



South Bucks
District Council

Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham, Bucks UB9 4LH
Telephone: 01895 837200 DX: 40261 Gerrards Cross
www.southbucks.gov.uk



Chiltern
District Council

King George V Road, Amersham, Buckinghamshire HP6
5AW Telephone: 01494 729000 www.chiltern.gov.uk

DEMOCRATIC AND ELECTORAL SERVICES

Dealt with by:	Democratic Services	Switchboard:	01895 837200
Your Ref:		Fax:	01895 837277
My Ref:		e-mail:	democraticservices@southbucks.gov.uk
Date:	20 May 2014	Direct Line:	01895 837225/837227

Dear Councillor

JOINT APPOINTMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Joint Appointments and Implementation Committee will be held as follows:

DATE: **THURSDAY, 29TH MAY, 2014**
TIME: **6.00 PM**
VENUE: **ROOM 6, CAPSWOOD, OXFORD ROAD, DENHAM**

Only apologies for absence received prior to the meeting will be recorded.

Yours faithfully

Jim Burness

Director of Resources

To: The Joint Appointments and Implementation Committee

Chiltern District Council

Mr Burns-Green
Mrs Darby
Mr Jones
Mr M Smith
M Stannard

South Bucks District Council

Mr Harding
Mr Kelly
Mrs Plant
Mr Reed
Mr D Smith

Declarations of Interest

Any Member attending the meeting is reminded of the requirement to declare if he/she has a personal interest in any item of business, as defined in the Code of Conduct. If that interest is a prejudicial interest as defined in the Code the Member should also withdraw from the meeting.

A G E N D A

	(Pages)
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Minutes	(1 - 2)
To sign as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 May 2014.	
3. Shared Services Reviews : Streamlining Implementation	(3 - 6)
To consider report of the Chief Executive.	
Appendix 1	(7 - 10)
Appendix 2	(11 - 12)
Appendix 3	(13 - 16)
4. Outcome of Harmonisation Terms and Conditions – Verbal Update	
To receive a verbal update from the Chief Executive.	
5. Exclusion of Public	
The Chairman to move the following resolution:-	
“That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public 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 Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.”	
6. Finance Shared Service Review	(17 - 20)
To consider report of the Director of Resources	
<i>Appendix A</i>	(21 - 26)
<i>Appendix B</i>	(27 - 100)
<i>Appendix C</i>	(101 - 114)
7. Parking Shared Service Review	
To consider report of the Director of Resources	
	(115 - 116)
<i>Appendix A</i>	(117 - 120)
<i>Appendix B</i>	(121 - 146)
<i>Appendix C</i>	(147 - 156)
<i>Appendix D</i>	(157 - 160)

The next meeting is due to take place on Monday, 23 June 2014

JOINT APPOINTMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Meeting - 1 May 2014

Present: Mr Burns-Green, Mrs Darby, Mr Harding, Mr Kelly, Mrs Plant, Mr Reed, Mr D Smith and Mr M Smith

Apologies for absence: Mr Jones and Mr Spate

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of the Joint Committee held on 24 March and 8 April 2014 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as correct records.

4. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public 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 1,2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

5. HARMONISATION OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The Committee considered a report setting out the formal response from UNISON relating to the improved offer on harmonised terms and conditions of employment and the following options to secure implementation:

1. Implement without a collective agreement
2. Implement with a collective agreement

The following appendices were attached to the report:

Appendix 1 - Details of the improved offer tabled to UNISON and staff in respect of:

- Salary Protection
- Overtime
- Locally Determined Pay
- Relocation Travel Rates

Appendix 2 - Document issued to staff and UNISON on the Management Proposals

Appendix 3 - Frequently Asked Questions

Appendix 4 - UNISON Response to the Revised Offer

Appendix 5 - Indicative cost modelling from the first 4 Service reviews.

Appendix 6 - Impact Assessment associated with option 1 above

Appendix 7 - Impact Assessment associated with option 2 above

A paper correcting the financial years referred to on pages 9, 25, 26 from 2017/18 to 2018/19 and page 31 2019/20 to 2018/19 and 2020/21 to 2019/20 was circulated at the meeting.

Also circulated at the meeting was a copy of an email from the UNISON Regional Organiser setting out UNISON's position following the meeting with Management on 29 April 2014. The email expressed a willingness to put one final proposal to all staff as a choice of two options as detailed in paragraph 3) (a) and (b) as follows:

Agenda Item 2

Joint Appointments and Implementation Committee - 1 May 2014

3. We are happy to put this final proposal to staff as a choice of two options, both alongside the offer to adhere to NJC pay increases for the next 3 years pending a review of that arrangement after 3 years. The choice would be between
 - a) the package as currently on the table, agreed by the last JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee, involving implementation on a phased basis, service review by service review with 2 years full protection of salary up to £5000 at the point of assimilation into the new role, and
 - b) the new package as outlined by yourselves at the meeting today of assimilation of all staff over to the new scales and terms and conditions at a fixed date to be defined, with 2 and a half years protection for those who needed it, followed by service reviews and the remainder of the protection already running post service review, or 2 or 2 and a half years protection at that point for anyone not previously protected if they were redeployed into a post at a lower salary at that point. This second offer would need to be clearly defined by yourselves by the use of indicative examples before we went out to consultation, and we would use the wording as supplied by yourselves

In considering the report the Committee was pleased to note that out of the fifty -one terms and conditions proposed, only two remain an issue - salary protection and locally determined pay. On the latter the Committee, after considering the points made in paragraph 25-27 and 38-40 of the report and mindful that it had no impact on the cost-neutral brief, agreed that a framework including the NJC agreed rate should be adopted subject to a review after 3 years.

During the debate on pay protection the Committee:

1. Noted UNISON's continued willingness to secure a collective agreement.
2. Reiterated the importance of maintaining staff commitment and morale during a period of significant change.
3. Arising from 1 and 2 expressed a reluctance to impose the harmonised terms and conditions on an individual by individual basis mindful of the information provided in Appendices 5, 6 and 7
4. Noted that a financial appraisal of 3(b) would be required before it could be considered for final approval.

Having considered the options the Committee, after reiterating its own commitment to secure a collective agreement, agreed that UNISON should be provided with an opportunity to ballot staff and UNISON members in accordance with their request in paragraph 3 of their letter but on the understanding that the ballot is carried out as soon as possible after 7 May 2014 when Personnel Committee at CDC were due to consider the report.

RESOLVED

1. That, in the event of staff agreeing to the package currently on the table, authority be delegated to the Chief Executive to conclude the negotiations and finalise the collective agreement.
2. That in the event of staff not agreeing to the package currently on the table a further report be submitted to the Committee with options on the way forward including a financial appraisal of the option in 3(b) of UNISON's email.

The meeting terminated at 7.30 pm

**CHILTERN & SOUTH BUCKS DISTRICT COUNCILS
JOINT APPOINTMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE –
29 MAY 2014**

*Not for publication by virtue of Paragraphs 3 & 4 Part 1 of Schedule
12A Local Government Act 1972*

**SHARED SERVICES REVIEWS: STREAMLINING
IMPLEMENTATION**

*Contact Officer: Alan Goodrum (01494 732001/01895 837363)
Judy Benson (01494 732015/01895 837288)*

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Members identify those areas of streamlining the implementation of shared service reviews they would like to take forward, particularly in terms of a standing delegation that once a shared service staffing proposal has been agreed by JAIC, changes can be agreed by the Chief Executive in response to consultation providing these are within the terms of the business case.

Report

- 1 JAIC at its meeting on 8 April 2014 expressed concern at the length of time it was taking to progress restructure proposals through to implementation. Whilst recognising the need to follow a number of processes, including staff consultation, the Committee asked for the timetable to be reviewed to see if there is any scope for shortening it.
- 2 This report provides an analysis of the various implementation steps and suggests potential improvements.
- 3 **Appendix 1** identifies the processes that are required to achieve successful implementation.
- 4 The table below sets out a summary of the timeline in weeks for the first six service reviews and shows the average duration for comparison purposes against those milestones.

Stage	Milestone points	Licencing	Community Safety	Building Control	Housing	Parking	Finance	Average
A	JC Approved Business Case to start date of shared service (Total)	40	40	31	23	23	24	30
B	JC Approved Business case to outcome of job evaluations	23	23	13	4	5	4	12
C	End of job evaluation to approved proposal for consultation JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee approval	3	3	4	3	3	4	3
D	Start consultation to end consultation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
E	End of consultation to approved final proposal JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee approval	3	3	3	5	5	5	4
F	Final proposal approval to offer of appointment	4	4	3-5	5	3	3	4
G	Offer of appointment to start of shared service	7	7	1	4	4-5	0-1	4

Key points are:

- 5 The end to end timeline between the approval of the business case to implementation has reduced by around 40% from 40 weeks to 24 weeks. Much of this has been through the lessons learned in earlier reviews.
- 6 Stage B. Proposed grades of new posts inform the potential degree of impact the proposals may have on the staff group. This information then helps to shape the approach and content of consultation. Again this period has been condensed considerably.
- 7 Stage C takes into account the present governance arrangements of reporting to both JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee and their respective lead times, for example when papers/agenda have to be despatched.
- 8 Stage D is the staff consultation component and consistent throughout.
- 9 Stage E is less consistent and again takes into account the present governance arrangements of reporting to the two committees and their respective lead times.
- 10 Stage F allows for appropriate internal expressions of interest and interviews.

- 11 Stage G is dependent on issues like accommodation and IT being resolved and also the optimum start date in service terms.

Implementation

- 12 There is no doubt that implementation on the initial service reviews was a little clunky and in terms of project management we need to be more adept at this. The project leader, usually the Head of Service, needs to adopt much more of a project management approach. However, the implementation timetables already built into the current service reviews reflect this and the optimum time to implement the new shared service is agreed through the Member Working Group. Effectively we have a phased programme of implementing reviews pre district elections and one major review, development management, which crosses over into the new Council. The last batch of reviews: environmental health, waste, customer services, personnel and communications will be timetabled by the Members Working Groups themselves.

Staff

- 13 **Appendix 2** sets out officer advice regarding the need for 30 days consultation period and the need for this consultation to be “meaningful and genuine”. This includes engaging with and listening to the views of staff and their representatives regarding the changes and the change process. This has the benefit of stimulating buy-in and trust, improving outcomes and reducing uncertainty.

Moving forward

- 14 **Appendix 3** sets out in more detail the activities involved from the Joint Committee decision to approve the business case to implementation of the new shared service. It shows realistically the timescales broken down by activities (having regard to dependencies) from the point of Joint Committee approval of the business case to implementation of new service. This shows a 24 week process. This includes time for:-

- Writing consultation documents including job descriptions and person specifications and the evaluation of these new roles
- Assessing the risk for current staff
- Approval of draft consultation documents
- Meaningful staff consultation (including with UNISON)
- Approval of final proposals
- Staff to write and submit their expression of interest
- Development of staff assessments
- Staff assessments and interviews
- Feedback to staff
- Staff appointments and assessment of remaining issues

- 15 During this process, 3 weeks are allocated for draft consultation papers going to JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee for approval (due to committee lead times) and a second 3 weeks is allocated for final proposals going to JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee for approval.
- 16 This timescale does not take into account other service delivery priorities and day to day delivery of services. Implementation of shared services is resource intensive particularly for the Head of Service and sometimes there may be other service priorities which need to be factored in.

Key issues

- 17 Business Case: The process of Member Working Group and progress through scoping and agreement of the final approach is now well established. Some reviews, such as community, have been lighter touch and this is appropriate for smaller service areas. The change in policy to establish 'where people will sit' as part of the business case certainly assists the later stages.
- 18 Restructure: At the heart of this process is the staff consultation period of 4 weeks. It is suggested that this has not been a major driver of the timeline and that this has contributed to the relative ease by which the new services have been introduced. It is clear though that some processes can be improved:
 - The need to take proposals to JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee creates double handling and in governance terms needs to be resolved.
 - Because of the extensive staff involvement, the changes made post consultation have been relatively minor; usually with the caveat that if it is within the business case, it is acceptable to Members. Thus there should be a standing delegation when staffing proposals are agreed that they may be agreed post consultation by the Chief Executive providing they are within the business case. Thus, only by exception proposals after this would come back to Members.

Conclusion

- 19 There are clear benefits for both Councils and to staff in making the process as streamlined as possible. Although the process is becoming more streamlined, there are further improvements that can be made to the Member/Officer processes which are reviewed in the report.
-

For context this shows indicative timings from start of a service review to the implementation of the new Shared Service. The exact timings will depend on the size and complexity of the service.

Average Time	Key milestones	What is involved	Comments
4 weeks	<p>Completion of “Project Start Up” activities.</p> <p>This culminates in the delivery of the Goals and Constraints Member Workshop and arrangements being in place to commence the review.</p>	<p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the project initiation document (PID) • Completing the project plan • Agreeing resources • Membership on Members Working Group agreed • Booking, preparation and delivery of the Goals and Constraints Members’ Workshop • Initial communications to staff and Members • Admin activities access, refreshments, room booking etc. 	<p>Thorough project start work up is essential to put reviews on a solid footing. Also time is needed to appoint Members to the Members Working Group and sufficient time to book the Goals and Constraints workshop.</p>
8 weeks	<p>Define stage activities completed programme</p>	<p>All define stage activities completed, these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff engagement session (to explain the programme and the goals and constraints of the review) • High level relationship diagram • Voice of the customer workshops (internal and external) • Process Mapping • Activity Analysis 	<p>This stage is about exploring and documenting the current business situation. It is not about designing something new.</p> <p>This ‘define’ part of the framework is the more standardised part of the framework i.e. the tools and techniques tend to be applicable for most major reviews.</p> <p>The amount of work done at this stage depends on the size and complexity of the service being reviewed</p>

Average Time	Key milestones	What is involved	Comments
3 weeks	<p>Analysis completed and conclusions drawn from define stage data.</p> <p>Findings reported to the Members Working Group and MT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collation and analysis of information • Presentation of findings to the Members Working Group • End of project stage report to the Management Team 	<p>This stage is not just about collation and presentation of information, it is also about insight, drawing conclusions, Members engagement and seeking approval to proceed.</p>
4 weeks	Design stage activities completed	<p>Design stage activities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning the design stage • Orientation of a design team • Develop design principles • Issues analysis and solutions findings • Process design • Skills capabilities and knowledge assessment • Location recommendation based on business considerations • Staff structure workshop – principles and pros and cons • Identifying enablers to a shared service • Engaging customers and staff in the design to act as critical friends 	<p>The design stage is more bespoke and requires an approach appropriate to the service being reviewed. Time needs to be allowed to select the appropriate tools, techniques and plan this stage.</p> <p>Unlike the define stage this stage is more closely tailored to the service being reviewed.</p> <p>Planning also needs to take into account the availability of the Head of Service and Staff.</p>
3 - 4 weeks	Business case developed	Includes drafting and finalising the document. The business case sets out:	This is a critical stage and major learning point has been to allow enough

Average Time	Key milestones	What is involved	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Goals and Constraints of the review • The current business situation at both Councils • The business case options and the recommended option • The shared service proposal • The benefits and costs including investment appraisal • Risks and mitigations • Brief staff on the business case 	time for this stage to ensure a quality business case and to allow enough time for the Members Working Group to review the business case before they formally consider it at the Members Working Group meeting.
1 week	Final Members Working Group meeting	This involves distribution of the business case one week in advance of the Members Working Group meeting. The meeting involves a presentation of the business case, discussion and seeks support from the MWG.	Members Working Group must be given sufficient time to review a final draft of the business case
2 weeks	Business Case is reported to the Joint Committee	<p>Final amendments to the business case are made following the Members Working Group</p> <p>Submission of the Business Case by the print deadline for the Joint Committee.</p> <p>Joint Committee considers the Business Case for approval.</p>	

Appendix 2

Staff Consultation

30 days consultation period fits with what is referred to as the need to have “meaningful and genuine consultation”

There are many good reasons, irrespective of the law, why the Councils should consult with individuals or their representatives in a meaningful and genuine way. The purpose of consultation is to provide an early opportunity for all concerned to share the proposals and explore the options and alternatives. It can stimulate better cooperation between managers and employees, reduce uncertainty and lead to better decision-making. When faced with a redundancy situation, trade union representatives or individual employees may be able to suggest acceptable alternative ways of tackling the problem or, if the redundancies prove inevitable, ways of minimising hardship. Discussing issues helps to promote trust and minimise misunderstanding. These benefits are most keenly felt during times of major change.

Consultation involves taking account of as well as listening to the views of employees and must therefore take place before decisions are made. Making pretence of consulting on issues that have already been decided is unproductive and engenders suspicion and mistrust about the process amongst staff. An important point to be made about a meaningful consultation process is that it is sequential with information being exchanged, digested and responded to. It is therefore necessarily time-consuming but is likely to result in attaining an ownership needed of the proposed way forward more quickly than if the staff are not properly engaged in the process. There are two points to be raised about the impact of timeframes on the consultation period. The first is that in order for the consultation to be meaningful, there should be adequate time allowed for employee representatives to respond and, second, there needs to be a conscientious consideration by the employer of that response. Both of these requirements necessitate suitable timetabling for the parties to meet and discuss the information/proposals being exchanged. The approach taken meets this requirement. Meaningful and genuine consultation should therefore be a pre-requisite in implementing shared services.

Consultation does not mean that employees' views always have to be acted on since there may be good practical or financial reasons for not doing so and this has been the case on occasions in recent consultation processes. However, whenever employees' views are rejected the reasons for doing so should be carefully explained. Equally, where the views and ideas of employees help to improve a decision due credit and recognition should be given. This is the approach taken with implementing shared services.

Consultation requires a free exchange of ideas and views affecting the interests of employees and the Councils. To avoid misunderstandings and the possibility of employee relations difficulties there is agreement with UNISON as the recognised unions to formally consult on Organisation Change.

From a legal perspective case law has developed from employment tribunals from examining whether consultation has been meaningful and genuine. The 30 day provision and the Council's approach to genuine consultation through engaging staff in the process mitigates risk of the prospect of a dismissal being found to be unfair as we progress through the shared service agenda. From a practical perspective comments and suggestions that have been received through the consultation stage has informed changes incorporated into the final decisions taken.

Some recent case law has found against some employers where clearly they have not been able to demonstrate meaningful and genuine consultation yet publically commit to related principles standards and values.

In this respect by way of example both Councils are proud of their "Investors in People" accreditation. Through this achievement the Councils commit to both recognising and valuing staff contribution and encouraging staff to take ownership and responsibility by being involved in decision-making. Meaningful and genuine consultation with staff as part of major organisation change is just one example that demonstrates such commitment. Another example is the CDC people management strategy where it clearly states our commitment to improving consultation arrangements and states that "Staff are consulted, both directly and via representative structures, on new developments....."

Case law emphasises the need for consultation to be meaningful. The tests adopted by the courts are:

- consulting with representatives when proposals are still at a formative stage
- adequate information which provides a basis for the employee representatives to formulate a response
- adequate time in which to respond; and
- a conscientious consideration by the employer of the employee representatives' response

A recent survey of 3,000 employees conducted for the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) found that that seven in 10 (70%) employees report that redundancies have damaged their morale, with more than a fifth (22%) of employees so unhappy as a result of how redundancies are being handled that they are looking to change jobs as soon as the labour market. It is recognised that redundancies are low through the first service review however there have been some compulsory redundancies and the perception of remaining staff on the fairness of the process.

Implementation of Shared Services – HR Stream

This shows realistically a timescale that activities having regard to dependencies can be undertaken from the point of Joint Committee approval of the business case to implementation of new service. This timescale does not take into account other service delivery priorities and day to day delivery of services.

Average Time	Key milestones	What is involved	Comments
4 weeks	Draft consultation documents	Complete detail of structure Draft Job Descriptions and Person Specifications Job evaluation Assess Risk and impact on current staff Informs proposed approach and content of document	Bottom up project planning to inform realistic milestones setting. More than one service review happening at any time , all at different stages of implementation Variable factors impacting on time taken. Time taken depends of size and complexity of service and number of roles.
2 weeks	Lead time for JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee	Final draft for Management team Review Final draft – UNISON meeting Review and meet print deadline for JAIC	During this time can organise pre-consultation workshop for staff
1 week	JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee		Governance issue could be streamlined
4 weeks	Consultation with staff including meetings with UNISON	All staff meeting – x 2 - presentation and issue formal consultation document, take and respond to question, Record questions and start the FAQ document – issue and reissue throughout the consultation period Set up 1:1s and conduct them, retain formal notes Incorporate issues/questions in FAQ	

Average Time	Key milestones	What is involved	Comments
		Mid consultation meeting with UNISON Review issues throughout	
2 weeks	Prepare final documents	Re-evaluate where necessary due to proposed changes to job descriptions. Liaison with UNISON on outstanding issues Draft final proposals	During this time can organise Expression of Interest and Interview Workshop for Staff
2 weeks	Lead time for JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee	Review and meet print deadline for JAIC	
1 week	JAIC and CDC Personnel Committee and communication of final proposals to staff		Governance issue? Does final proposal need to go back to JAIC if little changes? Delegation to CE?
	Communication of final proposals to staff	Issue final document	
2 weeks	Staff to complete Expression of Interest and Head of Service to prepared interview questions	Personnel liaise with HOS supporting on design of selection process	
2 weeks	Assessment of Expression of Interest and Staff interviews	Assess and record outcome Order interviews – determined by expression of interest Conduct interviews, record and score Assess outcome	Time this takes, depends on size of the teams.
2 weeks	Analysis of interviews and 1:1 feedback to staff offering appointments	Prepare objective feedback against competencies Meet with all staff to provide feedback Assess remaining issues	This includes discussions with UNISON where appropriate
2 weeks	Assess remaining issues – re non appointments/vacancies Support to staff Redeployment Redundancies Contracts of employment Payroll notifications Redundancy letters	Additional conversations with staff who are at risk, additional interviews of at risk staff for any vacancies and to commence recruitment to fill vacancies. Time for HR to prepare contracts.	There needs to be a bit of room at the end of the process for additional discussions and for HR to prepare and send out appointment letters and contracts.

Average Time	Key milestones	What is involved	Comments
Total 24 week process	Implementation of new service		Timing of implementation takes account of IT systems and solutions being in place.

Item 6

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Appendix A

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Appendix A

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

