

Appendix 2

Scrutiny Consultation Schedule of Responses.

	Question Indicate how well you agree with the following statements 1 not at all – 5 strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5
1	I am happy with the Scrutiny First principle?	2	1	1	0 (1)	5 (3)
2	I think Scrutiny Committee should in general review all reports before they are considered by the Board?	1	1	5 (1)	0 (1)	2 (2)
3	I think the Scrutiny Committee should restrict its review to reports relating to transport strategy and investment decisions?	4 (1)	0 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)	0
4	I think the Scrutiny Committee reviews Board reports well?	1	1	4 (2)	2 (2)	1
5	I think the Scrutiny Committee has an appropriate level of officer support at its meetings?	1	0 (1)	4 (1)	1 (2)	2
6	Comment If not, what changes would you like to see?					
7	I think the comments made by the Scrutiny Committee are acted upon by officers?	0	1	4 (3)	1 (1)	1

8	I think the comments of the Scrutiny Committee have been adequately reported to the Board?	0	1	4 (3)	0 (1)	1
9	Comment If not, what changes would you like to see?					
10	I think the Scrutiny Committee has influenced Board decisions	0	2 (1)	4 (1)	1 (1)	0
11	Comment What improvements would you like to see to the way the Scrutiny Committee operates	It shouldn't have too much power - that's the point!				
12	I would like Scrutiny Committee to identify topics for review in a Scrutiny Work Programme	1	0	2	4 (2)	2 (2)
13	I think the work programme should be carried out through the Scrutiny Committee?	0	2 (2)	2 (1)	0 (1)	4
14	I think the work programme should be carried out through a small Scrutiny Panel	2	3 (1)	2 (1)	1 (1)	0 (1)
15	I agree that the Scrutiny Committee should meet virtually online as a Consultation Call unless required by law		1		1	2

	to hold a physical meeting					
16	I agree that the Scrutiny Committee should hold 50% of its meetings online as Consultation Calls	1	1	1	1	
17	I agree that the Scrutiny Committee should hold all its meetings physically as face-to-face meetings	4				
18	I agree that all physical meetings should be held at a central location either Leeds or Manchester		1			3

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

- I can't objectively comment on the effectiveness of the committee as I'm not exposed sufficiently enough to its operation
- I thoroughly enjoy & value the work of TfN scrutiny I participate in.
- I would like to more about actual achievements on the ground with a regularly updated critical path programme that clearly shows planned and funded programmes of work, key milestones, and therefore progress & slippage.
- I have proposed that one meet a year – the AGM is hold face to face. The rest need to be online in order to get better attendance and more expertise present. The scrutiny has some very highly qualified attendees that add serious value to the conversation. They would be lost by a need to travel such distances. The spread of the area mean that members could be travelling for two hours each way for a two-hour meeting. If you work for a living as many do, then this would be financially impossible and certainly discriminatory. Or we would need to look at paying compensation for lost work if it were possible to take the time off. From time to time there might be a need to go on a field trip and hold a meeting near an area of interest!
- It shouldn't have too much power - that's the point!