

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 2 JULY 2013

**ROOM C1, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman (Chair)
Councillor Rachael Saunders (Vice-Chair)
Councillor David Snowdon
Councillor Helal Uddin
Councillor Abdal Ullah
Councillor Amy Whitelock

Co-opted Members Present:

Memory Kampiyawo – (Parent Governor Representative)
Nozrul Mustafa – (Parent Governor Representative)
Rev James Olanipekun – (Parent Governor Representative)
Dr Phillip Rice – (Church of England Diocese Representative)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Alibor Choudhury – (Cabinet Member for Resources)

Councillor Ann Jackson –

Guests Present:

Councillor David Edgar –
Councillor Carlo Gibbs
Councillor John Pierce

Officers Present:

Agnes Adrien – (Team Leader, Enforcement & Litigation, Legal Services, Chief Executive's)
Vicky Allen – (Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Strategy, Corporate Strategy and Equality Service, Chief Executive's)
Sarah Barr – (Senior Strategy Policy and Performance Officer,

	Corporate Strategy and Equality Service, Chief Executive's)
Daisy Beserve	– (Senior Strategy Policy and Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy and Equality Service, Chief Executive's)
Anne Canning	– (Interim Corporate Director, Education Social Care and Wellbeing)
Colin Cormack	– (Service Head Housing Options, Development & Renewal)
Paul Gresty	– (Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy and Equality Service, Chief Executive's)
Steve Grocott	– (Head of Careers Service, Education Social Care and Wellbeing)
Chris Holme	– (Acting Corporate Director - Resources)
Mehreen Hussain	– (Communications Advisor, Communications, Chief Executive's)
Frances Jones	– (Service Manager One Tower Hamlets, Corporate Strategy and Equality Service, Chief Executive's)
Louise Russell	– (Service Head Corporate Strategy and Equality, Chief Executive's)
Andy Scott	– (Interim Service Head Economic Development, Development and Renewal)
Diana Warne	– (Acting Service Head, Learning and Achievement, Education Social Care and Wellbeing)
Tim Williams	– (Post 16 Development Officer, Education Social Care and Wellbeing)
Angus Taylor	– (Principal Committee Officer, Democratic Services, Chief Executive's)

COUNCILLOR MOTIN UZ ZAMAN (CHAIR) IN THE CHAIR

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of:

- Councillor Stephanie Eaton (Scrutiny Lead Resources).
- Councillor Sirajul Islam (Mental Health and Housing Challenge Session Co-Lead Member/ Chair)
- David Galpin (Head of Legal Services - Community) for whom Agnes Adrienne (Team Leader Enforcement & Litigation, Legal Services, Chief Executive's) was deputising.

- Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Councillors Rachael Saunders (Vice-Chair and Scrutiny Lead Adults Health & Wellbeing), and Abdul Ullah (Scrutiny Lead Development & Renewal).

Noted

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

No declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or other declarations of interest were made.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

Matter Arising

The Chair:

- Informed OSC members that at the last OSC meeting he had indicated that he would be inviting the Mayor to attend the next OSC meeting [2nd July], for the first of a series of 'spotlight sessions' during the year ahead. This spotlight was intended to focus on the challenges and opportunities the Mayor foresaw for delivery of improved quality of life for local people in the year ahead. The Chair had extended the invitation at Cabinet on 5th June and formalised this in a subsequent letter. The Mayor had declined the invitation, because of prior commitments and therefore with OSC agreement he intended to invite the Mayor to the next OSC meeting [23rd July] for the spotlight session.
- Emphasised the significant contribution Scrutiny could make in shaping services to improve outcomes for local people, and the importance of engaging with the Mayor/ Cabinet to achieve this; and that the spotlight session was intended to be an element of this engagement.

The Chair **Moved** and it was:-

Resolved

That the unrestricted minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, held on 4th June 2013, be agreed as a correct record of the proceedings, and the Chair be authorised to sign them accordingly.

Action by:

Angus Taylor (Principal Committee Officer, Democratic Services, CE's)

4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

5. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

The clerk informed OSC members that:

- No decisions of the Mayor in Cabinet on 5th June 2013 had been “called in”.
- There has been one “Call In” of a recent decision of the Mayor outside Cabinet taken under executive powers. Although this met the criteria in the Council’s Constitution, the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal) had determined that it did not require urgent consideration and would be considered at the next OSC meeting to be held on 23rd July 2013.

6. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Removing Barriers to Youth Employment - Report of the Scrutiny Working Group

Councillor Ann Jackson, Lead Member/ Chair of the Scrutiny Working Group: Removing Barriers to Youth Employment, introduced and highlighted key points in the SWG report, which set out the rationale and objectives, methodology, key findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review. The following Officers were also in attendance to answer questions from the OSC.

- Anne Canning, Interim Corporate Director, Education Social Care and Wellbeing.
- Di Warne, Interim Service Head Learning & Achievement, ESCW.
- Steve Grocott, Head of Careers Service, ESCW.
- Andy Scott, Interim Service Head Economic Development, D&R.

The following points were highlighted by Councillor Jackson:

- Background to identification of this as a potential area for review including:
 - Awareness of the importance of employment, given the impact of Government welfare reforms, which combined with continuing recession made securing employment more difficult for young people in particular, because of their need of job specific experience, skills and qualifications to allow them to compete with others and get on a career ladder.
 - Awareness that Government has not intervened in the UK job market, relying instead on encouraging corporate and financial growth to bring employment, combined with a belief that more serious consideration was needed on how to get young people ready for work. A belief also that young people needed additional individual support and guidance to achieve this, as they found themselves in a position of understanding and choosing the best direction and were not equipped to do so. Consideration that the Council could adopt a more custodial approach with partners to ensure the best outcomes for young people.
 - Improving employment opportunities for young people in the borough was a Council and Mayoral priority, and it was important to ensure resources in this area were applied efficiently/ effectively and delivery/ outcomes were optimised.

- Review Objective: To investigate how the Council and its partners could improve the support provided to young people to become work-ready, and help remove barriers to employment.
- Key areas for review:
 - The demand for apprenticeships by young people.
 - The supply of good quality apprenticeships and how this can be stimulated.
 - Supporting young people to access opportunities and be competitive in the labour market: how could the Council add value to this agenda?
- Key Findings including:
 - **Information:** Much Government and Council activity focused on securing post 16 education/ employment for young people, but partnership working was not joined up. There was a significant opportunity to improve the quality and accessibility of information available for young people, to help them understand what happened after school: how to look for work, the offer available to them from the Council and other providers to support this, also information on benefits, housing and training. Easy to understand web based menu driven information was needed.
 - **Mentoring:** A mentoring resource needed to be available to young people. With mentor encouragement they could gain the insight needed to on education/ training/ careers available to them, consider their options, gain confidence/ motivation and weather problems that faced them.
 - **Council's role:** A more custodial approach with partners to ensure the best outcomes for young people was needed. A more coherent Council approach on opportunities for young people, particularly apprenticeships, would improve it's understanding of need and better enable it to influence funding in the borough, draw providers together and improve outcomes. National companies might then provide apprenticeships for local young people.
- Recommendations set out in the report were also highlighted. It was felt Recommendations 6 & 7 could be strengthened by reference to ensuring that all apprenticeship opportunities should appeal to both genders.
- Review Group Members, Ms Vicky Allen, Strategy Policy & Performance Officer and other Offices were formally thanked for their contribution to the review,

A discussion followed which focused on clarification being sought and given on the following points:-

- What action could be taken to raise young people's aspiration for apprenticeships to the level of aspiration they had for attending university to get degree level qualifications? *There were a range of schemes focused on parents and young people to inform them of progression routes and apprenticeship opportunities and information available on websites of Council and partners.*
- Could the role of the Council, particularly through the Skillsmatch service, be made more productive in securing outcomes for young people? *Skillsmatch provided a valuable service but information on the offer to*

young people could be improved, particularly by development of menu driven information. The Council's focus was on job brokerage and joining up the activities of providers to focus on young people.

- In welcoming the report for raising the visibility of the issues facing young people, comment that significant work was undertaken in this area by the Voluntary Sector, among others by City Gateway. *City Gateway did undertake valuable work, however the focus of the review, given time constraints, had been on mentoring and apprenticeships.*
- Many apprentices did not secure employment after the apprenticeship; what action could be taken to address this and how could improved outcomes be measured? *The apprenticeship offer to young people needed to be more coherent and this would help with the development of performance measures. Information about apprenticeship needed to be menu based to be more effective. Both would lead to more value for money. The Towerskills scheme was an example of good practice. It was important to develop business based apprenticeship opportunities, and whilst these might not lead to employment with that particular organisation, the experience and skills gained would prove valuable to securing employment. It was also important for the Council to monitor apprenticeships to ensure young people were not exploited.*
- Did the Council optimise its leverage with contractors, through its significant procurement, to secure apprenticeships for local young people? *There was a defined statement on apprenticeships in the Council's procurement policy, and clear targets for the number of apprenticeships which correlated with contract value.*
- Consideration that parents understood the value of an academic pathway for their children and for most this was the aspiration. What action could be taken to increase their understanding of the value of apprenticeships? *Information was available on the web for parents and school heads were stakeholders in reviewing this and the approach with parents.*
- There were many providers of apprenticeship for young people, but unless young people's understanding of the offer available to them improved, there would continue to be high drop down rates as they found themselves in jobs not suited to them as individuals. The consortium approach was welcomed as it should prevent young people transferring from one scheme to another. *When apprenticeships were created organisations had a choice of provider including the National Apprenticeship Scheme, and although the Council could endeavour to promote local providers this was a matter they might influence but did not control.*

The Chair thanked Councillor Jackson for her contribution in chairing the scrutiny review, and for attending OSC to present the report/recommendations arising. He then **Moved** the recommendations as set out in the report, and it was:-

Resolved

1. That the draft report of the Scrutiny Review Working Group, and the recommendations contained in it, be agreed; and

2. That the Service Head Corporate Strategy & Equality be authorised to amend the draft report before submission to Cabinet, after consultation with the Scrutiny Review Working Group.

Action by:

Daisy Berve (Senior Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)

Vicky Allen (Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)

6.2 Improving Post 16 Educational Attainment in Tower Hamlets - Report of the Scrutiny Working Group

Councillor Amy Whitelock, Scrutiny Lead Member Children, Schools & Families 2012/13 and 2013/14 and Lead Member/ Chair Scrutiny Working Group: Post 16 Educational Attainment in Tower Hamlets, introduced and highlighted key points in the SWG report, which set out the context/ rationale for the review, methodology and analysis of data undertaken, key findings and recommendations. The following Officers were also in attendance to answer questions from the OSC.

- Anne Canning, Interim Corporate Director Education Social Care and Wellbeing.
- Di Warne, Interim Service Head Learning & Achievement, ESCW.
- Tim Williams, Post 16 Development Officer, ESCW.

The following points were highlighted by Councillor Whitelock:

- Background to identification of this as a potential area for review including:
 - A discussion with other Councillors had noted significant that the progress in GCSE attainment appeared not to have been matched by post-16 results in Tower Hamlets.
 - Improving performance for post-16 attainment was a Council and Mayoral priority and therefore underperformance merited further investigation.
 - The ESCW directorate had recently undertaken an analysis of post 16 attainment in LBTH so this provided a good starting point for a review.
- Key Findings:
 - Analysis of the data showed that at the higher grades A*-B, LBTH fell well below the national average, with students achieving As at GCSE tending to underperform at A Level. It was vital that higher ability students also performed well post-16, as not doing so impacted on subsequent life choices and fulfilling their potential.
 - The range of subjects and destinations chosen for higher education was limited, with the vast majority opting to stay in London. Different types of universities might be more appropriate to certain career objectives, and it was important that all students were encouraged to

think broadly and explore different options for their futures, and that a range of information was available to them to allow this.

- The evidence also suggested that parental perceptions were that sixth form colleges in Tower Hamlets were not as good as in Islington, Camden and elsewhere. The review had however found good practice in Tower Hamlets such as Central Foundation School, where a separate sixth form environment had been created and the Headteacher stretched students' horizons.
- The reasons for the findings were found to be complex but included:
 - The challenge of the jump between GCSE and A Level with much support available to students at the GCSE but A level requiring more independent study skills.
 - Students choosing subjects they felt they ought to choose, rather than those suited to their skills set, resulting in not performing well.
 - The difficulties in navigating a complex post-16 landscape.
- The review had found much good practice in and out of the borough eg Hackney and Camden, and this had informed the recommendations. The themed groups of recommendations were signposted.
- Formally thanking all those who had contributed to the review.

A discussion followed which focused on clarification being sought and given on the following points:-

- Whether the review had examined governance standards and the positive influence good governance could have on changing performance. What action could be taken to secure greater participation from parents? *The review had examined the role of parent governors and recommended harnessing the resource of unsuccessful PG applicants who were interested in the school's future eg through Parent Teacher Associations and as role models to support parents. Ms Canning commented that school governor confidence in understanding the 'post -16 secret garden' was key to raising attainment.*
- Whether the review had examined the issue of teacher appraisal as a lack of this would lead to complacency and impact on students. *Ms Canning agreed appraisal was important and it was important to have school governors on board in this regard.*
- Expression of disappointment that good performance at GCSE was not being matched at A level and consideration that the Council's leadership must identify a way to manage this underperformance. If students were encouraged and choosing to stay at the wrong school for their skill set, what steps was the Council taking to address this. *Ms Canning responded that the universal improvement in secondary school attainment at GCSE, which was now above national standards was being driven forward post-16 and there were now pockets of excellence in the borough.*
- Concern expressed that post -16 underperformance was driven by a lack of ambition for young people both on the part of parents, often lacking education themselves, and on the part of teachers. The provision of new school facilities would not address underperformance unless the approach to teaching changed. *Councillor Whitelock commented that she shared the frustration regarding post -16 aspirations for young people.*

Central Foundation School was an example of good practice, with teachers encouraging broad horizons; and the review had found innovative schemes such as offering parental trips to universities which had led to students achieving university offers out of London. However the review had also found that a strong focus in Hackney on driving up teaching quality had led to significant improvements in post-16 performance. The Council could not force students into sixth forms but could support the Hackney Learning Trust Model. Ms Canning disagreed that the aspirations for post-16 attainment were not sufficiently ambitious, as there had been a significant push for improvement in the last 2-3 years. At the Heads of Sixth Form meetings all supported the post-16 strategy, and analysis of data for post-16 attainment was becoming forensic with schools held to account for non-achievement of individuals. To improve, investment in governors and parents was needed, improved academic literacy and provision of experience beyond the 'walled world of everyday. With regard to post -16 destinations Tower Hamlets provided a diverse experience.

- Consideration that the perceptions of young people regarding post -16 education also needed examination as some did not have a positive attitude to learning as they felt the outcome would have little value.
- Although it was important to prepare young people for the jump from GCSE to post-16 learning, especially at university, where students were expected to be self-sufficient at learning, it was also important not to spoon feed them as this did not allow them to grow and cope with the post-16 world.

The Chair thanked Councillor Whitelock for her contribution in chairing the scrutiny review and presenting the report/ recommendations arising. He then **Moved** the recommendations as set out in the report, and it was:-

Resolved

1. That the draft report of the Scrutiny Review Working Group, and the recommendations contained in it be agreed; and
2. That the Service Head Corporate Strategy & Equality be authorised to amend the draft report before submission to Cabinet, after consultation with the Scrutiny Review Working Group.

Action by:

Daisy Beserve (Senior Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)

Sarah Barr (Senior Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)

6.3 Mental Health and Housing - Report of the Scrutiny Challenge Session

Councillor Rachael Saunders, Scrutiny Lead Member Adults Health and Wellbeing 2012/13 and 2013/14 and Co-Lead Member/ Co-Chair Scrutiny

Challenge Session: Mental Health and Housing, introduced and highlighted key points in the SCS report, which set out the context/ rationale, objectives, and key findings/ recommendations of the challenge session. Colin Cormack, Service Head Housing Options, Development & Renewal, was also in attendance to answer questions from the OSC.

The following points were highlighted by Councillor Saunders:

- Background to identification of this as a potential area for review: a number of Councillors had felt that in setting the criteria to award priority for housing on medical grounds the focus was more on physical health issues rather than mental health issues, and there was a sense that in the decision making process those with mental health conditions did not manage to obtain housing priority so easily.
- Key Findings including:
 - Those with the most severe mental health conditions were supported by the current system eg dedicated accommodation and supported living arrangements, but a significant number of people with more subtle mental health conditions were not necessarily awarded the priority and housing they deserved. Therefore current medical priority award criteria for those people with a mental health condition needed review and revision.
 - The health prioritisation form was focused on questions regarding physical functioning and interaction with physical environment. There was now a need to progress the revision of the form to enable people to articulate any mental health problems and link mental health to housing need. This would also ensure more information was obtained to inform decision making on health prioritisation;
 - Medical professionals that had tried to help people with mental health issues in housing need had not understood how the housing system worked, and Cabinet had therefore decided that Officers should exercise the judgement on awarding housing priority. The Challenge Session had considered that Officers needed to be better equipped to make informed and confident judgements/ decisions about people with mental health problems and whether they should be awarded medical priority for housing, and this required additional and regular mental health specific training,

Colin Cormack, Service Head Housing Options, Development & Renewal:

- Acknowledged that the Challenge Session had highlighted that those suffering a mental health condition found the housing assessment process much more challenging than those with a physical health condition. Also that the health prioritisation form was geared towards physical ill health not mental ill health. Advised that whilst the mechanism for prioritising mental conditions needed improvement, it would advantage nobody if all this resulted in was many more people getting a higher priority, in the context of the finite housing available, as the prioritisation process was a mechanism to decide who did or did not get assistance.
- Suggested that Recommendations 1 and 2 be reversed, as it was appropriate for the Housing Options Service to work with colleagues and

partners who delivered support to those with mental health conditions on reviewing the medical priority award criteria, before reviewing and revising the medical priority application form.

- Informed the OSC that over the next 12 months the Service was striving towards a tenancy attainment function, with dedicated caseworkers for all those in housing need.
- Clarification was sought and given as to whether the issue of the health prioritisation form being filled out by the abuser of those with mental health or depression had been examined. *Officers were not aware of this safeguarding issue but it would be looked at by the Safeguarding Advisory Board, of which Mr Cormack was a member.*

The Chair thanked Members and Officers for their contribution to the Challenge Session. He then **Moved** the recommendations set out in the report (taking account of the advice of the Service Head Housing Options), and it was:-

Resolved

1. That, subject to (a) below, the draft report of the Scrutiny Challenge Session, and the recommendations contained in it be agreed
(a) Reversal of the order of recommendations 1 and 2.
2. That the Service Head Corporate Strategy & Equality be authorised to amend the draft report before submission to Cabinet, after consultation with the Challenge Session Group.

Action by:

Daisy Beserve (Senior Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)

Paul Gresty (Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)

6.4 Strategic Performance and Corporate Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring - 2012/13 Draft Outturn

Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources, introduced, and highlighted key points, in the monitoring report which detailed the financial position of the Council at the end of 2012/13 compared to budget, and service performance against targets. Chris Holme, Acting Corporate Director Resources, and Louise Russell, Service Head Corporate Strategy and Equality, were also in attendance for this item.

A discussion followed which focused on clarification being sought and given on the following points:-

- In response to a request from the Chair, areas of underperformance were also outlined:
 - A marginal dip in satisfaction with Customer Access understood to relate to parking.

- A slight rise in staff sickness absence resulted in the stretch target not being met, with mitigating action taken.
- Graffiti problems were on the increase and therefore the direction of travel against the strategic measure for environmental cleanliness was negative, with mitigating action being taken.
- There was under-performance for male mortality rate.
- The reported positive direction of travel for key poverty indicators: JSA Claimant Rate and Proportion of Children in Poverty; in the context that as more wealthy people moved into the borough there would be improved poverty indicators without any intervention being necessary. The OSC requested a numerical breakdown rather than percentages. Louise Russell undertook to **provide a written response** to all OSC members.
- The reported variance in the Communications Budget where 12/13 outturn was over 10 per cent more than the latest 12/13 budget and where 12/13 outturn was almost £1 million more than the original 12/13 budget. *In general terms there was more to communicate to people. A **detailed explanation would be provided in writing** to OSC members in a day or two.* The Chair re-iterated the importance of Officers being properly briefed and able to provide the answers to matters raised by the OSC in order that it could fulfil its scrutiny remit effectively.
- Postponement of development and implementation of the Mayor's Employment and Enterprise Board (2 years). *Further work was needed to engage stakeholders and ensure a proper Board and plan for delivery.* Councillor Choudhury agreed to **provide a timescale and action plan for implementation** requested by the OSC.

The Chair **Moved** and it was:-

Resolved

1. That the Council's financial performance compared to budget for 2012/13, as detailed in Sections 3 to 6 and Appendices 1-4 of the report, be noted;
2. That the proposed transfers to reserves, as detailed in Appendix 5 of the report, be noted; and
3. That the 2012/13 year end performance for strategic measures and Strategic Plan activities, as set out in Sections 7 and 8 and detailed in Appendices 6 &7 of the report, be noted.

Action by:

Chris Holme, Acting Corporate Director Resources

Louise Russell, Service Head Corporate Strategy and Equalities

6.5 Development of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2013/14 (Oral Report)

Ms Louise Russell, Service Head Corporate Strategy & Equality, gave a detailed PowerPoint presentation on the development of the OSC Work Programme in 2013/14 which focused on the following points:

- Progress to Date:
 - Scrutiny Leads received briefing notes/ discussion with Corporate Directors.
 - Work Programme development session had taken place
 - A range of possible areas and scrutiny methods identified
- Suggested Areas for Scrutiny were outlined.
- Analysis of potential scrutiny topics grouped topics by theme:
 - Policy development
 - Right to Buy
 - 2 year old provision
 - Assessment of existing processes and outcomes
 - Career development for disabled staff
 - School Spaces
 - Partnership engagement
 - Integration of health and social care
 - Resident engagement in the budget process
 - Spotlight sessions were linked with the themes.
 - Outcomes set out in a draft OSC Work Programme **Tabled** for discussion.
- Next Step: Corporate Strategy & Equality would continue to work with Scrutiny Leads and Officers on resource commitment, and finalise the Work Programme for presentation to OSC on 23rd July.

A discussion followed focused on the following points:

- The Chair thanked Louise Russell and her Officer team for the development session and formulation of the Work Programme. The programme was ambitious and frontloaded to take account of Member activity in the run up to Council elections in 2014.
- Councillor Helal Uddin commented that he had not attended the work programme development session and consequently the draft OSC Work Programme did not contain potential areas for scrutiny relating to his portfolio of Communities Localities and Culture. It was agreed that Councillor Uddin should forward any suggestions to Louise Russell, Service Head Corporate Strategy & Equality, and the Chair for them to consider inclusion in the finalised Work Programme to be presented to OSC on 23rd July.
- Councillor Saunders considered that the OSC meeting on 1st October was over-programmed, and suggested that the focus on integration of health and social care be included in the Health Scrutiny Panel work programme instead, with all OSC members invited to the appropriate HSP meeting.
- Councillor Whitelock considered that even with the suggested transfer of business, the OSC meeting on 1st October remained over-programmed: It was suggested that the SEN session be a Lead Member Briefing to reduce the items for the October meeting.
- Councillor Ullah considered that it would be more appropriate for the Community Safety Spotlight and Cabinet Member with portfolio to attend

the October OSC as there was normally a spike in community safety issues around Guy Fawkes night (5th November) and it would be helpful to reach an understanding of preparations for that by the Council and its partners. The Chair responded that he would consider that but the Work Programme had been constructed so Cabinet Member attendance was not too onerous.

The Chair **Moved** and it was:-

Resolved

1. That the position update contained in the oral report/ presentation be noted.
2. That the draft 2013/14 OSC Work Programme be finalised, taking account of OSC member suggestions if possible and after consultation with the Chair, and presented to the next OSC meeting [23 July] for consideration and agreement.

Action by:

Daisy Berve (Senior Strategy Policy & Performance Officer, Corporate Strategy & Equality Service, CE's)
Angus Taylor (Principal Committee Officer, Democratic Services, CE's)

7. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS

No pre-decision questions submitted to the Mayor in Cabinet [03 July 2013].

8. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

The Chair commented that the role/ function of Scrutiny was crucial and it was essential that OSC meetings were facilitated through appropriate provision of equipment, and the Executive was responsible for ensuring this. In this context the Chair noted that microphones had not been provided and the Clerk had been advised that day that they were broken; accordingly he requested that an explanation be provided as to why the microphones were not available and their repair had not been prioritised.

Action by:

Angus Taylor (Principal Committee Officer, Democratic Services, CE's)
Jean Waterson (East India Dock Manager, Facilities Management)

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The agenda circulated contained no exempt/ confidential business and there was therefore no requirement to exclude the press and public to allow for its consideration.

SUMMARY OF EXEMPT PROCEEDINGS

10. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Nil items.

11. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

Nil items.

12. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL) CABINET PAPERS

Nil items.

13. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

Nil items.

The meeting ended at 8.35 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman
Overview & Scrutiny Committee