

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL



MINUTES of a meeting of the Chief Officer Employment Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Monday 30 September 2013 commencing at 3.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Jackie Brockway (Chairman)
Councillor David Cotton (Vice Chairman)

Councillor Alan Caine
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Jeff Summers
Councillor Reg Shore
Councillor Anne Welburn

Apologies: Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Lesley Rollings

Membership: No substitutes were appointed for the meeting

In Attendance:
Manjeet Gill Chief Executive
Emma Redwood Team Manager – People and Organisational Development
Katie Coughlan Governance and Civic Officer

9 MINUTES

(a) Meeting of the Chief Officer Employment Committee - 30 July 2013

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Chief Officer Employment Committee held on 30 July 2013 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

10 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of Interest were made.

11 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the

likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

12 FUTURE DIRECTOR STRUCTURE AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION (COEC.05 13/14)

Members gave consideration to a report which outlined the outcome of the consultation on future Director (Chief Officer) arrangements. The report further proposed a structure and arrangements for the next steps.

Prior to the debate opening, the Chief Executive outlined the consultation responses which had been received since the Committee had last met. A total of 28 responses, of very high quality, had been received. As a whole, there had been no objections to the proposal to have a Commercial Director (some had suggested this should be a temporary post), and the three Director model had been preferred over the two Director model, hence the recommendation within the report.

The Chief Executive further explained that she had met with all Heads of Service, following the Committee's last meeting, in order to explain the effects of the re-structure, and thus had commenced the consultation for this tier of the organisation.

In summary, the Chief Executive recommended that the three Director model be adopted (supported by six Heads of Service). It was confirmed that recruitment to the Heads of Service posts would not commence until the Directors had been appointed in order that they could be involved and shape this tier of the organisation.

Whilst accepting that the Head of Service level of the organisation fell outside of the remit of the Committee, Members were of the view, that understanding the intentions at this level of the organisation was fundamental in their being able to establish the most appropriate format for the top tier of the organisation.

Debate ensued and Members asked numerous questions of the Chief Executive regarding her proposals around Heads of Service; including what the proposed six Heads of Service were, what their remit would be and how these would fit under the Directors. In responding, the Chief Executive outlined her view of matrix management, however the idea of people's line management and responsibilities rotating was not welcomed, with some being of the view that some areas were specialist and thus required a specialist.

In responding to questions, the Chief Executive outlined the role of Heads of Service versus that of a team manager and how the team manager role had been developed and strengthened over recent years. The specialist knowledge was now retained at a Team Manager level and thus Heads of Service needed to have an over-arching knowledge base but be more focussed on service development and strategy.

This led Members to question whether the Head of Service role was large enough and whether six were actually required. Members sought detailed information on the role of each Head of Service; the number of Team Managers under each of service; the numbers of employees in each team and the key projects and strategies covered by each.

The Leader of the Council placed on record his views as to why he felt the organisation needed a Commercial Director. Members sought indication as to level of remuneration which was expected to be attached to such a post.

In responding Officers indicated that this could be in the region of circa £80k. However the possibility of including an element of performance related pay was something that could be investigated and Members welcomed this idea, citing a number of options as to how they envisaged this could work. All were in agreement that long term, if the Commercial Director was of the right quality they would in effect pay for themselves.

It was suggested that the role of Chief Executive should be included in the re-structure. The Governance and Civic Officer expressed caution and advised the Committee that should they wish to explore this option and even discuss this in more detail, the Chief Executive could not remain in the meeting and the Committee would need specialist and independent advice to understand the implications of any of their proposals.

Having listened to the information offered during the debate, a Member of the Committee suggested an alternative structure, this being one Director alongside the Chief Executive, keeping operational issues away from business delivery, with the Commercial role being at a Head of Service level.

Debate ensued and whilst some were in agreement that the structure proposed by the Member could work, a number of Members were not. Some were of the view that if the Commercial post was not of a certain standing in the organisation it would not be effective, furthermore the post needed to be remunerated at a certain level to attract the right quality of candidate.

In light of Members of the Committee, all seeming to have differing views as to which structure would best suit the future needs of the organisation, a show of hands was taken on the following issues, to gauge members thoughts on whether there should be a commercial director. The majority were in agreement; and whether the post should have a portfolio. The majority feeling was that they should not.

However the Leader indicated that he felt without the additional information which had been requested throughout the course of the debate he was unable at this point in time to make an informed decision.

The Chief Executive re-iterated her rationale for the Commercial Director post as outlined in the report previously submitted to the Committee, she further outlined her rationale for now considering the three Director model to best suit

the future needs of the organisation, making reference to the pro's and con's table which had been circulated. Finally the Chief Executive wished to place on record her recommendations, these being that the 3 Director model should be adopted and both the commercial role and the Section 151 Officer role, in her view needed to be at a Director level, in order to safeguard the authority as it investigated more creative investment opportunities and business ventures. Furthermore the three Director option was the option that consultation agreed with overall.

With regard to the Director appointment, Members indicated they were not in a position to make such an appointment at this stage and this matter would be further considered when the Committee next met.

On that basis it was

RESOLVED that the meeting be adjourned and reconvened on 7 October 2013 pending further information relating to the structure; how it interacts with the Head of Service Level; the numbers of employees in each team and the key projects and strategies covered by each.

The meeting adjourned at 6.10 pm

Chairman

MINUTES of a re-convened meeting of the Chief Officer Employment Committee held in the Ancholme Meeting Room at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Monday 7 October 2013 commencing at 3.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Jackie Brockway (Chairman)
Councillor David Cotton (Vice Chairman)

Councillor Alan Caine
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Jeff Summers
Councillor Reg Shore
Councillor Anne Welburn

Apologies: Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Lesley Rollings

Membership: No substitutes were appointed for the meeting

In Attendance:

Manjeet Gill	Chief Executive
Emma Redwood	Team Manager – People and Organisational Development
Katie Coughlan	Governance and Civic Officer

13 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of Interest were made.

14 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

15 FUTURE DIRECTOR STRUCTURE AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION (COEC.05 13/14)

Members gave further consideration to a report which outlined the outcome of the consultation on future Director (Chief Officer) arrangements. The report further proposed a structure and arrangements for the next steps.

The Chief Executive made a detailed presentation to the Committee setting out what it was the Council wanted to achieve (informed by Member workshops and political priorities), the changing role of the Council, the role of the workforce at the various tiers within the organisation and thus the structure and skills she believed were required to see the Council into the future.

The Leader of the Council then addressed the Committee, setting out his future vision for the authority, stressing and re-emphasising the need for new skills, and the new role the Council had to play in the community. The expertise required to deliver the vision was not present in the Council currently and thus there was a real need to re-structure.

The Chief Executive re-presented her proposals, proposing that ideally Heads of Service should not be recruited until Directors were in post. However, the number of Heads of Service would be announced, six in total at this stage.

Members were comfortable with this approach and it was explained that the announcement was to ensure the Director structure remained within budget.

In responding to questions, the Chief Executive confirmed that the role of Deputy Chief Executive was likely to be shared amongst the Directors and explained her rationale for this, including giving all Directors a development opportunity, to which Members indicated their agreement.

Lengthy and detailed debate ensued during which each Member in turn, shared with the Committee their views on both the two and three Director model, indicating their preferred option and the rationale for this, based on the information which had been provided.

Discussion then turned to the appointment of an interim Director as suggested by the Committee at its meeting on 30 July 2013.

The Chairman indicated that she was not happy to make an appointment without having first met each of the potential candidates, but sought the views of the other Committee members.

Some were of the view, that on reflection, an interim should not be appointed as there were concerns that this was a “major ball to start rolling” and thus needed to be commenced in the correct way. Furthermore, this was considered an expense the Authority could do without. However, equally it was discussed that this was capacity at Director level to deliver existing / planned projects such as Trade Waste, that need Director level capacity rather than carry out the role of a permanent Commercial Director.

Assurances were given that the appointment would be met from within existing budgets.

The majority of members were of the view that additional capacity was required in order that progress could be achieved immediately against the commercial agenda, whilst the permanent post was being recruited to. This was viewed as a critical role given the current financial pressures and economic climate. However Members supported the Chairman’s view that they would first like to meet the potential candidates.

In response to a suggestion that the role could be shared by two interims, Members indicated that this was not something they wished to explore, and felt ideally the post should be held by one individual on a 3 day per week, up to full time basis.

At the suggestion of the Chief Executive, Candidate 3, was stood down from the process due to the remuneration rate requested. It was suggested the remaining two candidates, along with any other potentially suitable candidates be invited to meet with the Committee at the earliest opportunity.

On that basis it was

RESOLVED that:

Chief Officer Employment Committee – 30 September / 7 October 2013

- (a) taking into account the consultation feedback, and the additional information provided by the Chief Executive, the option for three future Directors be approved; and
- (b) the appointment of an interim Director be deferred at this stage, in order that the Committee may interview potential candidates at their next meeting.

The meeting closed at 6.00 pm

Chairman