

## **Appendix 2 – Responses to Question 15 “Any other comments about current Overview and Scrutiny arrangements”**

Attendance levels need to be good to guarantee a consistent and worthwhile outcome

For an authority with 39 members, having 5 Overview and Scrutiny Committees is excessive. The volume of reviews undertaken indicates that there isn't enough work to deliver by 5 Committees. There is some duplication between some Committees e.g. VFM Scrutiny and Audit Committee. Smaller Committees with increased membership would lead to greater debate and better quality reviews

Health Scrutiny is limited by the structure it operates and is limited to smaller less important reviews as the larger items are scrutinised at a county level. Also with two meetings cancelled due to not being quorate I feel the number of members needs to be increased

Health Scrutiny. This scrutiny panel is good for receiving updates from local providers etc, but as a scrutiny committee, in a council for which health is not a statutory obligation, I really don't know how much impact the committees work does, and how we can influence or affect change, if and when that's needed. I understood the idea of scrutiny is to assess council's operations, I therefore have to ask if Health should be scrutiny panel, or whether it should be more of an information based committee, where new provisions or changes to provisions are presented to ESBC and can be examined by Cllrs.

Healthier Staffordshire Select Committee has influence on what scrutiny we can undertake.

I am the LA appointee and sit on the Police Crime Commissioner panel - this is a Scrutiny role

I have only just joined the Council and so this is all very new to me

I think there is some duplication between audit and value for money scrutiny, I think they could be more productive if there were less committees, amalgamating the five that we have into either two or three, thus giving more members meaningful opportunity to get involved in overview and scrutiny activity

More could be done between meetings to involve more members

Personally I think with the work load of the health scrutiny we should meet every month

Standing orders for scrutiny are about right and should not be diluted

The only thing I would change is the way in which executive decisions are made. Clearly it would be too cumbersome to have every decision scrutinised by a committee before it can go ahead but certain decisions, to do with policy change or major projects, could be sent to the relevant committee for scrutiny before that decision is made. That relevant committee could then make recommendations or

suggest changes to the dept leader, which they may take notice of at their discretion. In no case would the scrutiny committee overrule the dept leader

The opportunity to look at wider community issues is not taken and reviews focus on ESBC services

The size and regularity of the various committees seems appropriate, and this is demonstrated by (some) committees looking at a reasonable number of reviews within a financial year. However these subject areas could quite easily fall under more than one corporate priority / committee. This suggests that there could be scope and capacity to reallocate these topics across other committees

The survey does not allow for discrimination between different scrutiny groups