

Options to reduce the number of main reporting committees

Option 1 : Continue the current arrangements: 2 main service committees built around Depute Chief Executive Roles	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Education, Communities and Organisational Development</b> To include CYPS, and service elements of Communities and P&amp;R.</li> <li>• <b>Economic Growth, Housing and Environmental Sustainability</b> To include EDIS and service elements of Communities and P&amp;R.</li> </ul>	
Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee structure is based on the organisational management structure that the council has decided upon for its functions, 2 main service portfolios.</li> <li>• Makes efficient use of officer resource.</li> <li>• Larger more strategic committees help with strategic focus, which helps address the level of detail issue in the BVAR.</li> <li>• We have had a chance to test it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional reporting required to full council. Some items currently within P&amp;R remit fall within the 2 roles. For example Council wide policies/programmes or council wide financial/asset management issues.</li> <li>• Potential for large agendas –whilst initial meetings included a backlog of material due to Covid restrictions, some recent meetings have also had long agendas. Of note, most of these items stem from the Children and Young People’s Committee agenda and so the issue is not predominantly related to the combined committee. Whilst these have been managed within allotted times they present members with a lot of reading material.</li> <li>• Children Social Work Services reports will still go through ECOD during shadow period until transfer to IJB – revised timescale Apr 22.</li> </ul>
<p>Additional Ctees:  <b>Statutory*</b>: Planning and Regulatory Services, LRB, Licensing Board, Licensing Committee  <b>Other</b>: Audit and Scrutiny*, Police and Fire Rescue, Appeals, Recruitment                      *further proposals below</p>	

Option 2: Current arrangements (2 main service committees built around Depute Chief Executive Roles) + a further committee picking up Corporate Issues.	
<p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental/Housing committee</li> <li>• Education, Communities and Organisational Development committee</li> <li>• Corporate committee picking up Finance, Corporate Policy and Risk issues with possibility of including Audit</li> </ul>	
Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee structure is based on the organisational management structure that the council has decided upon for its functions, 2 main service portfolios.</li> <li>• Larger more strategic committees help with strategic focus, which helps address the level of detail issue in the BVAR.</li> <li>• Recognises the benefits in having a committee to consider the Financial and policy issues that have corporate impact across all services and which don't neatly fall into the 2 committees in Option 1 above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional committee (compared with Option 1) will take up officer time with more behind the scenes administration.</li> <li>• Agendas for a Corporate Committee could be light. Most financial decisions require to go to Full Council.</li> <li>• No separate Audit committee –further detail note 6 below</li> <li>• Greater likelihood of reports going to more than one committee.</li> </ul>
<p>Additional Ctees:</p> <p><b>Statutory*</b>: Planning and Regulatory Services, LRB, Licensing Board, Licensing Committee</p> <p><b>Other</b>: Police and Fire Rescue, Appeals, Recruitment</p> <p>*Further proposals below</p>	

Option 3: Keep a wider range of committees in line with our existing Scheme of Administration.	
<p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move back to the pre-existing Committee Structure</li> <li>• Opportunities for some minor alignment of remits.</li> </ul>	
Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity</li> <li>• Minimal changes to Scheme of Administration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lose opportunity for efficiency</li> <li>• Does not fully align with the organisational structure that the council has decided upon for its functions, 2 main service portfolios.</li> <li>• Harder to achieve strategic focus.</li> <li>• Inefficient use of officer time servicing a number of meetings.</li> <li>• May need further review as Children SW Services move to to IJB.</li> <li>• Some agendas may be light with the enhanced use of information reports which has been an effective part of the temporary arrangements that there would be merit in retaining</li> </ul>
<p><b>Service Ctees:</b> P&amp;R, EDIS, C&amp;YPS, Communities,  <b>Statutory Ctees*:</b> Planning and Regulatory Services, LRB, Licensing Board, Licensing Committee  <b>Other Ctees:</b> Audit and Scrutiny*, Police and Fire Rescue, Appeals, Recruitment                      *further proposals below</p>	

**Specific Committee Options**

Option A: Align membership of the Licensing Board and Committee.	
<p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One Chair</li> <li>• 9 members for both Liquor and Civic</li> <li>• Single meeting with agenda split into Liquor and Civic sections.</li> </ul>	
Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now under same Chairperson, which makes combination simpler.</li> <li>• More efficient number for committee</li> <li>• Allows members to develop specialism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could cause timing difficulties with hearings however these could be overcome.</li> <li>• Statutory requirement for liquor training for members of the Board which is costly but not the same requirement for Members sitting on Licensing Committee so could influence which Members are chosen to sit on a combined Board/Committee</li> </ul>

Option B: Align membership of Planning and Regulatory Services Ctee and Local Review Body.	
<p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One Chair</li> <li>• Reduced numbers from a standard committee to say 9.</li> <li>• Single meeting with agenda split into PRS and LRB items.</li> </ul>	
Pros	Cons

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient number for specialist committee</li> <li>• Allows members to develop specialism.</li> <li>• Reduced number of meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller number of members setting policies which impact across the whole council remit</li> <li>• Could cause timing difficulties with hearings. LRB meets more frequently than P&amp;RS.</li> <li>• Different group of officers needed for each part of the agenda, Planning/LRB.</li> <li>• 2 bodies have separate roles – PRS committee setting policy and determining applications and LRB sitting as an appellate body – important LRB seen as a distinct body in determining appeals</li> </ul>
---	--

Option C: Review remit of Audit and Scrutiny Committee	
<p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scrutiny function is recognised as a Service Committee function with a Scrutiny Charter agreed as a Second Tier Governance document</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For Option 1 the Committee retains the remaining delegated functions to become an <b>Audit and Risk Committee</b></li> <li>○ For Options 2 and 3 the Committee’s functions merge with P&amp;R to become a <b>Finance, Policy, Risk and Audit Committee</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Pros	Cons

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With a minority administration, non-administration councillors have effective scrutiny of policy and performance through service committees.</li> <li>• Scrutiny Charter clarifies the scrutiny role for councillors.</li> <li>• Option 1 would mirror the IJB structure.</li> <li>• Allows a strong focus on corporate governance with the remaining committee functions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non administration councillors may feel that they have lost an opportunity to hold the council Administration to account.</li> <li>• For Option 1, agendas may be light although reducing frequency of meetings could counterbalance this.</li> <li>• Loss of independence of scrutiny function.</li> </ul>
--	--

Issues to be resolved from these options	
Issue	Suggestion
<p>1. Frequency of meeting cycle for main committees</p>	<p>Keep to an 8 week cycle as we do have other ‘partnership’ meetings scheduled in which may cause unnecessary complications in trying to re-arrange them.</p>
<p>2. Reporting for Children’s Services +remnants of Social Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children’s services are in the process of transferring to the IJB. This is being referred to as a shadow period. Meantime there still needs to be direct democratic accountability for these services within the Councils structure.</li> <li>• The role of the CSWO and remnants of social work services, although managed on a day to day basis through the IJB, need a direct report to the Council. There is no statutory power to delegate them to the IJB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children’s Services report to the committee taking on C&amp;YPS (in addition to any reporting required by the IJB) during shadow period. When the IJB takes on statutory responsibility for these services this accountability will cease.</li> <li>• CSWO and non-delegated social work services report through full Council</li> </ul>
<p>3. External committee members can be tied up in longer meetings with items in open and confidential sections. . (Religious, teacher, parent pupil reps attendance for educational policy reports on ECOD and Tenant reps on EGHE meetings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda can be managed so that items relevant to external committee members are grouped together.</li> <li>• Consideration is given to removing the voting rights of all non-councillor committee members.</li> </ul>
<p>45. Having a distinct audit committee</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is generally recognised as good practice for Councils to have a separate audit committee however the Council have found it challenging to find sufficient material to fill the agenda on an 8 week cycle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the Council decide to combine Audit with other elements such as Finance, it is suggested that a section of that agenda of that committee could be set aside for Audit Items.</li> <li>• The Council agree a Scrutiny Charter to help councillors fulfil their scrutiny role.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Senior Responsibility Allowances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulations allow up to 9 SRA's to paid, subject to an overall cap.</li> <li>• The Council have agreed that a total of 8 SRA's are paid to positions of significant responsibility and these are normally settled when committee chair positions are agreed.</li> <li>• With fewer Chairs the Council will need to reconsider how SRA's are allocated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider payment of SRA's to a combination of committee Chairs and portfolio holders.</li> <li>• Allow portfolio holders to lead on relevant agenda items within committees with wider remits.</li> <li>• Minute decision at full Council.</li> </ul>