



---

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

### Scrutiny Board (City & Regional Partnerships)

Date: 5th November 2009

### Subject: Recommendation Tracking

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 A formal system of recommendation tracking was introduced a few years ago to ensure that scrutiny recommendations are more rigorously followed through. The board now receives a quarterly report on any recommendations from previous inquiries which have not yet been completed.
- 1.2 This allows the board to monitor progress and identify completed recommendations; those progressing to plan; and those where there is either an obstacle or progress is not adequate. The board will then be able to take further action as appropriate.
- 1.3 A standard set of criteria has been produced, to enable the board to assess progress. These are presented in the form of a flow chart at Appendix 1. The questions should help to decide whether a recommendation has been completed, and if not whether further action is required.
- 1.4 For each outstanding recommendation, a progress update will be provided. In some cases there will be several updates, as the board has monitored progress over a period of time.
- 1.5 The recommendation tracking report (copy to follow) will provide members of the Scrutiny Board with a summary of the progress made in implementing the Board's recommendations arising from its Inquiry report into the role of the Voluntary Community and Faith Sector in Council led community engagement which was published in March 2009. Information will be provided by the Directors of Environment & Neighbourhoods and Resources and relevant Executive Members.

- 1.6 To assist members, the Principal Scrutiny Adviser will give a draft status for each recommendation. The board is asked to confirm whether these assessments are appropriate, and to change them where they are not.
- 1.7 In particular, members should note any recommendations which have a draft status of 4. For these recommendations, the Principal Scrutiny Adviser suggests that progress has been made. However, the decision as to whether this progress is acceptable is a judgement for board members to make.
- 1.8 In deciding whether to undertake any further work, members will need to consider the balance of the board's work programme.

## **2.0 Process of assessing progress**

- 2.1 Members are asked to assess the progress made with implementing recommendations on circulation of the report, and whether it is acceptable, following the flowchart at Appendix 1. Members are asked to classify the response, using the following classifications (see Appendix 1):

- 1 – Stop monitoring
- 2– Achieved
- 3 – Not achieved (obstacle)
- 4 - Not achieved (Progress made acceptable. Continue monitoring)
- 5 – Not achieved (progress made not acceptable. Continue monitoring)
- 6 - Not for review this session

- 2.2 It would be appropriate to use category 6 if the timescale was not yet reached for completion of the recommendation.

## **3.0 Recommendations**

- 3.1 Members are asked to:

- Agree those recommendations which no longer require monitoring;
- Identify any recommendations where progress is unsatisfactory and determine the action the board wishes to take as a result.