

Appendix 2

| PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------|--------|---|
| NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE | Performance | | | | |
| DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION | 23 May 2013 | | | | |
| TITLE OF REPORT | Annual Council Reporting Framework | | | | |
| P U R P O S E | 1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf) | There is a statutory requirement for the Director of Social Services to report annually on the delivery, performance and plans for developing and improving the authority's social service functions. | | | |
| | 2. What issues are to be scrutinised? | The Director's self assessment of performance in 2012/2013 and areas for service development/improvement in 2013/14 | | | |
| | 3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts? | Director of Social Services ACRF lead officers | | | |
| | 4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report? | Ensuring that the self assessment provides a recognisable picture of social care in Denbighshire and that identified areas for development/improvement are appropriately prioritised | | | |
| | 5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims & priorities and impact (see overleaf)* | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Aims & Priorities</th> <th>Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Aims & Priorities | Impact | 4 |
| Aims & Priorities | Impact | | | | |
| 4 | 4 | | | | |
| ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | | | | | |
| REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny's recommendations to be reported elsewhere? | It is a statutory requirement that the Annual Report be presented to Full Council each year. The final report will be presented to full Council in July 2013 for endorsement | | | | |
| AUTHOR | Sally Ellis | | | | |

Please complete the following checklist:

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

*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