CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 21

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:		CYPOSC Work Programme		
Date of Meeting:		15 September 2010		
Report of:		Acting Director of Strategy and Governance		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Tom Hook T	el:	29-1110
	E-mail:	Tom.hook@brighton-hove.gov.uk		
Wards Affected:	All			

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 This report presents to CYPOSC Members options for their work programme through to May 2011. Members are being asked to confirm the priority areas of work for the Committee, a series of workshops and scrutiny panels.
- 1.2 Each Overview and Scrutiny Committee has the power to establish scrutiny panels to undertake short, focused reviews on specific issues. During July consultation was undertaken with residents, partners and Members as to their priorities for scrutiny reviews during 2010/11. This report sets out the results of this consultation as relevant to CYPOSC.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**:

- 2.1 That CYPOSC:
 - (1) Agrees the Committee work programme for 2010/11 (Appendix 1)
 - (2) Notes the panel consultation responses (Appendix 2)

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 Appendix 1 sets out the work plan for CYPOSC during 2010/11.
- 3.2 The Strategic Director for People has been invited to the meeting in November; at which meeting Members will also be monitoring the implementation of recommendations from the scrutiny panel on alcohol related harm.
- 3.3 The focus of the January meeting will be looking at the draft budget proposals for 2011/12.

- 3.4 Appendix 2 of the report sets out the results of a consultation on possible scrutiny panel topics.
- 3.5 Public consultation on possible scrutiny panel topics ran during the course of July with a total 69 separate suggestions for scrutiny topics received. The consultation was promoted through a number of means:
 - 1. All Members of the council were invited to submit ideas
 - 2. All LSP themed partnerships were written to and scrutiny officers attended a number of partnership meetings
 - 3. Citynews and the Argus both carried articles promoting the consultation
 - 4. A press release was issued and promoted on Facebook and Twitter
 - 5. Information was be added to the Consultation Portal at <u>http://consult.brighton-hove.gov.uk/portal</u>
- 3.6 Preliminary research has been undertaken to see which suggestions are suitable topics for scrutiny. This has been based on criteria agreed previously at OSC and outlined below:
 - Length of review Topics need to be achievable within 3-4 meetings, or undertaken as Select Committees in around 6 meetings.
 - Relevance to Brighton and Hove The focus needs to be a local issue, or at least an issue that is within the decision making power of a local organisation.
 - Policy Context What is the policy/strategy development cycle, are changes expected to legislation, or has a local strategy just been finalised?
 - Alignment to LSP and Council priorities Reviews of issues identified as key to improving the lives of residents are by definition the best use of scrutiny resources.
 - Highlighted as an issue within performance regimes Is the issue in question something that has been shown as requiring improvement during performance monitoring? With limited resources scrutiny should avoid reviewing issues which the council and partners are seen as doing well.
 - Avoiding duplication with existing work-streams If a suggestion would replicate work already ongoing there is limited utility in also scrutinising it.
 - What is the outcome a scrutiny review could achieve? Will the review be able to add value to the issue?
- 3.7 Members may be aware that a scrutiny panel has recently been established to look at the societal impacts of the in-year budget reductions. A significant number of the reductions agreed by Cabinet are within CYPT and the focus of the panel will probably be mostly on these areas. As such it is not recommended that CYPOSC establishes another scrutiny panel, but that rather, a number of the suggested panel topics are brought to Committee, where if concerns are raised, further scrutiny can be undertaken through panels/workshops.
- 3.8 CYPOSC has also recently held a workshop on school attainment; an issue raised by Cllr Hawkes following the CAA. The report from this workshop will be made to CYPOSC members shortly.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 This report summarises the consultation responses received from residents, Members, officers and partner organisations. Consultation was undertaken throughout July.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

5.1 There are no financial implications as all panel work will be undertaken within the existing resource envelope allocated to scrutiny.

Legal Implications:

5.2 The recommendations at 2.1 is consistent with the statutory framework for overview and scrutiny committees under section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000.

Equalities Implications:

5.3 In undertaking detailed scoping work on panels equality implications will be addressed. The consultation as a whole has highlighted some equality issues that can be taken forward.

Sustainability Implications:

5.4 There are no direct implications.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5 There are no direct implications.

Risk & Opportunity Management Implications:

5.6 The consultation exercise was undertaken to ensure that scrutiny resources are focused on the most appropriate areas. There is an opportunity for scrutiny to influence some of the key issues facing the city.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.7 An annual work programme for scrutiny reviews should enable the scrutiny function to respond to those issues that affect the city as a whole and take a more active role in place-shaping.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Panel scoping information

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

- 1. The Community Engagement Framework
- 2. Report to March OSC