

# **What is 'Good Governance'? A Model of 'Good Governance' for restructuring English Local Government**

## **Introduction**

The Local Governance Research Unit at De Montfort University was commissioned to examine a number of issues around any future restructuring of local government in England by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. There were three sections to this report. The first focused upon the future role of a local councillor. The second examined issues around good governance appropriate to contemporary local government, from which this paper is based. The third section focused upon the issue of devolution in England.

The problem that exists in England, which is not prevalent across the rest of Europe, is the complexity of local government. Most obviously, there is not a uniform structure. Wilson & Game (2011) have described local government in England as "a dog's breakfast". There are both unitary and tiered authorities across England, some with elected mayors. Local authorities in London have to contend with the London Assembly - which is, effectively, a regional body. Across parts of England there has been the introduction of combined authorities with directly-elected metro-mayors - most notably in Manchester and Birmingham, but not to forget the likes of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough elected mayor. Cambridge and Peterborough are around 50 kilometres apart, but are now sharing a metro-mayor, along with much of that region.

When examining the issue of 'good governance' for local government, the original aim was to try to develop a single model which could underpin any future restructuring of local government. It became apparent very quickly, that a single model was not going to be viable. Instead, the focus moved to a number of issues surrounding the 'good governance' of any local authorities. These are the issues which need to be addressed in any proposed restructuring of local government.

It could be asked why does central government not impose a single structure on local government in England, as was been done to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland? When this was first investigated by the Banham Commission in the early 1990s, the aim appeared to be to push to unitary authorities across England, similar to that for the rest of the UK. What became apparent very quickly was that such a structure may not be appropriate in all parts of England. Consequently, the Banham Commission proposed a mixture of unitary and tiered authorities across England. Since then, there has been a more surreptitious push for unitary authorities, with many being imposed by the centre. It could be argued the underpinning of the investigations by the LGRU at DMU was to justify such a push.

## **What is governance?**

There are a multitude of ways in which the concept of governance can be defined. Gray (2000, p. 285), for example, examines how the state has moved from being a provider of services to an enabler and a regulator of the provision of these services. He goes further, arguing the central state has "lost control of the management and administration of goods and services" (p.288). This is all part of a move from government to governance. The managing and administration of these services is done by those who provide them - and that tends not to be the government. Instead, there are bodies who provide these goods and services on behalf of government.

Bache & Flinders (2004, p. 97) similarly describe governance as "the increased role of non-governmental actors in public policy making and delivery". In other words, quangos and other public bodies, as well as private companies, pressure and lobby groups, and voluntary organisations may all have a role to play in the formulation and delivery of public services at every tier of government.

Rather than the state delivering all of the services the public needs, the state instead finds other organisations to deliver these same services - but to do so more cost-effectively. This suggests the state actively, or at sub-national levels is actively encouraged or even forced, to find partners to deliver services. Offe (2009, p. 553) presents two rather blunt explanations of governance:

Private actors... substituting for deficient state capacities.

Private actors... take advantage of their power position in order to usurp genuinely public tasks.

Hooghe & Marks (2003) identify different types of multi-level governance. Regardless of the type of multi-level or multi-tier governance, it is seen "as an *alternative* to hierarchical government" (Hooghe & Marks, 2003, p. 234, their emphasis). According to Hooghe & Marks, there are two major types of multi-level governance. Type I sees "dispersions of authority to general purpose, non-intersecting, and durable jurisdictions" (Hooghe & Marks, 2003, p. 233). This can be seen within a federal structure, where power is shared between different tiers of government. There are clear boundaries in which the actors perform, and these boundaries, and the actors as well, are difficult to transform. Using the USA as an example, it would be very difficult indeed to create or abolish different tiers of government.

Type II governance sees "task specific, intersecting and flexible jurisdictions" (Hooghe & Marks, 2003, p. 233). Such an approach is seen as much more helpful to citizens, giving them a range of choice of service providers. The focus is upon the different services which need to be provided rather than who is providing these services. Different service providers may offer their services to different regions and locales, rather than being stuck within, for example, a single geographically-based unit such as a local council.

The reality with these two types of governance is they can and do co-exist. It is possible to see both types existing within the service delivery structures of a state. Both of them are clearly present within what has become the governance of the UK.

Local government has moved from being a provider of services to an enabler of services; quangos, at local, regional and national levels, are picking up greater responsibilities. More and more, the role of the government has become that of a regulator rather than as a deliverer of services. Within the UK there is now a complex, multi-tiered system of governance.

Offe, commenting more generally on governance, raises an important concern: the co-option of non-state actors... might either increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the policy in question through the coordination of responsibilities, or it might lead to the systematic creation of dependency of public authorities on private actors ("state capture") and outright corrupt practices. (Offe, 2009, p. 553)

The positive side of the above quote presents the reasons as to why the private sector or the voluntary sector may be better at delivering services than the public sector. Rather than the Type I governance of a rigid system of state provision within a geographically-confined area, the Type II approach, which focuses on the service being delivered rather than the deliverer of that service, might be seen as a better format. Such arguments would resonate most strongly with all those who want to gain government contracts or enter into public-private partnerships.

The second part of Offe's quote is one which tends not to be addressed - at least, not by those who want such structures to be put in place. If things go wrong, as they did with the privatisation of the British railway infrastructure, the building of the Channel Tunnel, the partnership established for the National Air Traffic Services (NATS), and the failure by a number of private businesses to run state schools properly, then the service delivery stops. Alternatively, the problem is transferred back to the state to pick up the pieces and to continue the service delivery, potentially until a new non-state service provider is found. The problem that arises here is who picks up any remaining liabilities?

One of the concerns around governance in the UK is the issue of accountability. Arguably, politicians are held to account for the way in which government is run - be it national, regional or local government. Whether holding such an election every four or five years is actually holding politicians to account can be debated. Arguably, that is still far more accountable than when a private company delivers a service on behalf of a public sector body. When such contracts last for ten or even twenty-five years, how does the average person in the street hold the supplier to account? Peterborough City Council, for example, no longer provides any services. Everything is contracted out in some form or another. It is suggested the private company is held to account, contractually, by the public sector partner e.g. the local council. Yet, if there is dissatisfaction with the delivery of the service, but it is within the contractual obligations, it would appear nothing can be done. Voting out the council may not help. The incoming ruling party may wish to break the contract, but there is likely to be a huge financial penalty for doing so. Such expense may be difficult to justify. As Kjær (2004) notes, for governance the focus is on efficiency. Democratic accountability is sometimes sidelined. The people want the most cost-effective service delivery possible, regardless as to who provides that service.

Thus when examining the issues around good governance for local councils, there are a number of issues that need to be raised:

- who makes policy?
- who implements policy?
- how is accountability maintained (in both of the above)?
- how are the various processes scrutinised?

While this may look relatively straight forward, this is not the case. It is complicated by a number of different factors. These include: whether or not there is an elected mayor; and, whether there is a unitary authority or tiered authorities. There will be other associated issues with regard to the geographical location of a local authority: there are different pressures on urban authorities compared to rural ones, not to forget those authorities that are a combination of both. Compare, for example, the following three unitary authorities: Birmingham City, Cornwall and Rutland. There are such large discrepancies in both population size and geographical spread, and with the consequential differing demands on

services, that is nigh on impossible to devise a single structure of good governance which would be both meaningful and applicable to all three councils.

Finally, with regard to the role of councillors in all of the above, there is the issue of having the time to complete the tasks, and to complete said tasks properly. Within this there are also the party political pressures - even for Independent councillors. To complicate matters still further, service delivery is often provided by bodies or organisations other than the council. There are issues around the scrutiny and accountability of such bodies, especially noting the length of contracts that have been negotiated.

### **Good Governance for English Local Government**

When examining the governance structures in English local government, there are a number of issues that need to be addressed. These include:

- how is policy made?
- who makes policy?
- who implements the policy decisions?
- where are the lines of accountability in all of the above?
- how is all of the above scrutinised?

For each of the above questions, there is likely to be a different answer depending upon the type of council. Unitary authorities have a wider range of responsibilities than individual councils in a tiered structure. There will also be different pressures on different councils: the pressures on urban authorities are significantly different to those on predominantly rural authorities. Policy making processes - and their scrutiny and accountability - may differ depending upon the management structures in place in a given council: for example, is it based on an elected mayor, a strong leader and cabinet system, or a committee system?

In an ideal, totally transparent structure, the whole decision making process should be visible. This goes from the source of a policy idea all of the way through to its implementation, or, just as importantly, the decision not to implement said policy. Included here should be the scrutiny of the whole process.

One of the alleged problems in the good governance of English local government is the extent of interference from the centre. The centre, for example, can restructure or abolish local government on a whim. It can require local government to deliver specific services - or, more accurately, require all local authorities to ensure said service is delivered. Even within the systems of scrutiny, the centre has placed requirements on all local authorities. The Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations (1990) lay down rules as to how seats must be allocated between the different political groups on all Committees and Sub-Committees of the Council. The legislation explains what is considered to be a 'group', as well as highlighting the need for political balance on all committees and sub-committees. While such legislation is a useful benchmark for the basic standards, it is sometimes impossible to implement. When looking at Leicester City Council, for example, it is difficult to ensure political balance on all committees and sub-committees when all but two councillors belong to the ruling group. It is important to note, however, that such legislation ought to be a benchmark but there do exist circumstances where the benchmark may not be met.

When examining the different models of running a council, it is possible to put in place some benchmarks. For example, it does not matter if there is an elected mayor or a strong leader

and cabinet system, as both systems are likely to use cabinets. The question arises as to the number of members that should sit on said cabinet. Across England, councils tend to use between six and nine cabinet members, plus the 'leader'. The variations often depend upon the geographical size of the cabinet, or the population size. A fixed number is not appropriate; the range of members is far more flexible. A council which operates a committee-based system does not have such concerns, but the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations (1990) comes into play much more prominently.

There is a similar issue with scrutiny committees. Scrutiny is a requirement, but it is often unclear as to what is under scrutiny. Scrutiny committees are often used as political weapons rather than actually scrutinising the policy making or the actions of the policy makers. In such circumstances, scrutiny committees can be far from effective. Conversely, there can be issues around the membership of such committees in particular when the vast majority of councillors are from one political group. In such circumstances there is the possibility of 'place-men' sitting on such committees, toeing the executive line in the hope of promotion. In Wales, legislation has been passed to compel the chair of scrutiny committees to belong to a political group other than the one which leads the council. While this might be an aspiration to consider in England, there remains the problem of councils being overwhelmingly dominated by one political grouping and the consequential increase in workload for those councillors who sit on or chair the scrutiny committees.

The number of scrutiny committees is not fixed. Numbers across England range from zero to eleven. In the case of zero scrutiny committees - which is a very rare position, and seems to be used in committee-based councils - the entire council acts as a scrutiny committee rather than handing the role down to a committee. It must be noted that there are many other committees on councils, most notably regulatory committees. Therefore it needs to be examined as to on how many committees any individual councillor may sit. This is an issue which was covered in the first paper, but it is worth noting that councillors sit on anything between zero and ten committees. Thus what needs to be considered is the frequency of these committee meetings. Some may be quarterly, others much more frequently. Added to this list are the extra *ad hoc* committee meetings which may be convened in response to a specific local issue or concern. Again, there are differences between individual councils.

The problem here is the assumption that each council works in isolation. As has already been noted, many services may be provided by non-council providers. Added to this, the relationships with adjoining councils (and this includes councils in a tiered relationship) needs to be considered as well. Joint working and the use of combined authorities is becoming more common across England, as councils work together to find more effective and efficient forms of decision making and service delivery. When drawing in issues of English devolution, this gets even more complicated and, potentially, cumbersome. Take, for example, the planned D2N2 devolution. This covers Nottingham and Derby City Councils, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils, and all of the district and borough councils in those tiered structures - of which there are seven in Nottinghamshire and eight in Derbyshire, as well as the Peak District National Park Authority. A consequence of this is the need for council representation on such bodies and the scrutiny of such bodies as well.

A final point to note on the good governance of councils is the development of technology. This appears to be something of a double-edged weapon. On the one hand, there is greater accessibility of any given council to the public, in particular through the use of e-mails and

social media. This has led to a large increase in the workload of many councillors, some of whom have withdrawn from social media usage after being 'trolled'.

The use of technology has enabled councils to keep their councillors fully informed of all proceedings. The other side of this coin is the deluge of information on individual councillors, where there is much anecdotal evidence of councillors feeling swamped by said deluge.

There is a small corollary here. While many councils are using social media and other forms of technology to inform their citizens, there is a small issue of access. Around three quarters of all homes in the UK have internet access. The remainder, assuming they are in a position to do so, can access e-mails and social media through services provided by local authorities eg libraries. The issue here is the extent to which these citizens are able to access such services. This applies, in particular, to large rural authorities where other services such as public transport have declined markedly. The consequence is the difficulty these citizens may have in accessing such services. There may be similar issues for the elderly and the infirm across all council areas in England.

### **A new model of local governance in England?**

The first point to note, prior to any model being developed, is the need to change the mindset of councils and councillors, as well as that of the centre. It could be argued that local government needs constitutional protection to prevent centrally designed changes being imposed on local government. Linked to this is the need for time to let any changes bed in. Over the past decade or so, there appears to have been endless change imposed on local government without any reflection upon the impact of earlier changes.

The mindset of the local councillors needs to change. There is a need to work towards striking a balance between the 'political' and the 'function' or 'operation' of local government. While there is political conflict in an election, there needs to be a change in some operations thereafter. There are councils which have tried to develop a more collegial method of operating, where the different political groups work together for the better of their council area. This involves a significant change in mindset, and it is one that cannot be delivered overnight. It must be acknowledged that in some council areas there are deep political divisions that have grown over the years, and have become entrenched. Similarly, the desire for political point scoring, especially through the scrutiny committees, needs to be balanced against the actual function of such committees. Again, such a change in mindset will be very difficult where there are longstanding political grievances.

Finally, before developing any model of good governance, there is the issue of transparency. To be able to hold elected local government to account, even when it is working with unelected bodies, requires openness and transparency. Without this, any trust in local government will be lost. Again, such a move requires a change in mindset.

From here we now move to a range of different issues that impact upon the good governance of a council. There is no fixed answer to any of the questions. Instead, when examining the role and function of a council with regard to good governance, these are the questions that may need to be raised and addressed.

#### **1. Structure**

In broad terms, this section focuses upon the size of a council. This could be in terms of population size as well as geographical area. The literature in this area highlights a number of issues (see Copus & Jones, 2013). Firstly, the evidence is split over the extent to which economies of scale exist with larger authorities. What is clear with larger authorities is the decrease in democratic participation - be this in voter turnout or engagement between councillors and members of the public.

This particular issue of 'size' of a council is wholly out of the hands of local government. Under the constitution of the UK, the decisions on the size, as well as the roles and functions, of councils is in the hands of the centre. There could be an issue over the need for constitutional protection of local government.

An issue which could be covered by this report is the question over tiered or unitary authorities, as well as the role for parish or town councils. Questions need to be raised over which is the most appropriate structure. Linked to this is the delivery of services. Academic sources, such as Wilson & Game (2011), detail very clearly as to which services are provided by which council in a tiered structure. This appears to have been set in stone since the restructuring of English local government in 1974. Arguably, it could be revisited.

When looking at the election of councillors, questions could be asked over ward size and the number of councillors per ward. While the focus tends to be upon getting a balance between the number of residents per councillor, there is another associated issue which needs to be raised. This is the different roles undertaken by councillors. Briefly, there are issues over the number of committees on which a councillor may sit, as well as the number of external bodies upon which councillors are expected to sit. The fewer councillors being elected means a greater number of bodies upon which each councillor will be expected to sit.

Subsequent to this is the number of councillors to be elected per ward - the district magnitude. Should there be single member wards or multi-member wards? Some councils use a mix of both.

Related to this is the electoral system. Rather than focusing upon the electoral formula, the focus could be placed upon two electoral rules prior to the formula:

- the district magnitude, as already noted above
- the type of ballot - ordinal voting, categoric voting, multiple votes, etc

Thereafter, the type of formula to be used could then be selected. Again, many people get hung up upon the proportionality of an electoral formula. The reality is the district magnitude has the greatest impact upon proportionality, not the formula (see Cocker & Jones, 2015, Appendix 1 for a succinct explanation of different electoral formulae).

## 2. Executive

Within the structure of the council, the first issue is which executive structure is desired:

- directly-elected mayor
- strong leader and cabinet
- committee structure

This will also feed into the relationship between the executive and the council.

When examining the issue of 'good governance', it is not about promoting a specific executive structure. Instead, the issue is about choosing the most appropriate executive structure for a given council. As has already been noted, different councils will benefit from different executive structures.

In simple terms, the debate can be started with a simple question: do you want or need a directly elected mayor? If the answer to that is 'yes', you can then move on to which form of mayoral system to adopt. If not, the supplementary question is: which non-mayoral executive system do you want - a strong leader with a cabinet, or a committee structure? In urban areas, there is a stronger argument for directly-elected mayors, as can be seen by the success of the elected mayor of London, but also smaller cities such as Leicester. Conversely, when a referendum was held for directly elected mayors in parts of England in 2012, nine out of ten cities voted against such a proposal. The turnout in Nottingham, a similar sized city to Leicester, was below 25%, with 57% voting against a mayor. Despite cities such as Manchester voting against such mayors at that time, the new metro-mayors have been imposed from the centre (after local consultation), and Manchester has such a mayor. Interestingly, the city of Bristol voted for a directly-elected mayor in 2012, and now has a metro-mayor as well, as Bristol is included in the West of England metro-mayor region.

A brief point to note is that there are different forms of mayoral system. Two different forms of directly-elected mayor have been used in England. The more prominent version sees a clear leader of the council with the power to pick a cabinet and to set the agenda for the council. The alternative is more akin to a manager, where power lies with the councillors and the full council than with the mayor (as was the case in Stoke-on-Trent). In this case, the mayor may be seen as little more than a figurehead.

### 3. Scrutiny

The issue of scrutiny is a very important one. Under both an elected mayor and a strong leader, there is a need for clear and robust scrutiny.

There is a key issue with regard to scrutiny: scrutiny of what?

There are many parts of local government that could be scrutinised:

- the executive (both individually and collectively)
- the law making processes
- the implementation of laws
- the relationship with external bodies. In a tiered system, there is a clear need to scrutinise the 'other' council. Yet there are also relationships with other service providers eg police, NHS, those bodies delivering services on behalf of the council, etc.
- spending

There then needs to be consideration as to how this scrutiny is carried out. With the 'internal' scrutiny, that of the council itself, this could be carried out by scrutiny committees. In such circumstances, questions arise as to who should chair such committees, as well as the political make-up of the committees. As has been noted earlier, there is legislation in place which deals with this specific issue. Perhaps, it should be left to the individual council to decide.

With external relationships, the burden of scrutiny becomes more problematic. With other public service providers

#### 4. Working with other bodies

Ever since the introduction of the 'enabling authority' in the early 1990s, as envisaged by the former Environment Secretary, Nicholas Ridley, a far greater emphasis has been placed upon the delivery of council services by non-council bodies. While there is a statutory obligation on councils to ensure specific services are delivered, the councils themselves may no longer 'deliver' the actual service. Thus there is a clear role for councils in scrutinising such service delivery.

Secondly, there are also interactions with local government quangos (or qualgos). Again such bodies are established to deliver a specific service at arm's length from the council. Such service delivery needs to be scrutinised as well.

Thirdly, there will be interactions with other public service delivery bodies, such as the police, emergency services and the NHS. Councils are again involved, through the establishment of various committees, to establish the terms of reference and to monitor the service provision. Added to this list could be Local Authority positions on school governing bodies.

Fourthly, there are interactions with other councils, through the establishment of combined authorities or simple cross-council workings. Again, this requires a serious input from each individual council.

Therefore questions have to be asked as to what is the relationship between a given council and these other bodies with which a council interacts. Some councils have identified numerous such relationships which require a council presence on some form of committee. These committees may only meet three or four times per year but there is also the workload associated with such roles beyond the actual committee meetings. Eastbourne Borough Council has identified 54 outside bodies, without specifying the number of councillors needed to sit on such bodies. Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council has identified 26 outside bodies which require a total of 39 councillor representatives and a further nine schools which require ten councillor representatives. Bristol City Council has identified 70 outside bodies which require 174 nominations, of which 133 are councillors. Southwark Council in London has identified the need for 335 places to be filled by councillors (including council committees). Of their 63 councillors, over half of them sit on three or more committees.

This leaves the question as to the role of councils and councillors on these committees. The individual councils have clear vested interests in the operations of these bodies; hence the need for council representation. This ensures a degree of answerability and accountability to both the council and to the general public.

#### Conclusion

When examining the good governance of a council, there are a number of key factors which need to be noted, which are summarised in the table below. These include issues around council size - both in terms of geography and of population. There are also issues around whether there should be unitary or tiered local government. With regard to the executive, there are issues around which form of executive is the most appropriate: elected mayor; strong leader and cabinet; committee system.

Interactions with bodies beyond the council need to be acknowledged. The question then arises as to what sort of council representation is required on such bodies. As councils are now developing more and more partnerships, there is a greater pressure upon councils to ensure there is a degree of public accountability. With a greater number of partnerships, the issue moves to what sort of presence the council should have in these partnerships. The increasing number sees more councillors sitting on even more committees and other bodies.

**Table: The Questions of 'Good Governance'**

Question	Issues	Examples
Structure	<p>Unitary Authority</p> <p>Tiered Authority</p> <p>Supplementary issue: Is there a need for Parish or Town councils?</p>	<p>Leicester City Council</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council, and the City of Lincoln Council, Boston BC, East Lindsey DC, West Lindsey DC, North Kesteven DC, South Kesteven DC, South Holland DC</p> <p>Boston BC has 24 Parish Councils, West Lindsey DC has 120 Parish Councils, East Lindsey DC has 163 Parish Councils. The City of Lincoln has one town council.</p>
Service delivery	<p>Public provider(s)</p> <p>Private providers(s)</p> <p>Supplementary issue: Scrutiny of contractual obligations Accountability for service delivery</p>	<p>Schools, social services, care homes</p> <p>Refuse collection, care homes</p> <p>Peterborough City Council has developed a Scrutiny Toolkit</p>
Executive	<p>Directly-elected mayor</p> <p>Strong leader and cabinet</p> <p>Committee system</p> <p>Supplementary issue: Where there is a cabinet structure, how many councillors should sit in the cabinet?</p>	<p>Leicester City Council, Lewisham Council, Liverpool City Council, Mansfield DC, Watford BC</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council, Milton Keynes BC, Nottingham City Council</p> <p>Worcester City Council, Oadby &amp; Wigston BC, Epsom &amp; Ewell BC</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council 10, Bolsover DC 10, Blaby DC 10 (but the constitution states between 3 and 10), Leicester City Council elected mayor plus up to 9 members of the executive.</p>

<p>Election of councillors</p>	<p>Single-member wards</p> <p>Multi-member wards  - uniform district magnitudes  - not uniform district magnitudes</p> <p>Mix of both</p> <p>Supplementary issues:  How many councillors should sit on the council?</p> <p>How many councillors in a multi-member ward?</p> <p>What electoral system should be used?</p> <p>Who should decide on the form of electoral system used?</p> <p>Frequency of elections  - whole council up for re-election  - elections by thirds  - biennial elections</p>	<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p> <p>Leicester City Council (not uniform), Southwark Council (uniform), Oadby &amp; Wigston BC (not uniform), Walsall BC (uniform), Wakefield DC (uniform)</p> <p>Northumberland County Council, East Riding of Yorkshire Council</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council -70, Northumberland County Council - 66, Leicester City Council - 54</p> <p>The norm is two or three</p> <p>The Block Vote is used in multi-member wards, Simple Plurality in single member wards</p> <p>In Scotland, the Scottish Parliament made the decision to move to STV for local elections</p> <p>All county councils and London Boroughs elect the whole council, as does Leicester City Council, Melton BC, High Peak BC, Dacorum BC, and Bolsover DC</p> <p>Councils which elect by thirds include: Derby City Council, Rossendale BC, Peterborough City Council, and Welwyn Hatfield BC</p> <p>Councils which elect every two years include: Oxford City Council, Gosport BC, and Nuneaton and Bedworth BC</p>
--------------------------------	--	--

<p>Scrutiny</p>	<p>Need to consider how scrutiny should be undertaken</p> <p>Need to consider 'what' should be scrutinised</p> <p>Supplementary issues: Who should take the lead on scrutiny?</p> <p>How should the 'lead' be appointed?</p>	<p>Most councils have specific scrutiny committees. In some cases, scrutiny is undertaken by the whole council</p> <p>Peterborough City Council scrutiny toolkit</p> <p>The full council - Peterborough City Council</p> <p>Appointed by elected mayor - Leicester City Council; appointed by full council - Wakefield DC</p>
<p>Interactions with outside bodies</p>	<p>Consider the need for council representation on such bodies</p> <p>Supplementary issues: How is accountability and answerability ensured?</p> <p>If there is no need for council representation on such bodies, what becomes of the role of a councillor?</p>	<p>East Sussex County Council identified 32 external bodies; Eastbourne DC identified 54; Bristol City Council identified 70</p>

A short caveat to this table is that there is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer to each of the issues. It is subjective. Responses will depend upon, for example, the type of council: the needs and requirements of each council differ.

### *Selected bibliography*

Bache, Ian & Flinders, Matthew (eds.) (2004); *Multi-level Governance* Oxford University Press

Cocker, Phil & Jones, Alistair (2015); *Contemporary British Politics and Government* Cambridge Media, 4th edition

Copus, Colin & Jones, Alistair (2013); "Welsh Local Government Association Literature Review on Council Size: Commission on Public Service Governance & Delivery Service Provider Consultation" as part of the WLGA submission to the Williams Commission

Gray, Clive (2000); "A 'Hollow State'?" in Pyper, Robert & Robins, Lynton (eds.); *United Kingdom Governance* Macmillan, pp. 283-300

Hooghe, Liesbet & Marks, Gary (2003); "Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance" *American Political Science Review* vol. 97-2, pp. 233-243

Kjær, Anne Mette (2004); *Governance* Polity Press

Offe, Claus (2009); "Governance: An "Empty Signifier"?" *Constellations* vol. 16-4, pp. 550-562

Rhodes, R. A. W. (2007); "Understanding Governance: ten years on" *Organization Studies* vol. 28-8, pp. 1243-1264

Rutter, Jill (2011); "The State of UK Governance" *Public Policy and Administration* vol. 27-1, pp. 89-95

Wilson, David & Game, Chris (2011); *Local Government in the United Kingdom* Palgrave, 5th edition

### *Web sites*

[www.civilsociety.co.uk](http://www.civilsociety.co.uk) presents some interesting perspectives on governance from the perspective of charities and the voluntary sector

[www.good-governance.org.uk/](http://www.good-governance.org.uk/) The Good Governance Institute is an advisory organisation which focuses on aspects of good governance, especially in relation to the provision of health and healthcare

[www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-revenue-customs/about/our-governance](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-revenue-customs/about/our-governance) the perspective of governance from a quango