Lead Officer: Chief Democratic Services Officer	Overall Progress Rating		Direction of Travel (delete as appropriate)	⬌
Code	**Improvement Priority**		**Contributory Officer(s) (CO)**	
VP-1c	Improve understanding and transparency of our decision-making and accountability processes		Head of Human Resources (HHR)	
VP-3a	Strengthen our democratic processes to improve governance and policy making		Head of Governance Services (HGS)	
VP-3b	Maximise member involvement in policy development, decision making and accountability		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development (HSMD)	

Overall Assessment of Progress on the Improvement Priority
Whilst good progress has been made in a number of areas, in particular the profile of Scrutiny Inquiries and in the delivery of the Ethical Action Plan, significant compliance issues have been identified with the council's decision making under delegated and sub-delegated powers. This not only put the council at risk of decisions being taken *ultra vires,* ie where a decision has been reached outside the powers conferred on the decision taker or where the prescribed procedures have not been properly complied with, it also undermines the democratic processes through which elected members can call in or scrutinise these decisions.

PI Ref	Definition	Baseline	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2008/09 Year end Result	Data Quality
BP-04biii	Use of Resources score for good governance (NB the Use of Resources Assessment scope and methodology has been amended substantially and this KLOE form part of this new framework)	3	3	3 (new framework)	4 (new framework)	**Overall Score = 4** (Internal Control Score = 3)	No concerns with data
BP-37	% of key decision which did not appear in the forward plan	33%	15%	10%	5%	**15.6%**	No concerns with data

Improvement Priority Key Activities and Progress as at 31st March 2009	Next Steps / Future Milestones for Q1&2 2009/10	Risks/Challenges	Timescale	Contributory Officer	Further Information/Evidence
A new framework for officer governance was approved and implemented in May 2008 and this has recently been reviewed.		➢ Failure to embed will result in ineffective and inefficient corporate boards without a clear remit. ➢ Responsibility for implementation relies on the board chairs. ➢ Ineffective decision making through these boards result in more CLT time being taken up with decision that should be made through other boards		HGS	
Review of governance arrangements for PFI projects completed. Proposals developed to ensure all PPP/PFI and Major Capital Projects are aligned with Delivering Successful Change and the provisions of the Constitution. These are currently subject to consultation	Complete consultation on proposals and take them to Corporate Governance Board prior to implementation.	Failure to align the governance arrangements of PFI projects with the Constitution could lead to inconsistent approaches to decision making and procurement processes which may lead to the increase of challenges and failure to have regard to best practice.	June 09	HGS	
Following specific concerns raised by an elected member around 2 decisions Internal Audit carried out a sample audit of 40 decisions taken using delegated and sub-delegated powers to test their compliance with the Constitution. The audit identified a number of areas where the Constitution had not been complied with; however, the conclusion drawn was that this was due to lack of awareness and training rather than a deliberate attempt to avoid Scrutiny.	Key actions to address these issues include: ➢ Review of sub-delegation to produce a comprehensive central list of decision makers ➢ Targeted formal training for these officers ➢ Development of capacity within Directorates to co-ordinate the process and provide assurance to the Director of compliance within their area ➢ Implementation of corporate monitoring arrangements ➢ Development of clear escalation procedures for serious or consistent non-compliance ➢ Regular review of the constitution to ensure its controls are fit for purpose	Risk of decision being taken *ultra vires* ie where a decision has been reached outside the powers conferred on the decision taker or where the prescribed procedures have not been properly complied with.	Action plan in process of being drawn up	HGS	Corporate Governance and Audit Committee Report May 09

Improvement Priority Key Activities and Progress as at 31st March 2009	Next Steps / Future Milestones for Q1&2 2009/10	Risks/Challenges	Timescale	Contributory Officer	Further Information/Evidence
A combined Ethical Audit Actions Plan for the 2006 and 2007 audits was agreed at Standards Committee in Oct 08. Key areas of progress include: ➢ the completion of training for members on the Member Code of Conduct and role specific training for members of planning and licensing panels ➢ Specific governance competencies have been developed to complement the Leadership and Management Standards and new appraisals which have recently been rolled out ➢ Development of ethical governance briefing	Development of training for governance competencies		Aug 09	HHR	
A Scrutiny Inquiry on Member Development has been completed and the recommendations, along with the response by the CO Democratic Services, were reviewed by Executive Board.	Key next steps include: ➢ Further work with Directors to deliver learning and development activities ➢ Improving the use of feedback and evaluation information ➢ Promoting and increasing the numbers of members with Personal Development Plans (PDP) ➢ Commitment to pursue CharterPlus in Feb 2010	Implementation of the recommendation for all members to have a PDP's requires the commitment of all individual members to engage in this process and is not within the power of officers to deliver.	March 10	HSMD	Member Development Scrutiny Inquiry Report Executive Board Minutes 13th May 09
Increasing Scrutiny involvement in Policy Development All Scrutiny Inquiry reports are now considered by Executive Board and they decide on the recommendations proposed. This increases the profile of Scrutiny Inquiries and gives more weight to approved recommendations. KPMG undertook and audit of the Scrutiny function including examination of their role in policy development –they identified that increasingly more work had been done in this area compared to the previous year ie 33% of their work in 2007/8 compared to 24% in 2006/7	Key action to address this; Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and officers to work together to identify areas where the Boards can add value to policy development work streams Where Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by the Executive Members a rationale should be provided to prevent any misunderstandings arising	Member involvement and challenge of policy at an early stage ensures a full range of views are represented and support robust and sound policy making.	June 2009		
Implementation of Empowerment White Paper Public consultation launched on the new executive arrangements to gauge public opinion on the possible options. All political groups have received a briefing on the requirements and the process	Make a decision on new Executive arrangements		Dec 2009	HGS	
Call-in arrangements Following reviews to the call in arrangements in May 2008 and October 2008, 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 authorities. The KPMG audit report states that this has led to the view that call-ins are becoming increasingly more effective.					KPMG report on Scrutiny review
Annual review of constitution This was reviewed at the Annual Meeting and included the notification of two additional officers with concurrent delegation	The Constitution will be reviewed prior to the next Annual meeting				Annual meeting agenda

Lead Officer: Chief Democratic Services Officer	Overall Progress Rating		Direction of Travel (delete as appropriate)	↑

Code	Improvement Priority	Contributory Officer(s) (CO)
Vfm-5	Develop sustainable and effective partnership governance framework	Head of Governance Services (HGS) All Directors & Partnership Lead Officers

Overall Assessment of Progress on the Improvement Priority
Good progress has been made in establishing the minimum requirements for governance arrangements for our significant partnerships within our revised Governance framework and to develop the register of what are our significant partnerships. This next steps over the coming year are to establish the extent of compliance with these minimum standards and to ensure any gaps identified through the monitoring processes are addressed. However, more work is also required to launch and embed the toolkit and the monitoring processes.

PI Ref	Definition	Baseline	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target	2010/11 Target	2008/09 Year end Result	Data Quality
BP-04biii	Use of Resources score for good governance (NB the Use of Resources Assessment scope and methodology has been amended substantially and this KLOE form part of this new framework)	3	3	3 (new framework)	4 (new framework)	**Overall Score 4** (Internal Control Score = 3)	No concerns with data

Improvement Priority Key Activities and Progress as at 31st March 2009	Next Steps / Future Milestones for Q1&2 2009/10	Risks/Challenges	Timescale	Contributory Officer	Further Information/Evidence
Governance Framework for significant partnerships has been revised and was approved in Dec 2008 Directors have reviewed all significant partnerships in which they are involved and a detailed register has been created	Lead Officers for each partnership to assess the extent of their compliance with the framework. Governance Services will produce a full report on the extent of compliance with the framework across all significant partnerships	The consequences of failing to implement effective governance arrangements for key partnerships include: ➢ Failure to deliver key priorities in the Leeds Strategic Plan ➢ Financial risk to the council ➢ Loss of reputation ➢ Poor CAA judgement ➢ Lack of engagement from partners ➢ Failure in compliance with Council's code of Corporate Governance ➢ Poor Organisational assessment score The challenge will be to embed the process and ensure all new partnerships are identified and assessed against the framework	June 2009 August 2009	HGS	Framework and Register published on intranet
A Toolkit which supports the framework has been drafted and is currently being consulted upon across the organisation. The toolkit provides more detail on the framework and monitoring arrangements	Toolkit to be launched Launch of toolkit will be supported by training for Lead officers and DMTs		May 09 June 09	HGS	Toolkit will be published when completed
Processes for assessing any new partnerships have been developed and implemented during 2008/09. Overall compliance was good for assessment of strategic contribution, consultation with stakeholders and risk management.	Issues were identified with compliance of new partnerships with options appraisal and equality impact assessments and Governance services are working with these partnerships to improve this. Directors remain responsible for identifying and assessing new partnerships and for notifying Governance Services of these partnerships so that they can be added to the register of significant partnerships.		June 09	HGS	