

Scrutiny Self Evaluation Framework Scoring Matrix

Key Areas	Current Procedure (brief description + presentation for each column) (Score 5 high 1 low)	Scrutiny & Executive Member Involvement (Score 5 high 1 low)	SLT involvement (Score 5 high 1 low)	Strengths (Commentary)	Weaknesses (Commentary)	Overall score (out of 15)	Opportunities for improvement (to be completed by Members & Officers at the meeting)
1.Work Programming	<p>Work programming starts in Jan/Feb. Scrutiny Members provide Scrutiny Officer with issues. Council's Social Media canvass views of public. Issues brought to Members in Committee reports in March, following discussion with SDs and ADs.</p> <p><u>Score of current procedure:</u></p>	<p>Each Scrutiny Member is invited to contribute ideas. Response rate is a little over 50%</p> <p>Executive Members are not able to direct the work programmes of the Scrutiny Committees. On occasions the Executive have requested scrutiny members to review a strategically important issue such as Sickness management at the Council.</p> <p><u>Score Member Involvement:</u></p>	<p>SLT receive details of the ideas that Members have raised when the report is being drafted. Following Members decision at the 3 meetings in March the work programme items for each committee are shared with SLT to agree timings and commitments.</p> <p><u>Score of SLT Involvement:</u></p>	<p>There is a long lead-in time allowing Members, Officers and the Public opportunities to influence what is scrutinised.</p> <p>Suggested work programme items go through a vigorous selection process to agree items.</p> <p>The process is Member led with the final decision sitting with Committee Members to agree their own work programmes</p>	<p>There is a limit to the number of items that can effectively be addressed by the three Committees so choices have to be made regarding what stays on the work programme.</p> <p>It could be argued that prioritisation could be improved.</p> <p>Agreeing a work programme before a new municipal year with potentially new Members and Chairs on a committee ties the committee to the programme.</p> <p>Testing potential impact/benefits of a review</p>	<p><u>Score out of 15:</u></p>	
2.Scoping	<p>Each substantive review item has a scoping document drafted and presented to the Select Committee for consideration. At the work programming stage it is agreed which items require a scope. The scoping document includes what the issue is that Members wish to scrutinise, who to interview, what info to collect, which areas Members wish to take a lead on? Etc.</p> <p><u>Score of current procedure</u></p>	<p>Currently the Chair and Vice-Chair receive an early draft copy of the scoping document. Scrutiny Members are then invited to comment and change the scoping document at a committee meeting.</p> <p><u>Score Member Involvement:</u></p>	<p>SLT receive a copy of the draft scope written by the Scrutiny Officer. A meeting is convened or there are emails between the Scrutiny Officer/SD & ADs and the Chair & Vice-Chair. SLT provide comment on content.</p> <p><u>Score of SLT Involvement:</u></p>	<p>Scoping provides a focus for the review and establishes who to interview and which evidence to collect.</p> <p>The form provides a simple document for Members and officers to complete.</p>	<p>It is hard for Members to determine probable or possible outcomes from a review until the review is undertaken.</p> <p>Even though scoping establishes an outline of issues to investigate, evidence to obtain and a list of who to speak to, it is still possible for there to be "mission creep"</p>	<p><u>Score out of 15:</u></p>	

Key Areas	Current Procedure (brief description + presentation for each column) (Score 5 high 1 low)	Scrutiny & Executive Member Involvement (Score 5 high 1 low)	SLT involvement (Score 5 high 1 low)	Strengths (Commentary)	Weaknesses (Commentary)	Overall score (out of 15)	Opportunities for improvement (to be completed by Members & Officers at the meeting)
3.Evidence Gathering/site visit/interviews	<p>Depending on the review site visits are set up. Information is sought from ADs and lead officers as well as desk top research compiled by Members who agree to take lead roles and the Scrutiny Officer. Setting up of interviews and areas to invite lines of enquiry.</p> <p><u>Score of current procedure</u></p>	<p>Members are involved with preparing questions for witnesses, attending site visits and undertaking their own desk top research using the internet and talking to resident and community groups to gather information.</p> <p><u>Score Member Involvement:</u></p>	<p>ADs and Lead Officers take a lead on site visits and in providing evidence that Members have requested.</p> <p><u>Score of SLT Involvement:</u></p>	<p>Members who carry out their own desk top research and evidence gathering is a very welcome development over the last few years as it adds independence to the process.</p> <p>Interviews –Questioning skills</p> <p>Site visits -</p>	<p>The decision making about what information /evidence/questions to ask etc. has an impact on what evidence and ultimately what recommendations the Committee make. If a particular emphasis is taken with questioning then the outcomes may be less productive than they could be, i.e. closed questions with witnesses</p>	<p><u>Score out of 15:</u></p>	
4.Final reports & recommendations	<p>Nearing the end of the review the Scrutiny Officer drafts a report which is sent to the Chair & Vice-Chair as well as the lead officer/Assistant Director for comment.</p> <p>Once agreed the draft report goes to Committee for Members to comment on and then a final version is published.</p> <p><u>Score of current procedure</u></p>	<p>The Chair and Vice-Chair receive a copy of the first draft for comment prior to sending to the whole Committee.</p> <p>Scrutiny Members own this process and have an opportunity to agree, amend or add additional recommendations prior to the final report being published.</p> <p><u>Score Member Involvement:</u></p>	<p>SDs & ADs have an opportunity to amend the wording of reports and recommendations in consultation with the Chair's agreement. Ultimately the final word should be with the elected Member.</p> <p><u>Score of SLT Involvement:</u></p>	<p>The review process makes Members and officers focus on practical outcomes that the Executive need to consider.</p> <p>The report provides a clear narrative of the issues that Members considered and why they are making specific recommendations.</p>	<p>Similar to above if the emphasis and direction of questioning is focused on a particular issue then the recommendations can be slanted towards this view.</p> <p>On occasion reviews generate too many recommendations which can dilute the impact of the review, so splitting recommendations to high, medium and low priority or short or long term can help.</p> <p>Is it a top priority to consider for the Future Town Future Council corporate plan?</p>	<p><u>Score out of 15:</u></p>	
5.Monitoring outcomes	<p>As part of the monitoring of recommendations and agreed actions, reports are responded to within the Statutory deadline of two months from the publishing date. In addition Members agree a suitable period to bring matters back to Committee to monitor progress, this is normally</p>	<p>Executive Portfolio Holders and relevant officers receive a template document detailing the recommendations following the publishing of final reports.</p> <p><u>Score Member Involvement (both Scrutiny & Exec):</u></p>	<p>The relevant ADs and officers meet up with the Executive Portfolio Holder within the Statutory 2 month period to agree the response to the recommendations.</p> <p><u>Score of SLT Involvement:</u></p>	<p>Once reports and Recommendations are agreed a template document is used to circulate the recommendations to the relevant Executive Portfolio holder and ADs/Officers for response. This makes the lines of responsibility clear and also makes</p>	<p>Beyond the Statutory 2 months Executive response to reports and recommendations and the six month or yearly monitoring of reports there is no fixed way at present to continue monitoring review actions and outcomes.</p>	<p><u>Score out of 15:</u></p>	

Key Areas	Current Procedure (brief description + presentation for each column) (Score 5 high 1 low)	Scrutiny & Executive Member Involvement (Score 5 high 1 low)	SLT involvement (Score 5 high 1 low)	Strengths (Commentary)	Weaknesses (Commentary)	Overall score (out of 15)	Opportunities for improvement (to be completed by Members & Officers at the meeting)
	either six months or a year later. <u>Score of current procedure:</u>			sure that a response is received.			
6.Council Priority	Within the scoping process, Scrutiny Members are invited to reflect on the suitability of the subject matter being scrutinised and whether this fits with the Council's core priorities? <u>Score of current procedure:</u>	Scrutiny Members are invited to agree the work programme items through the process explained above, this provides adequate time to test the suitability of the issue and whether it links to the Council's priorities. <u>Score Member Involvement:</u>	SD & ADs are able to comment on the suitability of a work programme item when the work programme is being considered and also at an early stage in the scoping process. <u>Score of SLT Involvement:</u>	At its best Scrutiny brings a focus to important local matters that the Executive are not able to focus as much time and attention on, examples of this are the reviews into Damp, Mould and Condensation in Council Properties, Meetings with Rail Companies & Public Health discussions, Indoor Market, Sickness review are some recent examples.	Sometimes the choice of review items are not linked to the Council's direct priorities or services and sometimes are not linked with the Future Town Future Council priorities. However, this can also be argued that there are benefits to this e.g. looking at Rail, Bus users, Public Health etc. which are not council services but are important to local people.	<u>Score out of 15:</u>	