

**Performance  
Improvement Scrutiny  
Committee**



Date	23 April 2009
Venue	Reception Room, The Town Hall, Lytham St Annes
Committee members	Christine Akeroyd (Chairman) Cheryl Little (Vice Chairman) Linda Nulty, Kathleen Harper, Ken Hopwood, Keith Hyde
Other Councillors	Lyndsay Greening
Officers	Dave Joy, Allan Oldfield, Allan Williams; Alex Scrivens; Annie Womack
Others	

1. Declarations of interest

Members were reminded that any personal/prejudicial interests should be declared as required by the Council's Code of Conduct adopted in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000.

Cllrs Hyde, Akeroyd, Nulty and Little all declared a personal interest in item 4, as they are all Member Champions.

2. Confirmation of minutes

RESOLVED: To approve the minutes of the Performance Improvement Scrutiny Committee meeting held 19 March 2009 as a correct record for signature by the chairman.

3. Substitute members

The following substitutions were reported under council procedure rule 22.3:

No substitutions

4. Member Champions

Mr Dave Joy, Director of Corporate Resources, presented this topic to the committee. The purpose of the report was to assist members in monitoring the work of the council's fourteen Member Champions. Appended were personal reports submitted by individual member champions, which summarised their work during 2008/09.

This report had first come to the committee on 18 March 2009, and the members had requested Mr Joy to obtain some more information. Further member champion questionnaires which had been received since 19 March 2009 were also appended to the report. Additionally, within the body of the report were the main points which had arisen from the paper which Cllr Lyndsay Greening, as Member Champion for Older People, had presented to the committee.

There was a lengthy debate, particularly about the level of support which was offered to Champions and whether the themes as they currently stand are still relevant. There was also a discussion around the method of selecting suitable members to be Champions. Mr Joy was asked whether the council had asked other local authorities about the roles and themes of Member Champions and he advised the committee that there was not any commonality across authorities. A suggestion was made that a job description and competencies was needed for each theme. Additionally, members felt that there was not sufficient clarity about how the Champions were meant to work with Portfolio Holders, and that it was not clear which Portfolio each of the themes was aligned with.

It was suggested that there should be a Member Champion Forum, facilitated by an officer, which would meet both as a support and information exchange, and also to discuss those issues.

Cllr Greening spoke to the committee about her work as Member Champion, and also about her experience of working towards and gaining the BTec Advanced Award for Local Government Member Champions

Overall the committee felt that most of the Member Champion roles were currently effective and decided to recommend that they should all be retained with the proviso that a Member Champion group should be set up. They also asked that Mr Joy write to each of the current Member Champions to ask them to confirm that they were still interested in retaining their role.

Mr Joy also agreed to devise and circulate a chart to define the alignment between the themes which the Champions represented, and Portfolio Holders.

**RESOLVED:**

1. To thank Cllr Greening for the work that she has done and the information which she gave to the committee.
2. That a Member Champion Forum should be established to meet regularly to exchange information and to deal with Member Champion issues raised in this committee.
3. To request that Mr Joy identifies the appropriate Portfolio Holder that each Member Champion supports and report to the first Member Champion Forum.
4. To request that Mr Joy writes to each Member Champion to ask them to confirm their interest in continuing in that role and report the results to the first Member Champion Forum.

## 5. Shared Services Evaluation

This report was also presented to the committee by Mr Joy. He explained that within the council's (draft) risk register for 2009/10 there was a management action for the production of a review and evaluation tool to assist scrutiny members in their review of shared service arrangements, and that attached to the report as an appendix was the proposed toolkit.

The report also included a proposed timetable for the review of shared service arrangements during 2009/10.

Mr Joy told members that the toolkit included two elements, the first of which was an assessment form for the lead officer to complete which would summarise all of the key features of the shared service in question and would be included in the officer's report to the scrutiny committee. The second element was in the form of a set of Key Lines of Enquiry for use by scrutiny members in formulating their conclusions and recommendations.

The committee was advised that the toolkit had been considered and approved by the Scrutiny Management Board at its meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> March 2009.

After debating the issue, the committee resolved:

1. To adopt the shared service evaluation toolkit for use in the future evaluation of shared services arrangements.
2. To agree the proposed timetable for the review of shared services arrangements.

## 6. The Procurement Shared Service

Mr Allan Oldfield, Director of Performance and Business Improvement presented the report to committee. His report provided members with details of the shared service arrangements in place between Fylde Borough Council and Wyre Borough Council for strategic procurement services. The report also included a proposed partnership agreement.

Mr Oldfield explained that the service in question was a single person specialist post, rather than a shared service in the usual sense.

He went on to outline the business case which had underpinned the establishment of this post, including the realisation of cost benefits for both authorities in funding such a post, and the economies of scale which are achievable through joint procurement of goods and services. He gave the committee examples of the benefits that the joint Procurement Officer post had brought to the authority.

The committee was advised that a Service Level Agreement had not previously been established for this post, but that performance had been managed through regular progress meetings and appraisals. However, a shared service agreement would be developed.

Mr Oldfield, who had used the shared service evaluation toolkit, was asked whether he had found it useful and he replied that it was easy to use and helpful.

The committee RESOLVED:

1. To recommend that the shared service arrangements for procurement is endorsed and to recommend support for the continuation of the service in partnership with Wyre Borough Council.
2. To recommend approval of the establishment of a formal agreement with Wyre to secure the continued provision of the shared post on procurement based on the heads of terms and conditions included in Appendix 3 to the report, and for this agreement to be brought back to committee.

#### 7. Corporate Performance 2008/09: Year End Report

This report was also presented to the committee by Mr Oldfield, detailing the performance to year end against national and supplementary performance indicators.

The purpose of the report was to ensure that the committee has the year end performance information available to make informed decisions on any potential performance shortfalls and areas that may require further scrutiny in order to support performance. The data has been subject to the appropriate quality checks and the national indicators will be submitted to the Audit Commission.

Mr Oldfield distributed to the committee a later version of the Appendix attached to the report, which included some late changes, which he pointed out to the committee.

He made the point that performance management is becoming firmly embedded at Fylde, enabling end of year figures to be provided quickly and accurately. Some indicators were new for this year, and therefore there is no comparison figure for the previous year. Mr Oldfield told members that there would be a further update report once the Audit Commission has published all the national results, and we know which quartile we are in for each National Indicator. This gives context and will allow us to set more meaningful targets, particularly for the new indicators.

Mr Oldfield highlighted areas where the authority has performed well, and also where it has performed less well. Overall the performance had been very good with the majority of performance indicators being close to or above target and direction of travel being generally encouraging.

He mentioned the poor sickness level figures, and told the committee that a new attendance management policy was in place, for which managers had received training. The policy was designed to support people back to work and at the same time allow managers to address issues of continued and unacceptable absence. Hopefully this would have an impact on sickness absence figures in the future.

Members queried certain of the indicators and targets, such as the percentage of people satisfied with sports and leisure provisions, and flyposting.

Cllr Little raised the question of s106 monies and queried the figures given as received and committed. Mr Oldfield explained in general terms how the figures were calculated and confirmed that monies due were monitored. Cllr Nulty also expressed surprise at the figures given in indicators FYS32, 33 and 34. The committee felt that they needed more information and suggested that within the next performance report a paragraph should be included to provide some detail, and that someone from Development Control or legal services could come to the next committee meeting to answer questions.

Mr Oldfield then provided a verbal update on the work done to provide a skills audit. He had sought specialist advice, and had a form to be distributed electronically, through Grapevine, and manually where required. He undertook to bring the results back to a later committee.

Following the debate it was RESOLVED:

1. To ask for a special section in the next quarterly report on s106 monies, and that an officer be requested to attend in order to answer the committee's questions.
2. To recommend the submission of these national performance indicator figures to the Audit Commission.

### **Fylde Borough Council copyright [2009]**

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium. You must re-use it accurately and not in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Fylde Borough Council copyright and you must give the title of the source document/publication.

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This document/publication was also available on our website at  
[www.fylde.gov.uk](http://www.fylde.gov.uk)

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at  
the Town Hall, St Annes Road West, St Annes FY8 1LW, or to  
[listening@fylde.gov.uk](mailto:listening@fylde.gov.uk).