

ANNEX 2

Figure 1: Five models of accountability at ward/area level

Model	Typical ward/area structure	What it means for local elected members	What it means for residents
Model 1: Traditional	Area committee (i.e. membership of councillors only, with formally delegated powers) Ward committee (same but at ward level)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Members get to decide , based on what they think is in the best interests of wards/constituents ▪ Take on responsibility for what happens in wards ▪ But also means they do all the work, with no extra inputs from residents ▪ Focus on elections as main contact with residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vote at local election time, and hand over control of decisions in wards to members through the election mandate ▪ Could also campaign for local members at elections, or stand themselves ▪ But their other potential contributions to the ward are not included, or take place outside members' work
Model 2: Telling	As above, <i>plus</i> Information to residents about decisions members have made (outside of election campaigning)	As above, <i>plus</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More communication between elections ▪ Extra work e.g. newsletters, websites, blogs, posters etc ▪ Helps to publicise members' positive work for wards ▪ But also have to explain and justify unpopular or controversial decisions 	As above, <i>plus</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Might feel democracy is more transparent ▪ Could help awareness of members' work ▪ Fits with people's ideas about how democracy works ▪ But might still disagree with some decisions ▪ And still only have elections as their main voice/influence
Model 3: Telling and listening	As above, <i>plus</i> Consultation with residents on public opinion	As above, <i>plus</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extra work organising consultation and gathering public opinion ▪ Might need to change or adapt decisions based on public opinion ▪ Could help make decisions more popular and based on residents' views ▪ Decisions might be more workable, and avoid conflict 	As above, <i>plus</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents have more of a voice ▪ Might feel more listened to and responded to ▪ Fits with people's ideas about how democracy works ▪ Majority could be happier with decisions if they are based on their views ▪ But the minority might get or feel left out

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ But might not always be what members feel is in best interests of wards, and might still mean members go against public opinion ▪ Danger of ‘those who shout the loudest’, but not if consultation is done properly ▪ Involves careful negotiation and dialogue 	
Model 4: Interest groups	Area or ward structures which also have membership from interest group representatives (e.g. BME rep; voluntary sector rep etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes decision-making to include people who are not elected ▪ Members need to negotiate and broker between competing interests ▪ Minorities, new voices and people who ‘shout quietly’ are included ▪ Includes new groups and voices in decisions e.g. business community ▪ Danger of gatekeepers to communities, and hard to decide who is a rep ▪ Still means members are in the deciding and doing role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interest groups feel more included, and their needs are more likely to be met ▪ Residents/interest groups could feel more part of democracy ▪ Residents who are involved are more likely to share responsibility for decisions ▪ But people not connected to interest groups might feel left out ▪ Still leaves residents just giving opinions, not helping actually do things
Model 5: Collective problem-solving	<p>Members create a framework for wards, with goals and priorities for action</p> <p>And within that framework, a wide range of groups, organisations and individuals do their own thing but they all contribute to action and goals for the wards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Members’ roles change from deciding and doing, to overseeing and setting direction ▪ Members benefit from many more additional inputs to ward working, so more action might happen ▪ Releases creative ideas and harnesses new ways of addressing issues ▪ But members need to adapt to ‘being in charge when you’re not in charge’ – a new way of working ▪ Members need to be able to cope with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents’ contributions are recognised; they are ‘local experts’ who work with members to solve problems ▪ Residents could feel more welcomed into democracy and less like ‘them and us’ ▪ Moves away from discussions/arguments about decisions by members to more consensus and collective problem solving ▪ Brings activity together so people are going in the same direction, so residents might feel their small projects are contributing to the bigger picture

		<p>more flexibility and less formal processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Could use a version of Scrutiny adapted for ward work to maintain accountability▪ Everyone gets the credit for work done across the ward regardless of who did it	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ But puts extra demands on residents to help solve problems, and relies on their being people who are active (or could be encouraged to be active)
--	--	--	---