Appendix 3

KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION

The overall quality of the consultation response was very good particularly given the short timescales. The following are the key issues which either occurred regularly as a concern suggesting further consideration may be appropriate or clarification is required, or where there is lack of support for a proposal and reconsideration or alternatives may need to be considered. There is in addition a considerable body of valuable and detailed comment that will be helpful as the project moves into the next phase.

1.   Neighbourhood Co-ordination & Service Delivery

Issue	Response

1.7.1 **Local service management**
Broad agreement but:-
a. Relationship with existing locally managed services is not clear.
b. The primary focus should be on service access with service access points across the city being seen as an alternative to Neighbourhood managers.
c. Leisure services and benefit advice needs to be better defined
d. Health & social care centres may need to be managed in a different way.
e. Should the following be added
    Highway Maintenance
    Education admissions & grants
    Under fives
    Payments (Council Tax)
    Community Econ development
f. Local office accommodation may not be suitable for integrated services
g. There should be adequate investment in new technology.
h. There needs to be minimum service Standards set across the city.
	The project identified services which people most wished to influence at a local level as priority for area co-ordination. This includes a mixture of existing locally managed services and new ones. Ultimately all Council and other public services could be added with a view to providing either:-
	- Local information, access and advice and/or
	- Local management or co-ordination and/or
	- Local Consultation on citywide management and policy through the forums.
	The package of services will now be defined in detail.
	It is agreed that minimum service standards should apply across the city.

1.7.2 **Neighbourhood managers** Broad agreement but:- a. Need to clarify the role and ensure consistency in role across the areas.	The role has been defined in broad terms but job descriptions will now be produced. The complexity and demands of the post are recognised but (subject to job evaluation) PO5 is

b. The posts should not create further ambiguities and bureaucracy in the existing management arrangements. c. The complexity of issues will vary across the areas, will this be reflected in the posts? d. Will they have the status and Is PO5 high enough to have sufficient credibility and influence e. The role will be demanding and there is concern we will need to ensure we attract the right calibre of person. f. Neighbourhood management should not be in Housing	believed to be appropriate for the role. Every effort will be made to appoint the right caliber of person. Three options for managing the posts have now been identified - Within the Housing Department as originally proposed - Within the Chief Executive's office reporting to either the Assistant Chief Executive or a nominated Strategic Director - Reporting to a new post of corporate Director Neighbourhood Renewal or Corporate Director Culture & Neighbourhood renewal.
Other general concerns a. Managing the tension between local priorities and Citywide/regional priorities b. Headteachers have concerns that the proposals will reduce the strategic focus on Education and reduce the scope for further growth/diversion of resources into Education. c. The IT implications need to be clarified and costed. d. The impact on internal trading arrangements (TAGS) needs to be assessed.	The tensions in managing the local and citywide /regional are fully recognised but are there already. The proposals will assist the local priorities to be better defined and advocated. There is nothing in the proposals that suggests the strategic focus on Education will be lost or that the present commitment made to Education will be weakened by the project. The council's commitment to raising Education Standards will remain a key priority and the associated commitment to revitalising neighbourhoods will it is believed enhance this work. A great deal of work is already taking place on IT & e government and will be piloted over the next six months to enable options and cost to be clarified Internal trading ensures support services respond to front line service needs therefore TAGs will respond to the service changes as they occur

2. Local Forums & Decision Making

Issue	Response
1.7.5 **Local Forums** - Although overall support for the concept significant concerns about the operation of the forums. Key concerns are a. Representative membership and	The concerns are fully recognised and identified in the project report. Once it is clear that forums are the preferred way forward detailed work will commence to define guidelines setting out what is not negotiable and what is

the use of elections b. Transparency of decision making c. The level and type of decision making devolved d. The need to set clear guidelines from the outset e. The need to invest in training and ongoing community capacity building f. Role of Cabinet members and links to the formal decision making process. Suggestion that Cabinet members should have an area role. g. The incentive for people to attend and the ability to recruit h. Young people need to be involved in the Forums.	open to consultation and choice including clearly defining the links to formal decision making structures. The desire to see some form of elected representation is recognised although business representation needs to be built into the forums and the potential high cost of elections need to be taken into account. The role of professional officers and officers of partner agencies will be defined along with codes of conduct governing their involvement in decision making. The importance of community capacity building is recognised and it is proposed that the current operation of community development functions across the Council be examined with a view to improving service synergy to support this work. The need to involve young people is recognised and supported.
1.7.6.**Existing consultative arrangements -** Differing views as to whether existing forums should be rationalised or whether existing arrangements should be incorporated into local arrangements.	Whilst the aim may be to rationalise where possible this will very much be an issue of local consultation and agreement over time. The scale of the areas means some form of feeder system from smaller neighbourhood meetings may be inevitable and special interest groups may also need to co-exist with the forums.
1.7.8 **Devolved budgets –** Broad agreement but different views as to whether areas should get the same budget or allocation reflects need	It is felt that given main budgets and regional / national resources are heavily needs based the 'Top Up' budgets should be the same in each area.
1.7.9 **Boundaries-** General support for 10 areas but:- a. Concern about their ability to have an identity with local communities. b. Concern that proposal does not take into account the capacity of schools to participate in the Forums. It is suggested that school development groups should form the basis of the boundaries and roles of schools and Headteachers clarified.	There is a balance to be struck between efficiency and local identity. If ten is the final number some form of second tier feeder mechanisms from each neighbourhood or community may be required. The potential duplication between the school development groups and the forums is noted and will be revisited when the final boundaries are agreed. It is recognised that schools will have resourcing constraints in supporting both mechanisms and considerations

	may need to be given to the provision of additional resources possibly through the NRF.
1.7.10 **City Centre -** Wide support for city centre as a separate area but :- a concern about the boundary and the need to ensure it is not just a commercial focus but reflects residents living in the area and other stakeholders	It is recognised that a mechanism will be required to provide a focus for both the commercial aspects of the city centre and the communities who live within it.

3.   Client, Consultant and Contractor Issues

Issue	Response
1.7.12 **Process mapping** - General support for the proposal to apply process mapping but :- a The process should be lead independently of either the client or the contractor function a. The process should also be applied to none CCT related areas. b. Concerns about relationship with Best Value reviews. c. Normal review processes and terms and conditions should be applied.	Where process mapping is applied through BV reviews there is already independent scrutiny and where outside this process, scrutiny will be applied by the Revitalising Neighbourhoods project and Directors' Board. Process mapping has been incorporated into the Best Value review process, therefore, over time will be applied to all services. The relationship between Best Value and Revitalising Neighbourhoods has already been clarified in that a number of Year Three reviews have been brought forward in order to deliver the changes required to achieve the objectives of the project.
Other issues a. Need to consider the implications and impact on Trading Agreements(TAGS)	Internal trading ensures support services respond to front line service needs therefore TAGs will respond to the service changes as they occur.

4.   Senior Management Reforms

Issue	Response
1.7.17 **Strategic Directors** –Overriding response is that Strategic Director and Head of Service roles will need more clarification, in addition:- a. Concern that Directors will still be involved in operational detail	It is acknowledged that not enough has been done in the first phase to demonstrate how culture will be changed and this needs to be a major focus of the implementation phase.

b. Concern that Directors will now get too involved in detailed area issues c. Concern about the imbalance in portfolios of Strategic Directors and Heads of service and whether this will be reflected in salary differentials d. Budget responsibility not clear. Concern about devolving budgets in Social Services because of volatility. e. Performance management of none line managed responsibility needs clarifying f. Concern about capacity to carry out the new roles particularly at second tier g. Head of H.R should be on Directors Board h. Suggestion that the role, function and agenda 0f Directors Board and Leaders Briefing will need to change i. Proposals do not include enough incentive to address the cultural, attitudinal and behavioural barriers. j. The proposals do not include a review of the support systems for Cabinet and Scrutiny	Capacity problems at the second tier are acknowledged and the concern expressed about creating further impact on this by devolving more to Directors of Service and reducing the number of Corporate Directors further is recognised. The dangers that Corporate Directors will get embroiled in more operational detail if they take on area responsibilities is also recognised although the Neighbourhood managers should be the main method of resolving issues not dealt with by service management. It is acknowledged that in addition to changing roles decision making processes would need to change. It is acknowledged that further work is required to demonstrate how the changes in roles would relate to the constitutional changes recently agreed. It is believed that the role of the Head of Finance is different to that of the other Heads of Resources' therefore the others do not need to be on the Directors Board.
1.7.22 **Portfolios.** Although there is general support to the proposed move to Strategic Directors and Heads of Service a range of very different and in some ways conflicting views were expressed about the detail proposals:- a. Portfolios not radical enough, too similar to existing responsibilities/ nothing has changed. b. Concern that it may be too much change at the same time, and concern that the organisation has not got the capacity to achieve it on top of everything else c. Concern that structural change may force us to look inward when we should be looking outward d. Suggestion that neighbourhood management should be	Although there appears to be no fundamental opposition to the concept of Corporate Directors and Directors of Service it is clear that there is no consensus about the proposals made to date. Whilst the concern about too much change is acknowledged the modernisation agenda clearly drives the organisation towards different organisational arrangements. The OPM report however clearly supports the view that tackling the change of culture is more important than structural change. There is however a real danger in now deferring the changes to the senior structures in that uncertainty about the future will make it difficult for the

implemented first then structural change should follow to support it.

e. Cultural services should remain a single portfolio
- Existing synergies have been ignored or distorted by the proposals
- Out of step with DCMS
- Cultural services devalued
- Negative impact on cultural strategy
- No evidence it will improve service
- Non statutory services will suffer
- Library focus on raising Education standards is too narrow
- Concern at separating Parks & Environmental services from Sport and events/festivals
f. Concern that the focus of the Director of Education will be diluted from Educational priorities with no capacity to be an advocate of an area.
g. Portfolios should be based round broader themes
h. Education portfolio is too large
i. Neighbourhood management should not be in Housing
j. Neighbourhood Renewal should be a Strategic Director portfolio
k. Area managers should report to appropriate Strategic Director
l. Distinction between Regeneration & Neighbourhood renewal not as clear as suggested
m. Property should be part of E.R & D
n. SRB should be part of Neighbourhood renewal
o. Housing services in E&D should be part of Neighbourhood renewal
p. Position of Creativity Works not clear
q. Advice services should be retained within the Environment, Development & Regeneration Portfolio.

Council to both retain and attract good quality staff.

As a result of the consultation it is proposed to amend the management structure and portfolios as set out in the original proposals and the following options are recommended for member consideration.

a) Identifying the Corporate Director of Education as the Strategic Lead for Children with further work on the management synergies through the Best Value Review.

b) Adding the Assistant Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer to the Directors' Board.

c) A major strategic focus will be given to customer care.

d) Improving urgently services synergies and possible further management changes in relation to:

Adults with Community Care and housing needs including supporting people
 Housing Benefit & Council Tax
 Policy & Performance
 Community Development, Community Cohesion & Community Capacity Building
 Regeneration and Neighbourhood Renewal.

The above are in addition to improving services synergies through the service reviews already taking place of:

Crime & Disorder
Environmental Services
Front of House. Customer Service & Advice
Communications LPL
Marketing & Tourism
City Centre
Community Transport Services

	d) <u>Neighbourhood Renewal</u>
	<u>OPTION 1 – New Corporate Director for Neighbourhood Renewal</u>
	<u>OPTION 2- New Corporate Director for Culture & Neighbourhood Renewal</u>
	<u>OPTION 3- Lead Corporate role for Neighbourhood Renewal in Housing portfolio</u>
	<u>OPTION 4- Lead Corporate role for Neighbourhood Renewal by lead Corporate Director or Assistant Chief Executive.</u>
	e) Cultural Services
	<u>OPTION 1 – Revert to current arrangements</u>
	<u>OPTION 2- New Corporate Director for Culture & Neighbourhood Renewal for Arts & Leisure</u>
	<u>OPTION 3- Reduced Cultural Portfolio</u>
Service Synergies a. Policy & performance should be added to the list b. Community cohesion/Community development should be added to list c. Further synergies exist between Housing and social services	It is agreed that the synergy between the policy and performance function within departments and the Chief Executive's office should be examined. It is agreed that the community development functions across the Council should be looked at particularly in the context of supporting community capacity building.
Heads of Resources. The composite view of SRG was that:- There needs to be a small strong and effective central resource functions focussing on Strategic planning, protocols, co-ordination and advice. There needs to be a resource function within each portfolio to focus on strategic planning and performance management, resourcing policy, resourcing	The views expressed by SRG are broadly supported as the basis for managing the resource functions.

service delivery, specialist advice, special projects & equalities	
Arts & Leisure believe the service should retain its own resource function & Education have concerns about combining the resource function for Cultural Services with Education due to capacity problems. Headteachers are concerned about the possibility of recentralising support functions.	The structural options include the option of retaining a separate head of resources for the cultural services/Neighbourhood Renewal portfolio. The proposals at no stage implied the recentralisation of Departmental support functions.

5.   <u>Resources</u>

Issue	Response
1.7.24 **Savings from process mapping** Two main concerns a Concern that the savings required cannot be achieved or achieved quick enough to enable the area manager posts to be appointed. b Also a view that any savings achieved should be redirected to improving the service rather than the area management posts	Whilst recognising the concerns it is believed that £400,000 should remain the target for the process mapping exercise within the existing client, consultant & contractor arrangements. It is also believed that by investing these resources in the neighbourhood management the services will be improved significantly.
1.7.24 **Project team-** Concern about resourcing the implementation phase of the project	It is recognised that this is a major change programmed and the project team has developed the first phase as far as possible within the resources available to it. It is clear that additional resources will be required if the implementation phase is to be delivered effectively.
<u>**1.7.26 H.R issues**</u> - a. Not enough detail to enable worthwhile consultation & consultation period too short. b. Trade unions should have been involved in consultations at a far earlier stage. c. Equality groups should be specifically consulted on the next phase of the project. d. Need to maintain good quality consultation and feed back the decisions and reasons for them	It is not possible at this stage to define in detail all the proposals. The complex nature of the project means that some broad decisions need to be made to enable a better focus on the preferred options to follow in the next phase. Whilst it is recognised that the consultation period is short the response has been good and the key concerns have been identified. More people will clearly be involved at the next stage in working up the details. Improvements will clearly need to be made to both the communication and

e. Need to maintain good communications and ongoing consultation and manage expectations throughout the project implementation. f. Proposals do not include enough incentive to address the cultural, attitudinal and behavioural barriers. g. Need to develop a culture change programme including training & development that develops new skills & competencies h The current Appendix R procedure needs to be overhauled i Revitalising Neighbourhoods will be seen as another method of further privatisation. j There is review fatigue and where possible existing reviews should be suspended to avoid duplication or consultation processes co-ordinated.Phase 2 of the Lifelong Learning review was particularly highlighted.	consultation mechanisms. It is recognised that more could have been done in phase one to develop proposals to change organisational culture and this will be addressed in the next phase. A new protocol on the application of Appendix R will be developed in consultation with the Trade Unions. There are no proposals in the project that will specifically lead to further privatisation outside the normal concepts of Best Value. The continuation of existing reviews will be considered once decisions are made on the next stage of the project.
<u>Other issues</u> a ICT not sufficiently represented in the proposals b Need performance indicators to measure level of success c There are factual errors in Appendix 5.	A great deal of work is already taking place on IT & e government and will be piloted over the next six months. It is recognised that these could have been incorporated into the project report. Outcomes for the project are set out in the project brief and it is possible for these to be developed into specific indicators at the next stage.

M. Allison
Assistant Chief Executive
January 2002