

Governance Improvement Working Group – SWOT Analysis

1. Members' involvement in the policy-making / decision-making process (see also Scrutiny below)	
STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Known" system • People with sound grasp of issues • Understanding Herefordshire • Clearly defined chain of command • Speed of decision-making • Forward Plan now more interactive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't feel involved • Understanding roles • Too reactive • Resources: people (limited), and use of • Limited involvement • Appointment to roles (but legal requirement) • Perception of "back room" deals • Concern re. workloads / spread • Lack of clarity on how to feed into decision-making process • Balance between council and executive functions • Members' training not member-focused in design and delivery and timing
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand and build on members' skills and experience • Be more proactive and have closer relationship with scrutiny • Improve communication • Effective use of Groups • Understand and make better use of corporate plan • Use Understanding Herefordshire • Use of resources in different ways • Cross-party executive functions • Support members to make more use of council systems e.g. intranet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break in continuity • Poor communication • Resources • Public disengagement and perception / knowledge of issues • Call-in process - hard to track history • Officers' skills gaps re training delivery and design, presentations and report writing

2. How the public / stakeholders are involved	
STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public meetings and media /web etc. • Very few "exempt" reports • Open meetings • Questions from the public and propose items for future work plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier release of draft minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low response-rates • Over-dependence on on-line methods • Lack of public knowledge of politics / council business • Misunderstood open-ness • Limited focus of where questions are directed • Number of clicks to web-site topics
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use IT to increase accessibility (beyond Planning Cttee) – webcasting and use of social media and Modern.gov (for audio webcasting) • Transparency Code 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of level of members' knowledge about specific issues – engagement without undue influence • Ward members spend most of evenings

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Varied ways of involving public • Formats for presentation – creativity • Timing of meetings and locations – consider adjusting some meetings within the day (evening meetings not considered sustainable) at discretion of the chair (only council mtgs are set times) • Webcasting and social media • Transparency statement at start of website • Group leaders to ask members’ views on timing of meetings 	<p>tending to local matters with public, therefore conflict with meeting timings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport issues and people travelling to meetings in winter time • Members’ existing commitments (personal and professional)
---	--

3. Having a clear scheme of delegation at member, officer and partnership level

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely decisions • It works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misunderstood! • Misunderstanding of how partnerships work • How training is provided for Members eg ref constitution • Understanding of the Forward Plan • Fear of asking “silly” questions about how decisions are/were made
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve understanding of and clear escalation of processes / way of managing flow • Clarify officer decision call-in • Expand call-ins • Format / accessibility of constitution • To develop members’ knowledge of the SOD. • Have individual officer mentors for Members (or in groups)/ people who can be cross-referenced • Make more use of Members’ handbook • Group leaders to make more use of their meetings by involving officers or relevant cabinet member 	

4. How members are involved in performance management and improvement

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding Herefordshire and amount of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor understanding and use of data
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better use and understanding of data • Improve outcomes in relation to use of resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreasing resources • Overwhelming data

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding Herefordshire • Linking outcomes to data • Greater role for scrutiny 	
--	--

5. Scrutiny	
STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can guide, advise and forewarn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding Herefordshire - lots of data and presentational issues, overwhelming, lack of understanding of significance of data • not understanding what Members' roles are and lack of knowledge of what scrutiny does • isn't reactive to here and now but works to programme of work • has no executive power/ final say • lack of positive challenge • seen as oppositional rather than part of process
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to be more forward looking • to be more challenging • to engage Members in scrutiny process • to have a better balance in the process/membership • to focus on performance / outcomes and what is better for the community • to strengthen the role of scrutiny to resolve other weaknesses identified in the SWOTs (pose as question) • more efficient scrutiny to make services more efficient e.g. responding to peer reviews etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential disengagement of Members • fear of constructive criticism (officer and Members) • over emphasis on policy rather than performance