

APPENDIX A
ORGANISATIONAL ASSESSMENT
BEST VALUE REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE
FRIDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2002 AT 2.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Jefferson (Chairman), Councillors Bain (substitute for Councillor J Prest), Blackadder, Bradley, Ellis, Guest and Styth (substitute for Councillor C Rutherford).

OABV.6/02 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Prest and C Rutherford.

OABV.7/02 MINUTES

Subject to an amendment in Minute OABV.4/02, under the heading for Paragraph 8.3 - Cultural Issue - (iii) - Lack of Customer Focus being amended to read "Employee Involvement and Value," the Minutes of the meeting of this Sub-Committee held on 31 January 2002 be received.

OABV.8/02 COMPARATIVE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURES

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive submitted Report TC.44/02 indicating that, in relation to the "Compare" element as part of the Best Value process, comparison would need to be made between the City Council's senior management structure against those of a range of other Local Authorities.

Mr G Norris (District Audit) was present at the meeting and presented a report from the District Audit which summarised information relating to the senior management structures of 26 District Councils in the Northern Region. He indicated that the main conclusions from this report was as follows:-

- (1) Almost half of the Authorities had changed their senior management structures in the last two years;
- (2) A structure in which most or all Chief Officers were replaced by Executive Directors who have corporate roles as well as responsibility for managing the performance of a wide range of Heads of Service was becoming increasingly common with over half the Authorities having Executive Director posts;
- (3) Authorities with Executive Directors had less senior management posts (3 senior posts including the Chief Executive is the most common number) than Authorities with different arrangements;
- (4) There was substantial variation between Authorities in the number of Heads of Service posts they have. Again, Authorities with Executive Directors had a smaller number of Heads of Service posts. There was no evidence to suggest that Councils with Executive Directors were smaller Councils or had less responsibilities;

(5) There were wide variations in the way service responsibilities were arranged under particular Directors;

(6) Carlisle needed to consider a management structure which reflected recent practice within the field with a smaller number of corporate Executive Directors supported by Heads of Service (current comparative evidence would suggest a number between 10 and 15). In these circumstances, the City Council would need to consider explicitly how the corporate work of the Executive Team was to be supported.

Members thanked Mr Norris for his report and noted the trend for change in senior management structures. Members also noted that the report was statistical in nature and did not provide any detailed information on performance, effectiveness or efficiency of different structures.

Members went on to consider how to keep the Executive informed of the work of this Sub-Committee. The Town Clerk and Chief Executive was asked to produce a report providing a summary of the present position of the work of this Sub-Committee for circulation to Sub-Committee Members which could then be submitted to an Executive meeting. The Town Clerk and Chief Executive also indicated that he intended to keep employees informed of the work of this Sub-Committee.

A report from HACAS Chapman Hendy suggesting a list of 15 comparative Authorities to consult with for the "Compare" element of the Best Value Review which most closely matched the profile of Carlisle City Council was submitted.

Members agreed that consultations should take place with the 15 Local Authorities suggested. The Town Clerk and Chief Executive was also asked to make arrangements to invite an appropriate officer from one or two of the Northern Authorities which had recently revised their senior management structures, in order to discuss their restructuring.

Members referred to the HACAS Chapman Hendy Report and the fact that a list of questions which they intended to ask of the comparative Authorities had not been included in the report. The Town Clerk and Chief Executive undertook to circulate the list of questions to Members.

RESOLVED - (1) That the report from the District Audit be noted and Mr Norris be thanked for attending the meeting to present the report.

(2) That the list of 15 comparative Authorities identified in Appendix B of the HACAS Chapman Hendy Report be approached as part of the "Compare" element of this Best Value Review.

(3) That the Town Clerk and Chief Executive be requested to circulate to Members of the Sub-Committee the list of questions HACAS Chapman Hendy intend to use when approaching Comparative Authorities.

OABV.9/02 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED - That the next meeting of this Sub-Committee be held on Friday, 8 March 2002 at 2.00 pm and take the form of a workshop session.

(The meeting ended at 3.15 pm)

gh Committee Minutes Vol 286 Organisational Assessment Best Value Review Sub-Committee 22 02 02