

## **Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

---

**Date of Meeting:** 26 November 2020

**Report Title:** Work Programme

**Senior Officer:** Jane Burns, Executive Director of Corporate Services

---

### **1. Report Summary**

- 1.1. To review items in the work programme listed in the schedule attached, together with any other items suggested by committee members.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1. That the work programme be reviewed and amended as required.

### **3. Reason for Recommendation**

- 3.1. It is good practice to regularly review the work programme and update it as required.

### **4. Background**

- 4.1. The committee has responsibility for updating and approving its own work programme. Scrutiny liaison meetings – held between the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the committee, alongside the portfolio holders and key senior officers – ensure that there is continued awareness and discussion of upcoming policies, strategies and decisions within the committee's remit area.

### **5. Determining Which Items Should be Added to the Work Programme**

- 5.1. When selecting potential topics, members should have regard to the Council's three year plan and to the criteria listed below, which should be considered to determine whether scrutiny activity is appropriate.
- 5.2. The following questions should be considered by the committee when determining whether to add new work programme items, or delete existing items:

- Does the issue fall within a corporate priority?
- Is the issue of key interest to the public?
- Does the matter relate to a poor or declining performing service for which there is no obvious explanation?
- Is there a pattern of budgetary overspends or underspends?
- Is it a matter raised by external audit management letters and or audit reports?
- Is there a high level of dissatisfaction with the service?

5.3. The committee should not add any items to its work programme (and should delete any existing items) that fall under any one of the following:

- The topic is already being addressed elsewhere by another body (i.e. this committee would be duplicating work)
- The matter is sub-judice
- Scrutiny would not add value to the matter
- The committee is unlikely to be able to conclude an investigation within a specified or required timescale

## **6. Implications of the Recommendations**

### **6.1. Legal Implications**

6.1.1. There are no direct legal implications.

### **6.2. Finance Implications**

6.2.1. There are no direct financial implications.

### **6.3. Policy Implications**

6.3.1. There are no direct policy implications.

### **6.4. Equality Implications**

6.4.1. There are no direct equalities implications.

### **6.5. Human Resources Implications**

6.5.1. There are no direct human resources implications.

### **6.6. Risk Management Implications**

6.6.1. There are no direct risk management implications..

**6.7. Rural Communities Implications**

6.7.1. There are no direct implications for rural communities.

**6.8. Implications for Children & Young People/Cared for Children**

6.8.1. There are no direct implications for children and young people.

**6.9. Public Health Implications**

6.9.1. There are no direct implications for public health.

**6.10. Climate Change Implications**

6.10.1. There are no direct implications for the environment and climate change.

**7. Ward Members Affected**

7.1. All members are potentially affected.

**8. Access to Information**

8.1. The background papers can be inspected by contacting the report author.

**9. Contact Information**

9.1. Any questions relating to this report should be directed to the following officer:

Name: Joel Hammond-Gant

Job Title: Scrutiny Officer

Email: [joel.hammond-gant@cheshireeast.go.uk](mailto:joel.hammond-gant@cheshireeast.go.uk)