



Safeguarding Overview & Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

Chairman: Cllr Pauline Batstone
Vice Chairman: Cllr Mike Lovell

Specific issues previously discussed by the Panel for potential further review:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Items relating to Children:-</u> • Child Protection • Child Sexual Exploitation and missing children • SEN reorganisation 	<p>For all items listed to the left members are asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the prioritisation methodology • Identify lead Member(s) and lead Officer(s) • Provide a brief rationale for the scrutiny review • Indicate draft timescales • Assign the item to a meeting in the work programme
<p><u>Items relating to Adults:-</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neglect • Deprivation of liberty • Making safeguarding personal • Hate crime safe places • Person Centred Care • Rogue Trading 	
<p><u>Work in Progress</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looked after Children – Task and Finish Group met 08/09/16 • Domestic Abuse – Agenda item 05/10/16, update 19/01/17 • EHCP’s – agenda item 05/10/16, update 19/01/17 	
<p>Schedule a Post Scrutiny Review covering an ‘Assessment of outcomes following changes to Youth Service provision’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is to proactively understand and consider the resultant impacts 12 months after the councils’ decision to change the way in which youth service provision is delivered – (<i>post decision scrutiny</i>). 	

Scrutiny Review Prioritisation Methodology:



Scrutiny Review Prioritisation Methodology:		
Q1 - Is the topic/issue likely to have a significant impact on the delivery of council services?	NO	
↓ YES		
Q2 - Is the issue included in the Corporate Plan (e.g. of strategic importance to the council or its stakeholders / partners), or have the potential to be if not addressed?	NO	
↓ YES		
Q3 - Is a focussed scrutiny review likely to add value to the council to the performance of its services?	NO	
↓ YES		
Q4 - Is a proactive scrutiny process likely to lead to efficiencies / savings?	POSSIBLY	NO
↓ YES		
Q5 - Has other review work been undertaken which may lead to a risk of duplication?	YES	
↓ NO		
Q6 - Do sufficient scrutiny resources already exist, or are available, to ensure that the necessary work can be properly carried out in a timely manner?	NO	
↓ YES		
INCLUDE IN THE SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME (HIGH PRIORITY)	CONSIDER (LOWER PRIORITY)	DO NOT INCLUDE

All items that have been agreed for coverage by the Committee have been scheduled in the Forward Plan accordingly.

Date of Meeting		Item/Purpose	Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE)	Lead Member/Officer	Reference to Corporate Plan	Target End Date
p						
6 July 2017 (10.00am)		Assessment of outcomes following changes to Youth Service provision Emergency Planning (Multi agency and Partnership working) Responses re Terrorist attacks, population based risks, weather etc.	This is to proactively understand and consider the resultant impacts 12 months after the councils' decision to change the way in which youth service provision is delivered – <i>(post decision scrutiny)</i> . Simon Parker Simon Parker	Jay Mercer		
12 October 2017 (10.00am)						

Sara Tough

Director for Children's Services (Lead Officer for the Safeguarding Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

Date: 15 March 2017