

| <b>PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS<br/>FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES</b>                                       |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>   | Performance Scrutiny  |  |
| <b>DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION</b>  | March 2014  |  |
| <b>TITLE OF REPORT</b>  | In-House Provider Visit 2013/14 Overview  |  |
| <b>P<br/>U<br/>R<br/>P<br/>O<br/>S<br/>E</b>  | <b>1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf)</b>                             | To provide feedback on the visits undertaken throughout the financial year which highlight the quality, customer experience and good practice/improvement actions for our in-house providers |
|   | <b>2. What issues are to be scrutinised?</b>  | The quality of service of our in-house providers   |
|   | <b>3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts?</b> | Yes – Lead Member for Social Care & Learning Disabilities Champion   |
|   | <b>4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report?</b>                                      | Awareness of the quality of services or any issues that arise from these visits  |
|   | <b>5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims &amp; priorities and impact (see overleaf)*</b>                  | <b>Aims &amp; Priorities</b><br>2  |
| <b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</b>  |   |  |
| <b>REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny's recommendations to be reported elsewhere?</b> | Back to the service providers   |  |
| <b>AUTHOR</b>   | Phil Gilroy, Head of Adult & Business Services  |  |

Please complete the following checklist:

|  | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Is the topic already being addressed satisfactorily?   | X   |    |
| Is Scrutiny likely to result in service improvements or other measurable benefits?   | X   |    |
| Does the topic concern a poor performing service or a high budgetary commitment?   |     | X  |
| Are there adequate resources/realistic possibility of adequate resources to achieve the objective(s)?  | X   |    |
| Is the Scrutiny activity timely, i.e. will scrutiny be able to recommend changes to the service delivery, policy, strategy, etc?                       |     | X  |
| Is the topic linked to corporate or scrutiny aims and priorities?  | X   |    |
| Has the topic been identified as a risk in the Corporate Risk Register or is it the subject of an adverse internal audit or external regulator report? |     | ?  |

\*The following table is to be used to guide the scores given:

| Score | Aims & Priorities  | Impact   |
|-------|--|--|
| 0     | No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities                                       | No potential benefits  |
| 1     | No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities but a subject of high public concern  | Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/customer/client group |
| 2     | Some evidence of links, but indirect   | Minor benefits to two groups/moderate benefits to one                  |
| 3     | Good evidence linking the topic to both aims and priorities                              | Moderate benefits to more than one group/substantial benefits to one   |
| 4     | Strong evidence linking both aims and priorities, and has a high level of public concern | Substantial community-wide benefits                                    |

## SCORING

### Aims & Priorities

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 4 | Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately                           | Priority topic for Scrutiny – for urgent consideration       |
| 3 |  |  |
| 2 | Reject topic for Scrutiny – topic to be circulated to members for information purposes | Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately |
| 1 |  |  |

0    1    2    3    4

**Impact**