

STAFFING AND APPEALS COMMITTEE - MINUTES

Date: Friday, 16th June 2017

Time: 2.01p.m. - 2.20p.m.

Place: Room 128, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors S Bywater (substituting for Councillor P Hudson), N Harrison, S King (substituting for Councillor S Hoy), M McGuire, L Nethsingha, K Reynolds (substituting for Councillor W Hunt), J Schumann (Chairman) and Councillor J Whitehead

Apologies: Councillors S Hoy, P Hudson, and W Hunt

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

8. MINUTES – 25TH MAY 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th May 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9. REVIEW OF SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM

The Chief Executive presented the outcome of the Shared Management Proposals, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council consultation. It was important to note that the proposed changes were supported by those affected. In fact they were excited by the proposals, as it would enable them to work differently to improve services. She urged the Committee to ask them about their ideas for future innovation, as part of the interview process on 23 June 2017.

She acknowledged that the changes would create challenges. For example, it had been suggested that the Adult Service Director should assume the statutory Director of Adult Services role. However, the Chief Executive was recommending no change, at this stage, as she needed more time to consider the accountability issues. She explained that the response from partners had been positive and they were looking forward to the opportunities the changes would bring. Attention was drawn to a risk and assurance section in the report. Dr Russell Wate who was a national expert and independent chair of the Local Safeguarding Board had given full assurance that the proposal had the necessary strengths and supports in place.

The Interim Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults reported that extensive conversations had taken place with partners since she was appointed in October 2016. The key beneficial issue for partners resulting from the changes was the ability to take decisions quickly. There were examples of joint working which were taking place such as in Public Health.

In discussing the report, one Member highlighted “Risk D – The new structure does not deliver the level of integration highlighted.” She explained that integration was not a benefit in itself and that the Council should be looking at the level of service quality. She suggested that there needed to be a new risk or this risk should be

rephrased to reflect the delivery of a better level of service. The Chief Executive acknowledged this point and agreed to add some words to this risk.

She also queried whether there had been communication with all staff via meetings or e-mails. The Interim Executive Director reported that there had not been any meetings but she had received a couple of responses from staff commenting that they already worked jointly with Peterborough. She reported that staff had got use to her joint role since October, as she made sure to give equal attention to both authorities but still meet the needs of specific issues such as inspections. She was keen to make sure that the new Service Directors met staff.

One Member queried whether this proposal would result in the re-organisation of local government. The Chairman suggested that this was an issue for full Council, which was currently been explored. Another Member requested clarification of the appointments process in Section 6.5. The Chief Executive reported that Peterborough City Council's Employment Committee and the County Council's Staffing and Appeals Committee would interview all candidates together. However, once a joint decision had been reached, both Committees would need to approve the appointments individually.

Councillor King queried the requirement for the newly appointed Service Directors to hold a social work qualification. The Interim Executive Director reported that only the Service Director: Children's Services would need to be a qualified social worker, the other posts could have comparable experience and qualifications. It was noted that Ofsted expected the Children's Services Lead to have this qualification. In response, he asked for it to be recorded that he did not agree with this as it unnecessarily restricted the selection pool for what was effectively a management job, and he also asked for it to be reviewed. His views were not supported by two Members who felt that the field of children's social work required this expertise. One Member commented that whilst she had expressed concerns previously, she had found the consultation reassuring.

It was resolved unanimously to:

agreed the final Joint Leadership structure considering the consultation feedback and noting the next steps.

Chairman