

Date of Meeting	Item	Members wished to make the following comments and conclusions:	Response/Comments	Further Information Requested	Response/Comments	
25-Jul-2018	City Deal	The Committee understand that the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal is an incremental process but Members are concerned that since the 10 Local Authorities signed the regional investment fund in 2016, there has been only one project that has been capitalised by the partnership.	The chair of the city deal joint cabinet and the leader of this authority explained the process around identifying our investments and the long term (20 year) time frame for the deal.			
		The Committee highlighted the fact that the cover report and business plan lacked any localised information and recommend that an update report be prepared for Members in the future to provide detail of how each project will benefit Bridgend specifically as well as the rest of the region. The Committee have also asked the report detail what administration costs accrued to date.	As further projects or investments are agreed by the City Deal Cabinet, members will be updated. In addition we anticipate that the regional scrutiny committee will take an interest in these matters too.			
		<b>Additional Information</b>				
		The Committee have requested to receive information on how citizens and local businesses are able to propose ideas and details for potential regional investment proposals.	Businesses are to be engaged through the regional business forum and the regional economic partnership. These bodies have been established as part of the governance arrangements required as condition of the deal by the Treasury. Further work is required to ensure that these bodies are effective in facilitating two way communication between the regional cabinet and businesses across the region.	<b>What is the Membership and remit of the regional business forum and the regional economic partnership?</b>	Latest membership and ToR requested from eth programme office and will be shared	
	Members have also asked to be provided with detail of what projects have been proposed so far and from what area within the region.					
	Financial Performance 2017-18	<b>Chief Executives and Finance</b>				
		The Committee recommend that Cabinet/CMB undertake a review into achievability of proposed Directorate budget reductions and further recommend that unrealistic offers are removed from the Medium Term Financial Strategy.	The MTFs proposals remain under development but all budget reductions are intended to be accurately costed unless otherwise stated.	<b>Members requested further clarification in relation to the response received.</b>	I am unclear as to what clarification they are seeking. no one wants to include proposals that are unrealistic. Members have ongoing opportunity to question and scrutinise the budget if they have concerns about specific elements that they regard as unrealistic.	
		<b>Education and Family Support Directorate</b>				
		The Committee raised concerns relating to over half of the schools in the Borough have deficit budgets and queried the level of school budgeting competencies. Members therefore recommend that financial training for all governors is made mandatory to ensure effective management and scrutiny of their school budget.		<b>What support is provided to schools to manage deficit budgets and how does the Council assist in signposting schools to external funding opportunities.</b>	Where schools have a deficit at the end of the financial year, detailed reasons for the deficit are requested from the school via a deficit proforma. The maximum deficit should be 5% of the annual budget share or £10,000 (whichever is the higher). The monitoring of these deficits is then carried into the following financial year and if a school sets a budget at the start of financial year that is greater than these limits a formal deficit recovery plan is required to be submitted which has to be approved by the Corporate Director of Education and Family Support and the Section 151 Officer. These plans are monitored closely by the Schools Finance Officers throughout the year.	
		Following discussions in relation to the pending review into appropriateness of catchment areas across the local authority, the Committee recommend that Ward Members are consulted as part of the exercise.	Noted			
<b>Social Services and Wellbeing Directorate</b>						
Members have requested that when the subsequent Financial Performance report is presented to Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Social Services and Wellbeing Future Service Delivery Plan is also delivered in conjunction with it.	noted					
Council's Performance against its Commitments for 2017-18	The Committee received this report as information and on reflection Members recommend that only the performance indicators that have not been met be presented in future reports.	If we provide an exception report by only including those that are green in terms of performance there are a number of issues as follows: We are not showing the whole picture of performance on the corporate plan / business plan throughout the year, there is a lack of transparency and as these are public documents that can be viewed via the reports that go to scrutiny, which satisfies public transparency and also means all our regulators can view them. If we only showed the performance against current RAG for the year we would not be looking at where performance is declining. It is important to see early indicators of declining performance as it is to see whether performance is being met in the current year. Targets may also have been set lower for the current year, which would not alert you to any decline. Therefore the suggestion is that we provide the performance reports as they currently are, but that we will grey out those that are green and have no declining trend. The rest will remain for members for information purposes which they can then scrutinise and can inform them on areas they may wish to include in their FWP.				