Meeting:	Performance and Finance
Date:	29 October 2008
Subject:	Scrutiny scorecard
Key Decision: (Executive-side only)	No
Responsible Officer:	Ed Hammond, Strategy and Improvement
Portfolio Holder:	n/a
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Scrutiny Scorecard

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report sets out scrutiny performance in the last quarter, as recorded in the scrutiny scorecard.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee is requested to:

1) Note the scorecard, attached at Appendix 1, and the commentary.
2) Discuss proposals for improvement.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

Background

The Scrutiny Scorecard was agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 July 2007. It was agreed that it would be used to monitor scrutiny's performance on a quarterly basis. Some of the measures, recorded quarterly, would be reported regularly to Performance and Finance. Annually, the scorecard data would be reported to Overview and Scrutiny for a more general discussion.

Current situation

Members are being asked to note the scorecard for Quarter 2, which is attached.

An important element of performance management is the use of performance information as an integral part of the improvement process. It is not an add-on, but a fundamental aspect of ensuring that the service provided by the Scrutiny Unit, and the value of the work provided by the scrutiny function in a broader sense, is value for money and making a positive contribution both to Harrow as an authority, and Harrow as a community.

There are a couple of additional issues that should be noted in looking at the attached scorecard.

1. The scorecard does not take into account reports considered at scrutiny committee relating to scrutiny's own business. This is to say, reports relating to review scopes, update reports, and reports on the reconfiguration have not been included, so as not to bias the figures. These reports constitute 63% of all items considered at O&S, mainly because O&S has now moved to concentrating on only one or two substantive items per meeting.

2. Original sources of data / methodology – many PIs are based on relatively small data samples. Where fluctuations in performance exist, this may provide some explanation. However, the situation for individual PIs is explained in more detail in the table below.

3. Methodology. A document relating to detailed methodology was agreed by the sub-committee in July. It can be found in the committee papers for that meeting.

Why a change is needed

Not applicable.

Main options

It is recommended that members note the scorecard. Further recommendations may be made relating to the "performance issues" outlined in the section below.

Other options considered

No other options are being presented.

Recommendation: - to note and endorse the contents of the report, and to identify any potential issues for P&F to investigate in the future.

Considerations

Resources, costs and risks: broad issues relating to risks and resources are referred to below, but there are no implications pertaining directly to this report.
Staffing/workforce: none
Equalities impact: none specific
Legal comments: none
Community safety: none

Financial Implications

None specific.

Performance Issues

Particular issues, and information on improvements either under way or planned, are identified below. More general analyses for all indicators are provided in the commentary section of the members' card attached to this report.

This scorecard is considered as a matter of course at every meeting of Performance and Finance, and is excluded from the ordinary "by exception" criteria for consideration at committee.

Issue / PI	Analysis of performance	Improvement proposals
General performance	Performance remains similar to that reported at quarter 1. It is troubling that improvements in areas listed as "red" (highlighted below) have not been realised. In many respects this may be due to limits on staff resources to deliver improvements in certain measured areas. The appointment of two new contract staff to the Scrutiny Unit should ensure that improvement in some key areas will be delivered by quarter 3. If this does not occur, more detailed improvement plans will be required.	Most improvement points are addressed below.
Member	This remains a difficult	As has been observed

attendance at review group meetings	area. Performance has improved significantly, but there is still work to be done.	previously, this is a matter that members, Group Offices, and whips need to resolve. Officer action on this issue has included: a) ensuring that members are aware of meetings they are expected to attend well in advance. b) Consulting widely on the dates of meetings. c) Advising members at the outset of projects about the likely workload. d) Sending out agendas five days in advance.
Forward Plan	Again, consideration of FP items at committee remains low.	The consideration of FP items reflects whether scrutiny is "plugged in" to the decision-making processes of the council, and that it is looking at important, upcoming issues and decisions. It is meant to be a marker of effective pre-decision scrutiny. However, the FP itself does not tend to reflect the ongoing decision-making process; nor does it reflect the organisation's priorities. It may be that this indicator will need to be changed in future – perhaps to reflect consideration of issues on the CIP.

Legal and financial implications

There are no legal or financial implications to this report.

SECTION 3 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

Name:…Sheela Thakrar.	Y	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

Date:.15 October 2008		
Name: Stephen Dorrian	Y	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 15 October 2008		

SECTION 4 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact: Ed Hammond, Scrutiny Officer, Strategy and Improvement
020 8420 9205: ed.hammond@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers*:*

List scorecards considered

IF APPROPRIATE, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES/ NO
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES / NO
3.	Manifesto Pledge Reference Number	