

Meeting:	Overview and Scrutiny
Date:	10 July 2007
Subject:	Scrutiny Scorecard
Key Decision: <i>(Executive-side only)</i>	Not applicable
Responsible Officer:	Ed Hammond (x5205)
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Paul Osborne (Strategy and Business Support)
Status:	Part I
Encs:	Appendix 1 - Scrutiny scorecard Appendix 2 - Explanatory notes

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out proposals for a new method for scrutiny to monitor its own performance.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the establishment of a performance management system for the scrutiny function, as set out in the annual and quarterly scrutiny scorecards (attached at Appendix 1) be agreed.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

1 - Brief Background

- 1.1 Currently, scrutiny committees do not formally monitor their own activities, other than the limited evaluation which results from end-of-review surveys, and the statistics collated for the scrutiny annual report. It has been suggested that a more formal system be adopted, to ensure that the scrutiny function can be delivered in a value for money and effective manner. The most efficient way of doing this is through a “balanced scorecard” approach, which allows the scrutiny function and its component committees to closely examine performance on a regular basis, with results and outcomes assessed according to easily-measurable targets.
- 1.2 The recording of data in the scorecard dovetails with scrutiny’s commitment to an enhanced performance management function, through the Performance and Finance Committee.

2 - Issue to be determined

- 2.1 A proposed scorecard is attached to this report at Appendix 1. Appendix 2 provides detailed information on the individual performance indicators, why they have been chosen and how it is intended that they interact. A “dry run” has been carried out to assess the robustness of the scorecard and its measures (using data from 2005-2007). Subject to some necessary changes to certain processes and procedures in the Scrutiny Unit, this was a success.
- 2.2 Members are being asked to agree that the scorecard will be reported to the Performance and Finance Committee as appropriate. Some measures will be reported to Performance and Finance on a quarterly basis. The entire scorecard will be reported to Overview and Scrutiny Committee annually. This is subject to members’ agreement that the Performance and Finance Committee will be established.

3 - Resources, costs and risks associated with recommendation

- 3.1 Resources would be met from the existing scrutiny budget. Much of the information on the scorecard relates to information which is already collected – albeit informally – and the practice of keeping a scorecard means that this information can be accurately measured and reported to members, enhancing the member-led nature of the scrutiny process, and the accountability and transparency of the scrutiny function.
- 3.2 The most obvious risk lies in the capacity, in terms of time, for officers to take on the responsibility of collating performance information in addition to other responsibilities. However, the fact that this information tends to be available anyway, and is now not analysed, and the benefits in terms of improving efficiency and value for money, will offset any additional commitment on officer and member time.

4 - Implications if recommendations rejected

Continuing with the present arrangements will mean that members and officers will not be assured that scrutiny is delivering the best service it can, and does not accord with the council's corporate aspiration to integrate robust performance management into all aspect of its services.

5 - Consultation

Members and officers have been consulted on these proposals as appropriate.

6 - Equalities Impact consideration

There are no direct equality implications to the recommendations.

7 - Current KPI's and Likely impact of decision on KPI's

Insofar as the scrutiny function itself, the scrutiny scorecard establishes a number of new KPIs that will permit formal monitoring to be carried out where none existed previously.

8 - Section 17 considerations

There are no section 17 considerations.

SECTION 3 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

Chief Financial Officer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Barry Evans
Monitoring Officer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Steven Dorrian

SECTION 4 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact: Ed Hammond, Scrutiny Officer, Business Development, 020 8420 9205

Background Papers: None

IF APPROPRIATE, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES
3.	Community Safety (s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998)	NO
4.	Manifesto Pledge Reference Number	D