

HSP criteria for prioritising scrutiny projects

| Criteria | For Example | Notes |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. Evidence of what has been done so far, by whom and when | Has the issue already been raised at a Service User Group? Has this issue been dealt with under fair comment? | |
| 2. What was the result? | | |
| 3. Evidence to demonstrate the extent of the problem | Evidence of under performance Evidence of service failure A community call for action | |
| 4. Number of tenants affected | Suggestion only: Under 10 10 - 100 100 - 500 500 - 1000 1000 - 5000 10,000+ | |
| 5. Is there a degree of danger or urgency (risk of serious detriment to tenants, health & Safety or damage to property) | Yes / No - Evidence | |
| 6. Length of time the problem has persisted. | | |

Notes:

a) Members to seek expert opinion or advice on matters of health and safety.

b) Matters of a serious nature that are not relevant for the scrutiny panel, should be brought to the attention of a Council officer. In such cases, the panel should continue its response to the tenant/s recommending use of an alternative channel e.g. Fair Comment.