

## + IVE

- WIDE KNOWLEDGE BASE
- SEVERAL POINTS OF DISCUSSION
- CAB MEMBERS HAVE SPECIALISED KNOWLEDGE.
- BIG DECISIONS - COUNCIL.
- COMMENTS OF MEMBERS AT PANEL ARE MINUTED.
- PANELS - GOOD MIX OF KNOWLEDGE/TYPES OF WARDS.
- ~~GA~~ PRE-COUNCIL BRIEFINGS.

## - IVE

- PANELS - RECOMMENDATIONS, NOT DECISIONS
- CHAIRS + VICE CHAIRS OF PANELS - NEED TO RECOMMEND PAPERS TO BE CONSIDERED (MEMBERS ABLE TO REQUEST INCLUSION) SD34.
- NOT ALL PAPERS HAVE TO GO TO PANEL (EG CIL)  
REC EVERYTHING VIA PANEL
- TIMESCALES DONT ALWAYS ALLOW FOR FULL (OPTIMUM) PANEL INPUT
- NEED TO IDENTIFY DECISIONS EARLIER TO ALLOW INPUT (ALLOW OFFICER COMMENT ON PANEL RECS)

QR

+

Decisions recorded but not easy to find on website

Website not tailored for electorate  
not intuitive

Training needed for new members  
and established councillors

Need to know about everything happening  
in the council!

Press releases to parish councils?

Call in process

Training

CPP

Panel process

elections cause us to be held  
to account

Q1

① Subset making Decisions (Not Council)

② CABINET Ref's To Council

(CONCERN IS PARTY PREVALENCE)

③ E.g. ART GALLERY.

- CAB ACCEPTED

SUBJECT TO DUE DILIGENCE

④

US .V. THEM.

- ADVERSARIAL -

INHIBITS DISCUSSION.

FACING RANKS.

SCRUTINY ISN'T WORKING.

⑤

⑥

COMMUNICATION STYLE

HOW / STYLE → UNDERSTANDING THE IMPLICATIONS

"WHAT" ARE WE DECIDING

"GOVERNANCE TASK GROUP"

- EXPLICIT DESCRIPTION

CLARITY OF DECISIONS - ?

- NOT GOOD

- CANNOT SEE QUALITY DECISIONS ?

(FDD)

# 1) INFO DISSEMINATION A PROBLEM

- COUNCILOR AWARENESS
- TOO MUCH INFO
- INDUCTION ISSUES
- CUL DE SACS
- TOO RIGID FRAMEWORK FOR CONTRIBUTION
- UNCLEAR CORPORATE PLAN - TRAILING OF INPUT
- TIME

E  
X  
P  
E

# 2) LACK OF AWARENESS IN ROLE OF PRIMARY LEGISLATION

E  
V

ARE CABINET DECISIONS SIMPLY RUBBERSTAMPED?  
 (NOT IN RUBBER STAMPED IF ON WIND ISSUES)  
 NOT ALWAYS - EVEN IF EXPERIENCED

# 3) LACK OF INFO SOMETIMES

E

ROLLER COASTER - HOW DO WE STOP & REVIEW  
 R+D - BREAK OUT GROUPS ✓  
 BUT WHAT ABOUT OFFICE TIME  
 KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR BACK BENCHERS  
 KNOWING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER &  
 AREA OF RESP.

# SESSION 5

## DECISIONS - ACCOUNTABLE? :

- INSUFFICIENT SCRUTINY BEFORE DECISIONS
  - COIN EXCHANGE CINEMA  
SECOND SET OF TENDERING
  - KLIC
    - Q. DECISIONS MADE BY EXEC. OR COUNCIL?
  - BOVAL QUAY
    - ASKED FOR SCRUTINY OF DUE DILLIGENCE  
WHICH DIDN'T COME BACK - WHO DECIDED?
- ROLLERCOASTER - TOPICS GET A MOMENTUM  
AND DIFFICULT TO SLOW DOWN  
MORE ANALYSIS REQUIRED
- NOT ALWAYS CLEAR AT WHAT LEVEL DECISION  
WAS MADE
- WEIGHTING OF DECISIONS BY OFFICERS OFTEN  
TOO GREAT
- NEW B.C.'S NEED MORE TRAINING
- NOT ENOUGH FEEDBACK AFTER SCRUTINY  
QUESTIONS
- TRAINING IN BUDGET ISSUES FOR NEW B.C.'S

# SESSION 1

- o BEST OUTCOMES? GOVERNANCE MODEL.
  - MONEY TO NIGHT SHELTER.
  - PEOPLE EXPOSED TO WRONG DECISIONS
  - INSUFFICIENT CHALLENGE TO ANY DECISION.
  - TOO FEW PEOPLE INVOLVED IN DECISIONS.
  - COMMITTEES PROVIDE OPPORTUNITY TO ENGAGE
    - CHOOSE NOT TO TAKE! + REP UNDER SECTION 34
  - = TRAINING - ASKING QUESTIONS
    - NOT ENOUGH MEMBERS TURNING UP TO TRAINING.
  - REPETITION OF QUESTIONS.
  - = ~~OR~~ MORE BALANCED REPORTING <sup>NEEDS TO</sup> ~~TAKING~~ TAKE ALL. <sub>(INCLUDING MINORITY)</sub>
    - ~~MINORITY~~ RELEVANT VIEWS INTO ACCOUNT - INSUFFICIENT
    - DETAIL - OFTEN WRITTEN TO SUPPORT RECOMMENDATION.
  - NEW ISSUES ARE TOO SLOW TO BE RECOGNISED + WORKED ON.

## SESSION 2.

### COUNCIL OPEN & TRANSPARENT?

- COMMITTEE BASED SYSTEMS LEAD THEMSELVES TO GREATER DISCUSSION + MORE TRANSPARENT DECISIONS

TRANSPERENCY TO MEMBERS? PUBLIC? ⇒ NEED BOTH.  
DETERMINED BY CIRCUMSTANCES. - RELEVANCE OF DECISIONS TO PUBLIC DETERMINE INTEREST.

- SCRUTINY PANEL FOR CABINET SYSTEM?
- POLITICAL APPORTIONMENT OF CHAIRMANSHIPS?
- DESPAIR OF PUBLIC AT PARTY WHIP. → DECISIONS TO BE MADE AT INDIVIDUAL BASIS.



## SESSION 3

### HOLD DECISION MAKER TO ACCOUNT?

- NO → CALL-IN <sup>DUE</sup> TO CHIEF EXEC. TO DECIDE VALIDITY
- CALL-INS <sup>SOMETIMES</sup> NOT FOLLOWED UP - ~~RE~~ COMMENTS ~~AND~~ / VIEWS NOT SUBMITTED
- QUESTIONS NEED TO BE POSED EARLY-ENOUGH IN THE PROCESS
- CABINET SCRUTINY? PREVIOUS INCARNATION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF ENGAGEMENT.
- EVIDENCE BASED SCRUTINY NEEDED. - SCRUTINY TO BE INDEPENDENT OF BOTH ADMINISTRATION & OPPOSITION.
- KPI'S ARE REVIEWED BY EXCEPTION REPORTS → MORE DETAIL?
- SCRUTINY OF SETTING KPI'S REQUIRED.
- AVOIDANCE OF SILOS NEED TO LOOK AT ISSUES MORE HOLISTICALLY

Q. 1.

FREQUENCY OF REVIEW?

ALL MEMBERS CAN ATTEND ALL PANELS. →

IS IT STOPPING BAD DECISIONS?

INCLUSION OF STAKEHOLDERS  
PUBLIC QUESTIONS.

Members & Public need time and  
~~patient~~ patience to pursue & forward  
other suggestions

Public need to be made <sup>more</sup> aware about  
all of our meetings

Advice is requested from Legal etc.

Reliance on a Core of Cabinet

① NEED TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE PROCESS/WAY THE CABINET ETC WORKS

② ENHANCE THE INDUCTION.

③ YES.... BUT NOT OBVIOUS. HAVE TO DIG & DELVE A LOT/PT. TO UNCOVER THE

④ MOST ISSUES COME TO PATHWAY.

PANELS ALREADY THOUGHT THROUGH & FORMED BY OFFICERS.

(IN RESPONSE TO CAB. MEMBER DIRECTION. ) ? ?

⑤ DEFINE A MORE INCLUSIVE PROCESS FOR A NEW POLICY

⑥ — EARLY VIEW & PANELS THE SYSTEM HAS WORKED ON TRUST.

⑦ INSUFFICIENT PRE MEETING QUESTIONS

⑧ PARTISANSHIP.

# Session 3

- 1) CALL IN - NEEDS GREATER PUBLICITY  
- + MORE SIMPLICITY / NOT EASY

WHY NOT MORE CALL INS.

- 2) REPORTS TO E+C.

WPI ✓

PROJECT REPORTS ✓

DO PAPERS APPRECIATE THEIR SCRUTINY ROLE  
THOSE NOT PARTICIPATING ASSUMING  
IT IS DONE.

- 3) SHOULD BE

IDEAS SOLD / RISKS

CONSIDERATION TO RISKS OF NOT  
DOING SOMETHING.

LACK OF MEMBER INVOLVEMENT  
+ NOT LEADING PAPERS

DEBATE EXPOSES RISKS

- KLIC ?

# Session 1

NOT FOR ALL MEMBERS AS NOT ALL ON PANELS. (SO 34?) (NEWBIER?)

~~DO THE~~ PERHAPS PANELS SHLD & DEBATE MORE THAN Q + A - ALTERNATIVES OF TAKE ADV OF OPP. MEMBERS MORE PROACTIVE ON PANELS IS THERE TIME AT PANEL FOR PANELS DETAILED ANALYSIS

MEMBERS DO NOT TAKE ADV OF THE OPP THEY HAVE.

MEMBERS NOT RAISING PROBLEMS RUSHED / SUFFICIENT TIME / MORE INTO SHY TO AMEND MINORITY REPORT.

3) YES, BUT PERCEPTION OUT THERE MAY DIFF OFFICER DRIVEN?

4) ~~LAW~~ STRUCTURE OF PRESENTATION

5) LIFE EXP HELPS



# SESSION 2.

## + IVE

- GENERALLY YES.
- PUBLIC QUESTIONS AT COUNCIL.
- OPTIMUM TIME FOR MEETINGS 2-3 HRS.
- FREQUENCY OF MEETING CYCLES 4 OR 6 WEEKS?
- LIAISON WITH PARISH COUNCILS HELPS COMMS/AWARENESS.

## - IVE

- USE OPPS FOR DEBATE AT FULL COUNCIL - TRAS TRANSPARENT
- WILL OR TIME CONSTRAINTS ON OPEN DEBATE?
- TIMING OF MEETINGS - MORE ENGAGEMENT IF DAY TIME?
- PUBLIC NOT CLEAR RE: DECISION MAKING - BUT OFTEN DO NOT USE CHANNELS/ENGAGE UNTIL DECISION ACTUALLY MADE (EG PLANNING)

## Session 3

In full Council - Yes.

Restricted Powers on Standards Com

CPP is fulfilling scrutiny cell.

Chairperson ~~to~~ of Panels to invite Portfolio holders to the meetings.

Not enough Political challenge.

Looking at the day to day running of  
The Council

Public Questions in full Council