

**Strategic Priority:** (What) Commissioners Corporate Governance Priorities

**Development Priority (*We will*):** Standards of Conduct and behaviour of Members and Officers

Key actions <i>(by...)</i>	Responsible Officer	By when	Success Criteria / Measure – <i>(How do we know when you have achieved the key action?) Performance Indicator / an Action you will undertake / or both</i>	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	RAG Status and Trend	Risks & Risk Mitigation Commentary	Risk RAG and Trend
Compliance with Protocol for Self Regulation adopted by the County Council 4.3.10	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	100% of Panels established by Standards Committee under Protocol for Self Regulation following request by Group Leader					↔	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Escalation of disputes</li> <li>2. Misconduct in meetings</li> <li>3. Misuse of media</li> <li>4. “Tit for tat” complaints to PSOW</li> </ol> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extraordinary meetings to expedite</li> <li>2. Member on Member complaints procedure to be published by PSOW – May 2012</li> </ol>	
Quarterly reports to Standards Committee	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	Reduction in number of conduct complaints received by Ombudsman in comparison with same quarter 2010/11.					↔	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>Reputational damage</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ongoing training and development</li> <li>2. Protocols for Resolution</li> <li>3. Group Leaders’ Meetings with Chief Executive</li> </ol>	
Signed job descriptions and person specifications received by Monitoring Officer	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	100% of up to date job descriptions and person specifications valid in each quarter					↔	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>Resistance to change and professionalisation of Members.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intervention by Group Leaders/Chair</li> <li>2. Member Development Working Group</li> </ol>	
Completed enhanced CRB forms received by HR	LB	Apr 2011 – March 2012	100% of Members submitted full data required for enhanced CRB checks					↑	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>Some resistance to change and professionalisation of Members.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p>	

**Strategic Priority:** (What) Commissioners Corporate Governance Priorities

**Development Priority (*We will*):** Standards of Conduct and behaviour of Members and Officers

Key actions <i>(by...)</i>	Responsible Officer	By when	Success Criteria / Measure – <i>(How do we know when you have achieved the key action?) Performance Indicator / an Action you will undertake / or both</i>	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	RAG Status and Trend	Risks & Risk Mitigation Commentary	Risk RAG and Trend
									1. Intervention by Group Leaders/Chair 2. Member Development Working Group	
PDR interviews taken place and pro formas received by HR	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	20 PDRs completed, in accordance with pilot, by December 2011					↑	<b>Risk</b> 1. Resistance to change and professionalisation of Members 2. Criticism by Regulators  <b>Mitigation</b> 1. Templates circulated 2. Briefing sessions arranged 3. Officer support	
Review and agreement on Member / Officer Relations Protocol	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	Review to be undertaken 14 <sup>th</sup> December 2011 revised Protocol to be adopted by full Council no later than May 2012					↔	<b>Risk</b> Missed opportunity to reinforce key recovery issue before May 2012  <b>Mitigation</b> 1. Local resolution re Members/Officers 2. Training	

## Strategic Priority: (What) Commissioners Corporate Governance Priorities

### Development Priority *(We will)*: The effectiveness of the Council's Standards Committee

Key actions <i>(by...)</i>	Responsible Officer	By when	Success Criteria / Measure – <i>(How do we know when you have achieved the key action?) Performance Indicator / an Action you will undertake / or both</i>	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	RAG Status and Trend	Risks & Risk Mitigation Commentary	Risk RAG and Trend
To conduct a preliminary hearing within 6 weeks following referral from the PSOW or following decision of Indemnities Sub Committee	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	100% preliminary hearings within timescale					↔	<p><b>Risk</b> - Lack of timely response to PSOW reports will cause reputational damage and governance issues</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> - 1. Adopted procedure for Sub Committee 2. To adopt new procedure for hearings</p>	
To conduct hearings into applications for dispensations within one month of receipt	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	100 % of applications decided within timescale					↔	<p><b>Risks</b> - Members/public wrongly disenfranchised</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> -1. Preliminary advice and drafting by Monitoring Officer 2. Extraordinary meetings 3. Panels established</p>	
To review the two Registers of Members' Interests followed by advice and guidance, if appropriate	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	Reviews of each to be undertaken annually					↔	<p><b>Risk</b> - 1. Lack of assurance role for public 2. Complacency by Members 3. Significant burden to Standards Committee</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b> - 1. Publish results 2. Issue advisories 3. Divide the work among co-opted Members</p>	
To supervise the Register of Gifts and Hospitality followed by advice and guidance, if appropriate	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	Reviews to be undertaken annually					↔	<p><b>Risk</b> - 1. Lack of assurance role for public 2. Complacency by Members 3. Significant burden to Standards Committee</p>	


**Strategic Priority: (What) Commissioners Corporate Governance Priorities**

**Development Priority (*We will*): The effectiveness of the Council's Standards Committee**

Key actions <i>(by...)</i>	Responsible Officer	By when	Success Criteria / Measure – <i>(How do we know when you have achieved the key action?) Performance Indicator / an Action you will undertake / or both</i>	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	RAG Status and Trend	Risks & Risk Mitigation Commentary	Risk RAG and Trend
									<b>Mitigation</b> - 1. Publish results 2. Issue advisories 3. Divide the work among co-opted Members	
To review the Council's Protocol for Member / Officer Relations	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	New Protocol to be recommended to full Council/Welsh Government by end Q4.					↔	<b>Risk</b> - Missed opportunity to reinforce key recovery issue before May 2012  <b>Mitigation</b> - 1. Local resolution re Members/Officers 2. Training	
Establish meetings of the Standards Committee to review policies relevant to its remit	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	100% of policies reviewed within timetable agreed with relevant Head of Service/requesting officer					↔	<b>Risk</b> - 1. Loss of independent view 2. Role to protect interests of minority opposition group/s  <b>Mitigation</b> - 1. Extraordinary meetings 2. Specialists present to advise	
To review Members' Training Plan and, attendance at training etc	LB	April 2011 – March 2012	Review completed and Standards Committee issues advisories to 100% of any Members not demonstrating adequate commitment to development					↔	<b>Risk</b> - Stagnation/development opportunities lost  <b>Mitigation</b> – 1. Personal Development Reviews 2. Alternative methods to “training” 3. Private “face to face” meetings of Panel of Standards Committee to resolve any issues.	

**Strategic Priority: (What) Commissioners Corporate Governance Priorities**

**Development Priority (*We will*) : Relationship between Members and Political Groups**

Key actions <i>(by...)</i>	Responsible Officer	By when	Success Criteria / Measure – <i>(How do we know when you have achieved the key action?) Performance Indicator / an Action you will undertake / or both</i>	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	RAG Status and Trend	Risks & Risk Mitigation Commentary	Risk RAG and Trend
Compliance with the Political Management Protocols as adopted and incorporated into the Constitution by full Council on the 8 <sup>th</sup> March 2011	LB	March 2011 – May 2012	Zero reports from statutory officers to the Commissioners notifying breach of Protocols						<p><b>Risk</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Committees continuing to operate contrary to Allocations Protocol.</li> <li>2. Political instability, especially when current Intervention due to end.</li> <li>3. Criticism from Regulators/Welsh Government</li> </ol> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intervention by Commissioners</li> <li>2. Negotiate a new 'deal' as part of constitutional review</li> </ol>	

DRAFT

CYNGOR SIR YNYS MON/ISLE OF ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL

MEETING:	Standards Committee
DATE:	14 <sup>th</sup> December 2011
TITLE OF REPORT:	Corporate Government Themes – Report on Second Quarter
REPORT BY:	Solicitor to the Monitoring Officer
PURPOSE OF REPORT:	To provide information to the Standards Committee

1. The Commissioners have issued Strategic Priorities which are their priorities for Corporate Governance.
2. Three important aspects of these development priorities are:-
  - a) Standards of conduct and behaviour of Members and Officers
  - b) The effectiveness of the Council's Standards Committee
  - c) Relationship between Members and Political Groups.

Attached are copies of the three reports for the second quarter of the financial year i.e. up to the end of September 2011. The third quarter concludes at the end of December 2011 and reports will be prepared in early January.

3. The reports are the progress reports by the Commissioners to the Welsh Ministers.
4. The Committee's attention is drawn to the key actions which are in the left hand column of each of the reports and especially to the risks and risk mitigation commentary in the right hand column.