

### Summary of Council operating structures across Scotland.

| Type of structure       | Description   | Evaluation  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Traditional Committee   |   |   |
| By management structure | Committee remit focused around the Council's departmental structures.   | <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear tasking and accountability of officers to that committee</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less able to develop cross cutting strategies-requires more issues to be pushed up to a central policy committee.</li> <li>• Potential for a greater number of committees and more resource intensive to service</li> <li>• If departmental structures change this can lead to overlaps.</li> </ul> |
| By theme                | <p>Committee remit focused around the Council's strategic priorities, or broader themes such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people</li> <li>• place</li> <li>• environmental</li> <li>• regulatory</li> </ul> | <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could help the council focus attention on the outcomes of our strategic priorities.</li> </ul> <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We still need to crunch through the operational detail of the wide range of services we provide.</li> <li>• More resource in pulling together multi-department material</li> </ul>   |
| By area                 | Many larger authorities operate area committees. Some of  | Pros:   |

|                             |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
|                             | these have local spending powers and local regulatory functions including planning and licensing. Others appear more focused on Community Planning issues.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for local democracy and accountability</li> </ul> Cons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q whether Moray is large enough (by population and area) to justify this.</li> </ul>   |
| Summary comments            | <p>Around two thirds of councils in Scotland operate this type of model.</p> <p>There is still a requirement to have distinct committees for statutory functions including planning, licensing and appeals. Best practice also suggests the need for an audit committee.</p>   | Pros <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tried and tested.</li> <li>• Gives flexibility.</li> <li>• Easy to reflect political balance</li> <li>• Allows high levels of councillor engagement committees so more inclusive and good for scrutiny.</li> </ul> Cons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource intensive</li> <li>• Potential for overlap and reports going to multiple committees.</li> <li>• Can there be too much scrutiny?</li> </ul> |
|                             |  |   |
| <b>Cabinet or executive</b> |  |   |
| Extent of powers            | <p>Some Councils have almost all policy decisions made by the cabinet/executive committee with just the annual budget setting and statutory functions reserved to full Council .</p> <p>In a hybrid model, less power is devolved to the cabinet with some decision making in service committees. This could be viewed as a “super P&amp;R”.</p> | <p>The more powers that are devolved to the cabinet/executive, the more the likely efficiencies are.</p> <p>The annual budget setting process and statutory functions are reserved to full Council.</p>   |
| Administration only         | Only administration members sit on the cabinet. Political balance is achieved by having a one or more scrutiny committees on which a majority of opposition members sit. These scrutiny committees have the power to call in decisions of the cabinet/executive but final decision   | Pros <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speedy decision making</li> </ul> Cons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for decision making to be slowed down by call</li> </ul>  |

|                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
|                  | <p>making.<br/>The scrutiny safety net for opposition councillors comes in the annual budget setting meeting spending priorities are agreed by all Councillors.</p>   | <p>ins to scrutiny committees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionable in terms of political balance</li> </ul>   |
| Rainbow          | The cabinet/executive reflects political balance.   | <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political balance observed.</li> <li>• Examples of it working elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is anecdotal evidence that opposition group members find it hard to operate in the cabinet without a steer from their group.</li> </ul>   |
| Rainbow light    | As above but token opposition Councillors sit on the cabinet/executive. Their position is more like an observer.  | As above.   |
| General comments | <p>Around one third of councils in Scotland operate this type of model.</p> <p>As in the committee structure above there is still a requirement to have distinct committees for statutory functions including planning, licensing and appeals. Best practice also suggests the need for an audit committee.</p> | <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faster decisions: more frequent meetings involving fewer councillors</li> <li>• Less potential for overlap</li> <li>• Potential to free up time of non-executive councillors to concentrate on constituency work</li> <li>• Less meetings to service</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for call-in to scrutiny committees could slow down decision making</li> <li>• Excludes majority of Councillors from core decisions.</li> <li>• Weaker overall scrutiny of decision making</li> </ul> |