Originator:	Richard Mills
Tel:	247 4557

Leeds
CITY COUNCIL

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (City Development)

Date: 8th December 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 is provided. In some cases there will be several updates, as the board has monitored progress over a period of time.

1.5   This report provides members of the Scrutiny Board with a summary of the further progress made in implementing recommendations 3 and 4 of the Board's Statement on the A660 corridor improvement. The Board agreed in September that recommendations 1 and 2 be signed off as "achieved". The progress update has been provided by the Director of City Development and the Executive Member for development and regeneration.

1.6   To assist members, the Principal Scrutiny Adviser has given a draft status for recommendation 3 and 4. The Board is asked to confirm whether these assessments are appropriate, and to change them where they are not.

1.7   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 3 and 4, 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 consider recommendations 3 and 4 and :

- 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.

Background Papers

None