



SELECT CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

at 6.30pm on Wednesday, 11th April 2018
Belle Vue Suite, 1 Belle Vue Square, Broughton Road, Skipton

Committee Members : The Chairman (Councillor Staveley) and Councillors Brown, Graham, Mason, Mercer, Moorby, Pighills, Shuttleworth, Solloway, Sutcliffe, Thompson and Whitaker.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for absence**
2. **Public Participation** - In the event that any questions / statements are received or members of the public attend, the public participation session will proceed for a period of up to fifteen minutes. (Note: Where the participation relates to any particular item on the agenda, participation will usually be at the point that item is considered.)
3. **Declarations of Interest** – All Members are invited to declare at this point any interests they have in items appearing on this agenda, including the nature of those interests.

(Note: Declarations should be in the form of:

a “***disclosable pecuniary interest***” under Appendix A to the Council’s Code of Conduct, or “***other interests***” under Appendix B or under Paragraph 15 where a matter arises at the meeting which relates to a financial interest of a friend, relative or close associate.

A Member of Council who has a disclosable pecuniary interest must leave the room and not take part in the discussion or vote. When declaring interests under Appendix B or Paragraph 15 of the Code, Members must move to the public seating area, not vote, and speak only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting.)

4. **North Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel : Update** – The Chairman of the North Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel and Leader of North Yorkshire County Council, Councillor Carl Les, together with Diane Parsons, Panel Secretariat, will be attending the meeting.

Briefing paper provided by the Panel Secretariat, attached.

Next Meeting : Select Crime and Disorder Committee : 27th June 2018 (provisional).

- Sitting as Select Committee -

5. **Confirmation of Minutes** of the meeting of Select Committee held on 10th January 2018.
6. **Work Programme 2018-19** – Members are asked to consider and agree a provisional work programme for the Committee in 2018-19. Committee Members are invited to suggest service areas / subjects they believe may merit review.
7. **Date of Next Ordinary Meeting** : Provisional - Wednesday 6th June 2018 at 6.30pm.
8. **Any other items** which the Chairman decides are urgent in accordance with Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972.

Agenda Contact Officer: Chris Waterhouse,
Democratic Services,
cwaterhouse@cravenc.gov.uk
Tel. 01756 706235
3rd April 2018

Recording at Council Meetings

Recording is allowed at Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public, subject to

(i) the recording being conducted with the full knowledge of the chairman of the meeting; and

(ii) compliance with the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at meetings, a copy of which is available on request. Anyone wishing to record must contact the Agenda Contact Officer (details above) prior to the start of the meeting. Any recording must be conducted openly and not disrupt proceedings.

Update to Craven District Council Crime and Disorder Committee

11 April 2018

Report by Diane Parsons, Panel Secretariat.

1. Summary

- 1.1. In November 2012 the landscape of policing underwent its biggest change since the creation of Police Authorities in 1964. This was the creation of a post of directly elected Police and Crime Commissioner ("PCC"); someone to be elected every four years, with a mandate to direct the strategic priorities of the police force in a given area. Nationally, PCCs control over £12bn.
- 1.2. As part of these reforms, Police and Crime Panels were created in each force area, with the aim of maintaining an important 'check and balance' of the PCC's performance. Julia Mulligan was re-elected PCC for North Yorkshire and York in June 2016, and as such the North Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel ("the Panel") is now also into its second term of responsibility for scrutinising and supporting her performance. Section 2 of this report outlines the Panel's particular functions and powers in discharging this role. The remainder of the report looks at some of the activities undertaken by the PCC and/or issues of interest to the Panel over the course of the last year.
- 1.3. Comments are welcomed from the Crime and Disorder Committee in relation to the issues reported herein, as indeed are any strategic issues you would like the Panel to take up with the PCC. Councillor Carl Les (Panel Chair) and I will be at the meeting to help answer any questions you may have.

Table of Contents

Item	Description
Purpose of the Panel Section 2, page 3	What the Panel does, its constitution, its funding arrangements and membership.
How the Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account Section 3, page 4	The Panel's views on how the PCC holds Chief Constable to account
Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021 Section 4, page 4	The key priorities of the new Plan and the Panel's views on this.
PCC's local business case proposing a change in governance of the FRS Section 5, page 5	Implications for the Panel and the Panel's response to the business case.
101 non-emergency service Section 6, page 6	Panel's consideration of issues affecting the service.
Precept Section 7, page 7	The Panel's role in approving the policing precept for 2018/19.
Other issues considered by the Panel Section 8, page 8	Other important issues under consideration by the Panel.
Development of the Panel and its work programme Section 9, page 8	Panel's planning around a forward work programme.

2. Introduction – Purpose of the Panel

2.1 The Panel's key function is to maintain checks and balances in relation to the performance of the PCC. The governing legislation intends that this is a dual support and challenge role with regard to the PCC, although independent national reviews conducted of the first term of operation of Panels suggest that many find this dual role somewhat difficult to achieve. Essentially, once a PCC is elected, the Panel provides the key mechanism for checking the PCC's performance for the remainder of the term. It is also a key vehicle for enabling access to the public to relevant information regarding how the PCC is fulfilling the commitments made to local residents. There are some specific responsibilities which the Panel has, including:

- Reviewing the PCC's proposals for the amount of council tax local people pay towards policing. It has the power to veto these proposals if it considers the amount is inappropriate.
- Considering the PCC's Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report.
- Considering the PCC's proposals for the appointment of a new Chief Constable, with the power to veto.
- Investigating complaints about the PCC.

2.1 The Panel cannot scrutinise the performance of the police force as a whole or the Chief Constable as this is the responsibility of the PCC. It can request reports from the PCC and, if it wishes, call the PCC to attend its meetings.

2.2 The North Yorkshire Panel comprises: one elected representative from each of the district authorities; one from the County Council and two from the City of York. In addition, two Independent "Community" Members have been appointed.

2.3 Each Panel has just over £65k of funding from the Home Office to support its operation. The County Council, as host authority, provides administrative and support services.

2.4 A key factor in the Panel's effectiveness to scrutinise the PCC is the development of a positive relationship between the Panel, the PCC and officers working to support both parties. The PCC is committed to personally attending Panel meetings so that the Panel can scrutinise across the totality of her responsibilities. The Panel has access to the decisions she has taken and the information used to hold the Chief Constable to account. Staff within her office regularly meet with the officers that support the Panel to ensure the Panel is able to focus on the key areas, and members are helped in interpreting the performance data which is considered.

2.5 The North Yorkshire Panel is committed to exploring ways to develop its membership, to improve key relationships and develop its forward planning to help ensure it is operating as effectively as possible (see also Section 9).

3 How the commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account.

- 3.1 The Panel has seen how the PCC has introduced mechanisms to ensure that the Chief Constable is effectively held to account for performance against the objectives within the Police and Crime Plan, and for other aspects of service delivery including financial performance, complaints and human resources. This information is publicly available on her website.
- 3.2 The Memorandum of Understanding agreed between the PCC and the Chief Constable sets out how each party fulfills their duties to develop a positive and constructive working relationship, which will be mutually supportive yet constructively challenging.
- 3.3 The formal body that performs this important role is the monthly Public Accountability Meeting (PAM). This meeting comprises members of the Executive Board and other Chief Officers/Heads of Department from within both the PCC and North Yorkshire Police. These meetings are 'live streamed' to the public, who can also submit questions. Details of these can be found on the PCC's website at <https://www.northyorkshire-pcc.gov.uk/police-oversight/governance/governance-process/corporate-scrutiny-board/>.
- 3.4 The Panel regularly incorporates consideration of items taken to the PAM within its own forward work programme, to ensure oversight of the PCC's scrutiny of NYP's performance.

4 Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021

- 4.1 The PCC refreshed her Police and Crime Plan for North Yorkshire in April 2017, following a process of consultation with the public and other stakeholders on the kinds of priorities which should form her focus for the next four years.
- 4.2 The PCC's four priorities within the agreed Plan for 2017/21 are:
 - Caring for the vulnerable – includes improving the response to the most vulnerable people in communities and developing a compassionate workforce;
 - Ambitious collaboration – includes the PCC's recent proposal to take on oversight of the Fire and Rescue Services (FRS);
 - Reinforcing local policing – includes equipping officers with the skills and technology needed to prevent and tackle crime and reduce demand;
 - Enhancing customer experience – includes improving the 101 non-emergency service and developing other ways for communities to report crime.
- 4.3 At the point at which the PCC's Plan was in development, NYP had been rated as "good" by HMIC across all areas. As such, a key target for the PCC with her new Plan has been to make NYP an "exemplary" force by 2021. However, following the recent report by HMICFRS which found that NYP "requires improvement" in certain areas, this target will be much harder to reach (see also Section 8).

4.4 The Panel's legal role in the process for the development of the new Plan was to review the final draft and provide the PCC with recommendations. The Panel welcomed the emphasis on developing a 21st Century workforce and on promoting core values of care, compassion and responsiveness. The Panel's role is to continue to keep under review the PCC's performance in ensuring that these objectives are delivered. This is done via a combination of regular reports on specific issues such as improvements to the 101 service (see also Section 6) and via sub-group meetings to obtain briefings (see Section 8).

5 PCC's local business case proposing a change in governance of the FRS

5.1 An issue which has dominated the business of the Panel over recent months has been the PCC's proposal to take on oversight for the FRS in North Yorkshire. The advent of the Policing and Crime Act 2017 placed an obligation on emergency services to collaborate and also enables PCCs to take over governance of the FRS where a local case can be made that this is in the interests of efficiency, economy, effectiveness and public safety. There are two different models that PCCs may adopt; the Governance Model and the Single Employer Model. The Governance Model enables PCCs to take on responsibility for the FRS from the Fire Authority in their area, but the Police and FRS remain two distinct bodies. The Single Employer Model enables PCCs to take an extra step and delegate fire functions to a single chief officer for fire and policing. Where the PCC has not taken on responsibility for fire and rescue services but wishes to enhance collaboration opportunities between police and fire, the Act enables them to seek representation on their local FRA under the Representation model.

5.2 The PCC's preferred option is adoption of the Governance Model. An outline case was developed by the PCC earlier this year and she went out to public consultation on this in July 2017 for ten weeks. During this time, the Panel reviewed the business case in detail at two of its meetings. The Panel also invited the FRA to appoint two of its Members as observers to the Panel during this process, to assist with developing understanding of FRS issues.

5.3 The Panel expressed concerns to the PCC about the fact that if the Governance Model is adopted, this change cannot be easily reversed and is high-risk. Members also shared concerns regarding the impact on their role under this Model, which would mean the Panel taking on a wider scrutiny remit for FRS issues, in addition to policing and crime. This would be done with potentially no additional resources from the Home Office and would require a significant additional time commitment. Scrutiny would be impacted by the loss of expertise of the 16-strong membership of the current NYFRA. The Panel felt this to be a concern not least in terms of accountability of the PCC as the Panel already has fairly limited powers in its scrutiny over the PCC's performance. As such, the Panel recommended that the PCC adopt the Representation Model, as a preferred option for achieving greater collaboration.

5.4 The Panel's full written response to the PCC's consultation is available to view at www.nypartnerships.org.uk/pcp. The two Tier 1 authorities (NYCC and City of York) both similarly rejected the Governance Model in favour of adoption of the Representation Model, as did the majority of the district councils.

- 5.5 The PCC's public consultation on the outline business case resulted in over 2,500 residents being surveyed and 207 staff from NYP and the FRS combined. Around 55% of all those surveyed during the consultation stated that their preferred option was the Governance Model, with the highest proportion of these having participated in the door-to-door element of the survey.
- 5.6 The Panel has expressed concerns at its November 2017 meeting that the material used in the residents' survey was potentially misleading in places. The Panel has also expressed concern to the PCC at the comments she has conveyed publicly since the close of the consultation which appear to have dismissed the Panel's concerns for the future of robust scrutiny.
- 5.7 As the Tier 1 authorities rejected the PCC's proposal, the business case was submitted by the Home Secretary for an independent assessment. At the time of writing this report, we are still awaiting news of the Home Secretary's decision. In the meantime, the Panel is in the process of considering how it might approach an extended scrutiny remit, including training needs, membership implications and forward work programme (see also Section 9).

6 101 non-emergency service

- 6.1 The Panel has taken a keen interest in the development of the 101 non-emergency service over the last couple of years, but has sought to more formally take an overview of the issues besetting the service in 2017/18 following a number of concerns voiced by Panel Members and members of the public regarding the service's performance. The principal concern has been around extensive waiting times resulting in call abandonment and members of the public ringing 999 as an alternative.
- 6.2 Some of the issues affecting the service have been national, but many have been local. Following the Panel's request for a report from the PCC in May 2017, it was apparent that the recruitment strategy for call handlers has been rather inadequate, followed by a lengthy training period and handlers having to take time out from taking calls to enter crime recording details into the police systems. The Panel requested information about the improvement plans of the PCC and also set up a sub-group consisting of a couple of its Members to get regular briefings via the Deputy PCC on progress. Some Panel Members have also recently visited the Force Control Room to get an insight into the workings of the centre.
- 6.3 Improvements identified by the PCC in May 2017 included:
- A more robust ongoing process of recruitment for officers to the control room;
 - Crime recording to be taken out of the control room from June 2017 to free up call-handler time;
 - A general enquiries desk will help to quickly re-route calls which aren't about crime reporting;
 - A system called Queue Buster which will help with call prioritisation and call waiting.

6.4 However, in spite of these measures, there were some highly-publicised failings in summer 2017 related to waiting times and ICT issues. This included a number of callers reporting a six-hour wait. There was a 20% rise in call volumes between April and June this year; the exact reasons for which are unclear. This was not a local issue but one being experienced across the country. Following further remedial work, the most recent report to Panel in January 2018 highlighted that a steady improvement in performance is being seen for the service.

6.5 Additionally, the PCC has recently announced investment of £3m into the Force Control Room to help make improvements sustainable over the more busy periods. This will include additional accommodation, additional staff, new IT equipment and a new unit set up to help improve crime recording. The Panel will be scrutinising related reports on this matter in both April and May 2018.

7 Precept

7.1 On 6th February 2018, the Panel considered and formally approved the PCC's proposal for the Police precept for 2018/19, which equated to an increase of £11.50 per year for a Band D property. When reviewing the formal precept proposal, the Panel took into account the requirements to satisfy the statutory requirements of setting a Council Tax Requirement and a balanced budget for 2018/19 and the precept proposal achieved this with no unfunded shortfall.

7.2 In order to give some certainty to next year's budget, the Home Office is seeking evidence from each force area of efficiencies and savings being made. The PCC is developing an ambitious transformational plan to re-configure the workforce within the police to make it better able to meet the changing nature of demand. This will include some savings being made across areas such as estates and ICT, along with investment (raised through the precept) into areas such as victims' services and the Force Control Room (see also 6.5).

7.3 Although the Panel recognised the need for the proposed increase, Members expressed concern at the level of general reserves, which were felt to be low, although noted that there are separate funding streams to help deal with unforeseen external circumstances, such as major incidents. Members also challenged the savings plan for the force (£7.5m over three years) but were reassured that plans in place will make this target attainable.

7.4 The Panel will continue to scrutinise aspects of the budget and areas of investment by the PCC over the course of the next year.

8 Other issues considered by Panel

8.1 The Panel has continued to review the outcomes of PEEL (Police Efficiency, Effectiveness and Leadership) inspections undertaken by HMICFRS (formerly HMIC) at NYP. Having reviewed reports earlier in 2017 which rated NYP as “good” overall across all of these areas, Members expressed concerns at the 16th November 2017 Panel regarding the downgrading of NYP by HMICFRS to “requires improvement” for Police Efficiency (including Leadership). NYP was found to require improvement across four key areas including investment in ICT and the force’s understanding of service demand and how to meet that. In addition, a subsequent report by HMICFRS on Police Legitimacy noted some “areas for concern”. These included the lack of external scrutiny over stop and search powers and a lack of support for the Independent Advisory Groups to the police. The Panel has asked the PCC to come back with a more detailed report on the improvements put in place to tackle the issues highlighted in the summer of 2018.

8.2 Furthermore, although it sits outside of the ‘PEEL’ cycle of inspections, the Panel has concerns regarding the recent HMICFRS report on crime recording in North Yorkshire (published February 2018), which rates NYP as “requiring improvement”. The inspection determined a recording rate of 80.1% of all crimes reported, estimating that over 9,200 crimes are not being reported each year. Most concerning was that these include violent crimes and sexual offences. The Panel will be taking a report from the PCC on this on 19th April 2018. It is anticipated that some of the urgent measures being put in place as a result of the PCC’s £3m investment into the Force Control Room will help address some of the critical issues raised by the inspection.

8.3 In addition to forming a sub-group to look at customer engagement/101 service, the Panel has also set up a couple of other thematic groups with the aim of developing Members’ understanding of key themes and as such the quality of scrutiny at Panel. These have included cybercrime/online fraud, finance and HR. These groups have met outside of formal Panel meetings, drawing on briefings and input from NYP officers and others.

9 Development of the Panel and its work programme

9.1 Key to the Panel’s effectiveness in dealing with all of the above issues and the critical areas of interest going forward are:

- ongoing development of an effective working relationship with the PCC and her staff;
- clear-sighted approach to forward planning and prioritisation of the work programme, linking in with the PCC’s own forward plan of decision-making; and
- taking a proactive approach to scrutiny where possible, engaging on the development of pieces of work with the PCC’s team at an early stage.

- 9.2 Members recognise that only by building on all of the above factors will there continue to be confidence and skill in discharging an effective scrutiny role moving forward. Should the Home Office consent to adoption of the Governance Model for FRS, the Panel will be challenged to accommodate consideration of FRS matters into its forward work programme, particularly if no greater resource is provided by Home Office. The Panel has already had to increase its meetings from 5 to 7 or 8 per year this last year in order to feel that it is giving due consideration to the range of policing and crime issues which fall within the PCC's remit. The issue of capacity – should the Panel have to become a 'Police, Fire and Crime Panel' – is one of considerable concern to Members.
- 9.3 The Panel is currently approaching this by exploring how best to develop the Panel's insight into FRS, via training from the LGA and other partners. It has also recently formalised arrangements for a regional collaboration with other Panels in Yorkshire and the Humber to assist on a number of issues around scrutiny practice. Once the outcome of the Home Office's deliberations on the local business case is known, the Panel will also be looking at whether any changes to membership are required and at how it can ensure adequate scrutiny of all the statutory areas for both policing and FRS matters.
- 9.4 Additionally, the Panel will be looking to keep under review the direction taken by the OPCC following the implementation of legislation in 2018 which will enable PCCs to take on a much bigger role in the handling of police complaints. While the premiss for the legislation is to make police complaints handling more transparent and independent of the police force, there are also risks inherent in the PCC becoming an independent arbiter of complaints if new processes are not clear or well-managed for the public. As the Panel is responsible for dealing with non-criminal complaints about the PCC's conduct, it is a concern for the Panel that the PCC's proposal to take on the fullest possible role around complaints handling will, as a consequence, lead to potentially many more complaints for the Panel to need to handle. A couple of Panel Members sit on a complaints working group with the OPCC and other partners to keep a watching brief on developments and the OPCC has been asked to report in formally to Panel on this work early next year.

Diane Parsons

Panel Secretariat, North Yorkshire County Council

29 March 2018.

Background documents: Nil

SELECT COMMITTEE

10th January 2018

Present – The Chairman (Councillor Staveley) and Councillors Graham, Mason, Mercer, Moorby, Pighills, Shuttleworth, Solloway, Sutcliffe, Thompson and Whitaker.

Officer – Chief Executive, Communications, Partnerships and Customer Services Manager, Senior Human Resources Officer and Committee Officer

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Brown.

Start: 6.30pm

Finish: 7.26pm

The minutes of the Committee's Crime and Disorder meeting held on 6th December 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

Minutes for Report

OS.390

ABSENCE MANAGEMENT 2017-18

Further to Minute OS.390/17-18, the Senior Human Resources Officer submitted a report presenting the Council's sickness absence data for the period 1st April 2017 to 30th September 2017, together with comparative data in respect of total days lost and long / short term absence in the corresponding period in 2016-17. Details of the number of vacant posts, use of agency staff / consultants, and arrangements in place with other local authorities to cover vacant positions were also provided.

For 2017/18 the target for sickness absence had been set at 8 days absence per full time employee (FTE), compared to 8.5 days in 2016-17. The actual average number of days lost per FTE in the first six months of the year had been 4.05 days; with the total number of days lost amounting to 790.10 compared to 757.10 in 2016-17. Long term absence had increased by 24% (453.80 days in total) and short term had decreased by 19% (336.3 days in total). Members were reminded that absence was classed as long term if it lasted more than four continuous weeks, and in the six month period to 30th September 2017 a total of 12 staff members had experienced a long term absence, with one being absent for the full period. The Waste Management Service which had an older age profile than the Council as a whole continued to show a higher proportion of musculo-skeletal related absences than any other area.

For 2016/17 the total estimated cost of days lost to sickness absence based on an average daily rate of £147.96 had amounted to £167,730.86.

During the course of the ensuing discussion Members raised a number of comments and questions relating to absence and recruitment, including the following, and received replies from the Human Resources Officer as indicated.

a. How was the annual absence target per fulltime employee decided upon? Response : In some respects the figure was the product of informed guess work using knowledge of the Council's workforce / absence performance, and other local authority statistics, the aim being to improve on the previous year's target. The proposed target was discussed with the Chief Executive and Lead member also.

b. How does the Council's performance on long term absence compare with the national position / within the Local Government context? Response : Attempts had been made to obtain that data to enable a comparison but responses were still awaited. Further requests would be made and details

circulated if received, however, absence statistics from other authorities always had to come with something of a health warning as each adopted their own protocols on what they collected, making comparison difficult.

c. Did the Council experience problems recruiting to vacant posts? Response : As a general rule the Council was able to recruit without difficulty, there were some exceptions to this, for example planning officers, where an added complication was competition from the private sector.

d. The age profile within waste management and potential for succession from operative to driver had been raised by the Select Committee on previous occasions, had any policy been put in place? Response : No awareness of such a policy having been put in place, but packages were available to help operatives' fitness, for example gym membership at Craven Leisure.

e. Were incentives in place for not taking any sick days? Could draws or similar be introduced on a monthly or quarterly basis to further reduce short term absence? Response : Those employees with a zero absence at year end were entered into a draw. The possibility of introducing a monthly or quarterly incentive question would be put to Council Leadership Team

f. In discussing absence management at the Committee's July 2017 meeting, reference was made to trialling a medical telephone service for employees, had any progress been made? Response : A number of options for medical support had been looked at, including a GP response service with video consultations but no further action had been taken. For the time being the success or otherwise of such medical support services used by the private sector would be monitored.

In drawing the discussion to a close Members thanked the Senior Human Resources Officer for providing a clear and very readable report and, it was

Resolved – That in reporting on the full year absence position in June 2018 the Senior Human Resources Officer is asked to provide in depth figures for the waste management service, and the position for the remainder of the Authority if those figures are excluded.

OS.391

CUSTOMER SERVICES PERFORMANCE

Further to Minute OS.380/16-17, the Communications, Partnerships and Customer Services Manager submitted a report presenting details of changes made in the management of customer services performance in the period from December 2016, planned improvements in performance monitoring and service improvement projects. In each of the first two quarters of 2017-18 the service had failed to meet the key performance indicator target for call handling of 90% of calls answered each quarter, however for the period October to December the target had been met. Copies of the most recent customer services performance management report dated December 2017 appended to the Manager's report provided the following information

Customer Services Performance

- A chart giving three years call data for service demand comparison
- Chart of calls offered, answered and abandoned
- Performance compared to service level target
- Chart showing average queue time of incoming calls
- Chart showing average time waited before call is abandoned
- Chart showing average call handling time
- Breakdown of reception queries
- Channel analysis of reception queries
- Analysis of Channel Data : Unique website visits, telephone and face to face interactions.

Breakdown Analysis of Customer Service Team Performance

- Resourcing of Customer Services including sickness data
- Summary of service specific issues
- Individual agent breakdown of calls answered
- Individual agent breakdown of call handling time

Members were reminded that at Minute OS.380, the Committee had asked that consideration be given to the following potential improvements

- a. Introduce a facility which enabled callers to leave their number and receive a call back when the customer service centre was less busy.
- b. Adapt the telephone system so as to include a message for callers indicating their position in the queue.

A call back facility had now been introduced and was activated during very busy periods, however because of the varied nature and length of calls handled by customer services it had been decided not to pursue introduction of a queue messaging facility, but additional lines for dealing with service specific queries at particular points in the year, eg. garden waste renewals, were now in place and could be activated as necessary. The Communications, Partnerships and Customer Services Manager highlighted the importance of keeping a track of how residents did business with the Council and drew Members' attention to the introduction of a new customer relationship management system which enabled the categorisation of all incoming calls to the contact centre; this in turn facilitated the ability to tailor promotional campaigns and target messaging, including the use of social media. Experience to date indicated that messaging reduced the number of incoming calls.

During the course of the ensuing discussion Members, amongst other comments and queries, made the following points

- a. The new website was much easier to navigate and could be viewed as a good investment.
- b. It was pleasing to hear that the Council was now embracing the benefits of social media as a channel for communication with residents.
- c. The data showed that call handling performance (and potentially customer experience) improved when the number of incoming calls was lower, therefore all attempts to reduce the number of calls should be examined.
- d. For those calls which weren't answered, did the telephone system capture those incoming numbers; if yes was there any value in the contact centre calling those numbers back?
- e. Was there a means of measuring or obtaining feedback on caller satisfaction / how did the service measure customer satisfaction?

In responding to d and e above the Communications, Partnerships and Customer Services Manager stated that she would ascertain what information was held on abandoned calls and whether something could be introduced along the lines suggested. Introducing a means of obtaining feedback and measuring customer satisfaction was within the Service's improvement plan; the aim being to introduce something in the year ahead.

In drawing the discussion to a close the Chairman thanked the Communications, Partnerships and Customer Services Manager for her report and indicated that the Committee looked forward to receiving a further update in due course.

Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

as at April 2018



Note : In commencing each review the Committee or working group, if appointed, will be asked to scope, as necessary, the work to be undertaken eg identify the issues to be considered, information required, who is to be asked to attend.

Date	Committee,	Agenda
Weds 6 Jun	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Programme and Appointment of Working Groups (if any) • Absence Management (in depth figures for the waste management service, and the position for the remainder of the Authority if those figures are excluded, also cost of absence.)
Wed 27 Jun	Select Committee (sitting as the Crime and Disorder Committee)	'Crime and Disorder' annual meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Policing – local crime situation, priorities, standards and performance • North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership Update • the Craven Community Safety Hub – Update / priorities, projects etc
Wed 18 July	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Wed 12 Sept	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Wed 17 Oct	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Wed 21 Nov	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence Management : Half Year Position.
Wed 12 Dec	Select Committee (sitting as the Crime and Disorder Committee)	'Crime and Disorder' mid-year meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Policing – local crime situation, priorities, standards and performance. • North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership – Update. • Craven Community Safety Hub Update. • Review the effectiveness of any public spaces protection orders

Wed 16 Jan	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer Services Call Handling Performance? •
Wed 20 Feb	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
Wed 20 Mar	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel : Annual Update (Committee sitting as Crime and Disorder Committee)
Wed 17 Apr	Select Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider draft work programme for 2019-20. •

Working Groups

The Select Committee may appoint up to two working groups of Members at any one time to deal with specific issues in the Select Committee's work programme, or any other matter referred to it by the Council or the Policy Committee. Members of Policy Committee will not normally be appointed to Select Committee working groups. The working groups do not have delegated authority. Working groups should include Members from more than one political group. Working groups may only deal with business referred to them by the Select Committee.

a. Waste Management Working Group – To date the working group has examined the following parts of the waste management service leaving the bulky waste element to be reviewed, the working group may also wish to receive an update on implementation of the revised collection (co-mingling / recycling) arrangements. In compiling their report in respect of commercial waste, Members indicated that they would wish to receive a report back to either Select / or the working group re the proposed solution to the rural question on commercial waste collection changes.

- Collection Point Policy / Response to Health and Safety Executive concerns.
- Garden Waste Subscription Service.
- Recycling Policy (co-mingling)
- Commercial Waste

The Select Committee's briefing note December 2016 to Policy Committee re Garden Waste Subscription Fee indicated that it would be the Select Committee's intention to further review the service and implementation of the position on cost recovery within the next two year period. If this remains the Committee's wish a further review of the Garden Waste Subscription Service and the position on cost recovery will need to be carried out within the period ending December 2018.

b. Assets and Property Management – During the course of 2017-18 the Shared Ownership Working Group concluded and reported on its review of the Council's shared ownership proposals and the Bereavement Services Working Group is approaching conclusion of its examination of the new business model for Bereavement Services.

Other Matters

- 1. Partnerships Review** - Partnerships were to have been the subject of a light touch review during the course of 2017/18, that review hasn't taken place. Standards Committee has produced guidance (adopted by Council August 2017) for Members appointed to outside bodies, consideration of partnerships had been held in abeyance pending production of the guidance.
- 2. Disabled Facilities Grants : Policy Committee September 2017** – During the debate, Members asked that the Select Committee review the new arrangements after six / twelve months to consider whether the in-house scheme was operating satisfactorily.
- 3. Member Ward Grants** – Annual report to be presented to Audit and Governance Committee. Member Ward Grants Scheme was retained within the 2017-18 work programme as a possible item for review, should a review be considered appropriate at some future point in 2018 or beyond

-o-o-O-o-o-