

**Addenda for Cabinet
20 December 2016
Item 11 – Senior Management Review**

Addenda 1 – Views from All-member performance scrutiny meeting on 9 December 2016

This meeting was a Performance Scrutiny session open to all Members and Chaired by Cllr Brighthouse in her capacity as Chair of the Performance Scrutiny. It was an opportunity for all Members to hear from Dr Barry Quirk who co-authored the Penna report. He described how the review had proceeded, on what principles, and with what ambitions, as set out in the Cabinet paper (of 22 November 2016).

The meeting was then run as a Q&A session with the key points summarised below:

Isn't "Place" a better Strategic Director role title than "Communities"?

It was acknowledged that there's no perfect shorthand to describe roles. Barry explained that the "Strategic Director for People" role relates to the minority of residents who need adult or child social services, whereas "Communities" refers both to locations and to the majority of residents who do not require social services.

There are 8 directors proposed: more than now? More expensive?

It was explained that in most cases "Director" would be a re-designation of posts which are currently Deputy Directors or Corporate Advisors, which would entail no salary increases.

Could the vacant Strategic Director role go to someone external, able to mediate with the District and City councils, and/or with experience of dealing with LEPs?

To do this would mean unhelpfully restricting the pool of applicants. As with the other two Strategic Director appointments, the successful candidate will need to have exceptional capability for strategic management, adaptability and flexibility.

Members highlighted misunderstanding of the role title of Assistant Chief Executive.

It was clarified that this is a renaming of the Chief Policy Officer role. "Assistant" does not mean "deputy" – one of the three Strategic Directors would deputise for the Chief Executive whenever needed. The post and its responsibilities are in line with similar posts with this title in other authorities. Members returned to this issue at the end of the meeting and still had concerns about the job title, they suggested 'Director for Policy & Scrutiny' better reflected the role.

Is the title of Assistant Chief Executive a missed opportunity to give prominence to the Chief Scrutiny Officer role incorporated in that post?

Cllr Hudspeth noted that the election of a new Council in May offers an opportunity to revisit the review of scrutiny implemented in 2013.

Some of the role titles won't mean anything to our public. Some of the ones being changed – for example County Director – are already adequate.

This was noted, but the Chair explained how the process of agreeing the proposed roles had shown the difficulty of identifying wording which met all individuals' perceptions equally. No further changes to role titles would be proposed for now.

Are there plans to follow the review with consideration of other structural reform such as Cabinet portfolios, scrutiny functions and so on?

Barry and Cllr Hudspeth agreed that the review offers that opportunity. Cllr Hudspeth noted the possibility of Cabinet roles being more strategic but stressed the value of "lead member for..." to provide a focal point and leadership.

How does the review fix the problem of the council's culture of operating in silos?

The review sets the conditions in which that change can take place. Strategic Directors will look across the piece to join up resources and activities for strategic benefit, as well as looking down at service performance to hold Directors to account. Greater coalescence around strategic priorities in the Corporate Plan – already happening now under performance reporting reforms – would naturally break silos. Systems and functions which enable services need to be more uniform across business teams, and we should work towards (for example) one commissioning team and one ICT system supporting all teams equally.

The new structure will meet the "aspirations of members" but we need to be clearer that it's about the "decisions" of members being implemented.

This was noted and wording would be updated in the final proposals.

If approved, when will the proposals be implemented?

From January 2017, building on changes already made this year.