papers**

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

**Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Date: 30 June 2009**

**Subject: Determining the Work Programme 2009/10**

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p>          <div style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; vertical-align: middle;"></div> Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)	<p><b>Specific Implications For:</b></p> <p>Equality and Diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Community Cohesion <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--

### 1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to help the Scrutiny Board determine its priorities and work programme for 2009/10.

### 2.0 Introduction

2.1 Through a number of the previous agenda items, the Scrutiny Board has been provided with a range of information and inputs from key stakeholders that should help identify the Board's priorities and develop its work programme for 2009/10.

#### Health Scrutiny Protocol

2.2 In order to successfully deliver the Scrutiny Board's work programme, the relationship between the Board and the NHS bodies across the City will be key. To help maintain this relationship it is essential that guidance exists to help provide a common understanding on how Health Scrutiny will operate in Leeds and provide a framework for the scope and style of Scrutiny in the City. Such a protocol will help to ensure that scrutiny remains a positive and challenging process for all parties concerned.

2.3 A protocol was previously developed and agreed by the Scrutiny Board in April 2003, shortly after the health scrutiny duty became a requirement. While the fundamentals for health scrutiny remain, there have been a number of developments, both nationally and locally, since 2006 that need to be reflected in a revised protocol. In this regard, a draft revised protocol is attached at Appendix 1 for the Board's consideration and agreement.

2.4 Subject to any identified and agreed amendments, the Board is asked to consider and agree the attached draft Protocol between the Scrutiny Board (Health) and NHS bodies in Leeds (Updated June 2009).

#### Health Proposals Working Group

2.5 Current legislation places a duty local NHS bodies to make arrangements to involve and consult patients and the public in planning service provision, the development of proposals for changes, and decisions about changes to the operation of services.

2.6 The requirement to consult on service changes and/or developments, includes a duty to consult the Health Scrutiny Board where the NHS body is considering any proposals relating to substantial changes and/or development of local health services.

2.7 In recent years, to help the Scrutiny Board maintain a focus on changes and/or developments of local health services, while maintaining the Board's capacity to undertake detailed inquiries, the Scrutiny Board has established a Health Proposals Working Group to:

- Consider, at an early stage, any future proposals for service changes and/or developments of local health services, including:
  - Whether or not the relevant Trust's plans for patient and public engagement and involvement seem satisfactory<sup>1</sup>; and,
  - Whether the proposal is in the interests of the local health service.
- Maintain an overview and on-going involvement in current service change proposals and associated patient and public engagement and involvement activity, including details of any stakeholder feedback and how this is being used to shape the proposals.
- Refer any matters of significant concern to the Health Scrutiny Board for consideration.

2.8 Within these arrangements it has always been recognised that the statutory duty to consider substantial changes and/ or development of local health services remains the responsibility of the Health Scrutiny Board itself.

2.9 As such, and in line with practice from previous years, revised draft terms of reference for a Health Proposals Working Group is attached at Appendix 2 for the Board's consideration.

2.10 In considering the attached revised draft terms of reference, Members' attention is drawn to the following proposed activity of the Health Proposals Working Group:

- Review the implementation of any agreed service change and/or development, including any subsequent service user feedback.

2.11 This addition seeks to further develop the role of the Working Group, not only to oversee proposed changes and the associated levels of patient and public engagement, but also to consider the implementation of agreed changes, to help ensure the anticipated improvements are delivered.

---

<sup>1</sup> This early engagement with Scrutiny will allow the Working Group to discuss and agree the proposed degree of variation, prior to the commencement of any patient and public engagement and involvement activity



- 2.12 The Board is asked to consider establishing a Health Proposals Working Group in line with the attached draft terms of reference (subject to any identified and agreed amendments) and determine the membership of the working group (if appropriate).

### Work Programme

- 2.13 Having considered the range of written information presented and discussed relevant issues with those present at the meeting, the Board is now asked to consider formulating a draft work programme.
- 2.14 In formulating its work programme the Scrutiny Board shall consider and determine;
- how the proposed inquiry meets criteria approved from time to time by the Scrutiny Advisor Group (Appendix 3)
  - whether the programme can be adequately resourced and timetabled (Appendix 4)
- 2.15 In addition, Executive Board minutes from 13 May 2009 and 17 June 2009 are attached for the information. These might usefully inform the development of the Board's work programme.

## **3.0 Recommendations**

- 3.1 Members are requested to:

- 3.1.1 Consider, amend as necessary, and agree the draft Protocol between the Scrutiny Board (Health) and NHS bodies in Leeds (Updated June 2009);
- 3.1.2 Establish a Health Proposals Working Group in line with the attached draft terms of reference (subject to any identified and agreed amendments) and, if appropriate, determine the membership of the working group;
- 3.1.3 Determine the Board's priorities and agree an outline work programme for 2009/10.

## **4.0 Background Papers**

Council's Constitution - Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules  
Protocol between the Scrutiny Board (Health) and NHS bodies in Leeds (agreed April 2003)

This page is intentionally left blank



**LEEDS**  
**CITY COUNCIL**

**Scrutiny Board (Health)**

**Protocol between the Scrutiny Board (Health)  
and NHS Bodies in Leeds**

**Updated: June 2009**

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this protocol is to provide guidance and a common understanding on how Health Scrutiny will operate in Leeds and provide a framework for the scope and style of Scrutiny in the City. In so doing the aim for all parties is to help ensure that Scrutiny remains a positive and challenging process.

## **Background**

The overview and scrutiny function was established through the Local Government Act 2000, which introduced new models of governance and decision-making arrangements for local authorities in England and Wales. In these arrangements, the overall role of the overview and scrutiny function is to hold the Executive Board to account for its decisions and to contribute to evidence-based policy development in the Council.

The Health and Social Care Act 2001 first introduced the concept of Local Authority scrutiny of health and required:

- NHS bodies to consult health local authorities about proposed substantial variations to or substantial developments of health services within their areas; and,
- those local authorities with social services responsibilities to establish an Overview and Scrutiny Committee to respond to consultations by local NHS bodies on proposed substantial variations to or developments of services.

Building on the powers to promote community well-being contained in the Local Government Act 2000, the Health and Social Care Act 2001 provides explicit powers for local authorities to scrutinise health services within their areas as part of their wider role in reducing health inequalities. Currently, the Health Scrutiny Board has been designated to act as Leeds City Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee responsible for undertaking the health scrutiny role

To assist with the planning and development of effective overview and scrutiny of health and health services, the Department of Health published its guidance '*Overview and Scrutiny of Health – guidance*' in July 2003. This guidance is available from the Department of Health's website. It should be noted that the Department of Health is currently undertaking a review of its guidance to reflect identified good practice and developments and changes to the legislation.

## **Scrutiny Boards (general)**

The overall role and function of scrutiny is to hold decision-makers to account and secure improvements in local practice for local people via a contribution to policy development and review. As such, Scrutiny Boards do not have decision-making powers.

Scrutiny Boards will comprise of Elected Members selected to represent the political balance of the local authority. These Members will be the only members of the Board with voting rights and will be selected to serve for a period of 12 months. The membership of the Board will seek to avoid conflicts of interest and where potential for this exists interests of those Members will be declared and subject to the Council's procedures on these matters<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Leeds City Council Constitution - Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Section 2

Scrutiny Boards may seek nominations from other representative groups to act as co-opted members of the Board. These nominations may be for the duration of a municipal year and/or on an inquiry by inquiry basis, as set out in the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, Leeds City Council Constitution.

### Support arrangements

The Scrutiny Support Unit is the primary source of support for, and co-ordination of, the work of the Council's Scrutiny Boards. In summary, the role of the Scrutiny Support Unit is to:

- Provide a research and intelligence function to individual Scrutiny Boards (each of which has been allocated a different area of specialism)
- Manage programmes of Inquiries for each of the Scrutiny Boards
- Manage the presentation of witnesses, research and reports to Scrutiny Boards and/or carrying out research and reports "in house" as appropriate
- Assist Scrutiny Boards to prepare reports of their Inquiries and steering recommendations through the Council's decision making arrangements
- Lead the continuing development of the Overview and Scrutiny function

## **HEALTH SCRUTINY IN LEEDS**

### **Overview**

#### Scope

Health scrutiny in Leeds covers all aspects of health and health related services provided to the population of Leeds; this includes the planning, provision and operation of services<sup>2</sup> commissioned and provided by NHS bodies and the local authority in Leeds. The primary aims of the health scrutiny function are to identify whether:

- health services reflect the views and aspirations of local communities;
- all sections of local communities have equal access to services;
- all sections of local communities have an equal chance of a successful outcome from services; and,
- any proposals for substantial service changes are reasonable.

#### NHS Trusts

The Scrutiny Board will not manage the performance of NHS Trusts in the City, or provide another form of inspection. Such functions will be undertaken by other external bodies such as, the Commission for Quality Care, the Strategic Health Authority, the National Institute for Clinical Excellence and the Commission for Health Improvement. However, it should be recognised that performance data will often usefully inform Scrutiny inquiries and support the work of the Scrutiny Board in considering the delivery of the objectives of the Local Area Agreement (LAA).

Health Scrutiny will be distinctive in being undertaken by lay, elected representatives and focussed on improving health and well being across Leeds.

---

<sup>2</sup> This includes all internally and externally provided services that contribute to the overall health and well-being of the residents and working population of Leeds

## Local Involvement Network

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave a duty to all 150 local authorities in England with social services responsibilities, to enable the formation of a Local Involvement Network (LINK).

LINKs will act as the successor to local Patient and Public Involvement Forums (PPIF) but with an extended remit covering social care, and have been established to give communities a stronger voice in how their health and social care services are delivered.

Regulations that established the health scrutiny function<sup>3</sup> state that Scrutiny Boards should take account of all relevant information available. Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, this now includes information identified and provided by the LINK. As such, the relationship between the LINK and the Council's Scrutiny Boards will be key.

An important power of the LINK is the ability to refer relevant matters to the appropriate Scrutiny Board<sup>4</sup>. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about the progress of any agreed actions. The process for dealing with such referrals is set out in a separate guidance note<sup>5</sup>.

A separate guidance note is currently being produced that will set out a common understanding for how the Health Scrutiny Board will work with Leeds LINK. This will provide a framework for the scope and style of this relationship. In broad terms, the Health Scrutiny Board will not seek to duplicate the advocacy role of the LINK and, wherever possible, will seek to avoid any unnecessary duplication within its work programme.

### **Work programme**

Although some matters may arise at short notice the Health Scrutiny Board will publish a forward work programme. The work programme will be considered and, where necessary, revised on a monthly basis. It will subsequently be widely circulate to all key stakeholders.

Where the production of a specific report is requested and/or necessary for a particular Scrutiny Board meeting, then sufficient notice will be given for the preparation of that documentation.

### **Information to be supplied to the Board**

The work of the Health Scrutiny Board will involve a combination of maintaining an overview of local health issues, including developing awareness of what health bodies are doing, and undertaking in-depth inquiries.

To support the work of the Scrutiny Board, it is likely that members of the Board will require a range of information from NHS bodies, including:

- minutes and reports from Trust Board meetings open to the Public;

---

<sup>3</sup> The Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committees Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations, 2002, HMSO

<sup>4</sup> As set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Local Involvement Networks Regulations 2008

<sup>5</sup> Scrutiny Guidance Note: Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters.

- advance notification of proposals for substantial development or reconfiguration<sup>6</sup> of local services;
- notification of current and/or planned service monitoring and review activity within Trusts across the City;
- information of sufficient detail to enable the Board to discharge its scrutiny role and function.

Where confidential information has been requested by the Health Scrutiny Board in connection with their inquiries it is incumbent upon NHS bodies to take all reasonable steps to anonymise this information. Where this is not possible the public must be excluded from the meeting whilst the Scrutiny Board considers the confidential information provided.

### NHS Officers

It is acknowledged that NHS officers are responsible to a range of bodies. These include NHS Trust Boards, the Strategic Health Authority, the Department of Health and the emerging local involvement network (LINK).

As an integral and essential method for publicly holding local NHS bodies to account, representatives of NHS bodies will answer questions openly and honestly and provide all information that will assist the Scrutiny Board in its consideration of specific matters, including scrutiny inquiries.

### The Director of Public Health (DPH)

The DPH role is one of advocacy and leadership that integrates the three domains of health protection, health improvement and health and social care quality. The DPH has responsibility for producing an independent Annual Report on the health of the local population and is charged with working with primary care and local communities to develop their public health capacity and capability.

To assist the Health Scrutiny Board discharge its role and function, the Directors of Public Health is likely to be a key source of information and is likely to be requested to assist the Scrutiny Board in matters under investigation – both in general terms and where the Scrutiny Board is undertaking a particular inquiry. In cases relating to specific inquiries, this input will usually be outlined in Terms of Reference for an inquiry. In all cases, notification of any input will be given well in advance.

## **Attending Scrutiny Board Meetings**

### Prior to Scrutiny Board meetings

Prior to Board meeting, the Chair receives a briefing from the Scrutiny Support Unit on items to appear on the forthcoming agenda. On occasion NHS officers may be requested to attend this or a separate session to enable the Chair of the Scrutiny Board to be briefed ahead of the Scrutiny meeting.

### Scrutiny Board meetings

Scrutiny Board meetings are usually held monthly in a committee room in the Civic Hall. However, from time to time meetings will be arranged at different venues – often dictated by the nature of the inquiries taking place.

Where attendance at a Scrutiny Board meeting is required, a reasonable notice period will be provided for NHS bodies to respond. This period will be at least 15 working days notice of the meeting at which attendance is being requested. Where

<sup>6</sup> Further guidance on the definition of Substantial is provided within this protocol

attendance will require the production of a report then sufficient notice will be given for the preparation of that documentation.

Where the Health Scrutiny Board requests a response from a local NHS body to whom it has made a report or recommendation, that body will respond to the Board in writing within 28 days of the request.

For all Scrutiny Board meetings the Scrutiny Support Unit will endeavour to give approximate times for when items are likely to be discussed. However, as items may over run, there may be a short waiting time.

### Conduct at Scrutiny Board meetings

A separate Member/Officer protocol <sup>7</sup> has been agreed by the City Council. This will be used as the basis for the conduct of Scrutiny Board Members in their dealings with officers from NHS bodies.

## **Conduct of Scrutiny Board Inquiries**

### The role of Terms of Reference

The majority of Scrutiny Inquiries have agreed terms of reference. These identify the subject areas members of the Board wish to pursue and are used to inform departments of the Council and NHS bodies of the emphasis of a particular inquiry.

Officers in the Scrutiny Support Unit will liaise with relevant officers of the Council and NHS bodies during the preparation of Terms of Reference to ensure that the focus of the inquiry is relevant and the timing of it appropriate.

Draft Terms of Reference are usually presented to the Scrutiny Board via a written report. This will provide a basis for discussion between officers and the Scrutiny Board. The Scrutiny Support Unit will advise on the particular information required.

### Gathering Evidence

The evidence to be gathered will be outlined in the Inquiry's Terms of Reference. This material may be considered at full Scrutiny Board meetings, which are open to the public, and/or by a small working group of Scrutiny Board, tasked with undertaking a specific evidence gathering task. In the latter case Board Members will report their findings to an appropriate full meeting of the Health Scrutiny Board.

The Scrutiny Support Unit will endeavour to give guidance on what will be asked and sometimes possible question areas will be passed on to allow some time for preparation before the meeting. However, Members may follow a related line of discussion and ask other questions on the day.

### Preparation of Reports

At the conclusion of an inquiry, where considered appropriate, the Scrutiny Board will produce a preliminary report. This will be drafted by the Scrutiny Support Unit in conjunction with the Scrutiny Board Chair and agreed by the Board. This report will provide a summary of the evidence submitted, along with the Scrutiny Board's conclusions and recommendations. Where the Health Scrutiny Board is considering making recommendations to the Council and/or an NHS body, it will invite advice from a relevant Chief Officer prior to finalising its report and recommendations.

---

<sup>7</sup> Leeds City Council Constitution - Section 5



## Publication of Report Findings

Once it has completed an inquiry, the Health Scrutiny Board may make reports and recommendations to the Board of the NHS bodies scrutinised and/or relevant decision-makers with the City Council. Any reports made will also be copied to:

- All witnesses/ organisation that supplied information to the Scrutiny Board during the inquiry
- The appropriate member(s) of the Council's Executive Board
- Leeds Director of Public Health
- Local MPs and MEPs
- The Strategic Health Authority (Yorkshire and the Humber)
- Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK)
- Local voluntary organisations and/ or other organisations that have expressed an interest in the issues dealt with in the report.
- A copy of the report should also be placed in local libraries, on local authority and Strategic Health Authority websites and made available to other local networks so as to be widely available to members of the public.

## Response to Reports

Where the Health Scrutiny Board has sent a report to an NHS body, the NHS body concerned will be required to send its response to the Board within 28 days. The reply should set out the general views of the NHS body on the recommendations, alongside any proposed action or reasons for inaction in response to each specific recommendation made. The NHS response should also be copied to:

- All witnesses/ organisation that supplied information to the Scrutiny Board during the inquiry
- The appropriate member(s) of the Council's Executive Board
- Leeds Director of Public Health
- Local MPs and MEPs
- The Strategic Health Authority (Yorkshire and the Humber)
- Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK)
- Local voluntary organisations and/ or other organisations that have expressed an interest in the issues dealt with in the report.
- A copy of the report should also be placed in local libraries, on local authority and Strategic Health Authority websites and made available to other local networks so as to be widely available to members of the public.

## **Consultation with the Scrutiny Board (Health) by NHS Bodies in Leeds**

The Health and Social Care Act (2012), subsequently reinforced by the NHS Act 2012 and the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act (2007), places a duty local on NHS Trusts, Primary Care Trusts and Strategic Health Authorities to make arrangements to involve and consult patients and the public in planning service provision, in the development of proposals for changes, and in decisions about changes to the operation of services.

The requirement to consult on service changes and/or developments, includes a duty to consult the Health Scrutiny Board where the NHS Body has under consideration any proposal for:

- a substantial development of the health service; or,
- a substantial variation in the provision of such a service in the local authority area.

However, levels of service variation and/or development are not defined in legislation and it is widely acknowledged that the term 'substantial variation or development of health services' is subjective, with proposals often open to interpretation. To assist all parties concerned, the following locally developed definitions and examples of service change/ development have been agreed:

- **Category 1** – ongoing improvement (e.g. proposals to extend or reduce opening hours)
- **Category 2** – minor change (e.g. change of location within same hospital site)
- **Category 3** – significant change (e.g. changing provider of existing services)
- **Category 4** – substantial variation (e.g. introduction of a new service)

In seeking to determine whether a development or variation is substantial, the NHS body concerned and the Health Scrutiny Board will have regard to issues such as (but not limited to):

- the number of people likely to be affected,
- whether changes in the accessibility of services will result; and,
- whether changes in the deployment of the workforce will be necessary.

In addition, any substantial variations or developments of local health care services need to be in the best interests of the local health service and the people it serves, and any consultation with stakeholders needs to be adequate prior to any final decision being made. Where the Health Scrutiny Board has concerns regarding any agreed substantial service changes / developments, there is provision within current legislation for the Health Scrutiny Board to refer matters to the Secretary of State for Health.

Any such referral must be relating to a substantial service change and/or development and should be seen as an action of last resort. The Health Scrutiny Board can refer matters to the Secretary of State for Health where the Scrutiny Board:

- Is concerned that consultation on substantial variations/ developments has been inadequate; and/or,
- Considers that any proposal is not in the interests of the local health service.

**SCRUTINY BOARD (HEALTH)  
HEALTH PROPOSALS WORKING GROUP**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**1.0 Background**

1.1 The Health and Social Care Act (2001), subsequently reinforced and amended by the NHS Act (2006) and the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act (2007), places a duty local on NHS Trusts, Primary Care Trusts and Strategic Health Authorities to make arrangements to involve and consult patients and the public in:

- Planning service provision;
- The development of proposals for changes; and,
- Decisions about changes to the operation of services.

1.2 The requirement to consult on service changes and/or developments, also includes a duty to consult the Health Scrutiny Board where the NHS Body has under consideration any proposal for:

- a substantial development of the health service; or,
- a substantial variation in the provision of such a service in the local authorities area.

**2.0 Scope**

2.1 The levels of service variation and/or development are not defined in legislation and it is widely acknowledged that the term 'substantial variation or development of health services' is subjective, with proposals often open to interpretation.

2.2 To assist Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees, and to help achieve some degree of consistency, the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) published a scrutiny guide, *Substantial Variations and Developments of Health Services*<sup>1</sup>. Based on this guidance, and through discussions between NHS Leeds and the Health Scrutiny Board, the following locally developed definitions and examples of service change/development have been agreed and are summarised in Table 1 (below).

**Table 1: Summary of levels of change**

Degree of variation	Colour code	Contact with Scrutiny
<b>Category 4</b> – substantial variation (e.g. introduction of a new service)	Red	Consult
<b>Category 3</b> – significant change (e.g. changing provider of existing services)	Orange	Engage
<b>Category 2</b> – minor change (e.g. change of location within same hospital site)	Yellow	Inform
<b>Category 1</b> – ongoing improvement (e.g. proposals to extend or reduce opening hours)	Green	No

<sup>1</sup> Published in December 2005 and available from the publications section of the CfPS website: <http://www.cfps.org.uk/>

2.3 The definitions of reconfiguration proposals and stages of engagement/consultation are detailed in Appendix 1.

2.4 The overall purpose of the Working Group is to provide an environment that allow local NHS bodies to have an on-going dialogue with Scrutiny, regarding changes and development of local health services. Therefore, the role of the working group can be summarised as follows:

- Considering, at an early stage, any future proposals for service changes and/or developments of local health services, including:
  - Whether or not the relevant Trust's plans for patient and public engagement and involvement seem satisfactory<sup>2</sup>; and,
  - Whether the proposal is in the interests of the local health service.
- Maintaining an overview and on-going involvement in current service change proposals and associated patient and public engagement and involvement activity, including details of any stakeholder feedback and how this is being used to shape the proposals.
- Reviewing the implementation of any agreed service change and/or development, including any subsequent service user feedback.
- Referring any matters of significant concern to the Health Scrutiny Board, for consideration.

2.5 It should be recognised that the statutory duty to consider substantial changes remains the responsibility of the Health Scrutiny Board itself. As such, any substantial changes and/or variations identified will automatically be referred to the Health Scrutiny Board for consideration.

2.6 Where a substantial change and/or development is identified, the view of the Working Group on the relevant Trust's plans for patient and public engagement and involvement, and on whether the proposal is in the interests of the local health service will usefully inform the deliberation of the Health Scrutiny Board when considering such matters.

### **3.0 Frequency of meetings**

3.1 It is initially proposed that the Working Group will routinely meet as follows:

- July
- September
- December
- March

3.2 However, due to the nature of the work and the potential timing of proposed service changes and/or developments, it is recognised that the Working Group will adopt a flexible approach to meeting dates and, as such, may choose to meet outside this timetable.

---

<sup>2</sup> This early engagement with Scrutiny will allow the Working Group to discuss and agree the proposed degree of variation, prior to the commencement of any patient and public engagement and involvement activity

#### **4.0 Membership**

4.1 The membership of the Health Proposals Working Group for the duration of the current municipal year (2009/10) is as follows (*TBC*):

- *To be confirmed*

#### **5.0 Key stakeholders**

5.1 The following key stakeholders have been identified as likely contributors to the Working Group:

- Leeds Primary Care Trust (PCT)
- Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust (LTHP)
- Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust (LPFT)
- Director of Adult Social Services

#### **6.0 Monitoring arrangements**

6.1 The full Health Scrutiny Board will be kept apprised of the activity of the Working Group and regular updates, including report from the Working Group, will be provided.

**June 2009**

Definitions of reconfiguration proposals and stages of engagement/consultation				
Definition & examples of potential proposals	Stages of involvement, engagement, consultation			
	Informal Involvement	Engagement		Formal consultation
<p><b>Substantial variation or development</b> Major service reconfiguration – changing how/where and when large scale services are delivered. Examples: urgent care, community health centre services, introduction of a new service, arms length/move to CFT</p>				<p><b>Category 4</b> Formal consultation required (minimum twelve weeks) <b>(RED)</b></p>
<p><b>Significant variation or development</b> Change in demand for specific services or modernisation of service. Examples: changing provider of existing services, pathway redesign when the service could be needed by wide range of people</p>			<p><b>Category 3</b> Formal mechanisms established to ensure that patients/service users/ carers and the public are engaged in planning and decision making <b>(ORANGE)</b></p>	Information & evidence base
<p><b>Minor change</b> Need for modernisation of service. Examples: Review of Health Visiting and District Nursing (Moving Forward Project), patient diaries</p>		<p><b>Category 2</b> More formalised structures in place to ensure that patients/ service users/ carers and patient groups views on the issue and potential solutions are sought <b>(YELLOW)</b></p>	Information & evidence base	
<p><b>Ongoing development</b> Proposals made as a result of routine patient/service user feedback. Examples: proposal to extend or reduce opening hours</p>	<p><b>Category 1</b> Informal discussions with individual patients/ service users/ carers and patient groups on potential need for changes to services and solutions <b>(GREEN)</b></p>	Information & evidence base		

OSC involved

OSC may be involved

Note: based on guidance within the Centre for Public Scrutiny *Substantial variations and developments of health services, a guide*

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 13TH MAY, 2009

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Carter in the Chair

Councillors R Brett, J L Carter, R Finnigan,  
S Golton, R Harker, P Harrand, J Procter,  
S Smith and K Wakefield

Councillor J Blake – Advisory Member

### 254 Exclusion of the Public

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:

- (a) Appendix 1 to the report referred to in minute 258 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the appendix provides a brief overview of the anticipated costs and identified funding associated with the proposed acquisition. It is considered not to be in the public interest to disclose this information at this point in time as it could undermine the Council's position in negotiating with the building owner. The release of this information could also prejudice the Council's interests in relation to this or other similar transactions in that the land owner of this or other similar properties would have information about the nature and level of consideration which may prove acceptable to the Council. It is considered that whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, much of this information will be publicly available from the Land Registry following completion of any transaction and consequently the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information at this point in time.
- (b) Appendices 1, 2 and 4 of the report referred to in minute 261 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information by reason of the fact that:-
  - (i) Appendices 1 and 2 – The success of the scheme could potentially be prejudiced by speculative investors acquiring properties in advance of the Council's action;
  - (ii) Appendix 4 – The costs attributed to the purchase of private properties are purely estimates at this stage and their disclosure

could prejudice the Council's ability to reach an agreement on the purchase price with owners.

**255 Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item relating to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009-2012 (minute 266 refers) due to his position as a Director of a Health and Wellbeing Centre.

Councillor Blake declared a personal interest in the item relating to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009-2012 (minute 266 refers) due to being a member of Leeds NHS Primary Care Trust.

**256 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 be approved.

**DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION**

**257 Football World Cup 2018**

The Director of City Development submitted a report advising of the invitation received from the English Football Association for the City of Leeds to bid to become a 'host city' for the football World Cup 2018.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That Leeds investigate the submission of a Leeds City Region bid to become a host city for the Football World Cup 2018;
- (b) That the governance structure proposed in the submitted report be approved;
- (c) That the proposed Leeds City Region representatives for the Host City Briefing to be held in London on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009 be noted;
- (d) That a report be brought back to this Board as soon as the likely human and financial resource implications of the project are known;
- (e) That dialogue with the City Region partners be opened at the earliest opportunity.

**258 West Leeds Gateway Site - 2 Branch Road**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on an in principle proposal that Compulsory Purchase powers be used to achieve the acquisition of 2 Branch Road, Armley subject to a further report being brought to the Board for final approval.

Following consideration of appendix 1 to the report designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which was considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report be noted and that in principle approval be given to the use of Compulsory Purchase powers to achieve the acquisition of 2 Branch Road, should this be necessary, subject to a further report to this Board seeking full approval.



**259 Response to the City Development Scrutiny Board's Inquiry into the A660 Corridor Transport Issues**

The Director of City Development submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the recent Scrutiny Board (City Development) inquiry concerning A660 Corridor Transport Issues.

**RESOLVED** – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained in the report, be approved.

**NEIGHBOURHOODS AND HOUSING**

**260 Response to the Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships) Inquiry into the role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in Council led community engagement**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships) with regard to the role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in Council led community engagement.

**RESOLVED** – That the Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships) inquiry report into the role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in Council led community engagement be referred to Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) and Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) for consideration, with a further report being submitted to Executive Board in due course.

**261 Regeneration of the Garnets, Beeston**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on options for the regeneration of the Garnets area and on the proposed commencement of acquisition and clearance of 112 properties within the Garnets by utilising £3,000,000 of confirmed funding during 2009/11.

The report presented and appraised the options of:

- (a) doing the minimum to meet legal conformity;
- (b) undertaking group repair and internal remodelling;
- (c) property acquisition and redevelopment of the site.

Following consideration of appendices 1, 2 and 4 to the report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) That scheme expenditure to the amount of £3,000,000 be authorised.
- (b) That the option of acquisition and site redevelopment be progressed.
- (c) That a further report be brought to this Board when further funding is made available through successful bids for the residual £1,300,000 of funding.
- (d) That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and Director of City Development authorise and promote any Compulsory Purchase Orders which may become necessary.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this decision)

**262 Update on Council Rents - 2009/10**

Further to minute 236 of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing an update on the rent changes for 2009/10, and the cost implications for this change.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report be noted together with the change in the 2009/10 average rent increase for Council dwellings from 6.2% to 3.1%.

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

**263 School Calendar 2010 - 2011**

The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report on the process of setting the school calendar in Leeds, providing an update on the consultation process and proposing one option for the approval of the Board.

The three options which had been the subject of the consultation were:

Option 1: The Easter bank holiday weekend falls at the end of the two-week school break. This option coincided with the recommendations of the Local Government Association.

Option 2: The Easter bank holiday weekend falls in the middle of the two week school break. Schools would not return to school until the day after May Day bank holiday, reducing the number of split weeks in school. However, the term would not be split equally resulting in a very short first half term after Easter.

Option 3: Schools have a separate Easter bank holiday weekend. They would experience three four-day weeks due to the occurrence of the May Day bank holiday the week after Easter Monday.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the extensive consultation undertaken to consider the implications for the 2010/11 school calendar in Leeds be noted.
- (b) That the school calendar dates associated with option 3, and as detailed in annex 3 to the report, be approved.
- (c) That subject to (d) below, the proposal for a fixed break between terms 2 and 3, irrespective of when Easter falls, with a corresponding adjustment to the summer vacation which ensures a two week Christmas break, be approved in principle;
- (d) That following the conclusion of the 2010/11 academic year, a report be submitted to the Board reviewing the success of the implementation of the school calendar schedule as detailed at option 3.

**264 The Achievement of Looked After Children**

The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report outlining the achievement of Looked After Children in Leeds and on strategies for the improvement of outcomes.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the main findings of the report and its conclusions be noted.
- (b) That a further update report be brought to this Board in Autumn 2009.

**LEISURE**

**265 Leisure Centre Refurbishment and Free Swimming Capital Modernisation**

The Director of City Development submitted a report on proposals for the DCMS Free Swimming Capital Modernisation Programme, refurbishment of changing rooms at Scott Hall Leisure Centre, installation of sound and light systems in the pool halls at Scott Hall, John Smeaton and Pudsey Leisure Centres and the extension of the Bodyline Gym at Scott Hall.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That approval be given to the injection of £572,300 into the Capital Programme consisting of DCMS Free Swimming Capital Modernisation Programme pot 4 (£410,000), Prudential Borrowing (£30,000) and Leeds City Council budgets (totalling £132,300).
- (b) That authority be given to spend in the following amounts:
  - £512,300 on the refurbishment of the changing rooms at Scott Hall Leisure Centre
  - £90,000 on the installation of sound and light systems in the pool halls at Scott Hall, John Smeaton and Pudsey Leisure Centres, thus achieving the criteria set by DCMS for the award of this funding
  - £30,000 on the extension of the Bodyline Gym at Scott Hall Leisure Centre through Prudential Borrowing

**ADULT HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE**

**266 Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009 to 2012**

The Director of Adult Social Services and Director of Public Health submitted a joint report presenting the final draft of the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009 to 2012 for comment and agreement that it be submitted to Council for approval as part of the Budget and Policy Framework.

**RESOLVED –** That the final draft of the Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan be agreed for submission to Council for approval.

(Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to this item due to being a Director of a Health and Wellbeing Centre, Councillor Smith withdrew from the meeting room during the consideration of this item)

- 267 Carers' Strategy for Leeds 2009-2012: 'Every Carer Counts'**  
The Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report on the content of the Leeds Carers Strategy 2009-2012 and presenting the strategy for approval for its publication and dissemination.

**RESOLVED** – That the Carers' Strategy for Leeds 2009-2012 'Every Carer Counts', as appended to the report, be approved for implementation, subject to an addition which reflects the Board's comments concerning the provision of advice and guidance available to carers in Leeds.

#### **CENTRAL AND CORPORATE**

- 268 Response to the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Member Development**  
The Chief Democratic Services Officer submitted a report in response to the recent Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) Inquiry into Member Development.

**RESOLVED** – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained within the report, be approved.

- 269 Response to the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Attendance Management**  
The Director of Resources submitted a report in response to the recent Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) Inquiry into attendance management.

**RESOLVED** – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained within the report, be approved.

- 270 Response to the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Procurement of Services**  
The Chief Procurement Officer submitted a report in response to the recent Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) Inquiry into the Procurement of Services.

**RESOLVED** – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained within the report, be approved.

- 271 Councillor Blake and Councillor Smith**  
Councillors Blake and Smith were both thanked for their services to the Board, as it was noted that this would be the last meeting in which both would be in attendance as Executive Board members.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 15<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2009  
LAST DATE FOR CALL IN: 22<sup>ND</sup> MAY 2009 (5.00 PM)

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12.00 noon on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2009)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 17th June, 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 17TH JUNE, 2009

**PRESENT:** Councillor R Brett in the Chair

Councillors A Carter, J L Carter,  
R Finnigan, S Golton, R Harker, P Harrand,  
K Wakefield and J Monaghan

Councillor R Lewis – Non-Voting Advisory Member

### 1 **Chair's Announcement**

In opening the meeting the Chair welcomed Councillor Monaghan to his first meeting as a member of the Board and Councillor R Lewis to his first meeting in his new role.

### 2 **Exclusion of the Public**

**RESOLVED** – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:

- (a) Appendices 1 and 2 to the report referred to in minute 5 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(2) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information by reason of the fact that
  - (i) Appendix 1 identifies each property address that it is proposed be leased to LHC and as such could be used to identify the supported tenants who already live at those addresses
  - (ii) Appendix 2 identifies each property address that it is proposed to be leased to GIPSIL and as such could be used to identify the supported tenants who already live at those addresses.
- (b) Appendix 2 to the report referred to in minute 16 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that it contains detailed sensitive information about the financial position of the Council and it is considered that the public interest in maintaining confidentiality outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because release of this information at this time could prejudice the ongoing negotiations with the vendor.
- (c) Appendix 1 to the report referred to in minute 7 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 22nd July, 2009

interest in disclosing the information because it refers to the Invitation To Qualify document which sets down the minimum requirements of FIFA which host cities must meet, England 2018 advises that the contents of the Invitation To Quality must not be made public and that Applicant Host Cities in breach of this condition may be disqualified from the Host City bidding competition, accordingly some of the information provided for Members is contained in the exempt section of this report on the basis that disclosure could prejudice the outcome of the bid and the commercial interests of the Council.

- (d) Appendix A to the report referred to in minute 10 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that it is considered not to be in the public interest to disclose this information at this point in time as it could undermine the Council's position in negotiating with the building owner, the release of this information could also prejudice the Council's interests in relation to this or other similar transactions in that the land owner of this or other similar properties would obtain information about the nature and level of consideration which may prove acceptable to the Council. It is considered that whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, much of this information will be publicly available from the Land Registry following completion of any transaction and consequently the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing this information at this point in time.

### **3 Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Wakefield declared a personal interest in the item relating to the Outline Business Case for the West Leeds Academy as a governor of Leeds City College.

### **4 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2009 be approved.

## **NEIGHBOURHOODS AND HOUSING**

### **5 Lease at Less Than Best Consideration - Agreement to Lease 28 Miscellaneous Properties to GIPSIL and Leeds Housing Concern on a 25 Year Lease Agreement**

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Environment submitted a report on a proposal to grant a long lease at less than best consideration for 28 Council owned miscellaneous properties to GIPSIL and LHC, for the purpose of refurbishment and improvement for accommodation for vulnerable tenants.

The report presented the option of the Council retaining the properties with the only alternative of open market disposal in the absence of funding to renovate them.



Following consideration of appendices 1 and 2 to the report designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(2) which were considered in private at the end of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED** – That the 28 properties listed in appendices 1 and 2 to the report be leased to GIPSIL and Leeds Housing Concern, at a peppercorn rent for a 25 year period at less than best consideration and that authority be given for formal negotiations to complete the leasing arrangements.

## **6 Area Committee Roles for 2009/2010**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the proposed delegated Area Functions and other roles for the ten Area Committees during 2009/10.

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) That the Area Functions and Well Being Function be delegated to Area Committees for 2009/10 as summarised in the submitted report.
- (b) That the enhanced roles of Area Committees as summarised in the report and the newly defined roles as detailed in Appendix 1 be endorsed.
- (c) That this information be reported to the Area Committees at the next cycle of meetings.
- (d) That the Area Functions referred to be incorporated into the Council's Constitution at the next available opportunity.
- (e) That a report be brought to a future meeting of the Board with regard to the issue of advertising on lampposts.

## **DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION**

### **7 Football World Cup 2018**

The Director of City Development submitted a report providing an update on the new information received from the Football Association and seeking approval from the Board to take forward the bid response.

Following consideration of appendix 1 to the report designated as exempt under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) That the additional information provided by England 2018 in relation to the Host City bidding process be noted.
- (b) That a bid from Leeds be formulated on the basis that the City wishes to be selected as a Host City for World Cup 2018.
- (c) That all necessary steps be taken to publicise the Leeds bid and to seek support from the community for the bid, in particular by encouraging all those in favour to register their support on the England 2018 website.
- (d) That the Director of Resources identify an appropriate revenue budget to facilitate the delivery of the Leeds bid document by the end of October 2009.

- (e) That the Chief Executive commence dialogue with City Region partners to establish how they wish to be involved in the Leeds bid.
- (f) That, in view of the fact that the deadline for submission of the (draft) Outline Bid will not allow for the submission of a further report to this Board, the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to approve the submission.

## **8 Planning Appeals at Royds Lane, Rothwell and Fleet Lane, Oulton**

The Director of City Development submitted a report on the outcome of recent planning appeals on greenfield sites at Royds Lane, Rothwell and Fleet Lane, Oulton, and the implications, if any, for the Council's approach to greenfield developments.

The report presented the following options:-

- (a) accepting the need for greenfield release recognising a deficit in the 5 year housing land supply; and
- (b) concluding that greenfield release, in the circumstances outlined within the report, would be inappropriate.

**RESOLVED** – That option (b), as detailed within paragraph 8.11 of the submitted report and as detailed above, be approved.

## **9 South Leeds Regeneration Area Governance Arrangements**

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and the Director of City Development submitted a joint report outlining a proposal to establish a governance framework for an informal partnership covering the regeneration of a large area of South Leeds.

In presenting the report, Councillor A Carter reported receipt of a message from the Chair of Renew on the day of this meeting and undertook to address the comments made in that message.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the opportunities for regeneration and investment in South Leeds and the findings outlined in the work already undertaken be noted.
- (b) That the establishment of appropriate governance arrangements in order to co-ordinate the Steering Group be approved.
- (c) That officers be authorised to establish the Management/Investors' Group, Partnership Engagement Group with MPCL and other interested private sector organisations.
- (d) That the joint working with MPCL and the production of an Investment Strategy for South Leeds be supported.
- (e) That the Executive Member for Regeneration and Development be appointed as Chair of the Steering Group and that the Member Management Committee be requested to appoint four further political representatives from the South Leeds Area to the Steering Group.

- 10 47-57 Chapel Hill, Morley: Acquisition, Demolition and Development**  
The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report outlining the proposed scheme design and related expenditure for the acquisition of 47-57 Chapel Hill, Morley and 1-8 Bank Court, Bank Street, Morley.

Following consideration of Appendix A to the report designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which was considered at the conclusion of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the project brief and scheme design as presented be approved and that the Asset Management Board be authorised to approve the final detailed design of Phase 2.
- (b) That authority be given to spend the amount referred to in exempt Appendix A to the report and that the Director of Resources be authorised to approve expenditure of the balance remaining shown in exempt Appendix A in the Town and District Regeneration Scheme 12154/MOR/000.

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

- 11 Playbuilder Initiative**  
The Director of Children's Services submitted a report on the Playbuilder Project and the intended programme to build or significantly refurbish twenty two playgrounds or informal play spaces across the City.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That approval be given for the injection of £1,145,914 into the Capital Programme (capital scheme no: 15390) fully funded by DCSF grant.
- (b) That authority to spend be given in respect of the sixteen play sites identified in appendix 2 to the report.
- (c) That approval be given to the Play Partnership recommendation to seek working solutions for the development of the remaining six sites with partners in the Council.
- (d) That a further report be brought to the Board recommending the location and provider of the remaining six sites.

- 12 Proposal to Add Specialist Community Provision at Whitkirk Primary School for Pupils with Complex Physical Difficulties and Medical Needs**  
The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report on a proposal to establish specialist community provision at Whitkirk Primary School for pupils with complex physical difficulties and medical needs.

**RESOLVED –** That approval be given for consultation on a proposal to make a prescribed alteration to Whitkirk Primary School so as to establish a resourced base for primary age children with complex physical needs.

- 13 Submission of the Outline Business Case for Leeds West Academy**  
The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report on the Outline Business Case for Leeds West Academy as part of the Council's Wave 1 Building Schools for the Future Programme and on associated expenditure.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That approval be given to the Outline Business Case for Leeds West Academy of the Council's Wave 1 Building Schools for the Future Programme and authority be given for its submission to the Department for Children, Schools and Families and to Partnerships for Schools.
- (b) That approval be given to the injection of additional expenditure of £17,018,000 financed by additional BSF Capital Grant Funding from DCSF into the Capital Programme, arising from the change from school to academy status as detailed in section 8 of the report.
- (c) That scheme expenditure of £31,128,000 from capital scheme number 15414 for Leeds West Academy be authorised.
- (d) That approval be given to the application of the previously approved City Council contribution of £2,529,000 to be committed elsewhere in the Leeds BSF Wave 1 Programme.
- (e) That the Board notes that further reports relating to 14-19 provision will be submitted to Executive Board for consideration, including a report to the next meeting on confederation arrangements.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter)

- 14 Children and Young People's Plan 2009/14**  
The Director of Children's Services submitted a report presenting the 2009-2014 Children and Young People's Plan for approval, prior to its submission to Full Council and Government Office.

**RESOLVED –** That Council be recommended to adopt the Children and Young People's Plan for Leeds 2009-2014, as attached to the report, as part of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

- 15 Expanding Primary Place Provision**  
The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report on trends in population growth and the changing context for planning primary school places in Leeds; on the proposed immediate response to the pressures for additional reception places in 2010/2011; and outlining planning arrangements to ensure sufficient places to meet future needs.

In presenting the report Councillor Harker indicated that he had requested that this matter should be the subject of Scrutiny.

**RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the changing context for the provision of primary school places and the potential demands on capital programmes in the future be noted.

- (b) That approval be given to communications with relevant stakeholders and the Schools Adjudicator and the DCSF as outlined in section 6 of the report.
- (c) That further reports be brought to the Board on proposed expenditure and future planning proposals, including a report to the next meeting of the Board regarding the arrangements being made to manage the provision of reception places required for September 2010.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter)

## **ADULT HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE**

### **16 Roundhay Road Relocation Project**

Further to minute 198 of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2008 the Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report providing an update on the proposed accommodation solutions in place, and the costs associated with the implementation of these, to support the relocation of remaining services from the Roundhay Road site to alternative 'fit for purpose' accommodation.

Following consideration of Appendix 2 to the report designated as exempt under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which was considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the contents of the report and the proposed accommodation solutions outlined in Appendix 1 be noted.
- (b) That expenditure of £1,100,000 on this scheme as outlined in the exempt appendix 2 to the report be approved.
- (c) That the Roundhay Road site be declared surplus to requirements subject to the completion of the acquisition of the property at Killingbeck.
- (d) That the demolition of the building be approved subject to the completion of the appropriate option appraisal taking into account both the potential impact on the asset value and the ongoing costs of security.

### **17 Response to Council Deputation - Provision of Changing Place Toilets in Leeds**

The Director of Adult Social Care submitted a report in response to the deputation to Council by the 'All Means All' organisation on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2009.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the actions being taken to provide city centre based changing places toilets be noted.
- (b) That the work undertaken to agree a specification for a changing places toilet be noted.

- (c) That a further report be brought to this Board in six months time which will recommend a strategy for the provision of changing places toilets in Leeds.
- (d) That a further report be submitted to the Board providing an update on the current position prior to the end of this year.

## **CENTRAL AND CORPORATE**

### **18 Tax and Private Hire Licensing: Age Criteria Proposals - Deputation to Council**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report in response to the deputation to Council from the GMB Trade Union on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2009.

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report, the rationale behind the proposals and the information that will be available to the decision makers be noted.

### **19 Financial Performance Provisional Outturn 2008/09**

The Director of Resources submitted a report on the Council's financial outturn position for 2008/09, including both revenue and capital and the Housing Revenue Account. The report also detailed revenue expenditure and income compared to the approved budget, and reported on the outturn for Education Leeds and the ALMOs.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That the report be noted.
- (b) That the transfer of £4,800,000 to general reserves be agreed in accordance with paragraph 3.8 of the report.
- (c) That the carry forward of £1,300,000 Area Based Grant be agreed as outlined in paragraph 3.7 of the report.
- (d) That contributions to and the use of Housing Revenue Account Reserves be agreed as outlined in the report.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter)

### **20 Leeds Strategic Plan 2008-11 Refresh: Amendments to Partnership Agreed Indicators**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Policy, Planning and Improvement) submitted a report proposing a number of amendments to the partnership agreed targets in the Leeds Strategic Plan 2008-11, the Local Area Agreement for Leeds.

**RESOLVED** – That appendix 1 to the report be approved as the Council's proposed revisions and additions to the partnership agreed targets in the Leeds Strategic Plan.

### **21 Annual Report on Risk Management**

The Director of Resources submitted a report providing an overview of the key risk management developments for the Council over 2008/09, reporting on the

corporate risk register and highlighting future areas of work to improve the Council's risk management arrangements.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and the progress made on further embedding risk management across the authority be noted.

**22 Review Process for the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Licensing Policy**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) submitted a report providing information on the review process for the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Licensing Policy and advising of the methodology and timeframe for the final approval of the revised Policy, taking into account the statutory requirements for consultation and the expressed expectations of Full Council.

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) That the methodology and timeframe for the adoption of the gambling policy be noted.
- (b) That the draft policy be referred to Full Council for Members to comment on the draft as part of the initial consultation process with stakeholders.
- (c) That the Assistant Chief Executive (Corporate Governance) be authorised to undertake public consultation as outlined in the report.
- (d) That the revised policy and the results of any subsequent consultations on the draft policy be referred to Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate) with a request that Scrutiny report back to the Executive Board on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2009.

**23 Procurement of a Corporate Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Solution**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Policy, Planning and Improvement) submitted a report providing an update on the steps taken to date to procure a corporate IVR solution, providing responses to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) and seeking support for the release of the funding necessary for this project to continue.

**RESOLVED** –

- (a) That the development of a corporate IVR solution for the Corporate Contact Centre be approved.
- (b) That authority be given for the allocation and expenditure of £262,000 from the ICT capital development pot to support the development of a corporate IVR solution.

(Under the provision of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he voted against the decisions taken in this minute)

(The matters referred to in this minute were responding to a previous Call In decision, and were therefore not eligible for further Call In)

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 19<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2009  
LAST DATE FOR CALL IN: 26<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2009

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12.00 noon on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2009)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Wednesday, 22nd July, 2009



**SCRUTINY BOARD PROCEDURE RULES GUIDANCE NOTE 7**

**INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules require Scrutiny Boards, before deciding to undertake an Inquiry, to:

*Consider how a proposed Inquiry meets criteria approved from time to time; and*

*Consult with any relevant Director and Executive Member*

- 1.2 This is to ensure that Scrutiny Boards, when agreeing to undertake an Inquiry, have considered carefully the reasons for that Inquiry, its objectives, whether it can be adequately resourced in terms of Member and Officer time and have sought the views of the relevant Director and Executive Member.
- 1.3 The decision whether to undertake an Inquiry or not rests with the Scrutiny Board.

**2.0 INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA**

- 2.1 At the time of deciding to undertake an Inquiry, the Scrutiny Board will refer to the Inquiry Selection Criteria within this Guidance Note and formally identify which of the agreed criteria the proposed Inquiry meets. The Board will also record the comments of the relevant Director and Executive Member. This process will be recorded in the Scrutiny Board minutes.

## INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

**Scrutiny Board** \_\_\_\_\_

**Inquiry Title** \_\_\_\_\_

**Anticipated Start Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Anticipated Finish Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**The Inquiry meets the following criteria**

- It addresses the Council's agreed Strategic outcomes by reviewing the effectiveness of policy to achieve strategic outcomes as defined by the Leeds Strategic Plan
- Shaping and developing policy through influencing pre-policy discussion

It fulfils a performance management function by

- Reviewing performance of significant parts of service
- Addressing a poor performing service
- Addressing a high level of user dissatisfaction with the service
- Addressing a pattern of budgetary overspends
- Addressing matters raised by external auditors and inspectors

- Addresses an issue of high public interest
- Reviews a Major or Key Officer decision
- Reviews an Executive Board decision
- Reviews a series of decisions which have a significant impact
- Has been requested by the Executive Board/Full Council/Scrutiny Advisory Group
- looks at innovative change

Comments of relevant Director and Executive Member (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

Date

## Scrutiny Board (Health) Work Programme 2009/10

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
<b>Meeting date – 30 June 2009</b>			
<b>Legislation and Constitutional Changes</b>	To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on proposed changes to the Council's Constitution in relation to Scrutiny.		B
<b>Co-opted Members</b>	To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on Co-opted Members.		B
<b>Input into the Work Programme 2009/10 - Sources of Work and Establishing the Board's Priorities</b>	To receive and consider various inputs to inform the development of the Scrutiny Board's work programme for 2009/10.		B
<b>KPMG Audit Report</b>	To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on a scrutiny review by KPMG as at May 2009.		PM/B
<b>Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK) – Annual Report</b>	To receive and consider the first annual report of the Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK).		B

Key:

RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

## Scrutiny Board (Health) Work Programme 2009/10

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
<b>Determining the Work Programme 2009/10</b>	To identify the Scrutiny Board's priorities and determine its work programme for 2009/10.		B
<b>Meeting date – 28 July 2009</b>			
<b>Quarterly Accountability Reports</b>	To receive quarter 4 performance reports		PM
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>	To monitor progress against the recommendations agreed following previous Scrutiny Board inquiries.		MSR
<b>Meeting date – 22 September 2009</b>			
<b>Improving Young Peoples Sexual Health</b>	To consider the initial response to the Boards inquiry published in April 2009.		RP
Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

## Scrutiny Board (Health) Work Programme 2009/10

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
<b>Quarterly Accountability Reports</b>	To receive quarter 1 performance reports		PM
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>	To monitor progress against the recommendations agreed following previous Scrutiny Board inquiries.		MSR
<b>Meeting date – 20 October 2009</b>			
<b>Meeting date – 24 November 2009</b>			

Key:

RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

## Scrutiny Board (Health) Work Programme 2009/10

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
<b>Meeting date – 15 December 2009</b>			
<b>Quarterly Accountability Reports</b>	To receive quarter 2 performance reports		PM
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>	To monitor progress against the recommendations agreed following previous Scrutiny Board inquiries.		MSR
<b>Meeting date – 19 January 2010</b>			
<b>Meeting date – 16 February 2010</b>			

Key:

RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

## Scrutiny Board (Health) Work Programme 2009/10

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
<b>Meeting date – 16 March 2010</b>			
<b>Quarterly Accountability Reports</b>	To receive quarter 3 performance reports		PM
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>	To monitor progress against the recommendations agreed following previous Scrutiny Board inquiries.		MSR
<b>Annual Health Check</b>	To receive and consider the local NHS Trusts self assessment against the 24 “core standards” set by Government under the domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety;</li> <li>• Clinical and Cost Effectiveness;</li> <li>• Governance;</li> <li>• Patient Focus;</li> <li>• Accessible and Responsive Care;</li> <li>• Care Environment and Amenities; and,</li> <li>• Public Health</li> </ul>	Precise timing and scope to be confirmed	PM

Key:

RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

## Scrutiny Board (Health) Work Programme 2009/10

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
<b>Meeting date – 27 April 2010</b>			
<b>Annual Report</b>	To agree the Board's contribution to the annual scrutiny report		

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in



## Scrutiny Board (Health)

### Work Programme 2009/10

Working Groups			
Working group	Membership	Progress update	Dates

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Scrutiny Board (Health)  
Work Programme 2008/09**

<b>Unscheduled / Potential Items</b>		
<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Clinical Services Reconfiguration – Children’s Hospital Services</b>	To maintain an overview on the service reconfiguration.	Subject to the Board re-establishing the Health Proposals Working Group, refer the matter to the Working Group for on-going monitoring.
<b>Clinical Services Reconfiguration – Children’s Hospital Services: Implications for Adult Medicine</b>	To maintain an overview on the service reconfiguration, particularly in terms of the implications to service provision on adult medicine.	
<b>Specialised commissioning arrangements</b>	To consider the current arrangements for specialised commissioning within the region and the role of scrutiny.	The planned Department of Health (DoH) consultation on developing / strengthening Health Scrutiny may have an impact.
<b>Hospital Discharges</b>	To consider a follow up report on progress against the recommendations detailed in the Independence, Wellbeing and Choice inspection report	Consider report in September/ October 2009.
<b>Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust – foundation status</b>	To consider the process and implications of the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust bid to achieve foundation hospital status.	

Key:

RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in