

Appendix 2

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