



Scrutiny Board

21 October 2014

Time 6.00 pm **Public Meeting?** YES **Type of meeting** Scrutiny
Venue Committee Room 3 - Civic Centre, St Peter's Square, Wolverhampton WV1 1SH

Membership

Chair Cllr Peter O'Neill (Lab)
Vice-chair Cllr Barry Findlay (Con)

Labour

Cllr Ian Angus
Cllr Alan Bolshaw
Cllr Paula Brookfield
Cllr Claire Darke
Cllr Julie Hodgkiss
Cllr Lorna McGregor
Cllr Rita Potter
Cllr John Rowley
Cllr Stephen Simkins

Conservative

Cllr Arun Photay
Cllr Paul Singh
Cllr Wendy Thompson

Quorum for this meeting is four Councillors.

Information for the Public

If you have any queries about this meeting, please contact the democratic support team:

Contact Jonathan Pearce
Tel/Email 01902 555043 or jonathan.pearce@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Address Democratic Support, Civic Centre, 2nd floor, St Peter's Square,
Wolverhampton WV1 1RL

Copies of other agendas and reports are available from:

Website <http://wolverhampton.moderngov.co.uk/>
Email democratic.support@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Tel 01902 555043

Please take note of the protocol for filming, recording, and use of social media in meetings, copies of which are displayed in the meeting room.

Some items are discussed in private because of their confidential or commercial nature. These reports are not available to the public.

Agenda

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

MEETING BUSINESS ITEMS

- 1 **Apologies for absence**
- 2 **Declarations of interest**
- 3 **Minutes of the previous meeting (16 September 2014)** (Pages 1 - 4)
[To approve the minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.]
- 4 **Matters arising**

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 5 **Employee performance appraisals** (Pages 5 - 20)
[To review progress on undertaking performance appraisals and the improvement plan.]
- 6 **Tracking and monitoring of scrutiny reviews** (Pages 21 - 40)
[To review progress against the following scrutiny reviews:
 - (1) Child poverty.
 - (2) Maintaining and building relationships with emerging academies and free schools.]
- 7 **Work programme** (Pages 41 - 54)
[To consider the Board's work programme for future meetings.]



Scrutiny Board

Minutes - 16 September 2014

Attendance

Members of the Board

Cllr Peter O'Neill (Chair)
Cllr Barry Findlay (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Ian Angus
Cllr Alan Bolshaw
Cllr Ian Brookfield
Cllr Paula Brookfield
Cllr Claire Darke
Cllr Lorna McGregor
Cllr Rita Potter
Cllr John Rowley
Cllr Stephen Simkins
Cllr Paul Singh
Cllr Wendy Thompson

Employees

Adam Hadley	Scrutiny and Transparency Manager
Keith Ireland	Strategic Director, Delivery
Martyn Sargeant	Head of Democratic Services

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

- 1 Apologies for absence**
Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Hodgkiss and Photay, for whom Cllrs Ian Brookfield and Paul Singh attended as substitutes.
- 2 Declarations of interest**
There were no declarations of interest.
- 3 Minutes of the previous meeting (31 July 2014)**
Resolved:
That the minutes of the meeting held on 31 July 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.
- 4 Matters arising**
There were no matters arising.

5 **Information governance**

Adam Hadley introduced the information governance performance report for the first quarter of 2014/15, noting that it had been reviewed by Cabinet (Performance Management) Panel the previous evening. He drew Councillors attention to:

- Much improved performance in responses to Freedom of Information (Fol) requests – 94% within statutory timescale. He advised this placed Wolverhampton within the first quartile for council performance.
- 69% response rate within the statutory timescale for subject access requests (SARs), although there is no benchmarking or trend information available.
- The difficulties faced in responding to SARs in respect of social services cases, particularly for people formerly in care, because of the administrative burden of redacting case files that can run to thousands of pages.
- 100% completion of the protecting information training by existing employees and Councillors, and the arrangements in place to identify new employees.

Concern was expressed about the cost of handling both Fols and SARs, particularly where those requests were vexatious or spurious. Keith Ireland explained every effort was being made to minimise the workload for the Council, by:

- Identifying the most popular repeat requests and making the information part of the Council's publication scheme.
- Clarifying and tightening retention schedules.
- Securely disposing of paperwork that no longer needs to be retained.

Resolved:

To receive a second quarter update once available, to include SAR benchmarking information.

6 **Quarter one performance**

Keith Ireland introduced the second quarter performance report, noting again that it had been reviewed the previous evening by the Cabinet (Performance Management) Panel. He highlighted the two exception reports in respect of looked after children and employee appraisals, as well as a small number of amber indicators.

Queries were raised about the target (and principle of having a target at all) for children moving in with adoptive families. Keith advised he would ask the responsible Assistant Director to discuss this further with Councillors.

Clarification was sought in relation to the performance in respect of the number of businesses assisted. Keith advised he did not have further detail available but further detail would be provided to members of the Board in writing.

Concern was expressed about the continued poor performance in respect of the number of employees having a current appraisal. Keith assured the Board that an action plan was in place, commencing with an audit of the existing records, which he felt did not provide a complete picture. He further highlighted his concern that a more critical issue was the quality of many of the appraisals that were taking place, which were not addressing issues of poor performance. He explained that this would be a key priority over the coming two years.

Resolved:

- (1) To receive the second quarter performance update at a subsequent meeting once available, to include school performance data for 2013/14.
- (2) To receive further explanatory detail in respect of the businesses assisted target.
- (3) For individual scrutiny panels to review performance rated amber in more detail.
- (4) To receive details of the improvement plan in respect of employee appraisals.

7

Work programme

Adam Hadley introduced the scrutiny work programme for the coming months.

Resolved:

- (1) To note the work programme and agree the amendments put forward by the individual panels.
- (2) That the Children and Young People panel would take the lead on reviewing children and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS), but members of the Health Scrutiny Panel would be welcome to attend.
- (3) That a joint meeting of the Adults and Community Scrutiny Panel, Health and Wellbeing Board, and Health Scrutiny Panel would be convened in October to consider the implications of the Care Act 2014.
- (4) That the looked-after children review be drawn to a close with the separate workstreams to be considered by the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel.
- (5) To receive an update on the 2014/15 scrutiny reviews at the next meeting.
- (6) To receive an update on the risk register at the next meeting.
- (7) To note that the challenging school performance review (2013/14) was on hold, pending a meeting between the Chair and the Assistant Director.

This page is intentionally left blank



Scrutiny Board

21 October 2014

Report Title	Internal Audit Report – Performance Appraisal Scheme	
Cabinet Member with Lead Responsibility	Councillor Andrew Johnson Resources	
Wards affected	All	
Accountable Director	Keith Ireland	
Originating service	Audit	
Accountable employee(s)	Peter Farrow Tel Email	Head of Audit 01902 554460 peter.farrow@wolverhampton.gov.uk
	Sue Davies Tel Email	Chief HR Officer 01902 554056 sue.davies@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Report to be/has been considered by	Audit Committee 14 July 2014	

Recommendations for action or decision:

The Scrutiny Board is asked to consider the report and make recommendations.

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to update Scrutiny Board on the work to improve the performance around the uptake of appraisals after its consideration of the Q1 performance report, and following a recent audit review of the performance appraisal scheme.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Council's new performance appraisal scheme has recently been subject to an internal audit review which found that the completion rate for appraisals was very low. The report also identified a number of issues that may have contributed to the low take up.

3.0 Progress

- 3.1 HR will give a verbal update position to the Scrutiny Board on the progress made in implementing the actions arising from the audit report.

4.0 Financial implications

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report.
[GE/07102014/W]

5.0 Legal implications

- 5.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.
[RB/07102014/Z]

6.0 Equalities implications

- 6.1 There are no equalities implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

7.0 Environmental implications

- 7.1 There are no environmental implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

8.0 Human resources implications

- 8.1 There are some human resources implications arising from the recommendations in this report in that they include proposals which will clarify the operation of the appraisal policy and procedures, therefore guidance will be updated accordingly.

9.0 Corporate landlord implications

- 9.1 There are no corporate landlord implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

10.0 Schedule of background papers – Internal audit report – Performance Appraisal Scheme

This page is intentionally left blank

Wolverhampton

City Council



Draft Internal Audit Report – Performance Appraisal Scheme

Date Issued: June 2014

Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Executive summary
3. Issues arising

Report distribution:

Keith Ireland – Strategic Director, Delivery

Tim Johnson – Strategic Director, Education and Enterprise

Sarah Norman – Strategic Director, Community

Sue Davies – Chief Human Resources Officer



1 Introduction

An audit of the Corporate Performance Appraisal scheme has been undertaken as part of the Council's Internal Audit Plan. In April 2013, a new performance appraisal scheme was launched across the Council. This was communicated to all employees via City People and managers were emailed directly informing them of the scheme and offering support in completing the process. The completion of performance appraisals is being monitored as one of the Council's 51 performance measures which are used to monitor progress towards delivery of the Corporate Plan. Target completion levels have been set for each quarter. However, the table below illustrates that there is a considerable shortfall in meeting these targets.

	Target % (Cumulative)	Actual % (Cumulative)
Quarter 1	25	1
Quarter 2	50	3
Quarter 3	75	10
Quarter 4	100	25

The current RAG rating for this measure on the Corporate Measures report is **Red**.

Our review also aimed to establish if there were any underlying trends that could be identified which are contributing to the problems in embedding the performance appraisals.

It is envisaged that Agresso will improve the monitoring of performance appraisals once the first appraisals have been completed and recorded on the system. However, as the majority of problems identified relate to achieving completion in the first place, then problems may still exist despite the implementation of Agresso.

1.1 Scope and objectives of audit work

The objective of our audit was to deliver reasonable assurance on the adequacy and application of the risk management and associated control framework. The control system is put in place to ensure that risks to the achievement of the Council's objectives in this area are managed effectively. Our audit considered the Council's objectives for the area under review and the potential risks to the achievement of those objectives.

System Objective	Potential Risks
All employees should receive an annual appraisal from their manager in accordance with Corporate Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to meet corporate performance measures established to demonstrate that Wolverhampton is a confident, capable Council.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low staff morale leading to poor performance and subsequent non delivery of services.

As part of our review we also issues a series of questionnaires to a sample of managers in order to obtain their views on the new performance appraisal scheme, and their views have helped inform sections of this report.

2 Executive summary

2.1 Overall conclusion

Taking account of the issues identified in this report, in our opinion the controls within the system, as currently laid down and operating, provide **limited assurance** that risks material to the achievement of the Council's objectives for the system are adequately managed and controlled.

Definitions for the levels of assurance that can be given:

Substantial	There is a robust framework of controls which ensures that objectives are likely to be achieved and controls are applied
Satisfactory	There is a sufficient framework of key controls for objectives to be achieved but the control framework could be stronger
Limited	There is a risk of objectives not being achieved due to the absence of key internal controls or a significant

2.2 Key issues identified

This report has been prepared on an exception basis. Therefore, we have only reported on areas where action is required to address weaknesses in controls or to limit exposure to risk.

We have identified one **red** and four **amber** and two **green** issues, arising from the following:

- Low number of appraisals completed, including at a senior level
- Inaccurate reporting of performance information
- Low participation in appraisal training
- Unrealistic profiling of performance measure targets
- Lack of clear lines of responsibility
- Insufficient promotion of the scheme
- Work plans not always fully completed

Suggested / agreed actions have been made for these areas and they are shown in the main body of the report. Consideration should be given to, where appropriate, feeding

any red or amber issues from this report, into the relevant risk management process in order to help manage any associated risks. Also, the key issues arising from this report may be included in summary form to the Audit Committee.

2.3 Acknowledgement

A number of staff gave their time and co-operation during the course of this review. We would like to record our thanks to all of the individuals concerned.

3 Issues arising and suggested/agreed actions

Priority rating for issues identified

Red - action is imperative to ensure that the objectives for the area under review are met.

Amber - requires action to avoid exposure to significant risks in achieving the objectives for the area under review.

Green - action is advised to enhance risk control or operational efficiency.

No	Priority	Issues arising	Action to address issues	Responsibility	Target date																								
3.1	Red	<p>Low number of appraisals completed, including at a senior level Within Council policy it is a mandatory requirement of managers to undertake a performance appraisal with the employees that they manage on an annual basis. Despite this requirement there has been a very poor take up on the number of appraisals undertaken across the Council. The new appraisal scheme was introduced on 1 April 2013, and in the first 12 months, as the table below shows, only 25% of employees had received an appraisal.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Directorate</th> <th>Approximate Appraisals completed*</th> <th>Approximate Employee Count @ 31 March 2014*</th> <th>Take up</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Community</td> <td>240</td> <td>2,400</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Delivery</td> <td>1,200</td> <td>2,400</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education and Enterprise</td> <td>150</td> <td>1,500</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OCE</td> <td>15</td> <td>40</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1,605</td> <td>6,340</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* These figures are approximate and at a point in time. As expanded upon below and in paragraph 3.2, the lack of an accurate and consistent approach makes it difficult to establish the exact figures.</p>	Directorate	Approximate Appraisals completed*	Approximate Employee Count @ 31 March 2014*	Take up	Community	240	2,400	10%	Delivery	1,200	2,400	50%	Education and Enterprise	150	1,500	10%	OCE	15	40	37%	Total	1,605	6,340	25%	<p>All managers should be regularly reminded through a number of channels, of the need to carry out, and log regular performance appraisals in line with the requirements of the Council's policy.</p> <p>The number of appraisals undertaken against performance targets should be monitored at regular intervals by each directorate's management team, and corporately by the Strategic Executive Board.</p> <p>Formal intervention should be taken in areas of continued non-compliance.</p>		
			Directorate	Approximate Appraisals completed*	Approximate Employee Count @ 31 March 2014*	Take up																							
			Community	240	2,400	10%																							
			Delivery	1,200	2,400	50%																							
			Education and Enterprise	150	1,500	10%																							
			OCE	15	40	37%																							
Total	1,605	6,340	25%																										
Page 13																													

No	Priority	Issues arising	Action to address issues	Responsibility	Target date
Page 14		<p>Within these figures, the number of more senior employees receiving an appraisal, and employees based away from the Civic Centre were particularly low.</p> <p>A number of reasons for such a low take up were offered from across the Council, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lack of awareness of the new appraisal process/differing levels of success in communicating the new process (this matter is further commented on in paragraph 3.6); • Appraisals being undertaken but not being logged on the performance appraisal system; • Time constraints; • Awaiting confirmation of restructures and ongoing uncertainties around changes in line management; • Employees awaiting completion of their own appraisal before undertaking others; • Appraisals completed, but awaiting the return of completed forms/documentation from employees; • Potential restructures; • Appraisals delayed to align with the previous Employee Performance Review Scheme cycle. <p>Implication: The Council's Performance Appraisal and Personal Development Policy is not being followed. Without an appraisal managers and employees do not have the opportunity to review performance or ensure that achievements, strengths and areas for improvement are recognised and acknowledged, personal development needs are not identified and managers are not providing the appropriate support.</p>			

No	Priority	Issues arising	Action to address issues	Responsibility	Target date
3.2	Amber	<p>Inaccurate reporting of performance information Inaccurate data on the number of appraisals being undertaken was being reported in the corporate performance report. There were a variety of reasons behind this, predominantly based around difficulties when attempting to reconcile the information held on the performance appraisal system to that on the corporate performance management system TENS, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear definition for the “% of appraisals completed” figure - the performance appraisal system can be updated retrospectively (i.e. appraisals can be added at a much later date) whereas TENS uses data within specific time frames and makes use of cut-off points. • Calculations using the total number of NI numbers appearing as live payroll records, but excluding school based and Pensions Fund employees. • Employees who have been directly employed by the Council for less than six months are not required to have an appraisal. However, these employees are not excluded from the total number of employees reported. • The total number of employees figure includes zero based hours’ employees. Whilst the policy does not specifically state that these employees are not required to be appraised, it would seem reasonable to exclude them from the process. • Uncertainty over how to deal with employees who have more than one job at the Council and if they need a performance appraisal for each role. At the moment they are recorded in the figures as doing so. <p>Implication: Inaccurate information on the number of appraisals completed/overall performance reported in corporate performance reports.</p>	<p>The corporate performance measure “% of appraisals completed” should be clearly defined and a data quality review undertaken to ensure the validity of the data provided within the corporate performance report.</p> <p>Following such a review, any required clarification to the performance appraisal policy, particularly around the comments made in this report and the subsequent impact they have on determining and measuring performance, should be addressed.</p>		

No	Priority	Issues arising	Action to address issues	Responsibility	Target date
3.3	Amber	<p>Low participation in appraisal training A range of training opportunities to support managers in undertaking performance appraisals, and raise awareness of the Council's Policy, can be accessed through the Council's Learning Hub or a face to face Skills Gym. We reviewed these and found them to offer a good level and quality of training. However, an analysis of training undertaken in the first eight months of the scheme highlighted that only 20 employees had completed e-learning modules, although over 200 employees had attended the Skills Gym.</p> <p>Implication Low level of engagement with training opportunities may reduce its effectiveness, and contribute towards the low completion rates.</p>	<p>Managers who have failed to carry out appraisals, or feel they have a lack of awareness of what is required, should be encouraged to engage in the various training/policy raising opportunities available to them.</p>		
Page 4	Amber	<p>Unrealistic profiling of performance measure targets Given the unequal pattern in which performance appraisals have historically been undertaken, the assumption of an equal profile of target percentages across the year (i.e. 25% of performance appraisals to be completed in each quarter) and that 100% would be achieved within the first 12 months, would appear unrealistic.</p> <p>Implication: Adverse pressure and poor performance reporting through unrealistic expectations.</p>	<p>The profiling of the corporate performance measure target should be reviewed to ensure that it is both realistic and achievable.</p>		

No	Priority	Issues arising	Action to address issues	Responsibility	Target date
3.5	Amber	<p>Lack of clear lines of responsibility</p> <p>During our review it was difficult to identify exactly who was responsible for undertaking performance appraisals due to the lack of readily available and current structural information and clear lines of accountability. It is envisaged that once fully operational, the Agresso system should improve this situation.</p> <p>Also, at the time of our review, there were approximately 240 agency/ interim/consultancy staff working at the Council. Given the issues identified above, it was not possible to identify which of these officers, if any, were responsible for completing performance appraisals, and if they were, what induction process they had received on this policy.</p> <p>Finally, we noted wide ranging differences in the number of appraisals being carried out by individuals, with many as low as performing just one, but in other cases, a much more significant number. This suggests that the levels of delegation for undertaking appraisals could be improved upon.</p> <p>Implication: Lack of accountability contributing towards the low number of appraisals being undertaken.</p>	<p>Accurate and up to date structural charts with clear lines of accountability should be maintained to identify responsibility for the completion of performance appraisals (including agency/interim/ consultancy staff). All such accountability should be kept within reasonable and manageable limits.</p>		

No	Priority	Issues arising	Action to address issues	Responsibility	Target date
3.6	Green	<p>Insufficient promotion of the scheme From a review of the Council's intranet, only two articles on the performance appraisal scheme could be found. One from March 2013, at the time of the launch and the other in June 2013, promoting the training available to support managers undertaking appraisals. Later in March 2014 the Chief Executive issued an email to all managers, raising the issue of non-completion of performance appraisals. Given the persistent low rates of completion and the overall red RAG rating in the corporate performance report, higher levels of promotion in order to raise employee awareness would have been expected.</p> <p>Implication: The high priority awarded by the Council to the performance appraisal scheme was not supported by the level of activity promoting the scheme, contributing to the low take up.</p>	<p>A more pro-active promotion of the performance appraisal scheme should be undertaken through mechanisms such as the intranet/Agresso/payslip messages.</p> <p>Further promotion activities should also be investigated at a local/directorate level</p>		
3.7	Green	<p>Work plans not always fully completed As part of each appraisal, an individual work plan should be prepared, setting objectives and key actions for the employee for the year ahead. From our review of a number of appraisals that had been undertaken, we noted that these work plans were not always being fully and correctly completed.</p> <p>Implication: Maximum benefit from each appraisal may not be obtained and objectives and key actions for employees may not be fully identified.</p>	<p>Managers carrying out appraisals should be reminded of the need to follow the official guidance, and fully complete the formal documentation (including the work plan).</p>		

Limitations inherent to the internal auditor's work

This report has been prepared solely for Wolverhampton City Council in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the terms of reference. Internal audit does not accept or assume any liability of duty of care for any other purpose or to any other party. This report should not be disclosed to any third party, quoted or referred to without prior consent. Internal audit has undertaken this review subject to the limitations outlined below.

Internal control

- Internal control systems, no matter how well designed and operated, are affected by inherent limitations. These include the possibility of poor judgement in decision making, human error, control processes being deliberately circumvented by employees and others, management overriding controls and the occurrence of unforeseeable circumstances.

Responsibilities of management and internal auditors

- It is management's responsibility to develop and maintain sound systems of risk management, internal control and governance for the prevention and detection of irregularities and fraud. Internal audit work should not be seen as a substitute for management's responsibilities for the design and operation of these systems.
- Internal audit endeavours to plan audit work so that it has a reasonable expectation of detecting significant control weakness and if detected, will carry out additional work directed towards identification of consequent fraud or other irregularities. However, internal audit procedures alone, even when carried out with due professional care, do not guarantee that fraud will be detected.
- Accordingly, these examinations by internal auditors should not be relied upon solely to disclose fraud or other irregularities which may exist.

This page is intentionally left blank



Scrutiny Board

21 October 2014

Report title	Monitoring and Tracking Scrutiny Reviews	
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor Val Gibson Children and Families	
	Councillor Philip Page Schools, Skills and Learning	
Wards affected	All	
Accountable director	Tim Johnson, Education and Enterprise	
Originating service	Standards and Vulnerable Pupils	
Accountable employee(s)	James McElligott	Assistant Director Tel 01902 554177 Email james.mcelligott@wolverhampton.gov.uk
	Keren Jones	Assistant Director Tel 01902 555410 Email keren.jones@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Report to be considered by	n/a	

Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Board is recommended:

1. To note the progress and outcomes arising from the scrutiny reviews:
 - a) Child poverty
 - b) Maintaining and building relationships between the local authority and existing and emerging academies and free schools
2. To agree to sign off the child poverty review on the basis that the majority of recommendations have been implemented and there are procedures in place to progress and monitor the remaining actions.
3. To sign off the remaining actions of the maintaining and building relationships review, which have been superseded by more progressive work with schools, academies and free schools.

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 To provide the Board with the opportunity to review progress in respect of two scrutiny reviews.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The child poverty review focused on activities being planned or implemented to identify and support lone parents at risk of poverty, particularly those with young children under five years old, looking for either paid work or help to gain the skills needed to apply for local job vacancies.
- 2.2 Local authorities' statutory responsibilities for educational excellence are set out in section 13a of the Education Act 1996. That duty states that a local authority must exercise its education functions with a view to promoting high standards. Local authorities are discharging this duty within the context of increasing autonomy and changing accountability for schools, alongside an expectation that improvement should be led by schools themselves. The 'relationships review' therefore focused on how the Council could build effective and co-operative relationships in that changing context.

3.0 Progress on scrutiny reviews

3.1 Child Poverty

- 3.1.1 The review findings were presented to Cabinet at a meeting on 25 July 2012 and proposed a number of recommendations aimed at reducing levels of child poverty by providing support to lone parents with children under five years old.
- 3.1.2 A summary of the Child Poverty Scrutiny Review recommendations and a brief update on progress against each are provided at **appendix A** is attached. Cabinet approved the recommendations detailed in the report.

3.2 Maintaining and building relationships between the local authority with existing and emerging academies and free schools

- 3.2.1 At the time the scrutiny review was initiated it proved a challenge to encourage engagement of witnesses from academies and free schools. The evidence gathered was useful in helping to identify and develop relationships and the recommendations to a large extent were undertaken.
- 3.2.2 It is important to recognise that since the review there has been significant change within the organisation of the Council's schools' services and the relationships with schools. The reorganised arrangements both locally and nationally have moved forward and a more discrete relationship is now expected between local authorities and academies and free schools with prime accountability for their performance resting with the Secretary of State, through the Department for Education (DfE).
- 3.2.3 The recommendations have been completed or superseded as demonstrated in the monitoring sheet attached at **appendix B**.

4.0 Financial implications

4.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

[CF/26082014/B]

5.0 Legal implications

5.1 Under the terms of the 2010 Child Poverty Act, each local authority has a statutory responsibility to publish a Child Poverty Needs Assessment followed by a Child Poverty Strategy. The City Board will be taking over responsibility for overseeing work in the City to reduce poverty, including child poverty. This will ensure a strong partnership approach to tackling the issue.

5.2 Under Section 13 of the Education Act 1996 the Council has a duty to contribute to the development of the community by securing efficient primary and secondary education in the City. The Education Act 1996 also requires such functions to be carried out with a view to promoting high standards. The 2014 School Improvement Strategy is intended to ensure that the Council succeeds in delivering these statutory obligations.

[RB/29082014/X]

6.0 Equalities implications

6.1 There are no further equalities implications for the Council.

7.0 Environmental implications

7.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.

8.0 Human resources implications

8.1 There are no direct human resources implications arising from this report.

9.0 Corporate landlord implications

9.1 There are no direct corporate landlord implications arising from this report.

10.0 Schedule of background papers

10.1 25 July 2012, Child Poverty Review, Cabinet

22 May 2013, Maintaining and building relationships between the local authority and existing and emerging academies and free schools, Cabinet

Appendix A

Child Poverty Scrutiny Review - Executive Response 25.7.12				
Recommendations to Cabinet	Accepted or Rejected Comments	Reasons for rejection(if appropriate)	Lead Director/ Organisation	Update on progress
1. In view of the national reductions in funding for CAB debt advice work careful consideration should be given to the child poverty implications of any future proposed reductions in the level of Council financial support available to CAB	Accepted		Helen Winfield, Welfare Rights Team	As part of the Coordinated Benefits Advice Strategy, Welfare Rights Service will become a Specialist Support Unit for organisations in Wolverhampton giving benefits information and advice. The Welfare Rights Service will be the 'expert hub' providing training, advice and consultancy to organisations so they can resolve benefit issues for their customers and expand the reach of benefit maximisation across communities.
			Sheila Collett, Head of Neighbourhood Services Partnerships, Economy and Culture	For the past year, CAB has received funding to run the Benefits Helpline and Response team (BHART) funded through Local Discretionary Grant Scheme (LDGS). Due to the end of this funding, BHART will stop at the end of March. However CAB has been successfully getting Lottery money for Local Advice Wolverhampton (LAW) which upskills other advice agencies to free up specialist provision.
			Heather Clark, Manager Strategic Project /Funding,	A Reducing Indebtedness Plan has been produced as part of the Welfare Reform Programme. Financial capability has been

			<p>Education & Enterprise</p> <p>Sheila Collett, Head of Neighbourhood Services Partnerships, Economy and Culture</p>	<p>included as an intervention under the Black Country European Investment Strategy in recognition of increased need for financial capability in response to Universal Credit.</p> <p>The Scrutiny Board should also note that with the disbanding of the Community Initiatives Team, the responsibility for the Council CAB Grant funding agreement has now passed to Sheila Collett, Head of Neighbourhood Services.</p>
<p>2. The current service level agreement between the Council and Children's Centres needs to make specific reference to the need to work with agencies such as Jobcentre Plus and Citizens Advice, as part of efforts to reduce levels of child poverty and or to mitigate its effects.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Emma Bennett, Assistant Director Children, Young People and Families</p>	<p>The requirements of the Children's Centre National Core Purpose are inclusive of this area of work.</p> <p>A revised specification has been produced stating a key aim is to reduce the impact of child poverty through services that address issues of financial inclusion and employability.</p> <p>The aim of the plan is to increase the number of parents who are supported to be economically active.</p> <p>The narrowing of the gap in economic wellbeing is a specific action aimed at providing access to services that support parents and carers to be actively involved with their local children's centre and help them to prepare for employment and access training and volunteering opportunities.</p>

			<p>Sheila Collett, Head of Neighbourhood Services Partnerships, Economy and Culture</p>	<p>An economic inclusion lead (Sharon Leonard) has been nominated who is liaising with Job Centre Plus, attending relevant meetings including Employability Group and enhanced job clubs. Links have already been made with Neighbourhood Employment and Skills Service (NESS) centres who will be working with children's centres.</p> <p>A troubled families/child poverty strand is part of the Community Learning Strategy.</p>
<p>3. Wolverhampton College and Adult Education Service should provide detailed plans to overcome the barriers identified to families considering education or training opportunities to the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Heather Clark, Manager Strategic Projects/funding, Education & Enterprise/ Sheila Collett, Head of Community Safety Partnerships, Economy and Culture</p>	<p>Links have already been made with Neighbourhood Employment and Skills Service (NESS) centres which will be working with children's centres.</p> <p>A troubled families/child poverty strand is part of the Community Learning Strategy co-ordinated through Adult Education.</p> <p>The Scrutiny Board should also note that with departure of the Head of Services for Skills and the Adult Education Service Manager responsible for Community Learning, the responsibility for the co-ordination of the Community Learning Strategy has now passed to Sheila Collett, Head of Neighbourhood Services. This will ensure there is a stronger</p>

			<p>Lorna Prosser, Wolverhampton College</p>	<p>co-ordination with the Voluntary Community Sector and the Council's new approach to community based economic inclusion, community enterprise and routes to employment in deprived neighbourhoods.</p> <p>City of Wolverhampton College is working in partnership with several of the children's centres offering numerous courses to their parents. Provision is identified by the Children's Centres in collaboration with their service users. Where possible, courses are held at the children's centre, but if this is not feasible then courses are held at a community venue close by. The short courses have been more successful with parents, the longer courses which require parents to attend on a regular basis have been problematic (with irregular attendance, and low retention), which resulted in courses either being closed or deferred with a later start date.</p> <p>In particular, parents found it difficult to commit to the progression from tasters (six weeks) to accredited provision in functional skills in maths and english.</p> <p>Courses are also promoted in a Community Prospectus.</p> <p>Wolverhampton College and Wolverhampton Adult Education Service are working in</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			Aziza Chaudry, Wolverhampton Adult Education Service	<p>partnership to put together a joint Community Prospectus, which will identify and promote provision from both service providers as well as other organisations across the City.</p> <p>Further details about the work of the Adult Education Service in helping parents to overcome the barriers to considering education or training opportunities is attached at appendix C.</p>
4. Children's centres need to look at how current links with health practitioners, such as health visitors can be improved to better support children at the different stages of the Healthy Child Programme and to identify those considered to be at risk.	Accepted		Emma Bennett, Assistant Director, Children, Young People and Families	<p>The original report was considered by Children and Young People panel.</p> <p>Health Visitors are now integrated into eight children's centres. Further, pathways are being developed for an integrated approach to support based on the Healthy Child Programme requirements.</p>
5. A review of the success of schemes being trialled in Bushbury and Eastfield children's centres to identify and support lone	Accepted		Emma Bennett, Assistant Director, Children, Young People and Families	<p>The report was presented to Children and Young Scrutiny.</p> <p>This issue refers to Inspire Plus, funded by Public Health, which integrated CAB workers working alongside confidence building courses.</p>

<p>parents to overcome barriers to employment. The findings to be reported to the Wellbeing and Resilience Board and children's centres management group.</p> <p>This group has been replaced by the Children's Centre Management Group</p>				<p>This has now ended.</p> <p>However the children's centres economic inclusion lead is making strong links with Neighbourhood Employment and Skills Service (NESS) Centres to ensure support is available.</p> <p>A meeting has been held between children's centres and Job Centre Plus to discuss their role in new rules concerning lone parents undertaking work related activity when their youngest child reaches the age of three.</p> <p>The national child poverty strategy suggests that support will be available, however it is not clear what this will look like.</p>
<p>6. The children's centres management group should be invited to review and monitor the effectiveness of current methods sharing of information provided by external agencies and to detail an action plan to deliver any necessary improvements.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Emma Bennett, Assistant Director, Children, Young People and Families</p>	<p>The Council agreed to this arrangement.</p> <p>There is an agreed protocol signed by the Council and the Royal Wolverhampton Hospital Trust about Information Sharing and Early Intervention meetings. These meetings are integrated into children's centre practice now.</p>
<p>7. A report of the findings to be presented to the Wellbeing and</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Keren Jones, Assistant Director, Partnerships</p>	<p>A report on progress was considered at the last meeting of the Wellbeing and Resilience Board before it was wound up. In future the progress to</p>

<p>Resilience Board for detailed consideration and to make recommendations where appropriate to support this work.</p>			<p>Economy and Culture</p>	<p>address child poverty will be considered directly by the Children’s Trust Delivery Board, as well as by the new Social and Economic Inclusion Board, which has a wider brief to reduce poverty in the city.</p> <p>Further work on the child poverty agenda will be done through the annual review to be commissioned by the Children’s Trust.</p> <p>The day-to-day tracking on the causes of child poverty will be presented to the City Board.</p> <p>The Social and Inclusion Board will be dealing with the outcomes of child poverty which will be overseen by the Early Help Board.</p>
<p>8. The Wellbeing and Resilience Board to review the current process for tracking the progress of lone parents who have attended education or job training sessions</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Keren Jones, Assistant Director, Partnerships Economy and Culture</p>	<p>This was trailed as part of Inspire Plus, however proved complex due to information sharing issues. In future the progress to address child poverty will be considered directly by the Children’s Trust Delivery Board, as well as by the new Social and Economic Inclusion Board, which has a wider brief to reduce poverty in the city.</p>
<p>9. The Children’s Centres management group is invited to consider reviewing the</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Emma Bennett, Assistant Director, Children, Young People and Families</p>	<p>Job Centre Plus is invited to attend meetings, but is not regularly represented due to capacity</p> <p>Representatives of Job Centre Plus are required</p>

<p>current membership to include a representative of Jobcentre Plus to advise the group and share information which impacts on their work being done to support families across the network</p>				<p>to be members of the eight locality boards.</p> <p>Sharon Leonard, Children's Centres Economic Inclusion Lead, has met with Jobcentre Plus and is actively participating in the employability partnership and enhanced job clubs networks resulting in links with NESS centres. Active discussions with Job Centre Plus re new rules regarding lone parents are ongoing.</p>
<p>10. An early report presented to Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel on the current initiatives aimed at reducing the educational gap and an evaluation of their success.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>James McElligott, Assistant Director, Education & Enterprise</p>	<p>A briefing paper on the pupil premium was presented to Children and Young People Panel on 11 December 2013. The pupil premium is allocated to children from low income families, those who have been looked after continuously for more than six months and those of service families.</p> <p>A further briefing paper was sent to CYP panel in August in response to a request for more information. The briefing paper set out the main findings from Ofsted about how well schools in England are using the extra funding they receive to raise the attainment of their more disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>A report giving a detailed analysis of the local picture and the impact of pupil premium in closing the educational attainment gap will be presented to CYP panel in April 2015.</p>

<p>11. The lead officer for the Troubled Families Initiative to present a report on progress to Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel after the first six months of its introduction and specific initiatives aimed at helping children to be 'school ready'</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Emma Bennett, Assistant Director Children, Young People and Families</p>	<p>A report on progress of Phase 1 of the initiative will be presented to future meeting of the CYP panel in 2015/16. The report will also include an update on implementation of Phase 2 from April 15.</p>
<p>12. All the original members' Assistant Director, organisations should renew their ¹commitment to the Child Economy and Culture Poverty Pledge (published in 2009).</p> <p>Those organisations who have not signed the Child Poverty Pledge should be invited to do so and to report on their progress annually to</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Keren Jones, Assistant Director Partnerships Economy and Culture</p>	<p>This has been superseded by a revised Child Poverty Strategy. The new partnership governance structure under the City Board – Social and Economic Inclusion Board – will take responsibility for anti-poverty initiatives going forward, including child poverty, ensuring ongoing commitment from partners.</p> <p>Under the new arrangement a workshop is planned for November 2014. At this workshop it is planned that we will ask partner organisations to pledge their involvements in supporting those affected through triage and signposting. Where appropriate they will also be given the opportunity to pledge to providing access to</p>

¹ This group has been replaced by the Local Strategic Partnership.

Cabinet.				digital access devices and personal budgeting support.
13. Director of Public Health to be invited to lead an evaluation of Health the effectiveness of current parenting support schemes	Accepted		Ros Jervis, Director of Public Health	A report on the effectiveness of parenting programme was presented to the Wellbeing & Resilience Board.

SCRUTINY REVIEW – MAINTAINING AND BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE LOCAL AUTHORITY WITH EXISTING AND EMERGING ACADEMIES AND FREE SCHOOLS.

<p>Recommendation 1 - Collaborative Working</p> <p>Upon considering a breadth and depth of evidence the review members recommend that:-</p> <p>Collaborative working must continue to be a key focus. Wolverhampton City Council aspires that all academies, schools and free schools sign up to the Wolverhampton School Improvement Partnership (WSIP)</p>		
<p>The review recognises the value of collaborative working especially through the role of the WSIP. Appropriate budget provision must be allocated.</p>		
<p>Comment</p>	<p>Timescale/progress so far</p>	<p>Officer Responsible</p>
<p>WSIP is an independent organisation which requires members to pay a membership fee to join. The WSIP Board is responsible for setting this fee and for overseeing the business plan for the partnership. Although the Local Authority (LA) has a seat at the WSIP Board, the LA is not in a position to make a financial contribution to the partnership as it is not a member with access to benefits of the partnership as schools are. Therefore, the LA has resigned its place on the WSIP Board.</p> <p>WSIP does not have full membership of all schools in the City. Approximately 19 schools have decided not to buy in to membership of this body this year. These are decisions made by individual governing bodies, some of which include Councillors, and Head teachers. The LA is not in a position to mandate</p>	<p>The revised School Improvement Strategy for Wolverhampton is in draft form and was circulated for consultation in July 2014. This will be agreed early in the autumn following a period of consultation with all partners.</p>	<p>Assistant Director, Education, Learning and Achievement</p>

community schools to join WSIP – this must be a decision for individual governing bodies, and this decision should, like other financial decisions, be made on a value for money judgement.

Collaborative working is a focus for the Council and for the Standards and Vulnerable Pupils team; however, this does not necessarily have to take place through the WSIP mechanism. Collaborative working, and working with all different types of schools (academies and free schools) can take place in other ways. For example, this year the LA Head of Standards and Vulnerable Pupils and the Assistant Director Learning and Achievement have visited many of our academy schools and liaised with key sponsors (e.g. through the Multi-Academy Trust sub-committee for standards) to ensure partnership working is a reality. Several leaders from academy schools are working to support other schools in the City (e.g. Aldersley Academy has provided very effective interim leadership at New Park Special School) and can access the full range of support from the LA (even if they have to pay for this support themselves). In providing evidence to the review group members the relationship with the local authority is an effective one and considered that the presence of an external sponsor could affect the current relationship because an external sponsor would not have to be part of the schools' improvement partnership. Councillors and officers acknowledged the system of schools working in isolation in Wolverhampton had not served the children of the city very well and that pupils should have the right to attend a good or outstanding school.

Collaborative working, and the need for the LA to have a relationship with and know all schools in the City (regardless of status) is a key aspect of this strategy, as is the aspiration for all schools to be Good or Outstanding by 2016. The vast majority of academy schools continue to work in partnership with other local schools – for example, nine out of 17 secondary schools in the City are now academies, and most of these have excellent partnership and transition arrangements in place with their primary feeder schools.

Recommendation 2 - Maintaining School Improvement

Vulnerable schools which might be targeted to become academies should be identified earlier and interventions should be in place to address failings.

Comment	Timescale/progress so far	Officer Responsible
<p>Councillors were informed of the importance of funding for the school improvement team as the local authority had invested £1.2 million to cover salaries of the post of Head of School Challenge and intervention and 13 other posts, some of the finance has been allocated to respond to various pressures, for example support for special schools. The School Improvement Team also offered support on issues ranging from human resources to financial matters and from the evidence received Councillors were informed of the importance of understanding the strengths and weaknesses in each school. This would be acknowledged as one of the many key measures of success.</p>	<p>The revised School Improvement Strategy for Wolverhampton is in draft form and was circulated for consultation in July 2014. This will be agreed early in the autumn following a period of consultation with all partners. This strategy includes a revised risk assessment process which is more robust and based on a wider range of evidence to ensure early identification of need and the targeting of appropriate support and interventions. However, this will only be for maintained schools (not academies or free schools as these are directly accountable to Department of Education (DfE)). The Standards and Vulnerable Pupils Team has been recently restructured and has faced budget reductions of more than £900,000.</p> <p>This has had a significant impact on the capacity of the team. As a result, there are significant risks of not being able to provide sufficient early intervention and support to those vulnerable schools which might be targeted to become academies.</p>	<p>Head of Standards and Vulnerable Pupils and school Governing Bodies.</p>

Recommendation 3 – Alternative Models of Education

Consideration of new or alternative models of education should be undertaken (not to view the academy model as the **only** model).

Alternative organisational structures should be considered, for example when a Head teacher’s post becomes vacant the school’s governing body should be advised that a Head teacher (substantive) post is not the only model available.

Comment	Timescale/progress so far	Officer Responsible
<p>An executive Head teacher referred the review group to other examples of schools working closely together to bolster support and promote shared learning. Councillors were encouraged by the local authority’s attempts to continue collaborative working throughout the review process and were passionate about the local authority’s role when working in this way. Councillors generally thought the local authority should explore any opportunities of this nature, particularly, to give serious consideration to any such arrangement.</p>	<p>It is standard practice within the Local Authority that when an Infant or Junior or Nursery school has a vacancy for a Head teacher, alternative models of education are always considered – this will include consideration of a range of options including amalgamation, hard or soft federation, or interim arrangements if required. These models of education are also considered for schools in difficulty. For example, St. Alban’s and St. Thomas primaries formed a hard federation when St. Alban’s went into Special Measures. Other models of education are also considered when schools share a site – for example, New Park Special School and Kingston PRU currently share a site, and both have interim leadership arrangements in place – this is an ideal opportunity to look at other possible models of education. Governing bodies have an important role to play in making these key decisions.</p>	<p>Head of Standards and Vulnerable Pupils and school Governing Bodies.</p>

Recommendation 4 - Academy Sponsors

Wolverhampton City Council must encourage local, education specific, sponsors.

Evidence shows that local solutions have been successful and should be sought before using external sponsors.

Comment	Timescale/progress so far	Officer Responsible
<p>Wolverhampton City Council has a unique relationship with its academy sponsors because all sponsors are based within the city and they are held accountable for the improving the performance of their schools. They do this by challenging traditional thinking about how schools are run and what they should be like for students by attempting to make a complete break with cultures of low aspiration and achievement.</p> <p>Councillors understood the importance of local sponsors, the relationships to the WSIP and partnership arrangements with other local schools as historically, the local authority, has always enjoyed a good relationship with voluntary aided, controlled and foundation schools. Councillors commended this arrangement and urged that any relationship with academies and free schools should not be seen as any different.</p>	<p>Officers within the Education and Enterprise Directorate will continue to work with all sponsors in the City and will endeavour to ensure that the best possible sponsors are found, where required, to meet individual need. This is often local sponsors who are keenly aware of local issues.</p> <p>However, occasionally it may be beneficial to consider other sponsors, particularly when specific areas of expertise (e.g. Special Education Needs) are required. The LA will work with schools, the DfE and academy sponsors as required to support appropriate partnerships and sponsorship arrangements which best meet the needs of all pupils. The LA will continue to develop relationships and work with all schools regardless of status. All schools (including academies and free schools) will be subject to an autumn term risk assessment and judgement.</p>	<p>Assistant Director/Head of Standards and Vulnerable Pupils</p>

Recommendation 5 - The Admission Policy

Wolverhampton City Council will work towards all academies, schools and free schools signing up to the local authority's admissions policy

Comment	Timescale/progress so far	Officer Responsible
<p>It is the responsibility of Wolverhampton City Council to ensure that its admission arrangements are compliant with the DfE's school admission code but where a school is the admission authority, this responsibility falls to the governing body or academy trust. The research also demonstrated the number of requests for places at pupils' preferred community or academy school does not exceed the school's admission limit, a place could potentially be allocated. However, if the number of requests is greater than the school's admission limit, applications will be prioritised in accordance with the Authority's admission criteria for over-subscribed academy and community schools.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>Service Manager, School Places and Transport</p>



Scrutiny Board

21 October 2014

Report title	Scrutiny Work Programme 2014/15	
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor Paul Sweet Governance and Performance	
Wards affected	All	
Accountable director	Keith Ireland, Delivery	
Originating service	Policy	
Accountable employee(s)	Adam Hadley Tel Email	Scrutiny and Transparency Manager 01902 554026 Adam.Hadley@wolverhampton.gov.uk
Report to be/has been considered by	Scrutiny Board	16 September 2014

Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Scrutiny Board is recommended to:

- (1) Review and develop the Scrutiny Board Work Programme 2014-15 to take account of emerging issues and Councillor suggestions.
- (2) To allocate any cross cutting pieces of work.

1.0 Purpose

1.1 To update and agree the Scrutiny work programme for 2014/15.

2.0 Background

2.1 The remit of the Scrutiny Board was agreed by Annual Council 15 May 2013. This remit included the specific responsibility to oversee the operation of the call-in mechanisms and to oversee the work programmes of Scrutiny Panels to avoid duplication of work and to ensure coherence of approach to cross-cutting policy themes. The Board may determine that one named Panel shall take lead responsibility for a cross-cutting policy theme or may determine that the work be shared between one or more panels.

3.0 Work Programme Planning

3.1 The work programme (appendix 1) is a working document which is reviewed at each agenda planning meeting to determine the timeliness and relevance of items for scrutiny. Any member can also ask for an item to be considered by Scrutiny. At each Scrutiny Board an updated work programme will be presented for discussion and agreement.

3.2 New items for consideration are highlighted in blue.

4.0 Financial implications

4.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report. Within the Office of the Chief Executive, there is a scrutiny budget to support the investigation of issues highlighted by Councillors through the work programmes of the panels and the reviews and inquiries. [GE/07102014/W]

5.0 Legal implications

5.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report. [RB/09102014/V]

6.0 Equalities implications

6.1 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

7.0 Environmental implications

7.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.

8.0 Human resources implications

8.1 There are no direct HR implications arising from this report.

9.0 Corporate landlord implications

9.1 There are no direct corporate landlord implications arising from this report.

10.0 Schedule of background papers

10.1 Report to Scrutiny Board agreeing the new method of agreeing the scrutiny work programme – 15 April 2014

Report to Scrutiny Board – 17 June 2014

Report to Scrutiny Board – 16 September 2014

Scrutiny work programme

Scrutiny Reviews 2013/14

- **Unclaimed Benefits**
This scrutiny review is nearing completion and being reported to Cabinet in December.
- **Challenging School Performance –**
It is recommended to close down this review due to the work being done around a School Performance and School Governor Strategy. This has been taken to Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel and will progress through to Cabinet.

At the start of the next Municipal Year it is recommended that an update on this Strategy and outcomes from it be considered by the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel.

Scrutiny Reviews 2014/15

- **Infant mortality**
The initial meeting has taken place where the review group received scene setting information. Based on this, scoping is now taking place and will be presented to the review group at its next meeting.

The overall aim of this review is to assess the effectiveness of current and future work aimed at addressing modifiable factors that are the main causes of infant mortality in Wolverhampton.
- **Employability and skills**
The first meeting of this review group will take place in November 2014.
- **Channel shift**
The initial meeting has taken place where the review group received scene setting information. Based on this, scoping is now taking place and will be presented to the review group at its next meeting.

Special joint meeting November 2014 (date to be confirmed)

A joint meeting of Health Scrutiny Panel, Health and Wellbeing Board and Adults and Community Scrutiny relating to the Care Act 2014 will take place on 29 October 2014.

Scrutiny Board

Date	Work items
17 June 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny work programme • Agree scrutiny reviews • Tracking and Monitoring of Scrutiny Review: Prevent
16 September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 1 performance report • Information governance Quarter 1 performance report • Scrutiny work programme
21 October 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the Council's approach to performance on appraisals • Tracking and monitoring of scrutiny review: maintaining and building relationships with emerging academies and free schools • Tracking and monitoring of scrutiny review: child poverty • Scrutiny work programme
9 December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking and monitoring of scrutiny review: welfare reform communication 2012-13 • Projects and programme – strategic dashboard • Quarter 2 performance report including an update on Families r First • Information governance Quarter 2 performance report including benchmarking of SAR performance • Budget • Update on the Council's Risk Register • Scrutiny work programme
27 January 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny work programme
17 March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking and monitoring of scrutiny reviews from 2013/14 • Projects and programme – strategic dashboard • Quarter 3 performance report • Information governance Quarter 3 performance report • Scrutiny work programme
28 April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual report • Scrutiny work programme

Adults and Community Scrutiny Panel

Date	Work items
8 July 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refreshed Joint Dementia Strategy and Implementation Plan 2014-2016 (pre-decision scrutiny) • Care Act Implementation
23 September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolverhampton adult safeguarding peer review outcome and action plan • Wolverhampton Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2013/14 • Information Portal demonstration • Removed from agenda – Warstones Community Service Hub (pre-decision scrutiny)
18 November 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary Sector Compact • % of people using social care receiving self-directed support and receiving direct payments (Q1 performance report) • Care Act – Better Care Fund • Food banks
13 January 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aids and Adaptations • CAB priorities
10 March 2015	

Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel

Date	Work items
23 July 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Wolverhampton School Improvement Strategy • Learning and Achievement structure chart
14 August 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of Play Service Provision (pre-decision) • Proposals regarding Children’s Residential and Fostering Provision (pre-decision)
24 September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAMHS (Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service) – briefing paper • Governor training and support • Families r First Programme
4 November 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Primary School Expansion Programme
12 November 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Ofsted inspection results and associated action plans • Fostering process and recruitment strategy • Licensing and safeguarding
14 January 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAMHS (Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service) – Briefing Paper (including invite to the CCG and evidence from the Black Country NHS FT) and 0-25 year old mental health care pathways and funding approach by commissioners • Key stage outcomes • Early help service (5-18) within Children and Young People and Families • Families r First Programme – update on progress
11 March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home to School Transport Review

[2015/16 An early report on current initiatives aimed at reducing the educational gap and an evaluation of their success in reducing levels of child poverty in Wolverhampton.](#)

Confident Capable Council Scrutiny Panel

Date	Work items
10 September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1 revenue budget monitoring • Q1 treasury management activity monitoring • Q1 finance & budget update • Independent Review of process for Medium Term Financial Strategy and Budget • Safety, Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2014-17
1 October 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominations for Earmarked Reserves Working Group • FutureWorks progress report • Report to agree terms of reference Specific Reserves Working Group
3 December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft budget 2015/16 and MTFS • Report of the Specific Reserves Working Group • Procurement and negotiating contracts process • Progress report on Individual Electoral Registration • Percentage of total debt collected during the year (Q1 performance report) • Eugene Sullivan report - Implementation of the action plan (update)
4 February 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 2 finance and budget update • Quarter 2 revenue budget monitoring • Quarter 2 capital budget monitoring • Quarter 2 treasury management activity monitoring • Q3 finance & budget update • Future Spaces and Corporate Landlord • Complaints and FOI report data update
22 April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q4 finance and budget update • Quarter 3 revenue budget monitoring • Quarter 3 treasury management activity monitoring • Employee volunteering update

Enterprise and Business Scrutiny Panel

Date	Work items
15 July 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Black Country Developments and applications• Education and Enterprise – structure and key service priorities
30 September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approach to business support• Approach to business investment• North Wolverhampton Enterprise Zone and corridor• Steam Mill
2 December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approach to Community Enterprise, economic inclusion, routes to employment, skills for work
3 February 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Urban Centres and growth<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ City centre (includes Area Action Plan○ Bilston Urban Village
21 April 2015	

Health Scrutiny Panel

Date	Work items
10 July 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust – report on plans for consulting with the public on the provision of elective services at Cannock Chase Hospital • Wolverhampton Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) - a report on Primary and Community Care Strategy • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust - Patient Experience report on Friends and Family Test • South West Birmingham CCG – stroke services review proposal • Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust - Mental Health Strategy
25 September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust – findings of consultation on the provision of elective services at Cannock Chase Hospital • NHS England / CCG - Commissioning of General Practitioner / primary care services in Wolverhampton • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust Patient experience report on Friends and Family Trust
20 November 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust CQC Inspection Action Plan update • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust – outcome of the public consultation on the provision of elective services at Cannock Chase Hospital
15 January 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francis Report update (and lessons learnt from Mid-Staffs) from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Care Quality Commission (CQC) (b) Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust BCPF NHS Trust (c) Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (d) Health and Wellbeing Board (e) CCG
12 March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Wolverhampton Hospital NHS Trust: End of Life Strategy • HealthWatch action plan

List of potential items (one for each meeting)

Work programmes will develop over the municipal year and the chosen items from the list below will be scoped in conjunction with the Chair of each panel

- Diabetes
- Public Health - Substance Misuse Service – 12 month review
- Adult mental health services
- Learning Disability services

There will be regular briefing updates from Trusts on performance and consultation outcomes:

- Community Dermatology (outcome of consultation)
- Community Ophthalmology (outcome of consultation)

Vibrant, Safe and Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel

Date	Work items
17 July 2014	Sustainability Improvement Strategy
2 October 2014	Anti-Social Behaviour: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anti-social behaviour service review – pre-decision• Anti-social, Crime and Policing Act 2014
4 December 2014	Crime Reduction and Policing: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Police and Crime Commissioner• Update on the Crime Reduction, Community Safety and Drugs Strategy• Wolverhampton Local Policing and Crime Plan 2014/15• Recorded incidents of crime (from Q1 performance)• Neighbourhood Wardens update and budget savings proposal
5 February 2015	Sustainable Leisure offer for Wolverhampton: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Added commercial value (to include the Wolverhampton Fit Card)
23 April 2015	Housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mortgage default / repossession/interest rates• Housing allocation and other housing matters