



INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT AND HEALTHCARE

Leeds City Council

Scrutiny Review

May 2009

AUDIT

Contents

1	Executive summary	2
2	Introduction	5
3	Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships	7
4	The vision and resources for scrutiny	11
5	Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles	13
6	Development of Scrutiny work programmes	16
7	Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards	18
8	Call-In arrangements	20
9	Service delivery, service improvements and added value of scrutiny	22
10	Policy development	24
11	Performance Management	26
	Appendix 1 – Recommendations and action plan	28

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any officer or Member acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. The Audit Commission has issued a document entitled *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies*. This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. We draw your attention to this document.

External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body's own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Adrian Lythgo, who is the engagement director to the Authority, telephone 0113 231 3054, email adrian.lythgo@kpmg.co.uk who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact Trevor Rees on 0161 246 4000, email trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk, who is the national contact partner for all of KPMG's work with the Audit Commission. After this, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access the Audit Commission's complaints procedure. Put your complaint in writing to the Complaints Team, Westward House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS34 8SU or by e mail to: complaints@audit-commission.gov.uk. Their telephone number is 0844 798 3131, textphone (minicom) 020 7630 0421.



1 Executive summary

1.1 Introduction

Scrutiny Boards are often referred to as the Council “watchdogs” by the press aiming to ensure that Council Tax payers get the best out of their public services. For Scrutiny Boards to provide this service they should have at least two components:

- Ongoing and retrospective consideration of decisions previously taken by the Executive; and
- Forward looking contributions to policy and improvement across the Council.

This review has focused on the ability for the Scrutiny function at Leeds City Council (LCC) to challenge the Council both in terms of ongoing and retrospective consideration of decisions and forward looking contributions to policy and improvement. We have also reviewed the scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards and the information available to Members of the Boards in carrying out their work and drawing their conclusions.

1.2 Key findings

We recognise that in light of the recent Corporate Assessment the Council has been in the process of continuing to strengthen its Scrutiny function and during our review we identified a number of aspects of good practice across the Council, such as:

- Professional relationships have been developed between the Scrutiny Board Chairs and the Principal Scrutiny Advisors;
- A wide range of training tools are used in providing training resources for Scrutiny Board Members;
- Personal development plans are available for all Members which assist in the identification of individual training needs; and
- Inquiry selection criteria forms are used to determine whether full scrutiny Inquiries items will be added to the work programme of the Scrutiny Boards.

Whilst the Council continues to develop its Scrutiny function further and reflect best practice it should ensure that the following areas are strengthened:

- An overall vision for the Scrutiny function should be developed, documented and published;
- The trust between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to be maintained and developed in order to reinforce the importance of joint working;
- The relationship between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to continue to develop and political views need to be kept separate from the Scrutiny function;
- There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide to not undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so as to prevent any misunderstandings arising;

1 Executive summary continued

- The Scrutiny Boards Procedure Rules Guidance Notes should be strengthened to incorporate that the Scrutiny Boards strive for enhanced lines of internal communication; add value to the Council through the Scrutiny reviews undertaken and incorporate innovation into the approach for challenging the way the Council operates;
- The process of selecting Scrutiny Chairs should be reviewed and a 'job specification' introduced;
- Scrutiny Boards should review whether co-opted Members should be invited to join in their Board;
- All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item so that Scrutiny Boards can scan the horizon to identify any emerging issues;
- The efficiency of Scrutiny Board meetings needs to be improved. To achieve this timed or single item agendas should be encouraged where appropriate and pre-meetings used more effectively;
- Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon;
- Reports of Members attendance at Scrutiny meetings should be made to each of the political groups. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political party to take appropriate action to address this;
- Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and highlight if they feel this should direct any area of their annual work programme;
- Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery; and
- The Scrutiny annual report should be strengthened to clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition its format should be standardised to clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings and to clearly display the outcomes of the previous years recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

1 Executive summary continued

1.3 Way forward

We will discuss the findings of the review with Officers and Members to agree an action plan to address the key issues going forward.

2 Introduction

2.1 Background

The current constitutions of Local Authorities give selected Councillors an important role in scrutinising the decisions of the Executive. The role of Scrutiny at LCC has evolved over the years and the Council now have established seven Scrutiny Boards whose responsibilities are to examine the decisions, policies and overall performance of the Council, making recommendations for improvement where necessary. The seven Scrutiny Boards cover:

- Adult Social Care;
- Central and Corporate Functions;
- Children’s Services;
- City and Regional Partnerships;
- City Development;
- Environment and Neighbourhoods; and
- Health.

The Scrutiny Boards are often referred to as the Council “watchdogs”, and are made up of Councillors from all political parties and some include Co-opted Members from outside the Council. Legislation requires that to ensure independence there are no Executive Members on any of the Scrutiny Boards.

2.2 Objectives and scope of our review

Our objective is to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in the improvement areas identified by the Corporate Assessment. We specifically focused upon:

- The scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards, their independence and the relationship with the Council’s leadership and the Executive Board;
- The extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision;

2. Introduction continued

- The extent to which the skills of the Members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfilment of their role;
- How scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards;
- The extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions;
- The design of the Call-In arrangements in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment' report;
- The extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements;
- The extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards;
- The extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council; and
- The extent to which Scrutiny provides effective challenge and adds value to the Council.

2.3 Audit approach

Our approach has been to:

- Review key documents;
- Interview key contacts;
- Observe scrutiny meetings;
- Share best practice; and
- Provide constructive challenge and support.

2.4 Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all those staff at the Council who have supported this review.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships

3.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards, their independence and the relationship with the Council's leadership and the Executive Board.

3.2 Scope and role of Scrutiny Boards

Each of the seven Scrutiny Boards have their own terms of reference which all outline the functions of the Boards. Within their terms of reference, all Scrutiny Boards state they will:

- Review or scrutinise the exercise of any function of the Council, Executive or any other matter;
- Make reports or recommendations to Council or the Executive either in connection with the exercise of any function of the Council, Executive or on any matter affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- Receive and review external audit and inspection reports;
- Act as the appropriate Scrutiny Board in relation to the Executive's initial proposals for a plan or strategy within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- Review corporate performance indicators; and
- Exercise the right to Call-In decisions made but not yet implemented by the Executive.

In addition all Scrutiny Boards may assist the Council and the Executive in the development and review of policies.

Having compared the terms of reference of the Scrutiny Boards at LCC with those of other Local Authorities it is evident that at LCC these are set within the legal framework whereas at other Authorities they also detail roles outside of this framework.

The softer roles referred to within other Local Authorities terms of reference include being innovative in the approach to Scrutiny; adding value through the reviews completed; striving for greater public involvement in Scrutiny; and improving communication within the Council and wider community. Whilst the role around engaging with the public is expressed within other documentation at LCC there is potential to enhance the procedural notes further by explicitly outlining additional functions / activities that Scrutiny could undertake.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

Recommendation One

The Council should review the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Guidance Notes and add that the Scrutiny Boards will:

- Be innovative in their approach to challenging the way the Council operates;
- Add value to the Council through the reviews they do; and
- Strive to improve communication channels within the Council and the wider community.

3.3 Independence of the Scrutiny Boards and wider relationships

By law no Members of scrutiny boards may be from the Council's Executive Board. However to ensure that an effective Scrutiny function is in place it is essential that a two way relationship is developed between the Executive Board and the Scrutiny Boards. In essence the relationship between the Executive Board Member and the Chair of the Scrutiny Board will impact on how issues are raised and dealt with.

A number of the Scrutiny Chairs feel that relationships with other Members and Officers is a continually evolving process and needs to continue to develop. Executive Board Members also acknowledge that whilst relationships have improved with Scrutiny Chairs there is still further work to be done.

As a result of the need to continue to develop the relationships between Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Board Members and Officers there is an acknowledgment that Scrutiny is not as effective as it could be at LCC and all political groups appear accepting of this.

Some Scrutiny Chairs feel that the role of Scrutiny is under valued by some of the Executive Board and as a result Scrutiny has not been as successful as it could be. Whilst some Executive Board Members felt that Scrutiny has added value to the Council, a couple were unable to give any specific examples of this. Scrutiny Chairs feel that they have tried various techniques to engage with Executive Members including inviting them to meetings; asking for assistance to develop work programmes; having regular update meetings; and sharing Scrutiny recommendations although still there is a recognised need to continue to engage further.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

Recommendation Two

The Council should publish and distribute local and national examples of where Scrutiny has added value and impact within the Annual Report. This should be seen by full Council and Officers. This will continue to convey the message that by engaging fully with Scrutiny the Council as a whole will benefit through improved public services.

The need to further develop the relationships between some Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers is clearly highlighted by a quote from one Scrutiny Chair “Executive Members will punish Officers for co-operating too fully with Scrutiny requests.”

The ‘Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny’ was devised to address the subtleties and nuances required to establish successful and robust Scrutiny. This should be re-distributed to facilitate professional working relationships and should be introduced on an Annual basis within the Members induction programme.

Recommendation Three

The Council should raise the profile of the ‘Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny’ and should encourage further engagement between the Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers. On an annual basis this document should also be included within the Members induction programme.

3.4 Public engagement

From the Scrutiny Board meetings attended it was noted that attendance by members of the public is poor. Advertising of Scrutiny Board meetings is principally done on the Council’s internet site and if a Scrutiny meeting is to be held outside of the Civic centre then fliers will be produced to leave at the place of the new venue. In addition the Scrutiny Support Unit has a mailing list to communicate with people who have previously attended meetings. The Council should consider whether it may be appropriate to try and encourage greater public engagement and as part of this they could look at different methods of advertising their Scrutiny Board meetings.

In order to encourage greater engagement with members of the public and other partners the Council should consider having single item agendas. There have been a number of occurrences within some of the Scrutiny Boards where agenda items have been given disproportionate amounts of time and as a result attendees have been left waiting sometimes not being able to present their given agenda item.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

Recommendation Four

Single item agendas should be introduced for Scrutiny Board meetings to improve their efficiency.

In addition to encourage greater engagement with the public, witnesses and co-optees the Council should remind Members that Scrutiny Board meetings are not the appropriate forum to raise political views as there is a risk that by doing so these individuals may feel alienated.

Recommendation Five

Scrutiny Members should be reminded that Scrutiny Board meetings are not a forum to voice personal political views.

3.5 Co-opted Members

Having attended Scrutiny meetings at LCC that had both co-opted Members on the Board and no co-opted Members there appeared to be a greater level of participation by all when the Boards contained co-opted Members. In addition the contribution made by the co-opted Members was very valuable as these Members were able to draw upon their experiences and provide a different perspective.

Currently the constitution of LCC does allow all Scrutiny Boards to have co-opted members it is just something that is not widely exercised. This is almost the opposite at Bristol City Council where there are a large number of Scrutiny Boards with co-opted Members. The Scrutiny Support Unit has however been proactive in this area and have recently taken a paper to the Scrutiny Advisory Group highlighting the benefits of having co-opted Members on Scrutiny Boards.

Recommendation Six

Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.

4 The vision and resources for scrutiny

4.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision.

4.2 Vision for effective Scrutiny

By having an overall vision, aim or objective for a particular function it can serve to provide a clearer understanding of that function and demonstrate the added value that that function can bring.

From the documentation reviewed relating to Scrutiny at LCC there was no reference to what the Council see as their vision for Scrutiny. Following discussions with the Scrutiny Board Chairs, it was also clear that they each had their own personal visions for Scrutiny with there being no overarching Council wide vision. The visions from speaking to various Scrutiny Board Chairs included "holding the executive to account"; "getting involved in pre-policy decisions"; and "improving services for members of the public".

Recommendation Seven

The Council should ascertain what their overall vision is for the Scrutiny function, formally document this and then publicise it, potentially within the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule Guidance Notes.

4.3 Resources for effective Scrutiny

Whilst there is no overall vision as to the role of Scrutiny at LCC all Officers and Members interviewed felt that the financial resources available to the Scrutiny function were adequate to enable it to fulfil its role. The actual expenditure relating to the Scrutiny support function totalled £574,312 in 2007-08; £585,247 in 2006-07; and £503,875 in 2005-06.

One area of concern that was raised by a Scrutiny Board Chair related to whether members of the Scrutiny Boards fully understand the totality of issues being discussed. Whilst the Scrutiny Boards have access to independent research facilities this

4 The vision and resources for scrutiny continued

Member felt that these were predominately internet based and did not allow for specialist expertise to always be obtained on a particular topic area. The Scrutiny Support Unit does however provide a newspaper clipping service for Scrutiny Board Chairs which enables Members to gain further information relating to topic areas and facilitates some horizon scanning to be undertaken and potential emerging issues identified. In addition the Scrutiny Support Unit keep track of up and coming legislation, current consultations, departmental forward plans, publications by pressures, quangos and national bodies and attend numerous seminars and conferences and report back on all of these.

In addition there are a number of web based forums which Scrutiny Members are encouraged to access to gain further information or identify emerging issues. There has also been a Regional Chairs Forum although Members from LCC have not accessed this facility.

Recommendation Eight

Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon and it will enable further horizon scanning of emerging issues to be undertaken.

5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles

5.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the skills of the members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfilment of their role.

5.2 Matching of members skills against the requirements of their role

The Scrutiny Boards are composed of elected Members who are selected to represent the political balance of the Council. As a result each political group has its own method of selection for appointing Chairs and Members to the Scrutiny Boards. However there is no formal matching undertaken by any of the political groups of the skills of Chairs and Members and the skill requirements of a particular Board. Given that there is no formal matching there is a risk that the most suitable candidate in terms of skills, experiences or even interest in the subject matter is not appointed as a Chair or Member of a Scrutiny Board.

5.3 Attendance

The table below highlights the percentage of members for each of the Scrutiny Boards that have attended 50% or less of the Scrutiny Board meetings in the time period 1 June 2008 – 19 March 2009:

Scrutiny Board	Percentage of members who have attended 50% or less of the meetings held between 1 June 2008 – 19 March 2009
Adult Social Care	23%
Central and Corporate	14%
Children's Services	27%
City Development	8%
City and Regional Partnerships	17%
Environment and Neighbourhoods	40%
Health	36%

5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles continued

This table clearly highlights that there are a large number of Scrutiny Board Members who are not attending meetings on a regular basis. In addition not only is there a poor attendance rate by some but there are other Members who are either late or who leave meetings early. Poor attendance rates, arriving late or leaving meetings early does not enable all Members to fully engage in the Scrutiny process.

Currently the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development sends reports to the Scrutiny Board Chairs and group Whips highlighting attendance rates for their Members. There is now a need for this to also be sent to each of the political groups for them to take action. For Scrutiny to be seen as effective across the Council it is paramount that Members who sit on each of the Boards attend and contribute to as many meetings as possible.

Recommendation Nine

Regular reports should be made to the political parties highlighting the attendance rates for their Members. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political group to take appropriate action to address this. Alternatively the number of members on Scrutiny Boards could be reduced if there are too many competing demands on Members' time.

It is recognised by some Executive and Scrutiny Members that the Scrutiny function at LCC could be strengthened. Having attended a number of Scrutiny meetings it has been evident that the chairing styles of the Boards does differ and this can lead to there being a lack of clarity over what information the Board actually requires; to agenda items being given disproportionate amounts of time; and the engagement with other partners and members of the public being weak. The Council should therefore look closely at the methods used in appointing Scrutiny Chairs. Due to the differences previously highlighted in the selection methods employed by each of the political groups there is a risk that the Members appointed as Chairs of the Scrutiny Boards are not the most suitable. The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.

Recommendation Ten

The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.

5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles continued

There appears to be a range of methods used within the Local Government sector in terms of appointing individuals as Chairs of Scrutiny. These methods include:

- An informal process of nomination, dealt with by each political group and endorsed by full Council;
- Having job specifications, against which each political party appoints the most suitable candidate; and
- Using job specifications for the leader of each political party to formally interview candidates against.

6 Development of Scrutiny work programmes

6.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses how scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards.

6.2 Development of Scrutiny work programmes

The first meeting of the year for Scrutiny Boards is held in June where the work programmes for the year are developed. Work programmes are developed having had access to a wide range of information including key performance indicators, external audit and inspections reports and financial data etc. Work programmes are not finalised documents as they are seen to evolve throughout the year.

As work programmes are evolving documents and to ensure that all Members continually identify new areas for inclusion in the work programme each Scrutiny Board should have a standing agenda item which allows for real time monitoring of issues, so that any emerging issues can be identified. This will enable any current issues to be added where appropriate to the work programme and will facilitate the Scrutiny Board being perceived to be having greater impact by continually scanning the horizon for potential issues.

Recommendation Eleven

All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item.

For a detailed inquiry area to be added to the work programme it will be considered against the Council's 'inquiry selection criteria' and the Scrutiny Board will consult with the relevant Director and Executive Member. The ultimate decision of whether to add an inquiry area to the work programme lies with the Scrutiny Board.

The Council also have a 'request for scrutiny' form that anyone can complete and submit to the relevant Scrutiny Board, this is subject to the same selection criteria above.

6 Development of Scrutiny work programmes continued

At one of the Scrutiny Board meetings attended there was debate about whether or not to add a particular inquiry area to the work programme. Whilst Members of the board spent a considerable amount of time debating whether or not to add this to their work programme it was incorrectly pointed out that this had not been discussed with either the relevant Director or Executive Member. It was therefore decided to move this agenda item to the next meeting. This action was not actually required and could potentially lead to alienation of Members, partners and members of the public if meetings are not conducted in an efficient manner. By ensuring that all Scrutiny boards hold effective pre-meetings this will help to ensure that similar situations are limited.

7 Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards

7.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions.

7.2 Quality / Quantity of information

There is a general feeling amongst the Scrutiny Board Members that the quality of information they receive to enable them to reach appropriate decisions is to a high standard. This is felt to be facilitated by the strong relationships that the Scrutiny Board Members have developed with their Principal Scrutiny Advisors.

Across all Council meetings, not just Scrutiny, there is a trend for very large agenda packs. The risk of having such large agenda packs is that people do not get sufficient time to read the contents fully. Having reviewed all Scrutiny agenda packs for March 2009 there are only two with less than one hundred pages and there are four Scrutiny Boards with agenda packs greater than one hundred and fifty pages. The quantity of information that is presented and the number of agenda items may be a contributing factor as to why the contribution within some Scrutiny Board meetings of some Members is limited. The Council should consider whether the agenda packs could be limited in size as this could potentially lead to greater engagement by both Members and other attendees.

At one of the Children's Services Scrutiny Board meetings however, some Members felt that insufficient information was presented to decide if to go ahead and hold an inquiry hence adding an item to their work programme. As a consequence the agenda item had to be carried forward to the next meeting.

All Scrutiny Boards should ensure that they use their pre-meetings more effectively as this should be the forum for Members to voice concerns over the sufficiency of information presented. Chairs should ensure that at pre-meetings all Members are focused upon the forthcoming meeting and they should ensure all Members identify which agenda item they will lead on. By having more focused pre-meetings this should lead to more efficient Scrutiny Board meetings.

7 Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards continued

Recommendation Twelve

Scrutiny pre-meetings should be more effectively used. They should be a forum to provide real focus in advance of the Scrutiny meeting.

8 Call-In arrangements

8.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the design of the Call-In arrangements specifically in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment'.

8.2 Call In arrangements

Within the Local Government Act 2000 there is a requirement that Overview and Scrutiny Committees are given the power to recommend that a decision made but not implemented be reconsidered, 'Called In'. As 'Calling In' of a decision can lead to a period of delay before a decision is implemented it was envisaged that this mechanism is used sparingly.

The recent Corporate Assessment made the following observations in relation to Call in arrangements:

".... Call-In arrangements need to be reviewed to support a fair and effective approach.... Call In arrangements are considered ineffective by many Councillors as two political parties have to agree which has resulted in few Call Ins in recent years."

Following this observation the Council approved changes to its constitution in May 2008. Call In arrangements must now be signed by:

- Two Non Executive elected Members (who are not from the same political party); or
- Any five Non Executive elected Members.

Following the changes implemented above another review of the Call In arrangements was undertaken in October 2008 and the following arrangements implemented:

- Scrutiny Board Members should no longer be signatories to Call Ins which they will hear;
- A substitute Member is entitled to attend the Scrutiny Board meeting where the Call In is received in place of a regular Member; and
- Call in meetings can be adjourned up to a maximum of five working days to allow information not available at the time but considered crucial by the Scrutiny Board in order to reach a decision.

8 Call-In arrangements continued

As a consequence of these changes there has been an increase in the number of Call Ins received, which now appear in line with the level of Call Ins at other Local Authorities. These changes have also led to the view that Call Ins are becoming increasingly more effective.

One of the decisions recently Called In was at the City Development Scrutiny Board and related to a decision made around cemeteries and crematoria fees. Whilst this decision was released for implementation, it was noted that under the Officer Delegation, the decision had been implemented before the Call In period had expired. Internal Audit at the Council have recently highlighted this issue and included a recommendation within one of their reports.

Recommendation Thirteen

The Scrutiny Support Unit should remind Officers of the processes that need to be adhered to relating to Call Ins.

9 Service delivery, service improvements and added value of Scrutiny

9.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements and the extent to which Scrutiny adds value to the Council.

9.2 Service delivery and service improvements

Historically Scrutiny Boards have had no comprehensive system for tracking the implementation of recommendations. Hence it has not always been clear to demonstrate service delivery or improvements following recommendations made. To address this the Council have recently implemented a formal tracking system so that Scrutiny Boards can monitor the implementation of their recommendations in a more systematic way.

In addition on an annual basis a report is produced of the work undertaken by the Council's Scrutiny Boards. This highlights in detail the areas of focus of each Board and highlights some of the recommendations made. This could be further strengthened by outlining the service benefits of these recommendations as a demonstration of the impact Scrutiny can have.

Recommendation Fourteen

Within the Scrutiny annual report each Scrutiny Board should clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the impact of their recommendations and the outcomes recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

Whilst not having had a formalised monitoring system in place for a long period of time, the Council is still able to highlight a wide range of examples of where the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in service delivery or improvements. A selection of examples are highlighted below:

- In November 2005 the Children's Services Scrutiny Board established a Young People's Scrutiny Forum to carry out scrutiny on topics chosen by the young people themselves. In their second year the Young People's Scrutiny Forum reviewed transport arrangements in Leeds for Young People and a local campaign has been launched for free bus travel for young people.

9 Service delivery, service improvements and added value of Scrutiny continued

- The Children's Services Scrutiny Board have been involved in steering the Council's approach to the development of Trust Schools to enable a proactive strategic approach to maximise the potential that Trust Schools might have in improving outcomes for children in deprived communities.
- The Scrutiny Boards also provide an important function to ensure that all parties have their views heard and comprehensively reflected. This has recently been evidenced where staff at a local school agreed to call off strike action after it was decided that Scrutiny would undertake an inquiry into a school based issue.
- The Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards have previously been acknowledged as being instrumental in improving the negotiations and working relationships between the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust and the LGI Kidney Patients Association.
- Some of the funding awarded by the Centre for Public Scrutiny has been used to achieve one of the objectives of the Healthy Leeds Partnership's 'Health and Wellbeing Plan' which was to establish a Community Development Network for Leeds.
- Following a recommendation made by the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards being implemented, for a representative from the Council's Development Department to become a member of the Leeds Childhood Obesity Strategy Group, it is recognised that they have played an active part in developing the action plan for tackling childhood obesity.
- The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board have been involved in an inquiry into the Council's own CO2 emissions. From reviewing this it is highly commendable to see the Board had factored into their inquiry future legislative changes relating to the Carbon Reduction Commitment.

All of the examples highlighted above have been identified by Scrutiny Members. None of the Executive Members interviewed were able to say when questioned any areas where Scrutiny has added value or where Scrutiny recommendations had lead to service improvements. When asked as to why the Executive Members felt this was the case, some stated that they felt Scrutiny had become "cosy" and the enquiries held were "not very challenging". Some Executive Members felt that Scrutiny recommendations were ones that predominately had been generated by Officers themselves. Having reviewed a large number of Scrutiny recommendations this does not always appear to be the case although it does highlight the need for all Scrutiny Members to ensure they act with professional scepticism in all they do.

10 Policy development

10.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards.

10.2 Policy development

Policy development can take the form of being involved in the development of a new policy area or can involve suggesting modifications to previous policies. Across the Council there are examples that a number of Scrutiny Boards are involved in some form of policy development, even if at the outset the area of review was not badged as policy development. Whilst there is still room for improvement in ensuring all Scrutiny Boards are more involved in policy development there is a consensus that there is a shift in the right direction and increasingly more work is being done in this area. From a review of the 2007/08 annual report which categorises the different types of work that the seven Scrutiny Boards have been involved in, it is clear to see that 33% of their total work in 2007/08 involved some form of policy review or development compared to 24% in 2006/07.

There are however, a number of Scrutiny Board Members who feel that they would like to be more involved in policy development. Following discussions with both Scrutiny Chairs and Executive Members there are a small number of inconsistencies in how the role of Scrutiny in policy development is viewed. From the feedback we received some Scrutiny Chairs do feel bypassed in policy development. Some Executive Members however felt that despite providing direction to Scrutiny Boards in terms of useful areas of work and policy development that they would like Scrutiny to get involved in, this is often ignored. During our review, however, we found limited evidence of this. In addition Executive Members stated that no rationale was provided as to why these areas were not felt to be priorities for the Scrutiny Boards.

Recommendation Fifteen

There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so to prevent any misunderstandings arising.

10 Policy development continued

From a review of this years and prior years' work programmes it is evident that one example of where the Culture and Leisure Scrutiny Board (as it was previously called) could have been more involved in policy development was in regards to the proposals to establish of a Sports Trust. The Board did however identify this as a potential area of work although following discussions decided against taking this forward.

There are a number of examples however of where the Scrutiny Boards have been able to demonstrate involvement in policy development. Examples include:

- The Children's Services Scrutiny Board where they have been actively involved in policy development relating to the services for 8 – 13 year olds; the development of an inclusion Strategy; and the education and training provision in Leeds for 14 – 19 year olds;
- The City Development Scrutiny Board have commented on a number of ongoing plans and strategies which has included the Local Development Framework;
- The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board have been involved in an inquiry into housing lettings which examined the Council's current housing lettings policy; and
- The Health Scrutiny Board have recently commenced an inquiry looking at teenage pregnancy and sexual health.

The Council's Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report is an excellent forum to highlight the examples of where the Scrutiny Boards have been involved in policy development or service enhancements. However other than in the introductory section - 'Work of the Boards' which shows the different types of work Scrutiny has been involved in, and the Children's Services section which shows the areas where they have been involved in the review of existing policy and the development of new policy, the remaining report sections make it difficult to identify which areas of work relate to policy development or review. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development is looking to make changes to the 2008/09 Annual Report to make the identification of policy development work streams easier.

Recommendation Sixteen

Templates for the layout of the Annual Report should be provided to Scrutiny Chairs so to increase the consistency and to enable greater comparability between the work of each of the Boards. Within the Annual Report each Scrutiny Board should clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings.

11 Performance Management

11.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council.

11.2 The role of performance management within Scrutiny

At the start of the year when the work programmes for the Scrutiny Boards are developed (June) performance management information is shared with each Board to enable this to shape the direction of their work.

Performance management information is then presented on a quarterly basis to enable the Board to challenge the information and ask questions where appropriate to either the Executive Member, a corporate performance management Officer or the relevant Services Director. This should then provide some assurance that adequate progress is being made and where this is not the case provides a mechanism to challenge performance further.

Concern was raised by one Scrutiny Board Member that consistent poor performance against a particular key performance indicator (KPI) is not identified by Officers as being a potential area where the Scrutiny Board can provide insight and add value to the Council. Some Members, however have to take greater ownership and accountability here and not rely upon others to direct their work programmes but should feel empowered to proactively identify this themselves.

Recommendation Seventeen

Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and use this to direct any area of their annual work programme.

Some Scrutiny Board Members also raised concern that whilst they are presented with data relating to KPIs on an exception basis they often do not fully understand the impact of this. Some organisations actually present information relating to what the impact is on the organisation of not achieving a particular KPI, this may be something the Council should consider for particular KPIs that have had historical poor performance.

11 Performance Management continued

Recommendation Eighteen

Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery. This may help identify areas where the Council could involve Scrutiny Boards further.

There are good examples however of where some Scrutiny Boards are clearly using performance information to shape their work programmes. The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board are one such board which have identified areas where performance was not meeting the required targets and used this to request more detailed information which lead to an inquiry being undertaken.

11.3 Performance Management of Scrutiny

Within the Scrutiny Annual Report there is detail provided of the work that is undertaken by each of the seven Scrutiny Boards. Each Scrutiny Board provides a brief summary of the work they have undertaken and the recommendations raised however it is difficult given the current format of the report to monitor the actual outcomes. Each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the outcomes of the recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable. This will ensure that the impact of Scrutiny is clearly identifiable. This is to be incorporated into the 2009/10 Annual Report.

Recommendations and action plan

	*** <i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale	
1	<p>The Council should review the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Guidance Notes and add that the Scrutiny Boards will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be innovative in their approach to challenging the way the Council operates; • Add value to the Council through the reviews they do; and • Strive to improve communication channels within the Council and the wider community. 	*	Agree.	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development September 2009</p>	
2	<p>The Council should publish and distribute local and national examples of where Scrutiny has added value and impact within the Annual Report. This should be seen by full Council and Officers. This will continue to convey the message that by engaging fully with Scrutiny the Council as a whole will benefit through improved public services.</p>	***	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The Annual report is already presented to full council.</p> <p>A number of scrutiny case studies have featured in national toolkits and studies. In addition some scrutiny reviews were featured in the 'Picture of Leeds' series produced for the CPA in 2007.</p> <p>We will look at strengthening this aspect by incorporating such messages into our overall 'communications strategy'.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development September 2009</p>	

Recommendations and action plan

	*** <i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>	
	Recommendation		Priority	Management response		Responsibility and timescale
3	The Council should raise the profile of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' and should encourage further engagement between the Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers. On an annual basis this document should also be included within the Members induction programme.		***	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The development of a Council vision for scrutiny (recommendation 7) will be a good tool to develop this engagement further.</p> <p>The 'Memorandum of Understanding' will be refreshed and re-circulated annually.</p>		<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>June 2009 onwards</p>
4	Single item agendas should be introduced for Scrutiny Board meetings to improve their efficiency.		**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Scrutiny Boards will be encouraged to focus on single item agendas wherever possible and appropriate when developing their work programmes.</p>		<p>Scrutiny Chairs/Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>June 2009 onwards</p>
5	Scrutiny Members should be reminded that Scrutiny Board meetings are not a forum to voice personal political views		**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This will first take place at the June meeting, but Group whips will be reminded via the publication of this report.</p> <p>We accept that whilst party politics should be left at the door, Members will rightly be influenced by their political views but will make recommendations based on evidence.</p>		<p>Scrutiny Chairs/Group Whips/Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>June 2009 onwards</p>

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	<i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale	
6	Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.	**	Agree. This will be a formal Item on the June Scrutiny Board meeting agendas.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009	
7	The Council should ascertain what their overall vision is for the Scrutiny function, formally document this and then publicise it, potentially within the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule Guidance Notes.	*	Agree. We would suggest that the CfPS five principles of scrutiny are used as a starting point. This will require sign up by the Leaders and should involve a wide range of stakeholders.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Administration Leaders/Scrutiny Chairs October 2009	
8	Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon and it will enable further horizon scanning of emerging issues to be undertaken.	*	Agree. Members will be reminded of these resources on an annual basis at the start of the municipal year, as well as on an ongoing basis.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards	

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk	**	Some residual risk	*	Little residual risk
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response		Responsibility and timescale
9	Regular reports should be made to the political parties highlighting the attendance rates for their Members. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political group to take appropriate action to address this. Alternatively the number of members on Scrutiny Boards could be reduced if there are too many competing demands on Members' time.	**	Agree. We currently do this to political groups.		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Group Whips Ongoing
10	The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.	**	We shall be introducing 'job specifications' as part of our bid to achieve 'CharterPlus' for Member Development. Whilst the competencies required for the role will be made available to the political groups, the groups need to consider the requirements for the role within the context of national party rules.		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development October 2009 Political Groups

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	<i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale	
11	All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item.	*	<p>Agree.</p> <p>All Scrutiny Boards have a standing item where they review their work programme, and receive the Forward Plan and Executive Board minutes to assist them in any reprioritisation of work. This is required by the Council's constitution.</p> <p>All Scrutiny Boards also have the facility to engage in general discussions with the appropriate Executive Member and Director about service issues. We would not envisage this being a standing item but a facility available to Scrutiny Boards when appropriate.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	
12	Scrutiny pre-meetings should be more effectively used. They should be a forum to provide real focus in advance of the Scrutiny meeting.	**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>We believe that there is scope to improve on the current use of pre-meetings.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/Scrutiny Chairs</p> <p>June 2009 onwards</p>	
13	The Scrutiny Support Unit should remind Officers of the processes that need to be adhered to relating to Call Ins.	*	<p>Agree.</p> <p>We will work with colleagues in Governance Services to ensure officers across the council are aware of the stages and timescales involved in the decision-making process, particularly in relation to the call-in requirements.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/Head of Governance Services</p> <p>September 2009</p>	

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	<i>Significant residual risk</i>	**	<i>Some residual risk</i>	*	<i>Little residual risk</i>
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response		Responsibility and timescale
14	Within the Scrutiny annual report each Scrutiny Board should clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the impact of their recommendations and the outcomes recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.	**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This will be introduced for the 2009/10 Annual Report.</p> <p>The progress of recommendations will relate mainly to those recommendations made the previous year. We will use our existing recommendation tracking system to provide this information.</p>		<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>May 2010</p>
15	There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so to prevent any misunderstandings arising.	**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The success of this will depend on the relationship between Scrutiny and Executive Board Members. The work programme setting meeting in June will be crucial for this to be a success.</p> <p>The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules already require the Board to provide an explanation where it turns down a suggestion from the Executive Board.</p>		<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>June 2009 onwards</p>

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk	**	Some residual risk	*	Little residual risk
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response		Responsibility and timescale
16	Templates for the layout of the Annual Report should be provided to Scrutiny Chairs so to increase the consistency and to enable greater comparability between the work of each of the Boards. Within the Annual Report each Scrutiny Board should clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings.	**	Agree. This will be introduced for the 2009/10 Annual Report. The use of categories of work has been introduced for the 2008/09 annual report		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2010
17	Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and use this to direct any area of their annual work programme.	**	Agree. A training session, facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny will take place in June and the messages reinforced throughout the year.		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2009 onwards
18	Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery. This may help identify areas where the Council could involve Scrutiny Boards further.	**	Agree. This will be fed into the quarterly performance monitoring reports received by all Scrutiny Boards		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and Head of Policy, Planning and Improvement October 2009