Public Document Pack

Penallta House,
Tredomen Park,
Ystrad Mynach,
Hengoed CF82 7PG

Tŷ Penallta,
Parc Tredomen,
Ystrad Mynach,
Hengoed CF82 7PG

CAERPHILLY
COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
CYNGOR BWRDEISTREF SIROL
CAERFFILI

www.caerphilly.gov.uk
www.caerffili.gov.uk

For all enquiries relating to this agenda please contact Cath Forbes-Thompson
(Tel: 01443 864279   Email: forbecl@caerphilly.gov.uk)

Date: 19th July 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

A meeting of the **Scrutiny Leadership Group** will be held in the **Ebbw Room, Penallta House, Tredomen Park, Ystrad Mynach** on **Thursday, 27th July, 2017** at **5.00 pm** to consider the matters contained in the following agenda.

Yours faithfully,

Chris Burns

Chris Burns
INTERIM CHIEF EXECUTIVE

A G E N D A

Pages

1   To receive apologies for absence.

2   Declarations of Interest.

Councillors and Officers are reminded of their personal responsibility to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interest(s) in respect of any item of business on this agenda in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000, the Council's Constitution, and the Code of Conduct for both Councillors and Officers.

To approve and sign the following minutes: -

A greener place   Man gwyrddach

Correspondence may be in any language or format | Gallwch ohebu mewn unrhyw iaith neu fformat

Circulation:
Councillors L.J. Binding, W. David, D.T. Davies, Mrs C. Forehead, Ms J. Gale, C.P. Mann, Mrs G.D. Oliver, Mrs D. Price, J. Pritchard and Mrs M.E. Sargent

For Information:
Councillor Mrs B. Jones

And Appropriate Officers

SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP GROUP

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, YSTRAD MYNACH
ON THURSDAY 26TH JANUARY 2017 AT 5.00 P.M.**

PRESENT:

Councillor G. Kirby – Vice Chair (Presiding)

Councillors:

L. Ackerman, Mrs P. Cook, W. David and C. Mann.

Together with:

C. Forbes-Thompson (Interim Head of Democratic Services), G. Williams (Interim Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer and E. Sullivan (Scrutiny Officer)

CHAIRS' ANNOUNCEMENT

It was noted that an apology of absence had been received from Councillor S. Morgan (Chair), in his absence Councillor G. Kirby took the Chair.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs E.M. Aldworth, D.T. Davies, S. Morgan, J. Pritchard and D. Rees

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received at the commencement or during the course of the meeting.

3. MINUTES – 27TH OCTOBER 2017

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Scrutiny Leadership Group meeting held on 27th October 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Consideration was given to the following reports.

4. SCRUTINY REVIEW: SCRUTINY SELF EVALUATION AND PEER REVIEW

Mrs C. Forbes-Thompson summarised the report which detailed the outcome of the scrutiny self-evaluation and the arrangements for the planned peer review.

Members were advised that the evaluation questionnaire had been sent out to all Members and Senior Officers and the questions contained therein had been based on the Outcomes and Characteristics of Effective Scrutiny. The Officer referred to section 4.3 of the report which detailed a breakdown of the responses received and noted that an overall response of 35% had been achieved amongst scrutiny members, with the majority responding in the Agree or Strongly Agree categories. The questionnaire also allowed respondents to give comments at the end of each section and all comments received had been listed within the report.

In terms of the Peer Review, Mrs Forbes-Thompson outlined the arrangements to date and confirmed that Councillors at Newport and Monmouth Council had agreed to take part in a reciprocal peer evaluation. The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) have also agreed to assist each group to carry out the observations and Wales Audit Office (WAO) will provide a briefing for the peer group members but would not take part. The Officer circulated a series of dates and scrutiny meetings within the various authorities that would be suitable for observation and asked that Members identify any available dates so that she could take arrangements forward.

The Chair thanked the Officer for her report and Members questions were welcomed.

Members expressed concern at the relatively low response rate and were advised that the majority of questionnaires achieved only a 20%-25% response rate, so the 35% achieve here was above average. Mrs Forbes-Thompson confirmed that there was still an opportunity to recirculate the questionnaire if Members thought this would be worthwhile. The Leadership Group confirmed that they would like to see it recirculated to see if a higher response rate could be achieved.

Reference was made to the comment at paragraph 4.9 of report and which stated that Councillors lacked awareness of back office work and queried how this could be improved. Mrs Forbes-Thompson confirmed that structure charts were currently being complied in readiness for the forthcoming induction programme, which would illustrate the service area structure from the head of service downwards. These charts would include photographs and areas of responsibility and should assist Councillors understanding of what happens within each directorate and should be fully completed by May.

Members expressed concern and frustration at the number of 'Don't Know' responses received and Mrs Forbes-Thompson confirmed that during the final evaluation process these would be analysed further with a view to taking them forward as part of the annual training programme following the election. It is intended that these sessions would be utilised as a 'back to basics' primarily targeted at newly elected Councillors, ensuring that going forward there is an overall understanding of how scrutiny operates.

Task and Finish Groups were discussed at length in light of the comment at 4.6 of the report and Members agreed that these groups were a very valid and worthwhile process providing tangible outcomes and a greater understanding of issues under review. It was noted that Mrs Emma Sullivan had moved over into an interim scrutiny role and would be assisting Task and Finish Groups. Attendance levels on Task and Finish Groups was discussed and the Leadership Group agreed that membership opportunities on Task and Finish Groups should be opened up to all Councillors rather than just those on the reviewing committee and that this should be included within the evaluation review.

> RESOLVED that the self evaluation responses and arrangements for the peer review be noted and the comments of the Scrutiny Leadership Group be incorporated into the final review report.

5. **WORKSHOP: SCRUTINY REPORTS QUALITY REVIEW**

Mrs Forbes-Thompson circulated a copy of a recent scrutiny report together with a summary worksheet on the reports constituent parts for Members analysis and comment. Members were asked to review the various sections of the report in terms of its clarity, understand-ability, information content and relevance to the topic under scrutiny.

Having read through the report Members agreed that it was well written, covered the subject well with clear recommendations but felt that the initial summary of the report was overly long and there did seem to be a degree of repetition between the summary and the main body of the report. Members agreed that the Wellbeing of Future Generations section of the report was well thought out and nicely drew together how the subject contributed to each of the wellbeing goals. It was agreed that this was an excellent example of how the new legislation was being imbedded into working practices.

The content was detailed enough to allow thorough scrutiny of the subject, opening up opportunities for questioning and there were no irrelevant details. Appendices were relevant to the report and provided useful supporting information and graphically data easily referenced from the body of the report.

Having fully considered the content against the analysis criteria, Members congratulated the author on a well written and interesting report and it was moved and seconded that a further quality review be conducted in six months and by show of hands this was unanimously agreed.

> RESOLVED that a further quality review be conducted in six months.

The meeting closed at 6.20 p.m.

Approved as a correct record and subject to any amendments or corrections agreed and recorded in the minutes of the meeting held on 27th April 2017 they were signed by the Chair.

_____
CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP GROUP – 27TH JULY 2017

SUBJECT: SCRUTINY TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

REPORT BY: ACTING HEAD OF CORPORATE SERVICES AND SECTION 151
             OFFICER

---

1.   **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1   The report outlines scrutiny training practice at Caerphilly County Borough Council and
      presents various options for future scrutiny training delivery following the Local Government
      Election 2017.

2.   **SUMMARY**

2.1   The Wales Audit Office (WAO) in its 'Good Scrutiny? Good Question?' improvement study in
      May 2014 recognised the importance of providing training and support to Councillors in their
      recommendation R2 to 'ensure that scrutiny members and specifically scrutiny chairs, receive
      training and support to fully equip them with the skills required to undertake effective scrutiny'
      and placed the onus for this provision on Councils, Welsh Government and Welsh Local
      Government Association as responsible partners. This report outlines the training provided to
      Councillors to support their role as scrutineers and presents some preliminary training options
      for returning Members continued personnel development together with introductory level
      sessions for newly elected Members taking on the scrutiny role for the first time.

3.   **LINKS TO STRATEGY**

3.1   Member training and development is required by the Local Government Act 2000, Local
      Government Measure (Wales) 2011 and Caerphilly County Borough Council Member
      Development Strategy 2015/18. By ensuring that decision makers are held to account the
      scrutiny function is vital to good government, assisting in the development and improvement
      of the Council's policies and services. Scrutiny training will therefore contribute to the
      following Well-being Goals within the Wellbeing of Future Generation Act (Wales) 2016 as it
      prepares Councillors for their role as scrutineers where they will be called upon to make
      recommendations that impact on future generations:

      A prosperous Wales
      A resilient Wales
      A healthier Wales
      A more equal Wales
      A Wales of cohesive communities
      A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language
      A globally responsible Wales

4.   THE REPORT

4.1   Caerphilly already has a well-established and extensive programme of Member Support and Development which was further enhanced as part of the Scrutiny Improvement Action Plan and Member Development Protocol. The Scrutiny Improvement Action Plan recommended certain training for Scrutiny Committee Members to improve the critical friend challenge and impact of scrutiny and the Member Development Protocol recommended a programme of mandatory, recommended and requested training for all Members.

4.2   During November 2013 through to March 2014 a series of specifically tailored scrutiny training sessions were held aimed at developing questioning and listening skills, the effectiveness of pre-meetings and chairing skills. The target attendance levels for the sessions were set at 90% for the first two modules and 100% for the chairing skills module and these were achieved by offering additional opportunities following on from the original roll-out. The overall feedback on the facilitator Mr D. McGrath of LinkUk Limited was extremely positive with between 89%-100% of Members that attended the training rating it as very useful to their role.

4.3   Comments arising from the feedback workshops on scrutiny development identified areas of training that Members felt required further consideration and these included the need for Cabinet Members to receive training on their role in scrutiny, more strategically focused training on public speaking and finance training. It is worth noting that Public Speaking (4th April 2016), Roles and Responsibilities of Cabinet Members (30th March 2015), Listening and Question Skills for Cabinet Members (7th July 2016) and Finance (16th May 2016) training modules were delivered during 2015/16.

4.4   The Member Development Protocol which was agreed by Council on the 22nd of April 2014 has been in place for last three years and implemented a programme of mandatory, recommended and requested training (based on Members Training Analysis questionnaire). The programme has been well supported by Members with regular updates on its progress presented to the Democratic Services Committee. The annual refresher training sessions have assisted new scrutiny committee Members appointed at the AGM to understand their committee's terms of reference and have been accompanied by 6 monthly update training sessions, that have ensure that Members are kept up to date on any relevant legislative changes, such as the recent training on the implications for scrutiny of the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act.

4.5   The Senior Councillor Development Programme was piloted during 2015/16 was also well received by Councillors and following a submission to the WLGA received a Good Practice and Innovation Award. The programme sought to enhance Members skills at a strategic level embedding a variety of competencies that would be transferable to and be of benefit for those in or aspiring to senior office or wishing to undertake a more prominent scrutiny role.

4.6   Looking forward to post Local Government Elections the Members Induction Programme will start the development and support process with a series of all Member Seminars (some of which will be mandatory) and 'introduction to' committee sessions, which will be held an hour before the formal scrutiny committee meeting. These sessions will be delivered at a basic level in order to accommodate newly elected Members taking on the scrutiny role for the first time.

Depending on the feedback from the induction 'introduction to' sessions should Councillors identify any specific areas of scrutiny they would like further training to concentrate on, there will be an opportunity to incorporate these topics into the forthcoming training needs analysis questionnaire which can be rolled out with a focus on the role of overview and scrutiny.

After induction the aforementioned training needs questionnaire will be compiled within which, for the first time, we now hope to include a section that will give Members the opportunity to identify any key skills or competencies they already possess or any specific areas they would like to develop. This skills baseline audit will allow us to improve Member support and enable us to appropriately highlight development opportunities as they come forward and we would

welcome the Scrutiny Leadership's comments on this new approach. As in previous years, the questionnaire will ask Members to choose from a variety of training module topics which will be then be prioritised so that a responsive schedule of training can be devised. Councillors will also be asked to identify their preferred start times for meetings and training and offered a choice of delivery methods (facilitator, seminar and e-learning or distance learning options).

At this time we envisage that Chairing Skills at an introductory and advanced level will be offered using both facilitator and e-learning resources with the advanced level training specifically targeted to scrutiny chairs and vice-chairs. Questioning and listening skills and holding effective pre-meetings will also be included as an option and again this training will be specifically targeted at scrutiny committee Members. In this way we hope to ensure that scrutiny have received all the training they require in order to maintain the quality achieved through the Scrutiny Improvement Plan continues going forward.

4.7   We are also mindful that the Welsh Government's White Paper 'Reforming Local Government: Resilient and Renewed' will have major implications in terms of regional working and the governance mechanisms required to underpin them. The Councillor role will be at the centre of this new decision making process in terms of accountability and scrutiny and we fully appreciate that additional training will be required and will need to be specifically tailored to assist Members with regional functions.

5.   WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS

5.1   This report contributes to the Well-being Goals as set out in Links to Strategy above. It is consistent with the five ways of working as defined within the sustainable development principle in the Act in that the training of scrutiny committee Members better prepares them in their role as scrutineers, to hold decision makers to account and by acting as a critical friend ensure that the economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing of the community is recognised and the long term outcomes of a decision and its positive or negative impacts on future generations, long term community resilience and economic, environmental and social capital are considered.

6.   EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

6.1   This report is for information purposes only, so the Council's full Equalities Impact Assessment process does not need to be applied.

7.   FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1   There are no financial implications as a result of this report.

8.   PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

8.1   There are no personnel implications as a result of this report.

9.   CONSULTATIONS

9.1   There are no consultations that have not been included in the report

10.   RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1   The Scrutiny Leadership Group note the content of the report and provide comments on the proposal to include a Councillor skills audit within the next training needs analysis questionnaire.

11.   REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1   To inform the Scrutiny Leadership Group on past and future scrutiny training and development opportunities.

12.   STATUTORY POWER

12.1   Local Government Act 2000, Local Government Measure (Wales) 2011 and Caerphilly County Borough Council Member Development Strategy 2015/18.

Author: Emma Sullivan, Interim Scrutiny Officer (sullie@caerphilly.gov.uk)
Consultees: C. Forbes-Thompson (Interim Head of Democratic Services)
               G. Williams (Interim Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer)
               N. Scammell (Interim Head of Corporate Services and Section 151 Officer)

Background Papers:
Scrutiny Improvement Action Plan – Member Training (Democratic Services Committee –
13th April 2014)
Member Training and Support Programme (Democratic Services Committee – 21st September 2016)

SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP GROUP – 27TH JULY 2017

SUBJECT: SCRUTINY REVIEW: SCRUTINY SELF EVALUATION AND PEER REVIEW

REPORT BY: ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES AND SECTION 151 OFFICER

---

1.   PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1   For Scrutiny Leadership Group to be informed of the outcome of the self-evaluation and arrangements for the planned peer review prior to this being reported to Council.

2.   SUMMARY

2.1   This report sets out the outcome of the scrutiny self-evaluation and the peer review as discussed by Scrutiny Leadership Group Council on 27th October 2016. Scrutiny Leadership Group is asked to comment on the outcome.

3.   LINKS TO STRATEGY

3.1   The operation of scrutiny is required by the Local Government Act 2000 and subsequent Assembly legislation.

3.2   The self-evaluation proposals contribute to the following Well-being Goals within the Well-being of Future Generations Act (Wales) 2016 by ensuring that scrutiny function evaluates its effectiveness and identifies areas for improvement. An effective scrutiny function can ensure that council policies are scrutinised against the following goals:

•   A prosperous Wales
•   A resilient Wales
•   A healthier Wales
•   A more equal Wales
•   A Wales of cohesive communities
•   A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language
•   A globally responsible Wales

4.   THE REPORT

SELF-EVALUATION

4.1   The Scrutiny Review agreed by full Council on the 5th October 2015 included a recommendation to carry out a self-evaluation 12 months after the changes had been agreed.

4.2   Scrutiny Leadership Group considered the methodology for a self-evaluation of the scrutiny function and agreed to measure the effectiveness of scrutiny against an established set of characteristics for good scrutiny. These Outcomes and Characteristics of Effective Scrutiny in

Local Government had previously been endorsed by full Council in October 2013, as its strategic vision for a scrutiny function. Therefore these characteristics were used as a basis for the questionnaire.

4.3 The questionnaire was issued to all 73 Members and senior officers. In January 2017 the response rate for members was 38% with a total of 28 responses received. Scrutiny Leadership Group considered the responses and asked that the questionnaire be circulated again to Members to encourage more responses. This resulted in one additional response from a scrutiny member and gave an overall Member response rate of 39.7% with a total of 29 responses. The following table gives a breakdown of total responses received:

Respondent	Responses	Percentage of overall responses
Scrutiny Member	24	36%
Cabinet Member	2	3%
Non-scrutiny member	3	5%
Officers (105)	36	55%
Not indicated	1	1%
Total	**66**	**100%**

4.4 The questionnaire was made up of three sections, Scrutiny Environment; Scrutiny Practice and Impact of Scrutiny. Each section set out a series of statements and asked respondents to indicate if they 'Strongly Disagreed' 'Disagreed' 'Agreed' 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Don't Know', however not all respondents answered every question. There was also the opportunity to give comments at the end of each section. In some instances there were some incomplete responses to the questions, therefore not all sections add up to 100%.

4.5 Attached at appendix 1 is a breakdown of the responses from all Members and highlighted below are some key points:

Scrutiny Environment

- 82.5% considered that scrutiny has a clearly defined and valued role in the council's improvement arrangements and has the dedicate officer support it needs.
- Almost 90% of Members agreed that they have the training and development opportunities they need to undertake their role effectively.
- 72% felt that the Executive and CMT recognise scrutiny as an important council mechanism for community engagement.

Scrutiny Practice

- 69% considered that task and finish groups are non-political but 24% disagreed, however 79% felt they were methodologically sound as opposed to 14% who disagreed.
- 83% agree that forward work programmes are member-led and scrutiny committees have ownership with 14% disagreeing.
- 80% consider that stakeholders have the ability to contribute to the development and delivery of scrutiny forward work programmes. 7% disagreed with 14% responding with 'don't know'.
- 86% consider that scrutiny meetings are well planned and 76% consider them to be chaired effectively.
- 45% consider that scrutiny operates non-politically, however 48% disagreed with this statement.
- 76% consider that scrutiny deals effectively with, sensitive political issues, tension and conflict. However 17% disagreed.
- In terms of scrutiny building trust and good relationships with stakeholders, 76% of Members agreed with this statement for internal stakeholders (17% disagreed) and 69% agreed for external stakeholders,(24% disagreed).

Impact of Scrutiny

- 76% agreed that scrutiny regularly engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers, with 72% agreeing in terms of challenging service providers.
- 69% consider that scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems. However 21% disagreed with this statement.
- 72% agreed that non-executive members provide an evidence based check and balance to Executive decision making, with 21% disagreeing.
- 66% agreed that decision makers give public account for themselves at scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities. However 28% disagreed with this statement.
- 69% considered that scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes, with 24% disagreeing.

PEER REVIEW

4.6   Arrangements for a peer review were made with Members at Newport City Council and Monmouthshire County Council and to take part in reciprocal peer evaluations. The WLGA agreed to assist each group to carry out the observations

4.7   WAO provided a briefing for peer group members that took place at Penallta House where Members were briefed on the good practice identified during the National WAO Scrutiny Study and the WAO report 'Good Scrutiny? Good Question.' The WAO identified some of the practice across Wales which could be useful during the peer observations.

- Recognising the value and status of scrutiny has been mixed across Wales.
- Cabinet Members being held to account at scrutiny committee meetings.
- Officer support, what is the culture of wider officer support and quality of information.
- Recognising the role of Co-opted Members, are they used effectively?
- Good planning focussed work programme that is aligned to Cabinet work programme and improvement agenda.
- Effective use of pre-meetings, not too many items, Members are prepared.
- Impact of Scrutiny, understanding of the role and purpose.
- Quality of information from officers to enable scrutiny to be engaged, options, costs, involvement of stakeholders. Performance information analysis to include previous years data and comparisons.
- Effective chairing, to ensure questions are focussed and on topic, summarise at the end and establish next steps.
- Good questioning, thematic, challenging and focussed with follow up supplementary questions.
- Accessibility and public engagement - are the basics in place such as introductions and nameplates.
- How easy is it for the public to become involved, access to work programmes? What public involvement is there for service change proposals, has there been adequate consultation.

4.8   The peer observations took place between February and April 2017. The following committees were observed:

- Policy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 28th February 2017.
- Health Social Care and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee on 21st March 2017.

4.9   The peer observers were provided with observation sheets based on the Outcomes and Characteristics of Effective Scrutiny. The observation sheets included statements under scrutiny environment, scrutiny practice and the impact of scrutiny. The assessments were as follows:

Scrutiny Environment	P & R	HSCWB
Scrutiny has a clearly defined and valued role in the council's improvement arrangements (based upon the observation of this meeting)	Agreed	Agreed
Scrutiny has the dedicated support it needs from officers (based upon the observation of this meeting)	Strongly Agreed	Strongly Agreed
Scrutiny members appear to have effective training and development opportunities, evidenced through their questioning, listening and analysis skills and understanding of the subject under scrutiny	Agreed	Agreed
Conclusion	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement.	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement.
Scrutiny Practice		
Scrutiny takes into account the views of the public, partners and regulators, balancing the prioritisation of community concerns against issues of strategic risk/importance	Agreed	Don't Know
Overview and scrutiny meetings, activities and work programmes are well-planned (based on observation of this meeting)	Strongly Agreed	Don't Know
Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are chaired effectively	Strongly Agreed	Agreed
Overview and scrutiny meetings demonstrate through their activities the best use of the resources available	Don't Know	Disagreed
Scrutiny operates non-politically and deals effectively with sensitive political issues, tension and conflict	Strongly Agreed	Agreed
Scrutiny builds trust and good relationships with a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders (based on observation of this meeting)	Strongly Agreed	Don't Know
Conclusion	Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement
Impact of Scrutiny		
Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers (based on observation of this meeting)	Agreed	Disagreed
Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of service providers (based on observation of this meeting)	Agreed	Strongly Agreed
Scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems (based on observation of this meeting)	Don't Know	Don't Know
Non-executive members provide an evidence based check and balance to Executive decision making.	Agreed	Agreed
Decision makers give public account for themselves at scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities.	Strongly Agreed	Agreed
Overview and scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes.	Agreed	Don't Know
Conclusion	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement

4.10 The detailed observation sheets are attached at appendix 2 and 3, which gives further detail and clarification for the above responses. The main areas for consideration by Scrutiny Leadership Group are as follows:

Policy and Resources Scrutiny Committee

Statement	Extract of Peer Comments
Scrutiny has a clearly defined and valued role in the council's improvement arrangements (based upon the observation of this meeting)	'The Cabinet Members' apparent commitment to and relationship with scrutiny was observed by the peer team, however, the peer team noted that the Cabinet Members were in attendance throughout the meeting (at least the parts of the meeting observed by the peer team) and wondered whether it would provide clearer 'demarcation' of responsibilities if they attended only for their specific items (although the peer team understood that cabinet members also wanted to remain for the presentation from BT).'
Scrutiny has the dedicated support it needs from officers (based upon the observation of this meeting)	'Several senior officers were in attendance at the committee meeting, which presumably is a customary approach, though it was noticeable that Cabinet Members answered most of the committee's questions, with officers providing only technical clarifications; the peer team regarded this as a positive approach as it showed clear political leadership.'
Scrutiny members appear to have effective training and development opportunities, evidenced through their questioning, listening and analysis skills and understanding of the subject under scrutiny	'The peer team noted that some members were more involved than others during the meeting; this might be due to different levels of confidence or engagement or whether this was due to the wide policy breadth covered by the committee and that members may have different interests and specialisms, which might not have been applicable or relevant to the specific housing matters under consideration at this meeting.'
Overview and scrutiny meetings demonstrate through their activities the best use of the resources available	'Some peer members questioned why some senior officers attended throughout the meeting, despite only having limited agenda items, but on balance it was felt that they may have benefited from observing the debate and views of members.'

Health Social Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee

Statement	Peer Comments
Scrutiny members appear to have effective training and development opportunities, evidenced through their questioning, listening and analysis skills and understanding of the subject under scrutiny	Some evidence was seen of members asking relevant and constructive questions. In some cases it was not always clear what the purpose of asking the questions was and sometimes comments were made rather than asking questions.
Scrutiny takes into account the views of the public, partners and regulators, balancing the prioritisation of community concerns against issues of strategic risk/importance	This was not observed at the meeting. It was interesting to have young people presenting. Although the committee did not appear to respond to their requests for feedback. In

	other meetings, there might be opportunities to question the Health Board.
Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are chaired effectively	The chair conducted a pre meeting, made people feel welcome, introduced those present and effectively summarised contributions. However no evidence was seen at this meeting of the chair clarifying the purpose of agenda items and encouraging the committee to achieve outcomes.
Overview and scrutiny meetings demonstrate through their activities the best use of the resources available	The observers noted that time was wasted, particularly officer time, they could have attended for their agenda items only. Opportunities to make recommendations and challenge witnesses were also not taken.
Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers (based on observation of this meeting)	There was no evidence of questioning or challenge of Cabinet members at this meeting although opportunities were available.

5. WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS

5.1   This report contributes to the well-being goals as set out in links to strategy above. It is consistent with the five ways of working as defined within the sustainable development principle in that by carrying out a self-evaluation and taking part in a peer observation the scrutiny function will be better able to identify areas for improvement. This should ensure that the scrutiny function is more effective when reviewing services and policies and ensure it considers the wellbeing goals.

6. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

6.1   This scrutiny self-evaluation included questions on involving a wide range of evidence and perspectives, building trust and good relationships with a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders. This sits alongside protocol and guidance on expert witnesses and task and finish group guidance. The aim was to evaluate the scrutiny function and any further areas for improvement.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1   There are no financial implications that are not contained in the report.

8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

8.1   There are no personnel implications that are not contained in the report.

9. CONSULTATIONS

9.1   There are no consultation responses not contained in the report.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1   Scrutiny Leadership comment on the outcome of the self-evaluation and peer review and consider if there are any further changes to scrutiny to be recommended to Council.

11. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 To ensure that the changes as a result of the scrutiny review are evaluated and identify if any further improvements are necessary.

12. STATUTORY POWER

12.1 Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000.

12.2 Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011.

Author: Catherine Forbes-Thompson, Interim Head of Democratic Services
Consultees: Chris Burns, Interim Chief Executive
                Nicole Scammell Acting Director Corporate Services and Section 151 Officer
                Gail Williams, Interim Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer

Background Papers:
Scrutiny Review Council 5th October 2015
Scrutiny Improvement Action Plan Council 8th October 2013
Good Scrutiny? Good Question! - Auditor General for Wales Improvement Study: Scrutiny in Local Government – 29th May 2014

Appendices:
Appendix 1   Scrutiny Self-Evaluation 2016/17 – Member Responses
Appendix 2   Policy and Resources Scrutiny Committee Peer Observation
Appendix 2   Health Social Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee Peer Observation

This page is intentionally left blank

There were 29 responses from Members to Scrutiny self-evaluation survey. Each statement had 5 response options and detailed below are the number of responses per option alongside the percentage in brackets.

Scrutiny Environment

1. Scrutiny has a clearly defined role in the council's improvement arrangements.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	3 (10.34%)	11 (37.93%)	13 (44.82%)	1 (3.44%)	0

2. Scrutiny has a valued role in the council's improvement arrangements.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	3 (10.34%)	10 (34.48%)	14 (48.27%)	1(3.44%)	0

3. Scrutiny has the dedicated officer support it needs from officers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	4 (13.79%)	13 (44.82%)	11 (37.93%)	0	0

4. Scrutiny members have the training and development opportunities they need to undertake their role effectively..

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	2 (6.89%)	18 (62.06%)	8 (27.58%)	0	0

5. Scrutiny is recognised by the Executive and Corporate Management team as an important council mechanism for community engagement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	4 (13.79%)	12 (41.37%)	9 (31.03%)	2 (6.89%)	1(3.44%)

Comments:

'I feel we need another scrutiny officer so we can do more task and finish'

'Councillors are not elected to be scrutineers or part of a mechanism for 'community engagement'. They are elected to be decision makers at Council and its Committees. In my view the Cabinet and CMT system does not work for the Council, its employees or the public.'

Scrutiny Practice

6. Scrutiny inquiries (Task & Finish Group) are non-political.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
2 (6.89%)	5 (17.24%)	14 (48.27%)	6 (20.68%)	2 (6.89%)	0

7. Scrutiny inquiries (Task & Finish Group) are methodologically sound

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	3 (10.34%)	17 (58.62%)	6 (20.68%)	2 (6.89%)	0

8. Scrutiny inquiries (Task & Finish Group) incorporate a wide range of evidence and perspectives.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	3 (10.34%)	13 (44.82%)	9 (31.03%)	2 (6.89%)	1 (3.44%)

7. Scrutiny is member-led and has `ownership` of its work programme

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	3 (10.34%)	13 (44.82%)	11 (37.93%)	1 (3.44%)	0

8. Scrutiny takes into account the views of the public, partners and regulators, whilst balancing between prioritising community concerns against issues of strategic risk and importance.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	6 (20.68%)	8 (27.58%)	12 (41.37%)	3 (10.34%)	0

9. Stakeholders have the ability to contribute to the development and delivery of scrutiny forward work programmes.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	2 (6.89%)	15 (51.72%)	8 (27.58%)	4 (13.79%)	0

10. Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are well-planned

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	3 (10.34%)	15 (51.72%)	10 (34.48%)	1 (3.44%)	0

11. Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are chaired effectively

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
3 (10.34%)	3 (10.34%)	16 (5.17%)	6 (20.68%)	1 (3.44%)	0

12. Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities make best use of the resources available to it.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1(3.44%)	1(3.44%)	19 (65.51%)	7 (24.13%)	1 (3.44%)	0

13. Scrutiny is characterised by effective communication to raise awareness of, and encourage participation in democratic accountability.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	4 (13.79%)	15 (51.72%)	7 (24.13%)	2 (6.89%)	1 (3.44%)

14. Scrutiny operates non-politically

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
3 (10.34%)	11 (37.93%)	7 (24.13%)	6 (20.68%)	2 (6.89%)	0

15. Scrutiny deals effectively with sensitive political issues, tension and conflict

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
2 (6.89%)	3 (10.34%)	15 (51.72%)	7 (24.13%)	1(3.44%)	0

16. Scrutiny builds trust and good relationships with a wide variety of internal stakeholders.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	5 (17.24%)	14 (48.27%)	8 (27.58%)	2 (6.89%)	0

17. Scrutiny builds trust and good relationships with a wide variety of external stakeholders.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	7 (24.13%)	13 (44.82%)	7 (24.13%)	2 (6.89%)	0

Comments:

'It still seems hard to get general public to engage in the scrutiny process.'

'With apparently over 500 services and 9600 staff, with an overall budget of £600million, Councillors are in the dark as the work undertaken in the 'back offices' of the council, Cabinet Members seem not to be in charge of their portfolios. Scrutiny should meet in the daytime, take longer if necessary, should involve much more of the public and less reports and, more practical visits to see for themselves the work that is done.'

Impact of Scrutiny

17. Scrutiny regularly engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1(3.44%)	4(13.79%)	15(51.72%)	7(24.13%)	1(3.44%)	1(3.44%)

18. Scrutiny regularly engages in evidence based challenge of service providers

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
0	5 (17.24%)	14 (48.27%)	7 (24.13%)	2 (6.89%)	1 (3.44%)

19. Scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
1 (3.44%)	5 (17.24%)	12 (41.37%)	8 (27.58%)	2 (6.89%)	1 (3.44%)

15. Non-executive members provide an evidence based check and balance to Executive decision making.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
2 (6.89%)	4 (13.79%)	15 (51.72%)	6 (20.68%)	1 (3.44%)	1 (3.44%)

16. Decision makers give public account for themselves at scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
3 (10.34%)	5 (17.24%)	10 (34.48%)	9 (31.03%)	1 (3.44%)	1 (3.44%)

17. Overview and scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	No response
2 (6.89%)	5 (17.24%)	14 (48.27%)	6 (20.68%)	1 (3.44%)	1 (3.44%)

Comments:

'Really difficult to get people involved'

'One cannot blame the staff it is the system that is at fault'

'Because we have pre-decision scrutiny it does not always affect cabinet decisions but cabinet always takes the views of scrutiny on board.'

Scrutiny Peer Review 2017				APPENDIX 2
Local Authority Caerphilly			**Meeting of Policy and Resources Scrutiny Committee 28th February 2017**	
Peer Observers Newport and Monmouthshire County Council Facilitated by WLGA				

A. Scrutiny Environment				
1. Scrutiny has a clearly defined and valued role in the council's improvement arrangements (based upon the observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know

Comments

It was difficult to assess the role of scrutiny in the council's 'improvement arrangements' from observing part of a single meeting, however, the meeting gave the impression that scrutiny is valued within the governance arrangements of the authority. This was evidenced by the fact that attendance was high and 4 cabinet members, including 2 Deputy Leaders were in attendance, and engaged in open and constructive dialogue with the committee, responding positively to proposals from the committee to follow up on correspondence for example. The Cabinet Members' apparent commitment to and relationship with scrutiny was observed by the peer team, however, the peer team noted that the Cabinet Members were in attendance throughout the meeting (at least the parts of the meeting observed by the peer team) and wondered whether it would provide clearer 'demarcation' of responsibilities if they attended only for their specific items (although the peer team understood that cabinet members also wanted to remain for the presentation from BT)

2. Scrutiny has the dedicated support it needs from officers (based upon the observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know

Comments

Evidence of preparation and support was seen from scrutiny support officers at the meeting, this included advice to the chair at appropriate points during the meeting and the preparation of comprehensive reports in advance. Many members of the peer team had met or worked with Caerphilly's scrutiny officer previously and all were complimentary and held her in high regard. Several senior officers were in attendance at the committee meeting, which presumably is a customary approach, though it was noticeable that Cabinet Members answered most of the committee's questions, with officers providing only technical clarifications; the peer team regarded this as a positive approach as it showed clear political leadership.

3. Scrutiny members appear to have effective training and development opportunities, evidenced through their questioning, listening and analysis skills and understanding of the subject under scrutiny				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know

Comments

It *appeared* that members have received 'effective training and development' given the effective approach undertaken during the meeting. Questions were varied, well balanced and some were obviously well researched beforehand. Members were proactive in their approach to business, including using the meeting as an opportunity to shape future business with an ad hoc proposal to add to the forward work programme. The peer team noted that some members were more involved than others during the meeting; this might be due to different levels of confidence or engagement or whether this was due to the wide policy breadth covered by the committee and that members may have different interests and specialisms, which might not have been applicable or relevant to the specific housing matters under consideration at this meeting.

Conclusion: please consider which of the following applies:				
Arrangements are hindering improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement	Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement

B. Scrutiny Practice				
1. Scrutiny takes into account the views of the public, partners and regulators, balancing the prioritisation of community concerns against issues of strategic risk/importance				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Agree**	Strongly Agree	Don't Know

Comments

This was evidenced at the meeting with the attendance and presentation from a group of tenants' representatives (although it was not clear how regular an occurrence this was). Members generally demonstrated good community knowledge, conveying community concerns and views about particular matters; it was noted that this was managed well and struck a healthy balance of providing a community perspective without appearing overly parochial.

2. Overview and scrutiny meetings, activities and work programmes are well-planned (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	**Strongly Agree**	Don't Know

Comments

Planning and preparation appeared to be very effective; the peer team observed part of the pre-meeting which was well-attended, appeared constructive and the questioning strategy well-managed by the chair; some members' had clearly researched some matters extensively, notably the questioning of the BT representative; and the proposal to amend the Forward Work Programme (as noted above) showed a clear approach to planning for the future. Members' questions appeared to be self-generated rather than 'scripted' by scrutiny officers. The layout of the committee room was noted as being conducive to constructive dialogue and was less adversarial than traditional layouts in council chambers for example.

3. Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are chaired effectively				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	**Strongly Agree**	Don't Know

Comments

The chair welcomed guests (including peer team and external witnesses), and had an assured, consensual, constructive approach to managing business. He was clear and firm when business needed to be moved on, when other members needed to be brought in or reminded to focus on the agenda and outcome required. He was also organised and rounded up discussions well, for example, reminding the Cabinet Member of the agreed action regarding the sending of a letter.

4. Overview and scrutiny meetings demonstrate through their activities the best use of the resources available				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	**Don't Know**

Comments

This was not immediately clear at the meeting; there were a number of 'For Information' reports and it was not explicitly clear why the BT item was on the agenda, although it produced an engaging discussion and was probably effective in terms of relationship management. Some peer members questioned why some senior officers attended throughout the meeting, despite only having limited agenda items, but on balance it was felt that they may have benefited from observing the debate and views of members.

5. Scrutiny operates non-politically and deals effectively with sensitive political issues, tension and conflict				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	**Strongly Agree**	Don't Know

Comments

The committee's business was discharged in a constructive manner; questions were appropriately challenging, but relations between the committee and Cabinet Members was courteous, constructive and respectful. Given the run-up to the elections and the likely political tensions emerging, this approach was commended by the peer team and one peer member noted 'it was difficult to see who belonged to which party'.

6. Scrutiny builds trust and good relationships with a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	**Strongly Agree**	Don't Know

Comments

A number of internal stakeholders (senior members and officers were in attendance) as well as external stakeholders at this meeting, including BT and a tenants group. All were made to feel welcome and questioning was constructive and challenging where necessary.

Conclusion: please consider which of the following applies:			
Arrangements are hindering improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement Monmouthshire County Council	**Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement**

C. Impact of Scrutiny				
1. Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Agree**	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
Scrutiny of Cabinet Members and senior officers was effective, with some challenging questions which demonstrated evidence and preparation, for example, a number of examples and issues were highlighted as part of the questions.				
2. Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of service providers (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Agree**	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
The scrutiny of the BT representative was similarly effective and appeared based on prior research and evidence from the communities. However, it is not clear how regularly other service providers, other than the council, attend scrutiny meetings.				
3. Scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	**Don't Know**
Comments				
This was not evidenced at the meeting.				
4. Non-executive members provide an evidence based check and balance to Executive decision making				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Agree**	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
Cabinet Members were scrutinised extensively during the meeting; interestingly the focus of questions largely related to the Cabinet Member 'Statements' which were circulated in advance and read out during the meeting rather than on the Committee's Reports which appeared to be largely 'For Information'. The peer team regarded the Cabinet Member statements as an interesting and effective approach to informing members of decisions and developments and encouraging challenge and scrutiny.				
5. Decision makers give public account for themselves at scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	**Strongly Agree**	Don't Know
Comments				
As noted above, 4 Cabinet Members were in attendance throughout, provided written and verbal updates to the Committee and were receptive to members' challenge and suggestions e.g. a suggestion for the cabinet to write to follow-up on a matter and were receptive to the suggested addition to the forward work programme which was viewed as mutually beneficial.				
6. Overview and scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Agree**	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
As noted above, the committee heard from a tenants' representative group and members raised issues of community concern throughout.				
Conclusion: please consider which of the following applies:				
Arrangements are hindering improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement	**Arrangements are positively supporting improvement**	Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement	

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Peer Review 2017	APPENDIX 3
Local Authority Caerphilly Review Team from Newport and Monmouthshire Facilitated by WLGA	Meeting of Health, Social Care and Wellbeing Committee

A. Scrutiny Environment				
1. Scrutiny has a clearly defined and valued role in the council's improvement arrangements (based upon the observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments Some evidence of this was seen with regard to the item on food safety, but the other items, on this occasion, did not provide evidence that Scrutiny had a clear and valued role in improvement arrangements. There was clearly a commitment from members to attend and mostly to participate in the meeting.				
2. Scrutiny has the dedicated support it needs from officers (based upon the observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments Much evidence of support was seen from both dedicated scrutiny support officers and other officers at a senior level both at the meeting and in the preparation of information for the committee.				
3. Scrutiny members appear to have effective training and development opportunities, evidenced through their questioning, listening and analysis skills and understanding of the subject under scrutiny				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments Some evidence was seen of members asking relevant and constructive questions. In some cases it was not always clear what the purpose of asking the questions was and sometimes comments were made rather than asking questions.				
Conclusion: please consider which of the following applies:				
Arrangements are hindering improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement	Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement	

B. Scrutiny Practice				
1. Scrutiny takes into account the views of the public, partners and regulators, balancing the prioritisation of community concerns against issues of strategic risk/importance				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
This was not observed at the meeting. It was interesting to have young people presenting. Although the committee did not appear to respond to their requests for feedback. In other meetings, there might be opportunities to question the Health Board.				
2. Overview and scrutiny meetings, activities and work programmes are well-planned (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
This was not evidenced at the meeting, it was not clear to the observers why items were on the agenda, some appeared to be for "consideration" without clear outcomes. No questioning strategy was evidenced.				
3. Overview and scrutiny meetings and activities are chaired effectively				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
The chair conducted a pre meeting, made people feel welcome, introduced those present and effectively summarised contributions. However no evidence was seen at this meeting of the chair clarifying the purpose of agenda items and encouraging the committee to achieve outcomes.				
4. Overview and scrutiny meetings demonstrate through their activities the best use of the resources available				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
The observers noted that time was wasted, particularly officer time, they could have attended for their agenda items only. Opportunities to make recommendations and challenge witnesses were also not taken.				
5. Scrutiny operates non-politically and deals effectively with sensitive political issues, tension and conflict				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
No evidence was seen of the committee acting politically.				
6. Scrutiny builds trust and good relationships with a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments				
There were no opportunities to see this at the meeting.				
Conclusion: please consider which of the following applies:				
Arrangements are hindering improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement	Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement	

C. Impact of Scrutiny				
1. Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of decision makers (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments There was no evidence of questioning or challenge of Cabinet members at this meeting although opportunities were available.				
2. Scrutiny engages in evidence based challenge of service providers (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments This was evidenced in the food standards agency audit.				
3. Scrutiny provides viable and well evidenced solutions to recognised problems (based on observation of this meeting)				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments This was not evidenced at the meeting.				
4. Non-executive members provide an evidence based check and balance to Executive decision making				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments Some questions were asked about policy throughout the meeting.				
5. Decision makers give public account for themselves at scrutiny committees for their portfolio responsibilities				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments Cabinet members provided a verbal update and were available for challenge although this opportunity was not taken on this occasion.				
6. Overview and scrutiny enables the 'voice' of local people and communities across the area to be heard as part of decision and policy-making processes				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Comments This was not evidenced at this meeting.				
Conclusion: please consider which of the following applies:				
Arrangements are hindering improvement	Arrangements are partly supporting improvement	Arrangements are positively supporting improvement	Arrangements are playing a significant role in supporting improvement	

This page is intentionally left blank