

“Our Council” Project and Management restructure – Consultation responses

At the Staff Briefings on the 24th October 2012, the Leader invited responses to the proposals for restructuring the senior management team at the Council. The deadline for responses was the 20th November, and over 20 responses were received. The Project Board considered the responses to the consultation at its meeting today.

UNISON has prepared a response, which, at their request, is being circulated in full. The Service Unit Managers also met to prepare a collective response, which has been summarised as follows:

- 1. SUMS would like further consultation on what will be in the service groupings*
- 2. They have no comment on the proposed overall structure*
- 3. They have no comment on Unison’s proposal other than it should be fully considered.*

The responses to the consultation fell into two main categories, those which dealt with the overall structure, and those which suggested changes to the service groupings under each Group Manager.

Given the volume of responses and the level of detail included, it was agreed that the Project Board would focus on those responses which suggested amendments to the overall structure rather than the services under each individual Manager.

The proposal that the Council move to a management structure consisting of a Chief Executive, 3 Directors and 11 Manager posts, was generally received positively. Comments included:

“It is pleasing to see both the principles behind the proposed structure and the structure itself bringing together services that share common work flows”

“The size and number of manager posts seems far more appropriate for a council the size of GYBC”

“I agree with the new 11 departments and the teams that sit within them although I have concerns that these teams may still work in ‘silos’.

Some respondents suggested alternatives to the proposed structure. These are listed below, and the reasons for accepting or rejecting them are included following discussion at the Project Board:

Alternative Proposal	Response from the Project Board
Retaining the Head of Department title, rather than renaming to Directors	The posts will be expected to operate at a more strategic level both within the organisation and outside the organisation, with other public and private sector bodies, deputising for the Chief Executive as and when necessary. These are significantly different roles to those that are currently undertaken by the Heads of Services, and the designation of “Director” reflects the greater span of responsibility and the breadth of services within the role.
Reduction of the number of new Manager posts to nine (with associated service groupings and cost savings)	The posts have been created to try to provide an even spread of responsibility, in terms of profile of services, budget and management responsibility. The reduction would potentially result in inequality between services, and a wider span of control than could reasonably be expected while maintaining core operational

	responsibility.
Growth portfolio is too large for one Manager, and should be split.	The Project Board agreed to recommend to Cabinet that the Growth Portfolio should be split. One grouping is proposed to consist of Strategic Planning, Economic Development and Enterprise GY, the other of Property Services, Construction Services and Market. As this would give the Director of Resources, Governance and Growth 5 direct reports, it is proposed that the Tourism and Marketing service grouping be moved under the director of Customer Services. There is an estimated £9k reduction in the level of savings identified in 4.2.3 and 4.3.1 as a result of this proposal.
Retention of Service Unit Manager posts, without the creation of Manager Posts (UNISON response)	In this proposal each Director would have between 7 and 8 direct reports, which would be very difficult to manage operationally. In addition, the Director posts are designed to pick up more of the strategic elements currently contained within the Managing Director and Deputy Managing Director posts. There is a strong thread through from the Chief Executive to the Group Managers, enabling better delivery of the Council's objectives and improved performance management, which would be diluted in this alternative proposal.
Creation of three Assistant Head of Department posts, rather than 11 Manager posts (UNISON response)	UNISON's proposal would require a greater span of control for either the Head or Assistant Head, in terms of the number of direct reports. It is not clear from the proposal whether the Head or Assistant Head would take operational and strategic responsibility for the services. It would either be taking a matrix management approach, whereby the Head was responsible for strategic elements and the Assistant Head was responsible for operational elements, or a line management approach, whereby the Head and Assistant Head managed different services within the Department. In the former it would be difficult to separate the operational from the strategic, leading to confusion and duplication; in the latter there would be little difference between the roles, so effectively there would be 6 Heads of Department.

With regard to the service specific proposals, the Project Board would like to thank those who have responded to the consultation, and to reassure them that their proposals will be considered. However, in order to ensure that these are considered in full, it is proposed that the final service groupings are determined following appointment of the Chief Executive, Directors and Manager Posts. As these are operational decisions, the Project Board agreed that it would be best for these to be delegated to officers, with further consultation being carried out as structures are finalised, in accordance with our agreed protocols.