

# **Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report to the City Council**

## **2006 / 2007**

To be considered at the City Council meeting  
on 11 December, 2007

**If you need this information in another format or language  
please contact us:**

**Telephone: (024) 7683 1091**

**Minicom: (024) 7683 1093**

**Fax: (024) 7683 1106**

**e-mail: [suky.dhindsa@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:suky.dhindsa@coventry.gov.uk)**

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Foreword	2
Section A Highlights	3
Section B The work of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee	6
Section C The work of Scrutiny Board 1	8
Section D The work of Scrutiny Board 2	10
Section E The work of Scrutiny Board 3	12
Section F The work of Scrutiny Board 4	14
Section G Support for Scrutiny	16

## Foreword



The Scrutiny process continued to develop during 2006/2007, building on the work of the previous year. Members worked collaboratively and achieved some good outcomes, as can be seen in section A of the report. Although the number of call-ins was (disappointingly) higher than the previous year, in some cases these resulted in more informed decisions by the Cabinet.

Sections B to F of the report give an overview of Scrutiny activity during the year, showing the useful work done by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee and the Scrutiny Boards. The Audit Sub-Group (which reports separately to the Council on its work) has also made a good start since it was set up in September 2006.

However, much remains to be done if Scrutiny is to be really effective and Members are to feel fully involved in the political process. The main areas for development are highlighted in section A 5 of the report, not least of which are the scrutiny of partnerships – a major extension of Scrutiny work – and earlier involvement in policy development.

As Members know, I no longer chair the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee – that responsibility has passed to my colleague David Arrowsmith. I know that he will press forward with developing Scrutiny, with the help of the Leader of the Council who has taken on the role of increasing Scrutiny's effectiveness.

However, it cannot be left to them alone to bring about improvement: all Members and Directors have their parts to play and I would encourage them to do all they can to support this work, which will ultimately help the Council to achieve its objectives.

**Councillor Tim Sawdon**  
**Chair, Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee 2006/2007**

## Section A - Highlights 2006/2007

### 1 Overview

1.1 The main highlights of Scrutiny's work are shown in brief below. Chairs have included more details about some of these in their reports.

- Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee oversaw the process for relocating the tenants of Cygnet and Orwell Courts, as part of the implementation of the Swanswell development
- Scrutiny Board 1 continued to give a high priority to the reduction of sickness absence levels
- Scrutiny Board 2 held a Teenage Pregnancy Event attracting over 100 practitioners from across the City sharing good practice and disseminating significant local research undertaken by Coventry University
- Scrutiny Board 3 has ensured that due prominence has been given to the preparations for the major development of a new city centre IKEA store
- Scrutiny Board 4 played an influential role in the consideration of phlebotomy services in Coventry, leading to the patient-centred re-commissioning process now underway
- We hosted a visit from a group of Johannesburg councillors and employees who were touring this country to find out more about scrutiny arrangements.

### 2 Scrutiny Development 2006/2007

2.1 In May 2006, the Council changed the remits of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee and the Scrutiny Boards. The new responsibilities are shown in Sections B to F below.

2.2 During the course of the year there were further changes involving Scrutiny:

- The Cabinet Member (Policy, Leadership and Governance) took on responsibility for ensuring that the Scrutiny process can work effectively
- Scrutiny Board 1 established an Audit Sub-Group of interested Members to carry out its audit functions
- Scrutiny Board 4 established a Neighbourhood Management Working Group to advise the Cabinet Member (Neighbourhoods, Inequalities and Health) on the development of Neighbourhood Management.

2.3 A Scrutiny "vision statement" was developed:

*"Scrutiny's role is to agree high-quality, relevant recommendations, that are supported by the Executive and partners, and lead to measurable service improvements and tangible benefits for Coventry residents that would not otherwise have been achieved."*

2.4 Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee agreed four Scrutiny "themes" to guide work planning:

- **Relevance** – place greater emphasis on Cabinet Member Strategic Plans as the basis for Scrutiny work
- **Public engagement** – look for wider and more ambitious involvement for the public

- **Value for Money** – use the Value for Money Strategy as a tool for developing Scrutiny work plans, and try to demonstrate the value for money of scrutiny activity (e.g. are we getting “value for money” from the resources required to support the political management arrangements?)
- **Outcomes focused** – be clearer about what Scrutiny activity achieves

2.5 A survey of all Members was carried out in February/March 2007. It found that, whilst the majority of Members were satisfied with the effectiveness of Scrutiny, there was some dissatisfaction with Scrutiny's role in policy development and a high level of dissatisfaction with the level of public engagement in Scrutiny.

### **3 Outcomes – What Has Worked Well**

3.1 Scrutiny continued to improve during 2006/2007:

- Members have worked collaboratively and recognised that Scrutiny works most effectively when party politics are put aside.
- There has been more effective reviewing of Cabinet Member Strategic Plans: the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee and the Scrutiny Boards each invited their relevant Cabinet Members to attend meetings during the course of the year to discuss the Plans. Scrutiny Members agreed beforehand the questions they would ask at these meetings and informed the Cabinet Members of them in advance. This enabled the Cabinet Members to provide considered answers and made the meetings more productive.
- Boards held meetings to discuss issues in detail e.g. Scrutiny Board 1 reviewed the incidence of sickness absence, Scrutiny Board 2 considered the findings and recommendations of the Joint Area Review, Scrutiny Board 3 considered travel issues and Scrutiny Board 4 considered issues relating to the reconfiguration of the West Midlands Ambulance Service.
- Scrutiny Boards now more regularly consider issues before decisions are taken by Cabinet/Cabinet Members, rather than after. This allows Scrutiny Members to make recommendations for Cabinet/Cabinet Members to take into account when making final decisions. However, given that consideration often takes place only a few days before a decision is taken, it is debatable whether this change has had a significant impact. Earlier involvement in policy development would enable Scrutiny to have more influence in the decision-making process.
- Scrutiny monitoring has ensured Council integrity, e.g. the Cygnet Court issue mentioned in section 1 above.
- Scrutiny has helped to manage risk by identifying areas in reports needing further work e.g. the review of library services and balancing the budget in Learning Disabilities Services. Much of this work was conducted through the call-in process.

### **4 Outcomes – What Has Worked Less Well**

4.1 Despite the improvements mentioned in the previous section, there were areas where Scrutiny did not develop as well as had been intended:

- The seminar programme intended as a way of providing Members with useful information on important issues did not prove successful. It remains difficult to find ways of providing sufficient information to Members to enable them to scrutinise issues effectively and make recommendations

- Some Members and officers continued to be sceptical of the value of the Scrutiny role and there still does not seem to be consensus on what constitutes "good scrutiny" across the key stakeholders (Cabinet Members, Scrutiny Members, senior officers)
- Attendance at meetings was variable and sometimes disappointing, perhaps reflecting Member uncertainty about the impact that Scrutiny can have
- Scrutiny arrangements continued to be dominated by a "committee-style" approach, which limits opportunities for public engagement and is not helpful when trying to obtain the information necessary to formulate reasoned recommendations
- The "Scrutiny Themes", mentioned in section 2 above, did not influence activity as much as had been hoped
- Scrutiny had mixed performance in terms of producing high-quality recommendations leading to positive outcomes that would not otherwise have been achieved. Possible reasons for this include:
  - the points mentioned above relating to the lack of consensus about what makes good Scrutiny, the committee-style approach which discourages public engagement and the lack of influence of the "Scrutiny Themes"
  - the late involvement in the decision-making process, which reduces the potential for Scrutiny's influence.

## **5 Challenges for the Future**

5.1 There are two main challenges for the future:

- to improve Scrutiny's effectiveness
- to implement the additional roles for Scrutiny set out in the Police and Justice Act 2006 and the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill

5.2 In relation to the former, the aim is for Scrutiny:-

- to achieve wider consensus on its role
- to have more involvement in policy development e.g. early engagement between Cabinet Members and Scrutiny Members, the use of informal task-and-finish groups, work plans based on Cabinet Member Strategic Plans
- to have a greater role in budget setting
- to demonstrate value for money in its activity
- to evaluate policy outcomes
- to increase public involvement
- to make high quality, relevant recommendations
- to demonstrate that Scrutiny activity leads to positive outcomes that would not otherwise have been achieved

5.3 The approach to the scrutiny of partnerships, as envisaged in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Bill, will be agreed when Government guidance is issued.

## Section B - the Work of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee



Councillor Tim Sawdon

### Members

Councillors Asif, Duggins, Lee, Mutton, Patton, Ridge (Deputy Chair), Sawdon (Chair) and Williams

**Co-opted Member for all matters:** Councillor Clifford

**Co-opted Members for education matters:** Ms M Foster, Mr. R. Potter, Mrs. L. Wainscot (2 vacancies)

### 1 Remit

- 1.1 Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee is responsible for the overall management of the Scrutiny function (including call-ins); consideration of cross-cutting issues; oversight of the portfolio of the Cabinet Member (Policy, Leadership and Governance).
- 1.2 The Committee continued to meet mainly on a weekly basis in 2006/2007, although some meetings were cancelled if there was insufficient business.
- 1.3 Work done by the Committee in relation to each aspect of its remit was as follows:

### 2 Overall management of Scrutiny

- 2.1 Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee continued to identify issues which Scrutiny Boards or the Committee itself could consider, although there was (and remains) a lack of clarity around which issues were best dealt with by the Committee and which by the individual Boards.
- 2.2 The Committee approved the Scrutiny Boards' initial work programmes, received quarterly reports on progress from the Scrutiny Board Chairs and considered (and agreed) a request from Scrutiny Board 2 for funding for a review of Teenage Pregnancy. The Committee's role in monitoring and supporting wider Scrutiny activity is an area for future development.
- 2.3 The Committee also discussed informally how Scrutiny might develop in the future.

### 3 Consideration of call-ins

- 3.1 The number of call-ins (18) was higher than in 2005/2006 (7), although three related to the same issue (Delivering modernisation and efficiencies in social care in order to balance the budget in learning disabilities services).
- 3.2 The Committee's discussion on this issue and on two further call-ins (one relating to the review of library buildings and the other to re-modelling buildings at Limbrick Wood Primary School) was very detailed and resulted in clearer information being provided to the Cabinet/Cabinet Member before they took their final decisions. Two call-ins (one relating to the impact of the closure of Holbrook Library on children and the other to the Ricoh Arena Project) were ruled inappropriate.



3.3 In the remaining cases Scrutiny Boards concurred with the decisions of the Cabinet Member/Cabinet.

#### **4 Cross-cutting issues**

4.1 The Committee continued the work it began in 2005/2006 on the relocation of the tenants of Cygnet and Orwell Courts (a crucial factor in the major Swanswell re-development project), which was an issue raised at a meeting of the full City Council. The Committee gave guidance to officers which helped to achieve a solution acceptable both to most tenants and to the Council.

4.2 The Committee continued to receive reports from Members about the outside bodies to which they were appointed by the Council and about conferences they attended.

4.3 Other issues discussed by the Committee were:-

- government consultation documents
- urgent issues to be considered by the Cabinet
- information from the national Best Value User Satisfaction Survey
- the role of Directors of charitable trusts

4.4 The Committee established a Review Group in September 2006 to consider the performance of the Council's IT provider (Serco) against its contract and to recommend future action. This work continued into 2007/2008.

#### **5 Oversight of the Portfolio of the Cabinet Member (Policy, Leadership and Governance)**

5.1 The Committee held two meetings (one in August 2006 and the other in February 2007) with the Cabinet Member to discuss his Strategic Plan. Amongst the issues raised were the Council's International Strategy, the City Region, his plans for developing the effectiveness of Scrutiny and the Council's restructure proposals.

## Section C - the Work of Scrutiny Board 1



Councillor Andrew Williams

### Members

Councillors Charley, Crookes (Deputy Chair), Chater, Lee, McKay, Skipper, Townshend and Williams (Chair)

### 1 Remit

- 1.1 Scrutiny Board 1 is responsible for oversight of the portfolios of the Cabinet Members (Culture, Leisure and Libraries), (Finance, Procurement and Value for Money) and (Human Resources, Corporate and Customer Services) and for audit Issues.
- 1.2 The Board held fifteen meetings during the year, of which ten were scheduled at the beginning of the year and five were added during the year to accommodate work on sickness absence and the Cabinet Members' Strategic Plans.

### 2 Audit Work

- 2.1 In September 2006, the Board appointed an Audit Sub-Group to carry out its audit responsibilities (relating to both internal and external audit issues), which left the Board free to concentrate on other areas of its remit. The Audit Sub-Group will report separately to the Council on its work.

### 3 Sickness Absence

- 3.1 The Board focused much of its attention on the issue of Council employees' sickness absence levels. The Board held two meetings (one in July 2006 and one in February 2007) with all Directors to question them in detail on the action they were taking to reduce absence levels. This helped to raise the profile of the issue, but did not result in significantly lower absence levels. The Board are continuing this work in 2007/2008 by looking in more detail at service areas with the highest levels of absence.

### 4 IT Issues

- 4.1 The Board considered a number of IT-related issues: progress on the Coventry Direct initiative, the ICT infrastructure strategy and the new IT system (Academy) introduced in the Revenue and Benefits Service. It was concerned that service to customers might be adversely affected during this system's installation period and therefore set up a task and finish group to consider this in more detail. Having been given much more information about the implementation process and the action proposed for ensuring the continuity of the service, the group was able to satisfy itself that the

effects on customers would be minimal. However, the Board continued to monitor progress on the system and is carrying on this work in 2007/2008.

## **5 Other Work**

5.1 Other work done by the Board was as follows:-

- Quarterly monitoring of the City Council's capital and revenue programmes
- Quarterly monitoring of the progress made on the Housing Benefits Improvement Plan
- Monitoring the Value for Money strategy
- Considering information on Section 106 agreements to find out how much money was held by the Council and what plans there were for its use
- Considering information on possible partnering arrangements for legal services, which are intended to ensure that a broad range of legal expertise is available to meet the Council's needs.

5.2 In common with all Boards, meetings were held with the three Cabinet Members to discuss their Strategic Plans.

## Section D – the Work of Scrutiny Board 2



Councillor Nigel Lee

### **Members**

Councillors Chater, Crookes, Dixon (Deputy Chair), Field, Griffin, Lancaster, Lee (Chair) and Lucas

### **Co-opted Members for education matters**

Ms M Foster, Mr. R. Potter, Mrs. L. Wainscot  
(2 vacancies)

## **1 Remit**

- 1.1 Scrutiny Board 2 is responsible for oversight of the portfolio of the Cabinet Member (Children, Learning and Young People).
- 1.2 The revised Scrutiny structure for 2006/07 allowed Scrutiny Board 2 to focus solely on issues relating to children, learning and young people. Whilst officers from various directorates attended meetings to support the Board, the main focus of activity was on the work of the Cabinet Member (Children, Learning and Young People) and the emerging Directorate of the same name.
- 1.3 In setting out its work programme for the year, the Board began by receiving the results of the Communities that Care survey of 11,000 children and young people from the City. This highlighted young people's concerns and experiences and was a useful tool for officers in planning and delivering targeted services for Coventry's young people. As a result of this survey, the Board included in its work programme the issue of young people being involved in, and suffering from, anti-social behaviour and crime.
- 1.4 Major work programme items for the Board were as shown below.

## **2 Respite Care Review**

- 2.1 Officers had done some work on consultation with parents of children and young people with moderate to severe learning disabilities concerning the provision of respite care. This care takes a number of different forms, one being the provision of scheduled stays for the young people at the Council's Broad Park House Children's Home. Additionally, the Council has a special respite fostering service provided through Barnardo's.
- 2.2 The Board decided to conduct some consultation of its own with regard to this Review and held a special meeting to which a number of carers and partner organisations were invited. A number of issues were raised at this meeting, including the importance of the flexibility of care packages, the lack of available carers for those families choosing a Direct Payments option and the high regard in which carers held the services at Broad Park House.

- 2.3 Following further discussions with the Board and further work with partner agencies, the decision was taken to extend the consultation and the issue has been included in the Board's 2007/08 work programme.

### **3 Teenage Pregnancy**

- 3.1 Following the inclusion of cautionary comments in national inspection reports concerning local teenage pregnancy levels, the Board included this issue in its work programme.
- 3.2 The Board considered the work of the local Teenage Pregnancy Partnership, which was beginning to show the results of co-ordinated efforts to encourage the education and promotion of sex and relationship education in the City and an improvement in the services available to support young women who have become pregnant.
- 3.3 As a result of discussions with the Partnership and relevant officers, the Board resolved to hold an event aimed at promoting good practice in the City. Additionally the event was to disseminate recent local research conducted by Coventry University into teenage pregnancy issues. The event was a huge success with over 100 practitioners attending and sharing ideas and initiatives.

### **4 Building Schools for the Future (BSF)**

- 4.1 Following the City Council's success in being awarded over £318 million in funding to transform the City's secondary schools, the Board appointed a BSF Scrutiny Review Group. This Group will consider the various stages of the project and act as a Member sounding board for the project. It is anticipated that this Review Group will need to meet for several years as the various stages of the project evolve and the plans become reality.
- 4.2 In preparation for the opening of Coventry's first City Academy, the Group visited the Grace Academy in Solihull. This visit gave an introduction to the type of facilities that will be available at the Academy in Coventry in September 2009, when the replacement school building will be completed. The Academy itself will open in September 2008 in the old Woodway Park School buildings.

### **5 Other Issues Considered by the Board**

- 5.1 Following the Joint Area Review Inspection, the Board met with the Coventry & Warwickshire Partnership Trust to discuss the development of a Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) Strategy for the City.
- 5.2 The impact of the children of economic migrants on Coventry schools was investigated in a special meeting with Minority Group Support Services (MGSS).
- 5.3 The Board held two meetings to consider the Cabinet Member Strategic Plan and its 6-month review, as well as considering the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP).

## Section E – the Work of Scrutiny Board 3



Councillor Cliff Ridge

### Members

Councillors Adalat, Lancaster (Deputy Chair), Mulhall, Reece, Ridge (Chair), Townshend, Waters and Windsor

### 1 Remit

- 1.1 Scrutiny Board 3 is responsible for oversight of the portfolios of the Cabinet Members (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning) and (City Services).
- 1.2 The revised Scrutiny structure for 2006/2007 allowed Scrutiny Board 3 to focus on two major portfolios: City Services and Urban Regeneration & Regional Planning. In a busy year the Board held thirteen formal meetings plus a number of seminars, site visits and informal meetings.
- 1.3 In setting out its work programme for the year the Board endeavoured to concentrate on major development issues affecting the City Centre and a smaller number of specific policy development issues.

### 2 City Centre

- 2.1 The Board held a number of meetings at which the City Centre and its development were the priority. The Board met with CVOne on a number of occasions, discussing the retail offer, visitor footfall and various infrastructure issues.
- 2.2 One issue in which the Board took a considerable interest was the redevelopment of High Street and associated street cleaning issues. The Board met with CVOne and English Landscapes along with City Services officers to discuss the experimental surfacing material and associated cleansing issues.
- 2.3 Following the announcement of a landmark City Centre IKEA store for the City, the Board scrutinised in detail proposals for highways and other works to the City Centre. In February the Board held a special meeting to consider various proposals and, as a result, the Board's Chair was invited to join the Project Group that has led the process of preparing for the store. In this way the Board's concerns could be addressed and the Chair was able to brief colleagues on progress.

### 3 Transport Issues

- 3.1 With the Council increasingly committed to promoting public transport in the city, the Board held a number of meetings in which transport issues centred. In particular a meeting was held in August with Travel Coventry, as a number of Members had expressed concerns about recent changes to bus services in the City. Travel Coventry presented information to the Board about their service redesign and dealt with a

number of specific points at the meeting. They also made an undertaking to meet with ward councillors to discuss other local issues on request.

- 3.2 The development of the Traffic Management Act allows (albeit slowly) the Council to take on additional powers to shape the transport network of the City. The Board heard about proposals for adopting powers and also received an update on the Council's Parking Services.

#### **4 Commercial Property Portfolio**

- 4.1 The Board considered the results of the Commercial Property Portfolio Review at a number of meetings during the year. This Review had been undertaken after advice from the external auditors for the Council to take a more strategic look at the property owned by the Council. The first part of the Review concerned rented property or leasehold property providing only minimal returns to the City Council. This Review is on-going and will be picked up in 2007/2008.

#### **5 Planning Issues**

- 5.1 The Board received a number of updates on the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) and on Government proposals for encouraging growth in housing completions. Following a seminar, the Board established a Scrutiny Review Group to look into various customer care issues. Due to a number of staff changes this Review Group's work has been interrupted; however, it is anticipated that it will complete its work during 2007/2008.

#### **6 Waste Strategy**

- 6.1 The City Council can be very proud of its track record in waste disposal and in recovering heat and energy from waste. The Board visited the London Road Waste to Energy Plant and were very impressed with the various initiatives underway, whilst being realistic about the potential life of this facility in an age of tightening regulation and increasingly higher environmental standards.
- 6.2 The Board has resolved to visit a modern Waste to Energy Plant in Hampshire when this is possible and will continue to scrutinise proposals for both local and national Waste Strategies.

#### **7 Other Issues Considered by the Board**

- The Board considered the Ricoh Arena Green Travel Plan in advance of the 2006 summer concerts at the Ricoh Arena
- Proposals for the redevelopment of Ironmonger Row were presented to the Board and Members made observations pending this scheme being further investigated
- The Council's proposal to replace all street lighting in the City through a PFI scheme was scrutinised
- The Board received a presentation on the developing Swanswell initiative
- The Council's response to "Gridlock or Growth", discussing the options for managing congestion in the region, was also considered by the Board

## Section F – the Work of Scrutiny Board 4



### Members

Councillors Asif (Deputy Chair), Bains, Clifford (Chair), Gazey, Harper (until December 2006), Hunter (from December 2006), Patton, Skinner and Waters

**Councillor Joe Clifford**

### 1 Remit

- 1.1 Scrutiny Board 4 is responsible for oversight of the portfolios of the Cabinet Members (Community Services and Housing) and (Neighbourhoods, Inequalities and Health) and for external Health scrutiny

### 2 Outcomes of the Board's Work

- 2.1 The Board made recommendations on the following subjects:

- The future of ambulance services in Coventry
- The local health economy and its impact on local authority services and budgets
- The Coventry and Warwickshire Acute Services Review
- Protocol for identification and notification of substantial developments and variations to health services

- 2.2 The Board has evidence of positive outcomes stemming from its recommendations:

- Recommendations on the future of ambulance services in the city led to closer liaison between the City Council, Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust and West Midlands Ambulance Service and greater clarity regarding the future of city centre health services
- The Board's work on the local health economy brought greater transparency and accountability to local decision-making, assisted in the formulation of Council policy and helped avoid unhelpful disputes between local stakeholders
- The Board's consideration of phlebotomy services prompted Coventry Teaching PCT to embark on a patient-led reconsideration of its proposed service model

- 2.3 The Board considered many reports related to Community Services, Housing and Community Safety, but did not make any recommendations on these topics.

- 2.4 The Board initiated a review of the experiences of older people in hospital and after discharge, utilising innovative methodologies for public involvement.



### 3 Lessons learned

3.1 The Board drew the following lessons from its activity in 2006/2007:

- Potential for joint working
- Committee-style working has its limitations
- Good scrutiny requires informed councillors
- Wider officer engagement would assist better scrutiny
- Work planning can be improved
- Closer liaison with Cabinet Members is required

3.2 The Board should make more recommendations. Good scrutiny is hard to measure. Some process measures – number of formal meetings, issues covered, or even numbers of the public involved, for example – are inadequate as measures of quality. Difficulties with causality make it difficult to be clear whether Scrutiny has had a positive influence, and evidence put forward tends to be qualitative rather than quantitative.

3.3 Statutorily, accountability for service improvement sits with the Executive, not Scrutiny. Thus it is always difficult to be certain whether Scrutiny is "weak" or "strong", "effective" or "ineffective". However, where Scrutiny fails to make recommendations (even implicitly), it can be difficult to determine whether or not Scrutiny has had an impact. Members and officers must focus more on agreeing quality recommendations, and monitoring their progress. Only by this means will Scrutiny become a *de facto* component of policy development and service improvement.

## Section G – Support for Scrutiny

### 1 Budget

- 1.1 The Scrutiny budget (which is held by the Head of Corporate Policy and meets the cost of such things as securing expert advice, paying travel expenses for witnesses to attend meetings, refreshments, publications and conference fees) was £36,072 in 2006/2007, of which £12,264.59 was spent.
- 1.2 The budget in 2007/2008 is £ 36,612.

### 2 Member Training

- 2.1 During the year, training sessions were arranged for Members on making Scrutiny more effective, improving questioning skills, risk management and audit work. Attendance at these sessions was variable.

### 3 Officer Support

- 3.1 The main support for Scrutiny continued to be provided by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Group (Peter Barnett, Jonathan Jardine and Corinne Steele). Roger Hughes, Head of Corporate Policy, also provided significant support, with particular emphasis on developing the strategic objectives for Scrutiny.
- 3.2 The Chief Executive's re-structuring plans (approved in February 2007) include a new Performance and Scrutiny Team, which combines the Scrutiny Co-ordination Group with Performance and Programme Officers. This will help to improve forward planning and enable Scrutiny Co-ordinators to support earlier Scrutiny engagement in policy development. The appointment of a Performance and Scrutiny Manager will also increase the direct officer support for Scrutiny.
- 3.3 Officer support from across directorates has continued to grow this year, but could be better. By enhancing Scrutiny's role in policy development, resources which currently support Cabinet Members will also improve Scrutiny activity.