

Gloucester City Council

Meeting:	Organisational Development Committee	Date:	21 December 2015
Subject:	A New Structure for the Museums Service		
Report Of:	Corporate Director		
Wards Affected:	All		
Key Decision:	No	Budget/Policy Framework:	No
Contact Officer:	Angela Smith, Museums Manager		
	Email: angela.smith@gloucester.gov.uk	Tel: 39-6119	
Appendices:	1. Original consultation document		
	2. Feedback on comments received and revised proposals		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

Note: The special circumstances for non-compliance with Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act as amended (items not considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that the additional period of consultation took the review process beyond the timescales for this meeting, however, as the additional consultation did not result in any further changes to the proposals, it is considered that bringing the decision forward would be a better outcome for affected staff.

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report sets out details of the consultation and feedback on the comments received during the period of consultation on the proposed changes to the Museums Service. The report seeks approval for the proposed structure, which has been revised as a result of the feedback received.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Organisational Development Committee is asked to **RESOLVE** that the proposed structure for the Museums Service Team, set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be agreed.

3.0 Background and Key Issues

3.1 Proposals to review the Museums Service were presented to staff on 3rd December 2015 by the Museums Manager and the details of the proposals are outlined in Appendix 1. This was the start of a period of consultation with both staff and recognised Trade Unions, with the close of the consultation being on the 10 December 2015.

- 3.2 As well as formally consulting the affected staff, the proposals were circulated for comment to the trade unions.
- 3.4 A number of questions were received from staff and responses to the points raised are detailed in Appendix 3.
- 3.5 The proposals were also presented to the Trade Union Consultation Meeting and Employee Forum for comment. Trade Unions were generally supportive of the proposals.
- 3.6 As a direct result of the feedback received, the proposals have been revised to allow a six month trial of annualised hours.
- 3.7 No further changes have been proposed as a result of the additional consultation or meetings with staff and the final proposal is that which is contained in Appendix 2.
- 3.8 It is acknowledged that the ongoing uncertainty brought about by these changes can be worrying for those staff involved, and HR and senior managers will continue to offer support.

4.0 Alternative Options considered

- 4.1 The proposed structure of the service is designed to provide the appropriate level of resource to operate two museums with due consideration to health and safety of visitors and staff. Annualised hours will ensure that there is adequate staffing for evening and weekend events.
- 4.2 A number of options were considered during formulation of the original proposal but rejected because of additional cost implications; this demonstrates that significant thought has been given to the appropriate structure and working arrangements for the team.

5.0 Reason for Recommendations

- 5.1 The proposals for the review of the Museum Service will provide the City Council with a service that responds to the need of customers and has potential to generate income to become more sustainable. The new structure ensures the appropriate level of resourcing required to maintain a high-performing service team.
- 5.2 Posts will be ring-fenced because the job is not essentially the same (less than 60%), the grades for some posts are not the same and for some posts there are less posts available than there are people.

6.0 Future Work and Conclusions

- 6.1 On approval of the proposed structure, the selection process will commence for the Business Development Manager, Duty Manager, Visitor Services Officers, Housekeeper and Visitor Services Assistants (Saturdays), in that order. Seasonal staff will be recruited in February for the summer season (April to September).

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 The cost of the proposed structure is approximately £283,000, requiring an additional budget of approximately £13,000. This additional cost will come from existing budgets.

(Financial Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report)

8.0 Legal Implications

- 8.1 There are no legal implications associated with this proposal, other than relevant Human Resources matters, for which support is being provided from the Shared HR Service.

(Legal Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report)

9.0 Risk & Opportunity Management Implications

- 9.1 The proposed structure offers the appropriate level of resource to ensure an efficient and effective Museums Service team and as such, there are no risks associated with the proposals.
- 9.2 There is a risk that individuals will fall outside of the posts available based upon the changes to the hours and days that they would like to work; there is a risk that individuals will not be successful in applying for jobs.

10. People Impact Assessment (PIA)

- 10.1 A PIA has been completed with no positive or negative impacts.

11. Other Corporate Implications

Community Safety

- 11.1 Not Applicable

Sustainability

- 11.2 Not Applicable

Staffing and Trade Unions

- 11.3 All staff affected by these changes, together with the recognised Trade Unions, have been consulted throughout this process.
- 11.4 A meeting was held with all affected staff at the beginning of the consultation process, to which Trade Union representatives were invited, and following circulation of the revised proposals, individual meetings were held with each member of staff.
- 11.5 Trade Unions had the opportunity to comment on the proposals at the Trade Union Consultation Meeting on 10 November 2015 and the Employee Forum meeting on 12 November 2015. The comments received were generally supportive and no written comments have been received.

Background Documents: None