

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Task and Finish Group Title	Engaging Young People in our Decision Making Processes
Membership of Working Group:	To be confirmed. Invite 2 young people onto the group
Area for Investigation: (Directorate and Service Area)	Potential for review to touch on the work of all Directorates
Key Officer Contacts:	Bernadette Allen Victoria Cook Peter Dixon
Scoping form completed by:	Councillor Mike Britland
Scrutiny requested by:	Executive Councillor Mike Britland
Criteria for inclusion in work programme	(If yes please provide details)
Customer Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – Petition presented to the Executive 23/04/08 by Councillor Britland on behalf of Ben Wesson, Members of the Youth Parliament (MYP) stated “We the undersigned, hereby call upon Warwick District Council to conduct a review on how it engages with young people on its day to day proceedings”. The petition was signed by 168 people.
Poor performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – Although there are no performance measures relating to this area of work, the submission of a petition and the referral of said petition by the Executive to scrutiny suggests that we are not performing in this area.
Area requiring policy development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – WDC has a duty to engage citizens in the decision making process.
Value for Money Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
Emerging issues; Executive Referral, Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – The issue has been referred by the Executive. Engagement with the community in the decision making process is an element of CAA on which we will be assessed.
Long term financial benefit anticipated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
Corporate priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – The work relates to a number of Corporate Strategy priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To understand and support the differing needs of our communities focussing support where it is most needed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To increase involvement by younger people ○ To use best practice to improve service delivery
<p>Summary of overall anticipated benefits and intended outcomes</p> <p><i>[Give a brief description of what we hope undertaking the review will achieve e.g. Improved performance, amended policy, efficiencies or increased footfall]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve our levels of engagement with our communities. • The development of an effective youth engagement process. The process is to ensure we create a process that meets the needs to young people, based on the feedback they give. • This will contribute towards the work being undertaken as part of the Warwickshire Award for Involvement.
<p>Indicators of success</p> <p><i>[Include details of desired indicators of success and how these can be measured]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased engagement and participation of younger people in the decision making process.
Policy Context	
National or Regional Policy Implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duty to Involve – Communities of Interest
Impact on local people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement strategy (To be written)
Scope	
<p>In Scope</p> <p><i>[Define what the scope of review]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our current consultation procedures and structures. • Possible future mechanisms for enhancing engagement. • Need to agree a definition of 'young person' to ensure age groups are defined
<p>Excluded from Scope</p> <p><i>[Define the exclusions from the scope of the review]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with young people on issues purely relating to the work of the County Council or other partner organisations. • The group is not carrying out the engagement role.

Council and Partner Involvement	
<p>Who would need to be involved from the Council?</p> <p>Which of our partners, stakeholders and Members of the community should we discuss this with?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Younger people • Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Town and Parish councils ○ Warwickshire County Council to find out about existing engagement routes • WDC Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy and Performance re: current consultation procedures ○ Service areas with younger people as a key element of their

	<p>customer base;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leisure ▪ Housing ▪ Community safety ▪ Licensing <p>○ Input from all service areas</p>
Review Resources	
<p>Evidence</p> <p><i>[Background Information and documents to look at]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practice from other Authorities • Warwickshire Award for Involvement, as a reference source for an engagement framework • Engagement, participation and involvement strategy
<p>Witnesses</p> <p><i>[Who to see and when]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petitioners • School council members • Youth groups • Town and Parish councils • Warwickshire County Council
<p>Site visits</p> <p><i>[Details of site visits and when they will be held if appropriate]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools • Youth Centres • Wherever young people meet
<p>Consultation</p> <p><i>[Is there any consultation which needs to be undertaken to feed into the review?]</i></p> <p><i>[consult with CMT on draft outcomes for any issues they may have]</i></p> <p><i>[Do findings need to be published for consultation before making final recommendations?]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people • Community Partnership Team • Corporate Management Team (CMT)
<p>Expert Advice</p> <p><i>[Do the task & Finish Group require expert advice support due to the nature of the review]</i></p>	N/A
Dangers/ Barriers/Risks	
<p>What are the risks to the review?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group start to try and do the engagement work rather than filling the void and solving the issue in the long term • There are no ideas brought to the table as to how engagement can be improved • Young people do not want to engage with WDC • The review does not engage with a wide range of young people and is therefore not representative, which impacts on the

	<p>effectiveness of the outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Executive do not approve recommendations • The outcomes duplicate work being undertaken by our partners
Timescales	
Anticipated Review Start Date	July 2008
Anticipated Reporting Date	October 2008
Frequency of Meetings	
<p>Date to evaluate impact</p> <p><i>[A review in six to twelve months (dependent on outcomes) at this point deciding to either re scrutinise this matter, with a different task and finish group, or sign it off as the indicators of success have been achieved.]</i></p>	