PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO DECISION SCHEDULE



Tuesday 14 September 2010

At 3.00 pm

in Committee Room C Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Councillor J Brash, Cabinet Member responsible for Performance will consider the following items.

1. KEY DECISIONS

No items.

2. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 2.1 Request for Use of the Town Seal Assistant Chief Executive
- 2.2 Review Of Charges For Criminal Records Bureau Admitted Bodies Chief Customer and Workforce Services Officer

3. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

3.1 Corporate Complaints – April to June 2010 – *Head of Performance and Partnerships*

PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO

Report to Portfolio Holder 14th September 2010



Report of: Assistant Chief Executive

Subject: REQUEST FOR USE OF THE TOWN SEAL

SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request the Portfolio Holder's approval in principle for the image of the Hartlepool Town Seal to be used as part of the naming of a train.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report explains the background to the request for the use of the seal and outlines the specific way in which it is proposed that the seal would be used.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER

The Portfolio Holder has responsibility for Performance Management.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key.

5. DECISION-MAKING ROUTE

Performance Portfolio meeting on 14 September 2010.

6. DECISION REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is requested to approve in principle this specific use of the Town Seal, subject to the appropriate legal agreements being reached between the Council and the two other parties involved.

Report of: Assistant Chief Executive

Subject: REQUEST FOR USE OF THE TOWN SEAL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To request the Portfolio Holder's approval in principle for permission to be given for the image of the Hartlepool Town Seal (**Appendix A**) to be used as part of the naming of a train.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Earlier this summer the Hartlepool Mail, in conjunction with rail operator Grand Central, ran a competition called 'Name Our Train', inviting school pupils in the Hartlepool area to suggest a name for one of the Grand Central trains which operates through the town on the rail route to and from London.
- 2.2 The aim was to celebrate a positive aspect of Hartlepool or its heritage, with the winning name being permanently displayed on the side of the train together with an acknowledgement of the person who had devised the name. The winner of the competition will receive a first class return family ticket to London.
- 2.3 The winning name has now been chosen 'Hart of the North' and the Hartlepool Mail and Grand Central hope to arrange a ceremony for the name to be unveiled on the train in late October.
- 2.4 The choice of the winning name has prompted the Hartlepool Mail to subsequently approach the Council to request permission to use the image of the Town Seal on the side of the Grand Central train beside the winning name.
- 2.5 Whilst the Council places rigorous controls and restrictions on the use and reproduction of the Town Seal, it is proposed that special permission for the use of the seal be granted in this particular case, subject to the relevant legal agreements being in place between the Council, the Hartlepool Mail and Grand Central to ensure that the integrity of the seal is maintained at all times.
- 2.6 It would be a very positive use of the Town Seal to promote Hartlepool and its heritage and its use on the side of the train would make it visible to potentially thousands of members of the public each day.

3. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 It is not recommended that the Council should seek any financial remuneration for permitting the use of the Town Seal for this particular purpose and there are no costs to the Council if it is agreed.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 That the Portfolio Holder approve in principle the use of the Town Seal on the side of the Grand Central train as part of the naming of the train, subject to the legal agreements referred to above.

5. CONTACT OFFICER

Julian Heward
Public Relations Officer
Chief Executive's Department
Civic Centre
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Tel: 01429 523044

Julian.heward@hartlepool.gov.uk



PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO

Report to Portfolio Holder

14 September 2010



Report of: Chief Customer & Workforce Services Officer

Subject: REVIEW OF CHARGES FOR CRB ADMITTED

BODIES

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to inform the Portfolio Holder of the outcome of a review of locally set charges associated with Criminal Record Bureau Checks undertaken for Admitted Bodies by Hartlepool Borough Council (Umbrella Body) and request approval to the scale of fees.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report provides details of the proposed revised fees and recommends that a simple structure of fees is adopted. The revised fees take account of the levels of charges set by neighbouring authorities.

3 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Corporate issues.

4 TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key.

5 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio holder only.

6 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Approve the changes to the local fees and financial procedures as outlined in section 4.

Report of: Chief Customer & Workforce Services Officer

Subject: REVIEW OF CHARGES FOR CRB ADMITTED

BODIES

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of the report is to inform the Portfolio Holder of the outcome of a review of locally set charges associated with Criminal Record Bureau Checks undertaken for Admitted Bodies by Hartlepool Borough Council (Umbrella Body) and request approval to the scale of fees.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Hartlepool Borough Council is a Registered Body with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB).
- 2.2 External organisations are able to use the services of a Registered Body that is willing to act as an intermediary between them and the CRB. This type of Registered Body is referred to as an 'Umbrella Body' or one that offers an 'Umbrella service'. Such external organisations are known as "Admitted Bodies".
- 2.3 Hartlepool Borough Council acts as an Umbrella Body.
- 2.4 Umbrella Bodies play a very important role by providing access to CRB checks to organisations that, for one reason or another, are not able to register directly with the CRB, for example the organisation may:
 - Lack the necessary administration resource or the relevant expertise.
 - Require only a small number of checks per annum.

2

- Do not wish to pay the CRB's registration fee.
- Cannot meet the minimum threshold requirements or the conditions of registration.
- Need help and assistance in order to comply with the Code of Practice.
- Need help with the interpretation of the information provided in a CRB check from a more experienced user.

3. CHARGES

- 3.1 The CRB charges a processing fee for checks undertaken which is charged at the point of application. The CRB invoices Hartlepool Borough Council on a monthly basis for completed checks.
- 3.2 Hartlepool Borough Council also levies an additional administration charge to Admitted Bodies for providing the CRB service. This arrangement is a commercial agreement between Hartlepool Borough Council and our Admitted Body customers. While the CRB has no legal duty to define a level of charge, they encourage Umbrella Bodies to keep any fee to a minimum.
- 3.3 Hartlepool Borough Council requires each external organisation (Admitted Body) that it acts on behalf of, to make the appropriate payment before undertaking a CRB check.
- 3.4 Admitted Body administration fees are reviewed annually by Hartlepool Borough Council and have in the past been increased in line with inflation.
- 3.5 The current administration charges for CRB checks are:

Paid employment £10.30Volunteers £ 8.25

3.6 The total charge for an Enhanced CRB is £46.30 (£36.00 Enhanced CRB fee plus £10.30 Admin fee) or £8.25 Admin fee for a volunteer, as there is no charge for the CRB disclosure.

4. PROPOSED INCREASES

4.1 The proposed changes are:

CRB Admitted Body Registration

It is proposed to introduce a nominal fee for external organisations to register with Hartlepool Borough Council as an Admitted Body. This one-off registration fee of £8.00 is intended to cover the cost of preparing, printing and posting a pack of information for organisations.

ISA Registration

Proposals to introduce new safeguarding arrangements through the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) have been postponed however it is proposed that a fee structure is determined now ready for implementation once the Government's comprehensive review of the ISA has taken place.

Paid employment

- £13.00 Admin fee for CRB & ISA registration. This takes into account the extra time it will take to process an ISA application in addition to a CRB Disclosure application.
- o £10.30 Admin fee for ISA registration only

Volunteer

- £10.50 Admin fee for CRB & ISA registration. This takes into account the extra time it will take to process an ISA application in addition to a CRB Disclosure application.
- £8.25 Admin fee for ISA Registration stand alone.
- 4.2 The above fees would be reviewed annually and will have any annual costs of inflation applied to them.
- 4.3 Overall, the proposed fees remain broadly in line with or are lower than the fees set by neighbouring authorities.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 That the Portfolio Holder approves the changes to the locally set fees.

6. CONTACT OFFICER

ALISON J SWANN HR Business Partner (CEX & Schools) 01429 523543 alison.swann@hartlepool.gov.uk

PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO

Report to Portfolio Holder 14 September 2010



Report of: Head of Performance and Partnerships

Subject: CORPORATE COMPLAINTS – APRIL TO JUNE 2010

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report to the Portfolio Holder on corporate complaints performance for the first quarter of 2010/11.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report covers performance information on numbers of complaints, times cales for investigation and outcomes of investigations for formal complaints dealt with in the first quarter of 2010/11. A total of 16 formal complaints were received in the quarter. Thirteen of these were responded to within authority deadlines. Three out of 16 complaints were upheld in full or in part.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The Portfolio Member has responsibility for performance management issues.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder meeting on 14 September 2010

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

That the report be noted.

Report of: Head of Performance and Partnerships

Subject: CORPORATE COMPLAINTS – APRIL TO JUNE 2010

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To report to the Portfolio Holder on corporate complaints performance for the first quarter of 2010/11 see **Appendix 1**.

2. FORMAL COMPLAINTS INFORMATION – April – June 2010

2.1 In the first quarter of 2010/11, a total of 11 formal corporate complaints were recorded by departments and 5 social care complaints. In the same period of 2009/2010, 11 formal complaints were recorded. See Table 1 for a break down of complaints received by department for 2010/11, and for the same period in 2009/10.

Table 1: Complaints received by Department

| Department | No. of complaints Qtr 1 – 2010/11 | No. of complaints Qtr 1 – 2009/10 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Chief Executives | 1 | 2 |
| Child & Adult Services | 12 | 7 |
| Regeneration & Neighbourhoods | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 16 | 11 |

- 2.2 The number of complaints recorded by the Child & Adult Services Department for 2010/11 Quarter 1 increased when compared to 2009/10 Quarter 1. The number is not usually high. Formal complaints for Child & Adult Services Department ranged from 5 to 12 per quarter in 2009/10.
- 2.3 The social care complaints received by the Child & Adult Services Department are dealt with under statutory procedures which differ from the corporate procedure in terms of time scales and investigative process. However, for the sake of completeness, basic statistics on numbers of complaints received are included in this report.

Responding to complaints within deadlines

2.4 The corporate complaints procedure has a deadline of 15 days for reporting back to a complainant with a written response to their complaint, after a thorough investigation. For social care complaints, deadlines vary depending on the level of the complaint - within 10 working days for the Local Resolution stage, 25 working days for the Formal Investigation stage and 30 working days for the Complaint Review Panel stage. There is scope for extending the social care deadlines should this become necessary. Prompt investigation is always a priority for all types of complaints, but in some cases the complexity of a complaint and/or the number of

- people to be contacted during the investigation can mean that the deadline cannot be met.
- 2.5 In the first quarter of 2010/11, the deadline was met in 81 percent of cases. This is largely the same as the figure of 82 percent of investigations completed within the deadline, for the same quarter in 2009/10. See Table 2 for a breakdown of complaints responded to within deadlines for quarter 1 of 2010/11, and for the same period in 2009/10.

Table 2: Complaints reported to within deadlines

| | Qtr 1 – | 2010/11 | Qtr 1 – 2009/10 | | |
|-------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|----|--|
| Reported | No. | % | No. | % | |
| Within deadlines | 13 | 81 | 9 | 82 | |
| Outside deadlines | 3 | 19 | 2 | 18 | |

Outcomes of complaints investigations

- 2.6 When a complaint investigation has been completed, a judgement is made by the investigating officer as to whether or not the authority has been at fault and hence whether the complaint is upheld fully, in part or not upheld.
- 2.7 In the first quarter of 2010/11, 2 complaints were fully upheld and 1 case was partly upheld. This compares with the figures for the first quarter of 2009/10 of no cases being fully upheld and 4 cases (34%) partly upheld. See Table 3 for the outcomes of complaints investigated for quarter 1 of 2010/11, and for the same period in 2009/10.

Table 3: Outcome of complaints investigated

| | Qtr 1 – 2010/11 | | Qtr 1 – 2009/10 | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----|-----------------|----|--|
| Outcome | No. | % | No. | % | |
| Not upheld | 13 | 81 | 7 | 64 | |
| Upheld in part | 1 | 6 | 4 | 34 | |
| Fully upheld | 2 | 13 | - | - | |

Remedies for complaints

- 2.8 Departments are asked to provide information on what remedies have been offered to people whose complaints have been upheld either in part or in full. In some cases, a remedy can put a complainant in the position they would have been in but for the Council's error but this is not always possible.
- 2.9 In the first quarter of 2010/11, apologies have been given to complainants; and explanations provided as to how the problem arose and of the action taken to prevent the problem recurring.

Learning from complaints

- 2.10 Complaints can provide useful information on how a service is performing and what problems are being experienced by service users. Departments have provided information on what lessons have been learnt from the complaints that they have received and what actions have been taken to prevent their recurrence.
- 2.11 In the first quarter of 2010/10, wherever possible, departments have taken action. For example, a system is to be implemented for all members of the Duty Team to provide the same response if they are unable to accept a referral from a third party including a mechanism to ensure that people are not being left at risk in the community; Supervising Social Workers are to ensure that appropriate standards of hygiene are maintained by foster carers for all ages of children placed with them and particular attention is to be paid to equipment used for babies in placement.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report be noted.

4. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Corporate Complaints April to June 2009 Report to the Performance Management Portfolio Holder, 14th August 2009.
- Hartlepool Borough Council Corporate Complaints Procedure 2008.

5. CONTACT OFFICER

Lisa Anderson, Research Officer, Chief Executive's Department, Corporate Strategy Division Hartlepool Borough Council

Tel No: (01429) 523041

Email: lisa.anderson@hartlepool.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1 – COMPLAINTS MONITORING – April 1st – June 30th 2010

| | NUMBER MEETING DEADLINES | | OUTCOMES | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------|--------|
| | Total no. of complaints | Reported on within deadline | Reported outside deadline | Not upheld | Upheld in part | Upheld |
| CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | = | - |
| Corporate Strategy | - | - | - | - | _ | - |
| Corporate Finance | - | _ | - | - | _ | _ |
| Customer and Workforce Services | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | _ | - |
| Legal | - | _ | - | - | _ | - |
| CHILD & ADULT SERVICES | 12 | 11 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| Corporate complaints | 7 | 6 | 1 | 6 | _ | 1 |
| Adult Social Care complaints | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Child Social Care complaints | 4 | 4 | - | 3 | - | 1 |
| REGENERATION & NEIGHBOURHOODS | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | = | - |
| Total number of complaints | 16 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 2 |
| | = | 81% | 19% | 81% | 6% | 13% |