

Responses to Senior Manager Consultation Process

Summary

At the time of preparing this report, written comments have been received from a number of members of the senior management team, the Corporate Leadership Group, other members of staff and the Scrutiny challenge panel. Written comments have been received from the Trade Unions but no written comments have been received from members of the Chief Officer Employment Panel. Overall, the responses to the consultation have been very positive and supportive of the new structure and the direction it takes us in. Respondents to the consultation viewed the restructure as being the right move for the next step of our journey given the current financial and political circumstances. They also welcomed the opportunities it presented in terms of the focus of the new directorates, better horizontal and cross council working and a more strategic role for the senior management team.

Appointment Process

There were some questions about the appointment process for the new posts and the COEP (who are responsible for appointments to these posts including agreeing the JD/Person Spec and selection process) have been made aware of these.

Open competition, prior to consideration of existing employees under the council's Protocol for Managing Organisational Change as set out above, would be a breach of employment contracts; lead to a risk of litigation; and is therefore not proposed nor desirable. There is also a statutory duty on the Council to avoid redundancy wherever possible.

Further work will also take place on developing 'competencies' for senior manager roles, based on the CREATE values and a skills audit.

S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer arrangements.

Some issues were raised regarding the role of the Section 151 and Monitoring Officers, I am therefore proposing that they:

- Receive all CSB agendas and papers
- Have an open invite to attend CSB when they feel it appropriate
- Will have a dotted line to the Chief Executive and a formal monthly meeting to report on their statutory responsibilities
- Will have full and open access to the Leader of the Council as Portfolio Holder for Finance and access to the Cabinet and chairs of Committees as required
- Will continue to attend all other required Council, Cabinet, committee and other meetings and continue to have a formal role in sign-off of any reports that are to be presented to these meetings.

Secondary Structures

A small number of issues were raised about the location of some services such as environmental health, adaptations, adult learning and estates caretaking in the new structure. I am suggesting that these be considered in the proposals the new Corporate Directors will be required to bring forward.

Greater horizontal working

There was broad support for the idea of Corporate Directors taking on Cross Cutting roles such as equalities, voluntary sector and community engagement. I will also look to discuss other

possible cross cutting areas such as climate change that were raised during the consultation process.

Deputy Chief Executive

There was no consensus on arrangements for a Deputy Chief Executive, this will therefore be reviewed once the new structure is in place.

Corporate Leadership Group

The consultation pack talks about the possibility of CLG becoming an operations board for the Council to better deal with the day-to-day issues thus freeing CSB to focus on the key strategic issues we face. This had strong support in the consultation responses particularly as a way of helping more horizontal working and CLG have volunteered to set up a meeting to work through as a group how this could operate in practice and report back to me.

Business Support and PAs

There will be no change to the number of staff in scope or benefit realisation of the business support project as a result of the restructure. Corporate Directors have agreed in principle to the 3 Hub model, which will be reconfigured to meet the requirements of the proposed new structure. The impact of the proposed restructure on PAs will be dealt with through the business support project once the new structure has been agreed. The business support model has been designed to be flexible in order to cope with such organisational restructures. Comments received during the consultation in respect of business support have been passed on to the project team for consideration.

Copies of the written responses are attached below.

Dear Michael

Senior Management Restructure

Thank you for providing me with an opportunity to consider and comment on your proposed senior management restructure. I am in agreement with you that the present structure has served the council well. There is now in place a strong business transformation focus led by your own Chief Executive's department. Adults & Housing and more recently Children's Services have made considerable progress. Over the last two years Community & Environment has been able to demonstrate a transformed approach, putting neighbourhoods at the heart of its agenda, in that time services have improved, satisfaction has risen and costs have been driven down. All these achievements, recognised through the MJ Best Achieving Council Award. Of course, difficult times mean there is much more to be done.

There are tough issues to be tackled, the sustainability of services and the need to take forward the regeneration agenda in the context of needing to do more with less. I agree and fully accept the rationale that it is right to review and consider whether new structural arrangements could better serve the council in the future and this becomes more pressing now the full extent of public sector retrenchment is beginning to become manifest.

I agree with the proposal to move to four corporate directors. It develops models that have successfully been adopted in other authorities and evidences a slimmed down authority with much more strategic focus at the top. The move to four Corporate Directors also mentions developing new arrangements with Portfolio holders. Again, I have seen a system of Programme Area Meetings between Members and Directors work well in other authorities. We do need to be mindful of materiality and capacity in determining priority in any slimmed down structure.

It is right to look at the relative size of the Corporate Centre, it performs an important, needed and necessary function enabling improvement and aligning service work to achieving corporate objectives. Bringing the respective elements together will enable greater commonality of approach and consistency of cultural principles on a smaller base at lower cost. This will enable it to continue to facilitate and support service improvement.

There is merit to the suggestion that Adults and Housing, which will in future include public health, might incorporate Community and Culture into a new Directorate of Health and Wellbeing and I would be supportive of most of the service transferring. However, I do think there is an option to consider whether the Adult Learning function which has as its main focus tackling worklessness might better locate with the Economic Development function enabling it to be aligned with supporting local jobs for local businesses and this is something that you might want to consider. There is also an opportunity to consider whether Estates Caretaking should be brought into a reinvigorated Public Realm.

Bringing Enterprise and Environment together would enable further significant service improvements to be achieved at a lower cost, cut duplication and introduce simpler, clearer delivery processes. At the October Community & Environment commissioning panel radical and innovative plans were proposed to improve services and reduce cost through resident engagement and service transformation an Enterprise and Environment directorate would the right blend of services to achieve this change. Furthermore, it would enable much better integration between people related public realm services and infrastructure related projects under a single Corporate Director focused on regenerating Harrow for the benefit of Harrow residents.

I fully support your proposed direction of travel and hope that you will find my comments useful when considering the final reconfiguration of the future structure of the organisation.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Michael

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed Senior Management restructure that you launched on 21st October. We would like to submit the following joint comments.

Overall we are in full support of your proposals, both in terms of the specifics of what you are proposing but also what you are seeking to achieve through this restructure. We will go into more detail below.

Current Structure

The current structure has supported us well. We have become recognized as a high performing Council from a low base of being the worst performing in London. However, we entirely agree that the world has moved on since the current structure was put in place and that some changes need to be made if the Council's performance is to go up another level. We should be seeking to continually improve at a fast pace both for our residents but also in order to provide a stimulating and rewarding environment for our staff. There are further opportunities to improve our performance and these proposals will help to achieve this.

Government policy has changed with the elections of May 2010 and the financial context has tightened. It is important to deliver a Senior Management structure that saves money.

Through the Commissioning Panel process it is also important that the Council not only identifies how it will deliver its savings targets but also develops a robust view of what the Council will look like in 4-5 years time. The Council needs to become a better commissioner of services in order to do this and these proposals should help to take this agenda forward.

Corporate Director Environment and Enterprise

Overall we agree with the creation of this directorate. This creates an opportunity for the Council to join up its work around the development of the physical environment. It also creates the opportunity to join up the work of a number of teams and to benefit from common technologies. It enables us to join up our work on the LDF, Green Grid and Parks and Open Spaces. It also enables us to have accountabilities for Property within one Directorate.

Corporate Director Community Health & Wellbeing

Overall we agree with the creation of this new directorate. This directorate should position itself as leading on the wellbeing of residents more generally and less narrowly on Social Care. There is a natural opportunity to join the service up with Leisure to achieve this.

Corporate Director Resources

Overall we agree with the creation of this new directorate. In March 2011 approximately half of Corporate Finance became part of the Chief Executives Department. This move reflected some of the very natural synergies between the teams involved. This was achieved with minimum disruption and has worked well with staff. The new Department achieved IIP Silver in September 2011 and this assessment had, among other themes, concentrated on how well this change had been managed.

The challenges ahead are usually expressed in Financial terms but the solution is one of holistic Business Transformation which properly coordinates the delivery of savings, IT led transformation, workforce transformation, community engagement and the management of the Council's reputation. There is a strong case for better coordination of this activity.

The creation of a Corporate Resources Directorate allows us to exploit further opportunities for improvement:

1. Our processes and practices for Financial Management need to be further improved for capital, revenue cost and income. This agenda involves the further development and management of the SAP system. It needs to be better coordinated across these departments as the system is developed as a tool for managers to manage their staff and budgets. SAP is also a control system. Reporting and interfaces need to be improved. Responsibilities for Financial Management also need to be clarified through HR processes such as IPADs and role profiles. Training and development is also required. Improvements are a cross Corporate Resources agenda.
2. The management of Business Transformation can be better coordinated in the new Directorate in the following areas:
 - a. Ongoing evaluation of the funding gap driving the ambition for Business Transformation.
 - b. The in year monitoring of projects on Verto with the monitoring of savings via SAP and the monthly budget monitoring and forecasting process.
 - c. The development of better coordination on the appraisal of capital schemes within a target Return on Capital (which needs to be developed), capital gateways, business case development and project management.
 - d. The join up with management and leadership development and internal communications.
3. The opportunity to better coordinate all aspects of the annual planning cycle:
 - a. July Cabinet report on Integrated Planning
 - b. Commissioning Panels, savings templates, capital bids, charging policy
 - c. Draft budget December Cabinet
 - d. Consultation on budget
 - e. Improvement Boards and financial monitoring
 - f. Service planning
 - g. Performance and value for money management
4. The opportunity to improve financial management by establishing stronger HR control on our permanent establishment, which should be aligned to salary budgets.
5. There is an opportunity to better coordinate Member Development between Democratic Services, L&D and Policy teams.
6. Community Engagement and Consultation can be better coordinated around the area of budget consultation.
7. There are natural synergies between Access Harrow and Revenues and Benefits which can be further explored.
8. Corporate Governance which is delivered by both Risk, Audit and Fraud and Legal Services

There will also be senior management savings that can be enabled by the join up of these departments. There is a major opportunity to improve the value from Procurement and to deliver this through tighter controls, better compliance and a more commercial focus. The integration of these departments does however need to be carefully managed.

Building on the progress that has been achieved to date there are further opportunities to strengthen the Finance function. The interim Corporate Director position will provide short term strength which will enable us to deliver a further improvement plan for Finance over the 18 months.

Personally we are very happy to work together to deliver a Corporate Resources directorate. We have also demonstrated an ability to work together in our coordination of the business planning process this year. We will work together (if Tom is appointed) to bring forward reorganization proposals within 3 months of the permanent appointment. The process of moving to the new Directorate must not destabilize what is working well and must allow areas that need to be improved to be focused on.

You have proposed that from July 2013 the Corporate Director of Resources does not need to be the Council's S151 Officer. By then, both the S151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer will be reporting to the Corporate Director of Resources. We have considered this carefully and would like to make the following observations and suggestions.

CIPFA guidance is very important and states that:

'The governance requirements in the Statement are that the CFO should be professionally qualified, report directly to the Chief Executive and be a member of the Leadership Team.'

The same guidance goes on to state that:

'There is a growing trend for CFOs to hold a range of different responsibilities beyond finance, including managing other services or leading change programmes. Whilst these can develop the individual as a corporate manager, authorities must not let the CFO's core financial responsibilities be compromised through creating too wide a portfolio.'

To be compliant with the guidance it is therefore important that the S151 Officer has a strategic role, is a member of the Leadership team, has a reporting line to the Chief Executive and is able to focus on the financial health of the Council, without being diluted by having multiple other responsibilities.

As described above there are also significant advantages of creating a Corporate Resources Directorate and there are many synergies between the corporate functions that need to be exploited. With the right details in place, we are confident that the existing proposals will both allow the broader strategic coordination of Corporate Resources as well as providing the sound financial management and control that is required. We make the following practical suggestions for how this can be achieved:

1. The S151 Officer should have open access to the Board especially when decisions are being taken or papers are being prepared for Cabinet or GARM.
2. The S151 Officer should have a formal role in signing off any reports that are on their way to Council Committees that involve the Council making decisions.
3. The S151 Officer should have a reporting line to the Chief Executive on the financial health of the Council. A number of formal meetings should be scheduled during the year for the S151 Officer to meet with the Chief Executive to report on their statutory responsibilities.

4. The S151 Officer should also have a reporting line to the Leader of the Council as Portfolio Holder for Finance and access to the Cabinet and Chairs of Committees as required.

The role of the Chief Monitoring Officer is also important for sound governance. Principles 1,2 and 4 should also apply to the Chief Monitoring Officer. A version of Principle 3 should apply which allows the Chief Monitoring Officer access to the Chief Executive at any time this is required to report on their statutory responsibilities.

Corporate Strategic Board

We agree with the proposals for CSB to become more strategic and less involved in the day to day operation of the Council. Currently too many issues are escalated to CSB that should be resolved by senior and middle managers who are closer to the operational detail of their services.

We must move away from a mentality of Corporate vs Services that exists at the Board.

We would welcome different corporate agendas being led on by different CSB members as corporate champions. This would also enable CSB to benefit more from the different experiences and backgrounds of CSB colleagues. It will foster wider corporate working and less of a mentality of representing ones own service.

We suggest the following themes:

- Equalities
- Commissioning
- Community Involvement
- Workforce strategy, culture and organizational change

Additional roles for risk management and health and safety could also be considered and there are existing corporate groups for these areas. The corporate Health and Safety policy requires a Corporate Health and Safety Group to be in place.

We also agree with the proposal to hold single meetings with Portfolio Holders.

Corporate Leadership Group

This group has improved substantially following the development programme run in 2010/11. There is a much greater appreciation of what colleagues do. Individuals know each other better. There is now a stronger platform for resolving issues at this level.

An Operations Board would be a welcome direction as it would empower CLG members to resolve issues without them being escalated to CSB. It will help build a more empowering culture across the rest of the Council.

We believe that the various Divisional Directors should be regarded as the lead experts in their relevant specialist areas and be empowered to make decisions accordingly.

Job Descriptions

The Corporate Director job description should make mention of Health and Safety responsibilities.

We hope these comments are helpful in taking us forward.

15th November 2011

Michael Lockwood
Chief Executive

15 November 2011

Dear Michael

Senior Management Restructure Proposals

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposals. We have decided to respond as a management team since following discussions we find ourselves in agreement on the main issues, although we will also provide you with individual responses where local or specific comments may be useful for you to take into account.

General

We support both the rationale and general direction that your proposals set out, in what are challenging times, not just for Harrow and its residents, but for the wider public sector. In this context we are re-assured that your proposals ensure there is sufficient capacity to deliver the changes necessary.

We share your view that continued improvement requires 'a different leadership style and culture', particularly if the proposed greater involvement of the wider CLG is to be effective. This is potentially a critical success factor given both the reduced capacity of the board and your rightful expectation that senior officers should be capable and willing to step up during these challenging times.

The opportunity to build on the development work undertaken with CLG is welcomed and the creation of one or more operational boards should increase capacity, and reduce the burden on CSB enabling it to become more strategic as you set out in your proposals. Such a model should also enable more effective cross council working and further break down organisational silos.

We welcome the emphasis on changing the roles of CSB members, focussing on corporate leadership and the opportunities for a new approach to decision making through empowerment. However, we recognise that to be effective wider behavioural changes will be required. Without this the opportunities afforded by your proposals, particularly the development of CLG's role, will not be fully realised.

By necessity the reduction in Corporate Directors means that some of new roles have grown significantly in size and in the context of the scale and pace of change that the council is facing, we agree that it is prudent that you review the effectiveness of the new arrangements in 18 months. Such a review should also consider whether the 'different leadership style and culture' has been effectively achieved given it will be a key enabler of your proposals.

Corporate Resources

We are in full agreement with the proposal to create a Corporate Resources Directorate and believe that as a team we have established the foundations for this to be successful. Under Tom Whiting's leadership the Chief Executive's department has demonstrated it is effective in delivering high performance at low cost. It has been 'the engine room' of the transformation programme and has demonstrated innovation in a number of areas. We have also already managed the effective integration of services from the Finance Directorate and from across the Council into Access Harrow, making a significant contribution to the Council's savings target in the process.

We are committed to working with the interim and new Corporate Director of Resources to develop and successfully implement a new structure. We are however concerned to avoid any potential destabilisation at a time when you are building capacity in areas which require strengthening. To this end we would appreciate greater clarity about the interim Corporate Director arrangements and how this will work in practice. As a Management Team we are keen that our current management arrangements remain in place for the first three months until there is clarity around the proposed new structure, and believe that this is the best way of managing the change whilst at the same time continuing to deliver quality services in our respective divisions.

In supporting your proposals we are committed to participating in a mature debate on the changes that are needed to deliver the best outcomes for our residents and to focus on what is best for the organisation rather than for the individual.

Deputy Chief Executive

We consider it too early to consider the question of whether to create a Deputy role. We believe that the new board should be focused on the objectives set out in your proposals and that this would be a potential distraction at this time. We also consider that any decision should be made in the context of the wider proposals to establish an operations board(s). We would however be concerned at the public and staff perception if the creation of a deputy role were to mean any additional cost.

Signed



Dear Michael

Thank you for the opportunity to consult on your restructure proposals:

I think the proposals provide an exciting and relevant response to the changing and challenging environment.

I have been here for over two years now and my focus (rightly or wrongly) has been very much housing focused. Whilst there is still much to do within housing and there is a very challenging agenda facing it, I think the service and my role in leading it is ready for change. I very much welcome the opportunities that can be provided within the new Community Health and Wellbeing directorate as I don't think there has ever been a more important time to make sure the focus of these front line services are as lean and efficient as they can be to ensure that the most vulnerable people within society get the best services possible with dignity and efficiency.

I also like the idea of CLG becoming an operations board and driving solutions to the meaty cross cutting issues. I'd particularly enjoy getting more involved in community engagement from a broader perspective and I am particularly proud of our recent IIP assessors recognition of how many of the Housing Ambition Plan processes have helped deliver change successfully. I would love to help share what was good and help the Council in its overall IIP ambition.

The one thing I would like to ask is whether the decision to keep Adaptations separate can be reviewed. I believe it is a critical part of the well being agenda and a really important plank in any supported accommodation strategy. I recognise that significant improvements have been made in that service but because I also think that it makes a such a lot of sense for it to be an integral part of the choices that we have in determining solutions for customers with multiple needs, that it should sit in a customer based service rather than a property one. I also think whilst recent successes have attracted increased demand and the budget has increased accordingly, there is an opportunity for doing things more efficiently and there has got to be unnecessary costs involved in delivering a service across three directorates.

I hope these comments are helpful.

Best regards

Michael Lockwood
Chief Executive

DATE RECEIVED: 22/11/11
PASSED TO:

17 November 2011

Dear Michael

Harrow Council Senior Management Restructure

When you met CLG on 21st October you said you would be glad to receive responses that support the ideas in your management restructure as well as those that will inevitably raise some concerns and issues. In the main I am very positive about what you are putting forward which I see as sensible and measured proposals in the context of the significant public sector funding reductions taking place and national policy developments.

I agree with the new senior management structure you propose. Whilst the size of the senior management team is reduced the structure succeeds in reflecting the needs of the organisation and the authority's residents in its broad configuration.

It is pleasing you have recognised the changes and developments we have made and continue to make within children's services that are delivering successful outcomes and results. The alteration to the name of the directorate to capture more adequately the work we do with families makes sense.

I appreciate the strong connection between the public health functions due to transfer to the council in April 2013 and adult social care, housing and cultural services. I wonder, however, whether the position with regard to children's public health services and corresponding health employees might require further consideration.

You ask specifically about the position of deputy chief executive. From my perspective, in particular from my experience within the children's services directorate, an official deputy might not be essential and corporate directors could fulfil the role as necessary.

I favour strongly the idea of the corporate leadership group becoming an operations board for the council; a smaller group than the current 30 managers is likely to be able to do this far more effectively. Since being part of the corporate group myself I have developed a better understanding of/

/wider council issues and would welcome the chance to work more closely with senior managers in other directorates and be more involved with the future direction of the council. I believe there is the capability and talent amongst those at the level below corporate director to take full responsibility for most day-to-day issues in the council.

With regards and best wishes

Yours sincerely

Dear Michael,

Thank you for sharing the proposed structure and inviting all to voice their views.

I think the groupings that are proposed are logical and - in the main - make it very easy for people to identify with the services brought together and for the public to understand where in the council's structure each service lies. My only critical comment would be one of naming.

The name of the directorate "community health and well-being" is slightly ambiguous: is the intended meaning to be "community" + "health" + "well-being" or "community health" + "well-being"? The latter might mislead to some thinking that a service like Environmental Health would be included, the former I believe is probably the more accurate title and therefore if that is the case a comma should be included to remove the ambiguity (and also make it grammatically correct), i.e. "community, health and well-being".

I hope the above can be taken into consideration.

Kind regards,

Dear Michael

Please find below my formal response to the above consultation issued on the 21st Oct 2011.

I support your proposals for the Directorate structure and their revised responsibilities, which I believe are well founded and should help to move the Council to a more joined up, efficient and customer focussed organisation.

I welcome the focus of CSB on Council wide strategic issues, which I believe is essential in order to effectively deliver community priority needs in a holistic and efficient manner. I support the review of CLG and the idea of an operations board to deliver the strategic objectives agreed by CSB. If this is to be successful the role and terms of reference for both CSB and the operations board need to be agreed and adhered to.

The proposed structure will assist in realising the synergies and opportunities that are available for working more efficiently across the Council, it's partners and the Community. That said, to be fully effective a change in culture and behaviour will be required at all levels in the organisation and this must start at the top tiers.

Yours sincerely

Dear Michael,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

Overall, I think, the structure makes sense. The only concern I have is that I think it is important that the monitoring officer and S151 officer are of a suitable grade to influence the corporate directors and the chief executive. It is critical that the council's structure assists this process. Also it is important that CSB and CLG has legal and financial advice on proposals at an early stage to avoid last minute alterations to projects and so that this advice may be embedded into the project plans and risk registers.

I like your idea of a dotted line from the monitoring officer to yourself.

Many councils have had successful legal challenges to the difficult decisions that they have made. We have not and I think that this is due to the legal advice the council has received at an early stage at CSB and CLG so that decisions can be made in a robust way and after appropriate consultation.

I hope that my comments will be of use to you.

Many thanks

Dear Mr Lockwood,

Regarding the proposed Senior Management Restructure, on behalf of the GMB Harrow Branch please note the following comments;

Generally, proposals which provide better service for residents by more engagement, etc is to be welcomed and from the information provided and the meeting with unions (21st Oct.), the proposals appear to do this. The proposals indicate a reduction in the management structure and with the limited information provided in the consultation document, the impact of this lower down is difficult to assess. However from previous experience, reducing staff at any level is very likely to have a negative impact on staff placed below the suggested Directorates.

1) The purpose and circumstances leading to the restructure is understood, including the rationale for creating various services whose responsibility comes under the newly created Directorates. However without detailed information and assessment for the creation of services mentioned in the proposal, the GMB Harrow Branch is unable to comment on the suitability for purpose.

2) Similarly, no savings, etc has been provided in the consultation document which could justify that the proposed structures are best placed to deliver the services. Alternative structures have not been provided. In absence of such information, the GMB Harrow Branch cannot fully comment on the fitness for propose of the suggested restructure.

3) The generic role profiles do not indicate any attributes, such as experience or education qualifications, etc required. Comments or feedback cannot therefore be made on the role profiles provided nor their suitability.

Kind regards

Harrow Branch GMB

Assistant Chief Executive
Tom Whiting

Michael Lockwood
Chief Executive

17 November 2011

Dear Michael

Senior Management Restructure Proposals

Further to our collective response as a Chief Executive's departmental management team, this is my brief individual response in addition to that.

As you know the Risk, Audit and Fraud (RAF) division became part of the Chief Executive's department in March this year and significant progress has already been made with harnessing synergies with new teams and colleagues.

The RAF Commissioning Panel proposals seek to develop this with a number of merger proposals specifically to exploit these new opportunities and create efficiencies across the directorate and I have no doubt that the proposed Resources directorate will create more of these opportunities in the future as I believe the services will fit well together.

Regarding the possibility of the CLG becoming an operations board I have already supported this through the collective DMT response but I would like to emphasise the opportunities this would present from a risk management and governance perspective.

I have previously supported CLG becoming more involved with decision-making and thereby freeing up strategic capacity at CSB.

There are strong links with this suggestion and the work in train around assurance mapping and "reducing the burden" through streamlined but fit for purpose governance arrangements, so in addition to the examples you give of the work you envisage the board might take forward, an operations board or boards should in my view also play an important monitoring / assurance / escalation role around performance, risks and compliance.

Whatever role the board / boards take on I believe the membership should consist of all members of the revised management tier rather than a selective membership approach, otherwise there is a risk of creating an artificial additional perceived hierarchy within this tier.

In considering the proposals for developing the new structure I would also refer to the CIPFA guidance around internal audit and encourage careful consideration around reporting lines, to ensure best practice.

The new Financial Regulations approved at Cabinet earlier this month refer to internal audit as reporting jointly to the Corporate Director of Finance and the Assistant Chief Executive and whilst it would be inappropriate for me to pre-empt the discussion around the new organisational structure, I would welcome more refinement than this in the final arrangements, to avoid potentially weakened independence or conflicting priorities.

I hope you find my thoughts useful and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Yours sincerely

Joint response to Michael Lockwood on Harrow Council Senior Management Restructure

Dear Michael,

At your consultation launch you asked CLG for advice, specifically on the next stages of the development of CLG and the proposals around setting up an Operations Board. As the CLG Development Sub-Group we wanted to put forward a joint response specifically on this question. We'll also be putting forward our own individual responses, but we felt it was important to give you a collective view, especially as you state in your consultation document that the Council will require a different style and culture in the future, of which we think acting in this collaborative way will show you that we are willing and able to step up to this expectation.

We believe that creating an Operations Board from CLG members would be a strong and positive step forward for the Council, and that in doing this we should not lose the undoubted value that CLG has been able to bring to the development of the Council in the last 18 months. On this basis we suggest that the Operations Board should be an addition to the current structure rather than being a substitute for the current CLG.

The challenge is perhaps in how we move to this arrangement and also get it right first time, in effect taking your two steps rather than one. In response to this we suggest that CLG should be entrusted to take our development over the last 18 months to the next level and support you in developing these new arrangements.

This may prove challenging for CLG, as we recognise that a successful Operations Board would not include the full complement of current membership. But given the leadership you're looking for in the Council we feel that with the collective knowledge, experience and talent in CLG it should be expected that we can put aside our own personal positions and think and work collaboratively in the best interests of Harrows' residents so that we create the right structures to support the delivery of the Council of the future.

If you are happy for CLG to work on these new arrangements, we are committed to designing such a session for our December meeting. We are of course very happy to speak with you on the above in more detail should you wish to.

Dear Mr Lockwood

Thank you for the above document and I would like to comment as you have advised it is ok to do so. I am Business Support/ PA to a Divisional Director, Safeguarding, Family Placement & Support (now) Targeted Services in the new set up.

As I work at Pinner Road I did not want to get missed out on seeking views on BS/PA support as the document is mainly around the 4 posts at the Civic (3.2). I would be grateful if you can advise me how you will seek views from PAs and hope I am included. (3.4).

In the new Targeted Services set up I think Business Support/PA to Divisional Directors needs to be looked at again as I do not think this has been thought through enough.

I work for a extremely busy Divisional Director along with supporting 4 Service Managers in high risk, front line, high paced, safeguarding of children. We have been advised that PA Support will only be provided to the Corporate Director at 0.75. I personally feel that no support for Divisional Directors will not work as they have very demanding roles, with high workloads and for them not to have any support is unworkable, in my opinion. This will put even more demands on the DDs. I work flat out all day/every day in my present post in fact my workload has increased not decreased.

I understand about having to make painful decisions and having to save/costs. I understand an appeal letter has been sent to you from 3 Divisional Directors raising concerns about Business Support to them.

In the new Business Hub 2 new roles have been created FOI Officer and another role to manage the print room. It would have been better if PA support was created instead of the 2 new role profiles added in on the 7th October Consultation document. The FOI Officer is a difficult post to carry out, as you do not know who to get the information from and the timescales involved. My feelings are that the FOI Officer post H8 (this is a lower grade than the staff in the post at present), no equality here. Staff feel that these posts have been "bunged" into the Hub now (as a way of getting rid of it).

I hope you will consider the above. I thoroughly enjoy my job in Children's Services all my skills and knowledge are Child Protection, Children Looked After, Children in need of protection and have a good knowledge of statutory (CLA) work.

Thank you.

Dear Michael

Thank you for the opportunity to feed in to this consultation. My comments are in respect of the climate change agenda.

I have been in this particular post for over two years and I feel that the council's current approach cannot deliver the results we need and require. Climate change is an issue that needs to be addressed across the council. At present, I think it is very much seen as an environmental issue and as a result is effectively in a silo. The reorganisation of the senior management team offers an opportunity to address two issues in particular:-

Corporate energy saving initiatives.

The climate change section has worked hard over the last two years to introduce energy saving schemes into corporate buildings and schools. However, to date, we have only managed to make small savings which are marginal at best. We are currently working on a RE:FIT programme that has the potential to make significant progress - subject to funding being made available.

One barrier to success is that schemes need to be considered holistically as part of asset management. The present split between PS and C&E in respect to asset planning and future accommodation needs is not helpful. The amalgamation of PS and C&E will help this process.

Delivering energy reductions also needs to be completely integrated within the maintenance function with clear targets being set. This will cross the new directorates: - Environment and Enterprise (corporate buildings); Community Health and Well-being (council housing); and Children and Families (schools). However, it has to be recognised that we do not have direct control of schools and there may not be an easy way to ensure they are fully on-board

Reducing energy use saves money, reduces our exposure to rising energy costs and carbon taxes - so make good business sense as well as delivering our carbon reduction targets. The new Corporate Directors should be set clear targets in each of their areas.

Energy saving in the community

Fuel poverty. We have developed the Delivering Warmer Homes strategy over the last year. It is clear to me that delivery of this strategy will be very difficult whilst it is located in C&E. Cold homes have significant adverse effects on well-being of vulnerable people and the council's response to fuel poverty needs to be delivered in partnership with the NHS. The transfer of well-being responsibilities to the council presents the ideal opportunity to do this. Rising fuel costs and the current financial climate will mean that fuel poverty will assume a higher profile over the coming months. This task should clearly be led by Community Health and Well-being as it encompasses all housing sectors and a range of vulnerable people.

Green Deal. We are in a transition phase with national and regional schemes to support vulnerable people living in cold homes. The Warm Front and Warm Zones are coming to an end and the government's Green Deal is to be introduced from next October. There are, as yet, no clear indications from the government as to details but they are indicating that local authorities have an important role to play. The Green Deal will cover all housing sectors. Once we have more details we will need to develop our strategy so that we are ready for this change. We risk a hiatus where we don't have a scheme to assist people in difficulties. Again the development of this should be led by Community Health and Well-being.

Regards

Dear Michael, thank you for the opportunity to comment on your restructure proposals.

Overall, I think the proposals are very positive and better reflect the strategic forces impacting on the council than the current structure which has served us well over a number of years. Notably I think it is important that savings are made in senior management costs and that we better join up services to deliver improvement for the community. I think the broad roles of resources, environment and enterprise, children and families and community health and wellbeing are sensible from a community and place perspective.

As we have discussed I think the proposed new community health and wellbeing area should achieve very important impacts for the council on the quality of life of vulnerable people, wider public health outcomes and our ability to join up our work with the voluntary sector and community engagement. I would see this very much as a new directorate which should be more than the sum of its parts. It would also allow the post holder to continue to play the lead role in advancing the integration agenda with the health service more broadly.

On a point of detail you make the point that public health will transfer to this new directorate in 2013 - This is very positive although it might be worth making clear that the joint Director of public health already reports into the CD Adults and Housing so your proposals will build on these current arrangements and minimise disruption for the staff affected by the transition.

I also think you are right to point out that different things will be required of Corporate Directors in the new structure. I think this will also impact on CLG who will need to take on new roles and ways of working. Bernie, Lynne, Carol and Andrew can all bring a lot to the authority in the future in this regard.

You set out plans for a number of statutory posts to operate at 3rd tier level. I think your new expectations on Corporate Directors and CLG mean that we should redesignate the Divisional Director, Adult Social Care role as the DASS in line with the wider changes you propose. I would be very happy to discuss how this will work in practice.

I support the proposed operations board and would be interested to talk to you about how we could best make it work. Similarly I have some thoughts on the Deputy Chief Executive role which I would be happy to discuss.

I think areas such as equality, community involvement and the voluntary sector are key priorities for the council and our refreshed transformation programme and we must build on your proposals to strengthen these areas. I think the new community health and wellbeing directorate can take a leadership role in these areas.

Finally, I think there are a number of smaller service areas which the position of which could be helpfully reviewed as part of the restructure - notably adaptations and environmental health. Again, I would be happy to discuss this further if it is helpful.

I hope these comments are helpful and I look forward to meeting you to discuss them more fully.

Michael Lockwood
Chief Executive
Harrow Council
Civic Centre
Station Road
Harrow

My Ref: JB/mg

18th November 2011.

Dear Michael,

Thank you for writing to me about the Senior Management Structure Proposals and making me privy to the consultation document dated 21st October 2011.

My first impression on your commitment to reduce the number of senior managers from 30 to 20 is to be welcomed and although much of the need to address a restructure is motivated by the state of the economy and the requirement to find very substantial savings year on year, the perception of the man on the street to cuts at the top will be seen as an acknowledgement that there is no hiding place from the austerity measures regardless of earnings and status.

In wanting to play my part in the consultation I have decided to approach it from more of an observational perspective and to try and view the workings of the council through the eyes of the residents and business ratepayers who contact us on a daily basis.

So let us start with titles!

I believe Place Shaping should never have been separated from Planning for instance. If in determining a planning application, however large or small, we are not shaping the place we live then what is the name for?

Public Realm in my view is a grandiose title and until I was elected to the council I was hard pressed to explain what this meant. Although Highways might seem a rather narrow definition and exclude many of the other services under the heading Public Realm, I firmly believe it is better understood.

The word Partnership is a much used council word but I notice it appears only once under the proposed new Corporate Director of Resources. Surely partnership is a natural aim for us all and does not mean as much when attempts are made to define it under an exclusive heading? I would

also point out that for partnership to have any lasting meaning it is necessary to explain who in fact the partnership is with.

I understand that in streamlining departments it is essential that areas of work need listing as shown but I am rather concerned that the voluntary sector is missing from any of the proposed corporate directorships. Is this just an omission or is it considered that this vital area of the community does not warrant inclusion within the council's business?

The reduction of a senior management team from eight to five is to be welcomed for the reasons outlined in the opening paragraph and I endorse the deletion of the posts of Corporate Director for Place Shaping, Community and Environment and Adults and Housing. I also share the view that a designated Assistant Chief Executive is surplus to requirements.

The vacant post of a Corporate Director of Finance whilst being deleted should be included in the remit of the Chief Executive, in my view, to retain a focus on the council's purse strings and to avoid becoming diluted in a directorate that is looking after the neighbourhood services currently under the remit of Community and Environment.

To conclude this consultation from my own viewpoint I welcome the approach you are trying to achieve and in cutting the number of directors to just five I am reminded that there were only four directors across the council just a few decades ago when my father was on the council!

You say that you are acting in the best interests of the people of our borough so I sincerely hope that a consensus can be found across all party colours and none that make up the current Harrow Council and that the necessary cost cutting will be in the longer term assist with the delivery of frontline services.

Yours sincerely

Good Morning

I would like to take you up on your offer regarding comments on the proposed restructure of the directorates. The principles behind the restructure cannot be faulted, as the Council does need to be more streamlined and more focussed. I am sure that some of the positioning of the services within set directorates are based on logical reasoning and, in part, what is currently being carried out. Regardless, there does seem to be a misunderstanding of Environmental Health and its role. For this reason, I make the following comment:

Environmental Health / Public Health

The "*Health Lives, Healthy People*" Government White Paper on Public Health states:

*"Local government, including county, district and parish councils, already plays a significant role in protecting and improving the health of its communities, through, for example, **environmental health**, air quality, planning, transport and housing."*

*"Local government already works hard to protect health, for example, with **environmental health officers** playing a vital role during infectious disease outbreaks."*

*"A very wide range of clinicians and other professionals – from GPs to dentists, pharmacists to nurses, allied health professionals to **environmental health officers** – have essential roles to play in improving and protecting population health and reducing health inequalities."*

Yet the new structure has Public Health and Environmental Health as two completely separate elements in two different directorates, with no apparent recognition of the above. There are elements of "Community Safety" that are suited to sit with planning, highways, etc (such as the parking element, envirocrime team and highways enforcement). But there are many more elements that are directly and intrinsically linked with public health - we are the lead officers for infectious disease, for food and health & safety, for air quality, contaminated land, private sector housing conditions, alcohol and smoking legislation etc. This can be seen clearly throughout history, as it wasn't that long ago that the EHO was known as the "Public Health Inspector". There are no more fundamental areas of public health within a Local Authority than the ones covered by Environmental Health services.

Your statement within the restructure document also seems to support the argument for like minded services to be placed together:

"I believe there are significant synergies between adult social care, housing, public health and cultural services, and therefore real advantages to bringing them together to provide better joined up services that will contribute to improving the health and well-being outcomes for our residents."

There is a strong argument that the service the Government recognise as Health professionals should be included in these synergies based on the reasoning above. It would make sense therefore to join up like minded services yet the proposed structure doesn't. An example is housing, with Council Housing (rented) and Private Sector Housing (rented) in separate directorates, with the inference that the former impacts public health but the latter doesn't. Published recognised research clearly shows that housing per se is directly linked to public health and well being and none more so than rented accommodation.

While I understand the argument that positions within directorates should not stop partnership

working, evidence suggest otherwise. Since the intention to move the PCT public health team to the Local Authority, we have been excluded from such discussions despite attempts to get involved. I understand the link with adults & housing, but not to the detriment of an even larger area that even Government recognises as a public health team. My section, for instance, is launching a Health Catering Commitment to improve the health of food in premises around school. It is only through the work of Officers and Public Health Consultants at a ground level that some partnership work is being maintained.

It would therefore make sense if Environmental Health and Public Health are recognised as integral and positioned together. There are even cost savings to be made. While the Director of Public Health may not know the fundamentals of environmental health requirements this can be easily overcome through the professional team leaders running the teams who already leads in these areas. There is nothing to stop the DoPH managing the section and making it a much flatter service in terms of management hierarchy. We have already seen the Team Leaders here take on the strategic and operational management of the teams, showing there is no longer the need to have additional layers in place as we do now. It is noted that most of the Public Health team will be funded externally and so it would make sense to make savings where council funded posts are in place, with significant savings.

It should also be noted that a lot of the Environmental Professionals are also members of public health institutes, and involved in public health in the wider context. This may be through the membership of the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health and / or a member of the Royal Institute of Public Health. As a Fellow of the RSPH, I regularly am involved in looking at the wider public health agenda which my position, and that of my team, are not able to do presently at Harrow. An example is the meeting being attended on Monday (agenda attached)

It is therefore strongly advised that to get the maximum improvement to health and well being for residents, Public Health and Environmental Health are seen as an integral unit, allowing the strategy element and frontline delivery to work together properly.

Directorate Hierarchy

Unfortunately this is not clear, as only the corporate director level is shown. I would assume, considering it has been stated that there would be 10 senior managers less than previously, that the tiers below this (Directors and potentially Heads of Service) are also going to change. This is a perfect opportunity to "flatten" the structure and implement the span of control. It does seem that at present you have some senior professionals managing 10 staff and those above them directly managing 2 for instance. I appreciate that this will be one of the roles of the new Corporate Directors, to address these matters.

I hope the above is clear, but please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or require any further information

Kind regards

Dear Michael

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the restructuring of the senior management tier. I think the overwhelming view from staff I have spoken to is that this is opportune if slightly overdue. I have a couple of points to make:

1. The number of directorates in proportion to the organisation is still too high. Other similar sized organisations offering the same services are less top heavy and perform well. We can do the same. I believe there is scope for reducing the directorates by one. I accept there is no one size fits all template and ultimately this is a judgment for you and the Members and accept you are best placed to assess overall needs.

2. The positioning of Environmental Health within the Community and Enterprise Directorate is a mistake. The overwhelming view of individual and the professional view from the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH), PCT and Health Protection Agency (HPA) is that Environmental Health would best be positioned with Public Health to maximise synergies with the Local Authorities new Public Health functions. I would ask that the positioning of Environmental health is therefore reconsidered. The proposed positioning consigns Environmental Health to an enforcement role. The past 10-15 years has seen huge resources pumped into enforcement yet the returns have been small, enforcement alone cannot make the societal changes we need right now. By repositioning Environmental Health with Public Health, with a shared management structure we can develop shared strategies and plans, introduce nudge techniques to change peoples behaviours and business attitudes.

Coincidentally the CIEH and the HPA published a Vision Statement in 2002 entitled Environmental Health 2012 - A key partner in delivering the public health agenda. (http://www.cieh.org/uploadedFiles/Core/Policy/Public_health/Environmental_health_2012/environmental_health_2012.pdf) The key points from this document are more relevant in the current climate than ever before:

Environmental health, working with public health are the key partners in local and national efforts to protect and improve the health and quality of the lives of individuals and communities, and to reduce health inequalities.

Environmental health working with public health colleagues have a direct and trusted relationship with the general public. Between them they have a shared agenda of improving the well-being of individuals and communities. Between them they have shared skills and knowledge and can apply their expertise in responding to the needs of individuals and communities while also tackling the wider determinants of the population's health by identifying, controlling and preventing risks.

Environmental Health Officers are one of the very few Local Authority professionals who are specifically educated and trained to play lead role in Council Services by developing, co-ordinating and implementing community health and well-being strategies through local strategic partnerships (and now Well-being boards), to actively contribute to the public health agenda through the NHS primary care trusts. They will also contribute to tackling public health issues at regional, national and international levels.

Prior to the Local government reorganisation of 1974, Environmental Health was an integral part of the governments agenda on community well-being. Environmental Health was a unique council service, it was managed by a clinician reporting jointly to Members the NHS, very similar to the proposed structure. The structure recognised the synergies between environmental and

clinical Health in reducing inequalities, improving public health and well-being.

Earlier this year I invited Cllr Phillip O'Dell and Andrew Howe to a seminar organised by the CIEH to consider the governments changes to the public health agenda and how Environmental Health could best engage in the changes. The seminar was attended by senior civil servants from the Department of Health, academics, practitioners and clinicians. The overwhelming view shared by all was that breaking the link between Environmental Health and Public Health had not served the country well, that the proposed changes represent a once in a life time opportunity to reinstate a local deliver structure that recognises the link between peoples environment, the houses they live in, the food they eat, the exercise they take, the safety of their workplaces and the state of their health.

Only by combining Environmental Health and the expertise of our colleagues in Public Health will we have a truly joint service and make real sense of our JSNA and the Well-Being agenda.

What is Environmental Health?

Environmental Health Officers are the only recognised professional specifically trained and educated to have a holistic view on the effects on the relationship between the environment (our communities) and well-being of our residents. They have been recognised by a previous Chief Medical Officer as the only health practitioner in local government. Their professional standards are underpinned by rigorous education and training, including compulsory continuing professional development as well as assured professional conduct overseen by the Environmental Health Officers work in every sector of our economy and in every community. They work to keep people healthy and safe and to reduce health inequalities and their work contributes to the local and national economy.

What can Environmental Health contribute to public health?

Environmental Health Practitioners have the knowledge, skills, experience and the public engagement that naturally make them an integral part of the frontline public health workforce. The document Environmental Health 2012 - A key partner in delivering the public health agenda sets out the contribution of environmental health can make to peoples lives in partnership with public health. The document also recognises that Environmental Health Officers and other public health professionals, will be the key partners in local and national efforts to protect and improve the quality of life of individuals and communities and to reduce inequalities. An example of Environmental Health Practitioners delivering this vision today:

Warm Homes' project managed by an Environmental Health Practitioner using partnership funding from the Strategic Health Authority, PCT and Acute Trust, together with funding from Energy Saving Trust, to ensure that insulation and other grants are targeted on the groups in greatest need. Reduction in haemoconcentration (thickening of the blood) with increased risk of heart attacks, strokes, mental illness and, surprisingly, the risks of falls.

How can Environmental Health contribute to the Public Health Service?

The Councils Public Health delivery vehicle will need the input from Environmental Health in order to address effectively the wider determinants of health and deliver the outcomes and priority areas identified by the Marmot Reports. Conducting meaningful JSNA, local commissioning of services, particularly around adult social care and young people will be complex and multi-disciplinary processes in which peoples individual environmental and clinical needs will need to be assessed as one. Repositioning Environmental Health with Public Health

will ensure the Council can demonstrate a robust and visionary approach to the Government's Public Health and Well-Being Agenda.

Many, including HPA, CIEH and PCT's maintain that a unifying thread running through the existing arrangements for addressing both health protection and public health issues is the Environmental Health workforce. Therefore one way to reduce the risks that may arise in managing the transition is to make clear, now, by providing a joint role for the Environmental Health and Public Health in the devolved public health arrangements.

There is an additional risk that the current climate of spending cuts is leading to the loss of existing skills and expertise between now and when the new Public Health Service is established. It is particularly important to ensure that the professional capacity remains to provide resilience and deal with the emergencies of the future. Combining these two services will allow savings whilst still maintaining capacity.

How will Environmental Health fit into the new structures?

Whichever structure is ultimately settled, the professional commitment from Environmental Health staff can be assured; our *raison d'être* is ensuring good health. The commitment to localism will mean various local arrangements being created. However, Environmental Health is a significant part of the frontline workforce and embedding this service with public health will mean that important strategic functions of Public Health will have an inbuilt frontline delivery services. In particular, those services around Obesity and Dietary Advice could be uniquely combined with our work with businesses under the Scores on the Doors scheme (particularly the practice of establishing fast food shops around schools), Anti-Smoking strategies could be combined with our enforcement and Licensing powers over places of entertainment, Drug and Alcohol Abuse, can be combined with our inspection and licensing of pubs and clubs, Home Safety and Prevention of Workplace Deaths and Accidents can be combined with our business inspection work program which can easily be expanded to include home safety for elderly people opting to live in the community or their own homes rather than remain in institutional settings.

I look forward to your comments

Re: Harrow Council Senior Management Restructure

Dear Mr Lockwood,

Harrow Unison LG will formally respond to the above entitled document which seems to concentrate on areas of this local authority which seem to be in opposition to the employment culture expected by the CEO in these unprecedented times of austerity.

It is evident that areas of this authority have suffered from an inconsistent approach to protect frontline services, which of course is in keeping with the incumbent administrations Manifesto pledge. It has been apparent to this Union for some considerable time that the approach adopted by the incumbent Children's service Directorate has not been replicated in other service areas more visible to the majority of Harrow Residents.

In direct response to the proposed implementation of new Directorates we therefore follow the same format that has been used in the proposed consultation documentation.

Environment and Enterprise

Unison welcomes the amalgamation of these two similar Directorates, though approaching this matter with extreme caution. It is apparent from the documentation that a fixed term contract is being offered to afford the CEO flexibility to change the poor culture and staff morale that exists in one of these highly visible and customer focused service areas.

It is extremely disappointing that the CEO is looking at significant changes to the way services are delivered especially when major organisations such as APSE have reported that most in-house services can be delivered more efficiently than by adopting either a shared service option or a possible external provider. We hope that the successful candidates will possess all the attributes required to increasing productivity, efficiencies and most importantly a change in the existing culture to boost the low morale we are currently experiencing, together with the heavy reliance on consultancy costs and consultancy led direction.

Whilst we recommend a cautious approach to these service areas, we acknowledge the CEO's pledge to review the directorate structure at tier 3 and below in the stated 3 month timeframe. Unison has to be totally assured that this is not to be a desk top exercise or undertaken lightly and that firm steps are introduced by the newly appointed person to introduce a programme of culture change and hopefully the introduction of new professionally qualified, highly dedicated and condensed senior management team to enhance the need for a complete change to employment relations and cost effective service delivery. Most fundamentally, is the need to increase frontline staff morale through full consultation processes and the participation at all levels of staff to meet this challenge.

Community Health & Wellbeing

In response to the changes being introduced by the CEO in this Directorate, the inclusion of Community and Culture is again a new innovative way of working. But the concern for Unison is the review of the 3rd tier and below. The Adults and Housing Directorate at present have been extremely effective to take a proactive approach to their failings. This is clearly evident by the change in the housing department's leadership which occurred at Divisional Director level. This change clearly identified the poor leadership qualities of the previous post holder. This proactive approach by the incumbent directorate has now achieved a 360 degree review to achieve a silver IIP accreditation. We would therefore again request an in depth and cautious approach

when conducting any review of the 3rd tier and below. This would then ensure that the hard work of those in this directorate is not overlooked.

To introduce Community and Culture provides a real opportunity to reduce costs and condense the senior management team providing an opportunity to instil the culture change needed.

Resources

Unison is extremely concerned that the proposal fails to address the 3rd tier and below in this area of the corporate body. This area is one of the main areas that is required to be fully compliant of corporate governance and the employment practices and policies at the employer's disposal. Unison has had to request the intervention of external impartial bodies such as ACAS to assist this Union in its endeavours to maintain compliance with due legal process and employee's rights to be treated fairly and consistently. It is paramount that this proposal seeks to change the poor culture that exists within certain high profile areas of the employer. This poor culture has been supported by certain areas of the corporate body identified in the proposed Resource Directorate. If the employer is intent on improving its ratings amongst other Local Authorities and independent advisory bodies then it will need to fully address areas that support "Less than satisfactory" processes. This authority is embarking on its most radical change in recent history, and the need to provide highly professional and qualified support is an absolute necessity, especially when the coalition government intent appears to be the erosion of employee rights throughout the UK. Unison would also request that the newly appointed Director concentrates on those areas that have consistently failed to improve. As a union we have always fully subscribed to the ethos of 'employer of choice'. Harrow Unison LG requests that the incumbent CEO formally reviews this section of the proposal.

PA's

Unison is fully aware that any senior level reduction has the implications of impacting on areas that support the top level. Unison would formally request that all vacancies that are deemed suitable alternative employment are frozen to lessen the impact on those professional individuals. This of course would be fully compliant of section 139 ERA 96.

Yours sincerely
Harrow Unison LG

Dear Michael,

I am pleased with the proposals for the new structure and believe it will ensure a more effective and streamlined service. It should support the delivery of savings through cutting management, admin, policy and support functions which will be possible by bringing the Directorates together. It is important to ensure this occurs. All areas of performance management should be centralised and rationalised based on the external demands and performance framework agreed by the administration and CSB.

Bringing together the Chief Exec and Finance Directorate is an excellent idea. I feel that it offers real opportunities to look at what we could do with back room services across councils and the NHS and to bring down our SSC costs, as if we don't it will impact on front line services.

Full support for bringing together Community and Environment and Place Shaping. There are a lot of areas which naturally fit together and it's a manageable size.

Adult care, housing, public health and culture is possibly too large a Directorate. The role of public health is predominately focussed on Children and Families not older adults. The role of public health shouldn't be a fixed position in adult services as I know many of the tasks fit across the directorates, i.e. performance management and research and policy, it will become sloped and we won't realise the benefits. With Health Visitors and School Nurses for children moving to public health a large percentage of their budgets will be children's commissioning. Public Health was managed in the Children's Directorate prior to the new DCS. It was moved without consultation or discussion with children's services partners or staff. I don't think there has ever been a proper discussion or understanding in the council of its potential and function. I think the council are missing a trick by not looking at the role in a wider context.

Finally I think leaving Children's Directorate intact fits with present Government consultation post Monroe. It does however mean there are less opportunities for savings in future years as the reorganisation has driven any possible savings without making the Directorate unsafe or unable to carry out its statutory obligations.

I think there is a lot of work that needs to be done across Directorates on key areas of performance management, complaints, commissioning, public health etc.

A good beginning and foundations for the way forward.

Dear Michael,

Apologies for the delay in offering some feedback to the senior management restructure document, I had intended to respond right away but half term got in the way!

The paper is very clear and the rationale makes absolute sense to me. There are lots of exciting opportunities referenced throughout it and I believe this offers strong motivational incentives to those prepared to take on the challenges offered.

The CLG steering group will be writing to you separately with some thoughts on how we believe the discussion around the Operations Boards is taken forward. Feedback from the functioning of both the steering group and the hit squad may assist in this.

With regards to the directorate I will sit in - Community, Health and Wellbeing, I believe this proposal will further strengthen existing relationships across these areas and will bind them in such a way as to ensure the synergies are realised through better outcomes for our community. I very much welcome the expansion of this Directorate and we have already started thinking of new innovations that may be derived from this new partnership.

Please know that I am very happy as ever to assist in any way you feel may be helpful or appropriate.

Regards,

Dear Michael

Thank you for inviting comments on the proposed new senior management structure. Please see my comments below.

I agree that the new structure needs to reflect the current financial context and I feel that these proposals send the right message to front line staff and Unions that 'doing more with less' applies to all levels of the organisation and has been reflected in the proposals.

To achieve the 30% savings target over next four years requires the council to operate in a very different way. This will require CSB to work as 'one council' and Corporate Directors having a cross council role will encourage this to happen. The proposal to develop an operations board will build on the development work that CLG has undertaken over the last year and maximise the opportunities to work creatively and innovatively to close existing funding gaps. This arrangement will also free up CSB to concentrate on strategic issues.

I am excited by the possibilities that the creation of the new Community, Health and Wellbeing directorate brings and agree that there are clear synergies between adult social care, housing, public health and community and culture. Many of the wider determinants of health sit across the proposed new directorate and by bringing these areas together it will make joined up delivery easier to achieve. The new arrangements will also help deliver the next stage of our personalisation journey. Enabling a joined up relationship with the voluntary sector will be welcomed by colleagues in the sector and I'm confident that the positive relationship that Adult Services has developed with the sector will bode well for the new arrangements.

I know that the next few years are going to be challenging but look forward to assisting Harrow with the journey.

Regards

November 2011

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Senior Management Restructure Proposals
Report from the Challenge Panel

Members of the Challenge Panel

Councillor Sue Anderson (Chairman)

Councillor Chris Mote

Councillor Paul Osborn

Councillor Victoria Silver

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	38
BACKGROUND.....	39
OBSERVATIONS.....	40
Evidence base for the restructure.....	40
Diversity of the Corporate Board.....	40
Commissioning.....	40
Statutory Officer Posts.....	41
Process for delivering the change.....	42
Review.....	43
CONCLUSION.....	44

CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The challenge panel was established at comparatively short notice in order to ensure that scrutiny comments could be submitted to the Chief Executive as part of his consultation on the proposed restructure of the senior management of the council. We are grateful to Michael Lockwood, Chief Executive, and Jon Turner, Divisional Director HRD and Shared Services, for meeting with us at short notice and enabling us to participate in the consultation process. However, we hope that in future, our requests for supporting information can be responded to in a more timely fashion in order that we are able to make the most effective contribution to the debate.

We met on 7th November and considered both the detail of the restructure proposals and also the process by which we will move to the new structure. Our findings are arranged under the following headings:

- Evidence base for the restructure
- Diversity of the Corporate Board
- Statutory officer posts
- Commissioning
- Process for delivering the change
- Review

This report constitutes the Overview and Scrutiny committee's contribution to the consultation process. We hope that our observations are helpful in securing the senior management configuration which the organisation needs to move successfully forward. On behalf of the members of the challenge panel, I commend this report.

Councillor Sue Anderson
Chair of the Senior Management Restructure Proposals challenge panel

BACKGROUND

On 21st October, the Chief Executive of the Council, Michael Lockwood, published his proposals with regard to the future senior management structure of the council.

His proposals are summarised as follows:

The deletion of:

- Corporate Director, Place Shaping
- Corporate Director, Community and Environment
- Corporate Director, Adults and Housing
- Assistant Chief Executive

The creation of the following posts:

- Corporate Director, Environment and Enterprise – to comprise the services in the Place Shaping Directorate and neighbourhood services from Community and Environment directorate which focus on place
- Corporate Director, Community, Health and Wellbeing – to comprise services in Adults and Housing and community and cultural service currently located in Community and Environment Directorate
- Corporate Director, Resources – to combine all of the corporate services in the borough, including current Chief Executive's office, Finance and Legal and Governance.

The proposed means of recruiting to the new structure is as follows:

- Corporate Director, Community, Health and Wellbeing – assimilation of existing Corporate Director of Adults and Housing
- Corporate Director, Environment and Enterprise – ringfenced interview of Corporate Director Place Shaping and Corporate Director Community and Environment
- Corporate Director, Resources – ringfenced interview Assistant Chief Executive

The current interim Corporate Director of Finance will be retained on contract for 18 months to support the transition to Corporate Director of Resources

The purpose of the restructure was highlighted to the challenge panel as an opportunity to secure a senior management structure which is fit for purpose, is able to respond to changing service delivery models, financial difficulties and a continuously changing policy environment, and which encourages a co-operative, cross-directorate working model by giving a more strategic role to the organisation's most senior managers. By structuring the organisation and its senior management around themes, the Chief Executive feels he can meet the administration's objectives and put the organisation on a firm footing to deliver the real outcomes which residents need and want.

OBSERVATIONS

Evidence base for the restructure

The panel sought assurance with regard to the evidence base used by the Chief Executive to restructure his senior management team, as previous reorganisation in the borough has resulted in significant difficulties for the authority.

We note that the Chief Executive chose not to seek the advice of our transformation partner, Capita, which we understand was because, in his view, whilst Capita can support the organisation through the *delivery* of change, they are not experienced in supporting the kind of structural change which the Chief Executive is proposing for the borough.

We note that the Chief Executive looked to peer authorities to assess impact of other reorganisations and other structures. We were reassured that he looked to industry best practice in devising his proposals but we were concerned about the robustness of the evidence that this provided.

The Chief Executive advised that he has grounded his proposals in an assessment of the needs of the organisation, whilst significant improvements have been delivered, the organisation must now step up a gear to meet the gap between where we are and where we wants to be and this in the context of significant financial stress and changing government policy.

It is the Chief Executive's view that this model will enable the authority to deliver the administration's priorities and the job descriptions devised reflect this. It is his intention to improve horizontal working and improve behaviours, it is his opinion that there is significant competition between directorates and he wishes to see much greater co-operation. He feels that a move towards a commissioning model, which will focus on identification of need and outcomes will assist in this and his new structures support this by emphasising outcomes for service users rather than professional experience. We are concerned that there is no competency model in place and urge the Chief Executive to move swiftly towards his stated aim of building competencies around the existing CREATE values. In this context we endorse his ambition to further embed the CREATE values.

Diversity of the Corporate Board

We are pleased that it is the Chief Executive's ambition to oversee a corporate board which reflects the demographic profile of the borough. We are disappointed however, that the proposed process for implementing change (and we discuss this further below) will see the profile of the board 'deteriorate' – we understand that the number of women will be reduced from two to one and it will include no Black or Minority Ethnic officers. Whilst it is not our intention to suggest that appointment should be made on the basis of ethnicity or gender, we do feel that as far as reasonably possible the process for filling posts should enable the possibility of women or members of the BME community reaching the highest managerial positions in the authority.

Commissioning

We note that in the response to our pre-panel enquiries, significant justification for the structural changes is given to the need to move the organisation towards a commissioning model. Whilst we are excited by this prospect, we have concerns

about the capacity of staff, particularly at the senior management level of the organisation, to deliver such a significant shift – we return to this point in our discussion of the process for delivering the restructure. We recognise that in order to deliver real commissioning, and particularly in a borough as diverse as Harrow, staff will require a new skill set and change in behaviours and again, we welcome the Chief Executive's assertion that he wishes to ensure the CREATE values are at the heart of the restructure.

We note his assertion that the commissioning model and a focus on outcomes and not professions and functions should be the future motivation of the organisation and that the commissioning model is the vehicle through which to deliver a re-focused organisation. We welcome the development and use of joint intelligence across the authority and with partners which can help to facilitate the shift to the commissioning model. We urge the authority to ensure that the skills base required to enable the authority to utilise this increasing understanding of need is in place. In this context, we were pleased to hear that the council is embarking on an extensive training needs analysis in order to identify the skills gaps which need to be addressed if the organisation is to move effectively towards the commissioning model.

We would urge the authority to consider the speed of change and also to ensure that clear communication with regard to the implementation of a commissioning structure is in place with all staff and residents. There may be compelling argument to support the move but it must be clearly articulated. In this context, we welcome proposals for a corporate Director sponsor for the move to commissioning.

It is important that recognition is given to the different skill set required in the new job descriptions for corporate directors.

Statutory Officer Posts

We are particularly concerned about the position of the Section 151 and monitoring officers and their potential removal from the corporate board. We are aware that CIPFA guidance suggests that an authority's Chief Finance Officer should be a member of the senior board and should share the same status as others in order to ensure that s/he has sufficient authority over her/his peers with regard financial matters. We are also aware, from CIPFA surveys, that 88% of Directors of Finance in public service organisations have a seat on the senior board 'by right' ¹ A survey by CIPFA ² in 2005, also found that in 93% of London Boroughs and 78% of metropolitan/unitary authorities in England, the Director of Finance reports directly to the Chief Executive. We welcome the Chief Executive's comment that both the Section 151 and monitoring officers can still have 'dotted line' accountability directly to him, however we remain concerned. We would observe that the requirement for the inclusion of an explanation in the council's Governance Statement if the Section 151 officer is not a member of the corporate board is further evidence of the presumption of this as a risk.

The Chief Executive commented that whilst the Section 151 and monitoring officers are both important roles for the authority, and he intends to strengthen

¹ Role of Director of Finance - YouGov Survey for CIPFA Annual Conference 2008

² Analysis of 2005 Survey of local Government Chief Financial Officers – CIPFA 2005

the authority's finance function, he is seeking the best leader for the proposed Resources Directorate. Whilst it is appropriate for a finance function to be headed up by an accountant, this is not necessarily the case for a Director of Resources, and he advised that his research had revealed that a number of local authorities which have implemented a similar structure had not appointed an accountant to this role.

The panel reflected on CIPFA guidance regarding the dangers of extending the responsibilities of the Section 151 officer beyond finance to include more corporate services. This concern was echoed by the Chief Executive, who suggested that his new structure will ensure the officer can focus specifically on finance.

We remain concerned about the extent to which the council is securing sufficient financial safeguards in the new structure by either not appointing an accountant to the role of Director of Resources or consequently, not offering a seat on the corporate board to the Section 151 officer. Although we note the Chief Executive's reflection on structures in Hounslow, Hillingdon and Newham, we are concerned that insufficient scenario planning has taken place to identify the potential risks of the proposed shift of the Section 151 officer.

Having reviewed the documentation presented by the Chief Executive we are still not convinced that it is sensible to have neither the S151 Officer or the Monitoring Officer on the Corporate Board.

Process for delivering the change

Our most significant concern is the process which the council intends to adopt in order to deliver the proposed change. Given our concerns highlighted above with regard to both the diversity of the corporate board and also the significant skills/behaviour changes required at the senior level, we are disappointed that a more open competition is not proposed. This we feel would have resulted in the most beneficial outcome for both the organisation and internal applicants.

We were advised by the Chief Executive and Divisional Director HRD and Shared Services of the reason that the proposed process is being applied:

- It is important that due process is followed. The council's own procedures prescribe that the process followed must –
 - avoid redundancies
 - consider current senior managers suitability for posts in the new structure and whether they can be assimilated into a new post, can have a ring-fenced interview or whether the post could go straight to open competition.
- Failure to follow due process could result in employment challenge and risk of litigation
- At such a critical time for the organisation, it is important not to lose the existing corporate knowledge. The current team has come along way and the Chief Executive wants to build on what is in place and develop the team which has delivered the council's success.
- There is risk associated with 'unknown' appointments'.

We were advised that the Chief Officers Employment Panel is responsible for agreeing the selection process but deviation from HR advice brings with it risk.

Whilst these explanations are helpful, we remain concerned.

As mentioned above, the process will not address any of the organisation's diversity objectives and will effectively simply redistribute the existing staffing resources without addressing the real skill changes that a commissioning model requires. We feel that going to the market, though doing so may bring with it risk, means that the potential of recruiting the highest calibre staff to these senior positions could be more likely. We wish to emphasise that in saying this we are not suggesting that the highest calibre staff are not the officers currently in the employment of the council but we do mean that their competence will have been tested in a more robust way and the organisation can thus be assured of the quality of appointments. We recognise the Council's contractual obligations in this context but are concerned that this means the process adopted may fail to address the need to appoint the best candidate for the job.

With particular regard to the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise, who will be appointed for two years, it is possible that the whole process will need to be repeated in 18 months, with significant legal risks if the person appointed in this review is not reappointed in 18 months time. This seems excessive to us and we feel it might be more appropriate to run the process once.

Under current proposals, unsuccessful ring-fence interviewees are able to apply in a second round of external interviews. If they are then appointed at this second stage, the organisation runs the risk of demoralising incumbent officers who are then expected to continue in post. Whilst the proposed process is designed to minimise risk, we feel that the potential demoralisation of the organisation's leadership brings with it an equal, if different risk to the successful development of the organisation.

We note that previous Chief Officer appointments have included multiple assessments – multi criteria decision analysis – whereby candidates were interviewed by different panels of people – officers, partners, political party representatives - who came to independent decisions regarding their suitability. We feel this approach has merit and therefore should be used in the recruitment of the new Corporate Directors.

One of the most innovative propositions in the restructure proposals is the introduction of the Operations Board at the Corporate Leadership Group level. We welcome this proposal, which will enhance horizontal co-operation at this senior level in the organisation - we are pleased to note that it echoes the findings of the 'Measuring up: Harrow Council's Use of Performance' scrutiny review. Further to our comments regarding more open competition, we note that there may well be officers in this tier who would relish the opportunity to apply for these senior posts. We welcome the Chief Executive's commitment to the development of this tier of officers.

Review

We were reassured to hear that the Chief Executive intends to review the structure in 18 months time. As we have observed, the success of the changes depend on the development of a new skills set and a successful shift in the

behaviours of the leadership of the organisation. Review in 18 months will enable positive experience to be replicated and mistakes to be remedied.

CONCLUSION

We are grateful for this opportunity to comment on the proposals and we hope our observations are helpful. We support the Chief Executive's assertion of the need to change and we commend his efforts to continue to improve Harrow Council. Where we have differences with his proposals this is generally in the pathway to that change, not the eventual destination.

Members of the Senior Management Restructure Proposals Challenge Panel

DRAFT