


### Scrutiny Committee Review 2020

This report was generated on 13/03/20. Overall, 58 respondents completed this questionnaire.


The report has been filtered to show the responses for 'All Respondents'.

The following charts are restricted to the top 12 codes. Lists are restricted to the most recent 100 rows.

#### Q1. From the options considered by Council in April 2019, do you agree or disagree that "to increase the number of scrutiny committees to 5" was the right option?




#### Q2. If you disagree, which of following options would you prefer?



#### Q2a. If you do not agree with any of the previous options what alternative do you want to suggest?

*I believe there should be a Community Engagement, Consultation Scrutiny Committee  
4 committees not necessarily in the grouping as listed above.*


**Q3. Moving forward, do you consider that the frequency of meetings should:**



**Q3a.**

1. With the option of special meetings if needed, already available I believe.
2. Would be good if we could explore options for members with childcare responsibilities.
3. Dependent on the number of Committees.
4. The frequency would obviously depend on the number of Committees.

**Q4. Moving forward, do you consider the scrutiny committee councillor membership should change:**



**Q4a. If you consider that the Scrutiny Committee membership of 16 Councillors should change, what do you consider appropriate?**

1. Too often down to 12 or less due to habitual non-attenders
2. Should be a nomination process where Cllr with knowledge & experience on a particular subject gets selected.
3. Again dependent on the number of Committees
4. It would depend on the number of Committees.
5. open to debate