

## **Current Arrangement – Model A**

### **Pros**

- Member involvement
- Use of Councillor call for action gives O & S power but has been underused
- O & S is counterweight to executive powers
- "A" distances the adversarial aspect from PAC processes
- Separate O & S enabled detailed consultations with invited guests
- Takes a wider view
- Current system does seem to work

### **Cons**

- CLA PAC has a very tight agenda
- You can do more O & S if O & S spread through PACs
- One PAC too many
- Low decision making ratio
- Lots of places need to be filled
- Too many people on O & S
- Possibly less expertise in O & S unless unique appointments made
- O & S doing too much work which isn't related to Council business
- Failure is scrutiny of non-corporate items e.g. Economic Regeneration, future of Leisure Centre, 1000 affordable homes
- Disconnect of knowledge between PACs and second tier
- Wrong – less informed councillors making decisions
- Delay between PAC recommendations and Cabinet making decision
- Cabinet is not making decisions and therefore not much to PACs to advise on
- More member involvement must entail longer time to decide
- System not tested because very few call ins on member requests

## **Model B**

### **Cabinet plus Policy Advisory Scrutiny Committees**

#### **Pros**

- Increased member involvement and expertise
- With fewer councillors it will reduce burden on individual councillors. 24 less committee places to fill.
- Need for task and finish to enhance decisions
- CLA agenda is frequently too light so good idea to combine
- Offers opportunity to review policy with a committee.
- PACS can have a scrutiny function
- Nice and simple
- Could you keep on here in reserve as overall OSC for cross council issues e.g. climate change/biodiversity
- Should committees be 11 rather than 9 to ensure full councillor involvement
- Supervisor to current structure enables more scrutiny than now
- Need to have 4 PACs as losing current OSC
- ?will opposition group members chair as a counter balance?

#### **Cons**

- O & S is too remote
- Which overview & scrutiny members take precedence/authority? Cabinet O & S
- This would be five down to three. Would this make meetings too packed?

## **Model C**

### **Cabinet and Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

- Going from 5 committees – 3!! 4 OSC
- Corp SVC
- Community, Housing and Health
- Communities, Leisure, Arts, Econ Dev (open spaces, parks etc)
- Planning Infrastructure

#### **Pros**

- Less burden on individual councillors to man/staff
- If no Overview Scrutiny Committee need to maintain 4 Committees to give sufficient review
- 9 is better for decision making
- Opportunity for large policy review but at cost of giving advice to Cabinet on general policy issues
- None we could find

#### **Cons**

- If only 3 Committees need 11 or more Councillors to ensure most councillors can have an input
- Lack of transparency up to 90%
- Describes not subject to Cllr input except Cabinet
- Process becomes too drawn out
- Increasing number of urgent Decisions which would lead to uninformed decision taking
- No pre-decision scrutiny
- Poorly framed decisions

## **Model D**

### **Cabinet and One Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

#### **Pros**

- Reduced clearing time
- Less printing cost and paperwork
- Greener
- If only 1 Committee would need say 19 so could have multiple teams working
- Simple for public/residents to follow and understand
- Could have sub-committees

#### **Cons**

- No!
- No input into general decision making
- No, as good as Option B
- High workload for O & S – too much!
- Only 20 Members are front and centre
- No check and balance - pre scrutiny
- Too many call-ins
- Minimal Member involvement
- Little Member involvement
- No presenting ideas
- If you are not on Overview and Scrutiny or in Cabinet you are excluded (yes not democratic)
- Very little Member input

## **Model E**

### **Cabinet plus Cabinet Advisory Committees and OSC**

Perfect – however more required on O & S to ensure better representation of all Groups

#### **Pros**

- Subject to the CACS being politically balanced
- If CAC had ability to question Cabinet member
- Good acronym for Committees
- Leader will always support this option – pro for Leader

#### **Cons**

- How can you have an OSC of only 4 members
- Any role for opposition parties/groups
- Still only an advisory role
- Inefficient, ineffective similar to what we have now
- Leader would put Chair forward for each CAC
- Leader still has too much power
- Dominant party could manipulate decision making process
- KCC model – does it work there? – not sure it does!
- Why should Leader decide on Committees and whose on them!
- Is KCC really a role model?!