

Appendix 2

Business Improvement Realignment Feedback on comments received

Employee Comments	Response, where necessary
<p>The Civica IT client Officer is shown as an H grade and although is subject to Hay evaluation, would it be appropriate to be supervised by the Senior Client Officer who is indicated to be a G?</p>	<p>This is a typo in the structure chart and the indicative grade for the Civica IT Client Officer should be G</p>
<p>Is the Head of service expected to play a direct role in the coordinating and leading of Business Improvement projects?</p> <p>Or will this be the role of the Business Analyst?</p> <p>Or is it intended to be no single lead for Business Improvement?</p>	<p>Yes – the Head of Service will have overall accountability for the delivery of the projects</p> <p>The Business Analyst will be primarily concerned with IT projects</p> <p>The Business Improvement Officers will be expected to take responsibility for delivering their activity</p>
<p>Should additional contracts such as parking enforcement be added to the list of responsibilities for the client team, would additional staff resource be sought or incorporated into on of the client officer roles?</p>	<p>Separate discussions are underway around parking enforcement, including resources required</p>
<p>When will the full job descriptions and person specifications be released?</p>	<p>JD/PS for each post will be finalized once the results of the consultation process have been considered. They will then be evaluated and released for information to staff for use in respect of the selection process</p>
<p>Will staff within the service have an opportunity to apply for posts prior to the jobs being open to external candidates?</p>	<p>The vacancies cited will be open for competitive recruitment, once the structure has been agreed. It is the City Council's intention to advertise the posts internally in the first instance and existing staff in the structure will be welcome to apply if they so wish</p>
<p>The timetable in the document is only partially populated are you able to clarify when expressions of interest need to be declared? When the posts will be Hay evaluated? When the interviews will take place? When new posts will be due to start?</p>	<p>The remaining dates in the timetable are contingent on the completion of the consultation process. Once this is done then staff affected will be provided with details of the process, supporting information and timescales</p>

<p>There is very little opportunity for career progression. This is particularly evident within the Business Improvement area of the service, where there is no step up between an F grade officer post and Head of Service. No opportunity is provided to allow officers to acquire experience in line management.</p>	<p>Development needs and opportunities to meet them will be considered as part of the SDR process. This may include informal as well as formal arrangements</p>
<p>My view is the current structure ("Current structure 9FTE") does not recognise the fact that while the 'Civica Tech' role (my role) (and the FOD equivalent role) does not report to the 'Civica Revs and Bens Client Officer' (Sarah), in practice many decisions relating to the work of the 'Civica Tech' role are made by the 'Civica Revs and Bens Client Officer' (for example, decisions re the overall relationship with Civica R&B; re the 10% quality checks; the R&B Client Officer was involved in recruiting the 'Civica Tech FOD' role). I am perfectly happy with the current structure and am not complaining about it at all but the structure as listed does not accurately reflect the actual practice / relationships / responsibilities.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>You said when we met you don't expect there to be interviews for existing members of the team for their proposed roles as shown in the document. I think this means 'assimilation' applies (in the terminology of the document), though I don't think it specifically says this.</p>	<p>Agreed, although it should be noted that there will be no changes to the roles in the new structure</p>
<p>Detailed JDs/PSs are not in the restructure document and in the absence of these I cannot comment fully on what will eventually be the proposals. The document says other (non-new) posts will be substantially the same (as they are now), and that all JDs/PSs will be reviewed and amended where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>I would like to better understand what is included in the role of the Client Officer and the Senior Client Officer, as no job descriptions are currently available. Without job description it does make it difficult to understand the roles and how they may all fit together.</p>	<p>JD/PS for each post will be finalized once the results of the consultation process have been considered. They will then be evaluated and released for information to staff for use in respect of the selection process</p>

<p>I feel the Client Officer role would prove impossible if, in this role, they were not empowered to make decisions relating to the Revenues & Benefit contract. I feel the two Contract Technicians should report to the Client Officer (Revs & Bens). I will give just one example of how this could impact if this were not the case. As part of both GCC and FoD client functions 10% of benefit checks need to be completed. Without the responsibility for the Client Officer to manage the Technicians and ensure they are keeping on track with those checks they will not know if they are falling behind. The Client Officers role is to report on performance to both GCC and FoD operations and partnership boards, yet may have no authority to instruct the technicians to ensure they are still on track with that work. This is a basic control on the contract performance. Prior to the move to the Business Improvement Service the Contract Technician did report this post (which is me - shown below). I have also shown below how I think the structure could better work to ensure this risk is mitigated. This does not apply to the other Client Officers as they do not have the same responsibility. Regardless of the grade given I think this is a must to make this post work.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>I'm aware the grades given are only indicative and are yet to be formally evaluated; however, I do feel that the role of Civic Client Officer is graded too low at grade F.</p> <p>I do not feel the grade reflects the complexity of the role and that additional responsibilities have been overlooked, for example, the role of the Revenues and Benefits client needs to make key decisions, which may differ from the the Amey client function, including, for example, dealing with complaints from external customers at the second stage. Also the responsibilities for the Forest of Dean (FoD) client function. The funding arrangements for the FoD include the full cost of the contract technician and the 25% Client Officer role. This would allow GCC to recognise these additional duties at no extra cost and still benefit from the arrangement</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This is an indicative grade and the posts will be formally evaluated</p>

financially.	
<p>With regards to the Senior Client Officer role, on the basis of the comments above, I would conclude that this role has also be graded incorrectly (or has an incorrect indicative grade) and should be grade H. The additional level of responsibility in this role for several contracts and large budgetary impact would appear to be worthy of this grade, again however I expect that these are only indicative.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be resolved through the evaluation process</p>
<p>It appears unusual that an IT Client Officer is paid more (grade H) than the Senior Client Officer, when it could be assumed that the senior position would require an equal, if not higher grade.</p> <p>If it is already recognised that Client Officers can be graded differently depending upon the skills required then it would seem acceptable that the Revenues and Benefits client officer could receive a higher grade than the Amey role as each role has different responsibilities. However, it may be considered that they are generic posts, in which case consideration should be given to aligning them to be the same (including the IT role).</p>	<p>This is a typo in the structure chart and the indicative grade should be G</p> <p>The existing Client Officers' posts have been evaluated on the basis of the requirements of each role. This will also be the case with the Civica IT Client Officer</p>