
**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Economy Scrutiny Committee – 24 September 2014
Subject: Outcomes of the Review of Scrutiny in Manchester
Report of: Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit

Summary

In May 2014, Manchester City Council undertook a review of its scrutiny function. This review comprised a survey and a self assessment and this report presents the findings.

All six scrutiny committees will be considering this report at their September meetings.

Recommendations

The Committee is invited to consider the information contained in the report and make any recommendations that it wishes.

Wards Affected: All

Contact Officers:

Eleanor Fort
Scrutiny Support Team Leader (Acting)
0161 234 4997
e.fort@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.
None

Appendices:

Appendix A – the survey
Appendix B – the self assessment
Appendix C – Responses to the survey
Appendix D – Responses to the self assessment

1.0 Introduction

1.1 At the end of the 2013/14 municipal year, the Overview and Scrutiny Coordinating Group agreed that a review of scrutiny should be carried out during the recess period before the 2014 election.

1.2 The Co-ordinating Group agreed that the review would consist of two elements. The first was a wide ranging survey of everyone involved in scrutiny including elected members, officers and members of the public. The second was a more detailed self assessment, to be carried out by elected members and officers closely involved in scrutiny.

2.0 Background

2.1 Manchester City Council has six scrutiny committees which between them examine all of the Council's activity:

- Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee
- Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee
- Economy Scrutiny Committee
- Communities Scrutiny Committee
- Finance Scrutiny Committee
- Health Scrutiny Committee

2.2 The role of the Overview and Scrutiny Coordinating Group is to

- acts as a mechanism to allow for dialogue between the Executive and the scrutiny committees;
- assist in forward planning of the work programmes of the Executive and the overview and scrutiny function;
- overview the Council's best value programme to consider proposals for the use of the overview and scrutiny budget.

2.3 The membership of the Coordinating Group is the six scrutiny chairs, the Leader of the Council and two other members of the Executive. The Coordinating Group acts to ensure that scrutiny in Manchester is working effectively and is organised in the most appropriate manner.

2.4 At its last meeting of the last municipal year in March 2014, the Coordinating Group agreed that it was a good time to carry out a broad review of scrutiny in Manchester. The Coordinating Group agreed that the purpose of this review would be to consider whether scrutiny is meeting its primary purpose of supporting the Council to meet its objectives. The Coordinating Group agreed that the review should engage with all elected members, key officers and all external people who had participated in scrutiny. The Group also agreed that the review would be carried out internally in the period up to the elections, using guidance from the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS).

2.5 The review was composed of two elements:

- A survey to be carried out by anyone who had come into contact with scrutiny in the last two year.

- A self assessment for those members and officers who worked closely with one or more scrutiny committees.

3.0 Survey

3.1 The survey was broadly in two parts. The first part was drawn up based on the four principles of good scrutiny, which originated in the CfPS's Good Scrutiny Guide and are well established in guidance and learning on scrutiny. The principles are to:

- provide 'critical friend' challenge
- reflect the public voice
- take the lead and own the scrutiny process
- make an impact on service delivery.

3.2 The second part of the survey was more tailored to scrutiny in Manchester. It surveyed support that scrutiny committees receive as well as ideas raised in the Co-ordinating Group meeting of 20 March 2014. It also included questions on some other examples of good practice and whether they would work in Manchester.

3.3 The survey was sent to:

- All elected members of the Council
- Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee's Co-opted members
- Officers who regularly attend scrutiny meetings
- All external people who attended scrutiny meetings or subgroup meetings in the last two years for whom contact details are known

3.4 The survey included a question on what the role of the respondent was (i.e. a member of a scrutiny committee, an executive member, an officer, or a member of the public). This meant that responses to each question could be broken down by this role.

3.5 It also included a question which committee the respondent attended most frequently which meant that the results have been provided for each committee as well as scrutiny in Manchester as a whole. If respondents attended more than one committee, they could fill in the survey multiple times for each committee and tailor their answers.

3.6 The survey is attached at appendix A.

4.0 Self Assessment

4.1 The self assessment was drawn up based on a CfPS document called "Mirror, Mirror... Reflecting improvement through review and challenge". The purpose of this document is to support councils in demonstrating that their governance arrangements include effective mechanisms for internal review and challenge to improve decision making, make better use of resources, increase transparency and support accountability. The document identifies three main formal mechanisms for review and challenge in councils: overview and scrutiny committees, audit committees and standards committees.

4.2 The document identified eight principles for effective review and challenge.

Local arrangements for review and challenge should:

- have a clear role and purpose within the council's governance arrangements;
- be a valued contributor to good governance;
- focus on important issues;
- lead and build organisational confidence in challenge;
- use strong evidence for reports and recommendations;
- influence council strategy and performance;
- develop a non-party political and inclusive culture;
- provide the foundation for review and challenge beyond the council.

4.3 The document contains a suggested framework for carrying out a self assessment against these eight principles. An amended version of this framework, focusing only on scrutiny, formed the basis of the self assessment element of the review.

4.4 The self assessment was sent to:

- The members of the Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group (the six scrutiny chairs, the Leader and two other members of the Executive)
- The strategic directors who support the six scrutiny committees and other key officers involved in scrutiny.

4.5 The self assessment is attached at appendix B.

5.0 Responses

5.1 Responses to the survey and the self assessment were provided anonymously.

5.2 The survey was sent to a total of 353 people:

- 96 councillors (27.2%)
- 26 officers (7.4%)
- 231 external attendees (65.4%)

5.3 The survey had a response rate of 18%.

5.4 The self assessment was sent to 21 people in total:

- 9 members
- 12 officers

5.5 The self assessment had a response rate of 29%.

5.6 In addition, an email from a councillor was received after the closing date of the survey, containing comments that the councillor wished to be reported as part of the results. The comments are as follows:

1. *Live stream scrutiny meetings online. I don't know what the viewing figures are for full council but I think it's a positive move and we should do the same for scrutiny. They do this in Edinburgh and Andrew says it has gone down well.*

2. *Use social media more to engage people in scrutiny. Perhaps in the same way ward co-ordination or the NDTs have Twitter accounts we could do the same for scrutiny committees?*
3. *Allow people to sign up for e-mails to receive scrutiny papers, either for a whole committee or issue based. Residents can sign up to be notified about planning and licensing but not other issues. This could be easily done in the excellent new online system.*
4. *Create simple videos to explain what each committee does and make it easier to search for reports and find out what reports contain on the committee pages.*
5. *Welcome more public participation in the meetings by allowing individuals and interest groups to speak on relevant items. We do this on Neighbourhoods anyway but it's reactive and not proactive.*

5.7 The responses to the survey and the self assessment are attached to this report as the following appendices:

Appendix C – Responses to the survey

Appendix D – Responses to the self assessment

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 The appendices contain the full response to the survey and self assessment. Appendix C contains nine spreadsheets: One with the results for all six scrutiny committees; one for each of the six scrutiny committees, including open text comments, and one compiling all the open text comments broken down by committee and role. Appendix D contains one spreadsheet with the responses to the Self Assessment.

6.2 All six of the scrutiny committees will be considering this report at its September 2014 meeting. The committees are invited to comment on the results of the survey and make any recommendations they wish based on these results.

6.3 The responses of the six scrutiny committees will be reported to the Co-ordinating Group at its next meeting. It will be asked to consider the next steps to take to proceed with the committees' conclusions and recommendations.

Appendix A

Survey on Scrutiny in Manchester

1. Your role:	✓
Elected member – member of a scrutiny committee	
Elected member – Executive Member / Assistant Executive Member	
Elected member – other	
Council officer	
External (please include the name of your organisation)	

2. Please select the scrutiny committee(s) which you attend the most often, and which you will base your answers on:	✓
Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee	
Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee	
Economy Scrutiny Committee	
Communities Scrutiny Committee	
Finance Scrutiny Committee	
Health Scrutiny Committee	

The Centre for Public Scrutiny is an independent charity that promotes transparent, inclusive and accountable public services and supports and celebrates excellent and effective scrutiny across the public sector. It has identified four principles of good scrutiny:

- Provide ‘critical friend’ challenge
- Reflect the public voice
- Take the lead and own the scrutiny process
- Make an impact on service delivery.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

[Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Don’t know]

3. Being a critical friend	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive				
The Executive engages and co-operates with scrutiny				
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council’s corporate strategies and budget				
External partners are involved in scrutiny				
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior management				

4. Reflecting the public voice	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny engages well with the public				
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public				
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public				
Scrutiny communicates to the public				

5. Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality				
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work programme				
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role				
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny				
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team				

6. Making an impact on service delivery	A	N	D	DK
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into the corporate processes				
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the Council and its partners				
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery				
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee				
Information required by scrutiny is well managed				
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester				

7. Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?	A	N	D	DK
Induction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)				
Guide for New Members (one produced for each committee)				
Overview Report				
Premeetings				
Work programming session (held at the beginning of each municipal year)				
Please describe how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive:				

8. The Scrutiny Process	A	N	D	DK
My role is made clear				
Scrutiny is an inclusive process				
I am treated as a partner				
If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below:				

9. Please describe any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Completed surveys can be returned by email to: scrutiny@manchester.gov.uk or by post to: Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Room 405, Town Hall, Albert Square, Manchester, M60 2LA.

If you have any queries, please contact the Scrutiny Support Team on the email above or on 0161 234 4997.

Appendix B

Self Assessment Framework

The Centre for Public Scrutiny has eight principles for effective review and challenge. Local arrangements for review and challenge should:

- have a clear role and purpose within the Council's governance arrangements;
- be a valued contributor to good governance;
- focus on important issues;
- lead and build organisational confidence in challenge;
- use strong evidence for reports and recommendations;
- influence Council strategy and performance;
- develop a non-party political and inclusive culture;
- provide the foundation for review and challenge beyond the Council.

The following questions are designed to assess how well scrutiny in Manchester fulfils these principles.

1. Your role:	✓
Elected member – member of a scrutiny committee	
Elected member – Executive Member / Assistant Executive Member	
Council officer	
External organisation	
Member of the public	

2. Please select the scrutiny committee(s) which you attend the most often, and which you will base your answers on:	✓
Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee	
Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee	
Economy Scrutiny Committee	
Communities Scrutiny Committee	
Finance Scrutiny Committee	
Health Scrutiny Committee	

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Don't know

Principle 1 – Have a clear role and purpose within the council's governance arrangements				
Question 3	A	N	D	DK
Members, officers, and others involved scrutiny are clear about their aims and contribution to good governance.				
Officers and members responsible for scrutiny are clear about their respective roles.				
Coordination of scrutiny work removes unnecessary overlaps and covers unintended gaps.				
Topic selection and scoping ensures scrutiny is topical, uses all relevant evidence, and makes an impact.				
Partners clearly value the arrangements for the scrutiny of				

partnerships.				
---------------	--	--	--	--

Principle 2 – Be a valued contributor to good governance				
Question 4	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny is valued throughout the Council as a way to demonstrate credibility to local people.				
The Council's constitution confirms the importance of scrutiny and sets out what local people can expect its impact to be.				
The role and importance of scrutiny is a fundamental part of member induction and development.				
The role and importance of scrutiny is a fundamental part of officer induction and development.				
Executive councillors and senior managers demonstrate support for scrutiny in how they respond to reports and recommendations.				
Scrutiny activity is supported despite spending cuts.				
The Executive regularly refers issues for scrutiny.				
Question 5	A	N	D	DK
The Council ensures that officers supporting scrutiny are not compromised by a fear of clashing with senior officers or councillors, through:				
• Staff protocols and procedures				
• Job descriptions				
• Staff training				

Principle 3 - Focus on important issues				
Question 6	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny topics clearly link to the strategic priorities or risks of the Council (including those presented by partnership working).				
Scrutiny topics clearly link to potential local gaps in service				
Scrutiny topics clearly link to issues of particular local public concern.				
A clear, evidence-based case underpins the choice of scrutiny topics.				
Officers supporting scrutiny understand why each topic is selected.				
Chairs of scrutiny committees 'reality check' to ensure they have resources to tackle topics.				
Time-limited task and finish groups support scrutiny committees.				
Scrutiny committees appoint independent expert advisers to help them with complicated issues.				
Programmes are flexible enough to respond to urgent needs for scrutiny.				

Principle 4 – Lead and support organisational confidence in challenge				
Question 7	A	N	D	DK

Newly elected members' training includes the role of scrutiny and allows for discussions with existing scrutiny members.				
Committee chairs ensure focused agendas and promote evidence based discussions.				
Question 8	A	N	D	DK
Members of scrutiny committees are offered specific development in:				
• Developing lines of inquiry				
• Assessing evidence				
• Critical thinking and analysis				
• Productive questioning				
• Writing and presenting reports and recommendations				
• Organising and chairing scrutiny sessions				
Question 9	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny committees get the support and information they need for:				
• Topic selection				
• Review scoping				
• Work planning				
• Question framing				
• Analysing information				

Principle 5 – Use strong evidence for reports and recommendations

Question 10	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny committee chairs have access to:				
• Administrative support				
• Internal expert support				
• Experts in partner or community organisations				
Question 11	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny committees ensure they get relevant, robust and clearly presented evidence.				
Robust data supports all conclusions and recommendations.				
Recommendations say who should complete them within a given timescale and these are followed up to check progress.				
Scrutiny reports are well-written and use plain language.				

Principle 6 – Influence Council strategy and performance

Question 12	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny activity is open and transparent to the wider Council, partners and to the public.				
Selection and scoping of reviews promotes a focus on recommendations and outcomes.				
Scrutiny reports are published and publicised.				
Scrutiny committees regularly review, and report on, the impact of their recommendations.				
Question 13	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny committees monitor the impact of the recommendations through:				

• Formal reporting from the Executive				
• Explanatory reports where recommendations are rejected				
• Recourse to a debate in full Council				

Principle 7 – Develop a non-partisan and inclusive culture				
Question 14	A	N	D	DK
Committees work in a non-partisan way, and roles (including chairs) and tasks are spread across political groups.				
Scrutiny is independent of the Executive.				
Reports and recommendations clearly draw on local people's views.				
Reports and recommendations are considered and adopted (or not) by the Executive on their merits and the evidence provided.				
Question 15	A	N	D	DK
The public and partners are actively involved through:				
• Independent chairs and members where appropriate				
• Proactively seeking views, contributions and input to scrutiny activity from the public, partners, service-users and others with an interest in the Council's work				
• Proactive use of existing Council (and partner) consultation mechanisms				
• The ability and resource to commission surveys and other opinion research methods				
• Reporting-back openly and honestly to communities and partners on the findings of scrutiny activity				
Question 16	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny arrangements actively ensure hard to reach groups are involved through:				
• Getting advice from representative groups on how to involve their members and working with partner organisations to reach groups to whom they may have stronger links				
• Ensuring meetings are accessible (location, timing, format etc) and using a wide range of other methods to gather views from different groups				
• Online evidence and discussion sessions				

Principle 8 – Provide the foundation for review and challenge beyond the Council				
Question 17	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny work programmes balance inward and external investigations.				
Partners and other key agencies help develop external scrutiny proposals.				
Scrutiny groups reviewing external providers include external representation or expertise.				
Scrutiny groups reviewing external providers include external				

Provide a training programme for scrutiny members, including more effective ways to improve our use of questions and follow-ups.				
Provide a training programme for scrutiny members, including more effective ways to improve our use of questions and follow-ups.				
Question 18	A	N	D	DK
Scrutiny work programmes include:				
• The Council's work with partners				
• Commissioned and contracted services, not just those directly provided by the Council				
• Partners' contributions to joint goals and their other activities that affect the local community				
• Wider issues that could affect public service delivery and community well-being				
Question 19	A	N	D	DK
The Council has agreed scrutiny protocols with important partners, for example:				
• Protocols covering consultation on topics and joint commissioning of scrutiny				
• Protocols covering the delivery and follow-up of recommendations				

Thank you for taking the time to complete this self assessment. Completed forms can be returned by email to: scrutiny@manchester.gov.uk or by post to: Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Room 405, Town Hall, Albert Square, Manchester, M60 2LA.

If you have any queries, please contact the Scrutiny Support Team on the email above or on 0161 234 4997.

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014

All Responses

May 2014

Number of people surveyed	353
Total number of responses	62
Response rate	18%

Are you a/an:	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	14	23%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	2	3%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	5	8%
External organisation	40	65%
Member of the public	1	2%

Which of the following Scrutiny Committee(s) do you attend? (please not some respondents attend more than one committee so totals may not add)

	Number	Percentage
Young People and Children	9	15%
Neighbourhoods	10	16%
Economy	22	35%
Communities	11	18%
Finance	7	11%
Health	15	24%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	26	18	15	11	4	74
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	40	11	5	13	5	74
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	23	16	18	13	4	74
External partners are involved in scrutiny	60	4	5	1	4	74
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	23	17	16	14	4	74

Percentage				
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response
42%	29%	24%	18%	6%
65%	18%	8%	21%	8%
37%	26%	29%	21%	6%
97%	6%	8%	2%	6%
37%	27%	26%	23%	6%

Reflecting the public voice

Scrutiny engages well with the public	16	22	21	12	3	74
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	21	21	19	10	3	74
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	25	19	16	11	3	74
Scrutiny communicates to the public	9	23	24	15	3	74

26%	35%	34%	19%	5%
34%	34%	31%	16%	5%
40%	31%	26%	18%	5%
15%	37%	39%	24%	5%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	25	17	23	7	2	74
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	44	10	6	11	3	74
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	32	9	5	25	3	74
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	34	7	9	21	3	74
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	33	6	2	29	4	74

40%	27%	37%	11%	3%
71%	16%	10%	18%	5%
52%	15%	8%	40%	5%
55%	11%	15%	34%	5%
53%	10%	3%	47%	6%

Making an impact on service delivery

The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	24	17	5	27	1	74
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	40	13	12	9	0	74
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	30	15	12	15	2	74
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	13	22	14	24	1	74
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	30	17	9	16	2	74
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	27	13	13	20	1	74

39%	27%	8%	44%	2%
65%	21%	19%	15%	0%
48%	24%	19%	24%	3%
21%	35%	23%	39%	2%
48%	27%	15%	26%	3%
44%	21%	21%	32%	2%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	6	15	5	43	5	74
Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	12	12	3	42	5	74
Overview report	26	8	3	33	4	74
Pre-meetings	14	8	6	42	4	74
Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	20	11	3	35	5	74

10%	24%	8%	69%	8%
19%	19%	5%	68%	8%
42%	13%	5%	53%	6%
23%	13%	10%	68%	6%
32%	18%	5%	56%	8%

The Scrutiny Process

My role is made clear	43	15	10	3	3	74
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	33	17	15	6	3	74
I am treated as a partner	34	11	24	3	2	74

69%	24%	16%	5%	5%
53%	27%	24%	10%	5%
55%	18%	39%	5%	3%

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014 Young People and Children's

Are you a/an:	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	3	33%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	1	11%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	0	0%
External organisation	5	56%
Member of the public	0	0%
Total responses	9	100%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	4	2	2	1	0	9
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	5	1	3	0	0	9
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	4	0	4	1	0	9
External partners are involved in scrutiny	5	2	1	0	1	9
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	4	3	2	0	0	9

Percentage					
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
44%	22%	22%	11%	0%	100%
56%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
44%	0%	44%	11%	0%	100%
56%	22%	11%	0%	11%	100%
44%	33%	22%	0%	0%	100%

Reflecting the public voice

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny engages well with the public	1	4	3	1	0	9
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	2	1	5	1	0	9
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	4	1	4	0	0	9
Scrutiny communicates to the public	1	3	5	0	0	9

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
11%	44%	33%	11%	0%	100%
22%	11%	56%	11%	0%	100%
44%	11%	44%	0%	0%	100%
11%	33%	56%	0%	0%	100%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	5	4	0	0	0	9
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	5	1	1	2	0	9
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	3	1	1	4	0	9
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	5	1	1	2	0	9
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	4	2	0	3	0	9

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
56%	44%	0%	0%	0%	100%
56%	11%	11%	22%	0%	100%
33%	11%	11%	44%	0%	100%
56%	11%	11%	22%	0%	100%
44%	22%	0%	33%	0%	100%

Making an impact on service delivery

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	3	2	1	3	0	9
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	5	3	1	0	0	9
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	5	3	1	0	0	9
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	3	2	2	2	0	9
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	4	3	0	2	0	9
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	3	2	2	2	0	9

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
33%	22%	11%	33%	0%	100%
56%	33%	11%	0%	0%	100%
56%	33%	11%	0%	0%	100%
33%	22%	22%	22%	0%	100%
44%	33%	0%	22%	0%	100%
33%	22%	22%	22%	0%	100%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	1	2	1	5	0	9
Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	1	3	1	4	0	9
Overview report	5	0	0	4	0	9
Pre-meetings	2	2	0	5	0	9
Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	3	1	0	5	0	9

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
11%	22%	11%	56%	0%	100%
11%	33%	11%	44%	0%	100%
56%	0%	0%	44%	0%	100%
22%	22%	0%	56%	0%	100%
33%	11%	0%	56%	0%	100%

Please describe below how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.

More members could attend pre- meetings and pre- meetings should add value not just rehearse what is to be said in committee
My experience has been of not being welcome, my questions being evaded and my challenges not being taken up. The Young People & Children's Scrutiny Committee has been toothless in supporting those it should be there to fight for. It accepted an 80% cut in funding for youth provision, failed to challenge the appalling commissioning arrangements for day care provision at children's centres by failing to involve local people in the process and fails to involve practitioners. Both the Jewish Rep Council and Faith Network 4 Manchester previously asked that I represent them on this Committee but I was told that that this is not possible. However, there are still spaces!
There needs to be direct communication with community groups as we have not received any information.
Training in effective questioning of officers and partners, particularly follow up questioning. Base Scrutiny more on a Parliamentary Select Committee model.

The Scrutiny Process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
My role is made clear	6	2	1	0	0	9
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	5	1	1	1	1	9
I am treated as a partner	5	0	4	0	0	9

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
67%	22%	11%	0%	0%	100%
56%	11%	11%	11%	11%	100%
56%	0%	44%	0%	0%	100%

If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below.

Real scrutiny should involve partners and deliverers, not exclude them. Members are clearly too willing to accept what is being presented by Officers without the knowledge or experience to challenge. Only Councillor Cox seemed to have any understanding of the issues. There should be spaces on the Young People & Children's Scrutiny Committee for voluntary and faith sector representatives, particularly the latter with so much youth provision in the City being run by faith groups. Papers from the voluntary and faith sector should be invited and welcomed and the Committee should direct Officers to work with voluntary and faith sector representatives in developing policy.
There is a lack of real inclusion as we feel that we are not invited to everything.
It is unclear to many people outside the Council how the Scrutiny Process works, and what difference it makes. Principal reason for a lot of 'don't knows' and 'unsures' above is that it feels like a very internal process that is simply about the Council wanting to be seen to have its decisions and processes scrutinized. Similarly, who outside the council really knows how well officers and elected members work together? There needs to be much greater transparency and access to these committees for members of the public and relevant stakeholders. The make up of the YP&C Scrutiny Committee seems very odd and doesn't reflect the current service delivery pattern in the city.

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014 Neighbourhoods

Are you a/an:

	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	4	40%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	0	0%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	1	10%
External organisation	5	50%
Member of the public	0	0%
Total responses	10	100%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	2	3	4	1	0	10
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	6	2	1	1	0	10
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	2	2	4	2	0	10
External partners are involved in scrutiny	8	1	1	0	0	10
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	3	3	2	2	0	10

Percentage					
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
20%	30%	40%	10%	0%	100%
60%	20%	10%	10%	0%	100%
20%	20%	40%	20%	0%	100%
80%	10%	10%	0%	0%	100%
30%	30%	20%	20%	0%	100%

Reflecting the public voice

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny engages well with the public	2	3	5	0	0	10
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	2	6	2	0	0	10
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	2	3	4	1	0	10
Scrutiny communicates to the public	0	4	5	1	0	10

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
20%	30%	50%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	100%
20%	30%	40%	10%	0%	100%
0%	40%	50%	10%	0%	100%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	5	2	3	0	0	10
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	7	1	0	2	0	10
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	5	2	1	2	0	10
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	5	0	3	2	0	10
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	6	0	0	4	0	10

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
50%	20%	30%	0%	0%	100%
70%	10%	0%	20%	0%	100%
50%	20%	10%	20%	0%	100%
50%	0%	30%	20%	0%	100%
60%	0%	0%	40%	0%	100%

Making an impact on service delivery

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	2	2	1	5	0	10
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	5	1	3	1	0	10
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	3	3	2	1	1	10
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	1	4	3	2	0	10
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	1	4	3	2	0	10
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	2	1	3	4	0	10

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
20%	20%	10%	50%	0%	100%
50%	10%	30%	10%	0%	100%
30%	30%	20%	10%	10%	100%
10%	40%	30%	20%	0%	100%
10%	40%	30%	20%	0%	100%
20%	10%	30%	40%	0%	100%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	0	2	1	7	0	10

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
0%	20%	10%	70%	0%	100%

Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	1	1	1	7	0	10
Overview report	5	0	1	4	0	10
Pre-meetings	1	1	2	6	0	10
Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	3	2	1	4	0	10

10%	10%	10%	70%	0%	100%
50%	0%	10%	40%	0%	100%
10%	10%	20%	60%	0%	100%
30%	20%	10%	40%	0%	100%

Please describe below how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.

This is an OSC which I have previously been a member of but now regularly attend and occasionally contribute to as majority lead on another OSC and through work on sub groups of this committee. I sometimes feel this OSC has too much on the agenda for effective scrutiny. As a former officer I know the work that can go into scrutiny reports and think that unduly short consideration is not satisfactory. Re-writing the terms of reference or making different allocation decisions to rebalance the workloads of committees may be worthwhile. E.g. Sending greening/carbon reduction reports to COSC instead.
The induction is terribly boring and desperately needs updating with information that is relevant to Councillors! Two hours + on data protection? Please, please don't punish the next batch of newbies with this, unless they misbehave of course ;-). I never even saw the scrutiny guide as a new councillor - interesting to know that it exists somewhere. The overview report is a limp-looking lettuce of a document that needs a keen eye on it from Councillors to stay relevant. Pre-meetings don't happen for this scrutiny committee (unless you count the members' lounge gossip) and I've never seen a work programming session in my life, despite the fact I attend virtually every meeting going!
There needs to be a work programme that is more clearly aligned to the Council's policies and not determined on a whim by scrutiny or its' Chair.
Agenda item papers are not often ready to go out with the agenda which leads to confusing meetings, especially as I use an ipad and receiving papers piecemeal is not at all helpful. If papers cannot be ready to go out with the agenda 7 days in advance, then they should be held over for the next scrutiny meeting date.
This question appear to assume that I am a member of the Scrutiny Committee (elected Councillor) - I am not and I indicated this at the start of the survey.

The Scrutiny Process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
My role is made clear	7	2	1	0	0	10
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	3	3	4	0	0	10
I am treated as a partner	4	2	4	0	0	10

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
70%	20%	10%	0%	0%	100%
30%	30%	40%	0%	0%	100%
40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	100%

If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below.

The public are not as involved in important processes and access to reports etc is generally on line so excludes many.
I think that the openness and accessibility to scrutiny could be improved, particularly to council tax payers. Must importantly for me, hosting scrutiny during the day (working hours) can be challenging for those who work, volunteer and the general public to participate.
Despite my criticisms in Q16, the committee is inclusive, friendly, helpful and feels like a true partnership between elected members and the hard-working, under-appreciated officers of MCC. It's definitely one of the best scrutiny committees I've seen, which is due in large part to the efforts of Cllr. Curley, along with Donna Ludford and Eleanor Fort, two of the Council's best people.
Too often the Committee don't scrutinise in a logical, measured way but ask random questions that satisfy them that they have made a contribution but do little to challenging and holding to account Executive members and senior officers.

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014 Economy

Are you a/an:	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	4	18%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	1	5%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	2	9%
External organisation	14	64%
Member of the public	1	5%
Total responses	22	100%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	11	6	1	2	2	22
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	16	1	0	3	2	22
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	8	6	4	2	2	22
External partners are involved in scrutiny	21	0	0	0	1	22
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	11	2	7	0	2	22

Percentage					
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
50%	27%	5%	9%	9%	100%
73%	5%	0%	14%	9%	100%
36%	27%	18%	9%	9%	100%
95%	0%	0%	0%	5%	100%
50%	9%	32%	0%	9%	100%

Reflecting the public voice

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny engages well with the public	7	4	4	5	2	22
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	7	4	4	5	2	22
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	11	2	3	4	2	22
Scrutiny communicates to the public	4	6	5	5	2	22

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
32%	18%	18%	23%	9%	100%
32%	18%	18%	23%	9%	100%
50%	9%	14%	18%	9%	100%
18%	27%	23%	23%	9%	100%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	10	3	7	1	1	22
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	17	1	1	1	2	22
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	11	2	0	7	2	22
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	14	1	1	4	2	22
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	8	2	0	10	2	22

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
45%	14%	32%	5%	5%	100%
77%	5%	5%	5%	9%	100%
50%	9%	0%	32%	9%	100%
64%	5%	5%	18%	9%	100%
36%	9%	0%	45%	9%	100%

Making an impact on service delivery

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	7	7	1	6	1	22
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	15	3	0	4	0	22
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	11	2	1	7	1	22
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	3	8	2	8	1	22
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	12	3	2	3	2	22
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	14	2	1	4	1	22

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
32%	32%	5%	27%	5%	100%
68%	14%	0%	18%	0%	100%
50%	9%	5%	32%	5%	100%
14%	36%	9%	36%	5%	100%
55%	14%	9%	14%	9%	100%
64%	9%	5%	18%	5%	100%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	2	6	0	12	2	22
Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	3	5	0	12	2	22
Overview report	6	3	0	11	2	22
Pre-meetings	6	2	0	13	1	22

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
9%	27%	0%	55%	9%	100%
14%	23%	0%	55%	9%	100%
27%	14%	0%	50%	9%	100%
27%	9%	0%	59%	5%	100%

Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	6	2	0	12	2	22	27%	9%	0%	55%	9%	100%
--	---	---	---	----	---	----	-----	----	----	-----	----	------

Please describe below how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.

Often not enough time for individual item consideration
I am from an external organisation and not a regular attender so therefore not fully aware of the supporting processes that are in place
Q20 - The session I attended (Welfare Reform) had invited members of the public but none attended, possibly due to it being an intimidating environment for a member of the public Q21 - Only labour members attended the Welfare Reform session so it was difficult to judge impartiality
I think some training and background on the specific areas of each Scrutiny Committee at the being of the municipal year would be helpful. Then follow this with an overview of issues likely to come to Scrutiny in the near 12 months followed by a work programming session. I think this would mean that members are better informed for the work programming stage.
This is another OSC I am not a member of but attend for relevant items, take part in sub groups and may contribute to. Quite heavy agendas but well managed here.
Develop clear guidance on the use of 'expert witnesses' from outside the Council - particularly the users of servces, with appropriate advocacy support.
These questions appear to assume that I am a member of the Scrutiny Committee (elected Councillor) - I am not and I indicated this at the start of the survey.

The Scrutiny Process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
My role is made clear	13	3	3	2	1	22
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	14	3	3	2	0	22
I am treated as a partner	11	3	5	2	1	22

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
59%	14%	14%	9%	5%	100%
64%	14%	14%	9%	0%	100%
50%	14%	23%	9%	5%	100%

If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below.

Only comment would be not enough depth allowed in scrutiny.
i did attend a meeting but since then i know nothing else about the committee my answers are based on my knowledge of the day i attended.
We have found Economy Scrutiny Committee, it chair, members and subgroup (sustainability) to be open to dialogue with external 'critical friends'. However, whether this is really an effective challenge to the executive / corporate agenda remains questionable, if only because the corporate agenda and rationality has its own momentum and dominates thinking and practice.
The role of the chair is key - my experience of Economy Scrutiny was that it was well chaired, good questions, one of the best scrutiny functions I have presented to.
A strong inclusive Chair is vital to good Scrutiny. Quality of Scrutiny can vary greatly dependant on the Chair. We have been extremely lucky in Economy Scrutiny in that our Chair is inclusive, seeks to support members in lines of enquiry that they raise and has been open to new ideas and invovlement of the public.
I have felt that the information I supplied to Econ Scrutiny committee on Welfare Reform from a Grass Roots perspective was well received and valued by members of the committee. Its heartening to know that officers and elected councillors take note of the impact of various economic changes to the working and workless people of Manchester. I would like to contribute further to this group in any way that I can,

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014 Communities

Are you a/an:

	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	2	18%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	1	9%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	0	0%
External organisation	8	73%
Member of the public	0	0%
Total responses	11	100%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	5	1	3	2	0	11
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	5	2	0	3	1	11
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	2	2	4	3	0	11
External partners are involved in scrutiny	11	0	0	0	0	11
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	2	3	1	5	0	11

Percentage					
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
45%	9%	27%	18%	0%	100%
45%	18%	0%	27%	9%	100%
18%	18%	36%	27%	0%	100%
100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
18%	27%	9%	45%	0%	100%

Reflecting the public voice

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny engages well with the public	2	2	4	3	0	11
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	4	0	5	2	0	11
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	1	4	2	4	0	11
Scrutiny communicates to the public	1	2	3	5	0	11

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
18%	18%	36%	27%	0%	100%
36%	0%	45%	18%	0%	100%
9%	36%	18%	36%	0%	100%
9%	18%	27%	45%	0%	100%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	3	1	4	3	0	11
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	5	2	1	3	0	11
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	2	3	1	5	0	11
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	2	3	1	5	0	11
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	4	1	0	6	0	11

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
27%	9%	36%	27%	0%	100%
45%	18%	9%	27%	0%	100%
18%	27%	9%	45%	0%	100%
18%	27%	9%	45%	0%	100%
36%	9%	0%	55%	0%	100%

Making an impact on service delivery

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	3	2	0	6	0	11
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	7	1	2	1	0	11
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	3	3	2	3	0	11
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	1	3	2	5	0	11
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	5	2	2	2	0	11
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	3	2	2	4	0	11

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
27%	18%	0%	55%	0%	100%
64%	9%	18%	9%	0%	100%
27%	27%	18%	27%	0%	100%
9%	27%	18%	45%	0%	100%
45%	18%	18%	18%	0%	100%
27%	18%	18%	36%	0%	100%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	1	1	0	8	1	11
Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	2	0	0	8	1	11
Overview report	4	2	0	4	1	11
Pre-meetings	1	0	1	8	1	11
Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	3	1	0	6	1	11

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
9%	9%	0%	73%	9%	100%
18%	0%	0%	73%	9%	100%
36%	18%	0%	36%	9%	100%
9%	0%	9%	73%	9%	100%
27%	9%	0%	55%	9%	100%

Please describe below how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.

COSC does not work as well as other SCs. There was a serious incident of political partiality/ambush in the last meeting, the Chair seems to have tried to game the remit e.g. Using press to announce items ctte has not agreed to, trying to bounce areas into us, ignoring ctte wishes on items, e.g. On who to invite, ignoring scrutiny coordination etc. Any future case of chair being from outside majority group needs some proactive managing so that these issues are reduced or eliminated. This SC has had few "decision" reports but had a large amount (23 or 27 recommendations) hanging business at the end of the cycle. This SC has capacity to deal with a different range of business.
I was just asked to attend a scrutiny meeting because I work for an organisation helping people affected by benefit changes. I have no knowledge of how the Committee works or the affect it has on Council business. I have never received any feedback on the findings of the committee around austerity measures
It would be helpful if the agendas were published earlier so that I can decide whether to come and who else to inform.
Q31 does not apply, I am from an external organisation

The Scrutiny Process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
My role is made clear	7	1	2	0	1	11
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	3	2	3	2	1	11
I am treated as a partner	3	3	3	1	1	11

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
64%	9%	18%	0%	9%	100%
27%	18%	27%	18%	9%	100%
27%	27%	27%	9%	9%	100%

If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below.

See above text box. Some of content there should be in this one but can't find way to copy and paste on Blackberry.
I received an invitation just before Xmas, and only returned to work a few days before the meeting. I was not aware that I was expected to produce a presentation, as other organisations had done. I did not feel that my role in the process was explained well enough in the documents I received.
Much more use could be made of external experts within scrutiny as often councillors are ill-equipped to understand and properly question the executive.
I think it is important that elected members have the opportunity to participate, but I also feel that independent, none political voices needs a stronger position, particularly as it is a majority labour (and this would be the same for any majority) authority. I'm not certain that the community members from accross Manchester have any idea what scrutiny is, or what it does - a bit of a communications exercise me thinks...
As I only attended one meeting and this was some time ago, it's difficult to answer some of the questions.
my experience is that the decisions are that Scrutiny Committee has no power and minimal impact on decisions made by the Executive and Officers. On the occasions where Scrutiny members or the Committee as a whole have raised specific concerns or asked for a specific action, I have not seen any result or change to proposals made by officers. The external organisation that I represent is greatly concerned about the quality of the reports from officers on the area that our organisation has expertise in. We have been dismayed at the inaccuracies, misrepresentation and lack of understanding in the reports related to our area of expertise presented to councillors.

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014 Finance

Are you a/an:

	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	3	43%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	0	0%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	2	29%
External organisation	1	14%
Member of the public	1	14%
Total responses	7	100%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	1	1	3	1	1	7
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	3	2	1	0	1	7
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	2	2	1	1	1	7
External partners are involved in scrutiny	3	0	3	0	1	7
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	2	2	2	0	1	7

Percentage					
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
14%	14%	43%	14%	14%	100%
43%	29%	14%	0%	14%	100%
29%	29%	14%	14%	14%	100%
43%	0%	43%	0%	14%	100%
29%	29%	29%	0%	14%	100%

Reflecting the public voice

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny engages well with the public	0	3	3	1	0	7
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	0	6	0	1	0	7
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	2	3	1	1	0	7
Scrutiny communicates to the public	0	3	3	1	0	7

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	100%
0%	86%	0%	14%	0%	100%
29%	43%	14%	14%	0%	100%
0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	100%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	0	3	3	1	0	7
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	2	3	2	0	0	7
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	5	1	1	0	0	7
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	3	1	1	2	0	7
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	5	1	1	0	0	7

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
0%	43%	43%	14%	0%	100%
29%	43%	29%	0%	0%	100%
71%	14%	14%	0%	0%	100%
43%	14%	14%	29%	0%	100%
71%	14%	14%	0%	0%	100%

Making an impact on service delivery

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	6	0	0	1	0	7
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	2	3	0	2	0	7
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	3	1	1	2	0	7
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	2	2	0	3	0	7
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	3	1	1	2	0	7
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	0	2	0	5	0	7

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
86%	0%	0%	14%	0%	100%
29%	43%	0%	29%	0%	100%
43%	14%	14%	29%	0%	100%
29%	29%	0%	43%	0%	100%
43%	14%	14%	29%	0%	100%
0%	29%	0%	71%	0%	100%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	0	2	2	2	1	7
Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	2	1	1	2	1	7
Overview report	2	2	1	1	1	7
Pre-meetings	0	1	2	3	1	7
Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	2	3	1	0	1	7

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
0%	29%	29%	29%	14%	100%
29%	14%	14%	29%	14%	100%
29%	29%	14%	14%	14%	100%
0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	100%
29%	43%	14%	0%	14%	100%

Please describe below how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.

Work programme sessions need to be properly planned and given more time. Finance Scrutiny has not had pre-meetings for 3 years - perhaps these could be revived? Committee time might then be better spent.
In finance scrutiny work program is ongoing. Pre meetings were and would be (if reinstated) a waste of time and just result in rehearsals for the main meeting.

The Scrutiny Process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
My role is made clear	1	3	2	0	1	7
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	2	3	1	1	0	7
I am treated as a partner	3	3	1	0	0	7

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
14%	43%	29%	0%	14%	100%
29%	43%	14%	14%	0%	100%
43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	100%

If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below.

One senior officer who has appeared before scrutiny I have no faith in and is out of her depth [redacted].
Chair and members were supportive of our suggestion of an area of work and our involvement in discussion.
Reports are often received late even when programmed. Challenge of Executive Members is rare and it should be acknowledged that all reports are 'cleared' by Exec Members before they come to the Committee.

Review of Scrutiny in Manchester 2014

Health

Are you a/an:

	Number	Percentage
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	3	20%
Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	0	0%
Elected member - other	0	0%
Council officer	1	7%
External organisation	11	73%
Member of the public	0	0%
Total responses	15	100%

Being a critical friend

	Number					Total responses
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	
Scrutiny provides effective challenge to the Executive	3	5	2	4	1	15
The Executive engages and co-operate with scrutiny	5	3	0	6	1	15
Scrutiny routinely challenges the Council's corporate strategies and budget	5	4	1	4	1	15
External partners are involved in scrutiny	12	1	0	1	1	15
Scrutiny works effectively with the Executive and senior Management	1	4	2	7	1	15

Percentage					
Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
20%	33%	13%	27%	7%	100%
33%	20%	0%	40%	7%	100%
33%	27%	7%	27%	7%	100%
80%	7%	0%	7%	7%	100%
7%	27%	13%	47%	7%	100%

Reflecting the public voice

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny engages well with the public	4	6	2	2	1	15
The work of scrutiny is informed by the public	6	4	3	1	1	15
Scrutiny makes itself accessible to the public	5	6	2	1	1	15
Scrutiny communicates to the public	3	5	3	3	1	15

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
27%	40%	13%	13%	7%	100%
40%	27%	20%	7%	7%	100%
33%	40%	13%	7%	7%	100%
20%	33%	20%	20%	7%	100%

Taking the lead and owning the scrutiny process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Scrutiny operates with political impartiality	2	4	6	2	1	15
Scrutiny committees have ownership of their own work and programme	8	2	1	3	1	15
Scrutiny members consider they have a worthwhile and fulfilling role	6	0	1	7	1	15
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with senior officers, including support arrangements for scrutiny	5	1	2	6	1	15
Scrutiny has a constructive working partnership with the scrutiny support team	6	0	1	6	2	15

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
13%	27%	40%	13%	7%	100%
53%	13%	7%	20%	7%	100%
40%	0%	7%	47%	7%	100%
33%	7%	13%	40%	7%	100%
40%	0%	7%	40%	13%	100%

Making an impact on service delivery

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
The scrutiny workload is coordinated and integrated into a corporate processes	3	4	2	6	0	15
Scrutiny adds value to the work of the council and its partners	6	2	6	1	0	15
Scrutiny has contributed to improvements in service delivery	5	3	5	2	0	15
Scrutiny demonstrates its impact on service delivery and this is reported back to the committee	3	3	5	4	0	15
Information required by scrutiny is well managed	5	4	1	5	0	15
Scrutiny makes a difference to the lives of people living and working in Manchester	5	4	5	1	0	15

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
20%	27%	13%	40%	0%	100%
40%	13%	40%	7%	0%	100%
33%	20%	33%	13%	0%	100%
20%	20%	33%	27%	0%	100%
33%	27%	7%	33%	0%	100%
33%	27%	33%	7%	0%	100%

Do you agree that the following tools and resources that you receive are useful in supporting you to carry out effective scrutiny?

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
Introduction to the Council (provided for newly elected members)	2	2	1	9	1	15

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
13%	13%	7%	60%	7%	100%

Economy Scrutiny Committee

24 September 2014

Guide for New Members (one is produced for each committee)	3	2	0	9	1	15
Overview report	4	1	1	9	0	15
Pre-meetings	4	2	1	7	1	15
Work programming sessions (held at the beginning of each municipal year)	3	2	1	8	1	15

20%	13%	0%	60%	7%	100%
27%	7%	7%	60%	0%	100%
27%	13%	7%	47%	7%	100%
20%	13%	7%	53%	7%	100%

Please describe below how these tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.

This SC has a heavy workload, largely with outside bodies/partners and some of the agenda is reactive including emergency items. Sometimes the agenda is over full. This can mean important items get less scrutiny than they merit or that recommendations are developed hurriedly and without full or clear discussion. Generally recommendations of any controversy (e.g. A reference back to Exec) should be taken one by one and ambiguity or lack of a clear, shared understanding among members must be avoided.

I feel that this Scrutiny Committee is not 'owned' by its Members. Chair allows plenty of input and questions from Members but always comes to his own conclusions and not the consensus of what Members have said. Reports are often received late and are sometimes withdrawn for no apparent reason. Health partners do not have sufficient opportunity for constructive dialogue with the Committee.

The Scrutiny Process

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
My role is made clear	9	4	1	1	0	15
Scrutiny is an inclusive process	6	5	3	0	1	15
I am treated as a partner	8	0	7	0	0	15

Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No response	Total responses
60%	27%	7%	7%	0%	100%
40%	33%	20%	0%	7%	100%
53%	0%	47%	0%	0%	100%

If you would like to provide further comments on the Scrutiny Process, please use the box below.

NHS officers attending scrutiny are not treated as partners by elected members but as pawns for political point scoring between each other. Elected members come across as disrespectful and ignorant to NHS officers, and also treat us as responsible for Government policy, which we are not. Political point scoring and anecdotal information seem to be the main driver to health scrutiny, and not consideration of what is for the greater good.

I was particularly concerned with this SC about a reference back to Executive. I'm not sure all members voting for recommendations understood them in the same way.

I would like this Committee to scrutinise the Health and Wellbeing Board more closely plus the 'Better Together' process and plans for integrated care. We are kept busy looking at detail and insufficient attention to the overview.

Scrutiny is an essential part of the process and should strengthen work of statutory bodies. It should be fair in its approach.

I certainly did not feel included or treated like a partner. We were treated significantly differently to the public pressure group present who were treated as old friends (they probably were all members of the same political group). Our views were treated disdainfully. There had clearly been a premeet at which the decision of the committee appeared to have been decided in advance. A lecture from the chair part way through the proceedings on democracy did not add value to the meeting.

As an external I have found scrutiny a poor process, poorly chaired, ill structured and led by prejudiced pre-formed opinion

Open Text Responses for each Committee

Young People and Children

Please describe how tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.	External organisation	My experience has been of not being welcome, my questions being evaded and my challenges not being taken up. The Young People & Children's Scrutiny Committee has been toothless in supporting those it should be there to fight for. It accepted an 80% cut in funding for youth provision, failed to challenge the appalling commissioning arrangements for day care provision at children's centres by failing to involve local people in the process and fails to involve practitioners. Both the Jewish Rep Council and Faith Network 4 Manchester previously asked that I represent them on this Committee but I was told that that this is not possible. However, there are still spaces!
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	More members could attend pre- meetings and pre- meetings should add value not just rehearse what is to be said in committee
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Training in effective questioning of officers and partners, particularly follow up questioning. Base Scrutiny more on a Parliamentary Select Committee model.
	External organisation	There needs to be direct communication with community groups as we have not received any information.

Further comments on the Scrutiny Process	External organisation	Real scrutiny should involve partners and deliverers, not exclude them. Members are clearly too willing to accept what is being presented by Officers without the knowledge or experience to challenge. Only Councillor Cox seemed to have any understanding of the issues. There should be spaces on the Young People & Children's Scrutiny Committee for voluntary and faith sector representatives, particularly the latter with so much youth provision in the City being run by faith groups Papers from the voluntary and faith sector should be invited and welcomed and the Committee should direct Officers to work with voluntary and faith sector representatives in developing policy.
	External organisation	There is a lack of real inclusion as we feel that we are not invited to everything.
	External organisation	It is unclear to many people outside the Council how the Scrutiny Process works, and what difference it makes. Principal reason for a lot of 'don't knows' and 'unsures' above is that it feels like a very internal process that is simply about the Council wanting to be seen to have its decisions and processes scrutinized. Similarly, who outside the council really knows how well officers and elected members work together? There needs to be much greater transparency and access to these committees for members of the public and relevant stakeholders. The make up of the YP&C Scrutiny Committee seems very odd and doesn't reflect the current service delivery pattern in the city.

Any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester.	External organisation	Partnership with others is the key. The majority of Scrutiny Committees should be non-Council and be those who are properly involved in the appropriate areas. School Governors are usually well-meaning but rarely understand the issues being discussed. Practitioners and others involved in the community should be sought out and welcomed, particularly those who are able to challenge. Finding 'Yes' people is extremely dangerous, especially as we are about to become a one party Council!
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Meetings in other places than just the Town Hall
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Better use of expert witnesses. Greater clarity about the role of Coopted Members A comprehensive training programme for Scrutiny members (In the case of YPCS) better involvement of young people in the process
	External organisation	Better communication There is a lack of a voice for the sectors and they should be included in giving their opinion, through invitation, inclusion and negotiating decisions.
	External organisation	More effective communication with members of the public and a wider partnership approach to Scrutiny. Feels like scrutiny, in the main, relates to what the council does, would welcome a broader "what are we doing as a City" approach to scrutiny
	Elected member - Executive Member/Assistant Executive Member	Live feed perhaps, like council.
	External organisation	More evidence of interconnection between different scrutiny committees. Greater sense that officers and elected members are working together, and recognition by officers that elected members provide the governance and accountability for the Council's actions and activities.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	With the present set up the Officers tell the Executive they decide, scrutiny might make minor changes, anything of importance is decided by CEO and leadership

Neighbourhoods

Please describe how tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	This is an OSC which I have previously been a member of but now regularly attend and occasionally contribute to as majority lead on another OSC and through work on sub groups of this committee. I sometimes feel this OSC has too much on the agenda for effective scrutiny. As a former officer I know the work that can go into scrutiny reports and think that unduly short consideration is not satisfactory. Re-writing the terms of reference or making different allocation decisions to rebalance the workloads of committees may be worthwhile. E.g. Sending greening/carbon reduction reports to COSC instead.
---	---	--

	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	The induction is terribly boring and desperately needs updating with information that is relevant to Councillors! Two hours + on data protection? Please, please don't punish the next batch of newbies with this, unless they misbehave of course ;-) I never even saw the scrutiny guide as a new councillor - interesting to know that it exists somewhere. The overview report is a limp-looking lettuce of a document that needs a keen eye on it from Councillors to stay relevant. Pre-meetings don't happen for this scrutiny committee (unless you count the members' lounge gossip) and I've never seen a work programming session in my life, despite the fact I attend virtually every meeting going!
	Council officer	There needs to be a work programme that is more clearly aligned to the Council's policies and not determined on a whim by scrutiny or its' Chair.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Agenda item papers are not often ready to go out with the agenda which leads to confusing meetings, especially as I use an ipad and receiving papers piecemeal is not at all helpful. If papers cannot be ready to go out with the agenda 7 days in advance, then they should be held over for the next scrutiny meeting date.
	External organisation	This question appear to assume that I am a member of the Scrutiny Committee (elected Councillor) - I am not and I indicated this at the start of the survey.

Further comments on the Scrutiny Process	External organisation	The public are not as involved in important processes and access to reports etc is generally on line so excludes many.
	External organisation	I think that the openness and accessibility to scrutiny could be improved, particularly to council tax payers. Must importantly for me, hosting scrutiny during the day (working hours) can be challenging for those who work, volunteer and the general public to participate.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Despite my criticisms in Q16, the committee is inclusive, friendly, helpful and feels like a true partnership between elected members and the hard-working, under appreciated officers of MCC. It's definitely one of the best scrutiny committees I've seen, which is due in large part to the efforts of Cllr. Curley, along with Donna Ludford and Eleanor Fort, two of the Council's best people.
	Council officer	Too often the Committee don't scrutinise in a logical, measured way but ask random questions that satisfy them that they have made a contribution but do little to challenging and holding to account Executive members and senior officers.

Any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester.	External organisation	More open , more robust , more independent expert evidence.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think more public engagement would be welcome and more media interest could be part of that. I think in general less subjects covered better would be the way to go, or perhaps an expectation that meetings will be longer than two hours, routinely. I think that carbon reduction and greening reports could usefully be moved to a renamed COSC as this SC doesn't currently have much 'decision' workload and would benefit from having a wider range of material.
	External organisation	More public participation. More sharing of what has been achieved and/or changed as a result of scrutiny (beyond the realms of the authority walls).
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Pre-meetings in the style of the Planning Committee's would be v good across the board. A more focused set of work programmes that are available as downloadable documents on each of the committee webpages where the agendas & minutes are kept & a further exploration of the relationship between the committees would be good, along with joint scrutiny committee sessions to consider the projects & work of MCC & its partners that overlap significantly. For example much of what's considered within Neighbourhoods has implications for the Finance, Economy and Communities Scrutiny Committees. Also, closer working with the Planning and Licensing Committees is going to be essential as we plan for the economic, social and cultural future of the city.
	Council officer	The role of Scrutiny chairs is vital to the effectiveness of scrutiny as a function. Having a strong grasp of the issues within the remit of the relevant scrutiny is important but the ability to chair meetings, ensure a more inclusive but appropriate approach with external partners or residents and shaping the debate and discussion rather than simply determining whose turn it is to ask a question.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Possibly less agenda items to allow for more concentration on important issues.
	External organisation	The meetings are held during mornings/afternoons (working hours/days). This makes it difficult for people working 'normal' days and/or away from the City Centre to attend the Scrutiny meetings. It is not clear how / whether it is possible to raise concerns / ideas via written submissions.

Economy

Please describe how tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Often not enough time for individual item consideration
	External organisation	I am from an external organisation and not a regular attender so therefore not fully aware of the supporting processes that are in place
	External organisation	Q20 - The session I attended (Welfare Reform) had invited members of the public but none attended, possibly due to it being an intimidating environment for a member of the public Q21 - Only labour members attended the Welfare Reform session so it was difficult to judge impartiality
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think some training and background on the specific areas of each Scrutiny Committee at the beginning of the municipal year would be helpful. Then follow this with an overview of issues likely to come to Scrutiny in the near 12 months followed by a work programming session. I think this would mean that members are better informed for the work programming stage.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	This is another OSC I am not a member of but attend for relevant items, take part in sub groups and may contribute to. Quite heavy agendas but well managed here.
	External organisation	Develop clear guidance on the use of 'expert witnesses' from outside the Council - particularly the users of services, with appropriate advocacy support.
	External organisation	These questions appear to assume that I am a member of the Scrutiny Committee (elected Councillor) - I am not and I indicated this at the start of the survey.

	External organisation	not applicable
Further comments on the Scrutiny Process	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Only comment would be not enough depth allowed in scrutiny.
	External organisation	i did attend a meeting but since then i know nothing else about the committee my answers are based on my knowledge of the day i attended.
	Member of the public	We have found Economy Scrutiny Committee, it chair, members and subgroup (sustainability) to be open to dialogue with external 'critical friends'. However, whether this is really an effective challenge to the executive / corporate agenda remains questionable, if only because the corporate agenda and rationality has its own momentum and dominates thinking and practice.
	External organisation	The role of the chair is key - my experience of Economy Scrutiny was that it was well chaired, good questions, one of the best scrutiny functions I have presented to.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	A strong inclusive Chair is vital to good Scrutiny. Quality of Scrutiny can vary greatly dependant on the Chair. We have been extremely lucky in Economy Scrutiny in that our Chair is inclusive, seeks to support members in lines of enquiry that they raise and has been open to new ideas and involvement of the public.
	External organisation	I have felt that the information I supplied to Econ Scrutiny committee on Welfare Reform from a Grass Roots perspective was well received and valued by members of the committee. Its heartening to know that officers and elected councillors take note of the impact of various economic changes to the working and workless people of Manchester. I would like to contribute further to this group in any way that I can,

Any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	More visits outside the Town Hall to engage with communities and interest groups.
	External organisation	send minutes out to people, give people the opportunity to attend more information to the general public on what they do who members are and how and what a difference they have made. if this is pertinent.
	External organisation	I felt some of the question by members were based on particular interests and not necessarily relevant to the specific issues being considered. However I thought the meeting was chaired efficiently and in a constructive, business-like manner
	Member of the public	Consider ways of communicating that go beyond posting agendas , papers and minutes on the council website. e.g. chairs to blog and tweet specifically in role of scrutiny committee chairs. Consult on areas for scrutiny. Co-opt more external members including constructive critics of council policy. Take more assertive role with 'partners' outside the council - calling them to account / bringing them in to discuss issues - e.g. supermarkets.
	Council officer	Fewer Scrutiny committees - need to ensure that the work in servicing scrutiny committees is commensurate with the value added. Terms of reference and focus should be refreshed on a regular basis to ensure that Scrutiny Committees are sighted on the major changes affecting MCC and its services and are able to incorporate new pieces of work e.g. which Scrutiny committee has oversight of PSR work or the Commissioning Hub? May be useful for each Scrutiny to have at least one session a year that is future focused. Are the relationships between MCC Scrutiny Committees and CA /AGMA Scrutiny clear and complementary?
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Better communication with the public. Accessible meeting times and days - so that sometimes members of the public who work in the daytime can attend. Expert external advice and support as and when required for Scrutiny so that an objective opinion can be sought on more complex issues.
	External organisation	More effective communication with memebers of the public and a wider partnership approach to Scrutiny. Feels like scrutiny, in the main, relates to what the council does, would welcome a broader "what are we doing as a City" approach to scrutiny
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think more public engagement would be welcome and more media interest could be part of that. I think in general less subjects covered better would be the way to go, or perhaps an expectation that meetings will be longer than two hours, routinely. I think that carbon reduction and greening reports could usefully be moved to a renamed COSC as this SC doesn't currently have much 'decision' workload and would benefit from having a wider range of material.
	External organisation	The public are generally unaware of what Scrutiny is or what it does. MUCH more needs to be done to engage and inform the public (and the media) so that Scrutiny can be a truly transparent and accountable part of the democratic process. Why not televise them (like Parliamentary Select Committees) and put the recordings on a Council TV Channel?
	External organisation	Use of social media to take the role and work of scrutiny "outside the Town Hall" and the formal meetings setting - it is too intimidating an environment for some people to engage with. Smaller groups could be used to gather views of local people with these being formally reported to the full committee by a nominated member.
	External organisation	The meetings are held during mornings/afternoons (working hours/days). This makes it difficult for people working 'normal' days and/or away from the City Centre to attend the Scrutiny meetings. It is not clearhow / whether it is possible to raise concerns / ideas via written submissions.
	External organisation	I have insufficient knowledge of how the process works to contribute here

Communities

Please describe how tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	COSC does not work as well as other SCs. There was a serious incident of political partiality/ambush in the last meeting, the Chair seems to have tried to game the remit e.g. Using press to announce items ctte has not agreed to, trying to bounce areas into us, ignoring ctte wishes on items, e.g. On who to invite, ignoring scrutiny coordination etc. Any future case of chair being from outside majority group needs some proactive managing so that these issues are reduced or eliminated. This SC has had few "decision" reports but had a large amount (23 or 27 recommendations) hanging business at the end of the cycle. This SC has capacity to deal with a different range of business.
---	---	---

	External organisation	I was just asked to attend a scrutiny meeting because I work for an organisation helping people affected by benefit changes. I have no knowledge of how the Committee works or the affect it has on Council business. I have never received any feedback on the findings of the committee around austerity measures
	External organisation	It would be helpful if the agendas were published earlier so that I can decide whether to come and who else to inform.
	External organisation	Q31 does not apply, I am from an external organisation

Further comments on the Scrutiny Process	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	See above text box. Some of content there should be in this one but can't find way to copy and paste on Blackberry.
	External organisation	I received an invitation just before Xmas, and only returned to work a few days before the meeting. I was not aware that I was expected to produce a presentation as other organisations had done. I did not feel that my role in the process was explained well enough in the documents I received.
	External organisation	Much more use could be made of external experts within scrutiny as often councillors are ill-equipped to understand and properly question the executive.
	External organisation	I think it is important that elected members have the opportunity to participate, but I also feel that independent, none political voices needs a stronger position, particularly as it is a majority labour (and this would be the same for any majority) authority. I'm not certain that the community members from across Manchester have any idea what scrutiny is, or what it does - a bit of a communications exercise me thinks...
	External organisation	As I only attended one meeting and this was some time ago, it's difficult to answer some of the questions.
	External organisation	my experience is that the decisions are that Scrutiny Committee has no power and minimal impact on decisions made by the Executive and Officers. On the occasions where Scrutiny members or the Committee as a whole have raised specific concerns or asked for a specific action, I have not seen any result or change to proposals made by officers. The external organisation that I represent is greatly concerned about the quality of the reports from officers on the area that our organisation has expertise in. We have been dismayed at the inaccuracies, misrepresentation and lack of understanding in the reports related to our area of expertise presented to councillors.

Any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester.	External organisation	Scrutiny could be improved by developing a more strategic and co-ordinated approach with the many and diverse community and voluntary sector organisations across the City which between them provide a conduit to public gauge public opinion on Council services. The current relationship mainly involves selected organisations reacting to requests for input from the Scrutiny Committees on topics on its agenda, which is perfectly effective but is ad hoc or informed by the Committee's work programme. An alternative would be to ask the organisations what issues they believe the Committee should scrutinise based on feedback from their beneficiaries or communities of interest. This could be co-ordinated via Macc or the Voluntary Sector Assembly.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think more public engagement would be welcome and more media interest could be part of that. I think in general less subjects covered better would be the way to go, or perhaps an expectation that meetings will be longer than two hours, routinely. I think that carbon reduction and greening reports could usefully be moved to a renamed COSC as this SC doesn't currently have much 'decision' workload and would benefit from having a wider range of material.
	External organisation	I do not have enough knowledge of the process to comment.
	External organisation	There seems to me to be an unhelpful and excessive antagonism between (some) councillors and officers and I know that some officers dread going to scrutiny. The reports that go scrutiny vary in quality but many are pitched at the wrong level both for the public and for councillors and can be very difficult to understand. A lot more thought needs to go into how (some) reports are written to encourage and enable useful conversations at scrutiny. There are many experts of all types in Manchester who could contribute to scrutiny in partnership with councillors. In general I would like to see a much more constructive relationship between scrutiny and the Executive and officers.
	External organisation	More public participation. More sharing of what has been achieved and/or changed as a result of scrutiny (beyond the realms of the authority walls).
	External organisation	Perhaps better publicise some of the work of the committees and the impact that this has had on service delivery etc.
	External organisation	Under the existing structure I would propose: Reports to committee to be available two weeks before the meeting to give the public and external organisations a more realistic chance of commenting and informing. When allowed to speak public and external organisations should not be limited to one contribution at the beginning but be allowed a further contribution during discussion to reply or add to points raised by officers and councillors. This has happened with Cllr Chamberlain and has helped to make external speakers feel more included. External speakers should be sent draft minutes to check they accurately reflect what they said. Otherwise, we would support reform of the system to give scrutiny committees some teeth.
	External organisation	How is this going to work in the future with the Council being run by one party ?

Finance

Please describe how tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Work programme sessions need to be properly planned and given more time. Finance Scrutiny has not had pre-meetings for 3 years - perhaps these could be revived? Committee time might then be better spent.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	In finance scrutiny work program is ongoing. Pre meetings were and would be (if reinstated) a waste of time and just result in rehearsals for the main meeting.

Further comments on the Scrutiny Process	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	One senior officer who has appeared before scrutiny I have no faith in and is out of her depth [redacted].
	Member of the public	Chair and members were supportive of our suggestion of an area of work and our involvement in discussion.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	Reports are often received late even when programmed. Challenge of Executive Members is rare and it should be acknowledged that all reports are 'cleared' by Exec Members before they come to the Committee.

Any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	More visits outside the Town Hall to engage with communities and interest groups.
	Member of the public	Consider ways of communicating that go beyond posting agendas , papers and minutes on the council website. e.g. chairs to blog and tweet specifically in role of scrutiny committee chairs. Consult on areas for scrutiny. Co-opt more external members including constructive critics of council policy. Take more assertive role with 'partners' outside the council - calling them to account / bringing them in to discuss issues - e.g. supermarkets.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think that Scrutiny needs to do more of its work through Task and Finish Groups, deciding on the major themes that require scrutiny at the start of the year at the work programme meeting.
	External organisation	There seems to me to be an unhelpful and excessive antagonism between (some) councillors and officers and I know that some officers dread going to scrutiny. The reports that go scrutiny vary in quality but many are pitched at the wrong level both for the public and for councillors and can be very difficult to understand. A lot more thought needs to go into how (some) reports are written to encourage and enable useful conversations at scrutiny. There are many experts of all types in Manchester who could contribute to scrutiny in partnership with councillors. In general I would like to see a much more constructive relationship between scrutiny and the Executive and officers.

Health

Please describe how tools can be improved or other ways to improve the support you receive.	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	This SC has a heavy workload, largely with outside bodies/partners and some of the agenda is reactive including emergency items. Sometimes the agenda is over full. This can mean important items get less scrutiny than they merit or that recommendations are developed hurriedly and without full or clear discussion. Generally recommendations of any controversy (e.g. A reference back to Exec) should be taken one by one and ambiguity or lack of a clear, shared understanding among members must be avoided.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I feel that this Scrutiny Committee is not 'owned' by its Members. Chair allows plenty of input and questions from Members but always comes to his own conclusions and not the consensus of what Members have said. Reports are often received late and are sometimes withdrawn for no apparent reason. Health partners do not have sufficient opportunity for constructive dialogue with the Committee.

Further comments on the Scrutiny Process	External organisation	NHS officers attending scrutiny are not treated as partners by elected members but as pawns for political point scoring between each other. Elected members come across as disrespectful and ignorant to NHS officers, and also treat us as responsible for Government policy, which we are not. Political point scoring and anecdotal information seem to be the main driver to health scrutiny, and not consideration of what is for the greater good.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I was particularly concerned with this SC about a reference back to Executive. I'm not sure all members voting for recommendations understood them in the same way.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I would like this Committee to scrutinise the Health and Wellbeing Board more closely plus the 'Better Together' process and plans for integrated care. We are kept busy looking at detail and insufficient attention to the overview.
	External organisation	Scrutiny is an essential part of the process and should strengthen work of statutory bodies. It should be fair in its approach.
	External organisation	I certainly did not feel included or treated like a partner. We were treated significantly differently to the public pressure group present who were treated as old friends (they probably were all members of the same political group). Our views were treated disdainfully. There had clearly been a premeet at which the decision of the committee appeared to have been decided in advance. A lecture from the chair part way through the proceedings on democracy did not add value to the meeting.
	External organisation	As an external I have found scrutiny a poor process, poorly chaired, ill structured and led by prejudiced pre-formed opinion

Any other ways in which you think scrutiny could be improved in Manchester.	External organisation	Better informed elective members on nhs processes Elective members more aware of the limits of their own knowledge A focus on evidence over anecdote.
	External organisation	Make work programmes widely available.
	Council officer	Scrutiny Boards benefit from a clear work programme with terms of reference drafted and agreed in advance for its areas of inquiry. These can be worked up by the Scrutiny Support with assistance from key officers for consideration by Members.
	External organisation	by somehow taking the local (and national) politics out of the room. by scrutiny members being prepared to listen - and take the time to understand - the inputs from partners who are often 'experts' in their subject matter.
	Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think more public engagement would be welcome and more media interest could be part of that. I think in general less subjects covered better would be the way to go, or perhaps an expectation that meetings will be longer than two hours, routinely. I think that carbon reduction and greening reports could usefully be moved to a renamed COSC as this SC doesn't currently have much 'decision' workload and would benefit from having a wider range of material.

External organisation	A recognition of the complexity of the whole system of healthcare and the interdependencies. Resources are stretched and the workforce is working to full capacity. There is no alternative other than making some difficult choices a lot of the time. Inevitably it is not going to be possible to please everyone. Achieving 100% performance all the time is not realistic. In some areas measuring performance is very difficult. There have been instances when time and energy has been diverted to areas where an acceptable outcome was highly unlikely. It would be desirable to avoid this in the future.
Elected member - Member of a Scrutiny Committee	I think that Scrutiny needs to do more of its work through Task and Finish Groups, deciding on the major themes that require scrutiny at the start of the year at the work programme meeting.
External organisation	It would be helpful to know what powers, if any, the Scrutiny Committee have in ensuring their recommendations are implemented by local health bodies and what further action/recommendations they can take/make if no progress is made within a reasonable period of time.
External organisation	I can only comment on health. There needs to be demonstrable political independence and transparency. Appropriate weight needs to be given to professional expert opinion and consideration of the decisions of the committee in the widest context of the health of the population not the political impact of proposals. The public voice must be heard and given due consideration for legitimate concerns but that needs to be seen to be weighed carefully when it is contrary to the professional view.
External organisation	Needs professionalism and an injection of more intelligence

Scrutiny Self Assessment May 2014

Number of people asked	21
Total number of respondents	6
Response rate	29%

		Number	Percentage
Q1:1What is your role?	Elected member - Member of a scrutiny committee	3	50%
	Elected member - Executive Member / Assistant Executive Member	2	33%
	Elected member - other	0	0%
	Council officer	1	17%
	External organisation	0	0%
	Member of the public	0	0%
	Total	6	100%

Q2:1Please select the scrutiny committee(s) which you attend?	Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee	1	17%
	Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee	2	33%
	Economy Scrutiny Committee	3	50%
	Communities Scrutiny Committee	2	33%
	Finance Scrutiny Committee	1	17%
	Health Scrutiny Committee	1	17%

	Number					Percentage				
	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No reponse	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know	No reponse
Q3aMembers, officers and others involved in scrutiny are clear about their aims and contribution to good governance.	4	0	2	0	0	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Q3bOfficers and members responsible for scrutiny are clear about their respective roles.	4	2	0	0	0	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Q3cCoordination of scrutiny work removes unnecessary overlaps and covers unintended gaps.	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q3dTopic selection and scoping ensures scrutiny is topical, uses all relevant evidence, and makes an impact.	3	2	1	0	0	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
Q3ePartners clearly value the arrangements for the scrutiny of partnerships.	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q4aScrutiny is valued throughout the Council as a way to demonstrate credibility to local people.	2	1	3	0	0	33%	17%	50%	0%	0%
Q4bThe Council's constitution confirms the importance of scrutiny and sets out what local people can expect its impact to be.	5	1	0	0	0	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Q4cThe role and importance of scrutiny is a fundamental part of member induction and development.	4	0	2	0	0	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Q4dThe role and importance of scrutiny is a fundamental part of officer induction and development.	1	1	2	1	1	17%	17%	33%	17%	17%
Q4eExecutive councillors and senior managers demonstrate support for scrutiny in how they respond to reports and recommendations.	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q4fScrutiny activity is supported despite spending cuts.	5	1	0	0	0	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Q4gThe Executive regularly refers issues to scrutiny.	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q5aStaff protocols and procedures	4	0	0	2	0	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%
Q5bJob descriptions	2	0	0	4	0	33%	0%	0%	67%	0%

Q5cStaff training	2	0	0	4	0	33%	0%	0%	67%	0%
Q6aScrutiny topics clearly link to the strategic priorities or risks of the Council (including those presented by partnership working)	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q6bScrutiny topics clearly link to potential local gaps in service.	2	2	2	0	0	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
Q6cScrutiny topics clearly link to issues of particular local public concern.	5	0	1	0	0	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Q6dA clear, evidence-based, case underpins the choice of scrutiny topics.	1	4	1	0	0	17%	67%	17%	0%	0%
Q6eOfficers supporting scrutiny understand why each topic is selected.	3	2	1	0	0	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
Q6fChairs of scrutiny committees 'reality check' to ensure they have resources to tackle topics.	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q6gTime-limited task and finish groups support scrutiny committees.	3	2	1	0	0	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
Q6hScrutiny committees appoint independent expert advisers to help them with complicated issues.	2	0	4	0	0	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%
Q6iProgrammes are flexible enough to respond to urgent needs for scrutiny.	4	2	0	0	0	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Q7aNewly elected members' training includes the role of scrutiny and allows for discussions with existing scrutiny members	3	0	2	1	0	50%	0%	33%	17%	0%
Q7bCommittee chairs ensure focused agendas and promote evidence based discussions	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q8aDeveloping lines of inquiry	0	1	4	1	0	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%
Q8bAssessing evidence	0	1	4	1	0	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%
Q8cCritical thinking and analysis	0	1	4	1	0	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%
Q8dProductive questioning	0	1	4	1	0	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%
Q8eWriting and presenting reports and recommendations	0	1	4	1	0	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%
Q8fOrganising and chairing scrutiny sessions	2	0	3	1	0	33%	0%	50%	17%	0%
Q9aTopic selection	6	0	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Q9bReview scoping	3	3	0	0	0	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Q9cWork planning	6	0	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Q9dQuestion framing	0	2	4	0	0	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%
Q9eAnalysing information	1	2	3	0	0	17%	33%	50%	0%	0%
Q10aAdministrative support	6	0	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Q10bInternal expert support	4	0	2	0	0	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Q10cExperts in partner or community organisations	2	2	2	0	0	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
Q11aScrutiny committees ensure they get relevant, robust and clearly presented evidence	3	3	0	0	0	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Q11bRobust data supports all conclusions and recommendations	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%

Q11cRecommendations say who should complete them within a given timescale and these are followed up to check progress.	5	1	0	0	0	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Q11dScrutiny reports are well-written and use plain language.	2	3	1	0	0	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
Q12aScrutiny activity is open and transparent to the wider Council, partners and to the public	5	0	1	0	0	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Q12bSelection and scoping of reviews promotes a focus on recommendations and outcomes	3	2	1	0	0	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
Q12cScrutiny reports are published and publicised	4	2	0	0	0	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Q12dScrutiny committees regularly review, and report on, the impact of their recommendations	2	2	2	0	0	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
Q13aFormal reporting from the Executive	2	1	3	0	0	33%	17%	50%	0%	0%
Q13bExplanatory reports where recommendations are rejected	0	5	1	0	0	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%
Q13cRecourse to a debate in full Council	1	3	2	0	0	17%	50%	33%	0%	0%
Q14aCommittees work in a non-partisan way, and roles (including chairs) and tasks are spread across political groups.	4	0	2	0	0	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Q14bScrutiny is independent of the Executive.	5	1	0	0	0	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Q14cReports and recommendations clearly draw on local people's views	3	3	0	0	0	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Q14dReports and recommendations are considered and adopted (or not) by the Executive on their merits and the evidence provided.	5	0	1	0	0	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Q15aIndependent chairs and members where appropriate	1	3	2	0	0	17%	50%	33%	0%	0%
Q15bProactively seeking views, contributions and input to scrutiny activity from the public, partners, service-users and others with an interest in the Council's work	5	0	1	0	0	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Q15cProactive use of existing Council (and partner) consultation mechanisms	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q15dThe ability and resources to commission surveys and other opinion research methods	2	2	2	0	0	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
Q15eReporting-back openly and honestly to communities and partners on the findings of scrutiny activity	3	2	1	0	0	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
Q16aGetting advice from representatives groups on how to involve their members and working with partner organisations to reach groups to whom they may have stronger links	2	3	1	0	0	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
Q16bEnsuring meetings are accessible (location, timing, format etc) and using a wide range of other methods to gather views from different groups	3	3	0	0	0	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Q16cOnline evidence and discussions sessions	1	1	4	0	0	17%	17%	67%	0%	0%
Q17aScrutiny work programmes balance inward and external investigations.	4	1	1	0	0	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%
Q17bPartners and other key agencies help develop external scrutiny proposals.	4	0	2	0	0	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
Q17cScrutiny groups reviewing external providers include external representation or expertise.	2	2	1	1	0	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%
Q17dProvide a training programme for scrutiny members, including more effective ways to improve our use of questions and follow-ups.	1	2	1	2	0	17%	33%	17%	33%	0%
Q18aThe Council's work with partners	6	0	0	0	0	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Q18bCommissioned and contracted services, not just those directly provided by the Council	5	0	0	1	0	83%	0%	0%	17%	0%
Q18cPartners contributions to joint goals and their other activities that affect the local community	5	1	0	0	0	83%	17%	0%	0%	0%

Q18dWider issues that could affect public service delivery and community well-being	4	2	0	0	0	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Q19aProtocols covering consultation on topics and joint commissioning of scrutiny	2	2	1	1	0	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%
Q19bProtocols covering the delivery and follow-up of recommendations	2	3	0	1	0	33%	50%	0%	17%	0%