

Proving the impact of scrutiny

Centre for Public Scrutiny - Annual Conference 2018

Dr Dave Mckenna

My hopes for this workshop

1. We discover lots of the good work you are already doing
2. The frameworks I'm going to share later will be useful for you
3. We get lots of useful work done
4. Our work together is enjoyable and helpful

Consider this...

On a scale of zero to ten, where ten is 'we are the world's best' and zero is the complete opposite,....

how good are the councillors and officers at your council when it comes to demonstrating the impact of scrutiny work?

Introductions

My name is

I had for breakfast

I'm with Council

And we score ... out of ten for
demonstrating the impact of scrutiny

What are the **practical things** that scrutiny councillors and officers in your council **do now** that help you to get to your 'score out of ten'?

Groups of three

Interviewer

Interviewee

Observer

What are the **practical things** that scrutiny councillors and officers in your council **do now** that help you to get to your 'score out of ten'?

What else?

What else?

Six helpful frameworks

Helpful questions to start with

1. What works well for us already?
2. Who are our audience and what do they need?
3. Exactly what question should we be trying to answer?

Demonstrating impact =





UCI

Policy impact

Constitution Unit, University College London

**SELECTIVE
INFLUENCE**

**THE POLICY IMPACT OF
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SELECT COMMITTEES**

MEG RUSSELL AND MEGHAN BENTON

The Constitution Unit

Forms of policy influence:

- Direct government acceptance of committee recommendations
- Influencing policy debate
- Spotlighting issues and altering policy priorities
- Brokering in policy disputes
- Providing expert evidence
- Holding government and outside bodies accountable
- Exposure
- Generating fear (anticipated reactions)

Parliamentary Scrutiny of Government

Outcomes

Institute of Government

Dr Hannah White



Impact	Questions for qualitative assessment	Possible qualitative evidence	Possible quantitative evidence
Evidence	Has the scrutiny drawn on any original research? ... contributed to the evidence on which government policy was based (e.g. by making relevant new voices heard)? ... prompted the Government to gather different/more up-to-date evidence?	Analysis of documentary sources, focus groups, workshops or interviews may be used to discern the views of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • those subject to scrutiny • those conducting scrutiny • third parties in the scrutiny process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to bills or regulatory changes made following recommendations in a report • Number/proportion of report recommendations accepted • Evidence of novel research conducted • Quantifiable financial savings arising from recommendations • Quantifiable non-financial benefits or trends, such as reductions in numbers of PQs or FOI requests
Analysis	Has the scrutiny highlighted any previously unrecognised trends in the evidence? ... identified the salience of particular issues? ... highlighted a weight of opinion on the evidence, of which the Government was unaware? ... changed the perspective of key decision makers in government on an issue?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of references to parliamentary scrutiny in government documents, the media, parliamentary proceedings, judicial proceedings, think-tank reports, etc. • Independent assessments of impact, e.g. Theyworkforyou polls on adequacy of answers to PQs • Quantitative surveys of interested parties
Openness	Has the scrutiny... ... improved the quality of information provided by government? ... increased the quantity/breadth of information provided by government?		
Learning	Has the scrutiny caused the Government to review or question its own actions or policies? ... identified lessons that can help improve policies and how they are implemented? ... created a positive environment in which lessons can be learnt?		
Processes	Has the scrutiny changed the Government's approach to policymaking or to planning policy implementation? ... changed the Government's risk appetite? ... made government more proactively open? ... made ministers and civil servants prioritise their own effectiveness?		
Context	Has the scrutiny made other actors aware of a previously unrecognised issue? ... changed other actors' evaluation of an issue? ... helped build relationships or coalitions in support of certain perspectives on an issue? ... influenced trust in government?		
Democracy	Has the scrutiny affected levels of public trust in the political system?		

Parliamentary Scrutiny of Government –
Institute of Government, Hannah White
(2015)

Scrutiny Annual Report
2017/18

DRAFT

Results scorecard

City and County of Swansea



Scrutiny Practice	A. How much scrutiny did we do?	B. How well did we do?
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of committee meetings = 13 ↔ (13) 2. Number of panel & working group meetings = 69 ↓ (91) 3. Number of in-depth inquiries completed = 1 ↓ (4) 4. Number of working group topics completed = 7 ↑ (4) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Councillors who say they have a good understanding of the work of scrutiny = 100% ↑ (97%) 6. Staff who say they have a good understanding of the work of scrutiny = 100% ↑ (45%) 7. Average councillor attendance at scrutiny meetings = 68% ↑ (67%) 8. Backbench councillors actively involved in scrutiny = 80% ↑ (76%) 9. Councillors who agree that the level of support provided by the Scrutiny Team is either excellent or very good = 91% ↑ (88%) 10. Staff who agree that the level of support provided by the Scrutiny Team is either excellent or very good = 79% ↑ (63%) 11. Councillors who agree that the scrutiny arrangements are working well = 85% ↓ (89%) 12. Staff who agree that the scrutiny arrangements are working well = 92% ↑ (39%)

Scrutiny Outcomes	C. How much did scrutiny affect the business of the Council?	D. What were the outcomes of scrutiny?
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Number of chairs letters written to cabinet members = 63 ↓ (77) 14. In depth inquiries reported to Cabinet = 1 ↓ (4) 15. Action plans agreed = 2 ↓ (4) 16. Follow ups undertaken = 4 ↑ (3) 17. Number of Cabinet reports subject to pre decision scrutiny = 12 ↑ (9) 18. Cabinet members who attended at least one question and answer session at the Scrutiny Programme Committee = 100% ↔ (100%) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 19. Scrutiny recommendations accepted or partly accepted by Cabinet = 92% ↑ (81%) 20. Recommendations signed off by scrutiny as completed = 74% ↓ (93%) 21. Councillors who agree that scrutiny has a positive impact on the business of the Council = 84% ↑ (69%) 22. Staff who agree that scrutiny has a positive impact on the business of the Council = 92% ↑ (41%) 23. Councillors who agree that the Scrutiny Work Programme balances community concerns against issues of strategic risk and importance = 85% ↑ (77%) 24. Staff who agree that the Scrutiny Work Programme balances community concerns against issues of strategic risk and importance = 75% ↑ (34%)

A model to measure the return on investment of
overview and scrutiny

Return on investment

Centre for Public Scrutiny



Process benefits of the review	Outcome changes in the topic/condition/area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Improved networking. ✓ Increased awareness of the chosen topic by all and the value of better communication. ✓ A shared understanding of a problem and possible solutions. ✓ Clear recommendations created on what can be measured and for which groups. ✓ Recommendations valued and adopted by Council's Executive, Health and Wellbeing Board, Commissioning Groups and providers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Short-term change in a proxy measure. ✓ Aspirations for long term improvements and commitment to measure progress over time. ✓ An increase in the number of people from X group who self manage. ✓ A movement along the social determinants "wheel". ✓ % improvement in smoking cessation. ✓ Increase in community activity. ✓ % improvement in the number of children deemed ready for school. ✓ % reduction in young people Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEETs).

Tipping the Scales, Su Turner and Linda Phipps, Centre for Public Scrutiny (2012)

Strengthening Health System Governance

Better policies, stronger performance

Governance (TAPIC)

European Observatory on Health
Systems and Policies

Edited by
Scott L. Greer
Matthias Wismar
Josep Figueras

TAPIC =

Transparency

Accountability

Participation

Integrity (things work as they should)

Capacity (to develop policy)

Reach and significance

Research Excellence Framework



Research Excellence Framework

The REF is the system for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions.



▶ **Draft Guidance on
submissions**

▶ **Draft panel criteria and
working methods**

▶ **Consultation webinars**

▶ **Expert panels**

276. **Reach** will be understood as the extent and/or diversity of the beneficiaries of the impact, as relevant to the nature of the impact.

277. **Significance** will be understood as the degree to which the impact has enabled, enriched, influenced, informed or changed the performance, policies, practices, products, services, understanding, awareness or well-being of the beneficiaries.

Six frameworks: A reminder

Policy impact

Outcomes

Results scorecard

Return on investment

Governance (TAPIC)

Reach and significance

Proving the impact of scrutiny

Centre for Public Scrutiny - Annual Conference 2018

Dr Dave Mckenna