

Question	Why do you say that? Answers
4	I've only been a councillor for two years and can't say I've noticed any difference between either of them!
	Now a specialist team rather than members who were clearly not interested
	By virtue of a single specialism it gives time but time is NOT an indication of effectiveness
	Previously the Audit Committee usually took place after the R&P meeting. This meant that if the R&P agenda had been particularly busy, I felt panel members if possibly tired, MIGHT sometimes be more ready to rather rush through the Audit agenda - but now it is a separate meeting I believe as a panel member we are better informed and can therefore ask more probing questions of the officers and cabinet members. We have also benefited by regular training sessions which I have found very beneficial. Whether we have 6 or a higher number of members is immaterial, what is needed is willing interested members, prepared to attend the training offered which unfortunately is perceived by some people to be a rather "dry" subject!
	The meeting concentrates on Audit and not tagged onto or after other meeting
	This is only my perception as I don't serve on the Audit Committee so have very little first-hand knowledge
	More time to study the paper work and understand.
	Fewer distractions, greater accountability, greater significance and utility of the training.
	It had given more time for training sessions.
	Because that is what I think.
	It is an assumption but I suspect those good with figures will have fewer periferal issues to deal with if only faced with 'audit' style work.
	I feel that Audit is a matter which requires detailed and in depth discussion and understanding which it might not receive if linked to another committee.
	There was less time when both committees met on the same evening, more pressure!
	No comment
	Members more interested and knowledgeable.
	Members are more aware of their responsibility
	The Councillors who are selected for this panel should be interested and have experience in the financial field
	I can only see that the impact has been a positive one
	I have not been a councillor long enough to really have view of what things were like before.
	Just a reasonable answer as I'm neither Committees. You would hope it gives them more focus to do the job effectively.
	Splitting it gives it greater focus.
	It is a conservative led council
	Am unaware of any negative outcomes.
	Whilst I favoured the split I have not been to Audit Committee and experienced the result - I did often go when it preceded the old R&P Panel.
	Things are not rushed through as they were
	I have no idea what these questions refer to and the response they require cannot be answered without an in depth knowledge of the seemingly arcane work involved.
	Because that is what I think.
	Audit is an important function and one included in the R& P panel could be rushed. Having a separate committee concentrates the knowledge and training of members.
	I don't know enough about the Audit Committee to make a comment and can only assume they are doing a good enough job.
	I have not been in post long enough to be able to judge this.
	The process of LA government has become too intricate like a Gilbert and Sullivan opera. If you have a good chairman then the panel stands a chance, but the cabinet whose decision he/she looks at still make the policies with chief officers. Government is generally counter productive and illogical no matter what party; a lack of analysis in most decisions/ coupled with their knee jerk -short term need.

Question	Why do you say that and how do you think things could be improved? Answers
9	I've never seen anyone called to account on anything!
	Not enough is being called to CPP
	Experience suggests that decisions are brought for info not debate and it is very frustrating possibly a process that needs to be reversed i.e. cabinet suggests committee endorses EXCEPT in critical areas such as budget
	Generally I think Cabinet take into account the views of panels.....
	Nothing seems to ever get called in
	Again, on my perception
	Don't know
	Very few significant decisions are called in. Attendance at Cabinet is often limited to Cabinet, with one notable exception of one Committee Chair. Set the expectation that Panel Chairs and/or their Deputies attend Cabinet and summarise the breadth of views & decisions of their members under SO34. Encourage all Councillors to attend to show commitment and collective accountability (or otherwise) for scrutinising Cabinet and its Members decisions.
	I have heard of no issues to make me think otherwise.
	Those members involved are still learning their new roll - and power! Allow them to develop and refresh their remit occasionally.
	There is compelling hearsay evidence that councillors still feel they are being 'disloyal' to the appropriate Portfolio Holder or council leader if they do not nod through Officer recommendation. If the mindset cannot be changed to match more closely the parliamentary select committee approach, then we are all wasting our time. Councillors need to learn that it is the community which should be put first and that can only come from training and a willingness from Cabinet members to foster constructive scrutiny. Personally, I have my doubts this can ever be achieved under the current regime.
	I feel that the CPP would benefit from having a stronger and more focussed Charter.
	I get that impression but am not entirely certain.
	No comment
	Training for members and chairs, vice chair on how call in can be effective
	Committee has more time
	I feel there should be a mix of political parties making these decisions
	This requires a degree of openness to all members
	Difficult to answer. I would however like the call ins to be more clearly written in plain English. This could also be case with much of what we do.
	Don't know.
	I think it's working effectively.
	Open to appropriate suggestion with a non-bias political opinion
	The Corporate Performance Panel carries out little scrutiny and doesn't seem to understand this role. I say that because I am on it. Restoring the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee under opposition control is the only way to effectively challenge Cabinet decisions.
	As a portfolio holder myself, I have to say that CPP has been invisible to me since it was formed. That is surprising.
	Poor chairmanship and meetings are very poor
	An elite monitoring an elite seems a little elitist. Randomly select councillors with few council responsibilities to pronounce on decisions or use full council more.
	I think that things are ok at present
	Not aware of this happening.
	I wonder why the question is being asked as it seems to be working the way it is
	I had to make an assumption due to short time in post
	The cabinet system seeks a group of consenting people, so they tend to take the style of the leader and any 'bullish' individuals.

Question	Why do you say that? Can you give an example where this has worked well? Answers
11	Panels are still not having any noticeable input into policies before they are made. For the most part, they're just rubber stamping everything and by the time it gets to panel they're told its too late to change anything.
	Not enough engagement in relevant issues just following the work programme
	Prefer not to comment
	As a panel member of R&D, we regularly have site visits and workshops where in small groups we feed our ideas about future projects. These are then presented to the whole meeting and officers and cabinet members present can take these ideas forward. This is an important part of our R&D work.
	Panels trying to be more proactive however more thought needed on content of each meeting, better to have quality rather than quantity.
	The initiatives are still very much Officer led and not Member led. It is difficult getting Members to put forward ideas
	Panel members being more involved.
	Lack of definition of topics for which policies need to be prescribed or developed as stated in the forward work programmes. R&D have used workshop processes to scope out the nature and scale of future policies.
	I feel they were also doing this before
	As a Panel chairman I believe that we have a healthy mixture of periodic reporting matters and initiating new ideas. Any of our last six or so meetings will show examples of successful new initiatives in the Minutes.
	It can work well but officers too must be trained to understand that it is the role of councillors to try and hone and improve their recommendations. My recent attempts to do just that left me feeling like the 'bad guy'.
	Only able to comment on the Panel on which I sit but I do feel that this has worked well with E&C in respect of the decision to disband the West Norfolk Disability Forum and replace with a Disabilities Champion.
	Engaging in more detail with bidding for the development of King's Lynn. More group sessions etc.
	No comment
	No progress
	Panels appear to have more time on chosen subjects
	The panels should have more scrutiny to discuss the way to go forward not verbal reports
	The use of break out sessions involves all panel members
	A difficult question for me as I feel I am still learning. My feeling is that generally ordinary councillors seem to have very little ability to affect development and new policies. To me it appears to come from cabinet member and officers.
	Not on any of these Committees.
	I feel the council as a whole is well run, so the panels must be effectively engaging with the development of new projects, initiatives and policies.
	King's Lynn has improved
	Not in my experience.
	R&D Panel on such matters as the South Gates and the Waterfront have had some insightful debates and made some excellent suggestions in the course of their work.
	Panels seem to miss to point
	I had to tick something
	Because things seem to go on in a similar way to previously
	This would take place in the service panels and my experience is with CPP with monitor's performance but does raise issues that might be considered by the services panels.

	I have served on the Regeneration and Development Panel for six years and have seen King's Lynn benefit from many of the decisions and changes taken place to date with more new projects in the pipeline.
--	--

	Asked others as not in post long
--	----------------------------------

	More time is now spent on reviewing areas of Council objectives, but again they are by central government ambitions, e.g. Build More Houses (when younger peoples incomes/ job prospects are falling they find it hard to get mortgages- yet we import skills rather than training our own young people in medicine/ science and engineering. Too much media studies,PPE, and Law which bleed our economic success, disenfranchise our children of good jobs.
--	--

Question	Why do you say that? Answers
12(a)	If panels aren't involved in policy while they're being created, only afterwards it doesn't matter how often they meet
	Members seem to be more interested at a meeting
	Loss of focus
	I am not really saying it's not working well because under the old system sometimes the agendas were rather light.....BUT ...Personally I think the always very interesting agenda at R&D is sometimes almost over full , it's a pity sometimes the last officer to speak maybe has to rush their presentation. This is unfair on them and the panel who realising time is getting on for the 3 hour mark, are more reluctant to pursue questions.
	Urgent items can be called to special meeting if required
	Because the projects/initiatives are not Member led to change to six weekly might not allow for Member led initiatives in future
	I have not seen any problems.
	More time to do useful work in proportion to the 'fixed' overhead associated with preparing, attending and reporting meetings.
	Gives more time for substantial content and implementation of matters discussed from one meeting to the next.
	The meetings cycle is now confusingly irregular and is often in a "wrong sequence" with Panel, Cabinet and Council sometimes several weeks out of sequence. Sometimes the six weeks is too long between meetings when a follow-up report would be useful.
	I believe too much 'padding' was evident in the four week cycle.
	6 weeks can prove to be too long between Panel meetings when there are urgent matters to be decided upon.
	No difference noticed.
	No comment
	Panels chairs still do not encourage debates
	Members place as many subjects on the Agenda some are unnecessary
	Nothing has changed regardless of time scale
	Can lead to extended panel meetings which become less effective after 2 to 2+ hours
	From an audit committee I would think the committee should meet more often and be more hands on. A monthly update on what is happening would I am sure help.
	I'm not on Cabinet or any panels. So haven't noticed a difference. Full Council not noticed any different.
	Everything is working ok.
	Because minority not heard either way
	Four weekly was too much.
	I was nervous of a move from 4 weeks given the obvious synergy with the Gregorian calendar of 4 week months but my fears were unfounded and the cycle works well although agendas can sometimes be overly long. However, overly agendas were rather too common prior to the move to a 6 week cycle and can and must be managed by the chairman.
	Cabinet has full agendas and works well, panels can no longer cancel meetings as there is always something to discuss
	Have not experienced earlier models
	Because I haven't noticed much difference
	Combined Sifting meetings although longer enabled chairmen to have an overall insight to other panels work
	Better for me as a Borough Councillor as it gives me the opportunity to attend more Parish Council meetings as some Parish Council meetings clash with Borough Council when they were held on the last Thursday in the month.
	.
	R and D needs to be 4 week cycle, the other panels are working well on a 6 week.

Question	Why do you say that? Do you have an alternative suggestion? Answers
12(b)	No opinion
	The Chairman do not seem very engaged
	Prefer not to comment
	No problem either way. However if the leader elects chairman and vice chairman of Licensing, Licensing and Appeals and Planning Committees, perhaps it's more of an even playing field if he elected them all, or alternatively none, leaving it to the panel members ..
	Creates problems between members on occasion.
	Members get to know their colleagues and how they work
	Have not heard of any problems.
	Too much focus on process and protocol, (also, to complete meetings asap) rather than in-depth consideration of the validity and consequences of the matter under consideration. Inadequate information about the skills, experience and motivation of proposed Chairpersons: lack of willing nominees from within Panels/committees.
	Allow nomination from all Cllr's, to be accompanied by a suitable CV and 'election address', and to be orally presented to the relevant electorate.
	It helps keep knowledge continuity with the chairs and officers.
	I am perhaps not the one to answer this! The Panel members are better placed to comment.
	Too much canvassing and hand shaking to arrive at Chairman. I had been in favour of the change but it has not resulted in the best Chairman being selected.
	Very often it is a case of keeping the status quo and this can lead to lack of opportunity for other councillors. It might be a good idea for the choice made by the Panel to be ratified by Cabinet.
	The 'ruling political group' tends to take both Chair and Vice- Chair positions on committees. No real change therefore! Opposing party to take vice - chair position if possible.
	No comment
	Lack of input to select the most relevant person whatever political party
	Members do not know who to suggest
	Selecting Chairs & Vice Chairs should be by secret ballot or the person (s) who are selected should leave the room so they are not aware who voted for them
	It is better to have an appointed Chairman and Vice Chairman to give continuity
	Not sure I knew the previous situation
	As the members know through working with Councillors in the past who has the knowledge and would be good for the role.
	I think the leader should elect.
	Opposition would not get a voice
	Gives Panel members ownership of their group.
	It was hoped that the election of chairmen would enhance the work of the Panels as happened when Parliamentary select committee chairmen moved to being elected in 2010. Those elections are a secret ballot open to the whole House but I suggest for Panel chairman/vice chairmen it would be enough to introduce a secret ballot. Procedure for level of support, whether seconded or wider support etc could be worked out in due course but the key I think, is a secret ballot.
	Chairs are poor and it should be down to the leader to nominate
	It seems much better for a panel to select their managers
	Committees usually elect their own chairmen. The power of the council leader does not need increasing further.
	Prefer the leader to appoint having awareness of individual member abilities and interest.
	If it isn't broke don't fix it
	..
	May be an interview process would work too.

Question	Why do you say that? Answers
12(c)	They're easier to read
	Points noted and recorded
	Key points emerge with greater clarity helps decisions
	More concise, easier to check main points.
	Only decisions need recording not chapter and verse of what was said and by whom
	My questions or comments are not my own views but those of my residents. If points are raised by me it is not always noted therefore residents aren't aware that I have asked a question on their behalf. I have to remember to ask for the point to be Minuted. I know other Councillors feel the same.
	Much less to have to read.
	The minimum need is for issues, actions and decisions to be documented.
	Clear and to the point.
	Generally this is fine. On the odd occasion that more detail is required it is easy enough for chairman and vice-chairman to liaise with the Panel clerk.
	Salient points are being sacrificed on the altar of brevity. I do not accept it is the role of 'minutes' to give councillors visibility to their voters, but I do believe that fuller minutes reflect debate and lead to greater accountability.
	As councillors we are required to read and absorb a great deal of information. This is made easier if the information is presented in a concise and accurate manner.
	Approve of shorter minutes but questioners not always named.
	No comment
	If members attend the meeting their input should be recorded
	Easier and quicker to read therefore more focused
	The minutes should have the Councillor named who asked the question and not all questions are being minuted at the moment
	If you were present at a meeting you just need a reminder of the main points of discussion and clarification of the decisions
	Minutes seem fine to me.
	Easier to read.
	Because I have enough to read so the shorter the minutes the better.
	Time consuming otherwise
	Preferred it when minutes were comprehensive as we had more detail on things like who was actually asking and answering questions.
	The crux of minutes is to record decisions. In most cases this means the recording of amendments put and either agreed or lost and the decisions taken in the form of amended or unamended substantive motions. Anything else is detail and given the scope for endless argument on what could be included or not then in my view the less detail the better. A departure from this is formal questions at full Council but unless an answer is substantive in policy terms or a commitment made then again brevity should be the order of the day.
	We only need the facts, we do not need individual councillors trying to stand on a soapbox
	It is too easy to be selective
	The minutes are usually well written and do not need to be longer.
	Minutes could be long and the main intent is to record decisions. However important reflection of discussion should give a background to the reasons for the decision conclusion.
	I feel Panel meetings should be limited to two hours as recently the Regeneration and Development Panel has had pre Panel tours which can make the meetings three and even four hours long.
	.
	For some panels detail is important, you are lucky if you get a recording officer who can do shorthand

Question	Why do you say that? Answers
14	I don't have an opinion
	They have the ability to place items
	Prefer not to comment
	No problem in anyone wanting to seek more information on a subject.
	It's up to them to be active
	It works well when used but it isn't often
	It lets them have their say.
	There has been little positive input from the opposition.....
	It helps all members to work as one council
	It works and we are very pleased to consider such items - BUT the opposition very rarely take advantage of their opportunity.
	Some of them do not seem to appreciate they have this right. I suppose my answer could just as easily been 'yes'.
	We need to be seen to be fair and open minded at all times.
	By and large it works!
	No comment
	I did have item put on but chair did not allow a proper debate
	I am not aware it hasn't taken place.
	Things have been put forward by the opposition parties but haven't been put on the agenda
	Opposition members need to feel that they are part of the decision process
	It sounds a democratic way of doing things but why not open it to all members?
	Haven't come across this situation so can't answer question effectively.
	They need to have there say otherwise it will look like a white wash or blue wash as the case may be.
	But not certain
	I am in opposition and sit on two Panels at present. One welcomes items, the other doesn't. Colleagues tell me this is quite typical throughout the Council as their Panels are inconsistent too.
	This facility is important for proper scrutiny and effective opposition and I believe it fulfils that purpose as well as encouraging opposition focus and knowledge on issues raised.
	Very poor opposition, I do not think they understand how things work
	It is a better answer than no.
	Because I haven't noticed any.
	All members have opportunity during meeting to raise issues that might be considered by the panel or chairman to be worthy of inclusion in a future agenda.
	It's called democracy and I feel it should be allowed as other opinions are always helpful
	.
	This must vary with regions considerably, so a generic answer will be confusing BUT because all the items go through a sifting process then this is fine.

Question	Do you have any other suggestions to help to improve the Council's Scrutiny and Policy Review functions? Please outline Answers
17	Not at this time.
	A multi stage process requiring off-line analysis by members of issues, then pooling of comments, then formal consideration of findings and leading to a statement of the implications, consequences and overall validity of the matter under review.
	Under 14 I am not in favour of "workshop sessions". Our existing procedures allow adequate development of topics. Under 15 I would support items 2 and 5 but not item 1 or 3. As already said item 4 is how we used to do it and it appeared to work well, as does its replacement by panel members. Again though, as chairman perhaps it is not for me to say!
	Please no to the presentation of reports by Cabinet Members rather than officers. Many Cabinet members (with notable exceptions) already struggle to remember that the panels are an opportunity for other just as worthy councillors to contribute. The sound of the dog whistles (i.e. If I as a Cabinet member am speaking this is our group's position as well) would be deafening and I suspect opposition will give up participation (as well as the will to live in some circumstances).
	Perhaps a little more training.
	Secret ballot
	It is very hard to get a full picture of options available if the offices and cabinet member agree. It seems at best a couple of options might be suggested one obviously right and one obviously wrong. Trying to get a full picture is difficult and then having the ability to challenge is hard. The authority of the committee system should be stronger and the committee furnished with the same information as given to cabinet.
	Not at the moment.
	As mentioned earlier, restore the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee and the Chair should have an Agenda item at each Full Council to report progress.
	Regarding Q15 1) Cabinet members should be encouraged to present reports as 100% focus on grilling officers on detail can do little to scrutinise the political aims and objectives of policy. Nevertheless, officers will need to support Cabinet members to allow proper scrutiny of detail. 2) Closer working on policy development is welcome in many ways but I worry it could detract from scrutiny so have not ticked the box. 3) A ballot of all members works well for Parliamentary select committees but for the council the much simpler to achieve introduction of secret ballots could suffice. 4) Not at this time. 5) Again this has merit but it depends almost entirely who is doing the appraisal and on what basis. Worth further exploration.
	Cabinet members and officers need to work and present together as they do now, there is no problem with officer presenting as policy can be very in depth
	I hope I have not appeared to be too flippant but as I have almost no knowledge of the matters this questionnaire refers to I find it a little trying.
	Not at present
	Papers to panels which are asked to make recommendations to Cabinet are issued often, when at the time of the meeting, the Cabinet papers are already in the public domain.
	Not at this time
	If you work for a living as well time pressure is great, and if the Panel chairs have to take on more items they should receive the same allowance as cabinet members. You can easily overdo the process, as a rule keep things simple where possible 14 (1) attend cabinet when the need arises. Q5, last item other Asks 'Please Specify' without there being a box to type it in. I would have used this if it would have allowed me, but without a 'throw away answer' I couldn't continue....