

# **Gloucester City Council Management Structure – the next phase**

## **Response to Consultation proposal**

**April 2023**

The Managing Director consulted on a proposed new senior management structure in February 2023, and thanks all those members of staff who responded to this consultation, which has helped shape an (hopefully) improved proposal.

A summation of comments received is shown in appendix 1, alongside a short response to each group of substantive comments made.

In the light of responses received, and following a discussion on these by SMT, the following key changes will be made to the proposed new management structure for the Council:

- Business Support will remain within the Policy and Governance Team, and a new Team Leader post will be created and recruited to manage this team.
- The Director of Communities post will be retitled 'Corporate Director' to reflect the broader range of responsibilities of this role.
- Clarity will be given to where a range of other roles undertaken by the former Director of Policy and Resources and others will sit in the new structure, the proposal document was silent on a number of these.
- The role of Monitoring Officer will be added to the structure diagram. This was an oversight in the original chart.

In other respects, the changes proposed in the consultation document will be implemented as originally proposed.

A revised structure chart is shown in appendix 2. New job descriptions will be developed for the four new roles in this structure (namely: Head of Finance and Resources; Head of Transformation and Commissioning; Business Systems Team Leader; and Business Support Team Leader) and recruitment (or slotting in, if appropriate) will begin as soon as possible thereafter.

It is proposed that in order to maximise the pool of potential applicants in the shortest time, both new Head of Service positions are advertised simultaneously internally and externally.

### **General support**

It is recognised that any reorganisation can be perturbing for those involved and for their colleagues.

Any individual employees affected by this review have access to the Council's free, confidential and external counselling service and should raise queries with the City Council HR business partner. Support to prepare for interviews will be considered if requested by employees.

## Appendix 1 - Senior management restructure consultation feedback

### Overall Structure and Balance

Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure does not reflect golden thread of strategies, policies, etc.</li> <li>• The proposed structure feels like an interim solution based on pragmatic situation, rather than on critical needs of the council in the coming years</li> <li>• The rationale of the MD having multiple reports at Director, HoS, Service Manager &amp; Team Leader level is not clear and sends out mixed signals on organisational priorities.</li> <li>• Overall, it would appear that the allocation of services and direct reports to SMT is not balanced, with the MD having more direct reports than any other member of SMT</li> <li>• There does seem to be some degree of inequity within the proposed head of service portfolios. It may be prudent to consider whether service areas may benefit from moving into different portfolios to improve performance but also succession planning and opportunity</li> </ul>	<p>It is an attempt to address current and future needs, but there is no one perfect structure for all Councils, they are always a compromise between idealised and pragmatic.</p>
<p>This feels like a significant amount of organisational change in response to one SMT departure</p>	<p>This was not just response to one departure but attempt to address several objectives noted in the covering report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we create a more uniform reporting structure e.g. all TLs have SM, all SMs have a HoS, all HoS have a Dir? Can we have 5 HoS?</li> <li>• Can we go back to having 1xMD, 2xDirectors and 4 HoS?</li> </ul>	<p>Don't have enough resource to pay for this</p>
<p>Suggest we have a SMT member aligned to each relevant Cabinet Member portfolio – and that Corporate cross-organisational work is picked up at Director level, not HoS level</p>	<p>We don't feel the Cabinet portfolios are evenly balanced enough to support this suggestion</p>
<p>As an alternative, create two new Head of Service posts within Communities, and balance out all Head of Service roles to report to either Director of Communities or MD</p>	<p>Don't have enough resource to pay for this, unless deleting another Head of Service role which we don't want to do</p>
<p>Proposed restructure does not sufficiently address the lack of capacity at SMT. Need to either create more capacity or reduce expectation on service and project delivery</p>	<p>This goes part of the way towards addressing this capacity challenge, we do not have sufficient resource to go further that this at the present time</p>
<p>Concerns over succession planning and promotion opportunities within new structure</p>	<p>Noted, we feel creating an extra Head of Service post does increase succession planning and promotion opportunities for some, but accept this may feel different depending on which part of the organisation you currently sit in</p>
<p>The document does not explain why the Transformation and Commercialisation Service Manager role has been reimaged at Head of Service level.</p>	<p>The document attempted to explain that we want to give greater focus in coming years to our Transformation Programme, and for this to be a cross-cutting corporate priority. Having considered options, we feel this is best coordinated at Head of Service level</p>

Appendix 1 - Senior management restructure consultation feedback

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Downgrading role of FD/S151 to Head of Service level represents risk to capital programme.	We don't believe this to be the case. The previous S151 Officer spent most of his time at Gloucester as a Head of Service, it was only when several additional service areas were added to his responsibilities that the post was regraded two years ago to a Director.
Should have less people at the top, and more working with our communities	Would love to have more people at every level but resources are constrained and the proposals reflect in part feedback from Peer Review that there is capacity stretch at Senior Management level and this proposal attempts to address that.
Previous Director of Policy and Resources role was too big so using his departure to reshape things is a good step forward.	Thanks and agree
Welcome bringing together Customer Services, IT and Transformation, and adding some key Applications Support roles within IT	Thanks and agree
I like the proposed structure, it creates extra capacity within SMT while also balancing the responsibilities of the roles more evenly. Bringing the IT elements of business support together with the business analyst posts into transformation and IT will provide a more rounded team, driving improvements but also ensuring application support for the long term	Thanks and agree

Business Support

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Disrespectful to put forward proposal around Business Support without advance consultation with the team	No offence was intended and apologies if given. Informal discussions were held with some in this management chain prior to consultation with all staff.
Moving the Business Support Systems team to the IT and Transformation Team makes sense but maybe over-emphasis on transformation in context of operational challenges facing the Council	Noted
When looking at remaining Business Support functions, granular analysis of the roles of each team member will need to be considered	Noted
Business Support team have different specialised roles, suggest that they are [broken up and] individually located into the teams they principally provide support to (e.g. some to planning, some to licensing, etc).	Disagree, this will reduce resilience and go against TG principles
Business Support not just administrative, there are many technical elements and some statutory functions with legal implications	Noted
Business Support need full-time and dedicated Team Leader.	Agreed
Doesn't make sense to move rest of Business Support team out of Policy & Governance service. Policy & Governance Manager has built up a lot of relevant knowledge on e.g. FOIs.	Agreed
Although on paper, Business Support and Corporate Support appear similar, they perform very differently and carry out different types of administration functions	Noted

## Appendix 1 - Senior management restructure consultation feedback

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Having a Corporate Support Team Leader reporting to the MD is understandable (if acting as a PA), but not the full business support function just below this. Can Business Support sit elsewhere?	Noted
Consider moving remaining Business Support team to Transformation and Commissioning Service area, for same logic as moving Customer Services.	Noted, but alternative proposal now being taken forward
Business Support would sit well with Corporate Support, should not move to Customer Services due to management stretch	Noted
Are there any plans for Business Support to do Corporate Support work or vice versa?	No longer relevant, alternative proposal now being taken forward
if Business Support moved to Corporate Support, concerned it would have less of a voice and less representation in the organisation.	Others might argue this is the other way around.
Too short a management chain between MD and Business Support if moved into Corporate Support	Teams that report directly to the MD have workarounds to ensure that the MD currently does not get too drawn into operational management.
Will there be any changes in working arrangements in Business Support (e.g. agile working)	None planned
Moving Business Support team leader post away will impact on service provision to DM planning team.	Noted
Might be sensible to leave one 'systems' officer with rest of business support, rather than moving all three to IT.	Noted but disagree, feel that all three form a strong team together, and can continue to support Business Support team's own IT and transformation needs.

### Director of Communities Role

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moving Customer Services away from Director of Communities appears unlikely to reduce her workload, as it is the service in her portfolio with the least challenges and is being replaced with responsibility for the whole of Culture</li> <li>Cannot see how Director of Communities will be able to provide the line management or support that Cultural Services area demands</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, this restructure cannot tackle all the capacity challenges that exist, and they will need to consider whether they have the best structure within their team to support her.</li> <li>Disagree. Just a few years ago, both Directors used to have two Heads of Service reporting to each (one of which was Cultural Services), along with their wider Corporate Responsibilities</li> </ul>
As the proposal is to only have one Director, can the job title be 'Director' rather than 'Director of Communities'?	Agree, this is a helpful suggestion, and we will look to rename the Director's title

### Cultural Services

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Culture is diminished in terms of profile through reporting through DoC rather than direct to the MD along with all other HoS roles. Culture HoS should report to MD.	This is a pragmatic solution to balance line reporting responsibilities between the MD and the Director and disagree that the service's profile will be diminished. The Head of Cultural Services will continue to sit on SMT and, as noted above, this service area previously reported through a Director just two years ago.

### Customer Services

Appendix 1 - Senior management restructure consultation feedback

Comment	Response
Don't move Customer Services from Communities Department – all its relationships are primarily with other Communities services, and transformation needs to be across all services	<i>Together Gloucester</i> principles were that it shouldn't matter where any team sits, and we want services to work smoothly across all Departments. In that sense, we very much see Customer Services as a corporate service and resource, not as a 'Communities' one. Agree transformation applies across all Council areas but there is a particular need to focus on improving the customer journey in the short term, including through the use of technology, which is why we feel this sits well with the Transformation area.

Diversity

Comment	Response
Can we target recruitment to increase the percentage of BAME individuals at the senior level?	Happy to look at different recruitment channels and other actions but not proposing to restrict recruitment to ethnic minority candidates only.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What thought has been given to using this as an opportunity to meet our ED&amp;I commitments, particularly around encouraging a more diverse Senior Management Team?</li> <li>Is a diverse management team important to the leadership of the organisation?</li> </ul>	Diversity is important to the leadership of the organisation, and would love to use this as an opportunity to increase our senior level diversity

Other

Comment	Response
Important that the s151 role, whether Director or Head of Service level, attends certain Member meetings e.g. Leadership	Noted, this seems sensible
Should Bereavement Services continue to sit under Head of Finance and Resources role?	This is where it sat when the previous S151 Officer was Head of Finance and Resources. Bereavement Services could sit in a number of places, but leaving it here has a number of continuity advantages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would HR and Comms sit in this Transformation and Commissioning Service Area if they were brought back in house?</li> <li>Would love to see HR and Comms brought back into City Council. Where would these functions sit?</li> </ul>	Not necessarily.
Client for HR, Comms and OneLegal should sit under Policy team	Possibly review this at a later date but, for now (and for balance), feel this review needs to be led by Transformation & Commissioning Head of Service – as these are Commissioned Services
Where will Client Officer for Payroll role sit in new structure?	New Head of Transformation and Commissioning would determine this.
No mention of where Data Protection Officer role sits in new structure. Currently with Policy & Governance Manager	We can review this once new Head of Transformation and Commissioning is in post but for now leave with Policy and Governance Manager
No mention of Senior Information Risk Officer (SIRO) role in new structure, and/or continuation of Information Governance Board. Should this sit with Policy Manager?	Currently considering sitting this role with Monitoring Officer

Appendix 1 - Senior management restructure consultation feedback

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Where will RIPA lead role sit in new structure?	Propose this sits with Head of Finance and Resources
Is there a conflict of interest for Head of Place between their role on Major Projects and direction of Development Management team? Can we separate regeneration from planning somehow?	Not without additional resource which is likely unaffordable
The proposed structure doesn't support capacity issues for the Head of Place	Noted, this restructure cannot tackle all the capacity challenges that exist, and they will need to consider whether they have the best structure within their team to support them.
Need extra resource to deliver Open Digital Planning Project – will the new IT Transformation team be able to provide this?	This will be a matter for new Head of Transformation and Commissioning
Consider introducing a project management team for internal transformation projects	This will be a matter for new Head of Transformation and Commissioning
The change to the reporting line for the Policy and Governance Manager is logical in this structure.	Agree and thanks

Appendix 2 – Revised organisational management structure following consultation feedback

