**Redesign Board Workshop 15.8.17**

**Criteria for identifying peer reviews**

Peer reviews are particularly helpful for:

Constructively and sensitively challenging the service delivery and resourcing model in use;

bringing Member views in early to a review process; and

involving Trade Union representatives and staff in service redesign.

Peer reviews apply to statutory and discretionary functions. They conclude within a 12 week period.

Drawing on the approach to identifying review areas to date, as set out in Appendix 1, it is proposed that Peer reviews are identified from the following sources/reasons:

**Member views**

Where Members seek change, improvement or enquiry or need more support and information to reach decisions. Policy Development Groups may also seek peer reviews of particular services or functions.

**Financial**

Large scale of current budget, savings potential, where we find budget growth, cost increases or high comparative costs.

**Service improvement**

Member feedback and other performance / CRM data that identify an unexpected decline in performance or satisfaction, benchmarking data that shows where other Councils perform better, internal or external audits or unexpected increases in complaints.

**Professional**

Where Directors, Heads of Service and managers identify unsustainable service delivery, feel that new levers for change are needed to deal with service issues that are ‘stuck’ or not concluded and where ‘fresh eyes’ are welcome to bring new insights to a complex service area.

**Staff side and Trade Union views**

Where staff and/or their representatives have particular workforce insights that suggest alternative service delivery models should be explored.

**Adapting to change from the external environment**

To prepare for changes expected or to be implemented as a result of a national policy review, ability to meet national targets, the Government’s Programme, legislative change, changes to operations of partner and other service providers.

**Partnership services**

Services delivered in partnership could still be included for peer reviews but they would need partner cooperation and agreed changes to the peer review framework. The Board might be minded to work with partners to develop a review framework for jointly commissioned reviews.

**Challenging and supporting the scope of other reviews**

The Redesign Board may also have an interest in other review activity that is already underway or planned in Services as part of ongoing service improvements. The Board may seek to:

challenge the scope of those reviews;

have assurance that alternative service delivery models are being considered if that is appropriate;

ensure review outcomes are aligned;

support the review activity; and

encourage improved pace.

**Other types of review**

Peer reviews are one type of review. Other types of review better suited to some areas of service include: lean reviews, commercial reviews, community reviews (to be developed), procurement reviews, professional practice reviews, reviews from national policy change, audit findings and digital change.

Peer reviews may conclude that another form of review is also required, e.g. identifying specific functions for a Lean review.

**Appendix 1**

**Identifying peer reviews: chronology**

**July to Sept 2016/17:**

Members identified in sub groups from the list of functions which needed a review. This led to 120/270 being identified and reported to Council in September 2017.

Council agreed in Sept that review areas would be prioritised by the Board according to:

1. The savings potential and scale of current budget;
2. Where a review is urgent for another reason (e.g. legislative requirements);
3. Where a review is already underway or planned. This would not necessarily take it out with the scope for the Redesign Board as the Board may seek involvement;
4. Where the Board has already indicated a focus for the review, e.g. charges and income as these could be seen as mini-reviews;
5. The impact of the Government’s Programme, due in September (2017) as that might highlight change to Council functions.

Members then agreed their prioritisation in a Sept workshop. This led to 7 significant reviews, over 10 mini reviews and challenging the scope of a few reviews underway. Future reviews were listed.

**March 2017** Council report: Appendix 4 included an action for criteria to be developed for reviews and for this to take into account:

Member views;

budget scale or cost increase;

performance data, CRM data, QPRs;

staff views;

and noting statutory functions are just as likely to be reviewed as discretionary functions.

**June 2017**

Those involved in peer reviews took part in the evaluation of the peer review process. This included views on how to identify future areas for review. Staff involved said peer reviews would help where:

decisions are deferred or stuck;

where costs are high compared to others or budget has grown;

the HoS needs support, fresh eyes or insights or where they are aware of outstanding work from earlier review;

issues from internal or external audit;

where complaints are high or satisfaction is falling (although other types of reviews may also be appropriate).

**Board workshop 27.6.17**

At the workshop Members agreed to review functions previously identified for review and not to pursue reviews at this time for:

* 1. adult social care (other approaches are under consideration);
	2. HLH services (as that is a matter for HLH noting that reviews may come from Council decisions on funding overall for HLH);
	3. Environmental Health Services (undergone recent changes and need settling in time);
	4. Mental health services (requires a partnership approach); and
	5. Child protection (subject to other forms of internal and external review).
	6. Members seek further information on the scope of the following reviews before they proceed:
		1. Procured legal services; and
		2. Regulated property maintenance. On this service area the Convener will liaise with the Leader.

Discussion on identifying future reviews: ideas on how to approach this were sought and those identified by staff were noted. The Leader emphasised the need to identify savings and suggested the Director of Finance could advise on review areas.

Other ideas for reviews were: tourism potential; car parking; our new build programme and how we build; legal services by-laws and traffic orders (seen to have delays); other HR functions and especially in sickness absence and in education; scope for streamlining the statutory consultation process around school buildings; links between land use and education planning. Some of these topics may be better suited to other types of review. Members were asked to contact the Chair of the Redesign Board with areas they felt would benefit from review.