



**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE CABINET**

WEDNESDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY 2009, AT 6.00 P.M.

THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE, BROMSGROVE

**SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION**

The attached papers were specified as "to follow" on the Agenda previously distributed relating to the above mentioned meeting.

3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 2)
18. Shared Services Board (Pages 3 - 8)

Please note that the minutes of the meeting of the Shared Services Board held on 26th January 2009 were considered during the open session of the Cabinet meeting.

For this reason, the minutes of the meeting of the Shared Services Board have been published here as a publicly available document.

K. DICKS  
Chief Executive

The Council House  
Burcot Lane  
BROMSGROVE  
Worcestershire  
B60 1AA

11th February 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MEETING OF THE CABINET

WEDNESDAY, 28TH JANUARY 2009, AT 5.30 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors R. Hollingworth (Leader), Mrs. J. M. L. A. Griffiths (Deputy Leader), Dr. D. W. P. Booth JP, G. N. Denaro, Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP, R. D. Smith, M. J. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker

Observer: Councillor S. R. Peters

Invitee: Mr. A. Davidson, Partner, Kimbells Solicitors.

Officers: Mr. K. Dicks, Mr. T. Beirne, Mr. P. Street, Mr. M. Bell, Mrs. C. Felton, Mr. D. Hammond, Ms. J. Pickering, Ms. J. Pitman, Ms. D. Poole and Mr. J. Godwin

#### 137/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs. J. Dyer M.B.E.

#### 138/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

#### 139/08 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

**RESOLVED** that under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the item of business the subject of the following minute on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, as amended, the relevant paragraph of that part being as set out below and that it is in the public interest to do so:-

<u>Minute No</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
140/08	4

#### 140/08 JOB EVALUATION AND SINGLE STATUS

Members received a verbal report on the latest situation regarding Job Evaluation/Single Status.

In accordance with their decision on 22nd October 2008, the Cabinet was advised that the 90 day period of consultation with the Trade Unions (Unison, GMB and UCATT) in respect of the consideration to use dismissal and re-engagement as a mechanism to implement Job Evaluation/Single Status had ended and that regrettably it had not been possible to achieve a Collective

Agreement during that period. Consequently the Cabinet had been reconvened in order to consider an appropriate way forward.

In addition, the Cabinet was advised of a request from Unison to extend the consultation period by a further 90 days. The Cabinet was also advised that GMB had indicated that they would now like to enter into a Collective Agreement and that they were anxious to see Job Evaluation implemented for their members.

Two options regarding the possible next step to be taken were considered.

As part of their consideration of the issue Members received the views of all Heads of Service present together with independent legal advice. It was

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that having considered the request of Unison to extend the consultation process for a further ninety days, this request be rejected on the grounds that a Collective Agreement is unlikely to be reached with Unison within this period;
- (b) that, as the only other course of action to bring certainty to the organisation and its staff, the changes arising from Job Evaluation and Single Status be implemented and that this be achieved through Collective and Individual Agreements where possible. Alternatively where implementation is not possible by these means a process of dismissal and re-engagement of employees be entered into with a view to achieving implementation by the end of May 2009.
- (c) that in view of the urgency of the matter, the Cabinet's decision be not subject to the Council's call-in procedure as set out in the Scrutiny Procedure Rules.

The meeting closed at 6.40 p.m.

Chairman

## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL AND** **REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### **SHARED SERVICES BOARD**

**Monday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2009**

**Redditch Town Hall**

#### **NOTES**

##### **Present:**

- Councillors Carole Gandy, Colin MacMillan, Bill Hartnett, Malcolm Hall (Redditch Borough Council)
- Councillors Roger Hollingworth, Jean Luck (Bromsgrove District Council)

**Officers** – K Dicks (Acting Joint Chief Executive – Redditch and Bromsgrove Councils), J Pitman (Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development – BDC), E Storer (Head of Human Resources and Communications – RBC)

**Consultant** – Brian Holland.

**Committee Support** – S Skinner

**Also in attendance** – None

**Apology** – Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Cllrs MacDonald & Webb (BDC).

#### **1. Minutes of previous meeting**

**It was AGREED that**

**the minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 18 December 2008 be confirmed as a correct record.**

#### **2. Matters Arising**

**It was AGREED that**

**discussion of the outstanding HR matters requested by Councillor Hartnett be referred to the proposed Redditch O&S review of the Shared Services proposals.**

#### **3. Progress Report - General**

Page 3

Chair referred Members to the documents attached to the agenda and

Members were asked to:

- note the report of all progress to date, as detailed in the papers to the meeting (which Members duly noted);
- comment upon the work undertaken by Brian Holland;
- comment upon the process for the six month review; and
- endorse the medium-term wins for consideration by the relevant Council's Executive Committee / Cabinet as follows:
  - a) Economic Development
  - b) Internal Audit
  - c) IT.

The following Notes summarise the outcomes of each of the above.

#### **4. Brian Holland, Consultant - Hollybank Associates**

The Chair introduced Brian Holland who, it was explained, had been recruited to support the next phase of the Shared Services Project – comparing performance and cost information for both Councils and identifying those service areas that could / should be targeted within the subsequent 'business case' and then developing the specification for going to the market to recruit competitively for a consultancy to prepare and develop the business case.

Mr Holland gave a detailed Powerpoint Presentation, during which he took questions of clarification.

Key issues that arose during the presentation were:

a) Local 'Sovereignty'

It was underlined that, in all the proposals currently under consideration, the special characteristics of both areas and the integrity and overall 'sovereignty' of both Councils were paramount.

Members acknowledged that there was a significant risk of public confusion and misinformation about this and therefore agreed that it remained important to emphasise at every stage that no merger of the two authorities was being considered.

b) Financial Data

Members expressed concerns that it was currently difficult to compare the financial data generated by the two Councils, as both worked to differing standards and formats.

Officers agreed that more work would be done to attempt to deal with this and this would need to be undertaken as part of the business case.

c) Management Structure Options

Clarifications were provided on the various potential models.

d) General Business Case - Terms of Contract

Members considered what might be the focus of the shared services contract specification to ensure maximum benefit was derived from this opportunity. They also considered the associated financial implications and issues of timing.

Officers advised that it was proposed to let the contract during the week commencing 2 March.

**It was AGREED that**

**Kevin Dicks, Sue Hanley (RBC) and Tony Beirne (BDC) would undertake a 'first sift' of the offers and then bring back a short list to Board who would interview prospective consultants.**

e) Commissioning model

Mr Holland explained the 'Commissioning Model' and illustrated a potential Commissioner / Provider structure.

The Board thanked Mr Holland for his work to date and for his presentation to the meeting.

## **5. Process for 6-month Review**

Members endorsed arrangements for the six-month review of the current arrangements:

There would be a report to the Shared Services Board detailing

- a) progress against each of the phases of the projects: Quick Wins (including progress against specific projects); Medium-Term Wins and progress with the business case.
- b) progress against the targets agreed for the Chief Executive (specific to each Council). These targets would include progress against the shared services project; and state what problems had been encountered by each Council working together in the first six months, and how any such problems had been resolved;
- c) what issues had been encountered by the acting Joint Chief Executive in the first six months;
- d) what was the current rating of risks in the original study;
- e) whether any new risks had materialized;
- f) what progress had been made operationally;
- g) what cost savings had been achieved;
- h) what overall conclusions had been reached: and

- i) how the Councils would review their positions at the twelve month point.

Members noted that, on Monitoring Officer advice, it would be each Leader who would be reporting their respective Council's views at their March meetings in relation to the overall effect of the secondment arrangements.

## **6. Medium-Term Wins**

As the next stage of the Progress Report, the Board considered the options for potential 'medium-term wins'. Officers suggested that in order to avoid problems of overload for both authorities, it would ideally be necessary to limit these to 3 areas.

Further to recent representations he had made to the Redditch full Council, Cllr Hartnett also strongly advocated inclusion of the CCTV / Lifeline Service, which had previously been run by Redditch on behalf of both Councils and, he believed, offered the potential for substantial financial savings.

Opinions varied, however, between Redditch and Bromsgrove representatives, as to whether Audit Services (Redditch preference) or Economic Development (Bromsgrove preference) should be considered as one of the proposals. Redditch's view was that there might be too much competition between the two authorities in terms of attracting new businesses to the respective Districts.

Following discussion, and in view of the potential for Wyre Forest's lead involvement in the Economic Development review, it was considered that four areas might be manageable, after all.

**It was RECOMMENDED that**

**Audit Services, IT Services, Lifeline and Economic Development Services be pursued as the potential medium-term wins.**

Note: Economic Development would be subject to Wyre Forest's willingness to contribute to the work.

## **8. Financial summary – Shared Services**

In relation to this item and the table provided with the papers for the meeting, the Chair pointed out that the Redditch figures included the costs of a redundancy payment to a former Redditch Director. She considered, and it was agreed, that this had no relevance to the Shared Services agenda and therefore required deletion.

Mr Dicks advised that he was happy to take this point on board and pointed out that the financial summary was still a draft, evolving document and that other elements needed to be added in. He had been liaising with the Section 151 Officers of both Councils to ensure an appropriate common approach.



## **9. Concessionary Travel / Smart Cards**

During consideration of Other Business, there was some discussion of current issues around concessionary travel and Smart cards.

No recommendations were made, however.

## **10. Dates of next meetings - to be confirmed**

Dates would be notified of further meetings, to include those required to deal with the interviews with prospective consultants and in respect of the 6-month review.

The meeting started at 5.15 p.m.  
and closed at 7.25 p.m. .

This page is intentionally left blank