

Scrutiny Feasibility Criteria

1. CBC's current criteria

SCRUTINY REVIEW SELECTION / PRIORITISATION

Business Item / Issue :	Suggested by:
	Date:

STEP 1: Selection Criteria:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improvements / benefits likely for Community / customer groups <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/> ▪ Corporate/Community priority area <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/> ▪ Key issue for public <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/> ▪ Poor performing service <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/> ▪ High level of dissatisfaction with service <input style="float: right;" type="checkbox"/> 	
Any reason(s) for rejection:	

STEP 2: Reason(s) for Selection

Reason(s) for Selection	Evidence	Desired Outcome/Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the issue link to Council's and Community's Key Aims and Priorities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What evidence is there to support the need for scrutiny inquiry / review? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What would we wish to achieve, is it likely and why?

STEP 3: Prioritise - Score for **IMPORTANCE** and **IMPACT** against Corporate Plan and Community priorities.

Scoring Guide					
'IMPORTANCE' Score Indicator		✓	'IMPACT' Score Indicator		✓
Score 0	NO evidence that topic is related to the Council or Community priorities. Reject		Score 0	NO potential benefits likely to result. Reject.	
1	SOME evidence that topic is linked to Council OR Community priorities.		1	MINOR potential benefits affecting only one ward OR stakeholder group	
2	GOOD evidence linking topic to Council OR Community priorities.		2	MINOR potential benefits affecting two or more wards/stakeholder groups; OR MODERATE potential benefits affecting only one ward/stakeholder group.	
3	GOOD evidence linking topic to both the Council AND Community priorities.		3	MODERATE potential benefits affecting more than one ward/stakeholder group; OR SUBSTANTIAL potential benefits affecting one ward/stakeholder group.	
4	STRONG evidence linking topic to both the Council AND Community priorities.		4	SUBSTANTIAL potential benefits community wide OR for a significant proportion or section of the community.	

Scoring Key			
Total Score	Priority Level		✓
0	N/A	REJECT topic for scrutiny	
1	LOW	REJECT or RESERVE topic for scrutiny	
2	LOW	REJECT or RESERVE topic for scrutiny	
3	MEDIUM	SELECT or RESERVE topic for scrutiny	
4	MEDIUM	SELECT or RESERVE topic for scrutiny	
5	MEDIUM	SELECT or RESERVE topic for scrutiny	
6	HIGH	PRIORITY topic for scrutiny	
7	HIGH	PRIORITY topic for scrutiny	
8	HIGH	PRIORITY topic for scrutiny	

OUTCOME:	<input type="checkbox"/> Select	<input type="checkbox"/> Reserve List	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject
Date:		

2. Nottingham City Council

Nottingham City Council uses the following feasibility criteria to add items to the work programme and establish Scrutiny review panels:

Aim	Criteria
Decision making and being a critical friend	Is it a topic/key decision which requires consultation with Overview and Scrutiny prior to the decision being taken?
Public Interest and relevance	Is the topic still relevant in terms of it still being an issue for citizens, partners or the council in terms of performance, delivery or cancellation of services?
Ability to change or influence	Can the Committee actively influence the council or its partners to accept recommendations and ensure positive outcomes for citizens and therefore be able to demonstrate the value and impact that scrutiny can have?
Range and scope of impact	Is this a large topic area impacting on significant areas of the population and the council's partners or significant impact on minority groups. Is there interest from partners and colleagues to undertake and support this review and will it be beneficial?
Avoidance of duplication of effort	Is this topic area very similar to one already being scrutinised in another arena or has it already been investigated in the recent past?

3. South Cambridgeshire District Council

South Cambridgeshire use the PAPER system of criteria:

- **Public Interest:** the concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny
- **Ability to change:** priority should be given to issues that the Committee can realistically influence
- **Performance:** priority should be given to the areas in which the Council, and other agencies, are not performing well
- **Extent:** priority should be given to issues that are relevant to all or large parts of the district
- **Replication:** work programmes must take account of what else is happening in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort

4. Adur District Council and Worthing District Council

A number of councils including Adur and Worthing use the PICKET system of criteria:

- Public interest
- Impact
- Council performance
- Keep it in context
- Executive request
- Timescale

5. South Somerset District Council

Some authorities like South Somerset use a criteria and scoring mechanism during the short-listing stage for work programming:

Subject / Issue	Score out of 10 (Where 10 indicates strong agreement)	Comments
1.This topic has not recently been or is due to be reviewed or by another group of members and/or officers		
2. The Scrutiny work can be delivered within existing resources.		
3. This is an issue of local concern that has been identified through or has been discussed at the Area Committees.		
4.This issue supports the delivery of the Corporate Plan (Local Strategic Partnership)		
5. The involvement of Scrutiny will lead to improved value for money.		
6. New Government guidance or legislation means a major change to service delivery. Scrutiny involvement will aid this process.		
7. This issue has been raised by External Auditors and will now be included in the Corporate Improvement Plan.		

8. Scrutiny Involvement in this subject will improve member understanding of a complex but important issue and will consequently lead to improved decision making.		