

Questionnaire comment

Analysis

Council Response

How people choose their community councillors

Voting & Nominations

- The nominating of community councillors should be done on a more open and widely available to all residents basis. At present only 2 people can nominate a community councillor. This should be extended to the whole town/village for EVERYONE to participate in the nomination/voting process. Local authorities are alienating the majority (99%) of the community. This ought to have been changed years ago., not now. Hopefully this will be taken on board and put in place before next year.
- All residents do not get/have a chance to vote/nominate the best people to serve their town as a community councillor. It seems that there are too many cliques within some.
- Allow residents to do an "open public" vote as we do for local councillors. Put nominee's names on a voting sheet and ask residents to put a X against their choice of person to be on as community councillors up to the maximum number allowed.

The nomination process for election to a community council is open and publicly advertised to ensure that all residents have the same chance to nominate people they think will be the best community councillors. The suggestion for the combined nomination and ballot method requires people to be present to nominate and vote and is something we could consider in the future if there was further evidence that people would participate in that way. Serving community councillors can nominate each other but have no control over who else is nominated. As long as residents take part in the nomination they can influence and change membership make-up.

The comments broadly describe the nomination and ballot stage of the current election process and we are not suggesting an alternative method at this point. Views expressed in the questionnaire were supportive of the current nomination and election method.

Proceed with existing nomination and election processes.

Office-bearers

- For Example. Friends are nominating friends at the AGM's and no one else gets a turn of being an office bearer even although there are people who can carry out the role better and more diligently. The constitution has to be made fairer as well and state that after 4 years maximum, community councillors must step down as office bearers.
- The constitution has to be made fairer as well and state that after 4 years maximum, community councillors must step down as office bearers.

Community councils do recognise the benefit of rotating office-bearers and strive to do so but setting a maximum has drawbacks as well as benefits. Arrangements for office bearers can be set in the constitution to suit the community council in question.

Community councils are generally wary of setting a maximum office term and would prefer to have flexibility on this.

We will continue to allow each community council to agree office-bearer appointments and the process to suit their own arrangements rather than through the Scheme.

-
-
- Stricter guidelines re: electing office bearers. If a person accepts the position then they should be allowed to take that one up. No second voting needs to be carried out

This appears to be a suggestion that the first person to be nominated for an office should be appointed. If so, it goes against the democratic principle that everyone should have a chance to take on a community council role, and it cuts down options open to a community council for filling an office-bearer position.

We would encourage a process which promotes deliberation and choice. However, this process remains in the control of community councils and we do not wish to add it to the Scheme.

Proceed without the addition of guidelines for office-bearer appointments.

How people become community councillors

Election versus appointment

- Election is the best process but I would keep the co-option as this will learn someone about the community council and how to be a community councillor and get them interested in staying on the community council.
- Despite willing and best intention to get quality contributions to the community councils we do not always get sufficient representation through election. With this in mind the option of co-opting members better suits the reality of our community availability, awareness and motivation to support community councils. The terminology around "elections" can also put feelings of pressure and discomfort with individuals who don't fully understand the role of the community councils.
- The timing of elections can often be through periods when likely candidates are on holiday so that we again miss out on good candidates.

We note the role that co-option can play in breaking down perceived barriers to standing for election to a community council.

Add co-option as a means by which people become community councillors.

Community councils agree with this comment.

It is difficult to find a slot in the year in which to conduct an election process which gives people enough notice and time to take part without coming close to or into conflict with a holiday period. The current nomination process lasts 3 weeks to give people taking the average 2-week holiday a chance to submit nominations. We realise this does not suit everyone but community councils know in advance the schedule of every election to give them time to plan how to publicise it locally.

Although it is not a safety net for catching people who are on holiday at the time of a regular election, we will add co-option as a means by which people become community councillor when a vacancy arising in between elections.

Election Method (Current Process)

- I have been approached by many people in who think that community councillors should be elected by a public vote NOT by nomination. I suppose in the same way that local councillors are elected. I agree with that totally. This "nomination" procedure does not bode well with the public in general and it would be a fairer and above board way of getting people to become community

The current election process does model the way by which local councillors are elected. We recognise that participation in community council elections ranges from passive to active so we are open to suggestions for approaches which better engage the public and which

Proceed with current process.

councillors. In other words, it would be the public's choice not the local authorities. After the public vote. the local authority would then check the "nominated" cc's for the electoral role. The decision should come back to the public at large. Also the public vote the office bearers too.

apply across the Local Authority area.

We note that it may not be enough for members of the public that the Scheme sets out the process by which people become members of a community council.

We will clarify this in the model constitution.

Although this did not come out through the questionnaire as a common view, the low response from the public to this consultation does suggest people are not interested in this sort of 'house-keeping ' issue.

We continue to welcome suggestions for new approaches which will motivate people to play an active part in the level of local democracy community councils provide.

However, we know the contrary to be true in most of our communities when it comes to matters which concern their community and where they recognise that the community council plays an important role in such matters, people do not remain passive.

- The community councils method of elections should be an integral part of it's constitution .

- people are not interested

Option for community council-run elections

- Why introduce new methods of election? How will this increase the number of nominations for CCs which MCC believes is the real issue?

This was proposed on the assumption that community councils would know best how to arrange an election to ensure optimum nominations. If this assumption is incorrect, we accept there is less merit in the proposal.

The proposal to allow community council-controlled elections will be removed.

- I do not agree that community councils have this power. In my opinion it would leaves it open to cronyism !
- No. Need a third party to stop rigging, electoral fraud etc.
- As long as it is an open and democratic process it would be fine. However, it would need someone to keep an eye on the process to

We note concerns and perceptions of scope for lack of impartiality. We also note that having more than one election method could cause confusion. If either of these were to lead to reduced participation in the election

prevent the CC's manipulating things to their own ends.

- Very bad idea as some people are community councillors for the wrong reasons i.e. for themselves. They don't seem to understand that it is for the community they carry out the role and not just to make themselves look great! There would have to be very strict guidelines/ disclaimers to the effect put in place and adhered to by all concerned.
- Having different methods of election, within the Clackmannanshire area, albeit ones that have been approved by the Council, will create confusion in the minds of the electorate and may open up claims of local election 'rigging'!!
- I do not agree with this as this could allow Community Councils to become insular and set-up elections in a way that would be favourable to the return of the same community Councillors term after term. Terms should be fixed and elections held in the proper manner. Elections should be overseen by Local Authority.
- I think this should be kept centralised at Clackmannanshire council level to maintain consistency and avoid overburdening already very busy volunteers. Is your suggestion just a cost cutting exercise for the council?
- I think this is a JOKE, community councils require the Council to organise and arrange elections which as things stand are not working due to lack of general information given to people.
- To allow community councils to organise their own elections would mean an area like Alloa which originally was split into 5 separate areas would mean whichever area the bulk of its members are from will ultimately use their area rather than request others be invited!
- waste of time
- Good idea as those who are well enough resourced to run their own will take on this responsibility and those who do not feel ready to do so will still have the original option
- Okay give it a try.
- Good idea
- If they are doing good for the community then by all means yes

process by the electorate, it would defeat the purpose of the proposal.

Although the scale and format of elections would be up to the community council, it is inevitable that another piece of work such as this will increase volunteer workload. The proposal gave community councils the option but not the duty, and did make it clear the Council would continue to administer community council elections if asked to do so.

The proposal aimed to prevent this, on the basis that community councils would know best to ensure equitable participation from all the areas they represent.

The comments in support of this proposal are heavily outweighed by comments against them. Community councils themselves do not support this proposal.

We remain open to suggestions for approaches which strengthen local democracy and improve participation.

How community council vacancies which arise in between elections are filled

Elections

- Casual vacancies should be voted on by the public (NOT CO -OPTED) election
- "Clackmannanshire Council will make arrangements for top up elections in the January of the second and third years after every regular election to fill only vacancies arising since the previous election" [proposed paragraph 8] is the most logical and secure way to fill vacancies
- By asking neutral people to come on board i.e. non family members/friends. They should be voted on by a public vote by everyone in the town/village.
- The vacancies should be public and not done in-house with friends or family member. This is a conflict of interest.
- perhaps a fast track mini pop up election process would be more effective in recognising contributions and legitimising membership than more co-option with some of the risks that a looser regime might bring.
- MCC also supports the introduction of a Top Up election process to allow members to be elected to bring the CC up to full strength. Also, where circumstances arise, the option of filling a casual vacancy via a Top Up election may be valid, for example, when a casual vacancy arises a few weeks before an arranged Top Up election (see last paragraph of existing Sec.9).
- MCC agrees that Interim Elections should take place when the conditions outlined in the draft Scheme occur

Co-option

- Co-option by 2/3 majority of present local councillors.
- Co-option onto community councils is a good idea to teach someone and to get them interested. I would continue this.
- Should be able to co-opt
- Co-opting allows us to ensure we have a full compliment of representation of the community, plenty pairs of hands to under take

We note the interest of the public in openness and transparency. This interest is shared by community councils and confirms our approach that election is the method by which people become community councillors.

Proceed with top-up elections proposal and amend wording to clarify that elections apply to all vacancies.

Although not the ideal method by which people become community councillors, and because elections cannot always be arranged at short notice, we accept that community councils need vacancies to be filled in-between elections.

Add Co-option as a means of filling vacancies arising between elections.

the numerous activities we under take, and the flexibility to approach members of the public who we know would benefit/bolster/strengthen our cohort. Further to this, we would be keen to be allowed to co-opt councillors (albeit without voting rights) up to our maximum of 14 if we do not get the requisite numbers during an election. Given that any nominations that are received below the 14 means that candidates are elected unopposed, it surely follows that any nominated candidate for cooption by dcc would fall under the same process. We don't see that there are any substantive differences between the two.

- A co-opted member, voted on with the two-thirds majority safeguard, as outlined in existing Sec. 9, should be allowed to continue until the next regular election
- existing limits on how many people can be co-opted, to prevent the number of co-opted members outnumbering the number of elected members, would remain in place. This approach offers the benefit of keeping a CC, when it loses one or more of its members, at the original number elected.
- the wording of Sec. 8.5 suggests that Top Up elections, rather than Co-options, are to be used when a vacancy occurs through a resignation, etc.. This would seem to be a retrograde step. Also, waiting until the start of the 2nd year to replace a casual vacancy is, potentially, too long a period to wait for an election to fill a vacant position. MCC supports the re-introduction of Sec. 8 and 9 relating to the reasons why vacancies might occur and to co-opting replacement community councillors (and also Sec. 13, the reasons for disqualification), as soon as a vacancy on the CC occurs
- The Scottish Governments' Model SoE and many other Council SoEs, allow for co-options when casual vacancies arise.
- In the case of a CC which has not managed to achieve full membership at the regular election, Co-option should only be used if a casual vacancy occurs.
- The problem with co-opting is that the community councillors will bring in people they know and who share an ethos. This takes away from an open and democratic process. I'm not sure what the solution is but if it could be advertised locally and open to anyone in the area

Community councils have made strong representation on co-options in favour of having a control over a method of replacing people who resign or are no longer eligible without delay and with minimum impact on workload.

Co-option not only fills vacancies without delay but it is also a valuable method of building confidence and commitment of people who would not in the first instance stand for election but wish to volunteer.

We agree that co-option should only be used for vacancies arising between elections. In the interests of expediency, we are allowing existing elected community councillors to elect people to fill the vacancy. As with all community council business, the process of co-option must be open and

Proceed with addition of provision for co-option

to put their name forward it may bring a wider range of experience. I don't know who would choose the person to fill the vacancy but it shouldn't be the existing community councillors. transparent.

Other

- Either is okay.
- Using the top-up election method so long as co-opting a small number is still available
- Prefer formal way of becoming a Community Councillor. With regards casual vacancies, there should be a time limit. If say a vacancy comes up within first 2 years of a say 4 year term, then a formal election should be held. If after this then co-opting with approval of the Community Council AND those present at meetings should be allowed.
- Ok as is but not unhappy with interim elections
- They should advertise it to the local community

We are happy that current arrangements and the provision for co-options ensure safeguards will be in place to ensure the process of co-option is fair, transparent and used appropriately.

Involving people in community council business

Meeting format

- The community councils must ensure that their meetings are held in an accessible meeting room by disabled members of the community and the format of the meeting must ensure that blind and other disabled attendees are not excluded due to their disability.
- This would ultimately depend on the actual meeting in process, if there is to be a speaker in which a large portion of the electorate attend then it should be a format in keeping with same!
- Depends on the people on board.
- They should allow different age groups to chair meetings
- Community Councils are best placed to know what format will work with the people they serve . Workshop or small group activity with skillful facilitation allows more voices to be heard and guards against the domination of meetings by one or two assertive voices.
- okay with me
- I do not see a problem with this as long that the method is within its constitution
- No they should address their own agendas.
- I think this will lead to inconsistency and disputes
- They do not always keep to the agenda
- Whatever the format, the minimum number of meetings outlined in the current Scheme, namely, 4 plus an 'AGM', should continue. We believe an annual public 'summary' meeting should still be required, though it doesn't need to be called an AGM, per se, in addition to at least 4 other, fully, public meetings.
- Setting aside one third of total meeting, to ascertain 'community views', seems to be far too prescriptive. How will such a requirement be calculated and monitored? Members of the community should simply be encouraged to comment upon and/or raise questions to the CCLrs present, at any point, during any CC meeting. Hence, the need to hold a minimum number of public meetings, per annum (e.g. 5, per annum - see Q.7 above).

Provisions in the Scheme are consistent with ensuring inclusion of all sectors of the community.

We agree that community councils are best placed to choose the appropriate format for each meeting.

It is already the case that community councils cannot take decisions which come into conflict with their constitution.

We note that traditional meeting format is easier for some members of the public to engage with.

The minimum has been set to balance the volume of work involved in fulfilling the core function and the spare time of volunteers. Community councils can already increase the number of times they meet per year beyond the minimum.

Community councils have assured us that setting aside time at meetings to ascertain community views is their core function and time to carry out this function should be allocated according to demand, not set out prescriptively.

Community comment suggests it is not so much meeting time that allows community

Proceed with proposed provision.

Proceed with proposed provision

Comments regarding meeting discipline have been shared with community councils.

No change to minimum number of meetings per year

The proposed provision is unnecessary and has been removed.

views to be ascertained but communication and engagement strategies.

Better involving residents

- One way round the problem of not having 14 Community Councillors elected at a regular election within the Community Council Boundaries would be to appoint individuals to a sub-committee who are not elected Councillors. These individuals shall have no voting rights on the Community Council but may be granted voting rights on the sub-committee in question. For example: a) Public transport;b)Education;c) Disablement issues;d) State of public parks;e) Licensing matters.
- MCC also suggests the introduction of an 'Associate Member' clause to the Scheme (again, see the Moray and Government Schemes). This would allow CCs to carry out agreed work, for example, by 'subject matter experts', or where a heavy CC workload exists and 'additional' interested members of the community, or members of community organisations, may be required to help complete agreed tasks or assist with delivering against agreed 'Action Plans'. This will become a greater issue, if the reduction in overall maximum CC membership is agreed, per the draft Scheme, and, in particular, from our recent experience, if all CCs in the area are to be encouraged to create and deliver Community Plans!! This may also lead to an increase in members of the community wishing to be nominated and stand at the next election – an additional benefit.
- If vacancies arise over the next 3 years I'd like to recognise their contribution by getting them on board. It was put to me after one of our meetings that " some of the people nearer the top of the table were not even full CC members" I'm an advocate of the old saying " By their deeds shall ye know them"
- Indeed community councils have a duty to seek to broaden both representation and expertise by making it possible for people who can represent within the community council area and people with specific skills to contribute to the work of the community council,where relevant
- They must always ensure they involve resident s from ALL AREAS in which they represent and not only those they would rather have attend!

This use of volunteers and sub-groups is already allowed, although volunteers do not affect membership numbers.

We agree with the comment about the community council role in seeking broad representation and in articulating reasons why people should stand for election. Broad representation is also in the hands of the electorate who choose who they nominate in the first place. Ultimately, community councils cannot choose

We will amend the model constitution to give community councils the option to include a specific provision in their constitutions saying this is allowed.

The proposal to change membership numbers to an odd number has been removed as it was perceived negatively and caused concern amongst community councils.

Although it cannot guarantee it, we feel the open election process already facilitates this duty.

- Get the correct minded people who are in touch with the community on the same level as they are. No airy fairy members who have not got the appropriate experience/know how re: meetings etc.

Communication

- Be more open, be more organised, be more pro-active, inform the public.
- They need to communicate better and be more open. I have no idea who my community councillors are and I never see anything about them in the area. Surely putting minutes in local shops/cafes etc would be a start. At the moment I think the only place to get them is the BCC. They should also be more encouraging about inviting people to attend meetings especially when there is n important topic to discuss. At the moment community councillors appear to be doing there own thing with no interest in the people of [REDACTED] as long as it suits the select few.
- Advertising and promotion
- In my area the Community Council SAY they are engaging with residents but in reality only engage with those who come through the door of [...venue...]. I live several streets away and in the 11 years I have been a resident I have NEVER had any letters or communications through my door. I personally feel that communication needs to be vastly improved. Social media should be better utilized, and libraries better used. Also any other local groups should have a representative invited to meetings, local churches and other groups so that the community is better represented and have plenty opportunites to have their voices heard. COmmunity Councils should reach out more to residents through newsletters and publications so more peopel are aware of meetings and also perhaps have informal discussions around particular areas of interest or concern.
- More communication of community councils. Idea what they are doing for all areas not just where a community councillor comes from.
- By talking to them and taking on board what is said
- CCs should also appoint, and make public, a single-point-of-contact who can provide an open channel of communication between the

their members even if that means sections of their community are under-represented in their composition.

The need for community councils not to depend on residents seeking information and the importance to respondents of using a variety of communication methods to involve residents is noted.

We are not proposing to include in the Scheme a provision requiring community councils to adhere to a list communication methods as communication approaches will vary from community to community and from one purpose to another.

The comments have been shared with community councils.

community and the CC.

Public votes and views at meetings

- Give the public a vote on non procedural items. E.g. Should we have Christmas lights or not.
- They should allow public members who attend [to this]* and the Chair should be open and honest to the members present at the meeting
- Where the topic or subject matter demands it (e.g. new housing developments or community planning activity) fully open, public meetings should be held where members of the community can raise, and have documented, their issues, concerns, feelings and opinions on matters of importance within the community – for example, recently, MCC has held numerous Open Meetings, Focus Group Meetings, etc., to help shape and inform our new Community Plan and to discuss community thoughts and opinions around the local housing development plan.

Other

- disbanding might be a start
- disband them

- They already do very well

Community councils are trusted to use their judgement on when to involve the public in decisions and in meeting business, and balance this against the public's expectation that they maintain a level of formality which promotes comprehension of matters of community concern, and that they get through the agenda in an organised way.

There is statutory provision for community councils to exist so disbanding them as a concept is not within the power of the Local Authority.

Communities are not obliged to establish community councils and may disband theirs if they no longer want one that already exists. Residents of an area have the power every four years to change the entire membership of their community council if they are not happy with how their community council involves them in matters which concern the community.

We are aware that the public take an active role in some community council meetings and do not wish to make any changes to the Scheme to discontinue this.

Proceed with current provision stating community council role in facilitating active community deliberation.
Comments have been shared with community councils

No requirement to change the Scheme.

Comments have been passed to community councils

Standards of representation

Integrity

- Some councillors think of themselves and not their community's
- An idea is for community councillors to sit an aptitude test in order to get the right people on board who have the integrity to do the correct thing for their community.

Complaints procedure

- Yes. This is a learning procedure and public should be given ways of complaints procedures against community council etc.
- Residents should have formal procedure to make complaints. This should also apply to community council members as well
- I think this is a good idea. Mostly CC's don't represent the people they represent themselves. It is difficult to access them and what they stand for. How do they know what stance to take if they have not asked the people?
- Good idea go for it.
- This is a good idea
- There should be an authority/public office/agency where community members and community councillors can take their grievance to. Then have it adjudicated accordingly. The results should be published in local newspapers to inform all residents of the community of the outcome.
- I think that members should be [allowed to do this as too many people are]* spoken over and [well-minuted]**illegible*
- The new Community Council should have expense and complaints

Clackmannanshire's approach is that the community can be trusted to elect the right people to represent the best interests of the community as a whole. It is also our stance that everyone who is on the electoral register is, without discrimination, qualified to be a community councillor. It would be difficult to devise an aptitude test that does not, at best, act as a deterrent to volunteering and at worst discriminate on some grounds. Discussions on the subject of mandatory training have to date concluded that it would not be desirable, nor practical.

No implications for the Scheme.

Comments from questionnaire respondents in support of a complaints procedure outnumbered those against. Community councils are keen to explore the introduction of a complaints procedure but have asked for time for careful consideration before implementation.

In consultation with community councils and with reference to examples of good practice we will look at introducing a complaints procedure that suits local needs and can be adopted by all Clackmannanshire community councils.

forms

- MCC suggests that, in the first instance, any CC should be given the opportunity to resolve any 'complaint' which may be raised against it or one of its members. A simple 'complaints procedure' (prepared by the Council) should be outlined and adopted by every CC in its constitution. For example, any complaint, initially, should be addressed to the 'CC Secretary' – or named single-point-of-contact - or the 'CC Chair', if one exists, to resolve the complaint locally within a specified period of time.
- This procedure needs to be widened to include those councils which regularly meet without either, a) a quorum of members, b) Allow meetings continue without properly discussing & following the Agenda of the meeting, c) Where councils do not keep their websites updated MONTHLY in which to allow public react to meeting content!
- Best not to have a formal complaints procedure. Community Councillors are re-elected annually and best to use the ballot box to try to improve the calibre of the councillors if necessary. Perhaps each public meeting should afford those present the opportunity to bring forward criticism in as positive a way as possible so that such suggested improvements become the subject of small group discussions and solutions arrived at collectively.
- No complaints process, would discourage people representing their communities
- Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should community council be allowed to have their own formal complaints procedures!
- Some of the [REDACTED] Community Council office bearers are only on for themselves. They forget that they are a community councillor to represent the town. Also, they do not operate in a transparent way within the group as there are things being done underhandedly, which is going against the whole of [REDACTED] Community Council within and out with the group
- Everyone should be treated the same

Members of the public can express their expectations of meeting standards direct to community councils. Such active involvement is welcomed by community councils and constructive suggestions do not constitute complaints.

We note comments about how queries can be dealt with outside a formal complaints procedure and that it could counteract the reward people derive from volunteering time and effort on behalf of their community.

The community council is responsible for ensuring that members represent community, not personal, interests, and operate transparently. By observing meetings, the public can and should reinforce this.

It goes without saying that community councils are already required to respect the law and this includes observing equalities legislation.

Comments have been shared with community councils.

Comments will be taken into consideration in the development of a complaints procedure for Clackmannanshire.

No implications for the Scheme at this review.

No implications for the Scheme.

the power and responsibility for upholding or rejecting a complaint

- A complaint raised against the community council should be brought up and discussed and investigated by the Joint community council and recorded against that community council.
- It should be the collective responsibility of the councillors to arrive at a consensus solution to any complaint so that the responsibility is shared.
- I think it should be independent people, possibly from the local community which could be done in a jury type selection process without being compulsory. So a number of people from the locality are asked if they would be prepared to participate and those that would could be on a register of some sort for when/if a complaint was in place . It would need to have specific regulations and processes around it
- The community council should be open and honest and take responsibility
- Should the issue not be resolved locally, and, again, this should be documented within every CC constitution, then a Council email / telephone contact should be available for any member of the community to 'register' any unresolved complaint against any CC or CClr. This would keep any 'problem resolution' process independent and separate from the CC and community involved. Again, existing Councils have similar schemes in place (e.g. Moray).
- This should be clacks council function and they alone should decide whether to uphold the complaint or not
- NO, role should lie firmly with the LA.
- It should lie with the community council with Clacks council being an arbitrator if required.
- Community Councils should NOT have the power themselves. It should be the Community Liaison Officer or another appointed local authority staff member who should be dealing with complaints.

Dissolution and Suspension

- I agree that LA should have the power to dissolve Community Councils, especially if they are not adhering to what they are

This empowered approach to dealing with complaints aligns with our aspirations for strong local democracy.

In partnership with the community councils we will weigh-up both preferences and consult further if necessary

We feel it is not as straightforward as it might appear to give Clackmannanshire Council the power to uphold or reject a complaint, and we welcome our community councils' proposal to consider this and all other aspects of a complaints procedure carefully before any complaints procedure is introduced.

We note that respondents are keen for Clackmannanshire Council to have power over

Proceed with provision for Suspension, the terms for which are

supposed to be doing. Money is given tot hem to do things for the community and if it's not being done then it's money badly spent (or not spent at all!) . Community should be well advised though if this has been proposed to give them chance to have their say in the matter.

MCC agrees with the addition of a clause on 'Suspension'. However, why replace Sec. 14 from the existing scheme, which outlines the terms for dissolution, and which are different from the terms for suspension, with 12.4? Should this new 'condition' not simply be added to Sec. 14 of the current Scheme and this section re-instated? Also, what would happen if the Council decided to suspend a CC but the community decided not to dissolve it? What then would be the status of the un-dissolved CC? (Also, Sec. 13 should also be re-instated and linked to the re-introduction of Sec. 8 and 9 - see Q.6 above).

community councils but we would argue that the community elected their community council and it should be the community who choose to dissolve it.

Clackmannanshire Council will assist communities which through the agreed process wish to dissolve their community council.

The power to consider a community council suspended means no further Council resources will be allocated to a community council which is no longer fulfilling the function or adhering to the governance standards of a community council.

Should the community choose not to take the action necessary to restore its status, they are choosing to dissolve it.

set out in the Scheme.

The process for dissolution is set out in the model community council constitution. The terms for dissolution

the important aspects of community council governance

<ul style="list-style-type: none">· It should guide community councils with all aspects of how it should be governed, it should also have allowances in which a council office attending meetings could interject when a meeting is not going in correct direction of procedure!· Ensure that ALL community councillors stick to the written guidelines and any of those who don't, can be disqualified immediately without a decision from office bearers necessarily.	<p>We note that many respondents feel the Council should be a higher authority than community councils even at meeting level. We would argue that it is not appropriate to give an external organisation power over the day-to-day operations of community councils and we feel that officer attendance at meetings to oversee governance is generally not necessary and might be perceived as interference, not guidance..</p> <p>Community councils are accountable to their electorate who have the right to ask for procedures to be enforced.</p> <p>Clackmannanshire Council will intervene when community councils breach the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Procedures for exchange of information already included in the Scheme are set out in the Protocol between community councils and the Council. It is understood that community councils determine their own workload and priorities to suit volunteer time and so these procedures are negotiated with community councils.</p>	<p>Scheme contains safeguards</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Remember community councils are par time and most members work during the day. A spokesperson on the clack's council could be helpful	<p>There is effective two-way communication between community councillors and Elected Members. They are also represented (have a 'spokesperson') on the community planning partnership.</p>	<p>No implications for Scheme at this stage</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">· The framework should provide a legal structure upon which each community council can safely build the workplan best suited to the needs of its community. That is all. Thus local people own the plan supported by a legal framework. Ownership is arguably	<p>We agree with the concept of a sense of ownership which we think is contained in the current principle collectively and in the process by which community councils are</p>	<p>We will examine the introduction of these suggestions as tools to guide good governance in partnership with community councils.</p>

the most important (and missing) principle.

- Ownership
- REPRESENTATION is the most important one here and the one in which many Community Councils fail their communities. ENGAGEMENT should be added which would strengthen their ability to REPRESENT.
- In the Scheme of Establishment, Code of Conduct and Standing Order, there ought to be a mandatory clause re: financial payments to community councillors in respect of their own businesses
- MCC agrees with all of these principles, particularly, 'Accountability'. This principle, by default, should allow discussion and dialog to take place, preferably, before any important decision is made and requires that the community is involved!!
- Disqualification
- MCC supports the re-introduction of Sec. 13, the reasons for disqualification

formed, elected and dissolved.

Good point. We agree that engagement strengthens representativeness. Engagement with the community they represent is the core function of community councils. Community councils also agree with this point and would point out that engagement also works in two directions.

As with all community council business there the open and transparent processes by which finances are managed and reported ensures all financial transactions can be vouched for.

Good point. We hope we have reflected that community councils are accountable to the electorate in the Scheme, model constitution and other guidance.

Our stance is that the electorate elects community councils and that is where the power to remove (or not to elect) community councillors should lie.

Although community councils suggest that the conditions for removal of a community councillor should be the same for all Clackmannanshire community councils, we feel it should be clear that the concept and responsibility for it lies with community councils who wish to have that power.

This safeguard is already written into the model constitution.

No implications for Scheme

We will amend the model constitution to include the reasons for disqualification suggested by community councils.

The principles to which community councils are currently working

Option	Total	Percent of All
They are the right principles	5	27.78%
They are right but there are some missing	4	22.22%
Some are right	4	22.22%

None of them are right	0	0%
Not Answered	5	27.78%

Other

Boundaries - there was a preference expressed for a Tillicoultry only CC however an awareness that what was left would not constitute a sufficient "community" to warrant a Coalsnaughton and Devonside CC. The future amalgamation of Coalsnaughton and Devonside will change the dynamics so perhaps this could be looked at again over time

There is an opportunity to re-examine the relevance of community council boundaries to suit demographic changes when the Scheme is next reviewed.

No change to boundaries at this stage.

These third sector organisations all play different but complementary roles. By all accounts, there is more work to do than organisations to do it and we do encourage collaboration.

No implications for Scheme.

Taking g overost of the role of Third Sector Forum and take over CSTI.

**illegible*

Respondent breakdown

Where in Clackmannanshire do you live?

Community Council Review Stage 2

Key Aspects

Option	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All
Alloa	3	50%	5	27.78%
Alva	1	17%	6	33.33%
Cambus	0	0%	0	0%
Clackmannan	1	17%	0	0%
Coalsnaughton	0	0%	0	0%
Devonside	0	0%	0	0%
Dollar	0	0%	1	5.556%
Fishcross	0	0%	0	0%
Forestmill	0	0%	0	0%
Glenochil	0	0%	0	0%
Kennet	0	0%	0	0%
Menstrie	0	0%	1	5.556%
Muckhart	0	0%	1	5.556%
Sauchie	0	0%	1	5.556%
Tillicoultry	1	17%	2	11.11%
Tullibody	0	0%	1	5.556%
Not Answered	0	0%	0	0%

Do you have any experience of community councils in the last 4 years either as a community councillor or as a member of the public attending community council meetings?

Community Council Review Stage 2

Key Aspects

Option	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All
Yes, I've attended one or more community council meetings in the last 4 years	5	83%	15	83.33%
No, I've haven't attended a community council meeting in the last 4 years	1	17%	3	16.67%
Not Answered	0	0%	0	0%