SPECIAL COUNCIL

To: All members of the Council

You are hereby summoned to attend a special meeting of South Norfolk Council for the purpose of transacting the business set out in this agenda.

Yours sincerely

Trevor Holden
Managing Director

AGENDA

Date
Thursday 28 February 2019

Time
10.00 am

Place
Council Chamber
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton
Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Claire White
01508 533669
democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

This meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed by the public; however, anyone who wishes to do so must inform the Chairman and ensure it is done in a non-disruptive and public manner. Please review the Council’s guidance on filming and recording meetings available in the meeting room.

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance

Large print version can be made available
The Council’s Prayer

A G E N D A

1  Apologies for absence

2  Urgent Items:

   Any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as
   matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100 B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act,
   1972; [Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances"
   (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that
   the item should be considered as a matter of urgency.]

3  To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members

   (please see guidance – pages 3 & 4)

4  Senior Management Recruitment and Appointment Arrangements

   (report attached – page 5)
AGENDA ITEM: 3

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether their interest in the matter is pecuniary, or if the matter relates to, or affects a pecuniary interest they have, or if it is another type of interest. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote. If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed. If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.

Does the interest directly:
1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in

If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.

Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?

If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting.

Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an ‘other’ interest. You will need to declare the interest but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.

Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, it may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting.

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.
PLEASE REFER ANY QUERIES TO THE MONITORING OFFICER IN THE FIRST INSTANCE
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?
A    Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?
OR
B    Does it directly affect me, my partner or spouse’s financial position, in particular:
    - employment, employers or businesses;
    - companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value or more than 1% of nominal share holding
    - land or leases they own or hold
    - contracts, licenses, approvals or consents

If you have not already done so, notify the Monitoring Officer to update your declaration of interests.

The interest is related to a pecuniary interest.
Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may make representations as a member of the public, but then withdraw from the room.

Does the matter indirectly affect or relate to a pecuniary interest I have declared, or a matter noted at B above?

The interest is not pecuniary nor affects your pecuniary interests.
Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may participate in the meeting and vote.

Have I declared the interest as an ‘other’ interest on my declaration of interest form?
OR

Does it relate to a matter highlighted at B that impacts upon my family or a close associate?
OR

Does it affect an organisation I am involved with or a member of?
OR

Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
Council 28 February 2019

Agenda Item: 4

SENIOR MANAGEMENT RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Report Author(s): Trevor Holden, Managing Director, 01508 533603 / 01603 430458, MDtoBDCandSNC@norfolk.gov.uk

Portfolio Holders: Cllr John Fuller / Cllr Shaun Vincent

Ward(s) Affected: All

Purpose of the Report: This report seeks Council approval on the preferred appointment panel for the recruitment and appointment of the Senior Management roles for Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council that will facilitate a single paid service. The report also includes an updated timeline (appendix A) and updated terms of reference for the Joint Appointment Panel (appendix B). Appendix C shows the responses and feedback from the formal consultation with the affected senior staff and UNISON.

Recommendations

For Council to:

1. Note the recruitment process and associated timeline (in Appendix A) for appointment of Chief Officer and Deputy Chief Officer roles to the Senior Management structure.

2. Confirm and approve the proposed panel format as set out in section 4.12 for the Member appointments panel of Chief Officer roles.

3. Confirm and approve the preferred option from the table of options in section 4.13 for the appointments panel of Deputy Chief Officer roles.
4. Approve the updated terms of reference for the Joint Appointment Panel (in Appendix B).

5. Approve that the Managing Director be given delegated authority to appoint on an interim basis in the event that any external appointments are required after all internal senior staff and wider internal staff groups are complete.

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report sets out the proposed arrangements for selection and appointment to the Senior Management staffing structure for Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council that will facilitate a single paid service. In January 2019, both Councils agreed the draft senior management structure that would be used for the formal consultation process with affected staff. Both Councils also agreed that formal consultation could commence in parallel with this report to seek agreement of the selection and appointment arrangements.

1.2 The following report describes the proposed process, involvement of Members and anticipated timeline for the whole assessment process. This report has been drafted taking into consideration the feedback that was received from both Council meetings.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Managing Director commenced employment on 2 January 2019 and proposes a senior management structure for Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers to support the delivery of both Councils’ ambitions. At Broadland these officers are the Deputy Chief Executive and the Heads of Service, and at South Norfolk these officers are the Directors and the Heads of Service.

2.2 These ambitions were stated within the feasibility report which was approved by Council in July 2018 and are to drive economic and housing growth and improve the services delivered to the residents. The feasibility report also agreed that subsequent to the appointment of the Managing Director, the establishment of a joint senior management team and one joint officer team across the two autonomous Councils was to be progressed.

2.3 The Managing Director has been entrusted to take the Councils forward in delivering a single paid service across two autonomous Councils, hand in hand with this, Members also need to own, and be accountable for, the appointment of the senior management structure who will go on to deliver the Council services and ensure that the aspirations will be achieved.

2.4 The key driver through the whole appointment process is to ensure that individuals have the opportunity to demonstrate their keys strengths and aptitude to meet the Councils’ overall objectives. Thus, ensuring that the right people are in the right jobs through an open and transparent process.
3. CURRENT POSITION

3.1 On 7 December 2018 the Joint Lead Members Group discussed the proposed approach to appointing the senior management team and in January 2019 both Councils met separately to agree this. This report has been produced as a result of both Councils agreeing the draft senior structure to start formal consultation process but postponing a decision on approving the preferred composition of appointments panel until further discussion could be held at Joint Lead Members, the new formal Joint Scrutiny, Cabinet and Council.

3.2 Prior to this Council meeting these meetings have been held to discuss the options available for appointments to be made to Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers.

3.3 As a result of these meetings it has been clear that the preference is for a member panel to be convened for both Chief Officer and Deputy Chief Officer appointments. The Managing Director will have a vote if an overall decision cannot be reached and the panel are to be supported by a representative from the external recruitment provider, but with no vote This is explored further in section 4 of this report – Interview Panels.

3.4 Section 4 of the report has also been updated to reflect the outcomes of the consultation process.

4. RECRUITMENT PROCESS

4.1 Appendix A outlines the appointment activities and proposed timeline that needs to be adhered to in order to ensure a robust recruitment process. There are key dates within the timeline that need to be achieved so that the requirements outlined in the background of this report are met. The appointment process requires significant time commitment from all parties, ie, recruitment panel members and affected staff. A summary of the key stages is shown below:
4.2 The following describes the above in more detail.

4.3 There are two levels of post proposed – Chief Officer (Director) and Deputy Chief Officer (Assistant Director). The draft Job Descriptions and proposed salary ranges have been referred to in the Employee Pack for formal consultation with affected staff and UNISON.

4.4 Chief Officer roles will be initially ring fenced to current Deputy Chief Executive and Directors. Deputy Chief Officer roles will be ring fenced initially to current Heads of Service.

4.5 The rationale for a ring fence for Chief Officer posts and a ring fence for Deputy Chief Officer posts is to ensure a fair open and transparent process for candidates and not to create the potential for (say) a Chief Officer to be dislodged by a Deputy Chief Officer. Similarly, the Deputy Chief Officer roles would be ring fenced to existing Heads of Service and not any lower tier groups as this would again create the potential to displace an existing Head of Service.

4.6 Individuals will have the opportunity to initially apply for up to three roles in total within both ring fenced groups. Therefore, the panel will initially interview an individual once for a potential number of roles which could be in either ring fence. The interview will comprise of both the key leadership elements required and any relevant role specific elements to ensure the individual is credible in the role appointed to.

4.7 If a Director role becomes available following the initial ring fenced interviews...
and a member of the Assistant Director ring fenced group has expressed an interest in this, they will be 'brought forward' for this interview ahead of the Assistant Director ring fenced interviews. If an existing Chief Officer expresses an interest in an Assistant Director role, they will be considered for this once the initial Assistant Director ring fenced interviews have taken place.

4.8 On completion of the ring fenced interviews, should vacancies still exist these will be offered internally for all staff to apply, and then following this exercise externally advertised should the need still be there.

4.9 The overall appointment process will focus on individual's leadership skills and take account of their previous experience and future potential. The Strengths Based Assessment Centre will be facilitated by an external recruitment provider therefore the process will be in two stages.

   i) Strengths Based Assessment Centre
   ii) Formal Interview.

4.10 A strengths based and behavioural approach is being taken to guide the recruitment. This means that officers will be assessed against core strengths and behaviours that support the values of the councils and support the move to ‘Two councils - One team’. This will support the development of a senior management team that has an effective and engaging leadership approach.

4.11 At the end of the Strengths Based Assessment Centre the external provider will make recommendations to the Interview panel about which individuals should progress to formal interview. It is the Panel decision whether to accept the recommendations.

Interview panels

4.12 **Chief Officer (Director) roles** - It is proposed that a Member panel is used for Chief Officer interviews with the Managing Director having a formal role and vote only if the panel votes are a tie. A balanced representation on the panels from each Council could otherwise result in a tie of votes. It should be noted that a tie of votes creates a risk of not appointing anyone even those who are suitable, which could lead to a scenario of creating additional costs in having to unnecessarily look externally to appoint. It is also proposed that a representative from the external recruitment provider attend but with no vote, in order to advise on HR procedure and the results from the Strengths Based Assessment. This Member panel would be composed of four Members from each Council with the same political balance as used for the Joint Appointment Panel that recruited the Managing Director, i.e., three Conservatives to one Liberal Democrat. This option enables Members to shape the direction of each Council. In total there would be 10 participants on the panel - eight Members, the Managing Director and an external recruitment specialist for the envisaged three Director interviews.
4.13 **Deputy Chief Officer (Assistant Director) roles** – Agreement by both Councils on one option is needed for appointment to these roles. The following is a summary of potential options. All proceeding Member meetings have indicated a potential preference to use the same format as with the Chief Officer roles described above. The options available are set out below for completeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pros &amp; Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>Same format as Chief Officer roles above i.e., an eight Member Panel plus Managing Director and external recruiter.</td>
<td>Pro: Consistent with Chief Officer roles. Cons: Highly resource intensive (11 interviews over two weeks) because the same panel members must be available for all interviews to be fair to all candidates; High number of panel members creates greater potential for not being available for all interviews, substitutes mid process would introduce an unfair bias to other candidates they have not interviewed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>A small Member Panel. Two Cabinet Members from each Council, MD and external recruiter.</td>
<td>Pro: Member involvement, increased likelihood of achieving Member availability. Cons: MD not empowered to choose his management team; Availability of Members for interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td>Delegated to the MD plus Member Panel involvement – The eight Members would receive presentations as the first stage of their interview from each candidate and feed their views to the MD.</td>
<td>Pro: Efficient and Member involvement. Cons: Availability of 11 candidates and eight Members on the same day. Availability needs to be confirmed for all 11 presentations by the same eight Members, to avoid the (unfair) use of substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong></td>
<td>Delegated to the MD to recommend for Cabinet endorsement.</td>
<td>Pro: Efficient and enables the MD to be responsible for selecting his management team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.14 As mentioned above, in order to ensure consistency and fairness to all candidates, panels must have the same representatives interviewing all candidates in their ring fenced group. Therefore, it is required that panel members are available for all steps within the process. In order to achieve fairness and equity of treatment it needs to be ensured that a common membership of no less than 75% must be maintained whilst ensuring equal representation from each Council. In the event of the absence of any member, a decision to suspend political balance may be taken by the respective council leader to ensure that the interview process is completed to the required timetable.
4.15 It is recognised that interviews will require a significant time commitment from panel Members. The following shows the date/times envisaged:

- **Fri 8 March 1pm – 4pm (at BDC):** A briefing by the external HR specialist developing the assessment centre to the Panel members about the Strengths Based Assessment including feedback on the senior managers’ assessment scores from the Assessment Centre to be held 6 March at SNC.

- **Fri 15 March 12 - 5pm (at SNC, first interview at 1230):** 3x Interviews for the Director roles.

- **11x Interviews for Assistant Director roles over 3 days:**
  - **Mon 25 March** (1230 - 530pm at SNC due to SNC Cabinet in morning).
  - **Tue 26 March** (1230 - 530pm at BDC due to BDC Overview & Scrutiny in morning and BDC Place Shaping Panel in evening).
  - **Thu 28 March** (1230 - 530pm at BDC due to BDC Full Council in evening). Further interviews potentially might be needed if vacant posts were to still remain after all candidates had been interviewed in order that all Councils’ staff can apply. If vacancies were to still exist after this, then interviews are envisaged with external candidates.

4.16 To reflect the approach of the interviews for Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers being as per the process for the Managing Director, the terms of reference for the Joint Appointment Panel have been expanded to include these officers and are attached at Appendix B to the report.

4.17 Built into the appointments is the process for notifying Cabinet of the appointments so that any reasonable objections can be raised. The appointments to the statutory posts – Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer – and to the Chief Officer roles will require ratification at each (Full) Council meeting.

4.18 Regardless of the composition for the interview panel it is important to note that they are delegated to make the appointments and empowered to meet the requirements of ensuring that the right people are in the right jobs and that the individuals’ strengths and aptitude will ensure that the Councils objectives are realised.

4.19 In the event that external appointments are required (as outlined above) it would be beneficial for the Managing Director to be given delegated authority to appoint on an interim basis, thus ensuring that progress against the objectives of collaborative working are not hampered. This then allows time for external adverts to be placed and permanent recruitments made, following the preferred appointments route.

5 OTHER OPTIONS

5.1 To continue to work as two separate senior management teams. In doing so
the immediate benefits of collaborative working would be lost and therefore it would become difficult to achieve the outcomes that were agreed as part of the feasibility study and the recommendations that were agreed by Members. It would not enable the benefits that are to be realised in terms of maximising efficiencies, developing a joint culture and driving forward the ambition of the Members.

5.2 Defer the introduction of the senior management structure, however delays in the process could be sensitive as it would prolong the period of uncertainty for the staff directly affected and impact the pace of delivery of improving our customer offer through joint working. Both Councils decided at their meetings in January 2019 to postpone the decision on agreeing the appointment process until further discussions had been had. It should also be noted that there has been uncertainty amongst senior management since July 2018 when the Feasibility Report was agreed. Having consulted with them on the structure and so to then not proceed to the appointment process would provide additional uncertainty which could result in good staff looking for alternative employment.

5.3 To take a staged approach to implementing the senior management structure, e.g. using the collaborative service groupings. This would delay the immediate benefits and again cause prolonged uncertainty for existing staff.

6 ISSUES AND RISKS

6.1 Legal Implications - Changes to the Constitution are necessary to facilitate the proper implementation of a single management structure. A single management structure is necessary to help both Councils work collaboratively to realise their ambitions.

6.2 Resource Implications – Given the presumption of no redundancy the aim is to bring this structure in as cost neutral, however there is potential for savings to be generated as we progress.

Should a redundancy situation arise, each individual Authority’s policies and agreements will be respected. There are cost implications to this which each Authority will honour for their individual employees.

6.3 Equality Implications – a fair and equitable recruitment process will be applied to all applicants regardless of any protected characteristic, notwithstanding, any reasonable adjustment an applicant may require as a result of a protected characteristic.

6.4 Environmental Impact – there is no impact on the environment.

6.5 Crime and Disorder- there is no impact on crime and disorder.
6.6 Risks-

6.6.1 The timeline for implementation provides for a speedy process, recognising that this is a period of uncertainty for those individuals affected. However, speed should not be at the expense of a robust process in which the relevant individuals and their representatives have had the opportunity to contribute.

6.6.2 There is risk due to time commitment needed from individuals on the panel and the need for panel membership consistency in order to ensure fairness to all the candidates.

6.6.3 In the current timeline, after the formal consultation process has finalised the structure and job descriptions, the affected senior staff will be notified on 21 February of which posts they can apply for in their ring fenced group. If these groupings change after this date the letters to staff will be void and the process delayed which would make implementation before the May elections unachievable.

6.6.4 Undertaking formal consultation with the senior staff and then not progressing with the appointment process will disengage those affected and be at risk of losing good people.

6.6.5 Not agreeing a process that is fit for future senior management appointments.

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 The report proposes how Members will be involved in the recruitment of the single senior management structure to facilitate the ambitions of collaborative working, to drive economic and housing growth and improve services to residents.

8 RECOMMENDATION

For Council to:

8.1 Note the recruitment process and associated timeline (in Appendix A) for appointment of Chief Officer and Deputy Chief Officer roles to the Senior Management structure.

8.2 Confirm and approve the proposed panel format as set out in section 4.12 for the Member appointments panel of Chief Officer roles.

8.3 Confirm and approve the preferred option from the table of options in section 4.13 for the appointments panel of Deputy Chief Officer roles.

8.4 Approve the updated terms of reference for the Joint Appointment Panel (in Appendix B).
8.5 Approve that the Managing Director be given delegated authority to appoint on an interim basis in the event that any external appointments are required after all internal senior staff and wider internal staff groups are complete.

Appendices –

Appendix A - Proposed activities and timeline for recruitment
Appendix B – Joint Appointment Panel terms of reference
Appendix C – Senior Management Structure - Consultation Feedback and Responses
## Appendix A – Proposed activities and timeline for recruitment
(Working timeline updated 20/02/2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (+ = Member-related)</th>
<th>When?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Deadline Papers – Broadland &amp; South Norfolk Special Councils</td>
<td>Wed 20 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates briefing by external HR provider on Assessment Centre</td>
<td>Thu 21 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual position letters to go out to all affected staff stating finalised structure JDs following formal consultation and the roles available to them in their ring fenced group</td>
<td>Thu 21 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Broadland &amp; South Norfolk Special Councils Report will include outcomes of consultation process</td>
<td>Thu 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk – if appointment panel not agreed will delay timeline of appointment process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of interest returned to HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Assessment Centre undertaken by all candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Panel Members briefing by external HR specialist about the Strengths Based Assessment including feedback on the senior managers’ assessment scores from the Assessment Centre to be held 6 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 discussions with any displaced staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 3x Director Interviews (5 day Cabinet objection period) &amp; feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 11x Assistant Director Interviews (5 day Cabinet objection) &amp; feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB Easter Holidays 8Apr-22Apr. Note Purdah from mid-March**

| Make residual vacancies available to all affected staff | Mon 8 Apr – Wed 10 Apr |
| 1:1 discussions with any displaced staff | w/c 22 Apr |
| + Ratify Chief Officer and Statutory roles | w/c 22 Apr or AGMs 22 May SNC and 23 May BDC |
| Development plans for successful staff and Leadership event for new senior management team | Early-May |
Appendix B – Joint Appointment Panel terms of reference

A panel, to be known as the Joint Appointment Panel, is formally established and takes ownership of the recruitment process for the Managing Director, Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers.

Attendance at meetings held by the Panel are an approved duty for the purposes of the respective Councils’ Members’ Allowance Scheme.

Broadland District Council shall appoint four Members to the Panel, with political representation applied 3 Conservatives 1 Liberal Democrat (with substitutes).

South Norfolk Council shall appoint four Members to the Panel, with political representation applied 3 Conservatives 1 Liberal Democrat (with substitutes).

The meeting will appoint its own Chairman, who will not have a casting vote and who shall not be with Councils’ Leader.

Any recommendation by the Panel for the appointment of the Managing Director, Chief Officers or Deputy Chief Officers requires a majority from each Council.

In the event of a tie of votes for Chief Officer and Deputy Chief Officer appointments the Managing Director shall have a formal vote.

In the event that any decisions are required outside the normal remit of the Joint Appointment Panel, then any such matters be delegated to the Managing Director in consultation with the Group Leaders.
Appendix C – Senior Management Structure – Consultation Feedback and Responses
Overview

All affected Chief and Deputy Chief Officers have been consulted on the proposed structure signed off by both Councils in early January. We have received a good strong response with positive constructive comments which we can work with as we progress our collaborative journey. It has been recognised some services will need early review to ensure that we meet both Councils’ needs now and in the future.

The following contains the full detail of comments made by senior staff, Unison and Members as well as the management response.

We have met with UNISON on a number of occasions with positive outcomes being achieved on both sides.

The following is a summary of key changes.

Structure

Clarity over where specific teams are located within the structure – see full response for detail.

Change of Job title for:

- Assistant Managing Director to Assistant Director - Chief Of Staff
- Internal Consultancy Team to Consultancy Team thus enabling the team to market their skills both internally and externally

The senior management structure is shown diagrammatically below.
Job Descriptions

Amendments to job descriptions to ensure they encompass the strategic requirement and adding the requirement to empower team as part of the person specification

Competencies

Some amendments to wording and additions to the proposed competency set.

Feedback from Consultation

The following shows the responses received to the formal consultation together with the management response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>The overall proposal is fine, and I am fully supportive of the approach. If anything, I would rather speed up as much as possible and if could shorten the timescale we could move on quicker.</td>
<td><strong>Management Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overarching structure presented seems sensible and well-thought through. I recognise that whilst this might be the right structure to take us forward on the next step of our journey, this may well adapt and develop as time goes on and as our organisations change. I therefore also welcome the flexibility/generality of the job descriptions which provides the opportunity for the structure and responsibilities to adapt to the organisations’ changing needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With regard to the process for appointing to the Director and Assistant Director roles (Member involvement or not as the case may be) – I would support the least bureaucratic and time-consuming process, with a view to expedite the new structure as efficiently as possible and, of course, in the most cost effective manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I appreciate the need for the re-structure, the requirement to bring the two authorities together in a speedy and coherent manner under one united Management team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>AD Individuals and Families</strong> – I wonder whether AD for families and communities might reflect better the aim of the role? Prevention work is rooted firmly within communities and through building strong communities we can provide our residents with the local peer and community support they need.</td>
<td><strong>Management Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe some reference to ‘inclusive growth’ under the AD Economic growth is important, forming an important link to the AD for Individuals and Families. It needs to be a shared agenda and the right candidate needs to own this Now referenced in JD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD Individuals &amp; Families – Community Capacity function: Greater definition of how the localism presence will work, given that this is an agenda which sits across people and place (i.e. connecting schools and vulnerable people with businesses and training opportunities, as well as navigation from a point of view of social prescription). Should community capacity therefore read ‘locality working’ and include some aspects which may feature under economic growth? Important in how we mesh together the people and place agendas and affect social mobility. This is a valid point and one for the new Senior Management Team to discuss once in place. To a certain extent this is about how the team works together rather than specifics in job descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this stage I appreciate it is difficult to understand where everything ‘fits’ in a new structure and I suspect that this will develop as time goes on. I cannot see at this stage where the role of training services at Broadland fits. Would welcome discussion about how this would support social mobility and help residents move into work/training through building confidence and skills. At SNC Economic development has concentrated on large infrastructure and big business, this is essential but feel that support is need for small business, starting self-employment and developing skills, particularly with lower paid/lower skilled jobs. Broadland Training Services (BTS), currently sits under Economic Development service and offers courses to individuals and small business. BTS will be under early review under our commercial strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the rationale for the proposed new structure and support its implementation. Although we have seen some indicative outlines of specific service areas within each directorate, I think it would be useful to have some further detail around these ahead of the recruitment process. A draft detailed listing of the posts that sit under the AD roles will be published by 22nd February. Successful candidates will be provided with a detailed pack outlining staffing structures and service budgets and go to contacts for more information to assist in developing their new teams. The establishment of the senior management team is just the start of an evolving single team to support the services of our two autonomous councils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21
For example, under the **AD for Economic Growth**, the service is listed as solely 'Economic Development'. I fully appreciate that the actual definition of Economic Development differs from Council to Council, but I believe some fundamental services could be included at this stage - Business support (including training and start up support), Inward Investment, Sector and Cluster support & development and alignment of priorities in line with the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership’s Economic Strategy.

Notwithstanding the above, I appreciate that some of the services for Economic Development will have to be re-defined following the implementation of the structure. Clearly, under the new structure, Food Licensing and Business Rates etc (SN) and GP Exercise Referral and Holiday Plays schemes etc (BDC) will move into specific Directorates more in line with the ‘purpose’ of their core service delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD – Community Service</strong>  – whilst I can see why bringing together the leisure centres and refuse teams together as the community service offer has been suggested, both services at South Norfolk Council are on a journey and have considerable distance to travel to make them secure for the future. Added into the mix the waste contract in Broadland and I wonder whether this is the right time to bring these two services under one AD as these would be a considerable job for one person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the recruitment of the senior management team we are not looking at stopping existing services, so if these functions currently exist they still will on day one for the new senior structure, and if they do not currently exist, it will be for the senior management team to propose and develop going forward.

For clarity Community Services is responsible for day to day operational services direct to the public, which can either be delivered in-house or contract managed by ourselves. Day to day contract management in BDC for Environmental Protection and Services currently sits in the proposed structure under AD Regulatory. This service area will be reviewed once the senior team is in place.

It is recognised that we must ensure the teams below the senior managers are appropriately resourced to deliver the day to day operational services thus freeing up the AD to look more strategically. This does mean that limited saving are likely to be generated unless we change the operating models. This would be achievable in the medium term but not immediately. To this end these service areas will be subject to early review to ensure consistency with service need across both Councils.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD for Community Services</strong> – huge job – I can fully understand the rationale but will contain large proportion of the workforce and highest areas of risk, and disproportionate to some of the other AD roles (on the face of it). Assume that this will need reflecting in the calibre of applicant and also remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD Community Service</strong> – This role looks like a fantastic opportunity for an individual. My question for this post is if this is a too big role for one individual in terms of staff/budget/responsibility. There is potential that the structure beneath this post could address these points to ensure resilience and effective delivery but it would be important to ensure the right resourcing around this as these are critical operational services and would include a significant portion of our workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does waste strategy and waste contract management of current BDC contract sit? I feel strongly both need to be under AD Com Services given that there needs to be a connection between waste policy/strategy and operations, and that we need to look to bring together operating models for waste collection as much as politically acceptable, so separating them out in the hierarchy would be counter intuitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there also be confirmation where Waste Strategy and also the Waste Contract Management at Broadland are within the proposed Structure as they aren’t mentioned. I would advocate that Waste Strategy comes under the same Assistant Director as the Depot and the waste contract Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having managed both the Leisure Services and Depot at SNC I do think that there is a disproportionate level of responsibility, risk and volume of work with them all coming under the same Assistant Director. These two services have the greatest level of Health &amp; safety risk, number of staff and going forward potentially could have very different delivery models which will need considerable work to consider and if taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and sports development - this is a Broadland function and I wonder whether a bit more thought is needed about where this role fits. SNC has had huge success in community capacity building, and hosts the community sports development officer, embedding community sports within the help hub and a partnership that is focused on supporting families and residents to develop their potential. I believe embedding community sports in the individual and families work would provide the right focus for this function. The delivery of the holiday club however fits with the community services group where the opportunity to create resilience would be realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As regards the Place Directorate – Regulatory services structure can you please indicate the services which are anticipated to be placed within this service area under the descriptor Environmental services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given some assumed regulatory functions within the Place Directorate – Regulatory services structure it is suggested that Community safety be placed in this service area given the close association between this and other regulatory work for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structure does not clearly define where the promotion of our area and the acceleration and enhancement of our growth agenda sits. This is a principle driver for establishing a single team but responsibility for this role is not clear. I have previously proposed a growth delivery team and the budget has been approved. This would sit under the Director of Place (and I appreciate that the DoP JD reflects this). However, there are two key concerns: can the DoP oversee promotion activity and fulfil the regulatory planning function without there being a conflict? Also, will the growth delivery team have a high enough profile if it sits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
under one of the AD roles such as AD Planning or AD Economic Growth? Therefore, an alternative option is to allow one of the AD roles, e.g. Assistant MD or an AD in the Consultancy Team, to be more outward and commercially focused in terms of promoting growth in this area. The more operational delivery of infrastructure, securing Govt funds, etc could still sit under the Director of Place. This alternative proposal is intended to raise the profile of the growth agenda in this area and harness investment opportunities more effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IT and Digital** - In the proposed structure IT and Digital sit with different Assistant Directors, namely IT with the Assistant Director for Governance and Business Support and Digital with the Assistant Managing Director role. Whilst where each service sits is not critical to their delivery and it is well established that service areas can work well together regardless of whether they are in the same area, I think that IT and Digital are going to be fundamental to the capacity of moving forward the collaboration and will have a number of interdependent key projects to deliver to move forward (e.g. telephony, new website, one team joint systems and enabled ways of working). There is also a clear link with digital to business improvement (transforming services through digital channels) and communications and marketing (communicating our message digitally to our customers) which supports where digital is currently represented within the draft structure under the AMD post. I would therefore propose that IT and Digital be brought jointly together under the AMD post to give the capacity and focus to moving these key work streams forward.

Digital is in high demand across all services and needs to be a corporate activity.

Representation can be made for Digital to reasonably sit either in Communications, IT or Business Transformation therefore early consideration will be given to this once the Senior Team is in place.

Regardless of where teams now sit, links need to continue or be established as overall it is one team and the reporting lines should not get in the way. In essence regardless of the structure it is important that we look at the way we work as one going forwards.

**Customer Services** - Currently in the draft structure the only reference made to customer services is under the Assistant Director for Governance and Business Support under ‘Customer Services (BDC)’. I think it would be helpful to establish a joint customer services function – both in operational terms but also clarify where the strategic corporate responsibility for customer service strategy lies. I would

In the draft structure, the only reason this is labelled ‘BDC’ Customer Services is that this is part of the BDC HR function where as SNC staff providing business admin support and customer front-facing services are decentralised in each service and also in the corporate business support team under Planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>propose that the operational customer service teams could either sit with the Assistant Director for Governance and Business Support or this could sit with the AMD post. Nonetheless, I think it would be helpful for the corporate approach to customer experience and strategy to sit with the AMD post as although services will naturally be key to the delivery of this it will be important to have a consistent approach to our customer service ambition and ensure this links clearly to our business improvement, digital and communications and marketing priorities. For day 1 of the new senior structure, the corporate approach to customer experience and customer strategy would sit with the AD – Chief of Staff function without the individual customer service/business admin support teams being restructured. A review of the overall Customer Service approach will be undertaken as soon as is practical once the senior management team is in place.</th>
<th>Under AD Governance and BS – why is customer services only for BDC? Needs to be uniform. We need to establish quite quickly, as West Suffolk described it, our target operating model so that we can establish how best we will manage the more transactional elements of service delivery in as efficient and customer orientate way as possible. Answer as above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Another question which will need to be addressed is the corporate approach to the administrative function of the single team. I personally prefer admin teams to sit within the respective service areas. However, if there is going to be a shift towards a corporate admin team which provides support across the whole single officer team then this will need to be a key responsibility for one post in the senior management structure. I raise this point because this issue is something we are grappling with in the Planning review and it will start slowing the review process down if we don’t answer it sooner rather than later. This will be picked up as we develop a collective customer service strategy.</td>
<td>I note that procurement is now specifically listed under the <strong>AD Finance</strong> – I understand the rationale for this but would not want to lose the links through to the governance team as they have worked together on a number of initiatives so I think we need to maintain this relationship. This can be as simple as making sure they touch base regularly. Regardless of where teams now sit, links need to continue or be established as overall it is one team and the reporting lines should not get in the way. In essence the structure is fine however it is important that we look at the way we work going forwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I agree that the name of Assistant MD role needs to change – the title is too close to</td>
<td>Title changed to AD ‘Chief of Staff’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>what would be better recognised as deputy chief exec, and this is not a chief officer role. I would be comfortable with Chief of Staff, but given the responsibilities equally a description of ‘Performance and Transformation’ or ‘Performance and Improvement’ might be appropriate. The role is not a first amongst equals in grade terms and the success of the candidate will be down to their ability to build constructive relationships across the senior management team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does housing strategy relate to social housing and housing options?</strong></td>
<td>This will be a key interrelationship – the right housing quality, type and tenure to meet the more vulnerable of our residents, as well as meeting government numbers targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where is it anticipated that Corporate health and safety will be located given this is a key function?</strong></td>
<td>AD Regulatory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s not mentioned specifically but can there be confirmation of where Tourism will be within the structure currently I believe this sits within economic development at both councils but has also sat in previous structures at SNC within communities – I just think it would be helpful to clarify where it will be.</strong></td>
<td>AD Economic Growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Consultancy Team</strong></td>
<td>The opportunity for an internal consultancy team strikes me a good one – giving the organisation capacity and experience to support it to move forward with our one team across the two councils. I think it is important that the internal consultancy team is seen as a resource for business improvement/transformation/corporate programme management and is not an entity in its own right as this could perhaps lead to conflicting priorities and focus. Although I appreciate there may be clear rational for these roles reporting directly to the MD I think it would be helpful to show some sort of dotted line the business/service improvement team to Regardless of where teams now sit, links need to continue or be established as overall it is one team and the reporting lines should not get in the way. In essence the structure is fine however it is important that we look at the way we work going forwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Consultancy Team</strong> – if the aspiration is to sell our services in this field should it just be ‘consultancy team’?</td>
<td>Agreed, name changed to ‘Consultancy’ Team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what point will the AD internal consultancy roles be better defined as currently it could be considered to be somewhat difficult to take a view on these posts in order to submit an EOI</td>
<td>These roles will be fluid due to the nature of work therefore the proposed JD stands at the current time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the AD internal consultancy roles have any direct reports/budget, etc</td>
<td>The management of staff within the Consultancy team will be fluid dependant on the work being undertaken at the time. The management of any budget allocation for a particular project would be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent will the existing Business improvement teams report to or interact with the internal consultancy ADs?</td>
<td>There would be a clear dotted line to the AD Chief of Staff who would set work priorities. An early review is envisaged on where the Business and Service Improvement would best sit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much influence and involvement/decision making the successful team (Directors &amp; Asst Directors) will have in shaping and appointing the structure underneath the new Senior team to drive the business forward.</td>
<td>Individual senior managers will be responsible for determining their own areas however collective sign off will be required by the whole senior management team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within job purposes I wonder whether reference should be made to the strategic nature of the role as well as the operational as outlined.</td>
<td>All job descriptions have been amended to reflect this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Director of Resources – I think there is a slight tweak needed to the wording around the S151 role as under the note it states that “The structure is open to the Section 151 role being undertaken by either this role or the Assistant Director Resources. “I think this should read the Assistant Director Finance. Assistant Director Finance The same applies to the wording for this under the Assistant Director Finance JD as it states the same but in this case it should read Director Resources (without the word Assistant)</td>
<td>Agreed, JDs amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director Regulatory</td>
<td>Agreed, JD amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Specific Skills, Knowledge and experience</td>
<td>The first bullet point references planning &amp; development (which is the same as the Assistant Director Planning) should this be a reference to Environmental Services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed, JD amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Director Community Services</th>
<th>Agreed, JD amended.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Specific Skills, Knowledge and experience</td>
<td>There is no mention of experience, skills in waste here but does mention sport &amp; leisure – so feels more weighted towards the sport &amp; leisure – could it be more around applying strategy to operational areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a working assumption that all appointments will be made at the salary entry level however due to the level of pay disparity this remains part of current ongoing discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The salaries have all been market tested and we are comfortable that these meet the organisation needs at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting pay – welcome the proposal to buy AD and Directors out of current terms and conditions and start fresh. However, the suggested start band for AD’s at £60k could be raised to reflect the move to an all inclusive salary but also the changing nature of the role covering a wider geographical footprint, more staff and dealing with two sets of members and communities. I feel a starting pay around £65k would reflect the change better.</td>
<td>There is a working assumption that all appointments will be made at the salary entry level however due to the level of pay disparity this remains part of current ongoing discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The salaries have all been market tested and we are comfortable that these meet the organisation needs at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are a myriad of ways to cut up the Management responsibilities and as each part of the structure is equally important to the whole joint authorities benefit, why will all of the new Asst Director positions not initially be commenced on the same salaries?</td>
<td>Any perceived unfairness would be removed by all starting on the same point. However, we would also need to recognise Pay Protection rules where it applied. Due to the level of pay disparity this remains part of current ongoing discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the AD roles are generic will it be right to assume that the salary starting levels will all be the same along with the range</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the pay bands for AD and Directors are unnecessarily wide. A £20k difference between starting and highest point could lead to discrepancies with staff doing the same job earning a considerable difference in pay and could lead to a feeling of unfairness and challenge. Whilst I welcome development within the band and an opportunity to increase salary based on performance, I feel £10 -15k band width would achieve</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the same aim of rewarding good performance.</strong></td>
<td>Salary Progression – the draft consultation references that the MD will review all salary progressions. Will this be the case for all ADs, even where the AD reports directly to the Director or will this be the Director’s responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms &amp; Conditions</strong></td>
<td>I would appreciate knowing how much this initial re-structure actually saves in real terms when compared like for like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I cannot see how the proposed AD for Community Service post is equitable in terms of the level of responsibility and number of staff this position is responsible for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies</strong></td>
<td>Buying holiday – will there be a maximum amount for this and will this be set out in the new terms and conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The last paragraph on the T &amp; C’s Holidays section doesn’t quite make sense to me with regards to selling holidays as its says you must take all of your entitlement - so how will you have any holidays left to sell?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our customers – there is reference ‘to put audiences at the heart of all you do’, however I think it would be helpful to more explicitly reference our customers, residents, businesses etc. through the competencies as ultimately we are here working to serve them!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Get on with it’ competency – I wonder if it would be helpful within this competency to reference a behaviour around being productive – i.e. using your time effectively to get the best results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Be the best you can be’- it would perhaps be helpful to have a competency here around being champions for the two councils externally, regardless of the level which you work at. It would also be helpful if we could capture a competency around learning from others and best practice elsewhere. I also wonder whether ‘Manage your own career’ should sit with ‘Be the best you can be’ rather than ‘Get on with it’.</td>
<td>The wording will be amended to- Act as a champion for the organisation both internally and externally however, it is felt this sits better in Act as One. Under Be the Best you can Be – we have ‘Always look for ways to do it better’ Have an open mind, think differently ‘Learn from your mistakes’ etc it’s felt these sufficiently cover learning and best practice. ‘Manage your own career’ will be moved to ‘Be the Best you can be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Be prepared to make sacrifices within your team for the greater good’ – Whilst I understand the sentiment of this competency, I wonder if wider staff may misinterpret this line as written and if it would be helpful to rephrase? Could we instead make reference to not working in silos and to working as one team to deliver our joint ambitions for the greater good of the organisation?</td>
<td>The current wording is strong and sufficiently clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Tell it like it is’ – I think this is a good competency and will support direct and honest conversations. It would also be useful if within this point we could also reference the importance of responsibility for developing of solutions too – i.e. being honest about the issue but also taking responsibility for how we can collectively solve it.</td>
<td>‘Take ownership of your work’ will be amended to: ‘Take ownership of your work and responsibility for developing solutions’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Make informed decisions’ – it would be helpful to perhaps make explicit reference to the use of data in decision making here.</td>
<td>The statement will be amended to ‘Make informed evidence based decisions’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the competency set looks fine, but I would say they are quite internally focussed. To my mind there needs to be a skill set, in line with the 21st Century Public Servant model (LGA?) which recognises the need for system and place leadership, building narratives and leadership across partnerships, acting on behalf of the community or customer (as well as the organisation/s) etc.</td>
<td>This will come out of the values work which will come next as we look to bed in across the whole organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there also needs to be recognition of the ability to manage and harness talent, as well as the obvious bit about poor performance – we need to start form the point of view that everyone has something valuable to offer, not a deficit model.</td>
<td>Currently we have: ‘Value &amp; acknowledge people’s unique experience, skills &amp; contributions’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>‘Celebrate great creative work and new ideas’ ‘Recognise people, their efforts &amp; achievements and say thank you’, ‘Stretch people who are performing well’ It is felt these sufficiently cover off recognition and managing talent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement – It would be helpful to have clarity on what the process would be if I was not successful in securing a role in the new senior management structure—would this follow usual policy/practice in terms of in the first instance being offered/or given the opportunity to apply for a different or lower level role as part the wider structure changes?</td>
<td>If an individual is fully displaced from the structure, then each Councils’ policies would apply. In essence this would mean working with the individual to find suitable alternative employment at the same time as they are serving their notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rationale for a ring fence for Chief and Duty Chief Officers - Whilst I understand this, I would ask that Deputy Chief Officer ringfence includes any chief officers who pass the strength based assessment but are dislodged by the panel decision. To my mind, the organisation is looking for the best calibre appointment for every role, and there should not be the assumption that a current Chief officers 3 preferences will only include the chief officer roles on offer. The way this will currently work will mean any chief officer dislodged from that level of ring fence will only be able to ‘apply’ for roles which are left vacant following the deputy chief officer selection process.</td>
<td>Neither Council is operating ‘bumping’ as this is not a fair and transparent way to work. We have to trust in the process that right people will be placed in the right jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given AD applicants are able to express interest in up to 3 positions and assuming only 1 role – their preference - is applied for and they are unsuccessful at interview will any inference be drawn or any disadvantage arise? If for example AD internal consultancy residual roles are then available (or indeed other roles) will the fact that they didn’t initially at least express an interest in that/those role(s) have any bearing?</td>
<td>No – individuals can apply for up to 3 roles although it is fine if they only want to apply for 1 as they feel this best fits their skill set. If unsuccessful in their first choice the panel will automatically consider them for alternative roles within the structure and will have a discussion regarding this with the individual concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the generic nature of roles will the same interview questions be constituted for AD roles across the board and who will constitute them? Is it correct to assume that role specific questions will be constituted?</td>
<td>There will be a proportion of interview questions that will be generic, and others will be role specific. These will be formulated with Penna our independent recruitment advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account the proposed start date for the new structure there is a significant risk in the proposed high level service groupings for the <strong>AD Governance</strong> position which will need additional support especially around the election/new municipal year implications and consequential Constitutional requirements which will be dictated by the results of the elections.</td>
<td>Noted, the current timescales are for the senior structure to be in place by the May election.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNISON appreciates its involvement in the restructure to date. The level of engagement with the Managing Director, HR Leads and the Programme Manager throughout this process has been high and is welcomed by the branch.

The branch has discussed the proposal with directly affected members and given members at all levels of the Councils the opportunity to provide feedback. This response encompasses all the points that have been raised with the branch by its members.

**Proposed Structure**

The branch accepts the rationale for the proposed structure and accepts that it will bring cohesion to the collaboration process. Two issues have been raised about the proposal.

1. **Remit of the Assistant Director for Governance and Business Support**

   It is not clear from the consultation pack whether “Business Support” refers to external businesses operating within the local authorities, or relates to the business of the two Councils themselves.

   If it relates to external businesses, there is reference to this in the job description and would be better placed sitting with the Assistant Director for Economic Growth.

   If it relates to the operational business of the two Councils, the post needs renaming to prevent confusion regarding the post holder’s remit.

   **Management Response:**
   This role is supporting the internal business. It is accepted that each organisation uses different terminology to describe functions however we will gradually move to use of the same terminology going forwards.

2. **Internal Consultancy Team**

   Despite further information being produced about the Consultancy Team, UNISON still has concerns about the relevance of these posts. These post holders will replace the use of external consultants; the use of external consultancies has
not previously been identified as a financial issue for either Council and UNISON questions whether this will deliver any financial efficiency going forward?

The Councils are presently equipped with highly skilled officers in the Programme Team who have been successful to date in driving change and coordinating the collaboration process. Will these officers see their roles changing and their responsibilities reducing as a direct result of appointment to these posts?

In order to effectively bring the two Councils together operationally, members of staff at all levels of service delivery will be required to engage in the process of change. UNISON believes that the financial resource identified for the internal consultancy team would be more effective if the Councils use it to backfill staff involved in redesigning services to enable service delivery to continue effectively while officers are taken out of their substantive roles.

Management Response:
To provide more clarity it has been agreed to retitle this team ‘Consultancy Team. i.e. drop the ‘internal’. The long-term ambition is not only to provide support to our own organisations but market this team to the wider local government arena.

Competency Set

The affected members of staff have been provided with a set of competencies in the consultation pack. Paragraph 10.15 of the Feasibility Report states that

“a new set of competencies and behaviours for all staff will be developed in co-production with staff. February – March 2019.”

UNISON seeks clarification on how the competencies that have been shared have been determined, which staff have been involved in this process, whether further work will be done to determine if they are appropriate going forward and when will all staff be told of the competencies and behaviours they are expected to adhere to.

Despite its relevance being consistently downplayed, UNISON believes that developing a shared culture with staff is key to the success of the collaboration. The Branch therefore seeks clarification on what further work is to be undertaken and the timescale for this work.
Management Response:
We had to be clear on what behaviours we were measuring against as part of the assessment process for the new senior management team.

Further work will be undertaken prior to any organisational roll out with staff and their representatives being fully consulted. After the senior management consultation and appointments, we would expect further development and wider consultation with all staff from June on competencies and all staff T&Cs for finalising by September this year.

Job Descriptions
UNISON would like to see leadership skills throughout the job descriptions being identified as “empowering.” This demonstrates the Councils’ commitment to engaging with its staff and allowing officers with the relevant knowledge and expertise to lead decision making processes for the benefit of services and residents. UNISON also believes that empowering staff is key to streamlining decision making processes going forward, ensuring timely decisions can be made without having to jump through unnecessary hierarchical hoops.

Management Response:
The job descriptions will be amended to include the word empowering.

In addition, we will amend the competency set to read ‘support and empower people to be the best they can be’

Ring Fencing
UNISON agrees in principle with the ring fencing of the Director posts and sees how this approach could be adopted throughout the two Councils in future restructures. The principle only works effectively where the duties and responsibilities of chief officers differ to those of assistant chief officers. In reality there are Heads of Service at Broadland Council who currently undertake duties that are performed by the Directors at South Norfolk Council.

By ring fencing the Director posts the process is inherently unfair on some Broadland staff and will preclude them from undertaking responsibilities that they presently have the authority to carry out. UNISON therefore requests that further work is undertaken to identify those Heads of Service at Broadland who undertake responsibilities that Directors at South Norfolk Council perform and allow them to be considered for Director roles in the new structure from the outset of the process.
Management Response:
The ring fenced groups are Tier 2 and 3 in each organisation. Preferences can be made for roles outside of the individuals ring fenced group however there is a clear process to follow. This process has been set to provide protection to each group of staff and not unnecessarily displace individuals from the new structure.

Terms and Conditions
UNISON has been involved in the formation of the terms and conditions for the senior management team and supports the offer. There are some points to raise regarding specific areas of the offer.

1. Working hours
The terms and conditions of employment need to state that the working week is 37 hours. UNISON understands the need for flexibility in chief officer posts however there needs to be clarity on the standard hours between which an officer can normally work each day, for example between 8.00am and 6.00pm.

In not doing so, the councils are creating a culture where senior officers never officially “clock off” which is not a healthy precedent to set. All staff are entitled to a home life, there is no need to be available 24 hours a day and boundaries need to be defined to ensure staff have a healthy work/life balance. Contracts should reference the Working Time Regulations to emphasise this.

In connection with this issue, UNISON has concerns about the various WhatsApp groups that have emerged. The use of mobile phones in the office is discouraged and if a member of staff is in the office, they should be able to access information about their work and the Council through the intranet and internal communications.

Promoting the use of WhatsApp to share information with staff is promoting interaction with work issues outside working hours. This is unhealthy and should be actively discouraged. IT systems and communications within the Councils should be adequate to convey messages to staff.

UNISON has concerns that using WhatsApp will disenfranchise sections of the workforce. Those with limited technological skills, older style mobile phones, limited phone memory and data will be excluded from this line of communication which is unfair.
If the Councils insist on using additional communication resources such as WhatsApp there needs to be a clear rationale behind its use and a digital inclusion strategy for all staff.

**Management Response:**

In terms of working time these are senior roles and there needs to be flexibility to meet service needs. The reality is that the majority of work is undertaken during the working day and any work outside of daily working hours is planned with the senior officer having control over this.

We will change the wording to make it explicit a standard working week is 37 hours.

Equally due to the operational nature of our services it needs to be accepted that in exceptional circumstances individuals may be contacted outside of standard working hours.

In relation to Whatsapp – this is totally optional with messages only sent during the working day. It is an alternative means of communication that recognises that not all staff are office based or have access to a computer and indeed do not work a standard 9 – 5 working day due to their shift patterns and the need to meet operational delivery requirements.

---

**2. Pay Awards**

UNISON requests that annual pay awards for chief officers and assistant chief officers are determined by the JNC for Chief Officers of Local Authorities and that this is stated in the terms and conditions of employment.

The branch welcomes steps to move away from local pay bargaining; UNISON representatives sit on the JNC for Chief Officers of Local Authorities and therefore members can expect to receive a market rate pay award on this basis.

**Management Response:**

NJ C Pay Awards aligns the Chief & Deputy Chief Officers with the Chief Executive and therefore ensures all staff regardless of level receive the same pay award.
The branch appreciates that consideration will be given to all the points raised and looks forward to receiving a response.

Becky Tye
Branch Secretary
Yare Valley UNISON Branch
Member Feedback

Feedback from 1 Member – via Email

I attach [see below] a proposed draft senior management structure which I consider to be suitable. I have changed the title of Director No 1 as in my view Place means nothing. The remaining 2 are acceptable.

I am not happy with the term Assistant Director as this is not a title which is used or recognised in Broadland and moreover reflect the current structure in South Norfolk. At this level I am comfortable with Chief Officer or Head of Service.

As we have discussed I feel the Internal Consultancy Team, Commercialisation Manager and Assistant MD should be deleted.

I think consideration could be given to appointing a Deputy MD who could take on some of the duties from those earmarked from the deleted posts as well as deputising for the MD when required.

The suggestions I have made are intended to assist in formulating a structure which would be seen to be efficient whilst at the same time recognising the independence of Broadland District Council for all concerned.

PROPOSED SENIOR MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Director 1 (Formerly Place)
Suggest Planning and Economic Development
Chief Officers or Heads of Service
Planning Policy, Economic Development and Conservation

Director 2 Resources
Chief Officers or Heads of Service
Human Resources and Committee Services

Director 3 People and Communities
Chief Officers or Heads of Service
Housing and Wellbeing and Environmental Services

Management Response:

Thank you for your proposal on the revised structure and job titles. The proposed structure has now been shared with all affected staff and all have had the opportunity to comment. As a result, there are very few changes to the proposals. There has been a recommendation that we change the Assistant Managing Director title to Assistant Director – Chief of Staff and ‘Internal Consultancy Team’ to just ‘Consultancy Team’ to provide further clarity on the purpose of this role. Taking all the comments received into account we propose to proceed on the basis of the proposed consultation structure on the understanding that this is an evolving process therefore all services are subject to movement in reporting lines and change in the future. In the meantime, we need to work on continuing or establishing links between teams to ensure overall, we are one team and ensuring reporting lines support these relationships.