

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 15th January, 2019

10.00 am

Council Chamber - Sessions House

**Members are asked to bring to this meeting the draft
(black combed) 2019-20 Budget Book document
published on 2nd January 2019**





AGENDA

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 15th January, 2019, at 10.00 am Ask for: **Joel Cook/Anna
Taylor**
Council Chamber - Sessions House Telephone: **03000 416892/416478**

Membership

Conservative (9): Mr A Booth (Chairman), Mr A M Ridgers (Vice-Chairman),
Mr M A C Balfour, Mr P V Barrington-King, Mrs P M Beresford,
Mrs R Binks, Mr G Cooke, Mr R C Love and Mr J Wright

Liberal Democrat (2): Mr R H Bird and Mrs T Dean, MBE

Labour (2) Mr D Farrell and Dr L Sullivan

Church Mr D Brunning, Mr J Constanti and Mr Q Roper
Representatives (3):

Parent Governor (2): Mr K Garsed and Mr A Roy

Tea/coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting

County Councillors who are not Members of the Committee but who wish to ask questions at the meeting are asked to notify the Chairman of their questions in advance.

Webcasting Notice

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for the live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by any member of the public or press present. The Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed by the Council

By entering into this room you are consenting to being filmed. If you do not wish to have your image captured please let the Clerk know immediately.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A - Committee Business

- A1 Introduction/Webcast Announcement
- A2 Apologies and Substitutes
- A3 Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- A4 Minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2018 (Pages 5 - 10)
- A5 Draft 2019/20 Budget and the Medium Term Financial Plan. Please can Members bring their copy of the Budget Book 2019-20 to the meeting

B - Any items called-in

None for this meeting

C - Any items placed on the agenda by any Member of the Council for discussion

- C1 Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC): Care Leaver Funding Shortfall 2018-19 (Pages 11 - 14)
- C2 Risk: CRR0045 - Effectiveness of Governance within a Member-led Authority. (Pages 15 - 20)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Benjamin Watts
General Counsel
03000 416814

Monday, 7 January 2019

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held in the Darent Room - Sessions House on Thursday, 8 November 2018.

PRESENT: Mr A Booth (Chairman), Mr A M Ridgers (Vice-Chairman), Mrs P M Beresford, Mrs R Binks, Mr R H Bird, Mr D L Brazier (Substitute for Mr M A C Balfour), Mr G Cooke, Mr P C Cooper (Substitute for Mr J Wright), Mrs T Dean, MBE, Mr D Farrell, Mr R C Love and Dr L Sullivan

ALSO PRESENT: Mr R W Gough and Mr A R Hills

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr K Abbott (Director of Education Planning and Access), Mr A Tait (Democratic Services Officer) and Mr J Cook (Scrutiny Research Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

35. Apologies and Substitutes

(Item A2)

1. Apologies had been received from Mr Balfour (Mr Brazier was substituting), Mr Wright (Mr Cooper was substituting) and Mrs Beresford.
2. Members of the Pupil Premium Select Committee had been invited to attend the meeting and apologies had been received from the following; Mrs Bell, Mrs Game, Mr McInroy and Mrs Cole.

36. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting

(Item A3)

1. Dr Sullivan declared an interest in the Pupil Premium Select Committee item as her husband was employed as an Early Help Worker for Kent County Council.

37. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2018

(Item A4)

1. In response to a question the Chairman confirmed that in future the minutes of each meeting would include apologies and substitutes given at the meeting.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2018 were a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

38. Pupil Premium Select Committee - 3 Months on Implementation Plan

(Item A5)

1. The Chairman introduced this item and explained that it was an opportunity for the Cabinet Member and Officer to give Members an update on the previous 3 months progress of the Select Committee recommendations.

2. Mr Gough (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Education) explained that the comprehensive report of the Select Committee was welcomed. The Committee had focussed on some areas which the Directorate were already working on, such as Early Help and Preventative Services, which enabled further input into the relevant issues. Mr Gough set out some of the highlights of the update report.
3. Keith Abbott explained that the delivery of a number of the recommendations were the responsibility of The Education People and that further information would be available post-Christmas. It was confirmed that as the 'commissioners' KCC was accountable but the day to day delivery sat with The Education People.
4. In response to a question about the difference between 'in progress' and 'on-going' Mr Gough explained that in some cases the recommendations built on work which in some areas was already taking place (on-going) and in progress related to those recommendations where work was just getting underway since the report was approved.
5. The Chairman took comments and questions on each recommendation in turn.
6. Recommendation 1: A Member asked about the timeline for the work and progress relating to this recommendation. Mr Abbott explained that it was hoped that the proposals and the timeline would be available before Christmas and the proposals should be in progress in Terms 3 & 4. It was requested that a timeline be produced showing the projected dates for progression of the recommendations.
7. A Member asked whether it would be possible to have comparative data from within the schools to enable Members to find out which schools were doing well with registration of children eligible for Free School Meals and Pupil Premium Funding. Mr Gough confirmed that this information would be circulated.
8. Recommendation 2: In relation to the Improvement Advisors, a Member asked whether the signposting would be in the form of an easy to read version which could be shared with schools. In addition, would the visits to school be ongoing? Mr Abbott confirmed that the visits by the Improvement Advisors would be ongoing. In response to a question Mr Abbott would circulate further information to the Committee outside the meeting about how the best practice would be captured and shared amongst schools.
9. It was requested that Members be advised of District Governor briefings taking place, it was considered beneficial for Members to have the opportunity to attend these briefings.
10. Recommendation 3: In response to a query about the pilot projects taking place in Swale and the subsequent reduction in demand into Children's Social Care in East Kent Mr Gough explained that, for Education purposes, Swale was in East Kent. Further information relating to the pilot projects would be circulated to Members. The intention was for the pilot projects to be scaled up to other schools across Kent where appropriate, the lessons from the pilots were being incorporated into a practice model. In response to a question about roll-out costs and consequences Mr Gough confirmed that there were some resource consequences,

but roll-out of the project would not be restricted by budget discussions. Mr Gough would ensure that information from the 'Change for Kent Children' project would be shared more widely with members. It was not considered appropriate or economical to implement the schemes in all schools in Kent, however the Council was committed to scaling the project up to appropriate schools in Kent.

11. In response to a question Mr Gough confirmed that the recommendations contained with the report were put forward by the Select Committee. A Member asked that figures be included in the report alongside percentages. Mr Gough confirmed that he would provide more detailed information on 'Change for Kent Children' to Members. It was considered that the Children's, Young People and Education Cabinet Committee should receive a further report on the scaling up of the pilot projects and it was suggested that this could form part of the agenda for the meeting in January 2019.

12. Recommendations 4: In relation to sharing data a Member considered it important to remember that this should only occur when it is relevant.

13. Members supported the development of better relationships across relevant staff groups, KCC and the education providers. Mr Gough commented that standards had improved at Primary level and it was hoped that the improved information sharing around transition would allow Secondary education to build on this effectively.

14. Recommendation 5: In response to a question Mr Gough commented on the role of the 0-25 Health and Well-Being Board, there had been progress with the work of KCC and the Health Service on Children's Issues and this was monitored by the 0-25 Health and Well-Being Board.

15. It was considered that engagement between schools and parents was vital.

16. Recommendation 6: A Member asked for clarification on the wording of this recommendation, Mr Gough confirmed that this should say "Early Years Pupil Premium funding should be doubled, funded by either a redistribution of Primary Pupil Premium.. or from elsewhere within the Department for Education (DfE) budget". Mr Gough explained that he had some reservations about this recommendation when it was proposed. There was more appeal to finding funding from elsewhere within the DfE Budget than redistributing the Primary Pupil Premium. Given that Kent performs already well at Early Years and pre-school, such re-distribution could be detrimental to other areas of work in need of support. Mr Gough would ensure that the recommendation of the Social Mobility Commission's report would be circulated to the Committee for information.

17. Recommendation 7: A Member queried the wording in the comments which stated: "There was no opportunity under current regulations to supplement a national resource with funds locally". Mr Abbott confirmed that the County Council had a policy confirming that it would not top up Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) money. There were also issues around the formula funding for early years. The Chairman confirmed that the Select Committee was clear on its findings and there was a significant steer that it was beneficial when finance was apportioned more to Early

Years. Mr Gough stated that he and his officers would confirm the current position around recommendation 7.

18. Recommendation 8: There were concerns that decisions by other authorities to place children in care in Kent schools were sometimes based on financial reasons. This issue had been raised previously an ongoing challenge for Kent. It was necessary to ensure that other authorities were as clearly sighted as possible with regard to the potential impact of the concentration of Looked After Children in particular areas, so that this could be taken into account when making placement decisions. Also, it was important to ensure that appropriate services were available to those young people when they arrive and that KCC was made fully aware. It was noted that this issue was also in the work programme for the Children's, Young People and Education Cabinet Committee and it would continue to be monitored in terms of the impact officers were able to have by talking to the placing authorities and working with schools. A Member commented that consideration should be given to engaging District and Borough councils as the relevant planning and housing authorities as part of the planned relationship building and forward planning.

19. Recommendation 9: A Member asked that planned piloting of the updated toolkit should include a school which had good outcomes, against the 2018 national average, for disadvantaged pupils so that it could confirm the appropriateness of the best practice being promoted by KCC – providing a stamp of approval from the sector. Mr Gough confirmed that this would be considered further.

20. Responding to questions, Mr Abbot advised the Committee that KCC had previously developed a toolkit and that the work on the recommendation was related to refining and improving it, rather than creating a new one. Mr Abbott offered to discuss the origins of the toolit development outside the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Committee thank Mr Gough and Mr Abbott for the update report and for attending the meeting and answering Members' questions.

39. Flood Risk Management Committee Annual Report *(Item A6)*

1. Mr Hills, the Chairman of the Flood Risk Management Committee introduced the report of his Committee which included work undertaken over the past year. The Committee was an outward facing body looking at flood risks and water management across the County. The Committee encouraged the external groups to attend and it was well supported by experienced officers.

2. The Chairman asked Mr Hills how his committee engaged with other organisations in relation to the delivery of water services to serve the high levels of housing that districts were due to build?

3. A Member also asked about the round England footpath. Mr Hills confirmed that this was a concern, and it would be necessary to revisit this in the future. The Committee asked that the Council take a positive stance in protecting every inch of the County's coastline.

4. Members welcomed the report, concerns were raised about the impact of significant housing producing high levels of waste alongside increased rainfall resulting in systems operating at capacity. Was there more that KCC could do to draw attention to this, perhaps in conjunction with the planning authorities? Mr Hills explained that extreme weather conditions were putting pressure on the drains, but officers were working hard to ensure that the drainage systems were in the best condition possible to cope with such weather conditions. In relation to housing, some sites were being developed with grey water and others were looking at how water and waste could be used in the future.

5. Members discussed the issues associated with climate change and the challenges facing Kent. The Committee was constantly evaluating the information available from the relevant agencies.

6. A Member referred to paragraph 7.2 of the report, and attendance by Committee Members.

7. Members welcomed the report and one Member asked about water resource and reduction in leakage, was there enough emphasis on water leakage reduction? Mr Hills explained that his Committee took this issue very seriously and had heard recently from Southern Water who had a target of reducing water usage per person per day. It was a changing world and in fact water usage in Kent had reduced in the last 20 years because of the change in industrial practices.

8. In response to a question about gulley clearance, whether this was done sufficiently, and the associated road safety aspects of flash flooding. Mr Hills explained that more information would be available after his meeting next week, it was important to ensure that accurate information regarding flooding was disseminated to members of the public. Mr Hills would report back to the Committee on this issue.

9. In relation to prevention, was there any way in which KCC could help prevent flooding issues? Mr Hills explained that it was preferable to divert or hold back water before it reached towns and villages; natural management of water. This was a slow process which required negotiation with land owners etc. it was important, and Mr Hills confirmed that his Committee would continue to investigate this within its powers.

10. A Member asked whether the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation had reported to the Flood Risk Committee, bearing in mind the 15,000 houses which were due to be built on this development site. Mr Hills was not aware that they had reported to the Committee, but this would be considered for the future work programme.

11. In relation to attendance at the Flood Risk Management Committee, Mr Tait clarified that an invitation was sent to all District and Borough councils and that if their nominated representative did not attend the papers were sent to the Leader of each Council. Mr Tait confirmed that it was not KCC Members who were not attending the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee thank Mr Hills and Mr Tait for attending the meeting and NOTE the content of the report.

40. Future meeting dates
(Item A7)

RESOLVED that the future meeting dates for 2019/20 be noted.

41. MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PRESS AND PUBLIC FOR EXEMPT BUSINESS
(Item A8)

RESOLVED that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

“Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”

42. Exempt minute of the meeting held on 4 October 2018
(Item A9)

RESOLVED that the exempt minute of the meeting held on 4 October 2018 was a correct record and that it be signed by the Chair.

From: Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Education
Sarah Hammond, Director for Children's Integrated Services (East), Lead for Asylum

To: **Scrutiny Committee** – 15 January 2019

Subject: Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC): Care Leaver Funding Shortfall 2018-19

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: Since the UASC crisis in 2015, the number of UASC Care leavers has continue to rise, with nearly 900 as at the end of November. The historical shortfall in grant rate paid by the Home Office along with a lack of recognition as to the impact of changes implemented following the Children Social Work Act 2017 have led to a significant financial pressure on this service.

1. Background

- 1.1 Since January 2018 Kent have been supporting over 800 former UASC children who are now young adults, having previously been UASC since the 2015 crisis before the implementation of the National Transfer Scheme (NTS). The number of UASC Care Leavers in 2016/17 was 696 rising to 871 as at November 2018. This is in addition to the 600+ citizen young people the service is supporting into early adulthood and independence. We are forecasting a total number of 940 UASC Care leavers by the end of the 2018/19 financial year. This number will continue to grow during 2019/20 as those who would previously have ceased to be eligible for a service at 21 years, remain within the service until they are 25 years old.
- 1.2 In addition, Kent is currently supporting 275 under 18 UASC, 42 above our 0.07% NTS cohort. The National Transfer Scheme (NTS) is a voluntary scheme administered by the Home Office and aimed to ensure UASC are distributed across Local Authorities more fairly (it does not cover Care leavers). Although there was some success with this scheme when first implemented, with Kent achieving its 0.07% quota for a short time, this programme has since stalled and the number of under 18 UASC in Kent is starting to rise. This will also negatively impact the longer-term number of UASC Care leavers as these young people turn 18.

2. Current Financial Position

- 2.1 In 2017-18, Kent received a total of £6.9m from both the Home Office and DFE to support UASC Care Leavers. However, the total cost of supporting these young people was £8.4m, a shortfall of £1.5m or 30%. In addition,

Kent spent an additional £0.9m supporting former UASC Care leavers that are no longer eligible for Home Office funding.

- 2.2 A similar story is expected in 2018-19, where Kent are currently forecasting a net shortfall of £1.5m in funding from the Home Office to support all UASC Care leavers. 26% of the total cost of supporting UASC relates to staffing whilst the remainder is spent on direct costs such as accommodation and expenses.
- 2.3 Funding is mainly received via the main Home Office grant for former UASC Care leavers, along with small grants supporting the agenda of “Staying Put” and the Controlling Migration Fund.

3. Main Challenges with UASC Care Leaver Funding

- 3.1 The current grant rate for Care Leavers is insufficient to deliver an Outstanding Care Leaver Services in accordance with the Ofsted ILAC guidance. Councils with disproportionately large numbers of UASC Care Leavers are heavily impeded and disadvantaged in achieving an Outstanding rating from Ofsted as a result of the too low level of funding. In addition to aspiring to be outstanding, the Council is under constant challenge from NGOs, immigration lawyers and special interest groups to provide to the fullest extent for this cohort. This activity is far more prevalent for UASC care leavers than for citizen young people. Below is an outline of the main issues:

Processing of immigration applications

- 3.2 Delays in processing immigration applications for 18+ UASC care leavers significantly impact on the resources of this Authority. Without a determination of status, the Local Authority continues to financially support all the housing, education and maintenance needs of UASC Care Leavers, when this should be being met by more general welfare benefits or indeed young people self-supporting by being able to seek paid employment. For this Authority, the number in this group currently stands in excess of 200+.

New Duties arising from Children Social Work Act 2017: Extending support up to 25 for all UASC Care leavers

- 3.3 Of significant concern are the new duties arising from Section 3 of the Children and Social Work Act 2017, the last set of guidance relates to the extension of personal adviser support to all Care Leavers under the age of 25. Under the new provisions, LAs are required to offer all Care Leavers ongoing Personal Adviser (PA) support up until 25, irrespective of whether they are engaged in education or training. This will include Care Leavers who return to the local authority at any point after the age of 21 up until the age of 25 and who request PA support.
- 3.4 To date all UASC Care Leavers in Kent reaching the age of 21 have requested to remain open to the service and to continue to receive the support of their Personal Advisor. There is no evidence so far that this is likely to change in the near future. The new duties also require all LAs to widely publish their local Care Leaver Offer by December 2018 which Kent has now done. We are yet to feel the full impact of the numbers of 21-25

year old UASC care leavers already closed to our service who may wish to return for a further service.

3.5 This Council has only received £121K in 2018/19 additional burdens monies from the DfE to meet the increased duties of the C&SW Act 2017. This amount is provided to cover costs incurred across all our 1500 care leavers. This sum of money is derisive and is based on an estimated cohort of 11-15% of all 21+ care leavers remaining open to the service at any one time. In the context that every single rising 21 UASC care leaver is choosing to stay open to our service, the Local Authority is negotiating with the Home Office that the current Home Office Grant rules needs to be reviewed. These individuals are currently excluded unless they are in full time education which goes against the requirements of the new Statute. This group of care leavers have very limited community or family support mechanisms outside of the council services, so it is not surprising that they are choosing to remain with their PA support in greater numbers than their citizen peers.

3.6 In Kent we currently supporting 183 UASC Care leavers aged 21 and over of which 50% are in education and are therefore eligible for Home Office Funding and 19% are considered ineligible for various other reasons (i.e. prison, hospital and naturalisation). This means there are 55 asylum young people who are currently expected to be supported via the DFE Grant. The number of over 21 UASC Care leavers are expected to increase by a further 89 before the end of the financial year of which an approximately 27 would be expected to be met from the DFE grant.

Appeal Rights Exhausted cases

3.6 This Council has undertaken over 350 Human Rights Assessments over the past 3 years for those who are Appeal Rights Exhausted. We support the principle of this activity and cease support for those found not to be eligible for ongoing support. However, this requires expert social work assessment and appropriately trained staff which is not currently funded from the Home Office Care Leaver Grant. This Council wholly meets the costs of these staff.

Challenge on Age Assessments

3.7 As with the Human Rights Assessments, challenge on previous age assessments at 18+ also require expert social work assessment. These costs are also not covered by the current UASC Care Leaver grant.

Legal costs

3.8 Substantial legal costs are incurred by the Council in defending actions against both Human Rights Assessments and Age Assessments. This is the case, even in circumstances when the Council wins the case, but the Care Leaver Grant does not fund any of this work and costs are met from the Council's own reserves.

Prevent Agenda

3.9 This group of Care Leavers are particularly vulnerable to social isolation, mental health difficulties and minor and major offending behaviours. Emerging research is linking these factors to a heightened risk of

radicalisation and subsequent terrorist acts. In order to provide early and effective intervention, this group of Care Leavers require very regular and evidenced based interventions delivered by trained and skilled staff. We were pleased to receive Controlling Migration Fund monies for this work, but this is time limited and should instead be built into the new grant funding formula.

Interpreter costs

- 3.10 Interpreter costs continue to be a major burden on the Local Authority. This is particularly relevant for YP who arrive close to their 18th birthday but meet the eligibility criteria for care leaver services. They will have had little opportunity to learn English before they turn 18 and therefore their lack of a common communication channel is an increasing financial burden as more interpreters are required to meet our statutory duties.

Travel costs

- 3.11 Delays in progressing asylum applications have resulted in YP being required to travel to London on a regular basis post 18. These are substantial costs on the South Eastern Network which are funded by the Council.

4. Recommendations

Recommendations:

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

- a) NOTE and DISCUSS the current financial position for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Care Leavers.

5. Background Documents

5.1 Care leavers Local Offer

<https://d1qmdf3vop2l07.cloudfront.net/hopeful-geyser.cloudvent.net/compressed/df60c5105867f0b0ed63daf6247d491c.pdf>

6. Contact details

Report Author(s)

- Sarah Hammond (Director of Children's Integrated Services East)
- 03000 411488
- sarah.hammond@kent.gov.uk

- Karen Stone (Interim Finance Business Partner)
- 03000 416733
- karen.stone02@kent.gov.uk

By: Benjamin Watts – General Counsel
To: Scrutiny Committee - 15 January 2019
Subject: CRR0045 – Effectiveness of Governance within a Member-led Authority.
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: The Chairman and spokespeople asked for further information on risk CRR0045 – Effectiveness of Governance within a Member-led Authority. An introduction to this risk is contained within this report and Members will have opportunity to ask questions of the General Counsel at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 15 January.

Recommendations: That the Scrutiny Committee note the report.

1. Introduction

(1) The Cabinet, at its meeting on 3 December 2018, noted a report on the Council's Corporate Risk Register. This report included the new risk CRR0045 – Effectiveness of governance within a Member-led authority.

(2) The report to Cabinet stated that *“over the past 12-18 months there have been numerous warnings from local authorities, auditors and professional bodies regarding the parlous state of local government finances, with the first section 114 notice in 20 years issued earlier this year. This brings into sharp focus the criticality of robust council governance.”*

(3) The relevant sections from the Corporate Risk Register – Summary Risk Profile are attached as Appendix 1.

(4) The General Counsel will be present at the meeting to update Members and answer questions about this risk.

<p>Recommendation: That the Scrutiny Committee note the report.</p>
--

Officer: Benjamin Watts
Tel No: 03000 416814
e-mail: Benjamin.watts@kent.gov.uk
Background Information: *none*

Corporate Risk Register - Summary Risk Profile

Low = 1-6
Medium = 8-15
High =16-25

Risk No.*	Risk Title	Current Risk Rating	Target Risk Rating	Direction of Travel since July 2018
CRR0045	Effectiveness of governance within a Member-led authority	10	5	NEW

Risk ID	CRR0045	Risk Title: Effectiveness of governance within a Member-led authority				
<p>Source / Cause of risk</p> <p>The continuation of a challenging financial and operating environment for Local Government (see risk CRR0009) will require difficult policy decisions to be made in a timely manner, which requires continued effective governance and robust internal control mechanisms.</p> <p>At a strongly Member-led Authority such as KCC, this places dependency / risk on the effectiveness of the member governance of the Council. It is crucial that the Council avoids some of the inherent risks such as:</p>	<p>Risk Event</p> <p>Members are unwilling or unable to agree necessary policy (service) decisions to deliver a legally balanced budget and sustainable medium-term financial plan (MTFP).</p> <p>Members agree a budget requiring unrealistic and undeliverable efficiency savings leading to significant in-year overspends.</p> <p>Officers act on direction from members which has no basis in statutory decision making or the</p>	<p>Consequence</p> <p>Decisions challenged under judicial review on the appropriateness of the decision-making within KCC.</p> <p>Monitoring Officer / Head of Paid Service statutory report to Council.</p> <p>Reputational damage to the Council.</p> <p>S114 Notice issued by the S151 Officer.</p>	<p>Risk Owner</p> <p>Paul Carter, Leader of the Council</p> <p>David Cockburn, Head of Paid Service</p>	<p>Current Likelihood</p> <p>Unlikely (2)</p> <p>Target Residual Likelihood</p> <p>Very Unlikely (1)</p>	<p>Current Impact</p> <p>Major (5)</p> <p>Target Residual Impact</p> <p>Major (5)</p>	

Over reliance on informal governance arrangements and political group meetings to direct officers and make decisions outside of formal statutory decision-making and scrutiny arrangements.

Policy options regarding the service offer of the Council are not adequately or appropriately considered within the budget development/approval process.

Failure of the governance structures of the of the council (Cabinet, Cabinet Committee, Full Council, Scrutiny Committee/Governance & Audit) to provide robust internal and external oversight, scrutiny and challenge of budget options and delivery of agreed MTFP savings programme.

Unwillingness of elected Members to appropriately consider advice from professional / statutory officers and / or professional / statutory officers failing in their duty to provide robust professional

Council's constitution.

Statutory officers (S151, Monitoring Officer, Head of Paid Service) are required to use their powers to intervene or alert the Council to inappropriate/illegal decision-making.

advice needed by Members to effectively discharge their member leadership role.	
Control Title	Control Owner
Strategic Statement agreed by County Council and published setting out medium-term objectives and priorities of the Council.	Paul Carter, Leader of the Council
MTFP and Budget Book agreed by Full Council and support/briefing provided for all political groups by officers on budget development options.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director of Finance
Key and significant decision-making process in place for Executive decisions and appropriately published Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Transformation plans and/or business cases for strategic change underpinning MTFP shared with non-executive members through Cabinet Committees as part of the executive decision-making arrangements.	David Cockburn, Head of Paid Service
Member and Officer codes of conduct in place and robustly monitored and enforced.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Member development and training programme in place and overseen by Selection and Member Services Committee.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Appropriate officer development and training programme in place and overseen by CMT.	Amanda Beer, Corporate Director – EODD
Appropriately detailed and timely financial monitoring reports considered by Cabinet and Cabinet Committees.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director of Finance
Appropriate performance reporting of service and corporate performance to Cabinet, Cabinet Committee and Full Council.	David Cockburn, Head of Paid Service
Effective internal audit arrangements in place and robust monitoring arrangements for the delivery of internal audit recommendations to Governance & Audit Committee.	Zena Cooke, Corporate Director of Finance

Provision for Chief Officers to seek written direction from Executive Members within the KCC Constitution.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
Annual Governance Statement (AGS) arrangements in place with returns made across both senior and statutory officers.	Ben Watts., General Counsel
Appropriate and effective corporate risk management procedures in place for the Council.	David Whittle, Director – SPRCA
Democratic Services appropriately resourced to support effective Committee governance and scrutiny arrangements.	Ben Watts. General Counsel
Action Title	Action Owner
Informal member governance arrangements authorised by the KCC Constitution, jointly agreed by the Head of Paid Service and the Leader and set out published document on KNet.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA
New 'operating standards' for KCC officers to be published on KNet.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA
Development of single Strategic Delivery Plan for KCC.	David Whittle, Director SPRCA
Refresh of the KCC constitution.	Ben Watts, General Counsel
	Planned Completion Date
	December 2018
	December 2018
	March 2019
	April 2019