

**Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel**

**Task & Finish Group Report**

**An efficiency and efficacy review of the current governance structures of the Council**

**Part 1: A review of scrutiny arrangements**

**Version: 1.2**

## Contents

Recommendations .....	3
Introduction .....	3
Background.....	3
Methodology .....	5
Current arrangements.....	5
Parliamentary review of the Local Authority Scrutiny Function .....	6
The Local Government Boundary Commission Review (LGBCE) .....	6
Task & Finish Groups.....	7
Frequency and time of meetings .....	7
‘Cross-cutting’ issues .....	7
Comparison to the groups of similar authorities.....	8
Selected District Councils .....	9
Comparison with Lancaster City Council (LCC) .....	9
Comparison with St. Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC).....	9
Comparison with Erewash Borough Council (EBC) .....	10
Overview of all other governance arrangements .....	10
Conclusions .....	11
Recommendations .....	12
Appendices: .....	13
A: Current scrutiny procedures and remits.....	13
B: Initial feedback .....	13
C: Parliamentary review of the Local Authority Scrutiny Function .....	14
D: Comparison groups.....	15
E: Suggested 2 panel scrutiny arrangement, working titles and summary work themes ..	19
F: Analysis of Overview & Scrutiny agenda items.....	20
G: Summary of current governance structure: .....	21
Table 1: Estimated percentage of members on scrutiny .....	6
Table 2: Summary of comparison groups (count of panels) .....	8
Table 3: Summary of comparison groups (count of meetings).....	8
Table 4: Summary of meetings and timetable for consultation .....	11

## Recommendations

1. The Task & Finish Group consider a move to 2 panels as preferable, but would like more evidence on the likely efficiencies and improvements, in particular the need for mandatory training in Overview & Scrutiny skills
2. The panels are made up of between 8 and 10 members
3. The panels meet every 6 weeks

## Introduction

The Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel Task & Finish Group has been established to scrutinise the governance arrangements for the Council. The tasks will be tackled in the following order:

- Overview and Scrutiny
- Statutory and other Committees / Panels

This report sets out the first part of the review, Overview & Scrutiny. The report sets out the background to the review, the methodology and analysis. The current arrangements, recent reviews and key areas of discussion are included, most notably:

- Parliamentary Review of Local Authority Scrutiny Function
- The Local Government Boundary Commission Review
- Task & Finish Groups
- Frequency and time of meetings
- Cross-cutting issues

The report summarises the current scrutiny arrangements for groups of similar selected Councils. In addition, three Councils are reviewed in more detail. An overview of all governance arrangements is included for context, this will form the second part of the review.

The report draws conclusions and presents three recommendations.

## Background

The Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel resolved at their meeting on 18 October that a Task & Finish Group be established to scrutinise the governance arrangements for the Council. The Task & Finish Group would include the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel, Councillor Ellis, Councillor Alcroft and Councillor Allison. Relevant Members and Officers would also be invited to take part in the Task Group work. Councillor Alcroft was, subsequently, replaced by Councillor McDonald.

Through the 2017/18 Annual Scrutiny Report it was agreed that in the new civic year, the Scrutiny Chairs Group will continue to review the number, frequency and remits of the three panels alongside the Local Government Boundary Commission Review. The Scrutiny Chairs Group planned to consult with the three panels throughout 2018/19.

The Scrutiny Chairs Group met on 16 August and discussed the future structure of the scrutiny function. It was resolved that the best way forward would be to establish a Cross Party Working Group to determine an appropriate and efficient future structure.

Subsequent advice from the Corporate Director of Governance & Regulatory Services was to the effect that, if Members wished to have such a Task and Finish group then it should

come under the ambit of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel as the Chairs' Group did not have a remit for this type of action.

On the 18 October The Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel was asked to consider:

- Whether the scope of any review should be around Scrutiny, or a more broadly-based review of governance structures.
- Whether a separate Task and Finish Group should be established to take this matter forward.
- In the event that the Panel agreed to limit any review to the scrutiny function, to agree what additional information from the Overview and Scrutiny Officer was needed to allow a decision to be made.

The Task & Finish Group met on 18 October 2018 and agreed:

- The work should be completed swiftly so that any recommendations from the Task & Finish Group could be tabled as an agenda item at the January Panel meeting or a special meeting.
- The objective, if a consensus is reached is to debate the new proposals at Council in March 2019 for implementation in the Civic Year 2019/20.

The Task & Finish Group met again on 29 November 2018 and agreed the methodology set out in the report. In addition, the Corporate Director of Governance & Regulatory Services (Monitoring Officer) was asked to prepare a timetable for consultation that ensured that any agreed changes could be put to Council in April for implementation in the Civic Year 2019/20.

This timetable was circulated on the 30 November and agreed by the Chair, the first deadline being the Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel 3 January 2018. The timetable is presented in Table 4.

The Task & Finish Group met on 13 December 2018 and agreed some additional information for the report, to be signed off by the Chair and Vice Chair. At this meeting Councillor Alcroft attended in place of Councillor McDonald.

The Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel and the Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel (Special) were consulted on this report, their views will be part of the agenda for the Special Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel meeting on 22 February 2019.

The Scrutiny Chairs Group met on 24 January and discussed the review and report.

The Task & Finish Group met on 14 February 2019 and agreed some minor amendments and additional evidence for the report. These changes had been incorporated into this version.

## Methodology

It was agreed that the review will include the following elements:

- 1) A description and analysis of the current arrangements. This will include the broad metrics of the current structures but will also include comments from relevant members and key officers, around strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement. Group leaders will be invited to comment as part of this exercise.

The timetable agreed in table 4 will enable consultation around the scope for improvement. At each meeting Members and key officers will be consulted on the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement.

- 2) An analysis of possible drivers for change. This will follow from (1) above and will include:
  - Any new guidance from Government, especially around Overview and Scrutiny arrangements.
  - The expected reduced number of Councillors from May 2019.
  - The need to continue to improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the Council's governance arrangements.
  - The need to consider, in terms of scrutiny, a growing number of 'cross cutting' issues, which would be better managed in a more streamlined scrutiny approach.
- 3) A material part of the work will be to compare the structural arrangements in this Council with those in similar sized second tier Councils.
- 4) The review will also take account of any relevant national guidance and / or principles or examples of good practice, where possible.

Whilst a review of any one part of the governance structure needs to be undertaken in the context of possible commitments in the other parts, it is suggested that the work be undertaken in the following priority order: -

- Overview and Scrutiny
- Statutory and other Committees / Panels

## Current arrangements

Scrutiny operates through three panels: Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel; Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel and Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel.

There are eight non-Executive members on each panel and each panel is politically balanced (i.e. the proportions of each political party on the panel are the same as on the Council as a whole). Individual Councillors are selected by their political parties to sit on the scrutiny panels. Each panel has a work programme and meets on a 6-weekly cycle. The link to the detailed procedure rules and remits for each panel is presented in [Appendix A](#).

The use of substitutes for meetings is a common occurrence, it is rare for a panel meeting not to include a substitute. This occurrence highlights that it is a challenge to sustain full attendance for the nominated panel members throughout the year. This can have an impact on the panel's ability to build expertise and knowledge. Additionally, with many substitutions occurring very close to panel meetings, substitutes are often placed in a difficult position by not having time to prepare properly for meetings.

The three work programmes are developed to fulfil the current arrangements, three panels need three work programmes and a 6-weekly cycle needs at least one item per meeting. On average, panel agendas have 3 agenda items per meeting.

Initial feedback on changing the current arrangements has been received from Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel and the Chair of the Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel. This feedback is presented in [Appendix B](#).

## Parliamentary review of the Local Authority Scrutiny Function

The Communities and Local Government Select Committee completed a review of the Local Authority Scrutiny Function in December 2017. The recommendations of the Committee and the subsequent response by Government (in March 2018) is presented in [Appendix C](#). The Government has promised to issue new guidance later this year to replace the current guidance, which was issued in 2006. An update on progress has been posted on the Centre for Public Scrutiny website: <https://www.cfps.org.uk/an-update-on-the-scrutiny-guidance/>

The new guidance will not be prescriptive. The decision on how to undertake the scrutiny role rests with individual Councils. It is the Government's view that each council is best placed to decide which arrangements best suit its own individual circumstances.

## The Local Government Boundary Commission Review (LGBCE)

The review has been completed and the finalised recommendations are:

- Carlisle should be represented by 39 councillors, 13 fewer than there are now.
- Carlisle should have 13 wards, nine fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of all wards should change; none will stay the same.

The LGBCE concluded that decreasing the number of councillors by 13 would still ensure that the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament and the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections on 2 May 2019.

Applying the 39 members to current arrangements could mean that 24 (3x8) members will be on scrutiny panels. A more likely outcome is that continuing with the status quo will require a greater reliance on a smaller number of members and subsequently a continued use of substitutes.

Table 1 below, illustrates the reduction and its impact on availability of members for scrutiny.

*Table 1: Estimated percentage of members on scrutiny*

Item	2018-19	2019-20
Total membership	52	39
Executive	6	6 (assumed)
Mayor	1	1
Available for scrutiny	45	32
Needed for scrutiny	24 (53%)	3 panel – 24 (75%) 2 panel – 16 or 20 (50 – 63%) 1 panel - 8 or 10 (25 – 31%)

Effective scrutiny is crucial to the Council carrying out its roles and responsibilities. Appointment to scrutiny is not just a simple numeric apportionment but rather a search for special skills capable of undertaking the scrutiny role. It is critical that scrutiny with a politically balanced membership.

## Task & Finish Groups

Members have commented that the less formal, more flexible, Task & Finish Group approach to a work programme can be more interesting. A Task & Finish Group allows members to bring their expertise to bear on a priority in a more dynamic setting than a formal panel meeting. The Member Learning Group has recently undertaken a survey of members to develop a pool of members willing to share their expertise through Task & Finish Groups.

The current approach to Task & Finish Groups ensures that the Council's reputation for transparency is maintained through regular reporting back to the parent panel. The Overview Report provides the panel, the Council and the public with a regular update on progress made in any active Task & Finish Group. This approach has been proven to work well in recent years, most notably in the Community Asset Transfer Task & Finish Group.

The group is clear that:

- Task & Finish Groups should be open to all members, thereby ensuring the greatest opportunity for Member engagement in policy development.
- Task & Finish Groups should only be convened when there is a clear need, they are not a substitute for scrutiny panels.

A decision to reduce the number of panels will likely lead to internal efficiencies which could be redirected to increase the amount of task & finish group work undertaken.

## Frequency and time of meetings

The group has discussed the options around the frequency and timing of the panel meetings. The Council meets on an 8-weekly cycle and Executive meets on a 6-weekly cycle. It would therefore be prudent to retain the 6-weekly cycle of Overview and Scrutiny in 2019/20. This will give the panel(s) the flexibility to respond to emerging issues and ensure a timely completion of 'call-ins'.

A discussion on the frequency of the panel meetings included the time of day. It was appreciated by the group that the morning meetings often excluded participation from members in employment. A consideration should be given to moving the meetings to the afternoon and it was noted that Executive met at 4 pm.

## 'Cross-cutting' issues

The experience of recent joint scrutiny panels and budget scrutiny has highlighted the challenges of 'cross cutting' issues. A more co-ordinated scrutiny process would present the following benefits:

- Avoid a duplication of member and officer effort.
- Avoid duplication of lines of inquiry by the three panels.
- Allow more in-depth scrutiny of the key issues.

The three major projects identified in the Carlisle Plan, Borderlands Inclusive Growth Deal, St Cuthbert's Garden Village and the Sands Centre Redevelopment, all have cross-cutting issues relating to economic growth, health, wellbeing and finances. An effective scrutiny will

be forward looking, scrutinising the most corporate and strategically cross-cutting of Council planned activity.

The performance report is presented at three panels every quarter, this an example of a cross-cutting issue divided into three separate reports. The risk management report, corporate programme report and finance monitoring reports are examples of cross-cutting issues that are only currently reported to a single panel.

Any changes arising from this review should clarify how these cross-cutting issues will be coordinated within the new arrangements. This will be considered alongside the work on panel name(s) and remits.

### Comparison to the groups of similar authorities

Several groupings consisting of similar sized District Councils have been analysed to compare scrutiny arrangements. There are 4 groups: Cumbria Districts, Nearest Neighbours (from the previous Audit Commission grouping), Historic Cities and South Lakeland District Council's (SLDC) comparator group. The details of each of these groups are presented in [appendix D](#).

Each of the groups are summarised in Table 2, Carlisle is only included in the Cumbria Districts Group and is excluded from the counts for each of the other groups.

*Table 2: Summary of comparison groups (count of panels)*

Group	Number of scrutiny panels				
	1 Panel	2 Panels	3 Panels	4 Or 5 Panels	Total
Cumbria Districts	4	1	1	0	6
Nearest Neighbours	4	5	3	3	15
Historic Cities	6	4	1	0	11
SLDC comparator group	12	0	1	0	13
Totals	26	10	6	3	45

The most frequent scrutiny arrangement within each of these groups is 1 or 2 panels.

Members should note that the number of panels is a rather basic comparator and doesn't itself show how industriously those panels undertake their duties. For that reason, the appendices also show the number of meetings held in a financial / civic year. That information ([Appendix D](#)) is summarised in table 3.

*Table 3: Summary of comparison groups (count of meetings)*

Authority grouping	Annual count of meetings		
	Low	High	Average
Cumbria	7	24	11
Nearest Neighbour	8	25	15
Historic Cities	4	24	13
SLDC Comparator Group	5	18	9

These figures, probably more than the more basic comparator based on the number of panels, demonstrate Carlisle's position as a relative outlier, with amongst the highest number of meetings from the 45 councils used in the comparative analysis.



## Selected District Councils

Three District Councils have been selected to provide more detail on scrutiny arrangements with 2 or 1 panel(s). The three are Lancaster City Council, St. Edmundsbury Borough Council and Erewash Borough Council.

### Comparison with Lancaster City Council (LCC)

LCC has undergone a LGBCE Review with the changes coming in May 2015 elections. The review concluded that the number of members remained at 60. LCC also underwent a Local Government Association Peer Review in 2015 which included an action to consider how to make best use of Overview & Scrutiny. The current arrangements are as follows:

#### Budget and Performance Panel

The purpose of this panel is to scrutinise the Council's arrangements and performance in relation to financial planning, including budget and target setting. The panel has a membership of 9 members and meets on a 9-week cycle, approximately, the meetings are in the evenings either at 6pm or 6:10pm.

#### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has overall responsibility for the performance of all Overview and Scrutiny functions on behalf of the Council. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee can create Task Groups and sets their Terms of Reference. The Committee has moved towards a more informal way of working which tends to deliver results more quickly. Looking back at 2017/18, as reported in the Scrutiny Annual Report 2017/18, the Committee had the following:

- Customer Service and Future Complaints Policy Informal Task Group
- Digital Lancaster Informal Task Group
- Resilience Commission Informal Task Group

The Late-Night Economy in the Lancaster District Informal Task Group recommendations were reported to Cabinet and Council in 2017/18.

The Committee has a membership of 9 members and meets on a monthly cycle. The meetings are in the evenings either at 6pm, 6:10pm or 6:45pm.

### Comparison with St. Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC)

In May 2018, Parliament authorised the creation of a new local authority called West Suffolk Council. This council will replace the existing authorities of Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council. The LGBCE is now carrying out an electoral review of the new council. St Edmundsbury Borough Council has 45 elected members.

SEBC has its own scrutiny arrangements for 2018/19 Civic Year and currently operates the following scrutiny committees arrangements:

#### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee covers the key scrutiny functions, holding the Cabinet to account. The Committee has 14 members and meets a 6-weekly cycle, approximately, with the meetings held at 4pm. They have on average one task & finish group a year. This year they have had two joint task and finish groups with Forest Heath District Council:

- West Suffolk Information Strategy

- Review of Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre

### Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee

The Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee scrutinises how well the Council's services are performing by considering a range of information such as performance indicators and reports from external inspectors and by monitoring action plans. The Committee has 10 members, meets on a quarterly corporate planning and budgetary cycle and the meetings are held at 5pm. The Committee does not carry out reviews but may recommend that a review is carried out by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

### Comparison with Erewash Borough Council (EBC)

EBC underwent an LGBCE Review with the changes, a reduction of 4 councillors, made in May 2015. EBC has 47 elected members and a single Overview and Scrutiny Committee with 17 members. The Committee meets on a 6-weekly cycle, meeting at 6:30pm. The Committee has active Task & Finish Groups working on:

- Out of Hours Task and Finish Group
- Progress of the Implementation of Universal Credit
- Review of Kerbside Collections and Recycling Services Task and Finish Group
- Task and Finish Group on Safeguarding
- Task and Finish review of Water Safety

### Overview of all other governance arrangements

There are prescribed arrangements for some of the statutory committees, including the range of members who can sit on them. There is therefore less scope to alter these arrangements and to improve their efficiency. This is the primary reason for leaving this task until a review of scrutiny has been completed.

A summary of the governance arrangements is presented in [Appendix G](#) to provide context for the review of scrutiny and a shared understanding for the next phase of the review. The Task & Finish Group will consider the wider governance arrangements once the recommendations for scrutiny have been shared for consultation, at the earliest this will be in January 2019.

*Table 4: Summary of meetings and timetable for consultation*

<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Activity</b>
18 October	Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel	Task & Finish Group established
18 October	Task & Finish Group Meeting	Initial meeting
22 November	Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel	Panel discussed change and provided feedback
29 November	Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel	Panel discussed change and provided feedback
29 November	Task & Finish Group Meeting	Agree methodology and set timescale
13 December	Task & Finish Group Meeting	Agree draft report
3 January	Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel	Approve report for consultation
7 February	Special Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel	Consider report and recommendations
7 February	Special Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel	Consider report and recommendations
22 February	Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel	Approve for Council via Monitoring Officer
11 March	Executive	Executive have four weeks to consider the report before it goes to Council
30 April	Council	Council decision
20 May	Council	Annual Council implementation

## Conclusions

The majority of scrutiny panel members agree that the current arrangements should be reduced from 3 panels.

The reduction of members from 52 to 39 for Civic Year 2019/20 is a key consideration, the function of scrutiny can be delivered with 39 members. How the scrutiny function is delivered is a decision for Council.

Nationally, work is underway to update the guidance for Overview & Scrutiny. The review found that the most significant factor in determining whether scrutiny committees are effective is the organisational culture of a council. The new guidance will not prescribe a scrutiny arrangement as this is a decision for each council.

Arrangements for cross-cutting issues should be considered once a recommendation for Council has been finalised. Historically, this issue has been resolved through discussions at the Scrutiny Chairs Group.

Carlisle has more scrutiny panels, meeting more frequently than any other District Council in Cumbria. It is increasingly rare to find any District Council operating three panels on a 6-weekly cycle, most have reduced the number of panels.

Any future work programmes for the new scrutiny arrangements will be developed with cognizance of the member and officer resources available. Prioritisation within the work programmes will ensure effective and efficient scrutiny.

To illustrate a 2-panel arrangement the following working titles and summary work themes ([Appendix E](#)) are suggested:

- Internal Overview & Scrutiny Panel with an inward-looking set of remits
- External Overview & Scrutiny Panel with an outward-looking set of remits

An analysis of the agenda items ([Appendix E](#)) confirms that a 2-panel structure would be practical, with an average of 5 items per panel meeting.

## Recommendations

4. The Task & Finish Group consider a move to a 2-panel structure as preferable, but would like more evidence on the likely efficiencies and improvements, in particular the need for mandatory training in Overview & Scrutiny skills
5. The panels are made up of between 8 and 10 members
6. The panels meet every 6 weeks

## Appendices:

### A: Current scrutiny procedures and remits

Link: [Constitution Panel Remits](#)

Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel Pages: 56-58

Business & Transformation Scrutiny Panel Pages: 59-61

Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel Pages: 62-63

### B: Initial feedback

As part of the process of reviewing the number of Scrutiny Panels, Chairs of the current three panel were asked for their views. These would ultimately be fed into the wider Task and Finish group review and reflected in any final proposals. The views put forward are set out below: -

#### **Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel**

The Chair of EGSP canvassed views at the meeting of the panel on 22 November 2018. A summary of the views of the panel is set out below: -

- One member thought that fewer panel members, but more panels would be a better way forward, with more clarity about the panel remits.
- It was recognised that changing panel numbers had been looked at previously, but there was now added focus, because of the reduction in councillor numbers expected in 2019. In that context, when taking account of the requirements to source (i) an executive and (ii) a number of statutory type committees, there would only be a small pool of councillors remaining, which led to the conclusion that a reduction was needed, to a maximum of 2, or perhaps a single overarching panel.
- There was a thought that maybe a reduction to a single panel would create too great a workload.
- Other views included: -
  - being more flexible around timing of meetings (evenings perhaps) - although other members saw this as potentially problematic, as they had a number of parish council commitments in the evenings.
  - Looking to improve the process of scrutiny could well be part of the solution (by doing things differently).
- In conclusion, the consensus appeared to be that a change was needed, and that a movement to two panels might be the best way forward at this stage.

#### **Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel**

The chair of the panel provided the following feedback..... 'I feel that with the number of tasks we have to do on Scrutiny, it would be wise to keep it at the three panels, otherwise two would end up being swamped.'

## C: Parliamentary review of the Local Authority Scrutiny Function

1. Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees; a report by the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Department:

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/369/369.pdf>

2. Government response to the Communities and Local Government Committee first report on the effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees:

<https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/communities-and-local-government/2017-19-Correspondence/Government-Response-to-the-Communities-and-Local-Government-Committee-First-Report-on-the-effectiveness-of-local-authority-overview-and-scrutiny-committees.pdf>

## D: Comparison groups

### Cumbria's District Councils

Authority	Population (Mid-2016 estimates)	No of Panels / Committees	Frequency of meetings	Total meetings
Allerdale	97,000	1	6-weekly	8
Barrow	67,300	1	6-weekly	7
Copeland	69,300	1*	6-weekly	10
Eden	52,600	2	10-weekly	10
South Lakeland	103,300	1	8-weekly	7
Carlisle	108,400	3	6-weekly	24

\*A sub-committee also exists.

<https://www.allerdale.gov.uk/en/council-and-democracy/scrutiny-committee/>

<https://barrowbc.gov.uk/about-the-council/barrow-council/council-minutes-agendas/overview-and-scrutiny-committee/>

<https://copeland.moderngov.co.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>

<https://democracy.eden.gov.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>

<http://democracy.southlakeland.gov.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>

## Carlisle City Council – Nearest Neighbour Scrutiny arrangements

Authority	Population	No. of Panels / Committees	Frequency of Meetings	Total meetings
East Staffordshire	117,600	2	6 weekly	14
Wyre Forest	100,700	1	10 per year	10
Cannock Chase	99,100	4	Quarterly	16
Bassetlaw	116,300	1	Monthly	12
South Kesteven	141,700	5	5 per year	25
Mansfield	108,600	3	6 weekly	24
Newcastle under Lyme	129,000	3	Quarterly	12
Tamworth	75,600	3	6 weekly	24
Chesterfield	104,600	2	2 monthly	12
Erewash	115,300	1	6 weekly	8
St Edmundsbury	113,700	2	6 weekly	16
Nuneaton and Bedworth	128,700	4	Quarterly	16
Kettering	100,300	2	5 per year	10
Lancaster	142,500	2	Monthly + 5 per year	17
Taunton Deane	117,400	1	6 weekly	9
Carlisle	108,300	3	6 weekly	24

<http://www.eaststaffsbc.gov.uk/council-democracy/committees>

<http://www.wyreforest.gov.uk/council/committees/com193.htm>

<https://www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/council/council-committees/schedule-memberships-cabinet-committees-and-other-bodies>

<http://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/browse-the-catalogue/council-agendas-and-minutes/overview-scrutiny-committee.aspx>

<http://moderngov.southkesteven.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=496&J=8>

<http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/scrutiny>

<https://moderngov.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

<http://democracy.tamworth.gov.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>

<https://www.chesterfield.gov.uk/your-council/the-council/overview-and-scrutiny.aspx#>

<https://moderngov.erewash.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=327>

<https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=130>

[https://www.nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk/info/20050/council\\_elections\\_and\\_meetings/309/overview\\_and\\_scrutiny/1](https://www.nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk/info/20050/council_elections_and_meetings/309/overview_and_scrutiny/1)

[https://www.kettering.gov.uk/info/20007/councillors\\_mps\\_and\\_decision\\_making/12034/council\\_and\\_committees/2](https://www.kettering.gov.uk/info/20007/councillors_mps_and_decision_making/12034/council_and_committees/2)

<https://committeeadmin.lancaster.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=298&MId=7233&Ver=4>

<https://www.tauntondeane.gov.uk/democratic/council-meetings-minutes-agendas/>



## Carlisle City Council - Historic Cities – Scrutiny Arrangements

Authority	Population	No of panels	Frequency	Total meetings	T&F Groups (17/18)
Mansfield	108,600	3	6 weekly	24	(3) 2
Lancaster	142,500	2	Monthly + 5 per year	17	(3) 2
Ipswich	138,500	1	6 weekly	8	(4) 2
Gloucester	129,100	1	Monthly + budget	13	Requested
Eastbourne	103,300	1	Quarterly	4	Requested
Dover	158,800	2	Monthly	24	(0) 0
Cheltenham	117,100	1	6 weekly	8	Requested
Boston	68,500	2	6 weekly	14	Requested
Bedford		Excluded on basis that it is a unitary authority			N/A
Bassetlaw	116,300	1	Monthly	12	Requested
Amber Valley	125,900	1	2 Monthly	6	Requested
St Edmundsbury	113,700	2	6 weekly	16	2 (2)
Swale	146,700	1	6 Weekly	8	Requested
Carlisle	108,300	3	6 Weekly	24	(2) 1

Information on current and 2017/18 Task & Finish Groups have been requested. The responses are recorded in the 'T&F Groups (17/18)' column. The number in brackets is the count for 2017/18.

<http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/scrutiny>

<https://committeeadmin.lancaster.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=298&MId=7233&Ver=4>

<https://democracy.ipswich.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteId=136>

<https://democracy.gloucester.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteId=408>

<http://democracy.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=128>

[www.dover.gov.uk/Council--Democracy/Scrutiny/Committees.aspx](http://www.dover.gov.uk/Council--Democracy/Scrutiny/Committees.aspx)

<https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=267&Year=0>

<http://moderngov.boston.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

<http://data.bassetlaw.gov.uk/browse-the-catalogue/council-agendas-and-minutes/overview-scrutiny-committee.aspx>

<https://www.ambervalley.gov.uk/council/committees-and-meetings/>

<https://democracy.westsuffolk.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteId=130>

<https://services.swale.gov.uk/meetings/mgCalendarAgendaView.aspx?XXR=0&M=1&DD=2017&ACT=Go&WN=1&CID=139&OT=R&MR=1&>

### South Lakeland DC nearest neighbour comparator councils

Authority	Population	No. of Panels / Committees	Frequency of Meetings (pa is per annum)	Total meetings
Wealden	158,900	1	6	6
South Hams	85,300	1	10pa	10
Teignbridge	131,400	1	10pa	10
East Devon	142,300	1	12	12
Cotswold	87,500	1	5	5
West Dorset	102,100	1	8	8
Chichester	120,200	1	6	6
Wychavon	125,400	1	9	9
Hambleton	90,700	1	8	8
New Forest	179,600	3	6	18
Lewes	102,300	1	6	6
Stratford upon Avon	125,200	1	12	12
Suffolk Coastal	129,000	1	12	12
Carlisle	108,300	3	6 weekly	24

Links not included.

## E: Suggested 2 panel scrutiny arrangement, working titles and summary work themes

Any changes arising from this review should clarify how cross-cutting issues will be coordinated within the new arrangements. This will be considered alongside the work on panel name(s) and remits.

Items in bold text have featured on the work programmes for 2018/19, remits that have not featured as agenda items are covered by the budget scrutiny and quarterly performance report.

### External Overview & Scrutiny Panel

To fulfil all the functions and have all the powers and responsibilities of a Crime and Disorder Committee under the provisions of section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 and any relevant regulations or guidance.

Bereavement Services 3	Environmental Strategy 1/3	<b>Performance Monitoring 2</b>
Business Support 4	Events 1	<b>Public Realm 3</b>
<b>Car parking 3</b>	Food Safety 3	<b>Regeneration 4</b>
<b>City Centre 3</b>	Greenspaces 3	<b>Sport and leisure 6</b>
Community development 5	<b>Health and Wellbeing 5</b>	<b>Strategic partnerships 1</b>
<b>Community Safety 5</b>	<b>Heritage 4</b>	<b>Tourism 6</b>
<b>Cultural Strategy 6</b>	<b>Homelessness Strategy 4</b>	Town Twinning 1
Disabled Facilities Grants 5	<b>Housing Strategy 4</b>	<b>Tullie House Trust 6</b>
<b>Economic development 4</b>	<b>Inward Investment 4</b>	Waste and recycling 3
<b>Emergency Planning 1</b>	<b>Local Plans and planning 4</b>	Welfare and advice 4
<b>Environmental Health and Protection 3</b>	Neighbourhoods 3	Youth engagement 1

### Internal Overview & Scrutiny Panel

<b>Asset Management 2</b>	<b>Financial Monitoring 2</b>	Organisation Development 2
<b>Budget Framework 2</b>	Governance Framework 2	<b>Performance Management Framework and Performance Monitoring 2</b>
Business continuity 1	Health & Safety (internal) 2	Procurement 2
Communication and marketing 1	Human Resources 2	<b>Property (strategic) 2/4</b>
<b>Corporate Plan 1</b>	ICT 2	Revenues and Benefits 2
<b>Corporate Programme and Projects 2</b>	Information Governance 2	<b>Risk Management 2</b>
<b>Customer contact &amp; care 5</b>	Insurance 2	Service Reviews 2
Efficiency Plans 2	Internal Audit 2	<b>Strategic Finance 2</b>
Electoral Registration 2	Legal, Licensing and Regulation 2	<b>Treasury Management 2</b>
<b>Equality Policy 5</b>	<b>Medium Term Financial Plan 2</b>	<b>Workforce Development 2</b>
External Funding 2	Member training and development 2	

Portfolio Holder Key:

1	Leader
2	Finance, Governance & Resources
3	Environment & Transport
4	Economy, Enterprise & Housing
5	Communities, Health & Wellbeing
6	Culture, Heritage & Leisure

## F: Analysis of Overview & Scrutiny agenda items

Year 2018/19 (based on initial work programme and actual meetings)

<b>Panel</b>	<b>Number of meetings</b>	<b>Agenda items</b>	<b>Average</b>
Business & Transformation	8	30	3.8
Economic Growth	8	23	2.9
Health & Wellbeing	8	23	2.9

Year 2017/18

<b>Panel</b>	<b>Number of meetings</b>	<b>Agenda items</b>	<b>Average</b>
Business & Transformation	8	31	3.9
Economic Growth	8	23	2.9
Health & Wellbeing	8	27	3.4

Year 2016/17

<b>Panel</b>	<b>Number of meetings</b>	<b>Agenda items</b>	<b>Average</b>
Resources	8	39	4.9
Economy	8	27	3.4
Community	8	25	3.1

For a 3-panel structure this averages 3 items per agenda for each panel  
(284 items/72 meetings)

For a 2 -panel structure this averages 5 items per agenda for each panel  
(248 items/48 meetings)

Please Note:

Panel names and remits were changes during 2017-18

Analysis is for normal business and therefore excludes special meetings and task and finish group meetings

**G: Summary of current governance structure:**

**COMMITTEES AND PANELS (TO BE APPOINTED BY COUNCIL)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Current</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Legislation and notes</b>
Appeals Panel (3)	As required	3 plus 3 subs – 18 members in total			A Member cannot hear a complaint if: They know the Complainant The Complainant resides in their ward They were involved in the decision i.e. Planning Permission
Audit Committee	Nominally quarterly, but in the last few years an additional meeting has been held in July to agree the sign off accounts	7 plus 7 subs			No member of the Executive and no Chair of Scrutiny Panels will be eligible to be a Member of the Audit Committee
Development Control Committee	6 weeks	12 plus 7 subs			Training to attend these committees is mandatory
Employment Panel	As required	6 plus 6 subs			One Executive Member must be a member of the Employment Panel
Licensing Committee	Quarterly –meetings coincide with Regulatory Panel	12 plus 7 subs	10	15	Licensing Act 2003. Committee can delegate to sub-committees (see over). No need for political balance. Training to attend these committees is mandatory
Regulatory Panel	6 weekly	12 plus 7 subs			Council has decided on same membership as Licensing Committee Training to attend these committees is mandatory
Scrutiny Panels (3)	6weeks	8 – plus 7 subs* for each Panel except BTSP which has 6			Executive Members cannot be members of Scrutiny Panels Local Government Act 1972. Guidance advises that Panels should meet frequently and be cross cutting. Must be politically balanced.
Standards Committee	As required	7 – plus 7 subs			Must be politically balanced. May contain non-voting Members – S104 LGA '72

COMMITTEES / GROUPS NOT APPOINTED BY COUNCIL: The following Sub-Committees are appointed by the Licensing Committee:

Name	Frequency	Current	Minimum	Maximum	Legislation and notes
Licensing Sub-Committee (4)	As required	3 – plus 3 subs per Cmttee = the 12 substantive members of the licensing Committee and its substitutes			No need for political balance.  Training to attend these committees is mandatory Members who attend the meeting must not be the relevant Ward Member

COMMITTEES / GROUPS NOT APPOINTED BY COUNCIL – APPOINTMENTS MADE BY THE LEADER OR BY OTHER COMMITTEES/GROUPS

Name	Frequency	Current	Minimum	Maximum	Legislation and notes
Executive	4 weeks	6	Leader + 2 cannot include Mayor or Deputy Mayor	10	Local Government Act 2000 Appointment by the Leader
Joint Consultative Group					Appointment by the Leader
Market Management Group	Bi-annual	3			Appointed by the Leader's Scheme of Delegation so are Executive Members Appointment by the Leader

<http://intranet.carlisle.gov.uk/yourcouncil/dirser/legal/demserv/Documents/Committee%20Membership%202018-19%20-%20Annual%20Council%2021%2005%2018.doc>

\*Consideration should be given to establishing a bank of named substitutes which could attend any of the three Scrutiny Panels.

---

## **EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON 17 JANUARY 2019**

---

### **EGSP.08/19    TASK AND FINISH GROUP REPORT – AN EFFICIENCY AND EFFICACY REVIEW OF THE CURRENT GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES OF THE COUNCIL**

The Policy and Communications Manager submitted OS.01/19 – Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group Report: An efficiency and efficacy review of the current governance structures of the Council. The two principal drivers which had precipitated the review were: the Local Government's Boundary Commission for England's Review of electoral wards in the district and its recommendation that the number of Elected Members at the authority be reduced from 52 to 39 and; recent national government's guidance on local authority scrutiny function.

Communications had been sent to each of the Political Groups and Group Leaders to inviting their views. The Policy and Communications Manager emphasised that the report was a working document which would be adapted as a result of input into the process. The Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel were scheduled to consider the matter at a special meeting on 7 February 2019 and the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel would consider the matter on 22 February 2019.

In considering the report Members raised the following questions and concerns:

A Member commented that the report was useful to a degree, particularly the comparison data with other local authorities. However, he felt that the report had not addressed the issues of efficiency and efficacy. In his view scrutiny was an important function, and whilst it was reasonable to consider the number of Panel, memberships, frequency of meetings, the issue of effectiveness was a more important consideration.

The Member noted that the report referred to a Parliamentary Review of Local Authority Scrutiny Function which outlined a number of metrics for assessing the effectiveness of scrutiny, he suggested that it be used as a template for further evidence gathering for the review into the Council's current governance arrangements.

The Policy and Communications Manager acknowledged the Member's comments, the Parliamentary Review had placed a significant emphasis on organisational culture, accordingly, such an approach would require the gathering of Member and Officer views. Developing a methodology to judge effectiveness in a valid way, required the comparison of activity against identified standards, of which there were none.

The Policy and Communications Manager indicated that the effectiveness of scrutiny was a judgement for Members to make, and that they may wish to consider the following as standards: the number of Panel resolutions which had impacted on Executive decision making; the number of Call-ins; number of Members involved in policy development through Task and Finish groups.

The Member appreciated the Officer's comments but reiterated his view that the methodology used in the Parliamentary Review constituted a useful template for the Council employ in its review.

The Chairman commented that it was a difficult issue and noted that there had been a review of scrutiny in the previous Municipal Year which had changed Panel remits. The current review had essentially provided an options exercise which questioned the sustainability of the number of Panels going forward. He felt that the proposed reduction in the number of Councillors was not the prerequisite for change, rather a consideration of the effectiveness of the function.

A number of Members supported the view that an assessment of the effectiveness of scrutiny should come before a review of the number of Panels and frequency of meetings. Moreover, it was important that a sufficient body of evidence was compiled to enable Members to meaningfully consider the issues.

A Member considered that policy development was an important aspect of the scrutiny function and that the low number of call-ins was a result of that. Consequently, such activity was important for involving Members in the Council's work. In terms of the proposals contained in the report he welcomed greater use of Task and Finish Group work and indicated that he felt able to support a proposal for 2 Panels, going forward.

Another Member noted that there had been one Task and Finish Group in the current Municipal year, and two in the preceding year. In the context of the review, she did not support the proposal of reducing the overall number of Panels as a vehicle for increasing Task and Finish Group work. Additionally, she felt that in assigning work to Task and Finish Groups there ought to be a checklist used to identify suitable items.

The Chairman sought Member's agreement that the Panel supported the resolution of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel on 3 January *"That the Task and Finish Group continue to gather further evidence to be submitted to the Business and Transformation Panel at its special meeting along with feedback from consultation with the Groups and other Scrutiny Panels"*, (Minute excerpt BTSP.09/19 (2) refers).

A Member commented that there would be a new Council in May, which may or may not be supportive of the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group, therefore it was important that there was a body of valid evidence for the organisation to consider whether its scrutiny function was effective.

RESOLVED – 1) That report OS.01/19 – Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group Report: An efficiency and efficacy review of the current governance structures of the Council be received.

2) That the Panel supported the resolution of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel on 3 January *"That the Task and Finish Group continue to gather further evidence to be submitted to the Business and Transformation Panel at its special meeting along with feedback from consultation with the Groups and other Scrutiny Panels"*, (Minute excerpt BTSP.09/19 (2) refers).



---

## **EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON 7 FEBRUARY 2019**

---

### **HWSP.11/19 TASK AND FINISH GROUP REPORT – AN EFFICIENCY AND EFFICACY REVIEW OF THE CURRENT GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES OF THE COUNCIL**

The Policy and Communications Manager submitted OS.02/19 – Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group Report: An efficiency and efficacy review of the current governance structures of the Council. The report outlined the stages and timetable for the review with the overall report having been approved by the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group as a suitable consultation document for the Panels to consider.

The Policy and Communications Manager stated the review was a work in progress and drew Members' attention to the report recommendations, the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel had discussed the matter on 17 January, its comments and issues raised therein had been considered at the Scrutiny Chairs Group on 24 January. The purpose of the work was to develop an informed evidenced based report for the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group to consider and determine the next steps for the review.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- Referring to the report recommendations, that future Panels be made up of between 8 and 10 Members, was that number prescribed?

The Policy and Communications Manager responded that he had looked at legislation regarding the make-up of Council Panels and that there was no stipulation on the numbers required to make up a scrutiny panel. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England, who had recommended a reduction in the overall number of Councillors at the authority, indicated that the scrutiny function was sustainable going forward.

In terms of the recommendation of 8 – 10 Members the Policy and Communications Manager advised that level of membership had been proposed on the basis of a reduction in the number of Panels and was aimed at sustaining the level of Member participation in the scrutiny function.

- The Chairman sought clarification that the report proposed an internal facing Panel and external facing Panel for the future.

The Policy and Communications Manager responded that the Council had previously conducted a review of its scrutiny function which had created the current Panels' remits. Appendix E of the report, which illustrated a two Panel model had been a consideration during that earlier review.

The Chairman responded that, in his view, a reduction to two Panel would mean that the workload for those Panels would be too vast and would lead to excessively lengthy meetings.

Another Member commented that he felt there were pros and cons to each model, he considered that a single Panel would be a workable format, although it would require a higher number of seats than any of the current individual Panels.

A Member stated that he considered scrutiny was an important function within the authority however, he felt the matter ought to be determined by the Council in the new Civic Year. He further indicated that he was supportive of three Panels with the chairmanships being allocated as follows: 1 Conservative, 1 Labour, and 1 Independent.

Responding to a question from a Member regarding the capacity to amend the timetable for the review, the Policy and Communications Manager noted that the report recommendations requested comments on that point. Were Members minded to amend the timetable to enable any decision on the scrutiny function to be taken in the forthcoming Civic Year, that was an important issue to feedback to the Task and Finish Group. In his view there were 2 aspects to the review: the number of Panels and their remits and; the timetable for making a decision, both of which were matters for Members.

- Who would decide whether recommendations on the future governance arrangements for scrutiny would be submitted to Council?

The Policy and Communications Manager advised that the Special meeting of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel on 22 February 2019 would decide how the review would be progressed, including whether any recommendations were to be made to Council.

A Member indicated, that were the Panel to vote on any agreement of principle in relation to the review, he would abstain, as he felt the matter ought to be determined in the new Civic Year.

The Chairman stated that he felt his interests were conflicted due to his chairmanship of the Panel. He reiterated that he considered three Panels to be the most appropriate system going forward, but stated that he would leave Members to decide the matter.

A Member sought clarification that the Panel was not required to vote on the matter, but to provide comments to the Task and Finish Group for their consideration.

The Policy and Communications Manager confirmed that the Panel was required to provide comments on the report recommendations. The minutes of the meeting would record the Panel's view, but it was not necessary for a consensus to be achieved.

A Member moved that a 2 Panel system be adopted with an increased number of seats on each. It was a matter for the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel to decide how to progress the issue. The proposal was seconded and put to the vote. The vote was carried.