

## Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

Question 1	What do you like or don't like about the current scrutiny structure of committees?		
	Member	Non-member	Comments
1	✓		Health and Care Scrutiny should be reintegrated into one scrutiny committee - with everything not directly connected to Health and Care ruthlessly stripped out and reallocated to other scrutiny committees
2	✓		HOSC is different from other Scrutiny comms.as it challenges the performance of external professionals and their organisations. Other committees focus on the performance of GCC, but bringing in other specialists to support that process. So we can't fully generalise.
3	✓		HOSC is still too presentation heavy most of the time i.e. we just want short introductions to items from NHS staff or officers. No lengthy presentations which we've already had. There seems to be a major duplication with the Adults Committee, whereby public health officers have to attend both committees in order to update on Covid-19.
4		✓	The committees are quite large and the frequency or number of committees perhaps doesn't allow for as much scrutiny (agenda items) as would be liked.
5	✓		<p>The Community Safety Directorate was moved from EE&amp;I to ASCCS Scrutiny, which clearly is a better fit. However, I am minded to suggest that the Community Safety Directorate should have a separate scrutiny panel. My reasoning is around the potential "battle" that could again be on the horizon regarding overall Governance. The HMICFRS would see a move to strengthen the scrutiny of Fire within the Community Safety Directorate as something very positive and would, I believe, strengthen the case for GFRS remaining as part of GCC. If we lose GFRS to the OPCC, any direct scrutiny of the service under the OPCC would be lost for the residents of Gloucestershire. In a nutshell, establish a separate scrutiny panel for Community Safety.</p> <p>I believe scrutiny plays a vital role in Local Government and should, where it can, be strengthened across the Authority, well all Authorities actually, but I must not deviate into the failings of scrutiny in certain 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier Authorities.</p>
6	✓		<b>Like:</b> We have a good range of members from both the County Council and District Councils who are interested in improving the service provided by Adult Social Care, Public Health and the Community

## Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			<p>Services provided by Glos Fire and Rescue.</p> <p><b>Dislike:</b> I have some doubts whether or not the work of the committee is transmitted to the relative District Councils in a timely manner.</p>
7		✓	<p>The Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee is well organised and well serviced by the scrutiny officer and team. The Chair is effective in being engaging and inviting of comments but also in ensuring business is relevant and concluded in a fair and appropriate manner. I particularly appreciate his willingness to allow NHS partners to contribute. The more recent separation of health and adult social care does not serve us well, in my view; the interdependencies between the two are huge and it is never clear where public health sits between the two.</p>
8		✓	<p>I don't believe the current arrangements work. There is a natural – and growing – affinity between Health and Adult Social Care. Separating ASC from HOSC and linking it to the Fire Service and Communities makes no sense. I know the intention was to raise the profile and level of scrutiny of ASC but this hasn't been the experience. ASC has been largely ignored. There have been meetings when we (ASC) have had a matter of minutes of attention whilst others have had an hour or more. I can dig out the evidence if that helps but I recall we had all of 6 minutes in one meeting.</p>
9		✓	<p><b>Like:</b> The dedicated time allocated to focus on NHS Commissioned health services. The agenda's and format are focused and well structured and allow for good debate</p> <p><b>Dislike:</b> The separation of Health from Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health) as this has limited the joined up scrutiny of 'integrated' activity in one place and there is a danger that we miss important aspects relating to children's and younger people's services. However, previously Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny arrangements did not allow sufficient time for consideration of 'Care' or Public Health agenda items.</p>
10		✓	<p><b>Like:</b> The dedicated time allocated to focus on NHS Commissioned health services. The agenda's and format are focused and well structured and allow for good debate</p> <p><b>Dislike:</b> Separation of Health from Adult Social Care (incl. Public Health) as this has limited the joined up scrutiny of 'integrated' activity in one place and there is a danger that we miss important aspects relating to children's and younger people's services. However, previously Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny arrangements did not allow sufficient time for consideration of 'Care' or Public Health agenda items.</p>
11		✓	<p>The areas of public health and adult social care are always caught between the Adult Social Care and</p>

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			Communities Scrutiny Committee and HOSC. It feels like a duplication of effort as I often have to tell two committees the same thing. Could Public Health and Adult Social Care be put back in HOSC but the committee meet slightly more frequently in order to deal with the wide agenda?
12	✓		<b>Dislike:</b> Disappointed GFRS was removed from the Committee, taking road safety with it.
13	✓		<b>Like:</b> I think the structure is about right <b>Dislike:</b> Given the amount of business could meet more often and go into more depth. The agenda planning meetings should be mandatory for the Scrutiny leads on committees and planned in to member's diaries well in advance. They should be chaired and vice-chaired by opposition councillors as per CfGS guidance.
14		✓	<b>Like:</b> The support provided by officers within DSU is greatly valued as it ensures that the committee process functions well with information provided in a timely manner. <b>Dislike:</b> However, under the existing structure services delivered by the EE&I Directorate are covered by 3 separate scrutiny committees. This is highly inefficient and does not represent how services are used or delivered in the round. The interdependencies between services are quite often lost with greater weight afforded to certain issues within one committee which are then conversely under represented within the other. This results in an inconsistent approach to policy development causing unnecessary delays when taking decisions. For example under the existing system Parking, Road Safety, Libraries and Registration report to the Adult Social Care and Communities Committee, but the Officer in charge of Parking & Road Safety also reports to Environment Scrutiny Committee with their responsibility for public transport, network management, highways development management and climate change.  Rather than by reporting to several committees it is difficult for Cllrs to maintain a strategic oversight and for Officers to demonstrate how reports/projects brought before Scrutiny link with others to move the county environment & economy priorities forward.  In addition attending and serving the three committees results in inefficiency, potential duplication and less chance of interdependent issues being considered in isolation. Group response from senior EE&I officers
15	✓		On the whole I feel the structure fulfils its requirements - any bigger and it becomes unwieldy, any smaller it no longer includes representation from the wider Gloucestershire.

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

16	✓		I like that District Councils have been included
17	✓		The current structure works well for Children services, HOSC is focus on health and for that reason Public Health should be included in the committee remit. The Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee seems to be confused between the desire to scrutinise the work of the Joint Economic Growth Committee which I see as its primary purpose and the desire to scrutinise economic growth in general.
18		✓	The current scrutiny structure (for the C&FOSC anyway) seems good to me, clear focus and very well handled administratively. In terms of structure, it seems well balanced to me. I like the idea of co-opted members to provide input direct from the teaching and parent governor perspective, and ambassadors in particular. Whilst policy is normally erudite, input from these apolitical sources provides counsel based on "street level experience". Personally, I think that is important in fulfilling a scrutiny role where it is easy to be seduced by officials' assurances (as GCC (and our children) witnessed at first hand to their cost in the previous era).
19	✓		I like the current scrutiny
20	✓		It is a good information giving meeting, although a lot of detail is given in a short space of time. If not from an NHS background some of the presentations would be more confusing. It would be helpful if each report could have a summary that we could take back to our district council O and S meetings. 150-200 pages of papers is a big ask for councillor to précis to feedback to their own councils and then take questions on
<b>Question 2</b>	<b>What changes, if any, do you think should be made to the committee structure?</b>		
1	✓		I think the current structure should continue until at least 12 months after the elections to allow new members to get to grips with it.
2		✓	As we bounce back from CV19, meet climate change commitments and support sustainable growth it is important that the Economic and Environment issues are considered by one committee. This will provide for a more balanced perspective to be considered by the committee when informing decisions on place making. We propose one 'Place making' scrutiny committee be formed by combining the existing Economic and Environment & Communities committees and bringing the services reporting to

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			<p>the Adult Social Care and Communities committee back into this single scrutiny committee. This creates a sufficiently wide remit for the interdependent policies and decisions to be fully considered and a more focused strategy for moving forward.</p> <p>As previously stated under the existing system Parking, Road Safety, Libraries and Registration report to a separate committee. There is a clear need to question this logic as it is difficult to see how they fit within the large Adult agenda.</p> <p>There is a sound case for these services to join the other EE&amp;I services being considered by the proposed 'place making' committee. Parking supply and pricing is a lever in managing vehicle demand and therefore has very strong links to both economic and environmental strategies. Likewise road safety is a key issue in determining modal choice by improving conditions for vulnerable road users. The role of libraries is changing and the extended offer to support economic growth through the expanded Innovation Lab programme supports both sustainable economic growth and economic recovery from CV19. If this change in focus is accepted then it is logical to move this service under the Economic scrutiny or proposed 'Place making' committee. The case for Registration Services is less clear, but as this is part of the Libraries &amp; Registration service it would reduce officer time serving two committees by also moving it.</p>
3	✓		I am happy with the current structure
4	✓		I don't have any suggestions. The Chair has been inclusive at the meetings that I have attended.
5	✓		I would move Public Health to HOSC. This would allow health issues to be considered in an integrated way and permit district representatives to take part. I think the role of Economic Growth Scrutiny needs to be reviewed.
6	✓		Health and Care scrutiny should be reintegrated into one scrutiny committee - with everything not directly connected to H&C ruthlessly stripped out and reallocated to other scrutiny committees.
7		✓	Adult Social Care and Public Health should be included with the NHS as a Scrutiny Committee that investigates and challenges the local services. We are an ICS so it's GHC, CCG, GCC ASC, the Ambulance Trust and the Acute Trust working together for the Gloucestershire community. You might argue that children's services should be included but I think they have a particular focus in the current

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			climate so should continue to have their own scrutiny arrangements. We could always cross reference any specifics, such as access to mental health services for young people , school nursing, dentistry for looked after children.
8	✓		Please return Public Health reporting to HOSC; it provides the essential context of all of the Health issues.
9	✓		I think the previous HOSC arrangement was better and to cover all agenda items should be made more regular. Fire would need to fit somewhere else where.
10		✓	Based on the intention of improving scrutiny for Fire and Rescue by removing it from EEI and placing it with adult social care and communities; whilst Fire has much more in common with ASC and the move is better, it is still much smaller and 'less political' than ASC. This means that, understandably, ASC needs to present larger, more detailed reports in greater numbers resulting in agenda time and Member interest suffering when it comes to Community Safety. If there is an appetite to ensure fully effective and ongoing scrutiny for Community Safety, I would suggest a Community Safety Scrutiny Committee.
11	✓		I am very happy with the Committee Structure (ASCC) and considering the short time that the Committee has been running I am very happy with the efficient manner which we cover all subjects.
12		✓	I understood that one of the main reasons to move ASC and PH from the former HCOSC was that ASC was not receiving enough scrutiny. I wonder whether we did enough through agenda planning to suggest ASC scrutiny items?
13		✓	Combining of health and social care.
14		✓	The Review should consider the implications of the growing maturity of the One Gloucestershire Integrated Care System and the potential for organisational restructuring during the next council year (2021-2022)as we move towards the anticipated creation of a new statutory Integrated Care System organisation by March 2022 (in line with national timescales). The work to support more care at neighbourhood level and our commitment to developing further the prevention, self-care and tackling inequalities agendas is an area not currently scrutinised. There is so much opportunity working more with local communities and VCSE and we have many great examples of

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			new pathways of care now being implemented. The ICS will focus on health and wellbeing and the current separation of health from Adult social care and other wellbeing initiatives will be increasingly difficult to separate in our reporting.
15	✓		I know of none, although it would be much better when the Covid is a thing of the past.
16	✓		None I am aware of.
17	✓		More scrutiny of planned changes and the reasoning why rather than topics being announced as a done deal . Also, HOSC should include public health and adult social care , it's impossible to to have an overall perspective on the health needs and delivery in the county without this.
<b>Question 3</b>	<b>We have tried to improve effective work planning and ensuring that scrutiny sets its own agenda rather than being directed by others. How successful do you think that has been and what else could we do to improve work planning?</b>		
1	✓		Put an end to council motions referring items to Scrutiny as a way of the administration kicking items into the long grass. When they did this with rainbow crossings the committee were unsure what they were meant to be doing and unable to take a decision as it is not a decision making body.
2		✓	At times it probably hasn't been as successful as it could be as the current system almost forces Members to look for things to scrutinise and because they don't see the bigger picture e.g. Are our transport policies supporting growth? Are we achieving the level of growth required in the most sustainable way? Does our skills agenda meet economic aspirations? Are we using our Libraries and Adult Education to best effect to assist employment? etc. They end up going for the more minutiae and parochial that they feel comfortable with because the structure of the Committees doesn't encourage that cross dimensional challenge.
3	✓		I think this is an important aspect - it is the scrutineers who need to set the Agenda although advice and input from others can be helpful to make sure no relevant or crucial issue is overlooked.

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

4	✓		I think it has been successful in setting its own agenda. I look forward to better scrutiny of the LEP, as planned. In the past, the scrutiny of the LEP has been non-existent and it is still weak.
5	✓		The selection of topics through the work planning process is haphazard focusing on topics that are top of mind. Whole areas of importance may be being ignored. Sometimes the work plan agenda items are led by officers and while this is constructive and often helpful it does compromise the independence of the committee. Whole areas are often ignored particularly if they are outsourced e.g. Adoption.
6	✓		Work planning is relatively good although (as you have provided) it clearly requires some direction! It has also proved possible to draw the committee's focus on to areas of current concern (such as mental health) which would otherwise be missed by too rigid a forward agenda process.
7	✓		I suggest the new H&C Scrutiny committee should revert to the previous practice of a separate meeting to discuss agenda items. I also recommend that the Vice-Chair role should be taken seriously (at present it has no function in practice). Given new responsibilities, consideration should be given to paying the Vice Chair a small amount (£1k?) - as is the case in other local authorities. (Over £5k would be saved by bringing H&C scrutiny back into a single committee, so remuneration of Vice Chairs for a meaningful role could easily be afforded at no extra cost to the taxpayer).
8		✓	The planning group works well. Both Members and Officers have an opportunity to influence and shape agendas. I know that HOSC has a NHS group and I wonder if that should be extended to ASC and PH. That said, I wouldn't want to compromise the confidence of Members of having a "no surprise" understanding.
9	✓		The HOSC agenda needs trimming in order to allow more analytical and more detailed scrutiny. This would reduce the frequency of attendance of Health Trust etc professionals and might mean we could eventually abandon the Chamber for a Committee suite where more informal scrutiny and relationships emerge and where the balance between Members and Health pros. is more equal
10	✓		Yes it has been fine
11		✓	Based on the intention of improving scrutiny for Fire and Rescue by removing it from EEL and placing it with adult social care and communities; whilst Fire has much more in common with ASC and the move is better, it is still much smaller and 'less political' than ASC. This means that, understandably, ASC needs to present larger, more detailed reports in greater numbers resulting in agenda time and Member

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			<p>interest suffering when it comes to Community Safety. If there is an appetite to ensure fully effective and ongoing scrutiny for Community Safety, I would suggest a Community Safety Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The space and time for community safety is limited. In principle, scrutiny setting its own agenda is the right direction.</p>
12	✓		<p>We have a very efficient method of work planning which ensures that we cover all necessary subjects as well as 'one off' matters which we have to deal with from time to time.</p>
13		✓	<p>The agenda planning for HCOSC used to work really well. But for this new committee it hasn't. Initially agenda planning took place without directors and so we were unable to help shape discussions. I was often given issues for scrutiny reports that were either vague or was something I had covered in an earlier meeting. This has now been corrected and directors are invited to agenda planning sessions. I would like to see this continue.</p>
14		✓	<p>Very successful and I feel work planning works well.</p>
15		✓	<p>Coproduction of the agenda through work planning discussions has been largely very successful. On occasion there has been more party political influence on the agendas; the lack of such influence previously has been a positive characteristic of HCOSC and HOSC arrangements.</p> <p>Single issues raised by a member of the public rather than HOSC members during the 'public representation agenda item', have on occasion dominated the meeting of the Committee and subsequent meetings disproportionately.</p>
16	✓		<p>It has been well done</p>
17	✓		<p>Work planning has been severely impacted by COVID this year. Some Councillors have a way of steering the agenda to meet their own needs.</p> <p>A clear work plan needs to be adhered too at the meeting, with perhaps 15mins for other Health related questions that can be answered. These can be sent in in advance or asked on the day to relevant staff.</p>

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

18	✓		OK
<b>Question 4</b>	<b>Are there any other areas of working practice you would like to see improved and how?</b>		
1	✓		<p>Cabinet members to present reports supported by officers. Officers not to debate but to answer questions and only to speak if requested. There is a tendency by some to take over meetings.</p> <p>We have had and read the reports, so shorter presentations and limited PowerPoints. Information not data please and consider how a member of the public might be able to understand.</p> <p>No items for noting or for information. That is not scrutiny – hold a briefing for members instead if it is that important. Too often used as a filler.</p> <p>More pre-scrutiny and policy development especially around service design. Get the people who commission services explaining their process to members and let members recommend changes.</p>
2		✓	<p>The role of Scrutiny committees is really important to the transparency of the decision making. The views of committee members are welcomed and respected by officers. The system supporting the committees' works – the issues covered by the committees needs to be revised so the focus of discussions can be on 'People' and 'Place'. This will be essential to maintain the value and relevance of the views discussed and agreed at the committee meetings. By having a Place Committee Members would be able to look strategically at the big picture and not just get drawn down into the 'parochial weeds' which often happens. It would force Members to look at both sides of the same coin at the same time – the impact on the environment from economic decisions and the impact on the economy from environmental decisions. This would prevent Members from operating in a narrow field of vision and allow them to take a more balanced view as they would need to look at both the 'ying and yang' of anything they scrutinised.</p>
3	✓		<p>With any of these type of committees drawn from a group of people who do not otherwise know each other well it does take time to develop relationships and understandings of their different viewpoints so overall it is probably good that as far as possible the group continues with the same members for two to</p>

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

			three years minimum.
4	✓		I prefer the virtual meetings because I found it very difficult to hear properly when we met in various meeting rooms.
5	✓		The core focus of most scrutiny meetings is challenging officers about service delivery. This is the role of the cabinet. Scrutiny should be challenging Cabinet members on the steps they are taking to deliver the right services effectively. Officers should support this process but not lead it. Frequently the line of questioning in scrutiny misses the role of cabinet entirely.
6	✓		I wonder if there would be merit on members meeting without officials) for a short period before the formal meeting commences? This would provide the opportunity to draw out any particular concerns and then focus on them during the meeting itself. For me, some officials tend to spend an overlong period of time verbally introducing the paper that members should already have read. I would prefer the focus to be on members' concerns rather than on officials' oratory (and we don't need DCS to comment on anything his staff had said, unless s/he disagrees of course!).
7	✓		I suggest the new H&C Scrutiny committee should revert to the previous practice of a separate meeting to discuss agenda items. I also recommend that the Vice-Chair role should be taken seriously (at present it has no function in practice). Given new responsibilities, consideration should be given to paying the Vice Chair a small amount (£1k?) - as is the case in other local authorities.(Over £5k would be saved by bringing H&C scrutiny back into a single committee, so remuneration of Vice Chairs for a meaningful role could easily be afforded at no extra cost to the taxpayer).
8		✓	I hope we hear the views of all parties, local members and colleagues but anything that extends that access is good. I would be interested to know if our District representatives believe they have sufficient space to sound out their perspectives and have an appropriate response.
9	✓		The HOSC Chair should not attempt to sum up the opinions of Members on the issues raised. Summing up is only relevant where we come to a decision, which is very rare. He tries to get to a consensus, which is irritating and pointless as differences are an essential part of the process of challenging partner organisations.
10		✓	No

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

11	✓		I would like to be confident that we can cover all work subjects in more depth in order to be assured that we achieve important improvements for the benefit of the Council Tax payer.
12		✓	I think if Directors can be involved in agenda planning then a lot of the issues I have experienced such as feeling poorly briefed in advance of scrutiny will not happen.
13		✓	The current virtual platform does not appear as effective as the two we use routinely in the NHS and improvements here would be welcome
14		✓	A practical improvement: At the current time, whilst virtual meetings are taking place, some NHS participants have experienced more connection problems with the Webex platform than with NHS Teams or Zoom.
15	✓		Leaving the GCC in about two months or so has got me thinking of what I do in the future
16	✓		<p>We used to get a meeting summary within a few days after the meeting so that the same message would be relayed to all the councils. It was just the key messages.</p> <p>Some of the presenters talk so quickly only some of the points made will make their way back to the relevant councils. This would provide more consistency.</p>
17	✓		More briefing sessions on key topics, papers to be jargon free and or with a glossary of terms. To also consider a geographic perspective ie how are X or Y services performing at district level
<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Do you have any other comments about the scrutiny function at the County Council?</b>		
1	✓		It has improved in the last 4 years but there is still some way to go before 'parity of esteem' is achieved. The Cabinet should be more open to ideas from Scrutiny and more available. Scrutiny needs to think about how the Council gets where it needs to go. More public participation and a wider range of witnesses would be better. It all moves very slowly. I'm not sure they are always asking the right questions and that has it's dangers.

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

2	✓		It is good that there will be reports from each local council on business and economic development in their areas at all future meetings.
3	✓		<p>The support from democratic services officers is first class permitting meetings to be well structured but I would like to see committee members taking more time at the start of the 4 year term to identify a programme of action that could be progressed. Children's is the best example of that being achieved but we have to accept that Ofsted did the work for us.</p> <p>Corporate Scrutiny still seems to be too focused on being the top tier scrutiny committee and fails to look closely at important corporate issues such as IT services, security, workforce wellbeing and risk although there is an overlap on risk with Audit. There seems to be inadequate follow up of items previously scrutinised to see improvements have been delivered. Again where this has been done in Children's the progress has often been slow.</p>
4		✓	Come to think of it there's not a lot I would change at present about CFOSC. I would be interested to see more activity outside of scrutiny to engage with services but this is something regularly discussed and I don't think a change of structure would alter this. I would say that if we are to continue in a virtual format in any way in the future we really could do with more stable ICT to allow for clearer comms during meetings – a frustration that seems to be shared by many participants which detracts from committee meetings.
5	✓		At Cheltenham Borough Council scrutiny is chaired by the main opposition group rather than, as at Shire Hall, largely by members of the ruling political group. The CBC model obviously avoids the challenge that the administration is "marking its own homework" and should be adopted by GCC.
6		✓	In my experience (45 years plus) GCC provides a really robust, supportive and responsive DSU. Just keep on going!
7	✓		Retaining two committees is probably essential because the whole agenda is impossibly large, even though there will always be overlap.
8	✓		There is still too much of a 'country club' feel to some members' observations and questions ie not enough probing or actual scrutiny but a tendency to say all is well or congratulating staff and officers. Whilst some praise is of course well made, it misses the overall point which is to scrutinise effectively. Do members from other authorities on HOSC for example get training on scrutiny and their role?

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

9		✓	No
10		✓	I feel the scrutiny function works well in Gloucestershire, and better than many areas I have experienced. It serves local people well through the democratic representation; it feels like a model of high challenge and support where appropriate.
11		✓	<p>We welcome the commitment of members of the scrutiny committee and want to ensure we share effectively with members the thinking as it is developed about the new ways of working to support our population. We want Gloucestershire residents to be able to access the highest quality services delivered in the most effective ways for our population. The impact of Covid has led to a series of very significant shifts and we will be working to understand these and identify which areas will be built into future plans. We are putting these under our “Silver Linings programme” and examples are online and telephone consultations for GP practices and outpatients and further rollout of our Cinapsis model which enables join up of care at the point of need.</p> <p>We have particularly appreciated the support from members of the scrutiny committee throughout the current pandemic response and the recognition that we have had to introduce significant temporary changes to services at very short notice during this period.</p> <p>The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU): Substantial Variation or development of Health Services has enable the Committee and the local NHS to be clear as to what constitutes a substantial variation or development in a health service and to clarify the role of scrutiny.</p>
12	✓		I am aware there is a lot more information coming to HOSC at the minute and the meeting now appears to be two with a separate one for Adult social Care, so we need to attend the two to get an overall perspective of the Health Service ad a whole.

### Scrutiny Review 2021: Responses to questions

13	✓	<p>To be frank, in my view the senior leadership at officer and Cllr level do not take the scrutiny role seriously. When was the last time any service change came about because of actions/recommendations from a scrutiny committee?</p>
14	✓	<p>I am a member of two committees – Children and Families and Corporate Overview.</p> <p>In many ways, I don't think Scrutiny has changed since the review.</p> <p>Scrutiny will only work well if committee members read the papers and take time to educate themselves about the many areas Children and Families, and other committees, cover. This would also apply to other committees. I don't know how well they work.</p> <p>I think agendas are too long – with both scrutiny committees I am a member of. Not enough time is given to discuss the reports and in particular the financial report is always at the end of the CFSC and so doesn't get the attention it deserves. How about putting it at the beginning of the report?</p> <p>Should more time be given to specific topics? Should policy be scrutinised prior to adoption by Cabinet? (The administration wouldn't like this!) I don't think we revisit a strategy to see if it is working and that its aims and objectives are being fulfilled. I raised this when I was on the Health and Wellbeing Board. Please can we introduce bench marking if it is available and when possible?</p> <p>Perhaps I am misguided about the aims and objectives of scrutiny – but I thought good scrutiny should determine what works well and where there is room for improvement or how a less successful area is being addressed so it improves. This then holds the administration to account for the decisions they have taken.</p>