



**Audit and Standards Advisory
Committee**
5 February 2019

**Report from the
Chief Finance Officer**

**Audit and Standards Advisory Committee – Self
Assessment options**

Wards Affected:	N/A
Key or Non-Key Decision:	N/A
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
No. of Appendices:	None
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer(s): <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	Michael Bradley Head of Audit and Investigations Email: michael.bradley@brent.gov.uk Tel: 020 8937 6526

1.0 Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report provides options for the conduct of an assessment of the performance of the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee (ASAC).

2.0 Recommendation

2.1 That the Audit and Standards Advisory Committee considers the options and provides direction on a preferred route to assess the performance of the Committee.

3.0 Detail

3.1 At the ASAC meeting in December 2018, a request was made to consider options for how the Committee could best assess its own performance and the value that it is adding to the Council.

Options

3.2 We have proposed three options to take this forward:

- a) A questionnaire to be completed by key stakeholders (members of the ASAC, selection of senior officers);
- b) A facilitated workshop(s) to engage and challenge members (to be facilitated e.g. by CIPFA/ Institute of Internal Auditors), and
- c) An independent review by a third party; peer members group.

4.0 Option Appraisal

Option	Pros	Cons
1. Self-Assessment Questionnaire	A quick, cost-effective exercise to gauge members opinion on how well the purpose and objectives of the Committee are achieved.	A questionnaire approach may be perceived as superficial and lacking in independent assessment.
2. Workshop	Effective facilitation can encourage optimum input and engagement from all members. Appropriate planning can focus the session on key issues in a tight timescale.	Relatively time-consuming compared to a questionnaire approach. There are potential costs in the region of £5k. There is also a risk of low attendance.
3. Peer review	This approach can introduce elements of benchmarking and thereby access to best practice.	It may be difficult to identify a suitable/ willing peer

5.0 Scope

5.1. The scope for this exercise will need to cover all elements of the Committee's terms of reference to provide an assessment on how well it is fulfilling that specific remit. In addition, potential areas for review may include:

- Induction;
- Training;
- Skills audit (key skills requirements and current coverage by members);
- Independence;
- Impact on achievement of objectives;
- Access to, and use of, other sources of assurance;
- Delivery against Terms of reference, and
- Interaction with Full Council, Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee activity.

6.0 Reporting

6.1. The report will be written to cover all aspects of the scope and provide recommendations for development where necessary.

7.0 Financial Implications

7.1 There are no specific financial implications associated with noting this report.

8.0 Legal Implications

8.1 There are no specific legal implications associated with noting this report.

9.0 Equality Implications

9.1 None.

10.0 Consultation with Ward Members and Stakeholders

10.1 None.

Report sign off:

CONRAD HALL
Chief Finance Officer