STANDARDS COMMITTEE

30 November 2009

MONITORING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS BY INDEPENDENT MEMBERS AND PARISH REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (GOVERNANCE)

Contact Officers: Stephen Whetnall/Chris Ashcroft Tel No: 01962 848220/848284

RECENT REFERENCES:

None

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This process was introduced in 2002 and has been repeated every two years. Meetings of Cabinet, Principal Scrutiny Committee and Planning Development Control Committee have been monitored in the past, being those that generate the highest levels of public interest.

For the benefit of members new to the Committee, the monitoring process involves two of the Independent Members/Parish Representatives (in various combinations) attending selected committee meetings as members of the public. They were not 'mystery shoppers', as this Committee decided that everyone at the meeting to be monitored should be aware of their attendance and their role, which was to observe proceedings from the public viewpoint and make comments regarding the observance by Members of the Code of Conduct and other protocols. The exercise also provided a useful opportunity to comment on a number of general 'housekeeping' issues, such as meeting facilities, signage and acoustics.

The feedback proved very useful and highlighted areas for improvement, many of which have since been addressed. The Committee is requested to consider whether it wishes similar visits to be carried out, probably during January and February 2010, as that would be timely in terms of incorporating any agreed amendments into processes etc. to commence in the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

A copy of the questionnaire previously used is attached as Appendix A to this report and, if the above is agreed, comments about the questions asked and possible changes would be welcomed.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- That the Independent Members and Parish Representatives be requested to undertake further evaluation of committee meetings to ascertain the level of compliance with the Code of Conduct and other guidance.
- That the Committee considers whether there is any other form of monitoring of the Council's ethical framework which it would wish to see undertaken.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN (RELEVANCE TO):

An Efficient and Effective Council.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

Minimal travel costs.

RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

None

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Draft Questionnaire for Monitoring Exercise



STANDARDS COMMITTEE - QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MONITORING MEETINGS

(Please circle the best description)

1.	How clear was the signage at the Guildhall to indicate where and when the meeting would be held?
	Excellent / Good / Average / Poor / Very Poor
	Further Comments
2.	To what extent was it clear who the Councillors, the officers and (if appropriate) the applicants were?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
3.	How good were the facilities in the meeting room? (eg seating and, if appropriate, monitors, projector screens etc)
	Excellent / Good / Average / Poor / Very Poor
	Further comments
4.	Were copies of the agenda and procedure leaflets available on the public seating?
	Yes / No
	Further comments

5.	How clearly was the opportunity for public participation announced at the beginning of the meeting?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
6.	To what extent did the agenda sheet and leaflet clearly explain the process of public participation?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
7.	Were you asked directly by the Committee Administrator or the Chairman if you wanted to speak during public participation?
	Yes / No
	Further comments
8.	If others did speak, to what extent were their concerns answered fairly?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
9.	How well could both the public speakers and the Councillors be heard?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all

	urther omments
•••	•••
de	buncillors who are not members of the Committee can sometimes contribute to the bate, including Portfolio Holders, Ward Members and the Leader. If applicable, how all was this fact communicated to the public?
C	ompletely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	urther omments
	····
Co Co	ollowing on from question 10 above, and specifically relating to the Planning ommittee, to what extent was the Planning Protocol followed (eg: Members of the ommittee not voting but choosing to speak as a Ward Member to advocate a articular view)?
C	ompletely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	urther omments
•••	
int	any Councillors declared an interest, how well was it made clear what the actual erest was (i.e. personal or personal and prejudicial and a brief mention of the cumstances)?
Co	ompletely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	urther omments
aft	d any Member leave the room after declaring an interest of either type, perhaps fer making a statement under Public Participation as permitted by the Code of anduct?

Yes / No

	Further comments
14.	.When items were debated, how well did the Chairman achieve a fair and balanced discussion?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
15.	How well did the Chairman summarise the debate prior to a decision being made?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
16.	How clearly did you understand the actual decision reached by the meeting on each item?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments
17.	Overall, to what extent was the debate and decision easy to follow for the lay person?
	Completely / Quite well / Partly / Not at all
	Further comments

OTHER COMMENTS:
•••••