

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**17 JANUARY 2019**

**TOWN HALL - BARNESLEY**

PRESENT Councillor C Furness (Chair)

Councillors: P Baker, J Ennis, P Innes, A Jones, S Mohammed, S Peake, K Richardson, I Saunders, P Short, C Smith, B Steele and A White

Observers: Councillors: K Reid and K Sarvent

Mayor D Jarvis MBE

Officers: R Adams, C Blackburn, A Frosdick, S Edwards, A Shirt, C Marriott, D Smith, S Sykes, A Wright and K Wooffinden

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Z Naz, G Morley and J Shephard

1 **WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

Councillor Furness welcomed Members' and Mayor Jarvis to the meeting.

Apologies from Members' were noted as above.

2 **VOTING RIGHTS FOR NON-CONSTITUENT MEMBERS**

It was agreed that there were no items of business for which the non-Constituent Members should not have full voting rights.

3 **URGENT ITEMS / ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

4 **ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

None.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY ANY MEMBERS

None received.

6 REPORTS FROM AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Following a request from Councillor Baker, officers present introduced themselves to Members and their job role.

7 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None.

8 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH OCTOBER 2018

Councillor Saunders requested that the minutes be amended to include a fourth resolution at minute 10 ('Co-ordination of Road Works and Public Transport Diversions') to state 'the Committee requests that the matter be referred to the Sheffield City Council's Scrutiny system and any other interested councils'.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting of the SCR Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018 are agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting, subject to the inclusion of the above resolution at minute 10.

9 MATTERS ARISING INCLUDING COMMUNITY TRANSPORT FOLLOW UP REPORT.

A report was presented to provide Members with an update on matters arising from the previous meeting held on 18 October 2018.

As requested at the previous meeting, Members were provided with answers to their queries with regards to the community transport (CT) budget and co-ordination of roadworks and public transport diversions.

Councillor Steele recalled that Members had highlighted at the previous meeting that, access to CT in rural villages and information available to people was very limited. Additionally, he highlighted that not all residents had access to the internet to be able to obtain information regarding CT services.

S Edwards replied that information provision regarding CT was provided through a number of sources (and not just via SYPT's website). Information was delivered through a number of organisations in each of the four local authority areas that provide CT services. Additionally, CT information was also provided to local councillors and MPs with regards to the services that are available.

S Edwards acknowledged that communications could be improved to raise the awareness of CT, the routes available and how people can access CT services. In terms of CT information available in doctors' surgeries it was highlighted by a Member that they had not seen any information in their local surgery. S Edwards agreed to check the information provided in doctors surgeries. **Action: S Edwards**

Councillor Ennis highlighted that CT usage in the Barnsley area had declined by over 30% in the last 5 years, making it the most disadvantaged area in South Yorkshire. He asked if analysis had been undertaken to understand why Barnsley residents were so adversely affected. Additionally, he had raised this issue with the Leader of Barnsley MBC, who would be raising this issue at a future MCA meeting.

S Edwards replied that he did not have any specific information as to what was driving the difference in Barnsley's usage in comparison to the usage in Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield. He suggested that, this may be due to the awareness of CT available in the area. S Edwards agreed to discuss this with Barnsley's CT provider. **Action: S Edwards**

Councillor Furness asked if Members could be provided with a list of the geographical areas served by CT, particularly in rural areas. **Action: S Edwards**

Councillor Furness asked Members if there was still a requirement for a CT Task and Finish Group.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the action to establish a CT Task and Finish Group could be discharged following the update provided at today's meeting.

RESOLVED – That the Committee noted the report.

## 10 MAYOR'S REPORT TO OSC

Mayor Jarvis thanked the Committee for the opportunity to join them at today's meeting. He recalled that he was last with Members in July and was subsequently asked by Councillor Furness to attend OSC meetings regularly, which he had committed to do so.

Mayor Jarvis commented that it had been a busy six months since he last met with Members and therefore, he wished to provide the Committee with a short summary of the progress that he had been making.

In relation to Brexit, Mayor Jarvis commented that, whatever happens in Parliament over the coming weeks, months and years it was his responsibility to make sure that we do everything we can to prepare as a City Region.

That involves making sure the Government understands the challenges we face, and the interventions they can make to help grow our economy.

With that in mind, last week Mayor Jarvis had met with the Chancellor to follow up an exchange in the Commons about the Government's approach to underinvestment in the North. Next week, Mayor Jarvis would be joining other

Metro Mayors to meet Ministers in the Department of Exiting the European Union to press the case for further levels of investment in the North.

At the regional level, he was now looking at how he could help businesses prepare.

The Local Enterprise Partnership had discussed this in detail earlier this week and would be working with business groups to help businesses prepare as best they can.

Mayor Jarvis reported that, since he had last met Members he had agreed a new and robust governance model for the Mayoral Combined Authority and Local Enterprise Partnership. All the South Yorkshire council leaders had supported the new model and he believed that this would strengthen the accountability and transparency of its decision making – as well as enabling robust debate and discussion to take place.

Mayor Jarvis had also secured Living Wage accreditation for the Mayoral Combined Authority and published the first Mayoral Combined Authority Gender Pay Gap report.

Working with the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Mayoral Combined Authority, Mayor Jarvis had continued to approve investment in projects across the region. Since May last year, 14 projects across the region had been approved totalling up to £42m, by the end of March this could rise to £86m of investment. Of which, £2.9m had been approved to develop employment sites in Rotherham and Bassetlaw to help create more than 1,000 jobs. £5.3m had been approved to support the regeneration of South Yorkshire's town and city centres including Sheffield City Council's 'Grey to Green' project and Doncaster MBC's 'Quality Streets' project.

In December, Mayor Jarvis launched a new Transport Vision for the Sheffield City Region. The region had never had a statement of intent of this scale and ambition. To make the region's transport system fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century there was much more work we need to do to make it work.

The launch of the Vision was the first step in that process.

Central to the Vision was a focus on active travel; investing in the physical infrastructure that will enable people to walk, cycle or take public transport across the region.

The SCR would launching its search for an Active Travel Commissioner to lead this work in the next few days.

The Working Win pilot programme continued to support those out of work, or struggling in their current job due to a physical or mental health condition, with 2,000 referrals being made.

In November 2018, working with partners across the City Region, the first ever Sheffield City Region Homelessness Summit had been held. This important work aimed to end homelessness in the Region would continue throughout the year.

Mayor Jarvis concluded his update by sharing with Members the positive news that he was establishing a Youth Combined Authority. He had met with a number of youth groups to develop the plans and was delighted that the Board would be holding its first meeting mid-February.

Councillor Furness thanked Mayor Jarvis for his update and asked him to address a number of questions grouped into the following themes:

Mayoral Combined Authority  
Devolution  
Future Investment in transport  
SCR Website

### Mayoral Combined Authority Meetings

<b>Question 1</b>
-------------------

<b>In terms of access to MCA meetings, does the Mayor believe that equal opportunities are extended to members of the public who would like to attend meetings held in public, but are prohibited in doing so due to a disability and/or are reliant on public transport, particularly in view of the lack of webcasting facilities at AMP?</b>
---

<b>Additional context information provided</b>
--

One member of the OSC would like to attend the MCA meeting as an observer; the member is reliant on public transport and has a visual impairment. He has planned his journey to AMP from his home; he found that he would need to change bus 4 times and would need to set off from his home at approximately 7.30 am to reach the AMP by the 11.00 am meeting start time.
--

<b>Mayor's Response</b>
-------------------------

Mayoral Combined Authority meetings must be accessible to all members of the public. And I am committed to making sure that they are.
---

At the 11 <sup>th</sup> June meeting of the MCA, my first meeting as Mayor, the MCA approved the plans and budgets to reconfigure the ground floor of the MCA owned Broad Street West building.
---

Improving accessibility, webcasting and better transport connections were all central to that decision being made.
--

Works have now started to deliver this and should be ready to host meetings from April 2019.
--

<b>Question 2</b>
-------------------

<b>Does the Mayor agree that, in the interests of openness and transparency, it would be useful to explain to the public and observers present at the Mayoral Combined Authority public meeting (or meeting held in public) how decisions have been made/reached at the private pre-meeting?</b>
--

**Additional context information provided**

Members of the OSC have attended the MCA pre-meeting and observed the discussions and decision-making process which takes place. The members have then attended the public meeting immediately afterwards where proceedings are completed within approximately 30-40 minutes with no reference as to how the decisions were made or the rationale behind the decision-making process.

**Mayor's Response**

Can I assure Members that no decisions are taken in private pre-meetings or other informal meetings. It is entirely proper that members of the Mayoral Combined Authority have an opportunity to debate issues in a private setting before any public decision.

It is clearly in the public interest that all decisions are made in an open and transparent way and I am confident that all decisions made by the Mayoral Combined Authority are done in public, with detailed papers setting out the rationale for any decision and that these decisions are made recorded and reported appropriately.

I can also remind Members that all key decisions are logged on a publicly available Forward Plan.

**Question 3**

**In view of the above, does the Mayor believe that the MCA meetings are accessible to the public and, therefore, operate at an optimum level of openness and transparency? If not, how does he plan to remedy this?**

**Mayor's Response**

I believe we have made significant improvements in making the Mayoral Combined Authority accessible to the public since I became Mayor. These improvements are in 3 particular areas:

Governance  
Conduct of Meetings  
Physical Location

Governance

As the business of the MCA has increased and become more complex the means by which we make decisions also has to evolve.

This has led me to put forward and reach agreement with the Mayoral Combined Authority on a new governance model.

This new model requires wider representation from Local Authority Elected Members in decision making and introduces further requirements on the publication of papers, minutes and decisions in a consistent and timely way.

I have also committed to reviewing the arrangements for public questions.

Conduct of Meetings

I have developed my contribution at the beginning of Mayoral Combined Authority meetings to provide a comprehensive update on activity and key issues.

I have also ensured that officers reports are timely and focussed, providing better and more concise evidence and information. I continue to encourage questions from the public and seek to address them at the meeting.

Physical Location

As I outlined in my answer to an earlier question, I have recognised the need to improve the physical accessibility of meetings. The work referred to earlier will provide improved meeting rooms, improved physical access and webcasting. These are all measures intended to encourage greater levels of awareness and involvement in the work of the Mayoral Combined Authority.

The Future

Over time as we find the strengths and areas for development from these new arrangements I am confident there will be more for us to do to improve openness and transparency.

**Question 4**

**Does the Mayor believe the alternative options, put forward to the MCA, when considering programmes, projects and strategy/policy present a robust evidence base for leaders to consider, supporting them to make informed decisions about the best option for the City Region?**

**Additional context information provided**

In relation to the reports submitted to MCA, presently, alternative options are not presented in a way in which members can make their own judgement regarding cost implications and the impact they will have on the region. There also appears to be a lack of information in terms of equality impact assessments for the options put forward.

**Mayor's Response**

As part of the review of governance I have previously outlined in response to question 3 I have asked officers to review systems and controls supporting decision making.

I am assured that the controls detailed within the strategic risk management framework clarify that arrangements are in place to ensure that the decisions made regarding the investment of Local Growth Fund are made using relevant, clear, objective analysis. Arrangements include the use of strategic, outline and full business cases, and information is assessed using the Treasury Green Book methodology.

I am aware that some Members of this Committee have participated in a workshop with Officers to look in depth at the processes and approaches deployed during assurance and contracting.

In addition, SCR Officers have recently worked with HM Treasury and the Welsh Government to host the inaugural Better Business Case Northern Network conference. All relevant staff are being supported to receive accredited business case training, in line with new government expectations, by the end of March 2019. Members of our Appraisal Panel will also attend a Business Case Reviewers Masterclass delivered by HM Treasury. We are also working with partner local authorities in this regard. The aim is to improve the project development process and thereby the quality of schemes and the value for money we derive from our investment.

MCA Members, in line with the observation of the Scrutiny Committee, have also requested that the information captured in the formal report, including the options analysis should be reviewed to ensure sufficiency of information is provided, in the right format and at the right time for decision makers.

Officers have added the options appraisal assessment as an adequacy concern in the strategic risk register with an associated action that part of the work to implement the new governance arrangements will include a review of the role, membership and responsibilities of the Assurance Panel and the reporting template provided to the MCA, LEP and the new Executive Boards.

**Question from Councillor Steele**

Councillor Steele asked for assurances that the eight Protected Characteristics of the Equality Act were taken account of when building projects commenced in relation to the building's accessibility.

**Mayor's Response**

Mayor Jarvis replied that he would confirm in writing back to the Committee.  
**Action: Mayor Jarvis**

**Devolution**

**Question 5**

**Can the Mayor give an account as to where the City Region is in terms of agreeing the devolution deal?**

**Mayor's Response**

Devolution remains my most important priority and I am working as hard as I possibly can to bring this issue to a successful conclusion.

I want to see powers agreed and funding released so that we can drive our economy forward and improve the lives of our residents. It is deeply frustrating that we have not secured more progress on this matter.

But progress is dependent on the Government as well as the Local Authorities recognizing, respecting and working with the views and aspirations for devolution.



<p>To this end I have had a series of meetings with Government Ministers, most recently including James Brokenshire, Secretary of State in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I am continuing to hold discussion with Leaders in South Yorkshire and I am contributing to discussions in wider Yorkshire.</p>
<p><b>Question from Councillor Jones</b></p>
<p>Could the Mayor please tell the Committee what the obstacles are with regards to progressing a Devolution Deal for the SCR?</p>
<p><b>Mayor's Response</b></p>
<p>In order to resolve the matter there needs to be a coming together of all parties, of which, Mayor Jarvis had been working incredibly hard to make that happen. National Government had been in receipt of very detailed proposal which was fundamental to locking this arrangement.</p>
<p><b>Question from Councillor Jones</b></p>
<p>Councillor Jones asked if there was anything the Committee could do to assist the process. He suggested that the four South Yorkshire Leaders be invited to attend a future OSC.</p> <p>Councillor Furness highlighted that the Committee could invite the Leaders to attend a meeting, but not compel them to attend. He also reminded Members that, presently there was no substantive decision available to scrutinise by the Committee.</p> <p>After discussion, all Members voted in favour of extending an invitation from the Committee to the four South Yorkshire Leaders to attend a future OSC meeting to discuss Devolution. <b>Action: C Marriott</b></p>
<p><b>Question from Councillor Mohammed</b></p>
<p>Councillor Mohammed asked if a deadline could be set to resolve this issue?</p>
<p><b>Mayor's Response</b></p>
<p>A judgement would have to be made whether this would help or hinder the process. He was not convinced in the end that it would help the process, but he did accept that the status quo was not acceptable and that it could not be allowed to run-on for a long period of time.</p>

### **Future Investment in Transport Infrastructure**

<p><b>Question 6</b></p>
<p><b>Will the MCA undertake a feasibility study and explore the funding opportunities for re-establishing a rail or tram-train link between Barnsley and Doncaster to improve journey times between the two principle towns in the region not currently service by South Yorkshire Supertram system?</b></p>
<p><b>Additional context information provided</b></p>
<p>Currently the South Yorkshire Supertram does not serve the whole of South</p>

Yorkshire and has only just ventured out of Sheffield. Already, vast amounts of capital are said to be required for track renewal and replacement of the original fleet.

There is a major transport disconnect between Barnsley and Doncaster – a major rail hub for access to the East Coast Mainline. Existing rail passengers have to change at Meadowhall adding to the journey time between two of the four major population centres in the City Region. Reinstatement of the former rail link, using Tram-Trains to circumvent post-Beeching development would greatly enhance connectivity between these two principle towns as well as opening new opportunities for stops not previously served by rail ... thanks to the flexibility of the Tram-Train.

### **Mayor's Response**

This is a really important point and I have spoken to many people who find it infuriating that they have to change at Meadowhall to travel between Doncaster and Barnsley.

Early 2018 the Sheffield City Region Integrated Public Transport (SCRIPT) study was commissioned to identify the key current and future travel flows across the region, in order to focus future transport investment to improve intra-city region connectivity.

This work identified 4 strategic transit corridors, including the Dearne Valley corridor which picks up travel flows in this area between Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham.

My Vision for Transport, as approved (17.12.18) and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy, due for consideration at the MCA in January, both have the ambition to improve how people move around the City Region as key priorities.

The next stage of work, just underway, is to identify specific interventions within each of these corridors which can have the greatest impact on improving travel flow. It will consider a range of types of interventions, including public transport, highways, active travel along with rail or light rail (i.e. Tram).

### **Question 7**

**Will the MCA use its influence (or powers) and funds to encourage bus operators to re-examine their route planning to promote services between adjacent communities rather than having a network that is radial in nature and thus incurs extra travelling time and cost to passengers wishing to make relatively short journeys?**

### **Additional context information provided**

Using Barnsley as an example, the overwhelming majority of bus routes in Barnsley are radial, ie, they connect villages and districts with the Town Centre. Often, to travel by bus from one village or centre to another even when they are only a couple of miles apart, it is necessary to travel into the town centre and then back out again.

**Mayor's Response**

You used the example of Barnsley and it is such a frustrating situation for people living at the edges of the town – as it is for many people across the region too.

My Vision for Transport, announces the intention to undertake a review of the bus network in South Yorkshire.

The intention is that this review will seek to identify improvements that can be made to the bus network to improve patronage levels and in doing so will include examining current routes, demand for routes and the experiences of passengers.

Bus operators will be involved in this review as well as user groups. I hope to make further announcements of this in the next month.

**Question 8**

**How will the MCA ensure that the public are consulted properly to ensure that services are fit for purpose and offer an attractive, reliable, viable, affordable alternative to private transport methods and entice customers back to using public transport?**

**How will the MCA measure the performance of public transport operators to ensure services are being run effectively and efficiently?**

**What will the consequences for public transport operators if they fail to provide reliable and affordable services? What measures will be put in place to ensure quality services are provided on a continuing basis?**

**Additional context information provided**

Public transport across the region doesn't offer any connectivity at the times they are required to places of employment, education and leisure. Services are unreliable and unattractive and customers are now choosing to use their own transport as public transport is seen to be unfit for purpose (source: social media, First Bus customer forum, comments on local newspaper websites). The negative consequences of this are considerable and include creating inequality in opportunities for numerous cohorts of the population, generating further road congestion leading to poor air quality and pollution.

**Mayor's Response**

I agree it is essential that the services offered ensure people are connected via public transport to current and future sites of employment, education and leisure.

As noted in my response to the previous question, the intention is to undertake a review of the bus network in South Yorkshire. This review will seek to gather evidence on current patronage levels as well as the current routes serviced. User groups and non-users will be consulted to understand the reasons why they use or do not utilise the current services. The outcome of the review will be to identify the way public transport should operate across South Yorkshire in the future, with all options having been considered.

<b>Question 9</b>
<b>What are the plans to modernise public transport and routes across the region to ensure that they serve rural areas and attract people back to using public transport as an alternative to using private transport methods?</b>
<b>Mayor's Response</b>
<p>As with my previous responses, I am planning to launch a Bus Review in the coming weeks and patronage and routes will be in scope for review.</p> <p>We have also been successful in being shortlisted for Transforming Cities Fund resources. We're developing a detailed submission to the Department for Transport which we will submit in the summer. I expect that resources unlocked through this process will enable us to deliver significant improvements to our transport infrastructure.</p>

### SCR Website

<b>Question 10</b>
<b>Does the Mayor agree that the Sheffield City Region website needs improvements in order for it to answer the questions businesses and public have, and be an attractive, effective and useful "shop window to the world"?</b>
<b>Additional context information provided</b>
<p>OSC Members and their associates have been trying to use the SCR website to find information relating to Sheffield City Region. For example, one member was trying to find information on how to apply for a housing grant but could not find the information on the website. The information available on the website was felt to be generic and on the whole, not very helpful.</p>
<b>Mayor's Response</b>
<p>Clearly the website is an important communication tool for businesses and the public and for transparency. Feedback is always welcome from members of the public on its attractiveness and accessibility.</p> <p>I can confirm that the website had a major overhaul in 2018 and continues to be renewed. Since this point usage of the website has increased by 62%.</p> <p>With regard to accessibility, a Deep Dive Audit conducted in 2018 found the website to be fully compliant with transparency arrangements for governance and promotion of funded schemes. One of the planned developments to be implemented by April 2019 is the investing in Modern.Gov tool to further improve the accessibility of information related to papers and key decisions.</p> <p>The context to question made a specific reference to housing grants. Regarding the LGF housing fund application process, Officers have advised that the scheme was closed to new applications late in 2018 due to the pipeline of schemes being oversubscribed. Following approval of the recommendation to increase the value of the Housing Fund a revised prospectus and application process was launched with information available through the search function.</p>

This may explain why Members were unable to find detail on this issue as at the time of the search there was no housing grant programme live.

## 11 UPDATE ON THE HOUSING FUND

A report was submitted to provide Members with feedback on how the Sheffield City Region Housing Fund schemes had progressed since the update provided to Members on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

Members noted that the pilot Housing Fund continued to move schemes forward, but not at the pace originally envisaged. The report set out a number of learning points from the Pilot which were noted by Members.

The target remained to progress schemes up to the original HF allocation of £10m for approval by the end of the current Financial Year. The SCR continued to progress schemes through the due diligence / appraisal process towards funding approval as quickly as possible, to accelerate 'additional' new housing development.

Annex A to the report set out details of the housing schemes progressed / progressing to Approval / Full Business Case.

Councillor Saunders referred to Annex A, he asked if Members could receive details of the site addresses of the schemes which were being progressed / progressing to Approval / Full Business Case.

C Blackburn explained that due to commercial sensitivities etc. the SCR were unable to release details of the schemes until they had been approved and the information was in the public domain.

D Smith added that the Combined Authority's role was to make an assessment on whether the schemes were viable and whether they represent value for money. The information on the sites were released at the point of allocation of resources.

A Frosdick added that the Committee's role was to make an assessment on how the housing fund was performing and how the strategic functions of the Combined Authority are being discharged.

Councillor Saunders and Steele were both of the opinion that this information should be provided to Members.

A Frosdick stated that we would produce a note for the Committee to help provide clarity on the approach being taken by the SCR. **Action: A Frosdick**

In response to a question from Councillor Saunders, C Blackburn provided further details regarding the work taking place onsite at the Former Park Gardeners site.

Members were informed that, on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2018 the Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA) approved the allocation of up to £15m from the Local Enterprise

Partnership (LEP) Local Growth Fund (LGF) bringing the maximum Housing Fund total up to £25m.

Following the original call to submit Expressions of Interest (Eoi) to the fund (which closed on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017), a further 'Open Call' for Eoi's for additional housing schemes had been advertised on the MCA/LEPs website since September 2018.

The Open Call had elicited:

- 9 new enquiries – 6 submitted Eois with 3 Eois still pending;
- The 6 Eois received requested a total of £11.3m; and
- Enquiries received from a range of scheme promoters including Housing Associations, Private Sector, Local Authorities and Partnerships.

Members were informed that the HF Prospectus had been updated and relaunched. The SCR continued to actively promote the HF and engage with partners.

RESOLVED – That the Committee reviewed the current progress and performance of the Housing Fund.

## 12 HEALTH LED EMPLOYMENT TRIAL

A report was received to brief the Committee on the progress of the Health Led Employment Trial in the Sheffield City Region.

In 2016, Sheffield City Region had put forward a successful proposal to Government to design and deliver a cutting-edge research trial to establish what could be done to help people who have a mild-moderate mental health and/or a physical health condition which is an obstacle to them working.

Members noted that, to provide a robust evidence base, the Health Led Employment Trial was a randomised control trial, meaning people who take part were randomly placed into one of two research groups. One group were provided with information about new services, and the other provided with information about existing services in their area.

The SCR Health Led Employment Trial had been designed and commissioned by the Combined Authority involving the active representation from health and local authority stakeholders.

A publicity campaign was currently active to raise awareness of the trial to residents and to start conversations with employers across the City Region.

The Committee received a presentation on the early impacts achieved from the trial. In summary, the following key points were noted:-

- 1,759 participants in the trial (May-November 2018).
- 877 are receiving the service being tested (remained in 'Control').
- 60% of participants are out of work, 40% are in work and struggling.

- 117 participants previously out of work have been supported into paid employment to date.
- 33 participants who were off sick have returned to work.
- 43 participants who were at work and struggling have retained their job.

Members noted the next steps involved in the trial.

Councillor Ennis queried why the number of participants in the trial from the Barnsley area was low, in comparison to Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield.

K Wooffinden replied that this gap had been recognised; analysis was being undertaken to identify the cause.

RESOLVED – That the Committee noted the update.

**At this point in the meeting Councillor Furness left the meeting to attend another meeting. In the absence of the Chair, Councillor Jones (Vice-Chair) assumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.**

### 13 UPDATED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR OSC

A report was received to inform Members of minor changes made to the SCR Overview and Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference to reflect the introduction of the substitute system and to formalise the remit of the substitute Members.

RESOLVED – That the Committee approve the updated Terms of Reference.

### 14 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Members were reminded that the next informal meeting of the OSC would be held on 14 February 2019 to set the Scrutiny Work Programme for the next quarter.

Members were requested to notify C Marriott of any topics for inclusion within the Scrutiny Work Programme.

It was noted that there had been no key decisions for call in and no reviews currently on going.

The key decisions document would be circulated to Members' on a monthly basis, when the Forward Plan had been updated.

RESOLVED – That the Committee:-

- 1) Noted the update.
- 2) Notify C Marriott of any topics for inclusion within the Scrutiny Work Programme.

CHAIR