

SCRUTINY SCORECARD - - SUMMARY FOR MEMBERS

Quarter 4 2007/08

Members wishing to find out more information on the precise definitions and means of measurement of each PI should consult the explanatory notes which were agreed by O&S on 10 July 2007.

Ref	Q/Annual	Ref name	Target	Variance	Q1 Actual	Q2 Actual	Q3 Actual	Q4 Actual	Annual	Commentary
C1	Q	% of issues considering data from the Forward Plan	60%	10% Variance	N/A	0% RED	8% - RED	0% - RED	2.6% - RED	Again, this is very low. The issue relating to consideration of issues in the Forward Plan has been raised by members at the members' awayday in April. It has been proposed that measures be put in place to ensure that FP issues will be considered more effectively. Whether these measures are effective will be measured in 08/09.
C2	Q	% of issues considering data from scrutiny leads	60%	10% Variance	N/A	100% - GREEN	73% - GREEN	42.5% - RED	71.8% - GREEN	Sudden drop in performance is partially because of a lower sample than in previous quarters, but may in part be a result of the large number of scrutiny lead items in previous quarters. Annual performance is still on target.
C3	Q	% of issues deriving directly from the corp S / PI function	50%	10% Variance	N/A	0% RED	41% - AMBER	71.4% - GREEN	37.5% - RED	Performance continues to improve, demonstrating that substantive items on agendas are being chosen to reflect wider issues of corporate improvement. Annual figure reflects earlier poor performance
C4	A	% of WP items subjected to VFM test under Scr Principles	100%	3% Variance					100% - GREEN	
C5	Q	% of comments to hits received at scrutiny website (as %)	13%	10% Variance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	IT have advised that it is currently impossible to measure this indicator. It is being proposed that it is removed for 2008/09.
C6	A	% of findings reflecting cmnts made by local ppl	30%	10% Variance					27% - AMBER	This is broadly in line with expectations. Reviews currently on stream are expected to involve more work with the community.
C7	A	% of res panel with a "g" or "fg" knowldg of scrutiny	30%	10% Variance					N/A	It has not been possible to carry out work this year with the residents' panel.
PE1	A	% of offs cnsdring scr's input into pol "useful"/"v useful".	100%	5% Variance					65% - RED	This was measured through both the end-of-review surveys and the scrutiny reconfiguration survey as a result of poor response rates to the former.
PE2	Q	Circulation of review info prior to publication	100%	5% Variance	N/A	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	
PE3	A	% of offs cnsdring opp to input into WP "useful"/"v useful"	100%	5% Variance					55% - RED	This was measured with reference to the results of the scrutiny reconfiguration survey.
PE4	A	% of offs sat with scrutiny process overall	100%	10% Variance					90% - AMBER	

PE5	Q	% of recs approved by cabinet	100%	3% Variance	N/A	0% - RED	N/A	100% - GREEN	50% - RED	The AccordMP review provided positive results for Q4.
R1	A	Delivery of scrutiny WP within budget (% budget spent)	100%	10% Variance					97% - GREEN	This reflects an underspend (the measure has negative polarity in this instance - ie, the lower it is, the better). It is being proposed that this measure be reworded for 08/09.
R2	A	Delivery of IDRs within resources (% of budget spent)	100%	10% Variance					N/A	There is no longer a separate budget for in-depth reviews / specific elements of the work programme; it is recommended that the measure be removed.
R3	A	Completion of PM framework as required	100%	3% Variance					89.7% - RED	There are a number of omissions in reporting which reflect the following issues - 1) it has been impossible to collect data on account of issues beyond scrutiny's control, 2) low data samples mean that data quality is an issue.
R4	A	% of reviews successfully monitored on a 0.5yr/1yr basis	100%	5% Variance					100% - GREEN	All reviews have been monitored by committee as required.
R5	A	Prop of revs dmnstrng signif pos imp on service revw'd	100%	10% Variance					N/A	See covering report.
PS1	Q	% of findings reflecting evidence received from ptrns	60%	10% Variance	N/A	24% - RED	100% - GREEN	67% - GREEN	63.7% - GREEN	This is based solely on the Care Matters review. The annual figures are based on this and the Accord MP review.
PS2	Q	% of meetings attended by co-optees where required	80%	10% Variance	N/A	50% - RED	54.5% - RED	89.3% - GREEN	64.6% - RED	Co-optee attendance was significantly higher in Q4. This is because a number of new reviews have begun where pains have been taken to explain to co-optees their roleS and responsibilities. The annual result reflects the previous quarters' poor results.
PS3	A	% of partners "satisfied" with scrutiny process	100%	10% Variance					100% - GREEN	Result looks good but the methodology might need to be tightened for future years.
PS4	Q	Ratio ext:int witnesses on relevant reviews (as %)	33%	10% Variance	N/A	62.5% - GREEN	57% - GREEN	64% - GREEN	61.2% - GREEN	
PS5	Q	% of recs based on analysis of "bp" evidence	100%	10% Variance	N/A	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	
PS6	Q	% of recs relating to ptrnship wkng, where appropriate	60%	10% Variance	N/A	80% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	93.3% - GREEN	
S1	Q	Reviews reporting at agreed times	100%	3% Variance	N/A	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	
S2	Q	Rev gp agendas made available 5 days in adv of meeting	100%	10% Variance	N/A	92% - AMBER	87% - RED	83.3% - RED	87.4% - RED	Performance has dipped here since Q2. More detail is provided in the attached report.
S3	Q	Timely production of Harrow Scrutiny newsletter	100%	5% Variance	N/A	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	
S4	Q	Info available on scrutiny website	100%	10% Variance	N/A	0% - RED	100% - GREEN	100% - GREEN	66.6% - RED	Information continues to be updated to reflect new reviews and scoping processes.
S5	Q	Review meetings attended by Members where required	100%	10% Variance	N/A	46% - RED	65% - RED	75.2% - RED	62.2% - RED	Member attendance has improved since Q2, but is still "red".

S6	A	% of councillors "happy" with op of the scrutiny process	90%	10% Variance					80% - AMBER	There remains some concern relating to the operation of the reconfigured scrutiny structure.
----	---	--	-----	--------------	--	--	--	--	-------------	--

RESULTS - Q4

Lower threshold: TEN
Middle threshold: THREE
Upper threshold TWELVE
No data: FOUR