SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Governance Committee

Meeting held 22 February 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Grocutt (Chair), Penny Baker (Deputy Chair), Sue Alston, Dawn Dale, Peter Garbutt, Christine Gilligan, Mark Jones, Mary Lea, Mike Levery, Mohammed Mahroof and Sioned-Mair Richards

....

1.   APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1   There were no apologies for absence received.

2.   EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1   No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public.

3.   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1   There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

4.   MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1   The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

5.   PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1   The Committee received questions from 3 members of the public, prior to the meeting.

5.2   **Nigel Slack**

Question 1
Page 8 Para 5.3

> This wording allowed for the Policy Committees to choose not to utilise the local experience and expertise of residents and community groups by making this a matter of flexibility. It would, in my opinion, be better to encourage the use of these resident skills (as well as experts from beyond the city) rather than providing get out clauses. Could 5.3 be rewritten along the following lines?
> *5.3 The Policy Committees will be expected to involve citizens in their decision making in ways that best suit the circumstances and the issue under consideration... etc.*
> The details of the resident involvement to be specified as early as possible in the process.

In response to question 1, the Chair (Councillor Julie Grocutt) commended this suggestion to the committee for their consideration as it was within its power to make amendments to recommendations. She said that it seemed that such an 'expectation' would be entirely within the spirit of the report, as long as the Council aren't losing sight of the idea that such engagement should be proportionate and tailored to the issue at hand.

Question 2
Page 9 Para 6.2.6 Recommendations
Recommendation 4

> I am concerned that not all questions to be raised at a Policy Committee Meeting will connect to the agenda but will still be integral to that committee's role. I have been known to bring issues to Cabinet that are emerging issues and therefore not yet on their radar. The limit expressed in recommendation 4 would prohibit this and raise obstacles to residents raising new issues with a Policy Committee.
> How can this omission be addressed without involving a further step in the question process?

In response to question 2, The Chair explained the processes outlined in this report added up to a system which would route people to Full Council if they wanted to submit a petition or question about an issue which is not already on a committee agenda. The Chair had raised a query about this and, without pre-empting the committee's discussion, the Chair thought the Committee should ask officers to look at how we allow these issues to go directly to whichever committee would be decision-maker on the matter at hand. However, the measures which are designed to keep public questions and petitions focused and efficient were also welcome. It was a balancing act and the committee may want to explore this, and perhaps ask officers to do a bit more work on it.

Question 3
Page 10 Para 6.2.6 Recommendations
Recommendation 11

> The inclusion of the expectation of electronic recording of Councillor votes is welcome, something I have been pushing for since the introduction of the new audio-visual system, and a vital component in the transparency and accountability of the Modern Committee Structure. Will Council undertake to progress this to, at least, the point where all the Policy Committees as well as Full Council use this facility?

In response to question 3, the Chair explained that all Policy Committees and Full Council, as well as every other formal committee

of the Council, are covered by the recommendation. The Chair expected that the clause about the 'availability of facilities' may mean that coverage may not be complete at first, and may remain limited for some meetings which, for example, won't take place in the Council Chamber. The Chair said that she expected officers to prioritise these key meetings as the Council brought the system online.

Question 4
Page 10 Para 6.2.6 Recommendations
Recommendations 12 j & k

> I welcome these recommendations but would ask, who will choose and monitor the participants in this initiative to ensure inclusiveness and avoid Party Political bias?

In response to question 4, The Chair stated the Committee haven't designed this much detail for any of the individual elements of the 'toolkit' at this point, partly because they were conscious of pre-empting Involve's work. Nevertheless, the committee will note these concerns.

Question 5
Page12 Para 6.4 Leadership
Para 6.4.2 The Lord Mayor's Role

> How will the issue of the Lord Mayor's casting vote be addressed in terms of proportionality?
> Perhaps exclude the Lord Mayor from ordinary votes at Council (changing the maximum number of votes available to 83 instead of 84) and only to be exercised at the point of a tied vote resulting from abstentions or absences?

In response to question 5, The Chair explained the Chair of every local authority meeting has a normal vote as a councillor, and a second or casting vote that may be exercised where there is an equality of votes under the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 2, Section 39 (2). When the Lord Mayor chairs full council, they are entitled to this second or casting vote in that limited and specific circumstance.

The Chair stated that in the late 1980s, the Mayor of Bradford's use of his second or casting vote in a hung council in favour of his own party's policies was challenged before the courts. The Court said that it did not think that the power to give a second or casting vote was fettered by any implied restriction that it should be exercised without regard to any party-political considerations, nor by any inter-party agreement on the rotation of the lord mayoralty that it would not be used politically.

Question 6
Page 13 Para 6.4.4 Recommendations
Recommendation 27 j

How will the pre-meetings in this recommendation be prevented from becoming de Facto decision-making meetings, in private?

In response to question 6, The Chair confirmed that in the new system, no formal decisions can be made by councillors unless they are meeting as part of a formally constituted committee, subject to both proportionality rules and the access to information procedure rules (which ensure that the meetings will be announced, conducted in public, and materials published). Informal meetings behind closed doors cannot take decisions. It was explained that it was going to be a critical part of the new environment that councillors and officers involved in every committee spend far more time doing their jobs in private in the run up to each committee meeting than they could ever spend in a committee meeting. It was important that the Council don't allow a kind of blanket suspicion to settle over this important machinery of government. It is a significant change for the Council that the recommendations referred to mean that members from all political Groups will now be in the room when these pre-meetings take place.

Question 7
Page 19 Para 6.10 Scrutiny

Currently SCC has a Councillor that is the city's 'Heritage Champion' in the form of Cllr Mike Drabble. Will such roles be carried over into the Committee System and what expectation of consultation or exercise of soft power & influence will be available to such champions?

In response to question 7, The Chair mentioned this was something the committee had not yet given their attention to. The Chair thanked Mr Slack for raising it, and asked officers to cover it in their next report.

Question 8
Page 19 Para 6.10.3 & 4 Scrutiny 'Call Ins'

The committee's inability to make a decision on this matter at the January 25th Meeting baffles me. It suggests to me and many others in the community that either, Councillors do not trust their own party members to represent the party's views within committees at development and pre-scrutiny stages, or they are looking for some means of creating mischief within the decision making of committees on which they do not serve.
I would be happy with an option to create a 'minority report' expressing dissent publicly within the committee and offering the opportunity for such a report to be used as the basis for a consideration for review by S&R or full Council.
I would be even more impressed to see a 'public call-in' facility, provided this is bounded by appropriate frameworks to prevent repetitious or vexatious actions.

In response to question 8, The Chair thanked Mr Slack for these comments, and overall, for his detailed consideration of the work it was doing today.

5.3   **Woll Newall**

Question 1

> The current proposed design for the new committee system fails to follow a number of the design principles agreed to by this committee, and even some of the Principles that you highlighted as the 5 most important Strategic Aims.
> As one example: Strategic Aim D: "Listen to everyone. Have the voice of residents at the heart of our decisions."
>
> You agreed that this should one of the 5 most important Principles to influence your design of the new system, but in the proposed new system design, the voice of citizens can in no way be said to be at the heart of decision-making, as it has been largely ignored or put to one side as an afterthought.
>
> Indeed, throughout the design process, this committee appears to have had difficulty listening to those very voices.
>
> Only, finally, in the latest report published for today's meeting is there mention of an as-yet undefined idea that stakeholders and citizens may be invited occasionally to give their input from the outside, not 'the heart'.
>
> Some of the other design principles have also not been followed, or even explicitly broken against the advice you received from national experts.
>
> How and when will this committee check its proposed design for the new system against the Design Principles it created, and publicly review why it failed to follow some of them?

In response to Mr Newall's question, the Chair recognised the Council was asking for trust and patience from Mr Newall in the way these recommendations are being worked up, with the technical detail of processes and structures coming first and the 'ways of working' - including public participation and engagement aspects – emerging later.

It was mentioned that the Committee saw that it would need to work this way well in advance, so since the Autumn its public reports have been consistent in describing how this would play out.

While the Committee was able to get on with designing the 'what'

straight away through the Inquiry process last year, the Committee needed to allow time for both their own listening exercise and then, after Christmas, more detailed work with the help of the Council's partner Involve, to properly design plans for how we build the voice of residents into this system.

The Chair mentioned that these questions contained many statements as well as questions, so she would permit herself one longer answer, as follows:

As the Chair understood, any system which only considers citizens' voices at committee meetings when decisions are due to be made – and not at any previous point – would indeed be a bit of a bolt-on. That is why the Council will continue with the plan as it has emerged over recent months, for Involve to help the Council to improve the way it involves people not just at the end-point when councillors are making decisions, but all the way along the journey from the germination of an idea through testing, refinement and development into final recommendations. The Council needed to get the committee-system part right, but the full answer to the call from residents to put their voices at the heart of the Councils' decisions means we must also foster a much greater and wider cultural change here at the Council, amongst all officers and councillors, which may take some years to realise. Recommendations 2 and 8 committed the Council to this long-term work.

The Chair added that a review against the principles which the Committee have been using to guide its decisions so far will be fundamental to the six-month review which this report discusses at section 6.14, starting in November 2022. Members have been committed to this since they agreed this publicly at their meeting on 30 November 2021.

5.4 **Ruth Hubbard**

Question 1
The main report on the agenda didn't appear until sometime on Friday and does not meet the "five clear working days" constitutional requirement for consideration at this meeting. According to the constitution the chair therefore needs to make the case for special circumstances if the report is to be taken and this needs to be minuted. I raise this as the same thing also happened at last Governance Committee and was not addressed. Obviously the late appearance of reports prevents proper examination and absorbing of reports by members of the public - where there is a clear public interest - and for public questions. I have had insufficient time to absorb, think about and properly prepare my public questions for today.

In response to question 1, The Chair stated that it was regrettable that

the papers were issued 'to follow' and this is not how the Council liked to do business. The Chair had accepted officers' apologies, and understood they took time out over the weekend to meet with Ms Hubbard, in an attempt to help. The Chair said she was moderately sympathetic to officers in this, and it may happen again, the scale of the task the Committee was attempting to complete was very challenging in the timescales available.

The Chair added her thanks to officers for their hard work when supporting the Committee to date.

The Chair explained the requirement for five clear working days' notice, was for an item to appear on a published agenda. A report was to be made available for public inspection at the same time it was made available for members of the committee, and this report was. However, the Chair was happy to minute explicitly her judgement to proceed given the enormous urgency and degree of public interest in the issue, to say nothing of the legal deadline at the May 2022 AGM by which the constitutional detail must be agreed.

Question 2

> Last Governance committee I reported a clear factual inaccuracy in the main report presented. This was not addressed in the answer by the chair nor was the factual inaccuracy corrected. This is misleading, please can the factual inaccuracy be corrected?

In response to question 2, The Chair stated she was keen for the committee to focus on decisions about the future of governance arrangements, but would concede that this was arguably one of *several* reasons for the creation of Overview and Scrutiny. But it is not misleading to say that this was the crux of the matter. The report was also right to say that the legal requirement for the new Policy Committees to have seats on them from every Group on the Council including, the opposition is very new and important.

The Chair mentioned that Ms Hubbard stated in a previous question, that it was always possible to have different parties in the cabinet, but that there had been a choice locally not to do this. It was added that Ms Hubbard viewed this had contributed to a democratic deficit in Sheffield.

The Chair stood by the original report on this matter. If Ms Hubbard was saying there should have been opposition seats on the Cabinet in Sheffield, this was simply not realistic. There is a difference between something being legally possible and something being a practical possibility. Even coalitions and co-operatives do not give cabinet seats to opposition party members except in the most vanishingly rare of circumstances. This is true nationwide. In the Chair's view it would be

misleading to suggest that any council, including Sheffield City Council, would realistically have done otherwise.

Question 3

> The main report on today's agenda appears to have been 'signed off' as having no equality implications. Yet the recognition of city inequalities and the need to take account of these and embed them in new governance arrangements is one of the central governance issues articulated strongly - and consistently reported on - from the conversations with 20k citizens across Sheffield. This issue was also echoed in the (comparatively minuscule) consultation undertaken by officers with members of the public and stakeholders. These issues are not a narrow concern and are evident elsewhere e.g. governance considerations are arguably central to the Race Equality Commission interim findings. Yet the proposals to date have pretty much nothing to say or propose on these and for operationalising in a new constitution. Does the committee agree that there are a whole range of equality considerations and implications for its new governance arrangements that are not identified and remain unaddressed, that this is a key weakness in work to date, and that it is necessary to address these?

In response to question 3, The Chair welcomed this question and commented as the transition to a committee system represented a significant opportunity to ensure that equality, diversity and inclusion were solidly embedded in its decision making and that we challenge ourselves and officers to tackle inequalities and consider the implications for all protected characteristics in the decisions made.

There will be a full Equality Impact Assessment presented at the Committee's next meeting, highlighting the implications of the proposed new system and this will form part of the advice to Full Council on the final proposals.

Further, there was an opportunity to ensure that all the proposed Committees in the new governance system show real leadership on EDI in their ways of working – including championing the city's Equality Objectives, ensuring that any implications and proposed mitigations for communities are fully considered and published in all decisions.

Question 4

> One example - that also includes considerable equality considerations - is in arrangements for public questions. Proposals on a citizen right to participate in this very basic way, common to almost all councils, appear to be introducing more conditionality and hoops to jump rather than making PQs more accessible. The idea of having, say, three

questions and being required to attend in person at maybe three different committees (or at full council) is profoundly discriminatory as well as impractical, An in-person requirement to attend is, alone, discriminatory - with travel costs, disability, employment, caring responsibilities, likely ongoing shielding for the most vulnerable, the nature of public speaking and much more all working against a stated commitment to participation, the exercise of citizen rights and for accountability. And any new stipulation that questions are submitted in advance in writing should at least bring a greater requirement for actual and better answers too - and this has not been particularly evident during the covid period of questions required in advance. Will the Governance Committee rethink public question proposals in line with its stated principles? (I make the usual offer of help with this as others would too, I am sure.)

In response to question 4, The Chair agreed the Committee needed to continue to consider the appropriate mechanisms for public questions at Council and Committee meetings, both in today's paper and probably at future meetings of this committee. As the Chair had already mentioned, she thought there was more work to do on this matter.

The Chair stated it did seem important that questions are heard at whichever committee has the authority to make decisions on the matter, but the proposal in the report allows questioners to opt to go to Full Council if they prefer not to go to a committee. There was currently a facility for officers to read out questions if people are not able to attend, and Officers had just finished installing equipment which it was hoped was going to allow for remote attendance of the public for questions.

Question 5

In the work on design principles the Committee appeared to fail to recognise and understand that just about all the input by stakeholders and members of the public in its consultation was an attempt to enable (and require) the Committee to be clear so that clear and specific outcomes - no more and no less - would be identified, articulated, measurable, realistic, practical and so on. But this committee decided to reduce and remove all this work and, once again, we are left with a set of principles that are bland and vague and linked to no clear, measurable and so on, outcomes by which it will call itself to account and that citizens can also be clear about. For work going forward, and for continuous improvement, this is a problem. Not setting clear outcomes leaves the council open and weak. It leaves great gaps and contradictions between vague and contestable principles and their operationalisation in governance arrangements and practices. It gives the impression of more of

the same, a commitment to actual change questionable, and does not serve to build confidence or trust. At no point has the committee - unlike in almost all other council projects - established any clear targets, outcomes framework, performance indicators or similar, against which to measure its progress, and change.

Will the committee ensure that a clear outcomes framework with real and measurable targets and indicators is at least provisionally outlined to take to full council and for its ongoing work monitoring and reviewing change? (There is much from the earlier small consultation work that can be used to assist this and again, as usual, we offer help.).

Can this include a clear articulation of areas where this committee might feel it has not yet begun or only just begun to scratch the surface, and that will need further attention?

In response to question 5, The Chair explained the final set of principles agreed by the Council in November 2021 were refined through engagement with stakeholders and the public. The final redraft addressed concerns from Councillors – which were absolutely echoed at the public, virtual event at which this was discussed – that the language was becoming too technical and jargony to remain meaningful for most people to make sense of, or indeed to respect.

The version which had been developed up to that point remains a matter of public record as it was in the papers on 30 November 2021, and as she said at the time the Committee will be able to refer back to that when undertaking its review later this year, but the version in appendix 2 of today's report remains the final, agreed version.

The Chair agreed that, when the review is carried out later this year, the Council should be clear about what qualitative and quantitative evidence it was able to present against each design principle. The Chair also thought it was not a bad idea to put in the committee's next report, a section about the next steps for continued development after May 2022.

Question 6

One of the areas of inconsistency and contradiction is in stated commitments to meaningful collaboration, participation and influence - even a mention of co-design - and the work of this committee, where the processes followed and the tangible proposals have not reflected that stated commitment. As yet I see no key changes that have actually operationalised any of the key items that citizens and communities have presented consistently over the last two years in respect of core governance system change. Will the governance committee, in working forward, at least now model some of its stated

aspirations and see the job of monitoring governance change as a joint venture? I do not mean more of the same with heavily managed, extractive, pretty standard 'consultations' that are not trusted by participants nor seen to be taken on board by the council. I am proposing, once again, proper arrangements for a genuine joint venture in monitoring and reviewing ongoing governance change and that can actually demonstrate the council's stated commitment in its actual practice.

In response to question 6, The Chair did not agree with Ms Hubbard's main point – instead saying it had been evident to her that the listening the Committee had been doing had influenced its decisions throughout. The Chair referred back to an earlier question discussing how the design principles which will be key in a concrete way to the review process, were heavily shaped by the public and stakeholders, and gave as another example the list of ideas in the 'toolkit' which had come directly from discussions with real people over the past months and years.

The report explicitly states that the Council will "actively seek and use feedback from residents, stakeholders, councillors and officers". This is not buried in the detail of the report, it is in one of the two main recommendations at the top of this report.

The Chair repeated that the Committee was not yet finished designing this system – Involve was yet to report back next month and the Council plan to work with them well beyond that initial report too.

The Chair thanked Ms Hubbard for her careful consideration of these reports and her detailed questions. The Chair added the Committee will continue to listen to It's Our City and to work with Ms Hubbard and Mr Newall over the coming months and years, and that her continued challenge to the Council is always welcome in Sheffield's vibrant democratic environment. The Chair was confident that the committee system which the Council was working their way towards designing, was informed directly by the public and stakeholders, and this report sets out, in good faith, the Council's intention to keep continuously improving by doing so over the coming months and years.

6.   COMMITTEE SYSTEM STRUCTURE

6.1.1   The Committee received a report of the Director of Legal and Governance concerning the committee system structure.

6.1.2   The Assistant Director (Governance), Alexander Polak referred to the report. It was mentioned there was 86 recommendations for the Committee to consider and these were split into 13 sections.

6.1.3   The Assistant Director (Governance) would aim to summarise each

section, if necessary, before Members of the Committee discussed any recommendations they wished to have a debate on. Members could then propose amendments to the recommendations, where necessary, then vote on that amendment and recommendation.

6.1.4   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained there were recommendations in italics within the report. These were recommendations that had previously been agreed in Committee.

6.1.5   The Committee were informed that the report had been produced in alignment with the framework and design principles, and that these should continuously be kept in mind when amending the recommendations.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT, PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

6.2.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the recommendations in this section outlined how the Council intended to engage with citizens, communities and partners immediately, and how the Council also planned to continuously engage in the future.

6.2.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 1-13 and the key points to note were: -

6.2.3   A Member of the Committee did not believe it was appropriate to only allow public questions / petitions that related to topics on a policy committee agenda. It was stated that questions / petitions on other issues needed to be brought to committees. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the reason for recommendation 4 was to reduce the amount of volume and time spent in committees.

6.2.4   In relation to recommendation 4, a Member of the Committee agreed that public should be allowed to present questions / petitions at policy committees that referred to issues separate to the items on the agenda, as that was their opportunity to input on policy.

6.2.5   In relation to recommendation 4, it was stated that questions / petitions that related to other topics should be allowed. This could lead to a particular committee wanting to investigate different issues, not currently on their work programme.

6.2.6   It was suggested that the total number of signatures required to trigger a petition debate should be included in recommendation 5, as it is not clear whether that detail had been rescinded. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that if details like this one had not been specified in the report, then it meant that the detail was to remain the same in the new system. Therefore, the threshold still required 5000 signatures to trigger a debate at Council.

6.2.7   It was suggested that recommendation 9 be amended, to make it more clear for the public, on how they contact their Councillor through the Council's webpage. The Assistant Director (Governance) agreed it needed to be clear, although stated there needed to be balance on how many enquires councillors received direct and what issues could be resolved through other services within the Council. Therefore, Councillors would not be overloaded.

6.2.8   It was stated that the use of electronic voting and the recording of those votes should be either used in every Policy Committee or none, to keep consistency within meetings. It was added that it needed to be clear whether other committees required recorded votes as well as policy committees.

6.2.9   It was mentioned that recording votes by show of hands or verbal agreement, was a quicker way to deal with votes, rather than carrying out a recorded vote each time. It was agreed that further consideration be given to this as part of recommendation 11.

6.2.10   A Member of the Committee advised that any future Council policy should embed how it intended to engage with public.

6.2.11   It was suggested that each Policy Committee could have an individual tasked with making sure the Committee reached out and engaged with as many citizens and communities as possible. However, an opposing view, that this ought to be all councillors' responsibility, was also expressed.

6.2.12   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards.

6.2.13   Removal of *'(limited to substantive topics on that day's meeting agenda,)'* from recommendation 4.

6.2.14   To add 'advise petitioners' in replace of *'route petitions'* at recommendation 5.

6.2.15   To add 'the decision remains with the petitioner' to recommendation 5.

6.2.16   To add 'or if not the option to attend another policy committee or full council' to recommendation 6.

6.2.17   To add 'and to make it easier to access to information on councillors both online and in other such places' to recommendation 9.

6.2.18   To amend recommendation 11 to read 'Further consideration be given to options relating to electronic voting and an online record of councillor's votes'

6.2.19   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.2.13 to 6.2.18 above were carried.

FULL COUNCIL

6.3.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the recommendations in this section were in place so that the function of Full Council will work effectively. Some recommendations had already been discussed and agreed at previous Committees. It was added that Full Council should not cut across any decision about to be made by a Policy Committee without following an appropriate path.

6.3.2   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained there were amendments to recommendations 22, 23 and 24, which had been suggested by officers, for the Committee to consider.

6.3.3   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 14-25 and the key points to note were: -

6.3.4   A Member of the Committee asked for clarification on recommendation 15. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that Council agreed a budget and corporate plan on an annual basis, to set out the division of resources and where those resources were intended to go. That constituted the proportion of the budget policy framework, which the policy committees will sit within. Therefore, the purpose of recommendation 15 was to agree for Full Council, to be the place where the policy committee remit is agreed each year.

6.3.5   A Member of the Committee asked for clarification on recommendation 18 b. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the intention was to ensure better use of Members' time in committees.

6.3.6   In relation to recommendation 24, it was mentioned that it needed to be clear that Council had the power to rescind a committee's authority, to investigate specific issues, if an outcome of a notice of motion meant that it would contradict that committees workstreams. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that he had looked to amend the Council's constitution, which would limit Full Council's ability to crosscut with Policy Committees, therefore making it more organised and aligned. The Director of Legal and Governance added that if Full Council needed to make a decision that affected a policy committee's ability to make a decision, then Full Council would have to agree to rescind delegated authority for the particular committee within that meeting. At the following Full Council meeting, there would be a report that outlined the legal, financial and equalities implications so that Full Council could then make an informed decision on that matter.

6.3.7   Concerns were raised around the time it could take for reports to

return to Full Council, if the decision was to rescind authority from a policy committee. It was mentioned that this could take up to 2 months, as the new system states that Full Council would meet on alternate months. The Director of Legal and Governance explained if there was an urgent decision needed to be made by a policy committee, that committee could call for an additional meeting. Also, Full Council could be called take an urgent decision if necessary.

6.3.8   The Director of Legal of Governance mentioned that Members could turn to officers for advice on notices of motion, prior to the submission date, and that this would be useful if Members knew a decision of a motion could cause significant impact.

6.3.9   A Member of the Committee advised that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee should have the ability to change a policy committees work programme.

6.3.10   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Peter Garbutt.

6.3.11   That further consideration be given to recommendation 18c and 18d.

6.3.12   To add 'advise petitioners' in replace of *'route petitions'* at recommendation 19.

6.3.13   To add 'but the decision remains with the petitioner' to recommendation 19.

6.3.14   To add 'advise questioners' in replace of *'route questions''* at recommendation 20.

6.3.15   To add 'but the decision remains with the questioner' to recommendation 20.

6.3.16   That recommendation 22, 23 and 24 be amended to read 'Further consideration be given to a system whereby full council can rescind authority from committees, in order to take decisions at full council'

6.3.17   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.3.11 to 6.3.16 above were carried.

LEADERSHIP – KEY COUNCILLORS' ROLES

6.4.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that this section of recommendations was to set out key roles for Councillors with Leadership responsibilities. These included the Leader of the Council, the Lord Mayor and Chairs of Policy Committees.

6.4.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 26-29 and

the key points to note were: -

6.4.3   A Member of the Committee raised concerns around the practicality of co-chairing and job sharing the Chair role of policy committees. It was suggested that a review should take place if councillors were to co-chair or job share that role. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained there was already co-chairs and job shares operating within the Council.

6.4.4   It was suggested that recommendation 29 defined whether there would be either a job share or co-chairs. Additionally, a maximum of 2 co-chairs.

6.4.5   A Member of the Committee believed evidence from the inquiry process gave the Committee knowledge that co-chairs were effective when aligned with cross-directorships. Sheffield City Council was to align the policy committees with a single directorship, therefore asked whether co-chairs would be necessary, or the current chair/vice chair model would be as equally effective. Another Member of the Committee mentioned that Brighton & Hove Council operated with co-chairs, and they had single directorships. That Council believed it was effective having co-chairs for large directorships, so that each chair could pick cover different areas, with it not being overbearing. It was added that Brighton & Hove Council did have Vice-Chairs although their role was not necessarily needed, as the work was divided across the co-chairs.

6.4.6   It was suggested that the Lord Mayor should be able to vote on decisions at Full Council. Rather than just having the casting vote, as this may not be needed throughout the term of Lord Mayor.

6.4.7   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Dawn Dale.

6.4.8   To amend recommendation 29 to read 'The facility for Councillors to either job-share a Chair role or to co-chair a committee, with clarity about expectations and allowances including:
    a. there should not be both a job share and co-chair on any one committee.
    b. That the role of vice chair on a committee, where the chairs' role is divided as above, needs to be clarified, or the committee may decide there's no need for a job share role.
    c. A maximum of 2 co-chairs in any given committee.
    d. There should be a full review of this arrangement as part of the ongoing review process after an such role has occurred for the first time.'

6.4.9   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraph 6.4.8 above

were carried.

INDIVIDUAL COUNCILLORS

6.5.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that the new system would potentially increase Councillor workload, therefore this section of recommendation set out provisions for councillors, with the intention to mitigate this.

6.5.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 30-36 and the key points to note were: -

6.5.3   In relation to recommendation 31 (Member development), it was suggested this was member-led.

6.5.4   The Director of Legal and Governance explained that she met with group Whips, to discuss member development, in addition, the Audit & Standards Committee currently reviewed member development as part of their terms of reference around the Code of Conduct. The combination of the two guided the Council's current member development. It was mentioned that officer support to Member development had previously been reduced due to the Council's budgetary position, although recently, more resource had been put in place within Democratic Services to facilitate this.

6.5.5   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Peter Garbutt.

6.5.6   To add 'Member-led' to recommendation 30.

6.5.7   To remove 'full time' from recommendation 32.

6.5.8   To add 'as part of the review of the scheme' to recommendation 32.

6.5.9   To replace 'member questions (casework)' with 'member's casework' in recommendation 35.

6.5.10   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.5.6 to 6.5.9 above were carried.

POLICY COMMITTEES

6.6.1   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 37-52 and the key points to note were: -

6.6.2   It was suggested that each policy committee had a member responsible for equalities, diversity and inclusion, and biodiversity and climate change. The Director of Legal and Governance advised that future reports would aim to be written in a way that covers important

aspects like these. Although, it was recommended that there not be an individual be responsible for this.

6.6.3   It was asked whether recommendation 40 needed to be amended to reflect that certain sub-committees may need to remain, rather than being time limited. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the recommendation stated that sub-committees, at a minimum, will be reviewed at the Council's annual meeting. Therefore, sub-committees may remain, if seen as still necessary at Council's annual meeting.

6.6.4   It was suggested that further consideration be given to recommendation 45. It was added that the Committee needed to consider other responsibilities and duties that some Councillors had, besides been an elected member, when agreeing the timings and scheduling for committees.

6.6.5   The Assistant Director (Governance) confirmed that Democratic Services were currently scheduling a timetable for committee meetings, for the consideration of Members.

6.6.6   A Member of the Committee suggested to include to separate meetings times to recommendation 45. To give each committee the option of which they would prefer to meet.

6.6.7   In relation to recommendation 50, a Member did not believe it was appropriate to agree a certain time period in which decisions can be overturned. Alternatively, decisions should stand unless clear evidence suggested otherwise.

6.6.8   It was raised that recommendation 52 needed to be amended, to align with previous amendments around public questions/petitions. Therefore, a Member suggested removing all wording within the brackets.

6.6.9   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Sioned Mair Richards.

6.6.10   To re-word recommendation 45 e to read 'Further consideration be given to the timing and scheduling of all committee meetings on an annual basis'

6.6.11   To add 'for councillors' to recommendation 47.

6.6.12   To add 'Further consideration be given to' to recommendation 50.

6.6.13   To remove '(which must relate to substantive agenda items on that day's agenda)' from recommendation 52.

6.6.14   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.6.10 to

6.6.13 above were carried.

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE (AND FINANCE SUB-COMMITTEE)

6.7.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the recommendations in this section outlined some important aspects around the strategy and Resources Policy Committee.

6.7.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 53-62 and the key points to note were: -

6.7.3   In relation to recommendation 54, a Member of the Committee asked what the process would be if a Member was to go on long-term sickness as the recommendation stated that no substitutes can attend for members of that committee. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee would comprise the Chairs of each policy committees, plus others for political proportionality. Therefore, if a Member was to be away for a long period of time, the policy committee would need to appoint someone as chair in their absence, which then gave them a seat on the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee. If a member of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, who was not a chair of a policy committee was to be away for a long period of time, the appropriate political group could re-nominate a member of their group onto the committee.

6.7.4   The Assistant Director (Governance) raised how it was important to ensure the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee stayed politically proportionate. If a Member of that committee was to send a substitute, who was not from the same political party, then it would unbalance the proportionality. Therefore, it was recommended that no substitutes can attend for members of that committee.

6.7.5   A Member of the Committee mentioned there was a duplication of work around the conducting of regular monitoring of the revenue and capital budget, as recommendation 62 stated that both the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and Finance Sub-Committee, would monitor this. The Assistant Director (Governance) stated that both committees would meet on alternate months. Therefore, monitoring this area would be checked each month, although it was agreed it needed to be clear that no overlap between the committees occurred.

6.7.6   After the discussion and debate, no amendments were proposed to recommendations 53 to 62.

URGENT DECISIONS

6.8.1   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 63-65 and

the key points to note were: -

6.8.2   It was raised that there needed to be clear understanding on what classified as urgent and whether the Chair of Strategy and Resources Policy Committee should be able to take these decisions. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained that no individual councillor can take an urgent decision. If an urgent decision was unable to go to a committee, it would go to an officer for a decision.

6.8.3   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sioned Mair Richards, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston.

6.8.4   To replace 'at least an attempt to consult with the Chair first' with 'wherever practically possible consultation with the Chair. In the absence of the Chair, consultation with the Vice Chair. In the absence of the Vice Chair, consultation the Leader of the Council' at recommendation 64a
.

6.8.5   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraph 6.8.4 above were carried.

LOCAL AREA COMMITTEES

6.9.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the Committee had already agreed the principle of how Local Area Committees operated and these recommendations do not intend to change their delegated authority, but to agree some specific functionality aspects within the Committees.

6.9.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 66-68 and the key points to note were: -

6.9.3   In relation to recommendation 68, a Member of the Committee asked whether it would be more appropriate for the Chair of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee to be consulted, when the Monitoring officer is reviewing referrals from one committee to another. The Assistant Director (Governance) stated that these referrals could occur often. Therefore, it would be more efficient for the Monitoring Officer to take a decision, and then report back to the committee once it had been referred.

6.9.4   It was suggested that recommendation 68 be amended, so it was clear that the Chair of the referring committee would be notified when any referral pathway had changed.

6.9.5   It was suggested that Local Area Committees were monitored by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, rather than the policy committee with responsibility for communities. It was mentioned that Local Area Committees and Policy Committees were equals within

the new system therefore a committee with more authority should have the responsibility for monitoring the Local Area Committees.

6.9.6 After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sioned Mair Richards, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston.

6.9.7 To amend recommendation 67 to read 'The Strategy & Resources Policy Committee will have a special role in monitoring what is referred to all other committees by Local Area Committees and looking for patterns, in liaison with the LAC chairs. The policy committee with responsibilities for communities will have a role to oversee the Communities/Localism strategy within which the LACs are operating'

6.9.8 To add 'and the LAC Chair to be notified where any referral pathway is changed' to recommendation 68.

6.9.9 On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.9.7 to 6.9.8 above were carried.

SCRUTINY (INCLUDING STATUTORY SCRUTINY)

6.10.1 The Assistant Director (governance) explained the term 'scrutiny' commonly referred to the Cabinet and Leader model which the Council would be moving away from. Although there would not be an Overview and Scrutiny Committee, there needed to be appropriate mechanisms for holding to account and other such statutory scrutiny functions within the new system.

6.10.2 It was added that the recommendation from Officers was not to implement a Call-in function within the new system. This was based on evidence received from the inquiry process, in which other Local Authorities explained it was not efficient for councillors to call-in decisions made by a committee as it was believed that decisions needed to stand to ensure certainty.

6.10.3 Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 69-73 and the key points to note were: -

6.10.4 A Member of the Committee believed the recommendations did not consider political differences. Therefore, it was suggested that a minority report should be able to be presented at either Full Council or the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, to decide whether a decision that had been made, needed to be looked into further. Another Member of the Committee stated that debates within committees should be the place where councillor's thoughts were considered, and the scrutiny of decisions took place.

6.10.5 It was suggested there needed to be a mechanism that allowed for

the public and stakeholders to call-in decisions made by the Council. This would also ensure the Council had considered them, at different points in the whole process. Another Member stated there would be opportunities for Stakeholders to attend policy committees and share their thoughts before a decision was made.

6.10.6   After the discussion and debate, no amendments were proposed to recommendations 69 to 73.

OTHER COMMITTEES

6.11.1   No discussion or amendments were proposed to recommendations 74-75.

SCHEMES OF DELEGATION

6.12.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) introduced this section and suggested that given the continued rises in property prices and the need to be efficient with committee time, a higher threshold might be more appropriate in recommendation 79, such as £300k or £500k.

6.12.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 76-82 and the key points to note were: -

6.12.3   A Member of the Committee believed the figure of 250k in recommendation 79 concerning decisions about property was too high. It was suggested that this figure be amended to 150k. Another Member thought £150k may lead to too much business for the committee to consider on a regular basis. The Director of Legal and Governance suggested this be monitored and reviewed within the 6-month review process.

6.12.4   After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Mohammed Mahroof, seconded by Councillor Mark Jones.

6.12.5   To replace '250k' with '150k' in recommendation 79.

6.12.6   To add 'Ongoing review of this threshold to be within the Governance Committee's terms of reference' to recommendation 79.

6.12.7   On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.12.5 to 6.12.7 above were carried.

STAFFING, RELATIONSHIPS AND CASEWORK

6.13.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained there were no recommendations in this section as these covered operational aspects on how committees would be supported. Although this section had no recommendations, it was still important for the

Committee have sight of this information and consider it, as necessary.

6.13.2   Members of the Committee did not further discuss this section of the report.

ONGOING REVIEWS OF GOVERNANCE

6.14.1   The Assistant Director (Governance) explained this section of the report was to inform the Committee of how it was intended to review the governance arrangements of the Council in the future.

6.14.2   Members of the Committee discussed recommendations 83-86 and the key points to note were: -

6.14.3   It was highlighted that the current Governance Committee is formed of Chairs and Vice chairs of transitional committees, which would mirror the membership of Strategy ad Resources Policy Committee. Therefore, would the Committee need to make it clear the membership of the Governance Committee, needed to be different to the membership of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained there were no constraints for which councillors can be nominated to have a seat on the Governance Committee.

6.14.4   It was suggested that at least 1 councillor who does not have a seat on any policy committee had a seat on the Governance Committee, for independent perspectives. The Assistant Director (Governance) suggested these perspectives are considered when nominating councillors onto committees.

6.14.5   A Member of the Committee stated that it needed to be clear, that members of the public were included in the review process, within the Governance Committee. It was added that public should also be appointed onto the Governance Committee and have the authority to vote on decisions. The Assistant Director (Governance) explained the Committee could co-opt an individual, with expertise in a certain area, onto the committee although they would not have voting authority. The Committee were advised to take caution if they decided to do this, to ensure the Council was not accused of political bias when appointing a co-opted member.

6.14.6   A Member of the Committee thought it would be beneficial for the current membership of the Governance Committee to remain the same, at least until the 6-month review was complete.

6.14.7   In relation to recommendation 84, The Head of Policy and Partnerships, Laurie Brennan, suggested that partners be included in the list of who the Governance Committee committed to directly engage and participate with in their ongoing consideration of the

health of Sheffield's democratic environment.

6.14.8 A Member of the Committee advised that there could be recommendations for the Committee to consider, following the report of the Race Equality Commission. The Member suggested a recommendation was included to reflect that the Committee would take into consideration, the recommendations of the Race Equality Commission. The Director of Legal and Governance mentioned there was risk of including specific names into the recommendations, as this could look like the Council was not taking other groups into account. The Member was content that recommendation 86a agreed to take account of any changes to the local and national context.

6.14.9 A Member of the Committee raised whether guidance around decisions been taken during the pre-election period needed to be included in the standing orders. The Director of Legal and Governance reassured Members on the position around decisions through the election period. It was added there is no restrictions for decision-making through the election period, the restrictions apply to the publication linked to decisions.

6.14.10 The Director of Legal and Governance confirmed the legislation allowed for the Leader of the Council to still take decisions, up until the annual meeting of the Council.

6.14.11 After the discussion and debate, the following amendments were proposed by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Peter Garbutt.

6.14.12 To add 'Governance' to recommendation 83.

6.14.13 To add 'and partners' to recommendation 84.

6.14.14 On being put to the vote, the amendments at paragraphs 6.14.12 to 6.14.13 above were carried.

6.15.1 **RESOLVED:** That **(1)** the elements of a committee system of governance set out in this report, including 85 recommendations as amended and Appendix 1, be agreed to inform the detailed drafting of the Constitution as follows;

1. Continue to work with the public, stakeholders and community groups to develop our approach to public participation and engagement over the coming months ahead of May 2022.
2. Create the framework, co-designed with communities in Sheffield, to transform our longer-term approach to involvement and empowerment
3. Continue to develop Local Area Committees' role as key conduits with local places and their communities, encouraging both local engagement on strategic matters and strategic

escalation or amplification of local issues of concern.

4. ~~Public~~ Question / petition opportunities at all new Policy Committees
5. Petition scheme to be formalised into the Constitution and reviewed to advise petitioners as to the appropriate decision-making body in the first instance (see 'Full Council). In some but not all cases this will continue to be Full Council – in others it will be a Committee but the decision remains with the petitioner
6. Improved signposting to a single inbox for people wishing to ask questions or present petitions to members, with a triage system to advise people as to whether their topic is on the work programme for any Policy Committee and if so providing an option to put them on the appropriate agenda or if not the option to attend another policy committee or full council
7. Review use and application of digital engagement tools in line with our developing involvement ambitions
8. Development and agreement of a medium to long term, public participation and engagement strategy
9. Improved provision of information online about democratic processes at Sheffield City Council and how to learn more or get involved and to make it easier to access to information about councillors both online and in other places
10. Commitment to involvement of the public and stakeholders in the Governance Committee's six-month review of the new committee system
11. Further consideration be given to options relating to electronic voting and an online record of councillor's votes
12. A toolkit to be developed for each committee to use when considering its 'menu of options' for ensuring the voice of the public has been central to their policy development work. For the most appropriate mechanism to be employed depending on the circumstances. This builds on the experiences of Scrutiny Committees and latterly the Transitional Committees and, subject to further consideration including the ongoing work with Involve, could include (but would not be limited to):
    a. Public calls for evidence
    b. 'Hackathon' style issue-focused workshops led by committees
    c. Creative use of online engagement channels#
    d. Working with VCF networks (eg including the Sheffield Equality Partnership) to seek views of communities
    e. Co-design events on specific challenges or to support policy development
    f. Citizens assembly style activities
    g. Stakeholder reference groups (standing or one-off)
    h. Committee / small group visits to services
    i. Formal and informal discussion groups
    j. Facilitated communities of interest around each committee (eg a mailing list of self-identified

stakeholders and interested parties with regular information about forthcoming decisions and requests for contributions or volunteers for temporary co-option)

   k. Facility for medium-term or issue-by-issue co-option from outside the Council onto Committees or Task and Finish Groups

13. Chairs of Policy Committees to act as the primary spokesperson on behalf of the Council for the subject area of the Committees they chair (see 'Leadership'). Group spokespersons on each committee may be expected to comment on behalf of their Groups but not the committee as a whole.

14. Eight meetings a year – six plus a budget council and an AGM. No 'scrutiny council'.

15. Agreement of the Council's Corporate Plans and associated annual plans to be reserved to Full Council as a key part of the Council's Policy Framework – these will in effect set out the delivery objectives for each committee during the periods concerned.

16. By agreeing the terms of reference of the various Policy Committees and any sub-committees, Full Council defines the policy boundaries within which each committee has authority to take decisions on behalf of the Authority in pursuit of their objectives as per the Corporate Plans.

17. By agreeing its annual budget Full Council defines the budgetary envelope within which each committee has authority to take decisions on behalf of the Authority in pursuit of their objectives as per the Corporate Plans.

18. Council Procedure rules to be updated, including the following:

   a. 'Questions to Cabinet Members' to become 'Questions to Chairs' of any committee (or to councillor nominees on outside bodies / joint cttees, including the Mayoral Combined Authority).

   b. No exclusively 'to note' items.

   c. Further consideration be given to: Clearer voting practices (no agreement by 'common assent', Chairs to clearly narrate For/Against/Abstentions and the outcome, and to request a show of hands where electronic voting is not available)

   d. Further consideration be given to: Where facilities for electronic voting / electronic recording of votes are available, this system will be used and the vote will be recorded and published online (see 'Public Engagement') this not to be included in vote. (was there something here)

19. Petition scheme to be formalised into the Constitution and reviewed to advise petitioners as to the appropriate decision-making body in the first instance (see 'Public Engagement'). In some but not all cases this will continue to be Full Council – in others it will be a Committee but the decisions remain with the

petitioner.

20. Public Questions rules to be reviewed to advise questioners about the appropriate decision-making body in the first instance (see 'Public Engagement' and 'policy Committees'). In some but not all cases this will continue to be Full Council – in others it will be a Committee but the decision remains with the questioner.

21. The current time limit to be carried over for the proportion of a public meeting used for petitions / questions from the public.

22. Further consideration be given to a system whereby full council can rescind authority from committees, in order to take decisions at full council. (A motion for Council brought under 'notice of motions' may propose that a report be brought to Council with a recommendation to rescind authority from a committee for a particular decision found on that Committee's work programme (ie such that the decision must then be taken by Full Council rather than by a committee). No valid motion under 'notice of motions' can itself move to rescind such authority (see 'Scrutiny'))

23. Further consideration be given to a system whereby full council can rescind authority from committees, in order to take decisions at full council. (Without reference to the above process, a report recommending the rescinding of authority from a committee to Full Council may be referred to Council by that committee or by Strategy and Resources Policy Committee (by simple majority) in advance of such decision appearing substantively on the relevant committee's own agenda. (see 'Scrutiny'))

24. Further consideration be given to a system whereby full council can rescind authority from committees, in order to take decisions at full council. (Outside of the processes above, while Committees should of course have reference to any Council resolution arising from a motion brought under 'notice of motions' which pertains to a committee decision, a motion to Council under 'notice of motions' will not be valid if it would have the effect of firmly binding the hands of a committee on a matter which falls within a committee's delegated authority, to the extent that members of that Committee would become predetermined.)

25. Committees (with the exception of Strategy and Resources Committee) may not refer to Full Council a matter which is properly within the remit of another Committee.

26. A role (and role profile') for the Leader in the constitution, to include:
   a. Primary spokesperson for the Council and its administration,
   b. Advocate for the city on a local, regional and national stage
   c. Representative of the Council in regional and national networks and with Central Government

     d. Chairing the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee

     e. a personal role with regard to:

         i. Core City status and associated meetings/bodies

         ii. The Mayoral Combined Authority

     f. A key role chairing various informal Member/officer forums

27. A role profile for Policy Committee Chairs in the constitution, to include:

     g. Primary officer point of contact with regard to the committee's ongoing business, formulation of a draft work programme for the committee's consideration, and for advice about engagement with the committee

     h. Primary spokesperson for the committee they chair (see 'Public Engagement and Comms')

     i. In the case of the Chair of the Children's Services Policy Committee, to be the Statutory Lead Member for Children's Services

     j. To convene and chair regular pre-agenda and pre-meeting briefings with all the Group Spokespersons from their committee

28. Committees to appoint their own Chairs on an annual basis as per current practice.

29. The facility for Councillors to either job-share a Chair role or to co-chair a committee, with clarity about expectations and allowances including:

     a. there should not be both a job share and co-chair on any one committee.

     b. That the role of vice chair on a committee, where the chairs' role is divided as above, needs to be clarified, or the committee may decide there's no need for a job share role.

     c. A maximum of 2 co-chairs in any given committee.

     d. There should be a full review of this arrangement as part of the ongoing review process after an such role has occurred for the first time.

30. Launch of modern.gov app to support digital ways of working

31. Member-led refresh of Member Development Strategy and annual Member Development and Induction Plan

     a. To include enhanced training on eg finance, audit, safeguarding responsibilities for the wider group of members involved in decisions of this sort

     b. To include specific training on working effectively within a committee system, including content on 'how to disagree effectively' or the art of effective negotiation and compromise within committee settings

32. Independent Remuneration Panel to consider the strength of the Scheme of Allowance's support for parents, carers and people in work as part of the review of the scheme

33. Ongoing consideration of options for use of hybrid and remote meeting options, subject to the legislative context

34. Implementation of improved Member newsletter
35. Implementation of improved arrangements for members' casework
36. Creation of job-share option for Chairing roles (see 'Leadership – Key Councillors' Roles)
37. *Seven themed Policy Committees which will be closely aligned to the functions of the Council;*
38. *A Strategy & Resources Policy Committee including all Policy Committee Chairs within its membership, with cross-cutting responsibility for the policy and budgetary framework, chaired by the Leader of the Council;*
39. *A programme of six meetings of each Policy Committee per year*
40. *Provision for Full Council but not individual Committees to agree the addition of sub-committees to this structure. When sub-committees are agreed they will be time limited or at minimum will be reviewed annually at the AGM.*
41. *Limits (to be defined) on the number and frequency of Task and Finish Groups carrying out detailed pre-decision scrutiny (policy development) on behalf of Policy Committees;*
42. Full Council to agree the size of Policy Committees at its AGM, based on best fit to proportionality. With the exception of Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, this must be within the parameters of a committee size of between 8 and 11 members.
43. A standing Finance Sub-Committee, reporting to the Strategy & Resources Committee (Chair and membership not constrained)
44. An annual exercise for Strategy and Resources Committee to develop an annual work plan with reference to the Corporate Plan and in consultation with all the other Policy Committees.
    a. This process to also be a work programming exercise.
    b. Each committee to keep its work programme under review at each meeting.
    c. Strategy and Resources Committee to consider the combined Policy Committee Work Programme every other meeting to ensure corporate objectives are being achieved.
    d. Space within this item to consider references from other committees – issues raised by eg LACs
45. Guillotine clause for all Policy Committee meetings (2 hrs + 30 mins)
    e. Further consideration be given to the timing and scheduling of all committee meetings on an annual basis
46. Extraordinary meetings to need approval of the Monitoring Officer
47. A corporate approach to the provision and use of business intelligence data and other regular, corporate items for councillors (corporate plan, finance etc)

48. Each Group on a committee to nominate a 'spokesperson' for their Group on that committee.
49. A mandated system of briefings for Chair/Vice Chair and Group Spokespersons. For each meeting of the committee there will be a:
    f. Pre-agenda briefing to discuss and agree agenda items and approach to items (and to briefings about items). Looking ahead at the committee's forward plan. Opportunity for all spokespersons to relay early information to their own Groups.
    g. Pre-meeting briefing to discuss published papers on the agenda and the process for the meeting itself. Spokespersons to brief their own Groups as necessary to ensure informed and organised discussions in committee.
50. Further consideration be given to the option of ensuring that decisions cannot be overturned via a normal decision process within a certain period, to support a degree of stability.
51. Policy Committees to have responsibility for monitoring the performance of services. Strategy and Resources Committee to have responsibility for considering the overall performance of the Authority as well as the performance of individual Policy Committees eg with regard to delivery against the Corporate Plan (see Strategy and Resources Policy Committee).
52. Time-limited space for public questions and petitions on every Policy Committee agenda
53. *A Strategy & Resources Policy Committee including all Policy Committee Chairs within its membership, with overarching responsibility for the policy and budgetary framework, is chaired by the Leader of the Council;*
54. *No substitutes can attend for members of this committee*
55. *A standing Finance Sub-Committee, reporting to the Strategy & Resources Committee;*
56. *Ability for scheduled Strategy & Resources Committee meetings to take urgent decisions for the other Policy Committees but only in extremis - if the relevant committee's Urgency Sub-Committee has been unable to meet in an appropriate timeframe (see 'urgent decisions');*
57. *Strategy and Resources Committee to have responsibility for considering the overall performance of the Authority as well as the performance of individual Policy Committees eg with regard to delivery against the Corporate Plan. In instances where there is a serious performance concern, they have the ability to refer this concern to Full Council for consideration (see 'Scrutiny').*
58. *Any issue which is wider than any one of the Policy Committee's remits (budget or policy) is within the remit of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee..*
59. Any issue identified as being of significant strategic importance or financial risk to the organisation is considered to be by its

nature cross-cutting and therefore within the remit of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee

60. In the case of any issue falling within the remit of S&R as above, this committee may opt to either take the decision itself or to dictate which individual Policy Committee will take the lead for the issue by ensuring it gets the necessary one-off delegation to do so.

61. Finance Sub-Committee has within its remit:
    a. Strategic financial overview
    b. Property decisions
    c. Accountable Body decisions
    d. Corporate Revenue & Capital monitoring

62. Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, alongside the Finance Sub-Committee, to conduct regular revenue and capital budget monitoring.

63. Urgency sub-committee for each policy Committee including S&R
    a. Quorum of 3 members, which must include Chair or Vice Chair.
    b. All parent committee's members and their named substitutes (where applicable) may act as substitute members of an urgency sub-cttee

64. Clear criteria for different degrees of urgency (including 'emergency') to be defined in the constitution along with processes and procedures applicable to each
    a. Including officers taking urgent decisions as last resort – will require wherever practically possible: consultation with the Chair. In the absence of the Chair, consultation with the Vice Chair. In the absence of the Vice Chair, consultation the Leader of the Council and reporting back to committee
    b. Examples of different scales of urgency might be:
        i. Too urgent to wait until next scheduled meeting of Committee
        ii. Too urgent to wait until an extraordinary meeting of an urgency sub-committee

65. Ability for scheduled Strategy & Resources Committee meetings to take urgent decisions for the other Policy Committees but only in extremis - if the relevant committee's Urgency Sub-Committee has been unable to meet in an appropriate timeframe.

66. *Seven Local Area Committees with a mechanism* (via work programme standing items on each Policy Committee's agenda, giving committees the opportunity to note the referral and to plan the matter more substantially into their work programme if they wish) *to allow for referrals between them and Policy Committees as necessary and regular informal meetings of local area committee chairs to ensure effective coordination;*

67. The Strategy & Resources Policy Committee will have a

special role in monitoring what is referred to all other committees by Local Area Committees and looking for patterns, in liaison with the LAC chairs. The policy committee with responsibilities for communities will have a role to oversee the Communities/Localism strategy within which the LACs are operating.

68. Note that the Monitoring Officer will be responsible for the review of all referrals to ensure they are going to the appropriate body in the first instance and the Chair of the referring committee to be notified where any referral pathway is changed.

69. *No separate scrutiny committee;*

70. Statutory Scrutiny functions to be written into the Terms of Reference of the appropriate Policy Committees
    a. Eg Health Scrutiny as part of the Adult Health and Social Care Policy Committee remit or as a standing sub committee

71. No mechanism which allows for committees to overturn legitimate committee decisions once they have been made

72. A strong mechanism by which Strategy and Resources Committee or Full Council can recommend to Council in advance of a decision being made that Full Council rescind that Committee's delegated authority with regard to a specific decision on their Work Programme.
    b. A motion for Council brought under 'notice of motions' may propose that a report be brought to Council with a recommendation to rescind authority from a committee for a particular decision found on that Committee's work programme (ie such that the decision must then be taken by Full Council rather than by a committee). No valid motion under 'notice of motions' can itself move to rescind such authority (see 'Full Council')
    c. Without reference to the above process, a report recommending the rescinding of authority from a committee to Full Council may be referred to Council by that committee or by Strategy and Resources Policy Committee (by simple majority) in advance of such decision appearing substantively on the relevant committee's own agenda. (see 'Full Council')

73. Strategy and Resources Policy Committee will have a role to hold the other Policy Committees to account on their delivery against the Corporate Plan. In instances where there is a serious performance concern, they have the ability to refer this concern to Full Council for consideration (see 'Strategy and Resources Policy Committee')

74. *No substantive changes to the committees referred to as Other Committees in the Governance Framework*

75. Various partnership bodies etc will need to have members nominated where previously the Cabinet Member (Co-Operative Executive Member) would have gone. In general it is

assumed that the relevant Chair(s) or Vice Chairs of Policy Committees will be nominated by Full Council instead.

76. The current, standard approach to continue, whereby Councillors take any decision explicitly reserved to Full Council or a Committee, except in specifically defined urgent or emergency circumstances.

77. All levels of decision currently identified as Individual Executive Member decisions will be taken by a committee unless good reasons are proposed and accepted as to why it is more appropriate for the type of decision to be taken by an officer

78. Procurement and contracting decisions are taken by officers once a committee has agreed the commission or purchasing decision and the budget on any given requirement

79. All property related decisions of a value of £150k or more shall be reserved to the Strategy & Resources Policy Committee.
    a. Ongoing review of this threshold to be within the Governance Committee's terms of reference

80. A standing sub-committee of the Strategy & Resources Committee be established to deal with the Council's Charitable Trusts

81. All Capital allocations and monitoring to be reserved to the Strategy & Resources Committee or its Finance Sub Committee

82. All bids for grants to be reserved to the finance sub-committee to ensure financial commitments are considered when applying for and accepting grants

83. The Governance Committee should have named responsibility for, amongst other things, ongoing review and maintenance of the constitution and the governance system it describes.

84. The Governance Committee's Terms of Reference should specify their commitment to direct engagement and participation of the public and stakeholders and partners in their ongoing consideration of the health of Sheffield's democratic environment.

85. A standalone Governance Committee will continue to hold this responsibility in 2022/23.

86. The Governance Committee shall conduct a review of the effectiveness of the new system, commencing six months after implementation (November 2022) with a view to Full Council implementing any necessary changes at its AGM in May 2023. This review will:
    a. Take account of any changes to the local and national context
    b. Include the previously agreed 'strategic aims' and 'design principles' in its assessment criteria
    c. Actively seek and use feedback from residents, stakeholders, councillors, officers and partners to inform its judgements against those criteria

(2) That the Governance Committee conduct a review of the new governance system, commencing six months after implementation (November 2022) with a view to Full Council implementing any necessary changes at its AGM in May 2023. This review will:

    a. Use the previously agreed 'strategic aims' and 'design principles' as its success criteria

    b. Actively seek and use feedback from residents, stakeholders, councillors and officers to inform its assessment against those criteria

    c. Take account of any changes to the local and national context

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on 9 March 2022.