

| PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES | | |
|---|--|---|
| NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE | Performance Scrutiny | |
| DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION | 6 September 2012 | |
| TITLE OF REPORT | Briefing on the Corporate Plan 2012-17 | |
| P U R P O S E | 1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf) | Briefing Performance Scrutiny on the draft Corporate Plan is a key consultative step that will help enable the final version of the Corporate Plan to be adopted by Full Council. |
| | 2. What issues are to be scrutinised? | Scrutiny of the draft corporate priorities and improvement objectives that are out to public consultation and will form the Corporate Plan 2012-17 |
| | 3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts? | Yes, the Lead Member for Modernisation and the Head of Business Planning and Performance. |
| | 4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report? | An effective input into the Corporate Plan 2012-17, and reassurance that the process of its development has been robust. |
| | 5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims & priorities and impact (see overleaf)* | Aims & Priorities |
| | 4 | 4 |
| ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | The Corporate Plan 2012-17 will provide direction for the whole Council for this election period. | |
| REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny’s recommendations to be reported elsewhere? | Scrutiny’s recommendations will be given due respect and consideration, and responded to appropriately. Where applicable, amendments will be made to the draft Corporate Plan that will be taken to Full Council on 9 October. | |
| AUTHOR | Alan Smith/Tony Ward | |

Please complete the following checklist:

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Is the topic already being addressed satisfactorily? | X | |
| Is Scrutiny likely to result in service improvements or other measurable benefits? | X | |
| Does the topic concern a poor performing service or a high budgetary commitment? | | X |
| Are there adequate resources / realistic possibility of adequate resources to achieve the objective(s)? | X | |
| Is the Scrutiny activity timely, i.e. will scrutiny be able to recommend changes to the service delivery, policy, strategy, etc? | X | |
| Is the topic linked to corporate or scrutiny aims and priorities? | X | |
| Has the topic been identified as a risk in the Corporate Risk Register or is it the subject of an adverse internal audit or external regulator report? | | X |

*The following table is to be used to guide the scores given:

| Score | Aims & Priorities | Impact |
|-------|--|--|
| 0 | No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities | No potential benefits |
| 1 | No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities but a subject of high public concern | Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/customer/client group |
| 2 | Some evidence of links, but indirect | Minor benefits to two groups/moderate benefits to one |
| 3 | Good evidence linking the topic to both aims and priorities | Moderate benefits to more than one group/substantial benefits to one |
| 4 | Strong evidence linking both aims and priorities, and has a high level of public concern | Substantial community-wide benefits |

SCORING

Aims & Priorities

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 4 | Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately | Priority topic for Scrutiny – for urgent consideration |
| 3 | | |
| 2 | Reject topic for Scrutiny – topic to be circulated to members for information purposes | Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately |
| 1 | | |

0 1 2 3 4

Impact