

Scrutiny Review Meeting - ACTIONS
11 February 2019

Present: Richard Auty (RA), Ben Ferguson (BF), Simon Pugh (SP) and Adrian Webb (AW).

Councillors Alan Dean (AD) and Simon Howell (SH).

		Action	Officer
1	<p>General Comment on CfPS Action plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SH said the relationship between the Executive and Scrutiny was better than it had been in the past, although there was still work to be done. There were still issues with partisanship and there was a need to clarify what a “critical friend” actually meant. AD said partisanship worked both ways. The fine line between legitimate challenge and party politics needed to be better defined. He felt this would be assisted by the CfPS recommendation to ‘strengthen the advisor/guardian role’. 	Take account of the CfPS recommendation in developing and implementing the Action Plan	All
2	<p>Scrutiny Work Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AD wanted greater input from Cabinet members when establishing a work programme. SH said there was an issue with scrutiny ‘surprising’ executive members with an ad hoc approach to the programme. He said Cabinet would be happy to engage with a scrutiny committee focused on adding value to council policy/services. SP said there were key areas in which Scrutiny could have a positive impact: the Budget and the Corporate Plan. A broad and unfocused work programme would create real issues in terms of staff resources. AD said there needed to be a mechanism by which items on the work programme were prioritised. He agreed that a focused programme could add value to decision making/services. A work programming meeting between Cabinet and Scrutiny was agreed. 	<p>Research work programming tool, such as CfPS SMART assessment.</p> <p>Setup a meeting between Cabinet and Scrutiny regarding the work programme.</p>	BF
3	<p>Scrutiny reporting to Full Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SH welcomed Scrutiny reporting to Council although a formal process would need to be in place to ensure it 		

	<p>was the views of the committee that were reported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP said it was important that this was not merely an update on the previous scrutiny meeting, but rather a formal report including the outcome of reviews/scoping projects. • It was agreed that a formal written report would go to Council meetings but it would need to be endorsed by the Scrutiny committee. 	<p>Ensure a timetable and resources in place to support the Chairman of Scrutiny in producing a report.</p>	
4	<p>Memorandum of Understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed draft MOU. Suggested amendment to 5.3 as follows: <p>1.1. Cabinet members will attend Scrutiny meetings as needed to present information, to provide context and to contribute to discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed to formalise the MOU before the new municipal year. It could be taken to the Scrutiny meeting on 21 March for the committee's approval, and the Leader could delegate powers to SH to make an executive decision to approve the MOU. • AD and SH said there was a need to establish an effective governance structure regarding Council investments. • AD said there was a need to include reference to scrutiny's role in improving decision making 	<p>Make suggested change to MOU.</p> <p>SH agreed to discuss the MOU and the delegation of powers with JET.</p> <p>Amend MOU.</p>	<p>BF</p> <p>BF</p>