Annex A

Scrutiny Topic Registration Form

Fields marked with an asterisk * are required.

* Proposed topic:	City of York Council scrutinises the availability, funding and uniform distribution of access to outreach workers (a different entity to a befriending service).
* Councillor registering the topic	Councillor James Alexander
Submitted due to an unresolved 'Cllr Call for Action' enquiry	☐

Please complete this section as thoroughly as you can. The information provided will help Scrutiny Officers and Scrutiny Members to assess the following key elements to the success of any scrutiny review:
How a review should best be undertaken given the subject
Who needs to be involved
What should be looked at
By when it should be achieved; and
Why we are doing it ?

Please describe how the proposed topic fits with 3 of the eligibility criteria attached.

	Yes?	**Policy Development & Review**	**Service Improvement & Delivery**	**Accountability of Executive Decisions**
Public Interest (ie. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)	☑	☑	☑	☐
Under Performance / Service Dissatisfaction	☐	☐	☐	☐
In keeping with corporate priorities [We want services to be provided by whoever can best meet the needs of our customers.]	☑	☑	☑	☐
Level of Risk	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service Efficiency	☐	☐	☐	☐
National/local/regional	☑	☑	☑	☐

significance e.g. A central government priority area, concerns joint working arrangements at a local 'York' or wider regional context

*** Set out briefly the purpose of any scrutiny review of your proposed topic. What do you think it should achieve?**

Many people in Holgate ward rely on an outreach worker service from providers such as Age Concern. During the recent dementia review looked at by Health Scrutiny Committee it became clear that this service is different from a befriending service and the outreach worker service was unequally available across the city (due to the way individual Ward Committees allocated their funding) and that this outreach worker service will cease in March 2009.

The review should: -Look at how to maintain the provision that has occurred over previous years -Indicate how this service can be more equally distributed across the city -Indicate how this service will be funded -List what providers are available -Make clear council obligations regarding this service

*** Please explain briefly what you think any scrutiny review of your proposed topic should cover.**

-Look at how to maintain the provision that has occurred over previous years -Indicate how this service can be more equally distributed across the city -Indicate how this service will be funded -List what providers are available -Make clear council obligations regarding this service

*** Please indicate which other Councils, partners or external services could, in your opinion, participate in the review, saying why.**

Older people, Older People's Champion (CYC), those with disabilities, carers, those who use or have used the outreach worker service, Adult Social Services (CYC), Neighbourhood Services (CYC), the general public, Voluntary Organisations: e.g. Age Concern, Older People's Assembly.

The above people can provide information on how the service has been run and funded in the past, their experiences of the service and what value it can give. They can also provide information on what kind of service and funding would be needed in the future.

*** Explain briefly how, in your opinion, such a review might be most efficiently undertaken?**

It is my impression that this should be looked at by an existing scrutiny committee. The members should clearly make the distinction between a befriending and outreach service. Members should look at how this service has worked in the past; look at the effect of such a service stopping. Investigate possible replacement services and indicate possible providers and funding.

Estimate the  1-3 months

timescale for completion.

☐ 3-6 months
☐ 6-9 months

Support documents or other useful information None

Date submitted: Friday, 28th November, 2008, 12.27 pm

Submitted by: Councillor James Alexander