

Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker 2014-15

All recommendations

Community Engagement Policy Statement - Scrutiny Committee 23 June					
Recommendation	Agreed Y/N	Outcome / progress	Considered by / when	Lead Member & Officer	Implemented Y/N
1. To provide a clear statement in the principles on the ambition for engagement focusing on depth as well as breadth.	Y	Merged with recommendation 3.	CEB / 3 July	Cllr Price; Sadie Paige	N/A
2. To provide information on the engagement ambitions set for all consultations during the last year, what was achieved and how this fits with the principles set within the Policy Statement.	Y	To provide this information for all consultations would be a huge piece of work so a sample will be used instead, together with a forward-looking approach. Expected at 10 November Scrutiny Committee meeting.	CEB / 3 July	Cllr Price; Sadie Paige	N
3. To suggest to the Scrutiny Committee an up and coming engagement/empowerment exercise that can act as a pilot study to demonstrate the effectiveness of the principles within this report.	Y	Two consultations identified as candidates for the pilot as per CEB suggestion. Project brief created for the pilot, which includes the objectives, and a reporting template. Interim update expected on 10 November.	CEB / 3 July	Cllr Price; Sadie Paige	N
4. To provide a table that shows how all comments received during the consultation on this Policy Statement have been handled.	Y	Expected at 10 November Scrutiny Committee meeting.	CEB / 3 July	Cllr Price; Sadie Paige	N
End of Year Integrated Report – 2013-2014 - Scrutiny Committee 23 June					
Recommendation	Agreed Y/N	Outcome / progress	Considered by / when	Lead Member & Officer	Implemented Y/N

1. The Committee supports the purchase of the Iffley Road building as an asset of value to the community and recognises that negotiations are on-going. There is a gap between the asking price and the money available and the City Executive Board is asked to do what it can within reasonable value for money criteria to secure the purchase of this property.	Y	Noted (£250k has been earmarked for acquisition of property).	CEB / 3 July	Cllr Turner; Nigel Kennedy; Jane Lubbock	N
2. To consider the contingency available to support homelessness in light of county proposals for implementing cuts in the Supporting People and if underspends from 13/14 should be maintained within this budget.	N	Current level of contingency considered to be sufficient.	CEB / 3 July	Cllr Turner; Nigel Kennedy; Jane Lubbock	N/A

Fusion Lifestyle Performance 2013-2014 - Scrutiny Committee 23 June

Additional information requested	Agreed Y/N	Outcome	Considered by / when	Member & Officer	Implemented Y/N
<p>Facility running costs It was agreed at the June meeting in 2013 that the running costs of the facilities would be shown including all capital investment and loan cost in the next report. This hadn't been done.</p> <p>Performance outside of expectations Members asked how poor performance was addressed and asked to see the issues raised and the actions/penalties taken over the last year.</p> <p>Publicity Campaign An issue was raised concerning literature used to highlight the Active Women Campaign. The images used were considered to be too</p>	N/A	Information paper to Scrutiny Committee meeting on 2 September.	Board Member / 26June	Cllr Rowley; Lucy Cherry	N

<p>stereotypical and gendered. The Committee asked that this issue be taken up with Sports England who run this national campaign.</p> <p>Views of non-card users at facilities The Committee asked to see any information on the views and experiences of non-card users.</p> <p>Falling attendance amongst young people The Committee were concerned to see this and wanted some more detailed data and information to understand more fully the reasons behind it and whether it was a particular set of circumstances or a trend.</p> <p>Information excluded from the public The Committee heard a complaint from a member of the public that the information provided outlining the running costs to the Council of each Leisure Facility should be made public because if the Council was still running these centres then the information would be available publically. The Committee heard that this was commercial information but asked that this exclusion is reconsidered by Fusion.</p> <p>Investment financing Members were interested in why the City Council financed investment spending that Fusion Lifestyle was originally required to finance, and in how much this saved the partnership.</p>		<p>Update to follow separately – this was a follow-up request that was made after the meeting.</p>			
---	--	--	--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank