

METHODOLOGY

This documents sets out the proposed methodology for the scrutiny scorecard for 2008/09.

Number	Title	Methodology
C1	% of issues considering data from the Forward Plan	Number of agendas items for O&S and P&F which are based on consideration of an issue identified in full or in part from a study of the Forward Plan. Identified on a case by case basis by the relevant Scrutiny Officer and entered into the agenda planning framework. Total number of FP items divided by total number of all agenda items, providing a percentage total.
C2	% of issues considering data from the scrutiny leads	As above but for issues identified by the leads.
C3	% of issues deriving directly from the corporate improvement function	As above but for issues deriving from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) corporate plan 2) corporate priorities 3) LAA 4) Improvement Boards
C4	% of work programme items subjected to "value for money" test under the Scrutiny Principles	Number of work items subject to assessment under the Scrutiny Principles divided by the total number of items expressed as a percentage.
C5	<i>% of comments to hits received at scrutiny website (as a percentage)</i>	<i>Indicator deleted</i>
C6	Percentage of recommendations reflecting comments made by local people	Identified through end-of-review recommendation matrix (one of which is produced for each review). Number of recommendations reflecting such comments divided by total number of recommendations, providing a percentage total.
C7	Percentage of residents' panel with a "good" or "fairly good" knowledge of scrutiny	Identified through single question posed as part of the annual residents' panel survey.
PE1	Percentage of officers considering scrutiny's input into policy as "useful" or "very useful"	Identified through relevant questions (ie where officers are asked to define scrutiny's input) in the following surveys: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) End-of-review surveys 2) End-of-year surveys 3) Any other survey being carried out by scrutiny that contains this question
PE2	Circulation of review information prior to review publication	Proportion of reviews where the following process has been adhered to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Review report sent to PH for comments 2) Review report sent to partners for

		<p>comments, where appropriate</p> <p>3) Review report sent to relevant officers for comments</p> <p>All the above in good time before the report's consideration at O&S. "Good time" usually means five working days before despatch.</p> <p>Number of relevant reviews divided by total number of reviews, as a percentage.</p>
PE3	Percentage of officers considering opportunity to input into work programme as "useful" or "very useful"	See PE1, but omitting point 1)
PE4	Percentage of officers satisfied with scrutiny process overall	See PE1, but omitting point 1)
PE5	Percentage of recommendations approved by Cabinet	Total number of recommendations submitted to Cabinet and approved divided by total number of recommendations actually submitted by O&S, expressed as a percentage.
R1	Delivery of scrutiny work programme within budget (percentage of budget spent)	Percentage of total scrutiny budget spent during the year. This review has negative polarity, so a lower score will be better for the purposes of RAG status and variances.
R2	<i>Delivery of in-depth reviews within resources</i>	<i>Indicator deleted</i>
R3	Completion of performance management framework as required	Number of performance indicators for which data has been collated, divided by number of performance indicators for which data is required to be collated (quarterly and annual) expressed as a percentage.
R4	Percentage of reviews successfully monitored on a six month or annual basis	<p>Number of reviews</p> <p>a) whose recommendation matrix is submitted to P&F at the agreed time after the conclusion of the review</p> <p>b) where a judgment is made on the implementation of each recommendation, based on the "measures for success" in the matrix itself</p> <p>divided by the total number of reviews which were meant to have been monitored in that period, expressed as a percentage.</p>
R5	Proportion of reviews demonstrating significant	Number of reviews monitored where 70% of the recommendations had been implemented (based

	positive impact on service reviewed	on the “measures for success”) divided by total number of reviews monitored in that period, expressed as a percentage.
PS1	Percentage of recommendations reflecting evidence received from partners	Number of recommendations reflecting partner evidence, as identified in the recommendation matrix for the relevant reviews (as determined by the review group) divided by total number of recommendations, expressed as a percentage.
PS2	Percentage of meetings attended by co-optees where required	Number of instances of attendance of co-optees at review group meetings divided by the number of instances where attendance was expected (ie where the co-optee is part of the review group), identified through agreed minutes of review group meetings.
PS3	Percentage of partners “satisfied” with scrutiny process	Identified through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) end of review survey 2) end of year survey as applicable. Methodology as PE1
PS4	Ratio of external / internal witnesses on relevant reviews, as a percentage	Identified through minutes of review group meetings. Total number of external witnesses attending review group meetings over the quarter, divided by total number of internal witnesses, expressed as a percentage.
PS5	Percentage of recommendations based on analysis of best practice evidence	Identified through “BP” identifier in recommendation matrix, as defined by the scrutiny officer and the review group. BP recommendations divided by total number of all recommendations, as a percentage.
PS6	Percentage of recommendations relating to partnership working, where appropriate	As PS6 but where partnership is identified as a factor in the recommendation matrix.
S1	Reviews reporting at agreed times	Measuring where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) scopes submitted to O&S 2) final reports submitted to O&S 3) monitoring reports to P&F as agreed in the agenda planning timetable. Total number of reviews reporting at these agreed times divided by total number of instances where reports of this type need to be submitted to committee, as a percentage.
S2	Review group agendas made available five days in advance	Total number of review group agendas sent out five days (not working days) in advance divided

	of meeting	by total number of instances where agendas needed to be sent out. NB this can also include electronic despatches where members have stated that they would prefer to receive information in this way.
S3	Timely production of Harrow Scrutiny newsletter	Publication of Scrutiny News in the month set out in the annual plan. This is a yes/no answer with 100% being "yes" and 0% being "no".
S4	Info available on scrutiny website	Instances of up to date review information available on the scrutiny website divided by total number of ongoing reviews, expressed as a percentage.
S5	Review meetings attended by Members where required	As PS2
S6	Percentage of councillors "happy" with operation of the scrutiny process	As PE1

EH
9/4/08