# Overview & Scrutiny

## Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission

All Members of the Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission are requested to attend the meeting of the Commission to be held as follows:

**Wednesday, 8th July, 2015**

**7.00 pm**

**Room 103, Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London E8 1EA**

**Gifty Edila**
**Corporate Director of Legal, Human Resources and Regulatory Services**

Contact:
Tracey Anderson
☎ 020 8356 3312
✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

**Members:** **Cllr Rick Muir (Chair), Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr Will Brett, Cllr Laura Bunt, Cllr Rebecca Rennison and Cllr Nick Sharman**

## Agenda

### ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

**Hackney**

# Access and Information

## Getting to the Town Hall

For a map of how to find the Town Hall, please visit the council's website http://www.hackney.gov.uk/contact-us.htm or contact the Overview and Scrutiny Officer using the details provided on the front cover of this agenda.

## Accessibility

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall.

Induction loop facilities are available in the Assembly Halls and the Council Chamber. Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

## Further Information about the Commission

If you would like any more information about the Scrutiny Commission, including the membership details, meeting dates and previous reviews, please visit the website or use this QR Code (accessible via phone or tablet 'app') http://www.hackney.gov.uk/individual-scrutiny-commissions-governance-and-resources.htm

## Public Involvement and Recording

Scrutiny meetings are held in public, rather than being public meetings. This means that whilst residents and press are welcome to attend, they can only ask questions at the discretion of the Chair. For further information relating to public access to information, please see Part 4 of the council's constitution, available at http://www.hackney.gov.uk/l-gm-constitution.htm or by contacting Governance Services (020 8356 3503)

**Rights of Press and Public to Report on Meetings**

Where a meeting of the Council and its committees are open to the public, the press and public are welcome to report on meetings of the Council and its committees, through any audio, visual or written methods and may use digital and social media providing they do not disturb the conduct of the meeting and providing that the

person reporting or providing the commentary is present at the meeting.

Those wishing to film, photograph or audio record a meeting are asked to notify the Council's Monitoring Officer by noon on the day of the meeting, if possible, or any time prior to the start of the meeting or notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

The Monitoring Officer, or the Chair of the meeting, may designate a set area from which all recording must take place at a meeting.

The Council will endeavour to provide reasonable space and seating to view, hear and record the meeting.  If those intending to record a meeting require any other reasonable facilities, notice should be given to the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting and will only be provided if practicable to do so.

The Chair shall have discretion to regulate the behaviour of all those present recording a meeting in the interests of the efficient conduct of the meeting.   Anyone acting in a disruptive manner may be required by the Chair to cease recording or may be excluded from the meeting. Disruptive behaviour may include: moving from any designated recording area; causing excessive noise; intrusive lighting; interrupting the meeting; or filming members of the public who have asked not to be filmed.

All those visually recording a meeting are requested to only focus on recording councillors, officers and the public who are directly involved in the conduct of the meeting.  The Chair of the meeting will ask any members of the public present if they have objections to being visually recorded.  Those visually recording a meeting are asked to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed or photographed. Failure by someone recording a meeting to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed and photographed may result in the Chair instructing them to cease recording or in their exclusion from the meeting.

If a meeting passes a motion to exclude the press and public then in order to consider confidential or exempt information, all recording must cease and all recording equipment must be removed from the meeting room. The press and public are not permitted to use any means which might enable them to see or hear the proceedings whilst they are excluded from a meeting and confidential or exempt information is under consideration.

Providing oral commentary during a meeting is not permitted.

This page is intentionally left blank

# ⊖ Hackney

| | |
|---|---|
| **Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission**<br><br>8<sup>th</sup> July 2015<br><br>**Minutes of the previous meeting** | Item No<br><br>**4** |

## OUTLINE

Attached are the draft minutes for the meeting on 10 June 2015.

## ACTION

The Commission is requested to agree the minutes.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Hackney

Minutes of the proceedings of the Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission held at Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London E8 1EA

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chair** | **Councillor Rick Muir** |
| **Councillors in Attendance** | **Cllr Laura Bunt, Cllr Rebecca Rennison and Cllr Nick Sharman** |
| **Apologies:** | **Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli and Cllr Will Brett** |
| **Co-optees** | |
| **Officers In Attendance** | **Joanna Sumner (Assistant Chief Executive) and Ian Williams (Corporate Director of Finance and Resources)** |
| **Other People in Attendance** | **Councillor Geoff Taylor (Cabinet Member for Finance), Jacqui Banerjee (Director), Donna Molloy (Head of Implementation) and Sally Mimnagh (Research Manager)** |
| **Members of the Public** | |
| **Officer Contact:** | **Tracey Anderson**<br>☎ 020 8356 3312<br>✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk |

**Councillor Rick Muir in the Chair**

## 1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair

1.1 Following formal nominations for the position of Chair, Councillor Rick Muir was elected by the Members as Chair of Governance and Resource Scrutiny Commission.

1.2 The Chair advised the Commission would not be electing a Vice Chair at this meeting. The opposition group were invited to appoint a member to the Commission. It is hoped they will appoint a Member to the Commission at the next Full Council meeting on 22nd July 2015.

## 2 Apologies for Absence

2.1 Apologies for absence were received form Cllr Deniz Oguzkhanli and Cllr Will Brett.

**3      Urgent Items / Order of Business**

3.1     None.


**4      Declarations of Interest**

4.1     The Chair advised the Council's Standards Committee asked all Chairs of Committees, Sub committees and Scrutiny Commissions to remind Members at the first ordinary meeting of their responsibilities regarding ethical governance.

4.2     The Chair read out the following:
Members will be aware of their responsibilities under the Code of Conduct as they relate to transparent and lawful decision making and declaration of pecuniary interest where appropriate.

All Members will have received relevant training and guidance from the Council's Monitoring Officer to ensure that compliance with the Code is understood.   For those Members of the Planning Sub and Licensing Sub Committees this is supplemented by the relevant Sub-Committee's Code of Practice together with additional training to support those Members in discharging their duties as decision makers.

The Council's Standards Committee, has asked all Chairs of committees and sub-committees to raise with their members under this item on the agenda the need to be mindful of our responsibilities under the Code of Conduct and the relevant Code of Practice at all times.

Advice to Members relating to Declaration of Interests are included in the agenda pack for each and every meeting and it is important to remember that for every item upon which we are asked to make a decision we ask ourselves the question whether we do have a relevant declarable interest which may prevent us participating in the taking of that decision.

If unclear about whether or not to declare an interest whether pecuniary or non-pecuniary the Member should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance or from the legal officer at the meeting.

It is important that on all matters on which we are asked to make a decision we act and are seen to act fairly, without prejudice and within the law.

Fundamentally we must always have regard to matters which are relevant to our decision and disregard matters which are not relevant and at all times conduct ourselves in a manner which will not bring either ourselves or the Council into disrepute.


**5      Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

5.1     Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16th March 2015 were approved.

| RESOLVED | Minutes were approved. |
|----------|------------------------|

## 6 Whole Place, Whole System Approach - Long Term Unemployed with Mental Health Evidence Session

6.1 The Chair welcomed Donna Molloy, Head of Implementation from Early Intervention Foundation.

6.2 The Chair outlined the context of the review; highlighting the Commission invited Early Intervention Foundation (EIF) to talk about their work specialising in early intervention. The aims of their work is to shift spending, action and support for children and families from late to early intervention.

6.3 The substantive points from the presentation were:

6.3.1 Graham Allen MP and Iain Duncan Smith MP co-authored a report "Early Intervention: good parents, great kids, better citizens". Graham Allen MP is an advocate for early intervention and produced 2 reports for the Coalition Government in 2011.

6.3.2 One of the recommendations was to establish an independent organisation to champion and support the effective use of early intervention to tackle the root causes of social problems for children from conception to early adulthood. The Independent organization set-up was Early Intervention Foundation which was launched in 2013 with 3 years funding from 4 Government departments.

6.3.3 EIF has 3 main functions: to assess the evidence; advise commissioners on how to apply the evidence; advocate for early intervention. The focus of their work is on children and families.

6.3.4 Early Intervention is about getting additional, timely and effective support to children who need it – enabling children to flourish and preventing costly, long-term and damaging outcomes. Providing ttargeted, preventive activity, for children (from conception -19/24 and families). Supporting parenting and family life, social and emotional skills, mental health, literacy and language and behavior.

6.3.5 Early intervention is key to:
- Tackling the root causes of social problems
- Improving children's life chances, breaking the often intergenerational cycle of disadvantage
- Reducing the cost of failure to the taxpayer

6.3.6 Using publically available data collated mainly from local authorities; the spending on late intervention for children and young people (in 1 fiscal year) was highlighted. Data specific to London Borough of Hackney was highlighted and the officer advised Hackney has 2 areas of spend that are higher than the national average.

6.3.7 Evidence from economic and social research, established over many years, supports the following principles:

- Wide and persistent gaps in children's wellbeing and development emerge very early in life  70% of the gap in attainment is present at age 7 and this becomes difficult to close as time goes on for that young person
- These factors have important consequences for future and intergenerational outcomes.
- These factors are not set in stone immediately, and can be influenced by timely intervention
- Programmes which successfully improve these factors deliver substantial individual and social benefits over time.

6.3.8   The key elements of an effective early intervention strategy to reduce demand are:
- Using evidence and data about where the real need is
- Breaking down silos - integrated services/teams in localities with shared systems/processes
- Evidence based Interventions that meet local priorities
- A focus on frontline practice – permissive environments in which professionals have the flexibility and scope to deliver what's needed and make real change
- Using the reach and contacts of wider services
- Building community capacity to solve their own problems.

6.3.9   EIF presented examples of early intervention programmes to the Commission from EIF's evidence base.  One example from Lancashire demonstrated how they managed to identify the root cause behind frequent callers to emergency services, by bringing all the information that already exists together.

6.3.10 There is a need for integration not collaboration.  The challenge now is breaking down silos to have integrated services/teams in localities with shared systems and processes.  This is a call for genuine service integration; not partnership working or co-ordination of services.  The resolution will come from traditional collaboration or multi-agency working. It is recognised that it is not sustainable to keep paying multiple different professionals to sit in the same room and talk to each other. We need one public/community sector asset not several.  A shift to deliver really integrated public service.

6.3.11 EIF developed an online toolkit to help identify the level of impact.  If the programme achieved a level 4 the evidence was consistently showing a level of impact.

6.3.12 There are many claims on interventions so EIF supported 20 pioneering places to deliver effective early interventions.  The evidence has shown that not all early intervention is effective.  Through this process they have identified that it is important to map both in house and commissioned provision; and to consider the strength of the evidence to identify what is known about its effectiveness and fit with local priorities.

6.3.13 EIF assessed the evidence of 13 pioneering places and they found:
- 47% had no known evidence of effectiveness in an established clearing house
- 24% were underpinned by at least one RCT
- 22% had evidence of potentially improving child outcomes from a pre/post evaluation not involving a comparison group

- 4% have a logic model only
- 3% had proven to be ineffective.

6.3.14 This evidence shows that when a service is mapped a number of them could not evidence change or impact. There are some programmes showing to be effective programmes but they are not necessarily tackling the root cause of the issue for that local area.

6.3.15 The Head of Implementation advised in one programme GPs expressed their lack of power to change or help people with low level mental health. Therefore the focus should be on creating permissive environments in which professionals have the flexibility and scope to deliver what's needed and make real change. Moving away from programmes to change practices. Taking the change and embedding it into everyday services.

6.3.16 Early intervention is everybody's business and delivering effective early Intervention will require everyone to think about the role of wider workforces. To make better use of core public sector workforces; through involving them in identifying need and providing basic information to help keep people out of expensive specialist services. Essentially giving front line officers the tools to address need.

6.3.17 EIF highlighted that there is a lot of early intervention work but little evidence to support the impact. In recent years EIF have seen real innovation with a proliferation of models of community based support peer support, co – production, volunteering and paid community capacity building roles. But there is still a lot unknown about what works and the effectiveness of different models. It was highlighted that the models, systems and programmes developed need to be tested for impact.

6.4 **Discussion, Questions and Answers**

Members thanked the Head of Implementation from EIF for her detailed presentation.

(i) Members commented although early intervention programmes are new and not evidenced. Councils did not have access to funding for trails to see if a proposed model will work. In the current climate Council's will have to make a decision and try out different options because of the need to address rising demand and shrinking resources. Although EIF has highlighting there is limited evidence demonstrating what works; this is not a reason to do nothing. Council's will need to move forward and try different options.

(ii) Members enquired if the examples outlined in the presentation had a key worker in their model? Members referred to EIF's expanding remit - from children to the whole family - and queried if this would make a difference long term or were successful outcomes based on the delivery of services to people.

The Head of Implementation from EIF confirmed for complex cases key workers were part of the model. It was noted people have key workers because of the different levels of need. The reason for this is to have a person who can build relationships, challenge and navigate the system to help the family.

Their definition and remit was broad covering conception, childhood and families. It is believed early intervention is applicable from the early sign of need, although the breadth of the remit does make it hard. Some of the solutions and whole place models need multidisciplinary

(iii)    Members referred to the evaluation of policy and queried if there was a problem with the evaluation process for policy planning. Member enquired if this is an area they should look at or if there were specific areas in an evaluation process that went wrong with past evaluations that they should look at.

(iv)    Recognising the need for a permissive environment that will allow staff to respond to need. Members expressed concern about boundaries and enquired how the system could be structured so that frontline staff do not experience more pressure.

The Head of Implementation from EIF recommended mapping the different areas of the workforce to establish recurrent demand. Then think about how the staff member could be equipped to do the right intervention at that time to tackle the problem and address the root cause of need.

(v)    The Cabinet Member for Finance from LBH advised the Council was doing a project in children services like this. He enquired if there was an issue with sharing data.

The Head of Implementation from EIF advised some areas have resolved this issue and some still struggle with this. The Government is looking at this and this is an issue that needs addressing.

(vi)    Members highlighted that information sharing and accountability were key issues that needed to be resolved for the new way of working. Members asked what they should be recommending about this.

The Head of Implementation from EIF recommended the Commission speaks to West Cheshire who have managed to resolve the legal implications this for their EIF model.

The Chair thanked Donna Molloy from EIF for attending the meeting.

**7    Information Reports for Whole Place, Whole System Approach - Long Term Unemployed with Mental Health**

7.1    The Chair referred to the reports in the agenda:
- Preventing Depression and Anxiety in Working Age Adults by Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission.
- The 21st Century Public Servant by Dr Catherine Needham and Catherine Mangan from University of Birmingham / Economic Social Research Council and Public Service Academy.

7.2    The Chair informed the Commission that the officers from University of Birmingham were unable to attend this meeting date and offered to provide a copy of their report for the commission to review.

7.3     Members were asked to note the reports.

        Members noted the reports.

**8     Whole Place, Whole System Approach - Long Term Unemployed with Mental Health Research Findings**

8.1     The Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission, commissioned BDRC Continental to carry out qualitative research with local residents to show case the 'customer journey'; to help understand the triggers, barriers and their interaction with current local services for the LT unemployed.  BDRC conducted 24 qualitative in-depth interviews with residents who are long term unemployed in Hackney.  The participants were a mixture of people with and without a mental illness.  The participants were recruited through the support organisation they were working with.  The age range of the participants was 33-57.

8.2     The aim of this research is to reduce duplication of support and services to the same individual and to support the redesign of services in the system around early intervention or at the point of need.

8.3     The final report was received and circulated to Members in advance of the meeting.  Copies of the report were available at the meeting.

8.4     The Chair welcomed Jacqui Banerjee, Director and Sally Mimnagh, Research Manager from BRDC Continental. The officers outlined the main findings from the research.  The key points highlighted at the meeting were:

8.4.1   The research participants were grouped into 4 categories.  Two of the categories have high need.  The people in the high need category were mainly from the older age group.

8.4.2   The participants with a mental illness were better supported and had a support network around them.

8.4.3   The research highlighted that participants were frustrated with the system and seem to go round and round.

8.4.4   The employment support provided by organisations was largely generic.

8.4.5   After speaking with participants the main causes of unemployment were: redundancy, mental health or changing their career.

8.4.6   All the participants interviewed wanted to work.

8.4.7   Barriers to employment identified were:
        • Taking Low paid job roles.  This was a key issue for people renting in the private sector
        • The cost of courses.  These were courses related to the individuals career aspiration
        • Support and help available for 18-24 year olds but nothing for over 25s.

8.4.8    People on JSA had more pressure to find employment than people on ESA.

8.4.9    The organisation participants expressed the biggest frustration with was Renasi who provided support for the Job Centre Plus (JCP) work programme.

8.4.10   The organisation 'Peter Bedford' appeared to offer a support service that worked well; this was tailored to individual need.

8.4.11   Hackney Community College have a case worker approach and this seemed to work well too.

**8.5    Discussion, Questions and Answers**

(i)    Members referred to the 4 categories and enquired who had the highest need for support.

       The BDRC officers advised people without a mental illness had the highest support need because they received no support.

(ii)    Reflecting on the research and from observations Members noted that participants appeared to have a strong connection with the support organisation they were accessing.

(iii)   A number of points were made in the discussion these were:
       • Members wanted to find out if there was trust in the system or only in specific services
       • People were being made to apply for jobs they were not qualified to do. There was emphasis on quantity over quality in relation to job applications with applicants applying for jobs they had little chance of getting.
       • The longer people were out of work the harder it was for them to get back into employment.
       • The system appeared to be organised in a way that was contradictory to how people find employment.  Members highlighted that in reality people build up their skill sets through volunteering etc. when seeking employment.
       • The system was being driven by payment plan and targets for results.
       • The system may need a key worker a person with empathy and knowledge about where to navigate people. Working inside the system or a trusted professional.  The system needs people with the ability to provide in-depth personal support and build relationships with people.

(iv)    The Cabinet Member for Finance from LBH asked BDRC to give their views about this cohort after conducting the research.

       The Director from BDRC Continental expressed deep passion for the people interviewed and a sense of despair that they could not help these individuals. The Officers pointed out that after working in this environment for a period of time, it was likely that an officer would become desensitised to the person in-front of them.

After conducting this research, as an organisation they felt they had a duty of care to suggest and provide information to the participants about other support organisations they heard about through the research.

The key pointed noted from the research were:
1) Personalised support was required
2) The ability to progress and move on was an issue.  For example participants accessing Core Arts services did not move on from this service.  Some research participants were carrying out work duties in the organisation, but did not progress to other volunteering roles or job opportunities
3) Early contact and timely intervention was key.  Getting people support at the start of the process was important.

BDRC highlighted the missing link in the system was quality jobs and having agencies that provided access to employers to help service users secure employment.

(v)　　Members discussed the demand for work and queried if the issue in Hackney was not the employability of the people but that employers were not taking the risk to employ a person who was LT unemployed.  It was important for a support organisation to have networks with access to employers.  Agencies that were successful in helping a person secure employment have connections with employers to refer people too.

(vi)　　Members highlighted that the research showed a need for ongoing support for people with mental health and the key to success may be connected to the place; namely the individual's positive experience with the place.  Therefore the structure of support for people should focus on the place not the person.  The organisations people found supportive were those that listened to them.  In their experience JCP did not listen to them this was a functional relationship.

(vii)　　Member commented the evidence was showing people needed a positive relationship with a place and access to a worker with the knowledge about where to go.

(viii)　　Members talked about looking at the current workforce in the system to identify current roles e.g. signposting, bespoke service, befriending etc.  To understand if the new system would require an expansion of current roles or redeployment of existing roles.  As opposed to employing new staff.

(ix)　　Members talked about exploring the offer at Core Arts to understand what made it successful with participants and to clarify if employment advisors engaged with the organisation.

(x)　　The key to moving people on may be to start with the place they have a positive experience to enable the discussion about moving on.

(xi)　　Members referred to the HiH report on Depression and Anxiety in Working Age Adults and commented that the two reviews needed to dovetail.

(xii)　　The Chair advised this cannot be achieved by the Council alone it was important to reach outside the Council.  The next stage would be to talk to

frontline staff about the research findings to obtain their views about the barriers highlighted by service users and to get a breakdown of the data associated with LT unemployment in Hackney.

(xiii)   Following the engagement with font line staff, a pilot should be conducted to demonstrate if the principles for system change work effectively across all organisations in the system.

(xiv)   Members agreed to postpone the steering group meeting scheduled for Monday 15<sup>th</sup> June to allow Members time to consider recommendations for the service area in this review.  The Chair advised the Overview and Scrutiny Officer would look for a new date.

| ACTION | Overview and Scrutiny Officer to do: |
|---|---|
| | 1. Send the Commission a breakdown of the LT unemployed data for Hackney |
| | 2. Look for a new steering group meeting date |
| | 3. Organise a date for the Commission and frontline staff to talk about the 'customer journey' as outlined in the research report. |

## 9   London Living Wage Executive Response

9.1   The Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission held two meetings in spring 2014 to consider the Council's journey to paying all of its staff, including contractors, a London Living Wage. At the time of the Commission's inquiries, Hackney was one contract away from being a total London Living Wage employer.

9.2   The Commission sent a 'Letter of Reference' to the Cabinet Member for Finance asking questions about the Council's work to further promote and strengthen the London living wage both within the Council and more widely.

9.3   The Executive response to the letter was on pages 123-130 of the agenda.

9.4   The Cabinet Member for Finance from London Borough of Hackney explained the Council did make changes to its contract with the provider and the issue about change of hours was interesting and complex.  The Cabinet Member agreed to keep a watching brief on the situation.

9.5   Members noted the Cabinet response.

**10      Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission - 2015/16  Work Programme**

10.1    The Chair referred to the draft work programme on pages 131 – 138 in the agenda.

10.2    The Chair advised the Overview and Scrutiny officer was consulting with relevant officers and stakeholder about scheduling the proposed discussion items into the work programme.

10.3    The work programme will be updated as confirmations are received.  The following items were confirmed for the work programme:
- Elections Update July 2015
- ICT Review Recommendation Update and ICT Strategy in September 2015
- Annual Complaints Report September 2015
- HR Strategy October 2015
- Welfare Reform Update April 2016.

10.4    The Corporate Director of Finance informed the Commission there was no clear indication about the impact of the Government's announcement on Right to Buy 2 or how it will operate on a local or national level.  It is anticipated there will be a consultation by the Government about their proposals.  Once details are received the Commission will be updated.

**11      Any Other Business**

11.1    None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00  - 9.15 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

# ⊕ Hackney

| | |
|---|---|
| **Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission**<br><br>8<sup>th</sup> July 2015<br><br>**London Borough of Hackney General Election 2015 Update** | Item No<br><br>**5** |

**Outline**

The Chief Executive from London Borough of Hackney will provide an update about voter registration and postal votes for London Borough of Hackney in the 2015 General Election.

**Action**
The Commission is asked to note the presentations and ask questions.

This page is intentionally left blank

**⊕ Hackney**

| Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission | Item No |
|---|---|
| 8th July 2015 **Hackney Council's Corporate Plan to 2018 – Update on the Cross Cutting Programmes** | **6** |

**Outline**

A Place for Everyone Hackney Council's Corporate Plan to 2018 was produced in March 2015.  This outlines the vision of what the Council wants Hackney to be.  This plan covers the next four years and beyond.

The Council's Corporate Plan outlines how the Council will deliver its core business and fulfil the Mayor's pledges to the people of Hackney.  Included in this plan are big cross cutting areas of work that will underpin the most ambitious areas of change, and which are demonstrative of a new way of working to take the Council forward over the coming years.

The report attached is an update on the Council's cross cutting programmes.

**Action**
The Commission is requested to note the report, presentation and ask questions.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Cross-Cutting Programmes

We set out the rationale for establishing cross-Directorate programmes in the Council's Corporate Plan for 2015-2018. Through the cross-cutting programmes we are looking at radically different ways of providing services in order to address the major commitments to improving services, and to promoting greater opportunity, set out in the administration's manifesto, while making substantial savings over the next three to five years.

## Procurement and service design

**Background**

This is an over-arching programme through which we will develop our approach to maximising the use of our resources, whether a service is delivered in-house or procured from an external provider, while looking to procure services locally and employ locally as far as possible.

The aim is provoke radical and creative thinking with a particular emphasis on:
- different approaches to demand management, and how these can be used to design services;
- outcome focus: understanding what outcomes we want to achieve, building on the work already underway through the range of cross-cutting programmes, and recognising the activities that contribute to these outcomes; making sure our proposals are evidence-based and that we have a more consistent approach to ensuring that with less resource we achieve the best outcome with clear lines of accountability for delivery;
- use of digital technology as integral to the delivery of better services for less money.

**Progress**

The scope of the programme has not yet formally been agreed.

## Customer Service

**Background**

Many of the manifesto commitments are essentially about providing better customer service. Given that these commitments are made in the context of significantly reducing resources, this cross-cutting programme will establish principles for how we will provide better, more efficient services by responding more effectively to demand, reducing wasted effort. This is in effect developing one of the different approaches to demand management and applying it to a range of services.

Projects include looking at specific services in this light, for example, housing repairs, including responsive repairs and the repairs call centre, and the communal repairs service. We will also review our approaches to performance management and complaints handling, and data-sharing, focusing on using our intelligence about service delivery and residents' needs in order to prevent demand rather than simply responding to it.

**Progress**

The business case and scope for the programme have been agreed, with an understanding that the range of services to be covered will increase over the life of the programme. We have worked with frontline staff in the housing repairs service to develop a set of recommendations for change, which they are now implementing.

**Potential savings**

As set out above, a large part of this programme so far has been looking at housing repairs (which involve HRA budgets), but it is envisaged that the programme will look at a wider range of Council services using a whole system approach from first customer contact to completion of the task; this is expected to include services such as Planning. In addition, improved processes for Council Tax, Business Rates and Housing Benefits are being developed, and are expected to generate savings of £2m.

## Public Realm

**Background**

This is a comprehensive review, looking at the efficiency and effectiveness of all services that contribute to the cleaning and maintenance of the public realm in the borough. Our ambitions for the overall impact of cleansing in the borough will be set as the goal, maintaining our commitment to the highest standards. We will look at all environmental cleansing functions, i.e. for streets, parks and estates, and how these should change over the next few years so that we can continue to maintain high standards as the population continues to increase and budgets reduce. No assumptions are made about any changes to structures, but our commitment is to look at all related functions at the same time; what do residents care most about, how well do we do what they care about? Are there things we can stop doing, or do less of, or do smarter?

**Stage one** runs from January 2015 and includes projects involving both the Council and Hackney Homes:

- Recycling 2020 – this will move towards further changes to recycling across the borough, and includes increasing recycling on estates

- Review of estate cleansing over the next year, focusing on cleaning inside blocks and design quality

- As part of the Parking Customer Journey project, working towards incorporating estate parking permits within the virtual permits change, as a later phase

- Working as part of a corporate approach to understand and address, where possible, increasing demand from the night time and hospitality economy, and events, including events in parks

- Maintaining interdependencies with the Enforcement programme

- Two key ICT projects: Mobile Working and Business Intelligence

- Pre-planning for stage two of the Public Realm Programme

**Stage two** will start following the transfer of Hackney Homes staff to the Council in April 2016, using the pre-planning analysis work referred to above, and runs till March 2017, including:

- Environment-related estate functions, and cleansing in parks

- Infrastructure and Design (Streetscene)

- Grounds Maintenance and Arboriculture

- Review of parking policy and charges across streets and estates.


## Enforcement

**Background**

This programme is about taking a step back and re-stating the purpose of the Council's different enforcement functions from the point of view of all of the people who live and work in Hackney - to promote a better quality of life, and to provide public protection.

This is about re-aligning the enforcement function to better achieve our aim, while dealing with the additional demand arising from an increased population and economic growth, and at the same time also making savings.

There are the issues that are important to most residents, for example, dogs, noise, or litter, and then there are the more hidden issues that are essential to tackle in order to reduce inequality, for example, the minimum wage, human trafficking, consumer protection, debt, and housing quality.

**Progress**

Recommendations agreed at Programme Board June 25<sup>th</sup>, now proceeding to implementation.

**Potential savings**

The scope of the programme covers Building Control, Planning Enforcement, Trading Standards, Licensing, Environmental Health, Environmental Enforcement, Parking Enforcement, Parks, Markets, Hygiene Services, Streetscene Enforcement, Shop Front Trading, Community Safety, including the Wardens Service, and Private Sector Housing; the gross budget for these services is over £29m with 184 posts in scope.  The net budget after income is around £5.5m, and officers expect to identify potential savings of up to £2m.


## Employment and Opportunity

**Background**

This programme aims to deliver a comprehensive and joined-up offer for local people in accessing employment and other opportunities, building on many of the great services currently in operation. At the same time, we will also develop specific interventions with groups that face particular challenges. We will bring all linked

initiatives together through clear and consistent branding, supported by online platforms that ensure that opportunities are accessible.

Underpinning this programme will be a clear set of principles which include a commitment to designing solutions with frontline staff and residents while working across different agencies and institutions. The programme will also draw on new rounds of enquiry, including work by the Governance and Resources, and Community Safety and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commissions, to inform new initiatives.

In programme sets a framework for practical interventions needed to deliver the promises set out in Mayor's manifesto commitments. The programme is being considered in two phases which were initiated in tandem; phase 1 relating to the under 25's and phase 2, the over 25's, particularly addressing the long-term, stubbornly high numbers of people out of work as a result of health conditions.

This programme aims to deliver a comprehensive and joined up offer for local people in accessing employment and opportunity pathways. The desired outcome is to build on the positive work being undertaken in this area to provide coordinated and evidence led service delivery, which enables local residents, of all ages, to access the most relevant employment and opportunity pathways available to them. This in turn would enable the better targeting of services with positive benefit in respect of demand management and early intervention. The work undertaken by a multi-departmental team of senior officers representing the following departments; Hackney Learning Trust, Policy, Estate Regeneration, Hackney Homes, Procurement, Human Resources, Regeneration Delivery and Economic Development, and Public Health and Adult Social Care. In addition, engagement with the voluntary sector and third sector has been ongoing as the central themes of the programme have emerged.

**Progress**
Phase 1 - Under 25

The objectives of this phase of the Employment and Opportunities Cross Cutting Programme are to:
•        Create clear and navigable pathways for 11-25 year olds to better understand and access the local work-based opportunities available to them;
•        Maximise community benefits secured through avenues where the Council can utilises its leverage as a regulatory body, major procurer or lead partner
•        Initiate a phased approach to developing evidence-led solutions across different age-groups, skill sets, and demographic groups. Develop appropriate targets in relation to supporting evaluation
•        Identify areas where 'fine tuning' and better co-ordination of services will achieve added value, and where new resource interventions are necessary
•        Deliver an integrated Employment and Opportunity strategy to co-ordinate joint working, collaboration and seamless interaction between services
•        Create a consistent communications and marketing approach that brings together the available offers under one umbrella, promoting the agreed vision in the process

•        Establish co-ordination principles and arrangements across the different services to deliver the objectives

This work, drawing on experience, evidence, past work and likely future policy direction, resulted in the establishment of four topic areas:

TA1:   Public Sector Opportunities
TA2:   Target Group Focus
TA3:   Service Design and Delivery Improvement in Schools
TA4:   Communication and Branding


## Families

**Background**

We already do lots of innovative work with families, joining up services to address their needs in the most effective way, aligning our responses to families from the first point of contact, and seeking to prevent problems from arising. This includes our new Family Learning Intervention Programme aimed at creating responsive interventions for young people on the edge of care, our expanded Troubled Families Programme, and our cross-cutting work to identify and target younger children on the edge of gang involvement.

The programme will need to work effectively alongside the work that is already underway within the Children and Young People Service on "One CYPS", overseen by a Transformation Board. One of the five strands of this programme is "Family Interventions".

Other local plans, programmes and projects related to this theme are:

- Children's Social Care and its Troubled Families Programme
- Children's Centres and other preventative and early intervention services for families
- Pembury Estate Project
- Integrated Gangs Unit
- Young Black Men Project
- Pause Project
- Hackney and City Healthy Child Programme for 0-5s
- Family Nurse Partnership
- Child Poverty and Family Well-Being Plan

The programme will focus on assisting families experiencing, or at risk of, very poor outcomes, to improve those outcomes and become independent and resilient, primarily by drawing on their own strengths. At the same time, it will reduce the overall and long-term levels of demand on, and cost to, both public services and local communities.

**Progress**

Business case produced, but scope of programme not yet formally agreed.

## Capital Investment Strategy

**Background**

With public sector finances facing more years of austerity, the Council will only be able to meet those challenges by developing and delivering a radically different approach to capital investment. A programme has been developed, taking us forward for the next five years to deliver this capital investment, alongside ongoing investment in the Council's highways, and maintenance of its ICT infrastructure.

The challenge is to provide essential services for a growing population, to meet the demand for housing across all tenures, and for school places, as well as renewing public service infrastructure to ensure that it is fit for the future; this includes:

• The manifesto commitment to build 3,000 new homes in the borough between 2014 and 2018 whilst at the same time ensuring that the HRA debt cap is not breached.
• A move towards the identification of a funding solution for the manifesto commitment (that would extend into the 2018/22 period) to develop a further building programme of additional council homes for rent and shared ownership.
• The need to maintain pace with the demand for school places with nine additional forms of entry at primary schools and a further six to seven forms of entry at secondary schools, including the provision of a new secondary school – this alongside ensuring all of our existing schools are in a suitable state of repair.
• The requirement to regenerate our town centres in particular Hackney Central and Dalston, including the development of the Fashion Hub.
• Potentially up to £50m investment in our leisure estate to up-date update those facilities that are no longer fit-for-purpose whilst maximising values from existing sites.
• Renegotiating and ideally 'buying out' the PFI contract in relation to the Technology Learning Centre.

The strategy is underpinned by the principle of maximising the value of our estate to provide investment in public infrastructure. It also provides for ongoing maintenance of the corporate property estate and it is assumed within the programme that highways maintenance will be retained at current levels and that associated programmes in respect to ongoing street lighting, surface water drainage and road safety engineering schemes are also maintained at current levels. It also provides for the maintenance of the ICT infrastructure going forward following the current investment in upgrade to the Council's main ICT platforms.

**Progress**

The Corporate Director for Finance will update Members on progress with this programme at a future meeting of the Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission.

# ⊕ Hackney

| Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission | Item No |
|---|---|
| 8th July 2015 | **7** |
| **Devolution and Public Service Reform** | |

**Outline**

The Mayor of London and London Councils have agreed to work on a joint approach in pursuit of devolution and the reform of public services in London.

This report provides an update on recent progress in pursuit of devolution and reform of public services in London. This follows the agreement at Leaders' Committee on 9 December 2014 to a joint approach with the Mayor of London, seeking talks with Government on the scope of London devolution and public service reform agreement.

The Commission will discuss the opportunities devolution presents to London Borough of Hackney in relation to the reform of public services.

**Action**
The Commission is requested to note the report, presentation and ask questions.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Leaders Committee

## Devolution and Public Service Reform

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Report by:** | Doug Flight | **Job title**: | Head of Strategic Policy |
| **Date:** | 24 March 2015 | | |
| **Contact Officer:** | Doug Flight | | |
| | | **Email:** | Doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk |
| **Telephone:** | 020 7934 9805 | | |

**Summary**

This report provides an update on recent work in pursuit of devolution and reform of public services in London. This work follows the agreement to a joint approach with the Mayor of London, seeking talks with Government on the scope of London devolution and public service reform agreement.

The Congress Executive, comprising the Mayor of London and the London Councils' Executive, met on 3 March 2015 and endorsed the joint work to develop a framework for negotiation with the incoming Government. This framework covers:

- Skills
- Employment
- Housing
- Health
- Crime, Community Safety and Criminal Justice

The Congress Executive went on to initiate an exploration of the potential for joint executive governance in relation to newly devolved responsibilities, whilst respecting existing borough and mayoral powers.

**Recommendations**

Leaders' Committee is asked to:

1) Note the endorsement of the joint work- between the Mayor of London and London Councils- to pursue devolution and reform at the Congress Executive on 3 March 2015.
2) Note the joint work that has been initiated to:
   a. develop a platform to support negotiation with Government after the 2015 General Election and in the run up to the likely Comprehensive Spending Review.
   b. explore the potential for streamlined governance in relation to newly devolved responsibilities.

# Devolution and Public Service Reform Update

**Introduction**

1. This report provides an update on recent progress in pursuit of devolution and reform of public services in London. This follows the agreement at Leaders' Committee on 9 December 2014 to a joint approach with the Mayor of London, seeking talks with Government on the scope of London devolution and public service reform agreement.

**Background**

2. Leaders' Committee has considered a series of linked reports over the last two years on the longer-term prospects for financing local government together with wider opportunities for devolution and reform, including the London Growth Deal.

3. At Leaders' Committee on 15 July 2014, members agreed that it would be advantageous for the focus of London Councils work in this area to encompass wider public service reform initiatives, particularly given the preparations for the General Election and likely comprehensive spending review expected in the summer of 2015 and the consequent opportunities for influencing manifestos and post-election spending plans.

4. This work led to the drafting of an outline proposition, which had been designed as a platform for practical delegation of responsibility to London in relation to a range of public services, where integration at a local level would produce more effective outcomes and greater efficiency. The outline proposition, which was approved by Leaders' Committee on 9 December 2014, included proposals for governance of newly devolved responsibilities, focussed on Borough Leaders and the Mayor and building to some degree on existing joint arrangements. The powers sought and the governance arrangements to support them, do not take any powers away from any existing local or regional authority. The sovereignty of individual authorities in respect of existing functions remains unaffected and paramount.

5. The Mayor of London and London Councils Executive considered the broad scope of a potential proposition at the Congress Executive meeting on 20 November 2014. There was support for an approach to Government seeking talks on the scope of a joint London devolution and public service reform agreement.

6. The Chair and the Conservative Group Lead for Devolution & Public Service Reform met the Chief Executive's Devolution & Public Service Reform Group in November and sought their

support for the development of detailed propositions supporting the political initiative agreed with the Mayor of London.

7. Leaders' Committee considered a report on the London Devolution Proposition at its meeting on 10 February 2015 and endorsed the approach being taken, including the work being taken by chief executives to develop the initial framework of operational detail to support negotiations with Government. The development of the propositions has begun with wide-ranging engagement with member authorities and officials.

8. Building on the themes agreed by Leaders' Committee the five current areas of focus are:

   o Employment
   o Skills
   o Health
   o Housing
   o Crime Community Safety and Criminal Justice.

   The intention is to develop a platform for discussion and negotiation, starting from the outline proposals set out in Appendix A.

9. Meetings have been scheduled in recent weeks between London Councils' Portfolio Holders and the the individual chief executives who are leading specific streams of work, to steer the development of the outline propositions. In addition, the Chair and Cllr Philippa Roe are scheduled to meet with Chief Executives' Group to review progress at the beginning of April.

10. On Friday 20 February 2015 the Chancellor and the Mayor of London made an announcement on a long term economic plan for London. The plan includes measures that relate to the devolution and reform agenda, including:

   a. Skills - Devolution of the Apprenticeship Grant to Employers and a remit to work with Government to reshape skills provision in London.
   b. Land - Establishing a London Land Commission to identify public sector land for development and support home building.
   c. Planning - Beginning discussions on planning devolution, including powers over sight lines for strategic views and wharves (i.e. those safeguarded for waterborne freight handling use).
   d. Housing -The designation of nine Housing Zones.

**Advancing the Joint Proposition with the Mayor of London**

11. The Congress Executive, comprising the Mayor of London and the London Councils' Executive, met on 3 March 2015 and took stock of the joint work to secure a London devolution and public sector reform agreement. The meeting endorsed the joint work, which is focused on developing a framework for negotiation with the incoming Government, once its policy priorities emerge following the General Election.

12. Mayor Johnson expressed his strong support for the joint work and he pointed to his regular mention of working with the boroughs at the recent launch of the long term economic plan for London. It was emphasised that the recently announced work with Government to reshape skills provision in London, for example, would continue to be pursed in partnership with London Councils.

13. The Congress Executive went on to consider what the Government might expect to see before significant devolution could occur, in terms of adequate governance in London. Government is expected to seek reassurances that any systems for governing newly devolved responsibilities are robust, efficient and provide adequate accountability mechanisms. The Chair of London Councils stressed the need to ensure that any new governance mechanism must be designed to facilitate devolution down from Whitehall, not draw responsibilities up from boroughs or impinge on either the boroughs' or the Mayor's existing powers.

14. It was agreed that it would be important to begin the development and consideration of potential propositions for joint executive governance of a London devolution settlement, so that London was prepared for questions that might emerge in negotiations after the General Election.

**Considerations and Next Steps**

15. Operational work to develop more detailed propositions is now underway and is being co-ordinated by the Chief Executive's Devolution & Public Service Reform Group, which encompasses both borough and GLA representatives. This is designed to provide Leaders with the technical advice needed to advance negotiations after the General Election, with the incoming Government.

16. As the overall package develops, the different thematic areas are likely to present questions on which Leaders will be asked to make a considered judgement. For example, in order to secure greater influence over skills provision, boroughs will need to consider greater collaboration across borough groupings to facilitate richer engagement with businesses and to gather intelligence on skills gaps. In relation to housing, greater collaboration across borough boundaries may be required to secure greater freedom over use of s106 monies and over borrowing secured against the housing revenue account.

17. In taking forward the exploration of potential propositions for joint executive governance of newly devolved responsibilities, called for at London Congress, consideration will need to be given to developing robust systems. To secure credibility with Government, these will need to demonstrate a capacity to allow firm decisions within a reasonable timeframe, whilst protecting the existing powers and interests of both boroughs and the Mayor.

18. Leaders will have the opportunity to shape the evolution of the thematic propositions, as well as any proposals on joint governance of new responsibilities which may emerge, after the General Election.

**Conclusion**

19. Work is now in hand to add operational detail to the joint London proposition being developed by the Mayor and Borough Leaders, and to assemble a platform which could then become the basis of negotiations with the new government after the General Election.

20. It is envisaged that engagement will be initiated on the basis of utilising the existing joint governance arrangements, but it is likely that negotiations will need to include an exploration of potential enhancements to the supporting governance systems. To prepare for this eventuality, exploratory discussions are due to be initiated with GLA officials.

21. As a result of the preparatory work on the joint proposition, London - the Mayor and Borough Leaders – should be positioned well to initiate a second phase of engagement after the General Election, offering the potential opportunity to secure significant public service reform in London and to help tackle the challenges that boroughs are likely to face in the next Spending Review period.

22. Leaders are asked to:

1) Note the endorsement of the joint work- between the Mayor of London and London Councils- to pursue devolution and reform at the Congress Executive on 3 March 2015.

2) Note the work that has been initiated to:
   a. develop a platform to support negotiation with Government after the 2015 General Election and in the run up to the likely Comprehensive Spending Review.
   b. explore the potential for streamlined governance in relation to newly devolved responsibilities.

**Financial implications for London Councils**

None

**Legal implications for London Councils**

Any recommendations arising from work to develop shared governance structures would be subject to detailed legal advice.

**Equalities implications for London Councils**

There are no direct equalities implications for London Councils as a result of this paper.

**Attachments**

**Appendix A:**  Outline proposals, which are being used to inform the development of the London Proposition

**Appendix A**:   **Outline proposals, which are being used to inform the development of the London Proposition**

The proposition, which is intended as a platform for discussion and negotiation, is being developed from the following outline proposals, which have previously been considered by Leaders' Committee and were reported to the Congress Executive on 3 March 2015. It is likely that each of the five areas will demand some different approaches to governance, geography and delivery.

Employment

- London government should co-commission with DWP the next phase of the Work Programme in London. This would result in better integration of mainstream employment services with other local support services and improve employment outcomes for the very long term unemployed and jobseekers with complex needs.
- Mainstream employment programmes for those closer to the labour market are delivered by Jobcentre Plus (JCP). The introduction of Universal Credit is an opportunity for more systematic co-location of JCP and borough staff to increase efficiency, as well integration of JCP staff and management with London local government in order to operate more closely with other welfare services.

Skills

- Incentives for further education through the Adult Skills Budget should be set at London level through collaboration between the London Mayor and the boroughs - to ensure that Londoners have the skills they need to succeed in the jobs market; and that businesses have the skilled workers they need to grow. Decisions on incentives would be informed by local knowledge, with London boroughs co-ordinating data from local business using cross borough partnerships. This information would have a formal role in informing London's decision making on further education funding.

- A similar model of pan-London decision making would create a new:
    - London Careers Service
    - London Apprentice Service.

Health

- The long term challenges faced by health and social care services, including demographic pressures and technological advances, cannot be met through simple refinements to the current system. Given the vital role of social care and public health in providing the integrated responses needed to tackle these challenges, London local government will be critical to shaping sustainable, locally embedded solutions for health.

- We are exploring ways to hasten improved, better integrated health and care, including strengthening system resilience to avoid future A&E crises.
- There is a significant opportunity to transform the way the health estate is used across London (particularly to support primary care) and also to release land for housing and economic growth.

Housing

- Current plans and resources leave London far short of the minimum requirement for home building to in London to keep pace with growing population. In times of austerity additional plans cannot rely solely on additional public funding.
    - For this reason the boroughs' ability to create value through change of land use is an essential part of any successful strategy.
    - Leveraging existing assets to raise funds is a second essential route to provide resources when public funding is limited.
    - Ensuring that different types of infrastructure – such as transport links and housing - complement each other in creating value is a third opportunity.

- To support improved supply of housing, we are exploring propositions around:
    - London solutions to improve supply. This will focus on how to maximise use of the resources already available to us, proposing the creation of new potential mechanisms to ensure homes are delivered across London, regardless of where the resource is currently held.
    - Flexibilities from government on planning and regulation issues to complement the above. This will focus on what policy changes are needed – particularly around devolution of further powers and resources – to help support successful and more effective pan-London mechanisms as above.

Crime, Community Safety and Criminal Justice

- The outline proposition being examined is that, by enhancing strategic leadership of the criminal justice system in London, the Mayor and boroughs could deliver significant savings and improve outcomes.
- A second level of devolution forms a core part of the proposition, through the development of a locally managed single pot arrangement for borough based crime and disorder work.  This would allow closer local integration of services and be more effective in preventing crime and reducing offending. This approach builds on best practice developed under the Troubled Families Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

# ⬡ Hackney

| | |
|---|---|
| **Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission**<br><br>8<sup>th</sup> July 2015<br><br>**Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission Work Programme for 2015/16** | Item No<br><br>**8** |

## Outline

Attached is the work programme for the Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission for 2015/16. Please note this is a working document and regularly revised and updated.

## Action

The Commission is asked to consider and note any suggestions for the work programme in 2015/16.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Overview & Scrutiny

## Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission
### *Rolling Work Programme June 2015 – April 2016*

All meetings take pace at 7.00 pm in Hackney Town Hall unless stated otherwise on the agenda.  This rolling work programme report is updated and published on the agenda for each meeting of the Commission.

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and officer contact | Comment and Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Wed 10th June 2015**<br><br>Papers deadline: Mon 1st June | Election of Chair and Vice Chair | Chief Executive's | First meeting of newly elected Commission. |
| | London Living Wage Executive Response | Chief Executive's | Cabinet Member for Finance response to letter of reference following the outcome of G&R's short inquiry |
| | Delivering Public Services – Whole Place, Whole System Approach<br>Evidence session | Early Intervention Foundation<br>Donna Molloy – Head of Implementation | Presentation by Donna Molloy from Early Intervention Foundation about prevention and spending on late intervention. |
| | Delivering Public Services – Whole Place, Whole System Approach<br>• Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission – Depression and Anxiety Report<br>• The 21st Century Public Servant | Chief Executive's | Review the findings from the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Depression and Anxiety Review.<br><br>Review of the finding from a review conducted by Dr Catherine Needham and Catherine Mangan on |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and officer contact | Comment and Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the changing public service workforce. |
| | Delivering Public Services – Whole Place, Whole System Approach<br><br>• Long Term Unemployed People in Hackney – The Customer Journey | Chief Executive's | Discussion based on the findings from the qualitative research report by BDRC highlighting the customers journey for the long term unemployed in Hackney. |
| | Work Programme Discussion | Chief Executive's | To agree a review topic and topics for one-off items for the year. |
| **Mon 8 July 2015**<br>Papers deadline: Fri 26 June | London Borough of Hackney 2015 Elections | Chief Executive's<br>(Tim Shields) | Report on the 2015 Elections - voters registration and postal votes |
| | Devolution | Chief Executive's<br>(Tim Shields) | Discussion about the opportunities devolution could provide for Hackney |
| | Corporate Cross Cutting Programmes | Chief Executive's<br>(Tim Shields) | Update on the progress of the Corporate Plan 2015-18 cross cutting programmes |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and officer contact | Comment and Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| **Tues 8 Sept 2015**<br>Papers deadline: Thu 27 August | Finance update | Finance and Resources<br>(Ian Williams) | Briefing on the budget scrutiny process and update on General Fund savings 2011/12-2013/14. |
| | ICT Review Recommendation Update | Finance and Resources<br>(Ian Williams and Christine Peacock | |
| | Complaints Service Annual report | Chief Executive's<br>(Bruce Devile) | Annual report of the Council's complaints service |
| **Tues 13 Oct 2015**<br>Papers deadline: Thu 1 Oct | HR Workforce Strategy | Legal, HR and Regulatory Services<br>(Gifty Edila) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Tues 10 Nov 2015** | | | |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and officer contact | Comment and Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| Papers deadline: Thu 29 Oct | | | |
| **Tues 8 Dec 2015**<br><br>Papers deadline: Thu 26 Nov | Finance update | Finance & Resources (Ian Williams) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Tues 12 Jan 2016**<br><br>Papers deadline: Mon 21 Dec | Cabinet Question Time with Cllr Taylor (Cabinet Member for Finance) TBC | Cllr Taylor – Cabinet Member Finance | Cabinet Question Time is now carried out by individual Commissions.  Cllr Taylor has lead responsibility for revenues and benefits, audit, procurement, pensions, and customer services. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Mon 22 Feb 2016**<br><br>Papers deadline: Wed 10 Feb | Budget and Finance update | Finance & Resources (Ian Williams) | Budget and Finance update on local government settlement and Council Budget for 2015/16. |
| | | | |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and officer contact | Comment and Action |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| **Tues 8 Mar 2016**<br><br>Papers deadline: Thu 25 Mar | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Tues 12 Apr 2016**<br><br>Papers deadline: Thu 31 March | Work programme for 2016/17 discussion | | Discussion on topics for work programme for 2016/17. |
| | | | |

This page is intentionally left blank