

Squirrels Run

24th July 2015

Dear Mike,

As you are aware I am concerned about poor procedural practices at the Council. A difficulty is that whilst I can see that things are wrong I am reluctant to propose a change which may be at odds with the recommendations of NALC. In addition I believe that some of these NALC recommendations are unwise and/or incorrect; in which case a letter should be written advising them of this. A more detailed summary of facts associated with this is attached at Appendix 1. I think that the easiest way forward is that I have full access to NALC's web site so that I can read everything over the summer break.

I am considering taking the CLCA qualification. It looks reasonably straightforward though I would need the co-operation of the Council on the accounting and certain other aspects. It must be of considerable benefit to the Council to have a member with this qualification. I would not intend to go on any courses and would seek to rely on the information produced by NALC.

It may be best if we could meet next week to discuss this and other matters.

Yours truly,

Appendix 1

Possible errors in NALC recommendations.

- 1 In SO 3l 'prior written' is inconsistent with statute. *Need to double check.*
- 2 In SO 3t 'or another interest' is not subject to statutory restrictions as stated.
- 3 In SO 13e 'by the Proper Officer' is at odds with statute.
- 4 SO 13h is in bold and therefore really ought to use the words contained in statute.
- 5 In the Code, disclosure of confidential information is at odds with the Model Publication Scheme.
- 6 In a later version of the Code dispensations are at odds with statutory requirements.

SMPC Code of Conduct, Standing Orders and Financial Regulations.

- 7 I have written separately to the Council on the Code. There are two instances where it does not comply with statute and over thirty drafting errors. By comparing this with another council the vast majority of these problems are drafting errors by SMPC.
- 8 The Standing Orders and Financial Regulations are years out of date. I think the Standards Board was wound up around 2008.

Confidential Meetings.

- 9 The manner that these are held are wrong and possibly make any decisions reached invalid. Errors include:
 1. No public resolution to exclude the public - SO 30.1.
 2. No reason given to exclude the public – SO 30.1.
 3. Minutes of previous meetings are not circulated and merely read out.
 4. Minutes are not agreed by members – statutory obligation.
 5. There is no resolution to approve and the minutes are therefore not properly signed
 6. Minutes are not properly numbered – statutory obligation.
 7. Minutes are not written in accordance with sound Data Protection principles.
 8. Important and controversial documents are not distributed and merely read out.