



Leicester
City Council

**WARDS AFFECTED:
ALL WARDS (CORPORATE ISSUE)**

CABINET

29 JANUARY 2001

BEST VALUE REVIEW PROCESS - YEAR ONE

ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT

Report of the DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1. To seek member consideration and approval of:

- (i) the Improvement Options put forward as a result of the Best Value Review;
- (ii) the implementation of the City Council's Best Value Review Process to date in respect of this review;
- (iii) the assessment of the review against the Audit Commission's "Seeing Is Believing" criteria.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 This report sets out the results of the Arts and Entertainment Best Value Review to date and provides the information and options for Member consideration prior to finalising the improvement plans for implementation. Key supporting information is appended and referenced within the report and full documentation is available on request via email / file in Members Library.

2.2 Members are aware that the reviews have been undertaken against a thorough process and very tight deadlines. The difficulties resulting from this allied to the recent introduction of a performance management framework within the Authority lead, as would be expected, to a significant amount of learning and development for both the process and the participants.

Evaluation of this year's review activities and recommendations for next year form the basis of a separate report.

3. REPORT

This Best Value Review of Arts and Entertainment's has been undertaken within the strategic framework for the service which currently exists. The Arts and Leisure Department has, already, embarked upon the preparation of a Cultural Strategy which will come forward for approval in the next calendar year and which will set the strategic context for each of the activities. In addition, it is recognised by the department that a full examination of management options is necessary in order to take forward the Arts and Entertainment service into the next decade. Taken together, the strategic discussions, which are referred to in the improvement options, will set a clearer direction for the service. In the absence of those documents this Best Value Review has concentrated on areas of improvement and change that are possible in advance of that strategic discussion.

3.1 Improvement options

The review has identified the following improvement options, based on analysis of information, consultation with stakeholders and staff, and discussion by the Core Review Team and Review project team. Trade Union comments have been taken into account throughout the process. Their comments relating to forms 6C and 6D (see appendix 3) will need to be incorporated at the implementation stage of the improvement plan.

Service Directorates have also been taken into account, and the Arts, the Environment, Public Health and Leisure Scrutiny Committee has been made aware of emerging issues through a report of 7 November 2000.

3.1.1 Option 1: Undertake a full analysis of management options for Arts Services, in the context of a departmental analysis of management options.

Task: Undertake a full analysis of management options for arts services, including De Montfort Hall, HayMarket Theatre and Phoenix in the context of other regional facilities:

- A Departmental all-inclusive NPDO
- Trust status (Company Limited by Guarantee, Industrial and Provident Society or Unincorporated Charitable Trust)
- Voluntary Competitive Tendering
- Development of the mix of Partnership arrangements
- Redirection of resources within the Department/Authority
- Decommissioning of some or all services, with

- greater reliance on private sector provision
- Transfer of services to other Departments
- No change.

The aim of this work is to establish the best and most appropriate mechanism for the management of services. This action will potentially provide savings to the Council which could be reinvested to improve services.

Timescale: Options analysis completed by September 2001. It is envisaged that action arising from this will be completed by January 2003.

Responsibility: Head of Arts and Cultural Services and Departmental Management Team

Cost: The cost of the options analysis is estimated as up to £25,000, of which at least 50% will be for external specialist advice. The cost of this could be funded from the capital provision for feasibility studies within the current year's Capital Programme. Full financial analysis of options will be a key part of this work.

Benefit : This action will potentially provide savings to the Council which could be reinvested to improve and add further value to arts services. It could also contribute to the 2% saving required from this review.

There is a need to improve capital investment in key buildings and facilities (which has been inadequate in recent years) to meet the needs of the City's changing demographic profile and the requirements of the DDA, and to achieve an appropriate level of facilities which can be adequately maintained. Leicester City Council alone cannot deliver the capital reinvestment necessary to do this, whereas examination of Trust options could allow the authority to lever in more external funding.

3.1. Option 2: Investigate options for more appropriate use of the City Rooms

Task: The City Rooms presently is unable to provide specific arts and cultural activities due to improvements required to the building to meet licensing regulations at a capital cost which the Council presently cannot afford. The facility has therefore become a low priority for the service, mainly utilised as a general hiring facility. The majority of the bookings taken could be accommodated at other venues without difficulty.

Timescale: April 2001

Responsibility: Head of Arts and Cultural Services and Departmental Management Team

Cost: 2 posts would be placed at risk as a result of adopting this

option. The council would seek to redeploy the staff concerned and in doing so avoid redundancy costs which would reduce any savings.

Benefit : This option would potentially contribute to the 2% savings and would enable the City Rooms to be put to a more beneficial use.

3.1.3 Option 3: Analysis of the management arrangements for the delivery of Media and Video services

Task: Review current management arrangements (done within the life of this Review) and seek Council approval to integrate the Fosse Community Studios with Line Out through a revised grant aid arrangement.

Timescale: Implementation by April 2001

Responsibility: Head of Arts and Cultural Services, with Chair of Line Out and Media Production officer, East Midlands Arts

Cost: It is anticipated that this integration can be achieved within existing budgets (including grant aid) and could contribute to the required 2% saving. Please refer to appendix 1, 6 series forms, for full breakdown of costs.

Benefit : The proposed management arrangement would ensure the delivery of a better service, ensure that Council resources are deployed more efficiently and improve the service provided to customers.

3.1.4 Option 4 Improved use of ICT in the directly managed arts services and facilities

Task: Audit existing ICT resources, analyse options and develop an ICT strategy to deliver improvements.

Timescale: Implementation of strategy by April 2001

Responsibility : Head of Arts and Cultural Services and Quality and Development Manager, in consultation with service managers and departmental Information Systems Manager.

Cost: The cost of this option will be identified through the development of the strategy. Suitable external funding strands exist to support this type of work, and an action plan to secure external funding will be a key part of the strategy.

Benefit: This will support the delivery and development of arts services,

and also improve access by the public.

3.1.5 Option 5 Develop a more strategic approach to the delivery of participatory arts.

Task: Develop and implement a long-term plan to deliver the above

Timescale: Implementation from April 2001

Responsibility Head of Arts and Cultural Services and Local Arts Manager

Cost: This work will be done through prioritisation of the time allocated to the management of the service (estimated at £700 of Officer time).

Benefit: This will ensure better cooperation between directly managed and grant aided services and will result in an improved service to customers and users.

3.1.6 Option 6 Improve the responsiveness of the service to cultural diversity

Task: Identify service issues and develop a medium to long term plan with SMART objectives to address the issues.

Timescale: Plan implemented by April 2001

Responsibility Head of Arts and Cultural Services and Quality and Development Manager

Cost: This work will be done through prioritisation of the time allocated to the management of the service (estimated at £2,200 of Officer time).

Benefit : This will result in an improvement in service and will further meet the needs of the City's diverse communities.

3.1.7 Option 7 Improve consultation of non-users of Arts and Cultural services

Task: Develop a programme of non-user consultation, and ensure that its outcomes are used by managers in the delivery and development of services.

Timescale: Programme in place, and results beginning to be used, by April 2001

Responsibility : Quality and Development Manager and departmental Marketing Manager

- Cost: The programme will be fully costed when the programme is developed. It is anticipated that costs will be met within existing departmental budgets.
- Benefit: This will ensure that the needs of non users are taken into consideration when planning services and will potentially extend and enhance the range of service offered.
- 3.1.8 Option 8 Development of Grant Aid Contracts and Service Level Agreements for the Haymarket Theatre and Phoenix Arts Centre**
- Task: Liaise with the Board of Directors and key personnel from both organisations to develop contracts and agreements.
- Timescale: Agreements and contracts signed by April 2001
- Responsibility Head of Arts and Cultural Services
- Cost: Approximately 700 hours of Officer time will be spent on this work. This will be met through prioritising the work programme of the Head of Arts and Cultural Services.
- Benefit: This option will clarify the nature of the Councils 'contract' with these organisations and provide improved Performance Management Information.
- 3.1.9 Option 9 Improvement of the Arts and Cultural Services' approach to the collection and use of Performance Management information**
- Task: Undertake a review of the service's Performance Management Information System (PMIS), develop an improved system and ensure its use across the service.
- Timescale: Implementation from April 2001
- Responsibility Quality and Development Manager
- Cost: The estimated cost of £1,100, equivalent to 10 days officer time, to implement the programme will be met through existing budget by prioritising the work of the Quality and Development Manager.
- Benefit: This will improve service quality by allowing decisions to be made on the basis of hard data.

3.1.10 Option 10 Improve the ability to measure performance of De Montfort Hall and its programme.

Task	Establish a benchmarking club with comparable venues, and establish Performance Indicators to measure quality and benefit, particularly in regard to the outdoor programme.
Timescale	Data to be available by April 2001
Responsibility	De Montfort Hall Manager
Cost	It is estimated that £800 of Officer time will be allocated to this work. The work will be done by prioritising the work programmes of managers of De Montfort Hall
Benefit	This will improve service quality by allowing decisions to be made on the basis of hard information and data.

3.2 Assessment against inspection criteria

The Cabinet may wish to consider the key criteria which will be used by the Best Value Inspectorate to make judgements about services and our examination of them.

The questions which will be asked by the inspectors are:

- Is it a good service?
- Is it going to improve?

INSPECTORATE QUESTIONS	RESPONSES AS A RESULT OF THE REVIEW
A good Service?	
<p><u>Are the authority's aims clear and challenging?</u></p> <p>Has the authority challenged the need for the service?</p>	<p>The authority's role in the provision of these services will be confirmed through the authority's cultural strategy which is currently being drafted. The draft will be available by May 2001. The need for the service has been demonstrated through the numbers of people using the facilities and services.</p> <p>Some testing of public opinion has been carried out but this has been limited (see also forms 2A).</p> <p>Initial meetings of stakeholders have emphasised the priority of confirming the</p>

<p>Does the service support corporate aims Community <u>Plan</u>?</p>	<p>future position of this service.</p> <p>The service objectives are in line with the corporate direction of the authority and demonstrate links with key corporate strategies and the community plan. (BV forms 2A & 2B)</p> <p>However not all links are equally strong and those areas will need to be addressed in the wider context of the authority's role</p>
<p><u>Does the service meet these aims?</u></p> <p>Is there effective performance management?</p> <p>Is the authority delivering?</p>	<p>These are being put in place and development work is being carried out. Some progress has been made this year as the authority now has a system for collecting data for the ACPIs and BVPIs. See also form BV4 and improvement option 9.</p>
<p><u>How does its performance compare?</u></p> <p>How does the authority compare with the top 25%?</p> <p>Has the authority demonstrated cost effectiveness?</p>	<p>In the year 98/99 the ACPI 'total net spending per head of population for sport and recreation' was high and the authority was in the bottom quartile. ACPI comparisons for this year are not available yet (to be published in Dec 00). However this indicator is not very meaningful and does not give an adequate view of the service.</p> <p>The council's expenditure on arts and entertainment attracts partnership support from East Midlands Arts totalling £1,203,755 per annum. The value of this leverage is approximately 50 % of arts provision in the city.</p>

INSPECTORATE QUESTIONS	RESPONSES AS A RESULT OF THE REVIEW
Going to Improve?	
<u>Does the BVR drive improvement?</u>	
Is the BVR process managed effectively?	The tight time scale of the reviews resulted in some aspects of the 4 Cs not being carried out as well as the process required, but these are being addressed in the improvement options (see form 6C).
Has the authority fundamentally challenged what it does?	This has been undertaken in part as outlined BV forms 2A & 2B. See section on 'competition' in the report to scrutiny panel 7 Nov 00 and improvement options 1 & 3. Also the aim is to adhere to the authority's Procurement strategy which will be available in March 2001. The supply mapping exercise for the voluntary sector needs to be carried out on the basis of the guidelines resulting from the procurement review. See also improvement option 1 'management options analysis'
Has the authority made rigorous comparisons throughout the review?	Comparisons have been difficult because of the non- availability of comparable data. (see also section on 'benchmarking' in the report to scrutiny panel 7 Nov 00). A benchmarking club has been set up with 'family' authorities but analysis is not available yet .
Has the authority made good use of consultation?	Ongoing consultation has been taking place in the context of the arts media and broadcasting strategy. The results are being incorporated in the planning process. Draft business plans will be available by Nov 2000. A non-user survey has been planned for autumn 2000. See also improvement option 7.
How competitive is the authority's choice of procurement?	The authority is in the process of drafting a procurement strategy (see above)

<p><u>How good is the Improvement plan?</u></p> <p>Is the authority trying to improve the right things?</p> <p>Are the improvements ambitious enough to get the authority into the top 25%?</p>	<p>The aim is to improve the service to users and make services more cost effective. Improvement options proposed are aimed at delivering this objective. See improvement plans</p> <p>There is a determination to improve this service within the council. This will take time but the improvement options proposed will move the service significantly forward towards this objective.</p>
<p><u>Will the authority deliver the improvements?</u></p> <p>Does the Plan have the commitment that it needs from Members and others?</p> <p>Is the Improvement Plan practical?</p> <p>Does the authority have a track record of managing both change and performance?</p>	<p>Not in a position to demonstrate this yet</p> <p>The plan has clearly identified tasks, time scales, responsibilities and cost.</p> <p>The authority has embarked on a major programme of change since it became a unitary authority in 1997 and has complied with all applicable government legislation in the past. It has acquired Beacon status in certain service areas. The council has taken steps to develop and enforce its Performance Management Framework which is being actively taken forward.</p>

4. **ATTACHED DOCUMENTATION**

Finance – additional information Appendix 1

Independent Consultee comments / report Appendix 2

TU comments – Appendix 3

Joint Trade Union comments Appendix 4

Extracts of Arts Leisure and Environment Scrutiny 7 November 00 minutes

Arts Leisure and Environment Scrutiny 2 January 01 minutes

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Background information

Leicester is one of the fastest growing multi-cultural cities in Europe; the rich diversity on offer helps to shape the focus and vision of the city's cultural content. It is also noted for its rapidly increasing youthful population.

- Leicester City Council expends, according to the CIPFA statistics (1999-2000), £4,053,000 per annum on arts (including museums) activities and events, including pro-rata amounts for central/departmental support costs. This represents a spend of £13.80 per head of population. Expenditure on the Arts and Entertainment excluding museums (expenditure £1,774,400 plus £988,300 in grant aid to voluntary projects) gives a spend of £9.40 per head.
- Leicester, when compared with the other Local Authorities in the comparator group, spends at a higher rate per head of population than the majority of the other authorities in the CIPFA grouping. Further information on issues influencing the spend per head in Leicester is provided at Appendix 1. It is important to note that the City Council supports, through its expenditure on arts and entertainments, three venues that fulfil a regional function, and offers services to a culturally diverse city. Both these factors have a significant impact on the City's spend per head in relation to comparator authorities.
- In addition, realistic and accurate benchmarking/figures has proved difficult because of the lack of adequate financial and performance information in the sector in the service and because it is not always clear what the individual authority figures represent.

CIPFA figures are currently the only source of published financial information but there has always been some doubt about the reliability of the data supplied to CIPFA by local authorities.

A. Implications of the 2% saving

The Council placed a requirement on the Year One Best Value reviews to identify savings of 2%. For the Arts & Entertainment theme the estimated 2% target figure is £50,000. In order to make this saving the following proposals could contribute to achieving a 2% reduction:

- Withdrawal of Arts Services from the City Rooms could achieve a saving of £26,500 per annum (full year effect) for that service. NB the cost of staff redundancies have not, at this juncture, been calculated, as redeployment would be the preferred outcome.

- Fosse Arts has retained (pending Council decision on the Line Out / Fosse Community Studios Service & Management review) its services, Ceramics, Print & Music Studios, 50% increase usage during 2001/02 could provide an additional income of £3,750.
- Task Line Out, as part of the revised Management arrangements for Media & Video Services, to increase income by £15,000 thereby reducing the transfer of financial resource to £58,000 from £73,000
- £5,000 efficiency savings resulting from the Service Improvement Plan.
- The above listed options would provide a potential combined saving of £50,250 (excluding redundancy costs if required).
- Explore Trust Management options detailed in the report. It is anticipated that significant savings could be generated by this process but will require a full analysis before accurate predictions can be made.

B. Reinvestment of 2%

It is anticipated that many of the 'ongoing' costs associated with the Service Improvement Plan will be met from existing budgets. However there is a notable area of concern that would benefit from a reinvestment of the 2% saving. This is as follows:

- ICT Strategy, hardware, software and training costs. It is envisaged that improved ICT facilities and resources will aid more efficient use of staff time and therefore there will not result in any additional staff costs after training. However there will be increased maintenance costs, these cannot be calculated until the strategy is written detailing the specific needs and requirements. The reinvestment of 2% into the service would allow the ICT strategy to be implemented. ICT has become increasingly important to the cultural sector particularly in regards to marketing and promotion and audience development, production and exhibition of work and retail areas of activity.

C. The implications of realigning the overall spend on comparator data

- CIPFA information only indicates/demonstrates that when compared to other similar authorities Leicester provides a relatively high level of directly managed arts and entertainment facilities and services.
- However based on the CIPFA figures if Leicester were to spend at the average rate of the other local authorities of @ £8.19 per head of population, a total budget of £2,404,584 would be required to provide for the **arts, entertainment and museums** services.

- A reduction by this amount would result in an available budget of £2,636,716 across the aforementioned (Arts, Museums and Entertainment) services.
- A reduction by this amount would mean that 54%, £1,423,826, would need to be found from the arts & entertainment budgets. This would leave a total budget of £884,074 available for arts and entertainment services and facilities.

Members need to consider the degree to which they wish to position these services in relation to other comparable local authorities. A reduction of the scale indicated above would have a major impact on current service provision.

In summary the impact of a reduction of this nature would:

- place the Councils funding partnerships with East Midlands Arts and the Arts Council of England in jeopardy
- severely limit and restrict the range of arts & entertainment services provided for the citizens of Leicester and the ability to meet existing/future needs
- impact negatively on the local economy and potentially lead to job losses – both directly and indirectly
- have a negative impact on the profile of the City and the potential to attract visitors to the City and further inward investment
- significantly reduce the potential to assist in regeneration (social, economic & environmental) of the City through the development of the Cultural / Creative Village in St George's area of the City Centre
- lose the support of existing service Stakeholders – specifically the voluntary and volunteer sectors

6. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

If approved by Cabinet, the legal implications are as follows:

The Review Process

The review process has sought to comply with the statutory requirements, against constraints noted in the report. However, certain elements of those requirements remain outstanding. This particularly applies to “challenge” elements of the fundamental review of the service, in the light of ongoing work regarding the service’s strategic direction. It will be necessary to ensure that all elements of the Review are completed within the statutory time-scale, i.e.

by January 2005.

Service Improvement Options

Implementing a number of the service improvement options set out in section 3 of the report will raise legal issues. The particularly applies to some of the management options set out in Option 1. These will need to be taken into account by officers as work on those options continues, and further advice given to members when decisions come to be taken.

7. **EQUALITY**

The service is aiming to improve responsiveness to cultural diversity. See improvement option 6.

8. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The committee is recommended to support the Lead Director in completing the review process and:

- i) endorse the Lead Director's management of the process to date;
- ii) endorse the Lead Director's proposals;
- iii) advise the Cabinet on the preferred options and any further action required.

Report Author/Officer to contact

Peter Webster: Lead Director
Rina Singh: Facilitator
Mike Candler: Lead Review Officer

Independent Consultee's Report**Leicester City Council Best Value Review Year One -Arts & Entertainment****Process**

Overall the process of BV seemed thorough although I felt that to do the service under review any real justice, perhaps the timetable should have been extended. It seemed to put the staff concerned under unnecessary additional pressure. Given the timetable issue it does also beg the question of whether the authority is allowing enough time to ask the right questions about the services it provides and scrutinise them properly. I also felt that there was real lack of awareness about the nature of Arts & Entertainment amongst non arts staff, and as one of the key tenets of Best Value is the 'I Challenge' -addressing the key question about the rationale for the service and the way it is provided -the process in this instance did not allow for that rationale to be made.

Stakeholder consultation and local consultation seemed excellent compared to other local authorities I have come across. Very few local authorities involved in the Best Value process have come with innovative ideas for consulting non-users so Leicester is not alone.

As far as the management of the process goes, I can only speak from my own experience in the consultee role and I did not feel I was sufficiently well informed about the process or facilitated to carry out my role effectively at times. The Arts & Entertainment staff did however keep me fully up to date with paperwork, meeting dates and responded to enquiries swiftly.

Issues

- .Look at trust management for De Montfort Hall within SIP
- .Look at Public Art going to development trust -already levers substantial funds and is the only service of its kind in the East Midlands region?
- .ICT strategy for the whole service absolutely essential and as Best Value is also meant to flag up the needs of the service under review as well as its shortcomings, this should be addressed as an absolute priority in the improvement plan. The service cannot b.e competitive when it lacks even the most basic technology in some sections.
- Performance Indicators within services under the 'cultural' remit are a particularly difficult sector within which to set PI's. There are several reasons for this; the wide range of activities, the range of partners that the service works with in delivering its facilities/activities, and whether you count non residents alongside residents in data collection. They also obviously fail to address the issue of participation and quality of experience, vital in the arts. The Audit Commission, DETR and DCMS have all recognised this and have asked the relevant bodies (LGA, Arts Council, DCMS, Sport England etc) to produce two national PI's for next year. This is the only LA service that has been allowed to do this by the Commission and it does mitigate against some of the slightly negative comments being made about the A&E service failing to meet the national PI's and the need for the service only demonstrated through its continued usage. Leicester is certainly not unique in this respect.
- The local demographic is a significant influence on Arts Services, and in the case of Leicester A&E service the implications are obvious. Unlike some Local

Authorities, its audiences/participants do not fall into several easily defined categories; instead there are myriad cultural needs and interests in the city. In this context the local indicators will need to be flexible and sensitive. In terms of benchmarking, all of the local authorities involved in the provision of cultural services will be sensitive to local influences and have varied reasons for supporting the arts. Again Leicester is not unique in this respect, as Benchmarking is at a very early stage for this sector. The Arts Council and the LGA Cultural Services Network regards the Benchmarking 'family' Leicester is a member of as an important one in the development of data this area and acknowledges the lack of available data at this stage. This will make comparisons difficult now, but the authority's willingness to tackle this issue has been recognised at the national level.

- Cultural Diversity is a key factor for the Local Authority and is now a priority for the arts funding system. It is an area where there have been well publicised difficulties, and in the case of the arts this translates primarily as under-investment, barriers to access and marginalising the interests of the communities concerned. The Arts Council and the Regional Arts Boards are increasing investment in this area of their work in preparation for the Year of Cultural Diversity in 2002. They will be expecting their local authority partners to assist them in developing the infrastructure and removing barriers to access. The arts funding system has a great deal to learn from local authorities like Leicester, and I stress this to reinforce the need for continued investment in the service you provide to the culturally diverse communities of the city.

Service Improvement Plan

Seems realistic and the process has worked well in this respect, identifying key areas for improvement.

Efficiency Savings

Could the savings be made from running costs (catering/cleaning) in one of the directly provided facilities such as DMH? I could not see these costs addressed in the review papers. Perhaps this could avoid potential controversy around closure and redundancies.

Conclusion

The Arts and Entertainment Service Leicester City Council provides, does on the whole, represent excellent value for money. Regional Arts Boards and ACE rely heavily on skilled local authority arts staff in cities like Leicester to assist them in developing the arts. Leicester is an important player in the East Midlands Arts Board region and has the potential to become a regional and in some instances, national, leader for the work it is doing; members should be mindful that aspects of the service already have a high regional and national profile. Cuts to an obviously overstretched service could be devastating and it would be a shame if this Year One Best Value process, which seems not to have taken full cognisance of the issues around the delivery of Arts & Entertainment or its rationale, damages a good quality service.

Margaret Cooney
November 10, 2000

TRADE UNION COMMENTS
ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENTS REVIEW 6 SERIES FORMS

Form 6B

Health and safety and equality issues have not fully been integrated into the Best Value process and the quality of consultation and performance management has been of concern.

These issues however have been picked up within the review period and appear to have been incorporated into the Service Improvement Plan -Race and Sex Discrimination Legislation has been omitted from the statutory standards.

Form 6C

Links must be drawn with other Best Value reviews regarding contracts and service level agreements. The areas covered by the Race Relations Amendment Bill and Terms and Conditions of Employment must also be taken into consideration.

Key personnel, Trade Unions, Board of Directors, etc, need to be involved in the development of contracts and agreements for the Haymarket and Phoenix Arts Centre.

Form 6D

Where staffing structures, changes to Terms and Conditions of Employment or out sourcing are under consideration, corporate procedures and consultative mechanisms must be adhered to. Trade union involvement at an early stage is vital

APPENDIX 4

COMMENTS ON THE PROGRESS OF THE ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT BEST VALUE REVIEW FROM THE JOINT TRADE UNION.

The overall process undertaken for this review has thrown up issues which have been raised by the Trade Unions. During the course of the review some of these have been incorporated in the issues to Scrutiny. However since then issues relating to consultation have arisen in respect of proposals for the arbitrary 2% savings asked for by the Authority as a product of the Best Value Reviews.

The proposal raised at the 8th November 2000 Core Group meeting were not outlined in detail however the Trade Unions are concerned that in formulating the proposal for the closure of City Rooms consultation with all staff involved in the provision of the service including those for example employed by Commercial Service, has not taken place.

The Lack of time allocated to staff and officers has been highlighted on numerous occasions but the constraints that it places on the Trade unions is not always recognised.

This being the case careful consideration needs to be given to whether the time table for progress this review is practicable.