

Cabinet

<p>Summary</p>	<p>This system maintains the current arrangements. The vast majority of decisions are made by Cabinet, collectively and individually in Decision Making Sessions (DMS). The Executive Scrutiny Committee will scrutinise all cabinet and individual key decisions, and the Budget Scrutiny Working Group will continue its role.</p> <p>The existing scrutiny committees continue with the current remits.</p>
<p>Resources (see Appendices C&D for detail)</p>	<p>The cabinet model was originally created with the intention that it was an efficient and non-bureaucratic decision making model. It is considered that the model can be delivered within the available resources with no specific areas where additional resources will be required.</p>
<p>Compatibility with organisational transformation</p>	<p>The Cabinet model has a good deal of flexibility. It is entirely within the gift of the Leader to determine the number of cabinet posts and the portfolios held by each cabinet member.</p> <p>The current scrutiny arrangements are also flexible, with two "generic" committees – the ESC and the Scrutiny Committee – which can therefore very easily sit alongside the new shape of the organisation. The two other scrutiny committees (Health and Education) reflect specific statutory requirements.</p>
<p>Key advantages</p>	<p>No large scale changes needed. The system is now well understood, and would require very little rewriting of constitutional rules and procedures. Lines of responsibility are clear internally and externally.</p>
<p>Key disadvantages</p>	<p>Decision making power in the hands of a small number of councillors. Always unlikely to mirror the political balance of the council.</p>
<p>Main areas of further work required (see also Appendix B on general issues)</p>	<p>To review cabinet portfolios. To review Lead member and Champion roles. To review number and scope of cabinet committees and working groups.</p>

Hybrid

<p>Summary</p>	<p>In this model, decisions are made by Cabinet and Cabinet members, but only after pre-scrutiny by a politically balanced committee. These new committees will be formally appointed scrutiny committees of the council.</p> <p>It is proposed that there are 4 scrutiny committee: Policy and Resources, Start Well, Live Well and Age Well. These new scrutiny committees will replace the existing scrutiny structure, and will conduct both "pre-decision" scrutiny in line with the current ESC model, but also more traditional policy review and development work.</p>
<p>Resources (see Appendices C&D for detail)</p>	<p>As the system would be, in law, a cabinet system, this system does introduce a degree of duplication in requiring officers to service both a partial committee and a cabinet decision making system. This is partially offset by the replacement of existing scrutiny committees with the new style scrutiny arrangements. However, experience with the existing ESC has highlighted some areas of duplicated work (for example in the production of almost identical agenda for ESC and Cabinet) which will requires resourcing and needs to be addressed.</p>
<p>Compatibility with organisational transformation</p>	<p>Cabinet is flexible (see cabinet section above). However, care will have to be taken when framing the specific remits of the new scrutiny committees. The proposal is currently to have committees themed on Start Well, Live Well, Age Well alongside a Policy and Resources scrutiny committee, but the detail of this will need further work. In general terms, committees are less flexible and slower to respond than individual decision makers.</p>
<p>Key advantages</p>	<p>Expands positive experiences of ESC felt by many members. Ensures that cross party engagement exists before decisions are taken. Gives scrutiny a formal, and perhaps stronger role.</p>
<p>Key disadvantages</p>	<p>May require additional resources. Some evidence that such committees (as with all committees) discourage consensus working and may impact on "non-political" nature of scrutiny. Possible confusion over influence and responsibility between cabinet members and committee chairs.</p>
<p>Main areas of further work required (see also Appendix B on general issues)</p>	<p>To agree precise remit of scrutiny committees. To agree protocols for role of call in where there is pre-decision scrutiny. To consider most appropriate arrangements for existing cabinet working groups and committees and existing O&S task groups to assess if current arrangements fit best with the intention of a hybrid system.</p>

Committee

<p>Summary</p>	<p>Decisions made by five politically balanced committees appointed by full council. There is no overview and scrutiny. The proposed committees are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and Resources • Children's Services • Adult Social Care and Health • Highways and Transport • Environment and Communities
<p>Resources (see Appendix C&D for detail)</p>	<p>Dependent on the frequency of meetings. The model proposed has fewer meetings than either the hybrid or cabinet models, reflecting a possibly reduction in resources (although see "disadvantages" below). However, whilst resources within democratic services and member allowances may be reduced, this would be offset with an increase in less formal resources, as the system is likely to see an increase in the number and complexity of briefings, both formal and informal, between officers and members.</p>
<p>Compatibility with organisational transformation</p>	<p>Aligning the committees and the new organisational structure is difficult. Coherent committee decision making depends on significant levels of service area knowledge by politicians, requiring committee to be largely service based. This does not reflect the new organisational structure, and there may be conflicts</p>
<p>Key advantages</p>	<p>All councillors directly involved in decision making. Knowledge and expertise of councillors (in their own service area) increases. System understood by many members of the public. May restore full council to a more important role.</p>
<p>Key disadvantages</p>	<p>Represents a formal change of decision making system, is therefore fixed for 5 years minimum. Decision making can be slow and unresponsive. This can be tackled by more meetings, but resources required increase quickly in that event. Possibly makes it more difficult for public and partners to identify responsibility for a function, decision or activity. Potential creation of "kitchen cabinet" and whipped voting. Likely increase in the use of urgency for decisions which can mean fewer councillors are involved in many important decisions.</p>
<p>Main areas of further work required (see also Appendix B on general issues)</p>	<p>Complete rewrite of constitution required. Precise remit of committees to be agreed.</p>

