

**Suggestion for Scrutiny Work Programme Form
(To be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee)**

Suggestion from:
Councillor Diane Hind, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
What would you like to suggest for investigation / review?
A review of the Scrutiny Committee’s working practices at St Edmundsbury Borough Council to try and see how the system might be changed or adapted to better meet the needs of Councillors and the democratic process.
What are the main issues / concerns to be considered?
<p>As its mid-term for the Council and two years since we introduced a harmonised Constitution with Forest Heath District Council, it feels like a natural time to check how the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is working and see if we can make any improvements. Specifically the following issues could be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reports from Portfolio holders should they be more focused on responding to members questions and not on restating the functions and remit of the role. 2. Quality of the work programme and Overview and Scrutiny taking ownership. 3. Review possibility of members speaking once only on a topic with supplementary questions at discretion of the Chair. 4. Review numbers of Councillors serving on the Scrutiny Committee 5. Consider if a pre-meeting would be advantageous 6. Review the layout of the work programme form. 7. Other items as might arise from discussions
Would this review benefit from a “West Suffolk” approach (i.e. joint scrutiny by both Councils), or is it relevant only to your council?
Not at this stage, but possibly in the future depending on the changes.
Who is responsible for providing this service, or tackling the issue in question?
<p>Ultimately, all members of the Scrutiny Committee are responsible for providing this service.</p> <p>Secondary, the Leader, Deputy Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance</p>

Have you spoken to them, and if so, what was the response?	
The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council have been appraised of the idea and support the review.	
What is the Portfolio Holders view on this issue?	
The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council have been appraised of the idea and support the review.	
What would be the likely benefits and outcomes of carrying out this investigation / review?	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Even more effective Scrutiny. 2. Changing the way we work is possibly more important than any of the items of strategic priority. The Cabinet system can only work and be truly democratic if there is full and effective Scrutiny. 	
Estimated Committee and officer resource implications (eg research group, one-off report, dedicated meeting etc)	
A dedicated meeting(s) of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	
Suggested witnesses, documentation and consultation	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council's Monitoring Officer and Scrutiny Officer. 2. Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance. 	
Will this investigation / review contribute to one or more of the Council's Strategic Priorities? If so, which (please tick)	
Increased opportunities for economic growth	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active	<input type="checkbox"/>
Homes for our communities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will this investigation / review contribute to the achievement of one or more of the commitments within the Council's Strategic Plan 2014-2016? If so, which (please tick)	
Increased opportunities for economic growth:	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Benefit growth that enhances prosperity and quality of life.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Existing businesses that are thriving and new businesses brought to the area.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. People with the educational attainment and skills needed in our local economy.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Vibrant, attractive and clean high streets, village centres and markets.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active:	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. A thriving voluntary sector and active communities who take the initiative to help the most vulnerable.	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. People playing a greater role in determining the future of their communities.	
3. Improved wellbeing, physical and mental health.	
4. Accessible countryside and green spaces.	
Homes for our communities:	
1. Sufficient housing for current and future generations, including more affordable homes; improvements to existing housing.	
2. New developments that are fit for the future, properly supported by infrastructure, and that build communities, not just housing.	
3. Homes that are flexible for people's changing needs.	

Will this investigation hit one of the essential elements of a scrutiny review when analysing potential scrutiny reviews? If so, which (please tick)	
Public Interest: The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen by overview and scrutiny.	
Impact (Value): Priority should be given to issues that make the biggest difference to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area, and which have the potential to make recommendations which could lead to real improvements. The outcome must also be proportionate to the cost of carrying out the review in terms of staff and councillor time.	
Relevance: Overview and scrutiny must be satisfied that an issue identified for review is relevant and does not duplicate existing work being undertaken elsewhere by various Working Groups, Cabinet, partners etc.	
Partnership working or external scrutiny: The focus of scrutiny is moving towards joint action and community leadership, so anything which offers this opportunity should be given serious consideration.	

Would you like to be involved in the investigation / review?	
Yes	
Date of request: 2/4/2017	Signed Diane Hind

Please return this form to the:

Scrutiny Officer, Forest Heath District Council, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk, IP28 7EY

Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Updated: July 2013
Updated: June 2014 (Revised West Suffolk Strategic Priorities)
Updated: March 2015 (Amended as a Joint Form)