



<b>REPORT OF:</b>	APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES REVIEW PANEL
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	MARGARET QUINE
<b>TELEPHONE:</b>	01737 276023
<b>E-MAIL:</b>	margaret.quine@reigate-banstead.gov.uk
<b>TO:</b>	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
<b>DATE:</b>	1 JULY 2004

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO:</b>	11	<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	ALL
------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	APPPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES
<b>PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:</b>	TO REPORT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL ON APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend to the Executive that:

1. Outside bodies be categorised into the following groupings:
  - Charitable
  - Core Funding
  - Local Government Network
  - Strategic Planning/Consultative
  - Environmental /Leisure
  - Community focussed
  - School Governing bodies
  
2. Appointments be no longer made to the organisations set out in Annex 2 for the reasons stated with effect from the 2004/05 Municipal Year;
  
3. Details of the nominated Officer contact be provided to all representatives on appointment;
  
4. The following protocol in relation to appointments be endorsed:
 

‘Appointments to the following categories of appointment shall generally fall to be made from amongst Members of the majority group (the administration)

  - Local Government Network
  - Strategic Planning/Consultative

All other appointments, where there is more than one nomination to the vacancy, shall be made irrespective of political allegiance to ensure that the most suitable person is selected having regard to local knowledge, skills and the attributes of the nominees’.
  
5. Representatives on outside bodies be requested to submit an Annual report on the activities of the organisation to be provided to the nominated Officer and the relevant Executive Member for information/appropriate action;

6. **The Best Value Review Panel on Community Centres be requested to consider the appointment of a Council representative to the Management Committees of the Banstead Civic Centre and the Woodhatch Centre;**
7. **All new requests for the Council to make nominations to outside bodies be considered in the context of their relationship to the delivery of Community Plan and Corporate Plan priorities;**
8. **The role related appointments in Annex 3 together with other existing role related appointments be approved and in future appointments be made administratively on this basis.**

## **Introduction and Background**

1. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 18th December 2003 agreed to establish an Appointments to Outside Bodies Review Panel. The Committee appointed the following Members to serve on the Panel:

Councillors B.C. Cowle (Chairman); R.M. Bennett, Mrs M.P. Brewster, S.A. Kulka and B.A. Stead.

## **Aims and Objectives:**

2. The purpose of the review was to examine:
  - (1) the method by which the Council appoint representatives to serve on Outside Bodies;
  - (2) the level of support provided to the Council's representatives in relation to the Outside Bodies that they are appointed to serve on, including:
    - a. training and briefing arrangements; and
    - b. the 'ambassadorial' role of the Council's representative.
  - (3) the role and responsibilities that the Council's representatives undertake on Outside Bodies, including the method and frequency of reporting back to the Council;
  - (4) whether the Council needs to continue with membership of each Outside Body. This element of the review should take account of:
    - a. whether the appointments are statutory or made under terms of a Charitable Trust;
    - b. the views of the organisation to establish whether they wish the Council to continue to appoint representatives to serve on their body; and
    - c. the Council's wider community partnership work including the audit of bodies that support the aims and objectives of the Community Plan.

## **Current Appointments**

3. The Panel received a schedule of current appointments to outside bodies and from the outset considered that some categorisation of organisations would be helpful in considering the issues set out in paragraphs 1(1- 4) above. As a result the Panel used the following categorisation of appointments to outside bodies:

- Charitable
- Core Funding
- Local Government Network
- Strategic Planning/Consultative
- Environmental /Leisure
- Community focussed
- School Governing bodies (see paragraph 5 below)

4. A schedule was then prepared on this basis indicating:

- Current representative(s)
- Period of office
- Purpose of the organisation
- Officer contact

A copy of this schedule is attached as Annex 1.

## **School Governing Bodies**

5. In relation to governing bodies of schools, the Panel noted that new Regulations are being introduced under the Education Act 2002 that will amend the composition of school governing bodies. Schools will be required to determine their own constitutions, which will include a decision on whether or not to invite Borough/District Councils to nominate representatives to their governing bodies. These will no longer be known as minor authority representatives but instead there will be a new category known as Community Governors and, subject to the new constitution of each school, the Borough Council may be able to submit nominations to this category. The constitutional changes must take place before 31st August 2006 and consequently the term of office of any current governor will expire after 4 years or on 31st August 2006, whichever is the sooner. In the circumstances, the Panel did not review the appointments to this category of appointment.

## **Core Funding Bodies**

6. With regard to core funding bodies, the Panel considered that the appointment of a representative of the Council was important but were assured that support and feedback worked well through the ongoing dialogue via the Grants Core Funding Panel.

## **Local Government Network etc**

7. Local Government network and strategic planning/consultative organisations were considered to be closely aligned to executive functions and therefore the need for appointments from the Administration was accepted.

## **Consultation**

8. The Panel consulted organisations and representatives using a postal survey. Core Funding Organisations, strategic planning/consultative and local government network organisations were not surveyed on the basis that the purpose of the organisation was clear and/or the Council already had established mechanisms for ongoing liaison e.g. via the Grants Core Funding Panel or through formalised Officer support.
9. The survey sought to explore:
  - the purpose of the organisation and its relationship to Community and Corporate Plan priorities
  - awareness of Council priorities/ roles and responsibilities of appointees
  - necessity for Council representation
  - whether a longer period of appointment might be appropriate
  - level of commitment/time required
  - support requirements
  - mechanisms for feedback
  - the appointments procedure
10. A detailed analysis of the responses received is available as background paper A. The pie charts attached at Annex 4 illustrate a summary of the responses to the survey. However, in summary the major outcomes from the consultation and the views of the Panel are set out as follows:

### ***Purpose of organisations***

11. The Council appoints to a wide range of organisations however in some cases there is little relationship to the Community or Corporate Priorities. The Panel found an inconsistent approach to appointments where, for example, the Council was represented on bodies for apparently historic reasons and not on others in other parts of the Borough or performing the same functions.
12. The Panel acknowledged the responsibility of the Council to appoint representatives to certain charitable organisations and accepted that to amend the Trust document to make alternative arrangements for appointment was likely to create an administrative burden on the bodies concerned.

### ***Council priorities/ Roles and responsibilities***

13. The level of awareness of the Council's priorities was mixed among organisations but high amongst representatives. However it was indicated by some respondents that the Council gave no guidance or direction on its requirements or priorities and some initial guidance would be beneficial.

### ***Requirement for Council representation***

14. Almost without exception organisations valued Council representation contributing to effective liaison with the Council and contributing to local understanding of priorities and issues. It was also considered important for the Council to be represented when it was a landowner.
15. The Panel identified inconsistencies in the type of organisation to which the Council made formal appointments much of which appeared to be historically based. In reviewing the appointments the Panel had regard to the linkages to Corporate and Community Plan objectives and to the level of resource commitment of the Council to the organisation concerned. In suggesting the Council should no longer make a formal appointment the Panel stressed that it would still be open to individual Members to become involved either as the Ward Member or on the basis of personal interest.

### ***Period of appointment***

16. A majority of respondents indicated that a longer period of appointment e.g. of 2 years would be helpful. In the context of the reducing number of appointments the Panel felt that, on balance, it was better to retain the flexibility provided by annual appointments unless a longer period was required by the organisation concerned.

### ***Level of Commitment***

17. The level of commitment required for participation in outside bodies varies considerably with most time required for those related to local government network, planning and consultative bodies.

### ***Support Requirements***

18. Many representatives indicated they obtained help from Officers or Executive Members when required. The Panel considered that this needed to be formalised and that contact officers should be provided for all appointments to outside bodies.

### ***Feedback***

19. The majority of representatives did not consider a structured opportunity for feedback to the Council would be helpful. However there was some support for report on an annual basis. The Panel noted that Annual Reports had previously been placed in the Members Room and were of the view that the relevant contact officer and Executive Member should monitor reports.

## ***Appointments Procedure***

20. The majority of organisations were satisfied with the Council's administrative arrangements but comment was made about the time taken to fill a vacancy.

### **Issues**

21. The Panel therefore identified a number of issues arising from the review and consultation process:
- effective feedback from outside bodies is important.
  - representatives need to be appropriately supported by the Officer organisation.
  - there are concerns about the distribution of appointments across the various Groups represented on the Council, particularly in relation to community and amenity organisations.
  - Appointments to new Bodies should be considered in the light of the Community Plan and the Council's priorities.
  - inconsistencies exist in appointment arrangements to similar organisations
  - a number of appointments are role related and therefore the administrative process could be streamlined.
  - the rationale for appointments to certain outside bodies is unclear.

### **Partnership Audit/Strategy**

22. The Panel were aware of related work being undertaken on a Partnership Audit as a precursor to the development of a Partnership Strategy. The Panel was also aware that Town Centre Management Groups were to be the subject of a separate review.

### **Conclusions**

23. The Panel has made a number of recommendations based on the issues identified above. These are intended to provide a differential approach to appointments, to discontinue formal appointments to a number of bodies and to put in place a protocol to recognise the close alignment of some bodies to Executive responsibilities. The Panel proposes that in future appointments to new outside bodies should be accepted only where there is a clear link to community plan or corporate priorities. The Panel is also seeking to provide improved communication between representatives and the Council.

Background Papers: Survey responses

**SCHEDULE OF ORGANISATIONS- APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED TO BE DISCONTINUED**

<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>REASON</b>
BOROUGH DETACHED YOUTH PROJECT COMMITTEE	No longer in existence
REDHILL CENTRE FOR LOCAL AND FAMILY HISTORY – MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	Consistency – Council not represented on other similar bodies.
REDHILL AND SURREY BEAGLES CLUB	Consistency – Council not represented on other similar bodies
REIGATE AND BANSTEAD TOWN TWINNING ASSOCIATION	No financial contribution to the activities
REIGATE PRIORY MUSEUM SOCIETY-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	No financial contribution to the activities
SCRAPP	Should be considered as part of wider partnership in relation to this project
PROSPECT HOUSING ASSOCIATION BOARD	Consistency – Council not represented on other similar bodies. Council no right to nominations
REIGATE AND BANSTEAD CONSULTATION GROUP FOR COMMUNITY CARE	
REIGATE QUAKER HOUSING ASSOCIATION	Consistency – Council not represented on other similar bodies. Council no right to nominations.

**LIST OF APPOINTMENTS PROPOSED FOR ROLE RELATED APPOINTMENTS**

<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE MEMBER OR NOMINEE</b>
SURREY ACCESS FORUM	Partnership
SURREY COUNTY PLAYING FIELDS ASSOCIATION	Leisure and Community Development
SURREY COUNTY SPORTS FORUM	Leisure and Community Development
BANSTEAD ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT	Partnership
EAST SURREY COMMUNITY MEDIATION	Community Safety and Transport