

AGENDA FOR

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Contact:: Andrea Tomlinson
Direct Line: 0161 253 5133
E-mail: a.j.tomlinson@bury.gov.uk
Web Site: www.bury.gov.uk

To: All Members of Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors : R Caserta (Chair), T Cummings,
E Fitzgerald, M Hankey, J Harris, M James, K Leach, J
Lewis, R Skillen, S Smith, J Walker and S Wright

Dear Member/Colleague

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

You are invited to attend a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which will be held as follows:-

Date:	Tuesday, 6 February 2018
Place:	Meeting Rooms A & B - Town Hall
Time:	7.00 pm
Briefing Facilities:	If Opposition Members and Co-opted Members require briefing on any particular item on the Agenda, the appropriate Director/Senior Officer originating the related report should be contacted.
Notes:	

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to consider whether they have an interest in any matters on the agenda and, if so, to formally declare that interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING *(Pages 1 - 10)*

The Minutes of the last meeting held on 22 November are attached.

4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A period of 30 minutes has been set aside for members of the public to ask questions on matters considered at the last meeting and set out in the minutes or on the agenda for tonight's meeting.

5 UPDATE ON DEVOLUTION IN GREATER MANCHESTER *(Pages 11 - 16)*

A report from the Leader of the Council is attached

6 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE UPDATE *(Pages 17 - 32)*

A report from the Leader of the Council is attached.

Cabinet report attached

Appendix 1A

Appendix 1B

Appendix 2

7 PROGRESS MADE ON ACTIONS IDENTIFIED IN THE NEWSAM REPORT *(Pages 33 - 36)*

A report from Karen Dolton, Interim Executive Director of Children and Young People is attached.

8 URGENT BUSINESS

Any other business which by reason of special circumstances the Chair agrees may be considered as a matter of urgency.

Minutes of: OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting: 22 November 2017

Present: Councillor R Caserta (in the Chair)
Councillors T Cummings, E Fitzgerald, M Hankey, J Harris,
M James, S Smith, J Walker and S Wright

Also in attendance: Councillor E O'Brien and Councillor A Quinn

Public Attendance: No members of the public were present at the meeting.

Apologies for Absence: Councillor K Leach and Councillor R Skillen

OSC.259 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor S Wright declared a personal interest in any items relating to schools as his wife is employed at a Bury School.

Councillor Cummings declared a personal interest two items; Highways Maintenance and Environmental Quality and Fly Tipping as he is Deputy Cabinet Member, Environment.

OSC.260 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no members of the public present to ask questions.

OSC.261 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

It was agreed:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 September 2017 be approved as correct records and signed by the Chair.

OSC.262 CORPORATE FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT , APRIL 2017 - SEPTEMBER 2017

Councillor O'Brien, Cabinet Member, Finance and Housing and Steve Kenyon, Interim Executive Director of Resources and Regulation presented a report informing Members of the Council's financial position for the period April 2017 to September 2017.

Members of the Committee were asked for comments and questions;

- Councillor Smith stated that the overspend hadn't reduced much from the last report received and asked how accurate the financial forecasts were.

Steve explained that the forecasts were made up of actual spend plus committed spend. At the start of the process activity and demand is considered and then new information is added as the year goes on. The forecast also needed to include changes in demand and unknown pressures that may arise.

- Councillor Harris referred to the Better Care Fund and other grants and asked whether the Council was doing as much as possible to utilise the funds available to it.

It was explained that there were two different types of grants. The Better Care Fund is one that is received automatically and then there are other ones such as 'I Will if You Will' that involve bidding for.

There isn't a dedicated officer to bid for the grants but every service is encouraged and do look for a bid for grants specific to their service.

- Councillor FitzGerald referred to the new national funding formula and the fact that schools were currently deciding which option to pick in relation to this. Councillor FitzGerald asked what would happen to the overspend in schools and the requirement that they pay it back. Councillor FitzGerald also referred to the 8 options for schools to choose from and whether schools were being advised on which option would be the most suitable for them.

It was explained that this was something that the Council was aware of and work was being done to address the issue.

- Councillor Hankey stated that the deficit usually reduces as the year goes on but the decrease is less this year and asked whether the Council was confident that it will reduce more.

Steve explained that he was confident that work was being done across the Council to address budget issues but there were always the unknowns that you couldn't anticipate.

- Councillor Hankey referred to service redesigns that were being carried out and asked whether there was enough time for these to be completed.

It was explained that the service redesigns had been scheduled to take place over 3 years but will deliver at different times.

- Councillor Hankey asked whether the Council could afford to keep services such as the civic halls open until the reviews were completed. There had

been a number of civic hall reviews and nothing had changed. Should this be dealt with as a matter of urgency.

Councillor O'Brien explained that the Star Chambers looked at all different aspects of services including how to increase capacity.

- Councillor Wright referred to the delays in achieving savings that were set out in the report and stated that there seemed to be a lot of delays highlighted.

It was explained that the service redesigns needed to be right so could take longer than initially planned or be changed. There was more analysis of budgets than ever before.

- Councillor Smith referred to staff vacancies and the fact that less staff meant that less work could be done on achieving the aims set out in the action plans.
- Councillor Smith asked that the Treasury Management Team be thanked for their hard work and achievements over the past year.
- Councillor Smith referred to the 10 point saving strategy and stated that the savings would get to a point where they would reach the maximum they could. Councillor Smith asked how close the Council was to not being able to provide services.

Steve Kenyon explained that Bury Council was in no worse situation than any other council but the test was to look at where to prioritise the money.

Councillor O'Brien explained that it was also necessary to inform the public and partners where the priorities were and what they should expect.

- Councillor Hankey referred to the Council's portfolio of investments and the properties that had been invested in and the shortfall that was being recorded in relation to this. He asked what the reason behind this was.

Steve explained that the Council had 4 properties that were purely for investment and there was a good yield being received from these. The Council also had operational properties across the borough that weren't achieving their full potential.

- Councillor Hankey asked for further information in relation to the investment properties.

Steve stated that he would provide this information to Councillor Hankey.

- Councillor Caserta referred to the shortfall in relation to the adolescent support unit and asked how this issue was progressing.

Steve stated that he would request more information on this issue from Children's Services.

- Councillor Caserta stated that a company had met with parents of children requiring home to school transport and discussed the use of mobility budgets to fund this service. Councillor Caserta asked how this issue was progressing.

Councillor O'Brien explained that there had been a change in the way that the service was delivered but the issue wasn't about money, it was about the number requiring the service.

- Councillor Caserta referred to business rate retention and asked what measures were in place to attract new business to the borough.

It was explained that work was being done in relation to Treasury Management, investments including the Manchester Airport Group, Increasing the number of businesses, access to sites, skill improvement, regeneration of brownfield sites and regeneration of other town centres across the borough.

- Councillor Caserta reported that Rochdale Council had a link to a dedicated website offering businesses incentives, the website and asked what Bury Council were doing.

Councillor O'Brien explained that Bury offered the same business friendly policies and incentives as Rochdale and he would ask that the information available on the Council website was reviewed to ensure that it was as informative and attractive as possible.

- Councillor FitzGerald referred to the projected £3.5m overspend and stated that if this stayed the same it could add up to a £12m overspend once everything was added up. Councillor FitzGerald asked if it would be possible to see how this bridge was to be gapped in relation to transformation money, business rates etc.

Steve stated that he would provide this information to Councillor FitzGerald.

It was agreed:

That the contents of the report be noted.

OSC.263 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL CARE OMBUDSMAN COMPLAINTS AND OMBUDSMAN'S ANNUAL REVIEW LETTER 2016/17

Jayne Hammond, Assistant Director - Legal and Democratic Services presented a report setting out the findings and recommendations of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.

It was explained that the Council receives an Annual Report summarising all complaints dealt with by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.

The number of complaints received for the last two years was reported as:
2015/2016 – 53, 2016/2017 – 57

These were broken down into services:

	2015/2016	2016/2017
Adult Care Services	12	13
Corporate & Other Services	1	1
Education & Children's	9	11
Environmental	11	13
Highways & Transport	9	5
Planning & Development	5	3
Housing	2	2
Benefits & Tax	8	5
Other	0	0

These were then broken down into decisions:

	2015/2016	2016/2017
Investigated – Upheld	6	5
Investigated – Not Upheld	8	10
Advice given	1	1
Closed after initial enquiries	15	12
Incomplete/invalid	1	1
Referred back for local resolution	29	25

Appended to the report were the Ombudsman's Annual Review letter 2017 and details of the upheld decisions and the actions required to remedy these.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments and the following points were raised:

- Councillor Smith asked whether any complainants who are advised by the Ombudsman to complain to the Council don't.

It was stated that this was a possibility but the figures would be unknown.

- It was asked whether Councillors received information regarding ombudsman cases relating to their wards.

It was explained that the Standards Committee had recommended that councillors be advised of any issues relating to their wards that have been referred back by the ombudsman.

It was agreed:

That contents of the report be noted.

OSC.264 HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

Councillor Quinn, Cabinet Member for Environment attended the meeting along with Neil Long, Assistant Director (Operations) and Peter Stokes, Group Engineer – Highways Maintenance.

It was explained that Highways Operations is the in-house team responsible for reactive highway maintenance, highway weed control, road markings, highway drainage, highway safety inspections, highway related customer enquiries, street works inspections and highway enforcement.

The key highway assets maintained by the team were set out:

Roads – 660km
Footways – 1200km
Road Gullies – 42,000 no.
Road Signs – 15,000 no.
Guardrail – 15km

The key statistics relating to highways operations were also set out:

Completed over 13,00m² of carriageway and footway repairs in 2016/2017.
Completed 5,516km of walked Highway Safety Inspection per annum.
Resolved 7,235 customer enquiries in 2016/2017.

It was reported that all road markings, highway drainage repairs and highway weed control works are carried out by external contractors, this equates to approximately 40% of the highway maintenance revenue budget for works.

It was explained that the Highway Operations revenue budgets for carriageway and footway maintenance have reduced by approximately 66% since 2009.

The total carriageway and footway revenue budget for 2017/2018 was reported as being £493,000 (based on a network length of 660km. The 2016/2017 greater Manchester average carriageway and footway revenue budget was approximately £726,000 for a 660km network length.

It was explained that Highways Operations employ a number of innovative systems and techniques including:

Handheld GPS technology to record inspections, instruct works and record defects/completed works;
CAT planing machines which reduce exposure to hand arm vibration;

Spray injection patching machines, and;
Highway inspection repairs.

It was reported that there remains a disparity between capacity and demand and it was projected that approximately 1500 highway safety repair jobs will not be completed in 2017/2018.

Those present were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments and the following points were raised;

- Councillor Steve Wright referred to the £10m investment that had recently been announced and the fact that only £1.5m had been allocated for work in the November action plan. Councillor Wright asked why more actions hadn't been included with regard to the investment money.

Neil explained that that the remaining £8.5m would be invested long term.

The £1.5 would be drawn down in three tranches of £500k for carriageway patch and footway lengths resurfacing and would focus on meeting reactive targets.

Neil reported that where planned utility work was due to be carried out maintenance would not take place. When companies such as Virgin Media indicate that they are carrying out a schedule of work Highways Operations will wait until that work has been carried out and then inspect.

It was also explained that there was a formula that was used to work out which roads were in most need of repair and this included the state and usage of the road insurance claims and public complaints.

- Councillor J Walker explained that work was currently being undertaken by a private company on some of the footpaths within his ward. Some of the reinstatement after completion looked quite messy and Councillor Walker asked what could be done to rectify this.

It was explained that the New Roads and Street Works Act included the standards and specification required for the reinstatement of openings in highways and footpaths. This allowed the Council to inspect works carried out to ensure that they have been completed to a satisfactory standard.

- Councillor Harris referred to weed spraying across the borough and the fact that there had only been 1 spray carried out.

Neil explained that there had been issues with the contract in relation to weed spraying and problems with the timing of when the spraying had been done. The concerns had been evaluated and the spraying would revert back to twice a year from now on.

- Councillor Wright asked whether the £10m in the budget would be financed long term by a decline in insurance claims.

Neil explained that there wouldn't be such a reduction in claims that this would be possible. £8.5m will be used on early intervention work and resurfacing which would reduce claims.

Councillor Quinn explained that the Confirm System allows for residents to go online and report issues such as potholes. As soon as the system receives the information it is automatically entered onto the system. It was anticipated that system would be updated to include a maps function which will help with tracking individual cases.

Neil explained that the aim was to have all issues reported online which will allow for easier tracking. It will also mean that residents can see if an issue has already been reported.

- Councillor Caserta asked whether there were any opportunities for the Highway Operations to generate income.

Peter explained that there were already a couple of services that the Council charged for carrying out such as dropped curbs. The Council would continue to look for income generating opportunities.

It was agreed:

1. That the contents of the report be noted
2. That Councillor Quinn, Neil Long and Peter Stokes be thanked for their report.

OSC.265 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND FLY TIPPING

Councillor Quinn, Cabinet Member for Environment attended the meeting along with Neil Long, Assistant Director (Operations) and Lorraine Chamberlin Head of Health and Environmental Protection.

It was explained that there was a small cross departmental group of Council Officers called the Environmental Quality and Fly Tipping Task Group who were working to improve the Council's response to increasing levels of fly tipping in the borough.

The group have identified hotspots which are targeted by fly-tippers on a sporadic basis. From this work they have been able to identify sites that are targeted more regularly and where a range of interventions such as signage, enforcement, targeted community action and deployment of CCTV may assist with catching offenders and act as a deterrent.

The group had been allocated a one off budget of £100k to tackle problems in the following ways:

Common Management Information System - £5,000
Targeted Neighbourhood Action - £30,000
CCTV Surveillance - £15,000

Replace Damaged and Missing Bins - £35,000

Replace Fly Tipping and Dog Fouling Signage - £5,000

Fly Tipping Clearance in Back Streets and Private Land Hot Spots - £10,000

It was reported that during 2017 there had been 4 prosecutions and 2 simple cautions for fly tipping and duty of care offences and these had been publicised through social media and the press.

It was also reported that the Council had been working with residents and local businesses to encourage the upkeep of unadopted back streets.

Work was ongoing in relation to public rights of way and sometimes attract fly tippers due to their ease of access and not being in view of the public. Barriers had been erected at some sites to prevent vehicular access and the areas which were considered hotspots were being evaluated for signage and CCTV coverage.

It was explained that there had been a recent community tidy up which had been carried out in one area of the borough. It had involved neighbourhood working with the community and had been a successful exercise. The area was being monitored following the tidy up and was staying relatively clear.

Those present were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments and the following points were raised:

- Councillor Walker asked if Councillors could be given information which would enable them to help with future tidy up schemes and arrange their own.

It was explained that the pilot that had been carried out would be assessed and it was planned to produce a toolkit which could then be rolled out to all neighbourhoods.

- Councillor Smith referred to the use of CCTV and asked what legal restrictions there were relating to this.

Neil explained that the use of CCTV would be used as a deterrent so would be signed in the areas in which it was installed, mainly small patches of land that were frequently being used for dumping.

It was agreed:

1. That the contents of the report be noted.
2. That Councillor Quinn, Neil Long and Lorraine Chamberlin be thanked for their report.

OSC.266 CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE SERVICES ANNUAL COMPLAINTS REPORT - APRIL 2016 - MARCH 2017

The Annual Complaints Report was submitted for information.

COUNCILLOR R CASERTA
Chair

(Note: The meeting started at 7.00 pm and ended at 9.00 pm)

A rectangular box with a 3D effect, containing the text "SCRUTINY REPORT" in bold, black, uppercase letters.

SCRUTINY REPORT



MEETING: Overview and Scrutiny

DATE: Tuesday 6th February 2018

SUBJECT: Update on devolution in Greater Manchester

REPORT FROM: The Leader of the Council

CONTACT OFFICER: Chris Woodhouse, Corporate Policy

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1. This item provides an update on devolution to Greater Manchester. In reality devolution hasn't been a one-off event, rather there have been a series of devolution deals between the region and central government, with the first in November 2014. It has been built on a history of working together as ten local authorities over the last 40 years, more recently through the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA).
- 1.2. Devolution is about local people, including those from Bury, making more of the decisions on local issues, with increasingly issues and opportunities for Greater Manchester being made by Greater Manchester, in Greater Manchester - rather than by Whitehall and Westminster.

2.0 GREATER MANCHESTER MAYORAL ELECTION

- 2.1 In May 2017 the residents of Greater Manchester voted for the region's first directly elected mayor, Andy Burnham.
- 2.2 Having a GM Mayor was one of the conditions of devolution deals with the Treasury. This isn't about Bury and the nine other local authorities losing sovereignty to the GM Mayor, rather the Mayor's power is what previously sat in Westminster. The role has responsibility over transport, housing, policing, fire service provision and industry (in its broadest sense).
- 2.3 The GM Mayor established a senior leadership team with three Deputy Mayors:
 - Councillor Sir Richard Leese – Deputy for Economic Growth and business
 - Baroness Beverley Hughes – Deputy for Policing and Crime
 - Councillor Rishi Shori – Deputy for Young People and Social Cohesion
- 2.4 At a similar time Eamon Boylan was appointed as the Chief Executive for the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

- 2.5 Each of the ten Council Leaders and Chief Executives is assigned to a Greater Manchester portfolio. Pat Jones Greenhalgh, Interim Chief Executive, is GM Chief Executive lead for Safer and Stronger Communities. As mentioned above, Councillor Rishi Shori, Leader of Bury Council, is portfolio lead for Young People and Social Cohesion, working alongside Joanne Roney, Chief Executive of Manchester City Council.
- 2.6 With respect to these portfolio areas, specific developments within the last six months have been the establishment of the Preventing Hateful Extremism and Promoting Cohesion Commission (following the Manchester Arena attack in May); design of a Youth Combined Authority for Greater Manchester; and the ongoing development of an updated GM Police and Crime plan – of note Councillor Tamoor Tariq is the chair of the GM Police and Crime Panel.

3.0 OUR PEOPLE, OUR PLACE- GREATER MANCHESTER STRATEGY

- 3.1 In July a refreshed strategy for Manchester was agreed. Publically launched in October, Our People, Our Place is an update to previous GM Strategies that reflects the changing conditions the region finds itself in, but continues to the principles of joint working that have underpinned previous iterations of regional plans.
- 3.2 The document outlines 10 priority areas and is largely reflective of Andy Burnham's election manifesto. Each priority area has an implementation plan sitting under it, the first set of these being for six months whilst new governance arrangements with the Mayor are developed. The ten priorities are:
- Children starting school ready to learn
 - Young people equipped for life
 - Good jobs for people to progress and develop
 - A thriving economy in Greater Manchester
 - World-class connectivity to keep GM moving
 - Safe, decent and affordable housing
 - Green city region, with high quality culture and leisure for all
 - Safe and strong communities
 - Healthy lives, with good quality care for those that need it
 - Age-friendly Greater Manchester.
- 3.3 There are a series of enablers to make this happen:
- Communities in control
 - People at the heart of all we do
 - Integrated place-shaping
 - Leading the way and taking responsibility
- 3.4 Alongside the strategy is a Greater Manchester Outcomes Framework, outlining the improvements being sought for the region. This has been cross-referenced against Bury's own Outcome Framework, with these being complimentary in detail. Similarly Bury's priorities locally sit well with those of the wider region, so the work taking place within the Borough is having a positive contribution on Greater Manchester rather than competing against it.
- 3.5 Likewise, when considering the enablers in 3.3, these tally with the principles of Bury's Neighbourhood Engagement Framework and system leadership model.

4.0 HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

- 4.1 Earlier this year Bury's Health and Wellbeing Board signed of the Bury Locality Plan. This sets out the transformation proposals for the Borough in terms of the integration of health and social care, keeping people well for longer, reducing failure demand and tackling the wider determinants of health.
- 4.2 Having a Locality Plan in place is an essential condition of accessing Transformation Funding from the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership. Detailed investment proposition documents were submitted as part of bidding process, and £19m has been successfully secured to develop new models of care, such as Home First and scale up interventions including social prescribing.
- 4.3 At a GM level, a commissioning review has been undertaken by Deloitte at the request of the GM Health & Social Care Partnership. Its purpose was to consider what might be most appropriate to commission once across GM, what may be commissioned in a 'cluster' of areas (for example across the North East Sector) and what should be commissioned at a local area level, as well as developing GM-wide standards. It is still expected that significant commissioning remains based within a locality – though within the locality this will be done with greater integration, through a Strategic Commissioning Function (eg Bury's One Commissioning Organisation) rather than the Council and CCG commissioning separately.

5.0 BURY'S REPRESENTATION IN GREATER MANCHESTER

- 5.1 Work is underway to understand the degree to which Bury is represented within the Greater Manchester governance environment, in terms of representation at meetings and on Boards.
- 5.2 A number of these are outlined in the Annual Appointments report of May's Full Council and this includes reference to regional scrutiny groups.
- 5.3 Many meetings though are not designed to have specific representation from every locality, with a more thematic approach. Even for those that do draw on each locality, consideration is made to the most appropriate representative for Bury to attend – at times it may be the council officers or Councillors, whilst at others it may be colleagues from the CCG, police or local business community.
- 5.4 Arrangements are being trialled through Team Bury Leadership Group to capture information from these meetings, from whoever has attended, to share key briefings and provide a mechanism with which to report back a Bury voice. This is to ensure that Bury can take advantage of opportunities within Greater Manchester, whilst retaining its own unique and appealing identity.

6.0 GREATER MANCHESTER SPATIAL FRAMEWORK

- 6.1 The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) is a joint plan that will provide the land for jobs and new homes across the region. It is being produced by all ten councils working together, to provide a co-ordinated consideration of requirements in terms of transport, schools, health provision and utility networks.

- 6.2 More than 27,000 responses were received overall as part of the initial consultation into the first draft of the framework, with these now able to be viewed on the GMCA website.
- 6.3 Work is taking place to produce a second version of the plan, in light of the initial responses, with an aim of maximising the region's brownfield sites. The intention is for this to be published in June 2018. Following publication of the draft plan there will be a 12-week consultation with the public.
- 6.4 Bury's Local Plan will reflect the Spatial Framework once confirmed.

7.0 BUSINESS RATES

- 7.1 Greater Manchester has put itself forward to pilot 100% retention of Business Rates with effect from April 2017.
- 7.2 Previously Local Authorities retained 50% (Local Authorities 49%; Fire Authorities 1%) with the remaining 50% going to the Government for redistribution through the Annual Funding Settlement. The Funding Settlement has been adjusted to reflect this change – to ensure a nil overall impact.
- 7.3 100% retention presents both risks (e.g. impact of appeals) and opportunity (e.g. business growth) to Local Authorities. As this is currently a pilot, the arrangement with the DCLG is that it will operate on a "no detriment" basis.

8.0 AUTUMN BUDGET 2017 AND THE FUTURE

- 8.1 In the Chancellor's Autumn Budget, the government agreed to strengthen the devolution to the region, the fifth such agreement (in addition to the Memorandum of Understanding that devolved the health and care spending). This included the allocation of £243 million Transforming Cities Fund; confirmation that GM will be a pilot for the Housing First scheme to support rough sleepers with the most complex needs turn their lives around; and the development of a local industrial strategy.
- 8.2 Transport will be of particular focus in 2018 following the recent 'Made to Move' report produced by Chris Boardman as part of the GM Moving campaign. Bury Council is due to refresh its Sports and Physical Activity Strategy early in the new year, so there will be a good opportunity to cast this in light of initiatives in the region.
- 8.3 In addition the GM Mayor has announced plans to utilise transport powers that he has responsibility for under devolution to reform bus services, with a public consultation due in the summer of 2018, and has signalled an increase in capacity on the Bury Metrolink line.
- 8.4 The Adult Education budget for the region was due to be devolved in April 2018, though this has been delayed, with the 2017 snap General Election and Brexit negotiations cited as reasons for this.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Scrutiny are asked to note this report and highlight if they would like to receive similar reports in the future.

List of Background Papers:-

Contact Details:-

Chris Woodhouse, Corporate Policy
c.woodhouse@bury.gov.uk 0161 253 6592

This page is intentionally left blank

A rectangular box with a 3D effect, containing the text "SCRUTINY REPORT" in bold, black, uppercase letters.

SCRUTINY REPORT



MEETING: Overview and Scrutiny

DATE: Tuesday 6th February 2018

SUBJECT: Corporate Performance update

REPORT FROM: The Leader of the Council

CONTACT OFFICER: Chris Woodhouse, Corporate Policy

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Corporate Performance is routinely reported to Cabinet, with the latest Cabinet report on this subject the focus of this item.

2.0 NATURE OF THE REPORT

- 2.1 As outlined in the Cabinet report, performance is based on the Single Outcomes Framework which outlines the high level outcomes that we are seeking to achieve for the Borough, indicators that quantify progress towards these, and success measures for programmes and services that we deliver or commission.
- 2.2 The Cabinet report outlines recent performance, including examples of good and improved performance, as well as areas where performance had declined or could be improved.
- 2.3 The one page 'snapshots' allow for consideration of some of most noticeable performance metrics and details updates over recent quarters.

3.0 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 This report to Scrutiny is a routine element of the performance management regime in Bury. Scrutiny Members are asked to note the report and raise any questions as appropriate.

List of Background Papers:-

Corporate Performance -2017/18 Quarter 2 (including corporate performance scorecard)

Contact Details:-

Chris Woodhouse, Corporate Policy
c.woodhouse@bury.gov.uk 0161 253 6592

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT FOR DECISION



DECISION OF:	CABINET
DATE:	15th December 2017
SUBJECT:	Corporate Performance – 2017/18 Quarter 2
REPORT FROM:	The Leader of the Council
CONTACT OFFICER:	Chris Woodhouse Improvement Advisor, Corporate Policy
TYPE OF DECISION:	CABINET KEY DECISION
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/STATUS:	This paper is within the public domain
SUMMARY:	This report provides an update on performance in line with the Single Outcomes Framework for Team Bury. The report details a series of indicators and performance measures under each outcome, with the most recent data provided for each of these.
OPTIONS & RECOMMENDED OPTION	Cabinet are asked to note the report
IMPLICATIONS:	
Corporate Aims/Policy Framework:	Do the proposals accord with the Policy Framework? Yes
Statement by the S151 Officer: Financial Implications and Risk Considerations:	A robust performance management framework is essential if the Council is to measure the effectiveness and value for money of the services it delivers. This report compliments the regular finance and risk monitoring reports that Members receive.
Health and Safety	There are no implications directly arising from this report. Any actions to manage

	performance should consider health and safety in accordance with Council policy.	
Statement by Executive Director of Resources:	There are no wider resource implications	SK
Equality/Diversity implications:	No This report does not impact upon the EA completed for the Vision, Purpose and Values document. The Single Outcomes Framework is a mechanism to manage the performance of the VPV.	
Considered by Monitoring Officer:	Yes Measuring and monitoring corporate performance is an important tool in ensuring legal and administrative requirements are regularly reviewed and that areas of risk are identified and improvements are sought where necessary. This report demonstrates the importance of having a robust framework in place and is in line with the other regular monitoring reports.	JH
Wards Affected:	All	
Scrutiny Interest:	Overview and Scrutiny	

TRACKING/PROCESS

Chief Executive/ Strategic Leadership Team	Cabinet Member/Chair	Ward Members	Partners
20/11/17	20/11/17		
Scrutiny Committee	Committee	Council	

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Bury Council, along with our partners in Team Bury, has adopted an Outcome Based Accountability approach to performance management. This focuses on the difference actions can have, rather than looking initially at activities carried out.
- 1.2 As part of this, work has taken place to develop a suite of high level outcomes - these being the 'conditions of wellbeing' the Council, and partners, are seeking to achieve for the people of the Borough.
- 1.3 A Single Outcomes Framework (SOF) has been agreed by Team Bury Wider Leadership Group with the high level outcomes being:

- *All people of Bury live healthier, resilient lives and have ownership of their wellbeing (SOF-1)*
- *Bury people live in a clean and sustainable environment (SOF-2)*
- *People of Bury at all ages have high level and appropriate skills (SOF-3)*
- *All Bury people achieve a decent standard of living, and are provided with opportunities through growth (SOF-4)*
- *Bury is a safe place to live, with all people protected (and feel protected) from harm (SOF-5)*

1.4 These five outcomes align with the Council's six corporate priorities, illustrated in the Vision, Purpose and Values document, and the five priorities outlined by the Leader of the Council in May 2016.

1.5 In addition to these outcomes, an 'enabler' has been added called 'organisational resilience' (SOF-E), in order to allow assessment of the state of the organisation, as well as that of the Borough.

2.0 MEASURING CORPORATE PERFORMANCE

2.1 Under each of the five SOF outcomes and the enabler, a series of indicators and performance measures has been identified:

- Indicators are ways of quantifying performance at a whole population level, so more reflect the state of the Borough. The Council will have a role to play in contributing towards these but no one organisation is solely responsible for the achievement of an indicator.
- Performance measures focus on a particular programme of work or initiative, usually aimed at a particular strand of the population and how successful this has been, so more reflect how well the Council is doing in terms of contributing towards an outcome.

2.2 This report provides a progress update on these indicators and success measures, with the key trends outlined below, and the wider set of performance information available in *Appendix 1A and 1B*.

3.0 LATEST PERFORMANCE

3.1 Each quarter a number of indicators and measures will be picked out if they show particular trends of note or if important new data has become available since the previous report. Appendix 2 provides an update on those that were included as highlights in the previous quarter.

3.2 Areas of good and improved performance include:

- The Bury Directory, Bury's 'digital first' self –help platform, supporting residents to become more resilient and engaged with local community assets has seen record numbers in both the number of hits to the site and entries. In quarter 2 there were over 44,000 hits, nearly 50% up from late 2016, whilst there has continued to be quarter-on-quarter increases on advice and information on community assets on the Directory. The Directory is an essential tool as part of Bury's Neighbourhood Engagement Framework.

- Levels of school readiness, that being having achieved a good level or personal, social, emotional, physical and language development, have increased from 51.1% to 68.9% in the latest data release. Progress has been through work to develop healthy pregnancy support and appropriate interventions through the Early Years Delivery Model including local phonics sessions and Family Support Plans.
- Percentage of working age residents who have obtained qualifications equivalent to NVQ4 and above has continued to increase relatively sharply in the last couple of years, with Bury now back to being better than the national average.
- There has been a sharp reduction in the number of long term absences within the quarter, with musculo-skeletal issues almost halved and stress and mental health related absences down by over a third

3.3 Areas of declining performance include:

- The percentage of calls answered within the contact centre for Council Tax and Housing benefit enquiries has declined and remained below average. This is due to a number of factors including changes to the council tax support scheme driving additional demand at the peak time around (financial) year-end; a review into single persons discount being conducted; an increase in the number of bills issued as the Borough has grown and resource issues in terms of staffing levels. It is anticipated performance should improve in quarter 3 with an number of these demand pressures easing.
- Delayed transfers of care have increased and whilst overall the figure for Bury is average for Greater Manchester, the proportion of cases where the delay is attributable to social care is high. Non-elective admissions have also increased given as part of the nationwide pressures on the urgent care system.
- Whilst school readiness and GCSE rates are positive as a whole across the Borough, the percentage of students achieving 3A*-A grades is significantly lower than the national average, particularly for males (5.9% compared to an average of 14.5% based on provisional 2017 data). This has been highlighted as part of the Bury Life Chances Commission.

3.4 Areas of note:

- Quarter 1 saw Bury exceed the 60% target for household collected recycling for the first time. Whilst the figure dipped slightly in quarter 2 this level remains high.
- Bury has not kept pace with national increases in employment rate since 2016, though females are much closer to the national average than males. In this period of time there has been an increase in self employment.
- The number of safeguarding concerns that have proceeded to a Section 42 enquiry has continued to increase during 2017 and is being monitored and discussed at the Safeguarding Operations Board, whilst the number of Looked After Children has also shown year-on-year increase (along the lines of regional and national trends).

- Additional Community Safety data will be confirmed once the GM Police and Crime Plan has been agreed.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The development of indicators and performance measures will continue as the Single Outcomes Framework becomes increasingly embedded in the organisation.
- 4.2 Departmental plans and Cabinet work plans will continue to be aligned to this during the next quarter so that performance at all levels of the organisation can be discussed in an increasingly consistent fashion.
- 4.3 Areas of declining performance will be looked at with an outcome based approach, to consider what steps can be taken to improve performance so that a positive contribution can be made to the delivery of the desired outcomes.

List of Background Papers:-

Contact Details:-

Chris Woodhouse

































Improvement Advisor, Corporate Policy

c.woodhouse@bury.gov.uk

0161 253 6592

This page is intentionally left blank

R	All people of Bury live healthier, resilient lives and have ownership of their own health and wellbeing (SOF 1a)					Baseline % Change	
		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend		
I	A	PHOF 0.1ii - Life Expectancy at birth (Male)	2014	78.0 yrs	—	↓ 1	1% ↑
I	A	PHOF 0.1ii - Life Expectancy at birth (Female)	2014	81.5 yrs	—	↑ 2	0% →
I	A	PHOF 0.1i - Healthy life expectancy at birth (Male)	3YC 2014	61.5 yrs	62.5 yrs	↓ 1	0% →
I	A	PHOF 0.1i - Healthy life expectancy at birth (Female)	3YC 2014	60.4 yrs	—	↓ 3	-4% ↓
I	Q	BCF - Delayed transfers of care (delayed days) from hospital per 100,000 population (aged 18+)	FYQ2 2017	746Days	728Days	↑ 1	178% ↑
I	A	PHOF 2.13i Percentage of physically active adults	2015	53.7%	57.6%	↓ 1	0% →
I	A	PHOF 2.23iii - Self-reported well-being - low happiness score	FY 2015	10.2%	9.0%	↓ 3	-11% ↓
I	Q	BCF - Proportion of older people (65 and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation services	FYQ2 2017	85.4%	83.7%	↑ 1	11% ↑
P	All people of Bury live healthier, resilient lives and have ownership of their own health and wellbeing (SOF 1b)					Baseline % Change	
		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend		
PM	Q	Number of Deprivation of Liberty safeguarding applications (DoLs)	FYQ2 2017	270	—	↘ 1	2900% ↑
PM	Q	Proportion of BEATS customers achieving 150mins of physical activity per week	FYQ2 2017	75.3%	30.0%	↑ 1	-15% ↓
PM	M	Non-elective admissions FFCE (First Finished Consultant Episodes)	Sep 2016	1,624	—	↑ 2	2% ↑
PM	Q	Proportion of BEATS customers who have achieved a behaviour change (inactive to active) in 12 weeks	FYQ2 2017	35.7%	40.0%	↑ 1	114% ↑
PM	M	Repeat Child Protection Plans	Jul 2016	18.7%	—	↑ 2	-5% ↓
PM	M	I Will If You Will- Attendances per month	Aug 2016	2,794	1,928	↓ 1	45% ↑
PM	Q	Quality of Life Wheel score improvements for those completing the Health Yourself to Wellbeing programme	FYQ2 2017	3.2	—	→ 0	0% →
PM	M	Number of hits to The Bury Directory	Sep 2016	10,936	—	↑ 1	16% ↑
R	Bury people live in a clean and sustainable environment (SOF 2a)					Baseline % Change	
		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend		

I	A	PHOF 3.01 - Fraction of mortality attributable to particulate air pollution	2013	4.9%	5.3%		1	-6%	
P		Bury people live in a clean and sustainable environment (SOF 2b)	Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend		Baseline % Change	
PM	Q	Household collected bin waste recycling rate	FYQ2 2017	60.00%	60.00%		2	13%	
PM	Q	Number of fly tipping service requests	FYQ2 2017	113	—		2	22%	
PM	A	(Tonnes) Per Capita Emissions of Carbon Dioxide	2014	5.2	6.3		2	-29%	
PM	A	Green Flag Awards for local public spaces	2016	12	12		1	0%	
PM	Q	Number of missed bins reported	FYQ1 2017	2,525	—		2	28%	
R		People of Bury at all ages have high level and appropriate skills (SOF 3a)	Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend		Baseline % Change	
I	A	Good level of development at end of reception-Foundation Stage Profile	2015	65.8	63.7		1	17%	
I	A	Achievement of 'progress 8' levels by pupils at KS4 [Placeholder for 2017/18]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
I	A	% children meeting age related expectations at the end of KS2 [Placeholder for 2017/18]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
I	A	PHOF 1.05 - % of 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training (NEET)	2014	5.5%	4.7%		2	-17%	
I	A	% of working age residents aged 16-64, who have obtained qualifications equivalent to NVQ3 and above	2015	57.1%	57.4%		1	22%	
I	A	% of residents 18-64 with no qualifications	2015	8.2 %	8.6 %		1	-21%	
I	A	% pupils achieving 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C including English and maths	2015	55.3 %	53.8 %		3	-12%	
P		People of Bury at all ages have high level and appropriate skills (SOF 3b)	Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend		Baseline % Change	
PM	A	% primary schools rated as 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted	FY 2016	92%	—		1	14%	
PM	A	% of secondary schools rated as 'good' or 'outstanding' by Ofsted	FY 2016	77%	—		1	0%	
PM	A	Attainment gap between pupils eligible for FSM - KS 2-4 English	2015	-16.3	—		1	-12%	
PM	A	Attainment gap between pupils eligible for FSM - KS 2-4 maths	2015	-14.0	—		2	-42%	
PM	A	SEN/non SEN gap achieving 5A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths	2015	-41.8	-44.6		1	-28%	

Document Pack Page 27

R	All Bury people achieve a decent standard of living (and are provided with opportunities through growth) (SOF 4a)		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend	Baseline % Change
I	BE	ASCOF 1D - Carer-reported quality of life	FY 2015	7.5	7.9	↘ 1	-13% ↓
I	Q	Employment rate 16-64	FYQ4 2016	70.6%	71.4%	↘ 1	-2% ↓
I	A	Average wage level in the Borough (hourly rate)	2015	£13.13	£12.44	↗ 2	4% ↑
I	Q	Proportion of working-age people on out-of-work benefits	FYQ4 2015	9.9%	10.6%	→ 1	-6% ↓
I	M	PHOF 1.17 - Fuel Poverty	2013	10.09	—	↘ 2	-18% ↓
I	M	Rate of Children Looked After at the month end (per 10,000 0-17 years old in population)	Jul 2016	75	70	→ 1	12% ↑
I	A	Children moving out of care into permanence - adoption	2014	20.0%	—	→ 0	0% →
I	A	The number of residential units that can be built on sites that have detailed planning permissions	2016	1,567	—	→ 0	0% →
I	A	The number of affordable housing units proposed to be built on sites that have detailed planning permissions	2016	327	—	→ 0	0% →
I	Q	Average house price in the Borough	FYQ2 2017	£168,300	£174,796	→ 0	0% →
I	A	Number of businesses in the Borough	2016	6,715	—	↗ 4	24% ↑
I	A	Net business growth rate (start ups minus dissolutions)	2015	670	—	→ 0	0% →
I	A	Inward investment into the Borough	2015	£3.22Mil	—	↗ 2	194% ↑
P	All Bury people achieve a decent standard of living (and are provided with opportunities through growth) (SOF 4b)		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Current Trend	Baseline % Change
PM	M	Number on Housing Waiting List	Oct 2016	1,426	—	↘ 1	-56% ↓
PM	M	Number of homeless acceptances	Oct 2016	5	—	↘ 2	-29% ↓
PM	M	Number of homeless preventions	Oct 2016	108	—	↗ 3	671% ↑
PM	Q	Residents moved into employment through Working Well (expansion and GP pilot)	FYQ2 2017	36	—	→ 0	0% →
PM	M	% Non-decent Council homes	Aug 2016	0	0	→ 2	0% →
PM	Q	Transfer of existing statements to Education Health and Care (EHC) plans	FYQ1 2017	85	—	↗ 1	124% ↑
PM	A	Empty properties brought back into use [Placeholder]	—	—	—	—	—



Number of visitors to Council cultural attractions

FY 2016

399,774

—

→ 0

0% →



Average number of weeks spent in temporary accommodation

FYQ2 2017

7.62 weeks

—

→ 0

0% →



Bury is a safe place to live with all people protected, and feel protected, from harm (SOF 5a)

Time
PeriodActual
ValueTarget
ValueCurrent
TrendBaseline
% Change

Potential to be victim of crime rate per 1,000 population [Placeholder]

—

—

—

—

—



Incidents of anti-social behaviour per 1,000 population [Placeholder]

—

—

—

—

—



Number of children flagged at risk of child sexual exploitation engaged with [Placeholder]

—

—

—

—

—



Number of hate incidents reported [Placeholder]

—

—

—

—

—



Police Satisfaction Survey scores [Placeholder]

—

—

—

—

—



Bury is a safe place to live with all people protected, and feel protected, from harm (SOF 5b)

Time
PeriodActual
ValueTarget
ValueCurrent
TrendBaseline
% Change

Community Safety Plan refreshed [Placeholder]

—























—

—

—

—

R Organisation Resilience (SOF-Enabler a)		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Forecast Value	Current Trend	Baseline % Change
I	Q	Council Tax Yield	FYQ2 2017	46.888£ (million)	45.106£ (million)	—	↗ 1 4% ↑
I	Q	Business Rates Yield	FYQ2 2017	30.009£ (million)	29.370£ (million)	—	↗ 1 2% ↑
I	M	Staff numbers (FTE)	Sep 2016	5,079	—	—	↗ 1 -5% ↓
I	A	Average age of workforce	HY1 2016	44.7yrs	—	—	↘ 3 -3% ↓
I	M	Spend on agency staff	Oct 2015	£151,081	—	—	↘ 3 -29% ↓
I	A	Number of online forms completed	HY1 2016	13,215	—	—	→ 0 0% →
P Organisation Resilience (SOF-Enabler b)		Time Period	Actual Value	Target Value	Forecast Value	Current Trend	Baseline % Change
PM	M	Rent loss from voids (STH)	Sep 2016	2.09 %	1.78 %	—	→ 1 0% →
PM	Q	Number of corporate complaints	FYQ2 2017	37	—	—	↘ 1 -52% ↓
PM	A	Number of adverse finding as rate of total ombudsman complaints	HY1 2016	1	—	—	→ 0 0% →
PM	Q	Percentage of Council Tax Collected	FYQ2 2017	54.91%	55.52%	—	↗ 1 -1% ↓
PM	Q	Percentage of Business Rates Collected	FYQ2 2017	55.60%	55.57%	—	↗ 1 0% →
PM	M	Percentage of Rents collected	Sep 2016	97.95 %	98.00 %	—	↘ 1 0% →
PM	Q	Overall gym membership	FYQ2 2017	4,031	4,100	—	↘ 2 -1% ↓
PM	A	Number of apprenticeships created within Bury Council	2016	15	—	—	↘ 2 -40% ↓
PM	M	Number of FTE days lost due to sickness absence	Sep 2016	3,434	—	—	↗ 1 -2% ↓
PM	M	Number of long term absences (over 20 days)	Sep 2016	129	—	—	↗ 1 -6% ↓
PM	M	Evaluation scores for attendees of the Leadership and Management Programme [Placeholder]	—	—	—	—	—
PM	Q	Average contact centre call waiting time					

			FYQ2 2017	182 seconds	—	—		3	119%	
		Percentage of Freedom of Information requests responded to within 20 working days	Oct 2016	91%	—	—		1	5%	
		Average time for processing new housing benefit/ Council tax support claims	FYQ2 2017	24.09 working days	—	—		1	-19%	
		Average time for processing change events for housing benefit and Council tax support claims	FYQ2 2017	8.78 days	—	—		2	-9%	
		Percentage of minor planning applications determined within 8 weeks	FYQ1 2017	99%	77%	—		1	4%	
		Percentage of major planning applications determined within 13 weeks	FYQ1 2017	100%	82%	—		4	0%	

Corporate Performance 2017/18 Quarter 2 – highlights

(Note the RAG colours below may represent performance against target, comparators, or based on current trend and relate to their position in quarter 2)

<p>The Bury Directory (SOF-1)</p> <p><i>Number of hit at a record high with over 44,000 during quarter 2, nearly 50% up from last year.</i></p> <p><i>Number of entries at a record high with over 2,600 listings of advice, information and events.</i></p>	<p>Planning Decisions (SOF-E)</p> <p><i>For both major and minor applications the rate decisions made within expected timescales have remained at 100%</i></p>	<p>Fuel Poverty (SOF-4)</p> <p><i>The rate has increased in the latest data release to a level above the national average. Work is taking place to complete the Council's refreshed Poverty Strategy.</i></p>
<p>School Readiness (SOF-3/4)</p> <p><i>Our young people are increasingly showing good progress towards personal, social, emotional and communicative development by reception age, with Bury now close to matching the England average.</i></p>	<p>Employment Rate (SOF3)</p> <p><i>Whilst the national rate continues to climb, Bury's rate has been more erratic and the last eighteen months have seen Bury's rate below that of the national average. Self-employment rates have risen during this time period.</i></p>	<p>Contact Centre call times (SOF-E)</p> <p><i>Lenghtening call waiting times/ reduction in call pick-up rate for a number of demand based reasons including due to changes in the Council Tax support scheme, a review into single persons discount and increase in number of bills as Borough has grown.</i></p>
<p>Fly tipping (SOF-2)</p> <p><i>17% drop in the number of complaints compared to this time last year.</i></p> <p><i>Process reviewed, including enabling the public to complete witness forms and send photos on the Bury website. Environmental Quality Action Plan in development.</i></p>	<p>A-level results (SOF-2)</p> <p><i>In Greater Manchester, only Salford have lower levels of pupils achieving 3A-A grades at A Level than Bury*. Male students are noticeably behind the national average.</i></p> <p><i>*16/17 provisional rather than revised data</i></p>	<p>Delayed Transfers of Care (SOF-1)</p> <p><i>Having peaked in February Q1 say performance improve to better than the NW average, though this has reversed in Q2. Weekly meetings are taking place with strategic and operational leads to manage this.</i></p>

Corporate Performance 2017/18 Quarter 2 – update on highlights from previous quarters

(Note the RAG colours relate to their position in previous quarters)

Physical Activity (SOF-1) <i>Proportion of BEATs customers achieving a behaviour change (inactive to active) in 12 weeks has remained at 80%, over 40 percentage points higher than last year. 67% of people who access the Bury Lifestyle Service have achieved a lifestyle behaviour change.</i>	Bury Council's Carbon Emissions (SOF-2) <i>The Council has achieved a 22% reduction in carbon emissions since our base year of 2008/09. A Staff Travel Survey, in partnership with TfGM in August 2017 showed 4% staff cycle to work, twice that of 5 years ago, but with further potential.</i>	Gym membership (SOF-E) <i>Gym membership increased during early 2017 exceeding the seasonal variation that would be expected to a level higher than the equivalent period last year.</i>
Household collected bin waste recycling rate (SOF-2) <i>Quarter-by-quarter seasonal variation. Quarter 2 slightly down on 60% target, having exceeded it for the first time in Q1. Slightly down on equivalent quarter for last year.</i>	Carer Reported Quality of Life (SOF-1) <i>Proposal for a New Deal for Carers has been included as part of work within the Bury Locality Plan, alongside work within GM to establish a Carer's Charter</i>	Average wage level in the Borough (SOF-4) <i>The Bury average rate is £11.86 per hour whilst the north west rate has been over £12 since 2012/13 and is now at £12.99.</i>
Sickness Absence (SOF-E) <i>Quarter 2 has seen a reversal of earlier trends within 2017 in which long term sickness has reduced compared to the respective periods in previous year, with a particular reduction in musculoskeletal absences</i>	Healthy life expectancy males (SOF-1) <i>The Bury Locality Plan acknowledges inequalities in healthy life expectancy. Transformation Funding in place to deliver a Wellness Model for Bury and improve all health outcomes.</i>	Delayed Transfers of Care (SOF-1) <i>Where as traditionally pressures were felt more in winter, demand on the system (across GM) is now high all year round. Increased effectiveness in local reablement effectiveness had positive impact on this but demand outstripping supply.</i>

MEETING:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE:	TUESDAY 6 FEBRUARY 2018
SUBJECT:	UPDATE ON ACTIONS FOLLOWING NEWSAM REPORT
REPORT AUTHOR	KAREN DOLTON, INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

SUMMARY: This report summarises the actions taken in relation to safeguarding and adoption procedures following the findings of Malcolm Newsam CBE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On 20 July 2017 an Extraordinary meeting of Council was held to consider the contents of the report of Malcolm Newsam CBE following his investigation into the actions of both Members and Officers of the Council surrounding safeguarding issues

The meeting resolved that the Executive Director of Children, Young People and Culture should implement any outstanding recommendations of Malcolm Newsam in relation to safeguarding and adoption procedures. This report provides details of the actions taken in relation to these matters.

From an operational perspective, the Acting Executive Director is satisfied that the failings highlighted in the Newsam report are not indicative of a wider or systemic problem. These failings occurred in 2015. Since then, between 22 February and 17 March 2016, there was a very thorough inspection undertaken by Ofsted (involving 8 inspectors and a Senior Inspector) of Bury's services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers. Bury was judged to be good for safeguarding children and judged as having a good adoption service. This judgement was made after thorough examination and auditing of a number of children's case files and extensive scrutiny of performance information and policies procedures. In addition, a wide number of staff, partners, children and families were interviewed to ensure that information could be verified.

In addition, following this investigation, a number of additional measures have been implemented to give assurance that practice is of good quality and compliant with procedures. In March 2017, we launched a new

quality assurance framework which requires monthly auditing by team managers and strategic leads of a number of randomly selected children's files. Each file audited is given a judgement (Inadequate, Require Improvement, Good or Outstanding) and remedial actions are followed up to ensure that practice improves. In order to make this process as robust as possible, we have also employed an interim practice improvement manager. Since her arrival in November, the quality and pace of auditing has improved further and positively impacted on the quality of practice. She has audited approximately 100 files since November and she has not had to escalate any safeguarding matters.

The Executive Director has met with the Senior HMI separately in February to give the information regarding the circumstances leading to the investigation. In addition, the Director met with them again in March and July to keep them updated about the events. In addition, there have been 2 meetings in (July and October) with the Ofsted Regional Director and his team of HMIs for the "annual conversation" meetings where they scrutinise our performance and ask challenging questions about our situation.

Recommendations relating to safeguarding and adoption

1) Council to publicise and reinforce the role of the LADO

The role of the LADO is well understood in Bury. The investigation did not reveal any ignorance of this role but rather a choice not to involve the LADO appropriately. The strategic leads have emphasised the role of the LADO at a number of meetings with staff and most recently attended a team managers meeting in October to again remind staff of the role.

The role of the LADO has been discussed at the Senior Leadership team meeting on 21 August and there are plans for a further discussion in January.

In addition, the LADO has done a presentation with several councillors in December.

The role of the LADO in relation to adopters has been updated and can be found in our online procedures at:

http://www.proceduresonline.com/bury/cs/chapters/p_alleg_against_adopt.html?zoom_highlight=LADO

2) Council to ensure all staff are aware of the regulatory role of Ofsted

The adoption procedures have been updated to reflect the content of the regulations, as follows:

Any person who receives information or suspects that a child has suffered or is suffering harm in an adoptive placement or during an introduction to an adoptive placement must immediately inform the child's social worker.

On receipt of any such information, the child's social worker or their team manager must immediately:

- Inform his or her line manager;
- Inform the prospective adopter's link worker and his or her manager in writing;
- Inform the **Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO)** and the **Designated Senior Manager** in writing within 24 hours
- Make a decision as to whether the matter should be immediately treated as a child protection matter and a Section 47 **Strategy Meeting** convened chaired by the Social Work team (see **Section 3.2, Section 47 Strategy Meeting**);
- Where there are concerns about standards of care, consideration should also be given to the convening of an urgent Placement Planning Review Meeting - see **Placement for Adoption Procedure** - or an urgent review of the adoptive placement should be considered - see **Adoption Reviews Procedure**.

N.B. If there are serious and/or multiple referrals about standards of care, it may still be appropriate to refer the matter for a Section 47 Strategy Meeting for a full investigation.

The prospective adopter's link worker will:

- Inform the designated allegations manager within the Adoption Service - see **Section 2, Introduction**; and, in consultation with the designated allegations manager:
- Inform the social workers for any other child in the placement;
- Inform any other local authority with an interest in the adoptive placement;
- Provide support to the prospective adopter.

Where it is appropriate to treat the allegation/suspicion as a child protection concern, the child's social worker will be responsible for initiating the Local Safeguarding Children Board's Inter Agency Procedures in relation to the allegation/suspicion. If the child lives in another local authority area, the social worker will make a referral to the relevant local authority and that local authority will be responsible for leading the Strategy Meeting and investigation, although should involve the child's social worker and the prospective adopters' link worker fully in the process. They will gather relevant background information and convene a Section 47 Strategy Meeting within 2 working days of the referral if there is reasonable suspicion of **Significant Harm** and invite the child's social worker and adopters' link worker to the Strategy Meeting. If the threshold for Significant Harm is not met, a decision will be made by the **LADO** as to

whether the threshold is met to hold a separate LADO Initial Consideration Meeting, chaired by the LADO - see **Section 3.3, LADO Initial Consideration**

Any action to protect the child in question or any other children in need of protection should not be delayed because of the Strategy Meeting.

Prior to the Strategy Meeting, the prospective adopter's link worker should notify the Regulatory Authority of the allegation/suspicion and invite them to be represented at the Strategy Meeting.

All staff are now aware of this requirement and our auditing process is used to check compliance with it.

3) Council to immediately ensure a conflict of interest assessment is undertaken on all councillors and employees who come to the attention of children's social care

The main policy change related to the Council acting as Adoption Agency where a member of staff or councillor was the applicant, and the necessary policy changes have been put in place. These can be found at: http://www.proceduresonline.com/bury/cs/chapters/p_assess_approval.html

Contact Details:

Karen Dolton
Interim Executive Director
Children, Young People and Culture
Tel: 0161 253 5501
E-mail: k.dolton@bury.gov.uk