

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday 12 September 2011

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Membership

Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)
Councillor Andy Simmons (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Gavin Edwards
Councillor Dan Garfield
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor Tim McNally
Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor David Noakes
Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Mark Williams

Reserves

Councillor Kevin Ahern
Councillor Patrick Diamond
Councillor Nick Dolezal
Councillor Mark Gattleson
Councillor Helen Morrissey
Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton

Education representatives

Reverend Nicholas Elder
Colin Elliott, Parent Governor
Leticia Ojeda, Parent Governor

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Access to information

You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Babysitting/Carers allowances

If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

Access

The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council's web site: www.southwark.gov.uk or please contact the person below.

Contact

Peter Roberts on 020 7525 4350 or email: peter.roberts@southwark.gov.uk

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Annie Shepperd

Chief Executive

Date: 2 September 2011



Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday 12 September 2011

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Order of Business

Item No.	Title	Page No.
----------	-------	----------

PART A - OPEN BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

In special circumstances, an item of business may be added to an agenda within five clear working days of the meeting.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Members to declare any personal interests and dispensation in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.

4. MINUTES

1 - 8

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meeting held on 11 July 2011.

5. REPORTING BACK FROM THE COMMITTEE'S FORWARD STRATEGY SESSION

9 - 13

6. PREPARING FOR THE LEADER'S SCRUTINY INTERVIEW

14 - 16

DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING.

PART B - CLOSED BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF ANY CLOSED ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING AND ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR AS URGENT.



OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Monday 11 July 2011 at 7.00 pm at Ground Floor Meeting Room G01A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)
Councillor Andy Simmons (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Gavin Edwards
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Cleo Soanes
Councillor Mark Williams

EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES: Colin Elliott, Parent Governor

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Richard Livingstone, Cabinet Member, Finance, Resources and Community Safety
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton

OFFICER SUPPORT: Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny
Doreen Forrester-Brown, Legal Services
Sam Fowler, Project Director, Southwark Schools for the Future
Eleanor Kelly, Deputy Chief Executive
Stephen Platts, Acting Director for Regeneration
Gerri Scott, Strategic Director of Housing Services
Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dan Garfield and Tim McNally and from the Reverend Nicholas Elder and Leticia Ojdeda.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

- 2.1 The Chair agreed to accept a late call-in request in respect of a decision by the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

- 3.1 Councillor Andy Simmons declared an interest in the part of the work-programming item relating to the health and adult social care scrutiny sub-committee.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings held on 1 and 13 June 2011 be agreed as accurate records.

5. CUSTOMER CARE STANDARDS

- 5.1 Gerri Scott, strategic director of housing services, gave an overview of the council's customer service improvement programme.
- 5.2 A member asked what was being done to improve training. He also commented that he found the current members' enquiries system cumbersome. Other members valued the current members' enquiries system but questioned the timescales and did not like complaints being closed down before they were fully resolved. Gerri Scott responded that it was important that departments interact better with the contact centre, particularly to provide correct information. She added that the main source of complaint was failure to get back to residents. In terms of the members' enquiries system, this was in need of review as some councillors were happy with it but others contacted officers directly because they felt that this was the quickest way to get a response.
- 5.3 Members were concerned that the aim of any review should be a better service and not solely to achieve savings. In the view of some members, there was little difference between stages 1 and 2 of the complaints procedure and a more robust system would be welcome. Gerri Scott explained that there was an opportunity to make savings within the current contract with Vangent, based on a clear understanding of the components of cost. She also reminded members that potential savings had been built into the council's budget for the next three years. In terms of the complaints procedure, some authorities had a single stage process and there was scope for a greater emphasis on resolving complaints. It was important that complaints not be closed down until the resident or member was happy for this to be done.
- 5.4 A member described his personal impression that some officers were patronising and that it might be useful to have a hotline or email address for reporting such attitudes. Officers should be required to give their names at all times. Gerri Scott

commented that it should be standard practice for staff to give their names and that all complaints in respect of staff attitudes were monitored.

- 5.5 Gerri Scott clarified the reasons local authorities had in the past looked to external providers to deliver contact centres. Partly it had been felt that the necessary expertise had not been available in-house. Although in themselves external contracts were not necessarily a bad thing, in-house provision could enable more direct control of service delivery. In Gerri Scott's opinion the council did not have sufficient expertise in managing the client interface because of a lack of knowledge around contact centres generally. The new post of head of customer experience was intended to address this and help in managing the relationship with Vangent.
- 5.6 Members of the committee noted the aim of channelling complaints into telephone and email correspondence and stressed the need to retain all options, including face to face contact. Members commented that Southwark's one stop shops had very good satisfaction rates. Gerri Scott agreed that there should always be the opportunity for face to face contact but that it was also important for residents to have confidence that other channels would deliver. As an example, she referred to the successful introduction of online purchasing of estate parking permits.
- 5.7 In response to questions about the call centre, Gerri Scott reported that the rate of abandoned calls was monitored on a regular basis and had decreased. She said that she would confirm the number of posts in the call-centre. She confirmed that the council did not pay twice for repairs that were not put right first time and that residents were compensated for missed appointments. She added that a contract based on call volumes, like the current Vangent contract, could mean that a contractor was perversely incentivised by repeat calls made by customers following poor service or because actions had not been carried out. Quality of customer experience was dependent upon a number of components, only one of which was the contact centre.
- 5.8 Members were concerned at the possible impact on performance of any suggestion that the contract might be taken in-house. Gerri Scott made it clear that there was no decision to bring the contract back in-house. The contract was not due to end until 2013/14 but it was prudent to consider now what the future might look like and to have early conversations with the contractor about this. In the first instance it was essential to improve performance from the contract. The key performance indicators were too low and although the contractor was currently meeting service level indicators, these in themselves did not equate to excellent customer service. The council had asked Vangent for proposals as to how the contract might be realigned in order to improve performance.
- 5.9 In response to further questions, Gerri Scott confirmed that the response times to emails was one of the performance measures for Vangent. The requirement was for a response within forty-eight hours. This was possibly too low a target. Gerri Scott also explained that historically there had been a problem in Vangent using a different management system to the council's iWorld but that this was now being addressed.
- 5.10 A member stated that the early aspiration for the contact centre had been that a caller would be immediately recognised by their telephone number and their

identity confirmed briefly. He felt that this had not been achieved and that a lot of time was wasted by the contact centre asking for name, address and postcode. Gerri Scott echoed her own experience of being unable to report a repair that she had identified on a walkabout as she had not had the postcode for the address.

- 5.11 The committee was interested in the member level process for monitoring Vangent's performance and the complaints process. Gerri Scott indicated that the cabinet member received a monthly report on all key performance indicators relating to the customer contact centre. In addition, a monthly group chaired by the cabinet member monitored repairs. Vangent attended this meeting along with Morrisons Southwark Building Services and resident representatives. The complaints team monitored complaints and also reported to the cabinet member once a month.

RESOLVED:

That the strategic director of housing services and new head of customer experience be invited to attend the 10 October 2011 meeting of the committee with detailed performance monitoring information across departments and comparative information and costs across other authorities.

6. WORK PROGRAMMING

- 6.1 This item was deferred.

7. CALL-IN: IDM - PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND PROCUREMENT AWARD OF LOCAL EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP TO DELIVER DESIGN WORK FOR THE ELEPHANT AND CASTLE LEISURE CENTRE AND ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL BUILDING.

- 7.1 Councillor David Hubber introduced the reasons for the call-in request.
- 7.2 Councillor Geoffrey Thornton, ward member, addressed the committee. In his view there had been a series of incremental decisions about the leisure centre, all well intentioned, but the recent decision provided no time line or action points. Councillor Thornton welcomed the council's commitment to providing a swimming pool but was concerned at the decision not to look at how lost sporting space could be re-provided, particularly taking account of the high childhood obesity rates in the borough.
- 7.3 Councillor Thornton stressed the evidence that it was not just provision of sport but provision of a range of sports that made an impact. The current decision provided only a four court sports hall and not the six courts that had previously existed. It did not include the only public squash courts in the borough and this at a time when England Squash and Racquetball were due to start a youth programme. Councillor Thornton believed that a solution to this existed in a multi-purpose sports facility or extension of the party walls to increase the building's footprint. He also pointed out that the financial return from squash courts was very good.

- 7.4 Members were interested to know how many representations in respect of the squash courts Councillor Thornton had received from residents of his ward. Councillor Thornton stated that the issue had come up in conversation with up to fifty individuals and that he had been approached by various sporting organisations.
- 7.5 Members suggested that there would be concern locally if there was any further delay in delivering the project. Councillor Thornton highlighted that planning permission was not due to be submitted until January and that continuing to explore re-provision of all the original facilities would not delay the process.
- 7.6 In response to questions, Councillor Thornton explained that in the recent consultation the reply card had included tick boxes for all the other existing facilities but not the squash courts. In terms of consultation he also passed on the concern of Sport England that they had not been approached by members or officers.
- 7.7 Councillor Thornton commented that he had not seen an analysis of the revenue implications of reducing the space available for a cafe and questioned the need to prioritise a cafe in view of facilities available in the area generally. At the same time he agreed with members that provision of a crèche was important in order to improve access.
- 7.8 Members noted that, in view of the impossibility of expanding the footprint and of a double-height squash court eating into the cafe/crèche, the only possible option would be a multi-purpose space. They were uncertain about the impact of this on the other facilities. Councillor Thornton replied that this was an issue of programming rather than space. The aim should be to achieve the best sporting solution.
- 7.9 Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety, addressed the reasons for the call-in.
- Inadequate justification of value-for-money and compliance with the MTRS by virtue of it being a non-competitive contract award*
- 7.10 Councillor Livingstone stated that the decision clearly complied with the MTRS and that utilising 4 Futures, the Local Education Partner (LEP), reduced procurement costs. He drew the committee's attention to the report, which identified the most appropriate procurement strategy and explained the use of partnerships. The report also outlined the promotion of partnership working and the opportunities for reducing costs by taking a coordinated approach. Paragraphs 22 to 24 set out the work undertaken to establish value for money for this procurement. Use of the LEP reduced the cost of and speeded up the procurement process, delivered better value for money and achieved an earlier risk transfer for the council.
- 7.11 Councillor Livingstone stressed that there were three safeguards – an agreed schedule of rates for any work, an independent cost programme and the projects being benchmarked against similar schemes. The issue of risk transfer was also really important. In addition, the option existed for the council to tender out parts or all of the work if it felt that it was not getting value for money.

- 7.12 Councillor Livingstone explained that decisions on further procurement for construction work would be taken by the cabinet at a later stage. He commented that beginning a new procurement process would lead to considerable delay at considerable cost. Full open competitive tendering would cost around £500K, a considerable proportion of the value of the project which would have to be found from the council's revenue funding.
- 7.13 Officers stated that the council had been working successfully with 4 Futures for a number of years and that robust management and governance processes were in place. Steve Platts, acting director for regeneration, added that the council had a very strong partnership with 4 Futures who had been involved in the project from its conception. 4 Futures were also responsible for long term facilities management in schools. Steve Platts believed that it was in the interest of 4 Futures to deliver well, meet the council's requirements and provide a quality service and value for money.
- 7.14 Members asked why the design contract was being let separately. Officers explained that stage 1 allowed the council to see if designs fit the budget and expectations. Stage 2 was to take design and development through planning. A decision about delivery would follow on from this. Officers also clarified that the design processes to be commissioned from 4 Futures did not include the residential element of the project.
- 7.15 Members of the committee were concerned that all risks to the council be mitigated by the time the cabinet considered the construction contract. Councillor Livingstone responded that the cabinet would want assurance about risks and to understand the variables involved.
- 7.16 Members also asked whether the decision precluded any consideration of the questions raised by Councillor Thornton about the design specification for the leisure centre. Councillor Livingstone indicated that the scope would be narrowed but that Councillor Thornton's suggestions could still be explored. Steve Platts added that there would be opportunities to amend the design in the run up to the detailed consultation in the autumn.
- 7.17 In response to further questions, officers confirmed the different costs liable if the council terminated the contract as a result of failings in performance. Steve Platts commented that the council was very happy with the quality of product delivered by 4 Futures to date in respect of Building Schools for the Future.

Lack of clarity re. relative cost/benefit analysis of multi-purpose sports hall v cafe provision

No analysis of impact of decision to jettison squash courts and sports hall on a key strategic aim of the Council's Sport and Physical Activity Strategy, namely "Improving access and choice for the whole population"

- 7.18 Councillor Livingstone reminded the committee that the principles around the squash court, cafe and crèche had been established back in November, following a consultation exercise. In comparison to other facilities, only a small number had been interested in the provision of squash courts. The space requirement was an

important element, a squash court requiring a double height space and only able to accommodate a maximum of four people at one time. Inserting a squash court would impact on the space available for the cafe, crèche and spinning room. Gym facilities would generate the most income in relation to space.

- 7.19 In Councillor Livingstone's view, the option put forward by Councillor Thornton of a flexible space might be a challenge. There was no reason that squash court users would have a different pattern of times of use in comparison with users of badminton courts or five-a-side pitches. A maximum of eight users on two squash courts would knock out four nets of badminton (possibly sixteen users).
- 7.20 In terms of extending the footprint of the leisure centre, Councillor Livingstone explained that the cabinet agreed design brief had already eaten into 2m of space originally going to be used for the residential development. Officers had advised him that another 4m of space would be necessary in order to accommodate squash courts and that this would effect the viability of the residential development and the deliverability of the site. Steve Platts clarified the boundaries of the site and that it was only possible to extend into the residential element. This would also have additional costs not included in the budget, such as lifts and fire exits.
- 7.21 Councillor Livingstone emphasised his understanding of achieving access and choice. This was not just about the range of sports provided but about the ability of different groups to access the facilities. He wanted to ensure that as broad a group of people as possible were able to use the centre and losing the crèche would have a big impact. In addition, a large number of respondents to the consultation had expressed a desire for a cafe. Steve Platts added that the primary aim of including a cafe was to provide a social space rather than to generate revenue. Some members were doubtful that the cafe would be a success.
- 7.22 Members drew attention to the omission of squash courts from the original consultation cards. Eleanor Kelly, deputy chief executive, provided some comparative information from the consultation. Some members remained concerned that no public squash courts would be available in the borough. Councillor Livingstone agreed to take this up with Councillor Veronica Ward, cabinet member for culture, leisure, sport and the Olympics.
- 7.23 A member referred to the recent themed council assembly which had highlighted the importance of sport and leisure. The Elephant & Castle was the most accessible part of the borough and likely to have around three thousand more residents within the next ten years. The new leisure centre should be the premier sports facility in the area and to provide less facilities was short-sighted. In response, Councillor Livingstone stressed that the provision of the swimming pool was delivering what people in the area had long wanted. The aim was to treble the number of users of the centre by 2015. Steve Platts added that sports facilities were being enhanced rather than decreased – a main pool, a children's pool, increased gym facilities and a still substantial sports hall.
- 7.24 Members were agreed that it would not be unreasonable to explore the possibility of sharing the sports hall. Councillor Livingstone stated that this could be looked into and if feasible this could be included in the detailed design consultation in the autumn.

- 7.25 At 9.30pm it was agreed that the committee go into closed session in order to receive details of the report from Faithful & Gould. At 9.40pm the committee returned to open session and considered the evidence received from Councillor Thornton, Councillor Livingstone and officers.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decision of the cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety not be referred back to the cabinet member and therefore be implemented with immediate effect.
2. That the cabinet be requested to instruct officers to consult with Sport England and England Squash and Racquetball regarding design solutions to re-provide the two squash courts in a multi-use sports facility at the new Elephant & Castle leisure centre.
3. Should this be impossible, that cabinet be requested to seriously investigate the option of providing an equivalent squash court provision elsewhere in the borough.
4. That no later than the letting of the construction contract the cabinet satisfies itself that
 - a "fixed price contract" as referred to in paragraph 24 of the report will be entered into and
 - the monitoring of "value for money" is genuinely robust and independent

8. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the closed minutes of the meeting held on 1 June 2011 be agreed as an accurate record.

The meeting ended at 10.45 pm.

Item No: 5.	Classification: OPEN	Date: 12 September 2011	Meeting Name: Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Report Title:		Reporting back from the committee's forward strategy session	
Ward(s) or Group affected:		All	
From:		Head of Overview & Scrutiny	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Committee members met informally on 2 August to discuss how to reframe the scrutiny arrangements given the budget reduction required.
2. The facilitator's note from the session is attached at Appendix A.

MOVING FORWARD

3. The session produced a number of areas for follow up work, which can broadly be divided into three areas: the committee model, scrutiny practice and housekeeping/admin management.

Committee model

4. The notes reflect the discussion on the current system for scrutiny and the changing context within which we are operating. The view of the group was to remove two sub-committees, with OSC taking a stronger role in determining effective work programmes. There was some discussion about the roles of the remaining sub-committees, concluding that they would need to be cross-cutting, rather than service-based as at present. Following the session, one member has suggested that the three sub-committees could be:
 - Contracts and Partnerships: to encapsulate any future roles OSC might develop and to oversee contracts with providers inc. the Voluntary sector
 - Performance and Corporate mission: To monitor the council plan and KPIs - could provide an audit-like function
 - Resources and Assets: would monitor capital programmes - housing - and would also be the OSC budgetary committee

Scrutiny practice

5. The key point here was how to sharpen the work so that while there is less of it, quality is driven up. An immediate practical suggestion was to work more closely with cabinet members, inviting them to join the discussion when scrutiny reports are being finalised, inviting their honest feedback on reports, and asking questions about previous reports in their interviews with scrutiny committees.

Housekeeping/administration

6. This was a discussion about squeezing as much efficiency as we can from the system. This is largely an issue for the officer support team, but there are matters that cut across, such as reducing the volume of paperwork for cabinet member interviews.
7. Since the session, the Head of Scrutiny has also begun a discussion with a number of members about operating one or two sub-committees without printing papers.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held at	Contact
None		

APPENDICES

Sue Charteris' note from strategy session

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
Report Author		
Version	Final	
Dated	August 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Communities, Law & Governance	No	-
Cabinet Member	No	-

Appendix A

1. Reviewing what we have

Scrutiny outcomes we are proudest of:

- Improving, simplifying and increasing reliability of systems e.g.
- Housing repairs; school admissions and support to families
- Ensuring the council's procedures work for the most disadvantaged e.g.
- E.O.I.'s of adult day services

Our scrutiny is most effective when:

- The reports are credible
- There is buy in that the issue needs attention- cross party consensus and Cabinet
- We have been willing to confront and push
- There is a deadline
- We get down to brass tacks
- We have consistency in officer support
- Members have familiarity with the issues and
- Where it's seen as a development opportunity for Members

What is more difficult?

- Finding the balance between deadlines and depth
- Sheer volume on some agendas
- Getting to grips with broad topics e.g. child obesity
- Identifying the right people to give evidence
- Grappling with rapid changes in policy (health, regen)
- Maintaining attendance esp. in years 3 and 4
- Getting the right balance between OSC and the Subs
- Coming to terms with recognising we cannot cover everything in one cycle
- Finding the balance between scrutiny and representative roles*

2. The Future Landscape

The system is growing in complexity as resources shrink but:

The working assumption is that Southwark Council wants strong scrutiny with a wider remit in the governance of Southwark as a whole.

The framework is in flux and likely to remain so for the next year at least; after which time we could decide not to review certain functions because other bodies are charged with doing this e.g. Health Watch and Safeguarding Boards.

There are new functions and powers:

- Public Health
- Holding utilities to account?
- Localism- impact of Southwark governance structures

And new legislative framework and issues

- Health and Well Being Boards? Clinical Senates?GP commissioners*
- Transition from Links to Health Watch
- Education- Academies and Free Schools

But less resources-

- Financial pressures on acute trusts
- Life expectancy – people with complex needs
- Response to crisis issues and need to watch out for systemic failures

Facilitator comment: is anything shrinking?

3. Getting more for the Scrutiny £

- We need to recognise the tradition is of operating in a hung council and since this is no longer the case the way we scrutinise can also shift.
- We have to recognise only 18 hours of scrutiny per sub going forward and this will be less. But we can be more effective!

The options to be explored include:

- More focused role for OSC as the driver of the work programme with emphasis on performance even if it does not do all this itself
- Strengthen the role of OSC so that it decides collectively what issues need reviewing and then allocates them out to Subs- likely to be two substantive topics a year per sub (an advance on the old taxi rank system)
- Moving from mirroring functional areas to looking at life episodes or group themes differently e.g. health and well being with leisure
- Recognise health and housing topics will dominate and this needs resourcing
- The potential for the governance arrangements to combine scrutiny and standards will have implications
- Combination of one or two sub committees
- Performance/efficiency sub?

- Could make some savings on admin but not at expense of access to expertise and communication- cannot pass these costs elsewhere
- Fewer reports might be more: premium on quality and timely outcomes
- Links with outside bodies and working with the community more
- Front load the 'holding to account scrutiny' – policy review in last quarter?
- Strengthen buy in from Cabinet e.g. Cabinet Members to come to hear / help shape final scrutiny reports as well as report to cabinet. Must ask for updates on earlier reports
- Should OSC or the subs do the interviews?
- Chairs to do more- can use of IT help?

What Chairs and Members will need to take more responsibility for?

- Getting up to speed
- Shaping agendas to use time well
- Helping finalise reports
- Recognising the hidden costs of scrutiny: pressures on officer time in attending to give evidence

4. What the system needs to keep:

- Staying transparent in our decision making
- Flexibility to respond to pressing issues
- Consistency of officer support and their policy tracking role
- Interviews with Cabinet Members
- Responsiveness to NHS Referrals*
- Involvement of Young people – helping to create policy
- Need to be strong on performance Review
- Be on the watch out for systemic failures
- Do more policy development – possibly shift this to years 2 and 3

5. Issues to come back to:

- Some issues may not have to be reviewed on a single borough basis.
- Who will hold the mirror to the scrutineers e.g. in the health system
- How we can involve the community more but without it costing more
- We have to hold on to our USP: to address the parts of the system that others do not reach? Our democratic role - transparency

Item No: 6.	Classification: OPEN	Date: 12 September 2011	Meeting Name: Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Report Title:		Preparing for the Leader's scrutiny interview	
Ward(s) or Group affected:		All	
From:		Head of Overview & Scrutiny	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. The Leader's annual interview with Overview and Scrutiny Committee is scheduled for 10 October 2011. Members are asked to use the committee's September meeting to prepare lines of questioning and agree a timetable for the interview. The leader's formal responsibilities are set out at Appendix A.
2. Members are reminded of the committee's earlier discussions about
 - i. modifying the approach to cabinet member interviews so that there is less emphasis on written questions and
 - ii. agreeing to use cabinet member interviews to raise performance questions based on the council plan. The leader does not have his own schedule of targets, but has overall responsibility for performance management.
3. Suggested structure for one hour interview:
 - 30 minutes on topical matters
 - 20 minutes on what are the major issues looking forward (12 October council assembly theme is state of the borough)
 - 10 minutes on key performance issues

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held at	Contact
Southwark Council constitution	160 Tooley St SE1 2TZ	Shelley Burke 02075257344

APPENDICES
Leader's responsibilities

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
Report Author		
Version	Final	
Dated	August 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Communities, Law & Governance	No	-
Cabinet Member	No	-

Appendix A

The leader's responsibilities

To provide leadership of the council, by setting the strategic direction and key priorities and representing the council in the community and in negotiations with regional and national organisations. The leader appoints the deputy leader and other members of the cabinet and has the discretion to change cabinet member portfolios during the year. In the absence of a cabinet member the leader will have responsibility for all relevant matters within the remit of the cabinet. The leader will work closely with the deputy leader and cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy on developing a long-term housing stock strategy.

The leader will have particular responsibility for:

- performance management
- external communications and the reputation of the council
- strategic partnerships, relationships with government and local authority associations
- the council's legal services
- developing a thirty year strategy to make the borough's housing stock fully sustainable with the deputy leader and cabinet member for regeneration and corporate strategy.

This page is intentionally blank.

DISTRIBUTION LIST**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011/12****COMMITTEE:** **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****NOTE:** Please notify amendments to Peter Roberts (0207 525 4350)

<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>		
<u>OSC MEMBERS</u>		<u>COUNCIL OFFICERS</u>	
Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)	1	Annie Shepperd, Chief Executive	1
Councillor Andy Simmons (Vice-Chair)	1	Eleanor Kelly, Deputy Chief Executive	1
Councillor Toby Eckersley	1	Gerri Scott, Strategic Director of Housing Services	1
Councillor Gavin Edwards	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Dan Garfield	1	Doreen Forrester-Brown, Legal Services	1
Councillor David Hubber	1	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	1
Councillor Tim McNally	1	John Bibby, Principal Cabinet Assistant	1
Councillor Victoria Mills	1	Alex Doel, Labour Political Assistant	1
Councillor David Noakes	1	Steven Gauge, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant	1
Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole	1	Paul Green, Liberal Democrat Office	1
Councillor Mark Williams	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
<u>RESERVES</u>		<u>EXTERNAL</u>	
Councillor Kevin Ahern	1	Albion, Newington & Dulwich Libraries	3
Councillor Patrick Diamond	1	Local Studies Library	1
Councillor Nick Dolezal	1	Press	2
Councillor Mark Gettleson	1		
Councillor Helen Morrissey	1	Charles Cherrill, Southwark Pensioners Forum	1
Councillor Paul Noblet	1	Mr C George, Southwark Advocacy Alliance	1
Councillor Lewis Robinson	1	Chris Sanford, Community Action for Southwark (8 th floor	
Councillor Cleo Soanes	1	Hannibal Hse)	1
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton	1		
<u>EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES ON OSC</u>		TOTAL HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION	56
Revd Nicholas Elder	1		
Colin Elliott	1		
Leticia Ojeda	1		
<u>CABINET MEMBERS</u>			
Councillor Peter John (Council Leader)	1		
Councillor Ian Wingfield (Deputy Leader)	1		
<u>OTHER MEMBERS [on request]</u>			
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	1		
Councillor Renata Hamvas	1		

HARD COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE SCRUTINY TEAM Tel: 0207 525 4350