



## Personnel Sub Committee - 9 April 2010

### Management Restructure

#### Summary

This report is to update Members on the results of the consultation on the proposed management restructure and to ask the Sub-Committee to recommend the proposed structure to the Policy & Resources Committee.

#### Attachment(s)

Annex A - Update for Staff and Members on 9 March 2010

Annex B - Summary of consultation feedback to 31 March 2010

#### 1. Background

- 1.1. Details of the proposed management restructure were circulated to staff on 28 January and staff were asked to comment by 12 February. Those comments, along with SMT's response to them, were shared with this Committee on 15 February.
- 1.2. As a result of those comments the timetable for the restructure was extended. The comments and proposals made during the consultation were considered by the Corporate Management Team (CMT), and Heads of Service discussed some of them in detail with relevant middle managers to consider whether changes should be made to the original proposals.

#### 2. Proposed changes following initial consultation

- 2.1 The proposed structure at Head of Service level remains unchanged. Some changes have been made to the proposed reporting lines of particular service areas, and the middle manager structure has been developed. These changes and the proposed structure down to middle manager level are set out at Appendix A.
- 2.2 The structure at middle manager level in the two new services, provisionally called Customer Services and Resources & Organisational Development, include some new posts to ensure that the Head of Service roles are primarily strategic and managerial rather than operational. The number of direct reports to Heads of Service has been reduced from 38 to 25.
- 2.3. These revised proposals were published on Eunice on 9 March for a further period of consultation, which was due to end on 30 March. Following consultation with Unison, the job descriptions for the two new Heads of Service posts and the six new middle manager posts were published on Eunice on 26 March, along with responses to the consultation feedback received up to 25 March, and the consultation period was extended to 1 April.

#### 3. Feedback from second consultation phase

- 3.1. The feedback from the second consultation phase up to 31 March is summarised at Appendix B. Any further comments received after then will be tabled at the meeting.

#### 4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The approximate annual financial benefit of the changes is set out below.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Saving £000</b>
Heads of Service posts deleted	165
Changes to middle manager posts	( 55)
Business Analyst or similar*	( 30)
	80
Reduced cost of admin support	15
<b>Total savings in salary costs</b>	95
Oncosts (NI + Pension)	33
<b>Total estimated annual savings</b>	128

\* - CMT has agreed that there is a need for an additional post in the structure to support and help accelerate the drive for service improvement and efficiency. It is proposed that the precise role be developed once the middle manager structure is in place and the skills/capacity gap is clearer.

4.2. There will be some one-off costs depending on what appointments are made. These are not expected to exceed two years' cost savings, and are likely to be considerably less.

## 5. Summary and recommendation

5.1. The new CMT will need to be focused on service improvement in an increasingly challenging financial situation, and the structure is designed to strike a balance between delivering essential cost savings and creating an environment where continuous improvement can be achieved with fewer resources.

5.2. Members are recommended to:

- note the rationale for the restructure set out in paragraph 5.1 and the expected financial savings set out in paragraph 4.1;
- note the consultation feedback set out in Appendix B; and
- recommend the approval of the proposed management structure set out in Appendix A by the Policy & Resources Committee.

<b>Implications:</b>		
<b>Corporate Outcomes or Other Policy/Priority/Strategy</b>		
Good Quality of Life	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good Reputation <input type="checkbox"/>
Good Value for Money	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	High Quality Service Delivery <input type="checkbox"/>
Effective Partnership Working	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strong Community Leadership <input type="checkbox"/>
Effective Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Knowledge of our Customers and Communities <input type="checkbox"/>
Employees and Members with the Right Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Other:</b>		
Decision(s) would be outside the budget or policy framework and require full Council approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Financial</b>	There are no financial implications at this stage	<input type="checkbox"/>
	There will be financial implications – see paragraph 4.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	There is provision within existing budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Decisions may give rise to additional expenditure at a later date	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Decisions may have potential for income generation	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Risk Management</b>	An assessment has been carried out and there are no material risks	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Material risks exist and these are recorded at Risk Register Reference - 574 inherent risk score – 5/4 residual risk score – 3/3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Staff</b>	There are no additional staffing implications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Additional staff will be required – see paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Equalities and</b>	There will be no impact on equality (race, age, gender, disability, religion/belief, sexual orientation) or human rights implications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Human Rights</b>	There will be an impact on equality (see categories above) or human rights implications – see paragraph <input type="checkbox"/>				
<b>Legal</b>	Power: Local Government Act 1972				
	Other considerations:				
<b>Background Papers:</b>					
<b>Person Originating Report:</b> David Oliver, Chief Executive doliver@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk					
<b>Date:</b> 31 March 2010					
<b>CFO</b>		<b>MO</b>		<b>CX</b>	

(Committee Report Normal Rev. 21)

## **Management Restructure Changes to original proposals following consultation**

### **Original proposal**

The original proposal was to:

- Merge Customer Services and Revenues & Benefits.
- Merge Resources and Organisational Development (OD).
- Split Policy & Community Development (PCD) between Customer Services and Resources & OD as follows:
  - Communications and Community Development to Customer Services
  - Policy & Performance and External Funding to Resources & OD

We also proposed to:

- Transfer Community Safety from Environmental Services to Customer Services and merge it with Community Development
- Transfer Land Charges from Planning Services to Customer Services
- Transfer Housing Strategy from Planning Services to Environmental Services and merge it with Private Sector Housing
- Transfer the management of web content to Communications

### **Consideration of consultation feedback**

Following the initial consultation and consideration of the feedback by CMT, some further discussions took place with relevant middle managers. SMT has reconsidered the original proposals and has decided that:

- The proposed structure at Head of Service level should remain unchanged
- All the proposed mergers of teams set out above should go ahead, with the exception of the transfer of Housing Strategy, which we now propose to keep in Planning Services
- Management of CCP will sit within Customer Services.

### **Middle manager structure**

The proposed middle manager structure is set out at Appendix A. All the managers and staff directly affected by these changes have been spoken to by their current Head of Service.

### **Next steps**

This proposed structure is now out for consultation until 30 March. Following a suggestion received in the initial consultation, we have set up a separate e-mail account where your comments will be received anonymously, so please send those comments to <http://eunicesrv/restructure>

The final proposals will go to the Personnel Sub-Committee on 9 April and the decision on the new structure will be made by the Policy & Resources Committee on 19 April. Head of Service appointments will be completed by 14 May and we expect the appointments to new middle manager posts to be completed by 11 June.

**Revised proposed middle management structure  
(defined as direct reports to Heads of Service)**

<b>Customer Services</b>	<b>Resources &amp; OD</b>	<b>Environmental Services</b>	<b>ICT</b>	<b>Planning Services</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revenues Manager (new post)</li> <li>• Benefits Manager (new post)</li> <li>• Customer Services Manager (new post)</li> <li>• Community Services Manager (new post)</li> <li>• Communications Manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance Manager (new post)</li> <li>• HR Manager (new post)</li> <li>• Democratic Services Manager</li> <li>• Solicitor to the Council</li> <li>• Policy &amp; Performance Manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial Health Manager</li> <li>• Environmental Protection Manager</li> <li>• Waste Manager</li> <li>• Admin team leader</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICT External Support Manager</li> <li>• ICT Internal Support Manager</li> <li>• ICT Infrastructure Manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Control Manager</li> <li>• Planning Policy Manager</li> <li>• District Development Manager</li> <li>• Building Control Manager</li> <li>• Housing Strategy Manager</li> <li>• Admin team leader</li> </ul>

Notes on structure:

- **Customer Services** - All four new posts will be ring-fenced to relevant internal applicants. The structure below those new posts will be determined after appointments have been made – the overall number of posts is not expected to increase. Land Charges will report to the Customer Services Manager.
- **Resources & OD** – The Amenities Manager and the External Funding Manager will report to the Finance Manager. The reporting line of the Business Analyst will be decided once the Head of Service is in post. The Central Admin team will be split so that each service has its own dedicated admin support.
- **ICT** – The Senior Systems Developer will report to the ICT External Support Manager as the Senior Web Developer. The ICT Programme Manager will report to the ICT Infrastructure Manager and the Information Governance and Programme Manager will report to the ICT Internal Support Manager.
- **Environmental Services and Planning Services** – The administration team leaders will report direct to the Heads of Service but will not form part of the Council's Middle Manager Team.

**Personnel Sub-Committee  
9 April 2010**

**Summary of staff comments on proposed management restructure  
following publication of revised structure and timetable on 10 March 2010**

Comments received from staff up to and including 30 March are summarised below.

The following **general comments** were made:

- I like the new structure and I think it will remove conflict between Heads of Service which currently prevents things getting sorted.
- Hopefully with fewer service areas there will be better team working.
- I note that comments made by my colleagues and me in respect of the proposed relocation of the Housing Strategy team to Environmental Health have now been taken into account. I am pleased that this proposal has now been dropped and Housing Strategy is now to be retained within Planning Services.
- The creation of the new middle manager posts has provided greater opportunities for existing employees to develop and move up through the organisation. Hopefully in the long term this will improve staff retention below middle manager level and stop so many people getting stuck and feeling they can only progress by leaving. I think this is a strong element of the new structure.
- I think the new structure is workable now the middle manager layer has been put in place.
- Inevitably the two tier restructure, currently being consulted on, is causing some staff to feel insecure and they are going through all the difficulties that change brings. However now that we have started this process it is really important that we move forward and get on with it. Everyone knows the Council needs to save money and this restructure not only saves money from posts but hopefully will help us to work in a more targeted and efficient way. If we don't go through with it now then we are only putting off the inevitable and will have to take staff through another uncomfortable ride in the near future. I say let's just get on with it and try to shorten the pain as much as possible.
- The notes on the proposed structure include the sentence - "The Central Admin. team will be split so that each service will have its own dedicated support". I welcome the comments by SMT that "all service areas will have the appropriate level of administrative support".
- I was really disappointed with the negative feedback received so far, I think the restructure is a positive move forward and creates not only greater opportunities for staff but there will no longer be the 'voids' which are apparent in the structure we currently operate.

The following comments and questions required a response from SMT. They have been grouped according to the theme of the question.

**Uncertainty / perception of ‘drip feed’ of information / low morale**

Comment / question	SMT response
If SMT wanted to bring in a complete restructure, why not be upfront about it and say so from the beginning?	We have said all along that this is a management restructure, not a ‘complete restructure’.
What is the logic behind the 'drip-feed' approach to the restructure? It leads to uncertainty and speculation which, in turn, affects staff morale. Would it not be preferable to define the full structure at the start of the process? I'm sure this would be more reassuring, not only to employees, but also to Members.	<p>There is no ‘drip feed’. That expression assumes that the whole structure has already been drawn up and that lots more changes are in the pipeline, which is not the case. Once the middle manager changes have been made, we envisage little or no change below that level.</p> <p>As we said in our response to the initial consultation, when some people felt it was too rushed:  “Any delay to the process will result in prolonged uncertainty for many staff. On balance, though, SMT feels that this is outweighed by the need to ensure that people feel that all the issues have been given due consideration”.</p> <p>This is a bit of a ‘no win’ situation. Either it’s too rushed or it’s too drawn out.</p> <p>There is always the risk in any restructure that morale may suffer temporarily and good people may leave, but if anyone thinks that going somewhere else represents a more certain route you have only to read a newspaper or watch the news to realise that every council is looking to cut costs. The future isn’t certain anywhere.</p>
I feel we are back in exactly the same position. How can staff comment on a revised middle management structure when the entire restructure isn’t available?	
Once the middle managers have been selected is the restructure to continue downwards?	
I think it is very unfair to ask and expect staff to comment on this restructure when they do not know how it will affect them. While information is only being drip fed nobody knows what their future may hold everybody is getting very unsettled and wondering if they will be out of a job or end up having to do something completely different just so they have a job. This is not very good for morale	
Failing morale causes more pressure and causes sickness leave to increase. Are the Members aware that morale is already starting to fail with this drip feeding of information?	
I believe if you are really trying to save money you need to provide the whole agenda so the bigger picture can be seen and the effects that job positions and restructuring will have within services.	
Why are we being drip fed information?	
If you have a full plan why can we not see it instead of only letting us have details a bit at a time?	

<p>Where does it stop, and how long do we have to wait, are you planning this restructure from staff's comments.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>'Investors in people'??? Obviously not the staff. Why are staff being fed bit by bit instead of treating us like adults? By dealing with a restructure in this manner you are causing unrest and demotivation. This can lead to stress related illnesses.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>The restructure process is extremely drawn-out. This initial phase of the restructure will not be complete until the new middle-manager appointments are made - 11 June. This will be a protracted period of considerable uncertainty and concern for ring-fenced applicants. Priceless experience and irreplaceable skills may be lost if some of those officers elect to follow a more certain route and succeed in finding alternative employment.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>I know the Council is trying to save money and it is considered a high priority and therefore staff that are leaving are not being replaced and we are not recruiting more staff in order to further save costs, however a lot of staff in the Council are complaining of unmanageable workloads, when we voice our concerns to managers they simply tell us we can only do what we can do. Which means we either get stressed working but still struggling with the workload or stop caring about our work, which seems a bit of a daft suggestion. I thought the LNA/PDRs were all about personal development and work satisfaction. If we are being encouraged only do what you can do, surely we are letting our standards slip, we are being advised not to care about the backlog of work and that ultimately affects the Council's standard towards our customers. While we are grateful we have jobs in this economic climate, it won't be long before some good workers seek employment elsewhere due to the attitudes of the top people in the Council.</p>	<p>It is not true to say that staff who are leaving are not being replaced – that would amount to a recruitment freeze, which some Councils have introduced but we haven't. Each vacancy is considered as it arises and most have been filled.</p> <p>It is disappointing if any managers are giving out the message that 'we can only do what we can do', and that's certainly not the case across the organisation. As we've said many times, we have to work smarter and eliminate waste. The LNA was about identifying what skills we need, and among those are business process improvement skills. We need to apply those to do more for less, because that's the reality for us and for every other Council in the country. We continue to invest in our staff where many others have cut training budgets.</p>
<p>I think management within ENC must be suffering with low morale, unfortunately it is cascading to the workers in the organisation. As it is the busiest time of year I have been willing to come in early and work really late so I can get as much work done as possible. However when I spoke to managers and am not getting any support, have decided not to bother. Several colleagues are developing that attitude too.</p>	<p>It is very disappointing if this is happening at all and, as above, it's certainly not the case across the organisation. Even though things are uncertain at the moment, everyone has a responsibility to do their job to the best of their ability at all times.</p>

## Appointment process

What is the timescale for the new jobs being advertised?	The timescale for the new Head of Service jobs was set out in the 9 March update. We will decide the timetable for the middle manager appointments once the Head of Service appointments have been made.
What is the timescale for the whole restructuring programme.	See above.
What is the timescale for the new job descriptions being available? When will the new posts be JE'd?	We have now published these on Eunice and they will go through job evaluation in the next couple of weeks.
When will the new job descriptions be available for the new middle manager jobs to know what is involved in the role?	See above.
How long after the appointment of the Head of Service and new Middle Managers positions are the 'current' middle managers jobs going to be restructured.	See above.
If my post is at risk, what jobs am I allowed to apply for ie any of the other - what does ringfenced for relevant internal apps mean?	Ring-fencing is designed to protect people who may become at risk of redundancy, so no, the phrase 'relevant internal applicants' does not mean all middle managers.
Can you explain the phrase All four new posts will be ring-fenced to relevant internal applicants? Does the relevant internal applicants mean any current middle manager? and can i apply outside my current service area?	We will decide which posts are ring-fenced for which jobs in consultation with Unison, once the structure has been decided by the Policy & Resources Committee on 19 April.
What selection process will be used for the appointment of the new 'middle manager' posts?	That will be decided once the new Heads of Service structure is in place.
Are all positions under the new middle managers level going to have to sit interviews for the positions below, presumably with Job Evaluation taking place where changes are made?	See above.
What selection process will be used for the appointment of the remaining 'manager' posts in the next phase?	See above.
What will happen if a holiday has been pre-booked at a crucial time for applying for a position or an interview for that position?	We will schedule the application and interview dates to fit in with people's holiday arrangements.
If I apply and I am unsuccessful can I apply for another job at middle manager level?	Yes, if there is a vacancy.

<p>If I apply and I am unsuccessful will you make me redundant? - protect my salary - advertise externally - can I take early retirement?</p>	<p>The options for anyone who is not successful in their application to one of the new posts will depend on whether their existing post remains or is deleted, and on their personal situation, for example their age.</p> <p>We will not advertise externally in the first instance - we will only do so if we don't make an appointment from the internal applicants, or if there are no internal applicants.</p> <p>Early retirement is only available for people over the age of 55 after 1 April 2010.</p> <p>Salary protection is only relevant where someone takes a job at a lower grade than the one they are currently on. The length of time for which protection would be given will need to be negotiated with Unison.</p>
<p>If I apply and I am successful will I have any say over the structure below me?</p>	<p>Yes, although once the middle manager changes have been made, we envisage little or no change below that level.</p>
<p>Does this restructure mean that all current middle manager posts will have to be regraded / JE evaluated - if so when/how will that happen?</p>	<p>No. Only those posts that are new or where the job content has changed will need to go through job evaluation.</p>
<p>Would it not be best for Heads of Service to determine the structure they need to deliver their services?</p>	<p>That was the original intention, but people said they felt they couldn't comment on the Heads of Service structure without seeing the middle management structure.</p>

## Savings

<p>I have looked at the proposed restructure but find it difficult to understand the logic. How much is being saved by this? If anything. What is the breakdown for savings?</p>	<p>The changes need to be looked at as a whole. We are reducing the number of Heads of Service posts by 3. The middle manager changes are designed to ensure that we still have the capacity and capability to deliver services.</p> <p>Overall, the changes will result in annual savings of at least £100k. The details will be set out in the report to Personnel Sub-Committee.</p>
<p>If the reasons for the restructure are to save money I don't understand how when new posts are being created where the savings will be made.</p>	
<p>In revenues &amp; benefits two, out of 7 managers, will be promoted to the new posts. How is this saving money? It just means that their current workload will disseminate downwards to staff members who have agreed not to have a pay rise. If this is happening in other departments the saving of losing 3 head of services is absorbed into promotion of other staff.</p>	
<p>Staff are losing confidence in Members &amp; SMT allowing this restructuring when we cannot see what savings are being made. If we are making savings it's not clear to everyone. What savings are we making in plain English please?</p>	
<p>Won't the redundancy packages and or early retirement packages outweigh any saving that can be made over the next 3 years?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>If the objective is to save £100k in the staffing budget, surely this has been largely achieved as a result of the Head of Customer Services resignation? An organisational restructure is never going to be achieved without considerable cost to the authority. Is a full restructure really necessary?</p>	<p>The objective is to save as much as we sensibly can while ensuring we've got the capacity and capability to continue to provide high quality services. The financial pressure is only going to get worse after the general election, and there's no point doing the minimum we absolutely have to now then having to revisit the structure again in a few months.</p>
<p>Is this a restructure to address the Head of Customer Services leaving or is it what the Council needs to face the challenges ahead?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>You are planning on having only one HOS taking on the new very large Customer Services area and at the same time, by reducing HOS so drastically, losing a huge wealth of experience. What makes SMT &amp;</p>	<p>No-one is indispensable. The success of any service, and of the Council as a whole, is a team effort and isn't dependent on 1 or 2 people.</p>

<p>Members believe the savings (if any) are worth jeopardising the success of some services?</p>	
<p>What has happened about the suggestions made at staff workshops? Why not offer redundancies to those nearing retirement? Why not offer reduced working hours? See how much natural wastage there is and then restructure. Restructuring costs money that we should be saving. It also causes ill feeling amongst staff. In this economic climate, when you need the good-will and co-operation of staff, is counter productive.</p>	<p>Anyone can apply for early retirement, voluntary redundancy or reduced working hours at any time. Each application will be considered on its merits. This restructure will save money or we wouldn't be doing it. We recognise that this is an unsettling process for people, but we have to cut costs and any cost-saving measure that affects staff is bound to cause concern.</p>
<p>Why not consider asking for voluntary redundancies if you have to save money.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Could you not have saved the money you require by offering voluntary redundancies or early retirement without the upset you seem to be causing.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>If the Council doesn't achieve the expected savings from this restructure, what's next?</p>	<p>We will achieve the savings because our staff costs will be lower afterwards. What's next will depend largely on what cuts the next government decides to make to our funding, which is out of our control. As we've said before, what we need to focus on is being more efficient, particularly by reducing wasted time and avoidable contact.</p>
<p>The new management structure appears to be about doing the same with less. Should we not be looking at doing more with less?</p>	<p>To be able to do more we need to be more efficient – see above.</p>

**Revenues & Benefits/Customer Services**

<p>Is the new Customer Services structure too big a service for one HoS to operate effectively, even with the support of a team of middle managers?</p>	<p>No. As we said in our original briefing on this proposal:          “This is a common structure in other councils, and recognises that the majority of our direct contact with customers, particularly face-to-face but also by phone, is in relation to Revenues &amp; Benefits services.”          And in our response to the initial consultation:          “This is one area where the middle management structure will be considered carefully to ensure that there is the right level of capacity and capability.”</p>
<p>There are 4 new manager posts in Customer Services and the overall number of posts is not expected to increase. Combine this with the removal of 1 HoS post and the ring-fencing of the relevant internal applicants and the net effect is the loss of 1 fte post in Revenues and Benefits. This successful service is already overstretched, both in terms of management and of staff resources. I am extremely concerned about the effect this restructure would have on the morale of the staff and the operation of the service.</p>	<p>The changes in Revenues &amp; Benefits are really quite minor. There isn't a loss of even 1 FTE, and the changes will not 'effectively be taking two full time positions out of the office'.</p>
<p>You are not telling us what will happen below the Revenue Manager and Benefit Manager (new posts) although it will need to be decided before the new posts can be filled. It will effectively be taking two full time positions out of the office.</p>	<p>There will be the same number of staff at middle manager level and below, and the only change is that there will be a Head of Service for a broader Customer &amp; Community Services function rather than one solely for Revenues &amp; Benefits.</p>
<p>Revenues and Benefits are to be joined with Customer Services making this a huge Service area. So why has this area had positions lost when Revs and Bens are already working to capacity?</p>	<p>We all appreciate the excellent job that our Revenues &amp; Benefits staff do, and recognise the increased pressure on the service because of the recession.</p>
<p>You now have managers in turmoil, not knowing who their Head of Service may be or who will be the new Revenue Manager or Benefit Manager. How is, the person that gets one of those jobs, work going to be redistributed amongst the remaining managers or staff. This turmoil will filter down to all staff by the time this is all resolved.</p>	

<p>When 4 new 'Manager' position is in place, will this mean more work for current middle managers who are already overstretched?</p>	<p>No. The middle manager changes are designed to ensure that we have the right level of capacity and capability to deliver services.</p>
<p>The middle management in Revenues at the moment are all experienced staff and the expertise that they bring to service delivery is essential. Should one of those post be lost in the restructure then a considerable void would be left which would be very difficult for the remaining staff to fill.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>You are doubling the size of Revs &amp; Bens by including Customer Services. Yet it appears that this service area will have the same number of managers as planning who have half the staff?</p>	<p>The Revenues &amp; Benefits part of Customer &amp; Community Services will have 7 managers, exactly the same as it does now. The difference is that only 2 of them will report direct to the Head of Service.</p>
<p>Assuming the Revenues Manager and Benefits Manager new posts are filled from the pool of ring-fenced applicants, what arrangements will be put in place to cover their duties whilst the next phase of the restructure is carried out. This could cover a period of some months and the service (ultimately the customer) will suffer if adequate cover is not arranged during that time.</p>	<p>It will be up to the Head of Service and the middle manager team in that service to ensure that the transition is well-managed.</p>
<p>Who will carry out the new 'Revs &amp; Bens Managers' current duties when they get their new post if the restructure is not in place at the current middle manager level?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>What is likely to happen to the workload of existing managers if they take on the role of the new manager? Will jobs be evaluated where work is offloaded to managers remaining?</p>	<p>See above re managing the transition. All jobs where the job content changes will be evaluated.</p>
<p>My understanding of this new structure is that we could end up with a situation when staff know more about their jobs than their "new line manager". This means that we would be losing "hands on expertise" for who we go to for advice and guidance. For instance if my line manager is successful in getting one of the new post this would mean that his/her job would be divided between the remaining line managers who would then know nothing about recovery work/court work. How will this work? I for one am getting very concerned.</p>	<p>There are two points here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managers' primary job should be to manage, not necessarily to be the technical expert on everything in any particular service area. If staff need better technical knowledge to do their jobs effectively, that's a training issue that should have been identified through the PDR / LNA process</li> <li>• Secondly, it is obviously in everyone's interests to ensure that we have the right level of capacity and capability in the structure overall, and we will make sure we do that.</li> </ul>

Can someone answer why, when a service area works well, changes are made. Revs and Bens have earned the respect from Councillors and the public over the years for the work we do, service areas that do not perform should have an overhaul first.	We haven't got any failing services, and all services can improve.
Can the Members explain why are we not getting ruthless with failing services instead of jeopardising those that are succeeding?	See above.
Can you confirm please that this function will now rest with the new Customer Services Service area? It would make sense for both aspects (incoming and outgoing post) to be combined under the same management. If this is so, I would want to continue to foster the good working relationship which currently exists between administrative, print room and franking staff and a clear recognition of mutual needs.	Yes.

### Redundancies

Now you want to change service areas and without losing jobs (redundancies) get rid of 3 heads of service! How does that work?	We have never said that there will be no redundancies. We have always said that we will seek to avoid redundancies if we can, and that is still the case.
Why are the leader and CX saying there are no redundancies? Can you tell us where the HOS's who don't get a new HOS post, go?	
You have quoted that there will be 'no redundancies' What will happen to 2 'Head of Services' that doesn't get one of the new positions. They are not ring fenced to apply for the new managers positions. Be upfront and honest, their will be redundancies.	

## Admin support

<p>All service areas and the relevant HOS will require admin support to enable to run efficiently. At the moment this is only shown for Planning and Env services. Thought needs to be given to how this can be divided up equally across the organisation.</p>	<p>All service areas will have the appropriate level of administrative support. The reason that the admin team leaders in Environmental Services and Planning Services are shown on the structure is because it is proposed that those posts will report direct to the Heads of Service. In other service areas the admin staff will report to a middle manager.</p>
<p>The Central Admin support team supports me quite significantly in my role doing letters, databases, inputting surveys which happen on a weekly basis in the summer. Without this support I would not be able to do the day to day job as it would be spent on the admin instead. They are also helping me with quite a significant piece of work at the moment and requires lots of work and it would be difficult for this to happen without the support from Janet and team.</p>	<p>All service areas will have the appropriate level of administrative support.</p>
<p>When admin support is looked at again can it include all of staff that provide administrative support across the organisation so that we can start from a blank sheet of paper and come up with the best solution for the whole. e.g all staff currently called admin, staff that support the directors and Cx, hidden admin such as that provided by Revs and bens temp/pooled staff.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>It is essential for the administrative support needs within each Service area to be adequately resourced. At present, the support given by admin. staff is greatly appreciated. I recognise that it is impossible at this stage to consider all the detail, and that management has the responsibility to ensure the most effective use of resources. Whilst there may be better ways of doing things, the value of administrative support should not be forgotten or overlooked in terms of freeing up other officers to undertake their professional roles more effectively. There are many examples of the considerable benefit provided by admin. staff in enabling other staff to operate in a more meaningful way. Attending to back door deliveries - and freeing up Print Room staff - is just one example. I would not want to see administrative support under-resourced.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

## Other comments

<p>I understand the last restructure which was only 2 years ago created 2 new service areas with 2 new 'Head of Service'. Why are these now being removed and is this likely to happen every 2 years.</p>	<p>The last restructure was completed in November 2006, nearly 3½ years ago. We explained the rationale for the current changes in our briefing note of 28 January. Restructures will happen as and when they are needed.</p>
<p>What benefits and risks have been identified for the restructure?</p>	<p>See above re the rationale. The risks are set out in the Council's risk register (ref. 574), along with what we are doing to minimise them.</p>
<p>In planning this restructure was a SWOT analysis of the Council done and if so does this restructure address the weaknesses and threats and exploit the strengths and opportunities?</p>	<p>No. A SWOT analysis isn't the only way of assessing benefits and risks. See above.</p>
<p>The new middle management structure loses some of the former middle managers, whose input to the authority, and to middle managers' meetings, is still valid. It would be a shame if, because of a simple name change, those people were to perceive themselves as less able to contribute than formerly. Could we look to revise job titles overall? Rushcliffe's use of titles such as Lead Specialist is much clearer.</p>	<p>The middle manager structure that we have published is designed to simplify the reporting lines to Heads of Service. Under these proposals there will be people who are currently in the middle manager group who will no longer report to a Head of Service. Other than that, their roles will be totally unchanged and their value and contribution to the Council will be just the same. We can look at job titles at a later stage if people feel that changes would be helpful.</p>
<p>The restructure would be a good time to look at who manages whom and to see if those managers without staff could take on staff. Some have years of staff management experience, which is currently not being used. Alternatively, could a formal mentoring system be developed? I have mentored a staff member I do not manage, to enable him to complete a specific task. I would imagine many staff across the Council have skills, and perhaps management qualifications, which are not being used to the full.</p>	<p>We want to keep changes to a minimum at this stage.  The LNA was designed partly to identify what skills people have that they are not currently using.  We can look at introducing a mentoring scheme.</p>
<p>Who decided there should be no change at SMT level? Will they be taking on any extra responsibilities from the heads of service posts that are going?</p>	<p>As we said previously: "The structure of SMT was discussed with the Budget Review Group when Barbara Ding left and has now been reviewed again. Various models have been considered and the existing structure where the</p>

	three key statutory roles of Head of Paid Service, S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer are represented at SMT is felt to be the best at this point in time. SMT will continue to keep this issue under review, especially in the light of any opportunities to share management teams with other local authorities.”
You are removing positions within services to create a new middle manager – where is the work going from manager’s positions you are cutting?	We are not removing positions from within services. We are removing 3 Heads of Service posts. Below that, the number of posts will be increased slightly.
After going through a costly LNA last year has SMT considered the skills they could lose through this restructure?	Yes. We lose skills to some extent whenever anyone leaves, and our continuous programme of training and development is designed to make sure that we have the knowledge, skills and behaviours we need.
A lot of experience will be lost in the proposed management restructure, what actions will be taken to ensure this does not impact on the performance of the Council?	See above.
How will you address the issues regarding different salary bands for middle managers?	Presumably ‘issues’ refers to the fact that different posts at middle manager level are at different grades. This will always be the case. All posts in the structure have been, and will continue to be, assessed using the job evaluation system, and will be graded accordingly.
Who can I ask for personal advice and guidance when both HoS and Manager are involved in the restructure?	It depends on what advice and guidance you need. You can consult Unison if you are a member, speak to someone in Personnel or, as mentioned previously, seek confidential advice and support from Peter Piranty and Associates on 01604 259770.
Are Councillors being consulted and what are their views about the new restructure.	SMT discussed the proposals with the Budget Review Group in the first instance. We reported the results of the initial consultation to Personnel Sub-Committee on 15 February, when they agreed to extend the timetable. We will meet them again on 9 April following this round of consultation and the Personnel Sub-Committee will decide on the proposed structure on 19 April.
Can you confirm that the Members are being allowed to see <u>all</u> consultation feedback?	Everyone is seeing all the consultation feedback, because it is published here along with SMT’s responses. The only exceptions are 1 or 2 comments which we’ve received which were about individual members of staff.

<p>Are our comments being passed on to Councillors so they are aware how staff feel before making the decision on 9/4/2010.</p>	<p>See above. Note that the decision will be taken on 19 April, not 9 April.</p>
<p>Comment on Finance Manager post: under section 3, purpose of job, the JD states "To secure external funding for the district to help the Council achieve its priorities." This is already being done by the External Funding Manager. This line should either be deleted or rephrased to read "to oversee the work of the External Funding Manager".</p>	<p>Good point. We will change this.</p>
<p>More of a 'technical' comment really - Job description for Head of Customer Services and Community Services doesn't flow and needs looking at - Communications is not mentioned under Sections 2, 3 and 4 - doesn't appear until Section 5.</p>	<p>We will amend the wording to reflect these comments.</p>
<p>How will the situation where the grade of the manager is the same as a member of their team be handled?</p>	<p>Given the way the job evaluation process works we don't expect this to happen. We will look at each situation if and when it arises.</p>
<p>The job titles of External Support Manager and Internal Support Manager in ICT are confusing. Alternative titles would be: Applications Manager - Instead of External Support Manager Support Manager - Instead of Internal Support</p>	<p>The Head of ICT felt that the proposed job titles best reflected the roles, but they can be looked at again if anyone feels strongly about it.</p>

**Personnel Sub-Committee  
9 April 2010**

**Comments received after production of the Committee report**

**General comments:**

- I think that reducing the number of HoS is a very good idea and hopefully making them a key part of the leadership team will enable the council to move forward.
- Devolving the admin team to the remaining five services is a good idea and should only help improve the services that have not had a dedicated admin resource before.
- I fully support the plans to provide each service area with their own admin support. This will enable the service area I work in to make better use of this resource.
- Succession planning for those staff in more corporate roles will be clearer and benefit those who want to progress their career at ENC.
- I hope that the restructure and the opportunities it will bring will see us, as a Council, make much more use of tools such as Mosaic, GIS and Customer Journey mapping to improve the services we deliver to our customers and more importantly that as a Council share success stories across service areas... We need to make sure that going forward we can answer the "so what?" question. We have got "you said, we did" and need to close the loop...

## Comments requiring a response

Comment / question	SMT response
<b>Uncertainty / low morale</b>	
<p>As someone directly impacted by the proposed restructure I am experiencing different emotions at different times. I am mainly struggling with the question of why some decisions were made.</p>	<p>We understand that change and uncertainty are difficult for some people, which is why we have the confidential support service referred to below. Heads of Service held meetings with all staff who are directly affected by the proposals on 9 March, prior to the proposals being published on 10<sup>th</sup>. If, for some reason, you missed that meeting or need more explanation of the changes, please speak to your Head of Service or one of SMT.</p>
<p>I feel that the news of the reorganisation should never have been made public until all the details had been decided as this has resulted in the whole process dragging on since January and will probably not be sorted before summer. It would have prevented some people who thought that they were 'safe' realising that this was not true when the middle management structure was published.</p>	<p>It is obviously not possible to have meaningful consultation without publishing details of what's being proposed. It has been difficult to get the balance right between publishing enough information for people to be able to make informed comments, which is why we published the middle manager structure as people had asked, and leaving a lot of uncertainty below middle manager level because it is up to Heads of Service and their teams to work out the structure at that level. As we have said, though, we envisage very little change below middle manager level.</p>
<b>Appointment process</b>	
<p>Why weren't HOS given the ultimate responsibility to restructure their own departments, outside of this initial process? Surely the better way of doing this would be appointing the right HOS in the right position and then giving them a deadline for restructuring and possibly targeted cost savings?</p>	<p>Already answered. That was the original intention, but people said they felt they couldn't comment on the Heads of Service structure without seeing the middle management structure.</p>
<p>Will Service Managers be given the ability to restructure their teams to support the needs of the council?</p>	<p>Already answered. Yes, although once the middle manager changes have been made, we envisage little or no change below that level.</p>

Will those in new posts have a probationary period even if they are internal candidates?	No – internal appointees will not be subject to a probationary period.
<b>Savings</b>	
Any cost savings need to be quantified, documented and agreed with all parties prior to any restructure taking place.	The cost savings don't have to be 'agreed'. It's the structure that has to be consulted on and agreed. The cost savings are simply the financial effect of the restructure, and we have said all along that they would be around £100k. We have quantified and documented the savings in the Personnel Sub-Committee report and estimate that they will actually amount to around £120k.
<b>Redundancies</b>	
We have all along been assured by the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council that there would be <b>no redundancies</b> and that our jobs would be secure for the next two years.	Already answered - we have never said that there will be no redundancies. We have always said that we will seek to avoid redundancies if we can, and that is still the case. We have certainly never given any guarantees about anyone's job being secure for the next two years.
<b>Admin support</b>	
I note from the consultation that it is possible that the post of the officer who provides administration support to the Council's Legal Services Section is at risk of being deleted. I therefore want to set out below a summary of how that post holder supports Legal Services and how the loss of that post would impact upon that service.	It is premature to say that any post below the published middle manager level is at risk of being deleted. As we said in the consultation feedback that we published on Eunice on 26 March, 'All service areas will have the appropriate level of administrative support.'
I have now had an opportunity to look at the revised proposed middle managers structure and the following service areas do not have any identified support services: ICT, Customer services, Communications, Community Development and HR. Although Admin is not a key service as far as the public are concerned and we do not bring any money into the Council, I believe that without the admin positions and the work that we carry out, more pressure would be put on officers.	The admin work that is carried out at the moment will obviously still be necessary after the restructure, and the structure will be put in place to ensure that it can be carried out effectively. See above.

<b>Clarity on job roles and terminology</b>	
Can you please explain what criteria was used to define a middle manager? 'Direct report to a Head of Service' doesn't explain why some of the existing 'middle managers' have not been included. Is it based on grade, budget responsibility, number of reports?	Already answered. The middle manager structure that we have published is designed to simplify the reporting lines to Heads of Service. Under these proposals there will be people who are currently in the middle manager group who will no longer report to a Head of Service. Other than that, their roles will be totally unchanged and their value and contribution to the Council will be just the same.
A clear definition of a middle manager is required as there appears to be no consistency applied across the board - does it relate to number of staff directly managed responsibilities or is it just based on HOS's opinions??	Middle managers in the new structure are defined clearly in the structure document attached as Appendix A to the update report published on Eunice on 9 March 2010 (Annex A to the Personnel Sub-Committee report).
Not clear from the document how many middle managers we have at present, whether the new positions are in addition to these and if not, what happens to those immediately affected (will they be put under threat of redundancy?)	The middle manager changes are clearly set out in the document referred to above. Heads of Service spoke to all staff directly affected by the changes on 9 March, before the middle manager structure was published on 10 March.
For clarity, and to distinguish between the roles of the External Funding Manager and the Finance Manager, could the last point in the Purpose of the Job section in the Job Description of the Finance Manager be changed to: "To secure and include in the budget process any external grant funding received by the Council to achieve its priorities".	Raised previously. We will look at the wording.
Is the 'Risk Management Officer' who will be reporting to the Finance Manager a new post?	We've not made any reference to such a post. It doesn't exist now and we don't propose to create it.
The job titles of External Support Manager and Internal Support Manager in ICT are confusing. Alternative titles would be: Applications Manager - Instead of External Support Manager Support Manager - Instead of Internal Support	The Head of ICT felt that the proposed job titles best reflected the roles, but they can be looked at again if anyone feels strongly about it.

<b>Land Charges</b>	
<p>It seems that a decision has already been made, in that the land charges function will definitely be moving out of planning services to customer services .. perhaps I am wasting my time sending in this submission? Have my previous representations actually been taken into consideration?</p>	<p>No decisions have been made yet. The Policy &amp; Resources Committee will make a decision on the structure on 19 April, based on a recommendation from the Personnel Sub-Committee, which meets on 9 April. CMT considered everyone's comments (including those both against and in favour of the transfer of Land Charges), Heads of Service had meetings with relevant staff to decide whether or not to change the original proposals and to explain the rationale for the proposals.</p>
<p>It would have been beneficial to the members of the Land Charges Team if we had been told the reasoning behind the decision to transfer us to the Customer Services Department. Also, who was going to be classed as Land Charges, where we were to be located and whether we were to be a separate unit within that department.</p>	<p>See above. It is disappointing if those explanations have not been passed on to the team.  That will need to be worked out once the structure has been agreed.</p>
<p>Whilst I appreciate that the Land Charges Team is only a small unit nevertheless because no details have been given it has caused a lot of unrest over the last few weeks. I feel that all this could have been avoided if a short meeting had been arranged so that our concerns could have been addressed by someone who actually knew all the answers. After all, very few people were being moved into a different department so it would not have been asking too much to have been spoken to by a senior person. Even now, when the final decision seems to have been made, we are still unaware of the reason and logic behind it.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>I have noticed that in the budget book for 2010/11 the salary allocation for land charges is approx £11,000 less than for the current budget for 2009/10 - interesting reading.</p>	<p>This has nothing to do with the restructure. It is a result of a short-term contract ending and not being renewed.</p>

<p>I raised two questions in my previous representations, for which I would now like a response:-</p> <p>(1) in 2006 it was suggested that the land charges function be transferred from admin to customer services - why was this proposal not followed through and why was the land charges function moved to planning services?</p> <p>(2) what has the land charges function in common with customer services?</p>	<p>We're sorry if not all of your comments were addressed fully in our published response to the initial consultation, but we can assure you that all the detailed comments we received were considered by CMT.</p> <p>Whatever the rationale for what we did 4 years ago, things move on. We need to look forwards, not backwards.</p> <p>It primarily involves responding to routine customer requests for information.</p>
<p>I have been involved in land charges work for a substantial number of years now, and during this time the land charges function has been based in various departments. The land charges function seems to be passed from pillar to post. From my experience, the land charges function works better in planning services, as the majority of land charges data is planning related.</p>	<p>Customer Services was set up to deal with calls that are relatively routine and involve the provision of information, rather than the exercise of professional judgement, irrespective of what service the calls relate to.</p>
<p>I feel that nobody really understands the work involved in carrying out the land charges function - how detailed it is etc. Management are not taking into consideration the views of the people who are carrying out the land charges function and who perhaps know best.</p>	<p>We received comments from within the Land Charges team both against and in support of the transfer. Having considered everyone's comments, we still feel that Customer Services is the best place for it.</p>
<p>It appears that very few people actually understand what Land Charges is which has resulted in the team being moved from one department to another and as previously, the specialised nature of our work and the complexity of the work that we actually do appears to have been ignored. I am very disappointed that our concerns and opinions seem not to have been taken seriously and yet again Land Charges appears to have been relocated to another convenient slot and another department, this time under the general umbrella of Customer Services.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

<p>We know that there will be changes in the land charges regulations, but we don't yet know the full implications of these. I fear that because of the restructuring a premature decision on how the land charges function will work in the future will be made. If more land charges data is put on the website, I do not think that this necessitates the land charges function moving to customer services. Other service areas have substantial information on the web-site and there is no intention to move them to customer services. Not everyone will want to self-service land charges data from the web-site, therefore land charges would remain a primarily back office function.</p>	<p>As explained above, the rationale for moving Land Charges is not based on an assumption about the extent to which people will choose self-service in the future. I am aware that Sharn, Trevor and you are discussing future delivery of the service in the light of the Information Commissioner's decision with regard to the Environmental Information Regulations.</p>
<p>I feel that splitting the current land charges and admin team will lead to a drop in services to planning services and to our customers.</p>	<p>We think it will improve service in both areas. The performance statistics for Land Charges over the last year have been very poor. This is partly down to staff shortages and new software but clearly there is also a conflict between providing the Land Charges service to customers and the administrative support to Planning Services. When Land Charges is in Customer Services there will be a larger pool of Customer Service Advisors who, with the appropriate training, will be able to provide basic information to customers and will therefore provide greater resilience and better response times than the current team can. Similarly, the Planning Admin team will be solely dedicated to Planning Services.</p>
<p><b>Other comments</b></p>	
<p>If we are to challenge the way we do things and save money through efficiencies the Business Analyst role should be where it can make the most impact. In my opinion that would be within a corporate service that is involved in most if not all of the transformation projects in the council: ICT.</p>	<p>This was suggested in the first phase of consultation. CMT considered it and agreed that Resources &amp; OD, which is also a corporate service, would be the best place for the role.</p>
<p>Should Housing Strategy become part of Planning Policy?</p>	<p>We considered the options for Housing Strategy following the initial consultation and decided that it should stay in Planning Services, alongside but not part of Planning Policy.</p>

<p>I think that longer term there is value in re-looking at the structure as a whole and reviewing in detail the three service areas left quite unchanged. Perhaps starting from what services we need to deliver, who we need to be able to deliver them and working upwards from that.</p> <p>In the short term the new structure will (hopefully!) break down some of barriers to change currently in place and enable staff to work outside traditional silos...</p>	<p>We did review the structure as a whole. Just because three service areas remain largely unchanged doesn't mean we didn't look at them.</p>
<p>Is there provision in the budgets to ensure that those who will be taking on a new role will have the knowledge, skills and behaviours that they require to undertake their new roles?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Interesting article on communicating change (and how to do it well) and on the different perceptions regarding the results of change. Is there anything that we can learn from this?</p> <p><a href="http://www.guardianpublic.co.uk/change-management-public-sector">http://www.guardianpublic.co.uk/change-management-public-sector</a></p>	<p>We are always willing to learn. There are several things that are certainly true about change management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No matter how much you involve people in the process, whatever changes you make, not everyone will be happy with them.</li> <li>• No matter how frequently, openly, honestly and clearly you think you've communicated the reasons for the change, there will always be people who hear something different to what you think you've said, and there will always be people who are determined to believe that there's a hidden agenda.</li> <li>• There is never a shortage of consultants keen to persuade you that they can do it better than you can for a (generally very high) price.</li> </ul>