

## The Highland Council

### Redesign Board 30.8.16

Agenda Item	4
Report No	RDB/11/16

### Redesign progress: concluding Phase 2 on re-prioritising services and the proposed approach to Phase 3 on appraising options for change

Report by the Head of Policy and Reform

#### Summary

This paper describes the process undertaken by the Board to conclude Phase 2 of its work and sets out proposals to begin Phase 3. The Board is asked to confirm the long list of functions proposed for review. The Board is asked to agree the approach to undertaking reviews and other action for Phase 3 as set out in the report. The Board's final recommendations will be reported to the Council on 8<sup>th</sup> September.

## 1. Background

1.1 At the Council meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> June the Council agreed the draft statement of Council purpose, values and outcomes. That concluded Phase 1 of the Board's work. The Plain English version of the statement agreed by the Board is attached at Appendix 1. This provides the framework for:

- Phase 2 of the Board's work to re-prioritise statutory and non-statutory duties, with recommendations to be made to Council in September 2016; and
- Developing Phase 3 of the Board's to appraise the options for change and Council redesign.

1.2 The Redesign Board has continued to work through the summer recess and this has involved:

- 1 Member workshop to consider the process for Phases 2 and 3;
- 5 meetings of small groups of Board Members to propose the re-prioritisation of functions and functions for early review;
- 3 further Member Workshops to:
  - challenge and discuss the proposals from the small groups above;
  - consider presentations and information about:
    - i. the experience of achieving better outcomes and savings by integrating Council welfare functions;
    - ii. the experience of achieving better outcomes and savings from the Digital Highland Programme and future plans;
    - iii. new digital tools available for engaging the public and staff;
    - iv. the tools in use for measuring social value;
    - v. how to become a more enabling Council from the

perspectives of 12 diverse community groups.

- Discussion between the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board with the Highland Community Planning Partnership Chief Officers' Group on redesign ideas and approaches;
- A study trip to Wigan Council to find out about their Deal with the public to re-set expectations of the Council and develop new approaches to services given their budget reductions and the Manchester Devolution Deal.

## **2. The approach to Phase 2 – Re-prioritising statutory and non-statutory duties and identifying functions for review**

- 2.1 To re-prioritise the Council's duties information on all Council functions was required. Over 270 functions were identified in the Council. The extent of their statutory requirement was clarified with staff<sup>1</sup>. These functions were subsequently grouped according to the five outcomes agreed at Council on 29<sup>th</sup> June. The large scale of Council activity within each outcome led to grouping them into supporting outcomes, which may also be helpful when the Board comes to consider the structure and management of Council operations between December and March. Booklet A lists all of the functions identified, grouped by the outcomes agreed and the extent to which they are statutory or discretionary.
- 2.2 Further information on the functions was provided to Board Members working in small groups. This included:
- Any further detail on legislative requirements for the function;
  - The budget attached to them – if identifiable, and if the revenue budget was reduced for 2016/17;
  - Corporate performance data (SPIs, KPIs and benchmarked indicators);
  - Public satisfaction from the annual surveys of the Citizens' Panel; and
  - Whether there are procurement contracts for them ending within 24 months.
- 2.3 The small groups then developed proposals for:
1. Prioritising the function as essential or desirable;
  2. Whether the function should be part of an early review – to enable Phase 3 to begin;
  3. Whether the functions for that outcome were sufficient to achieve it or whether there were gaps in provision or new approaches needed to be designed-in to redesign.
- 2.4 The proposals from the small groups were then considered and challenged in Board workshops.

## **3. Proposals on re-prioritisation and functions for early review**

- 3.1 Booklet B includes all of the functions proposed for review or other action

---

<sup>1</sup> This was done through discussion with Directors, interviews with Heads of Service, feedback from management briefings and staff workshops held locally. The information is included on the Redesign pages of the Council's website and intranet.

arising from workshops with the Board. It also includes whether functions were regarded by Members as essential or desirable. This provides a long list of around 120 functions proposed for review.

- 3.2 In keeping with the new values Board Members have been challenging in their approach to identifying what needs to be reviewed as part of redesign. Board Members have also been thorough and not simply focused on discretionary services; over 70 are required in statute compared to around 40 that are discretionary. Functions regarded by Board Members as essential as well as desirable are proposed for review. For some functions more information was needed to classify them or there was challenge around whether the Council is best placed to provide them. These are listed as not classified in Booklet B and are also proposed for review.
- 3.3 Functions proposed for review are found across all five Council Services and in the Chief Executive's office.
- 3.4 For most outcomes Members have identified other strategic action that is required. These are included in Booklet B. They focus on discussions required with Government, partners, and community bodies, the opportunity to influence national reviews and some issues to consider in Phase 6 of the Board's work on the structure and management of Council operations.
- 3.5 To conclude Phase 2 of the Board's work within the timescale set, the Board is required to agree its recommendations for Council on 8<sup>th</sup> September on the re-prioritisation of services and the functions to review as part of redesign. Any changes to Booklet B can be made for that Council meeting.
- 4. Proposals for taking forward Phase 3 of the Board's work**
- 4.1 Phase 3 of the Board's work is to appraise the options for change with recommendations to Council in December 2016 on budget decisions and in March 2017 on structure change.
- 4.2 Taking forward the reviews of functions and the other action highlighted in paragraph 3.4 will form the work of Phase 3. To make this a managed programme of work Board Members need to consider:
- How to prioritise the reviews
  - How to undertake and resource the reviews
  - How to engage key stakeholders of staff, partners and the public in the review process
  - Taking forward the activities agreed on partner, Government and community body engagement.
- 4.3 The values developed by the Board and agreed by the Council should guide the approach to Phase 3; focusing on:
- |             |               |               |            |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Challenging | Open to ideas | Participating | Empowering |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
- 4.4 There are many opportunities to demonstrate the values during Phase 3 of the Board's work.

- Challenging and being open to new ideas are essential for good options appraisal, the focus of Phase 3;
- Participation of key stakeholders will improve the appraisal process;
- Staff can be empowered during Phase 3 with their involvement in reviews. The outcome of reviews will also highlight where workforce development and planning is needed to support the values and implement review recommendations; and
- Community bodies can be engaged in Phase 3 on relevant individual reviews and strategically in helping us to develop with partners the right supports for them to do more with their communities.

#### 4.5 Proposals on how to prioritise the reviews

It is proposed that the Board takes the following factors into account in identifying which reviews should be undertaken first:

1. The savings potential and scale of current budget;
2. Where a review is urgent for another reason (e.g. legislative requirements);
3. Where a review is already underway or planned. This would not necessarily take it out with the scope for the Redesign Board as the Board may seek involvement;
4. Where the Board has already indicated a focus for the review, e.g. charges and income as these could be seen as mini-reviews;
5. The impact of the Government's Programme, due in September, as that might highlight change to Council functions.

- 4.6 It is proposed that the Board seeks delegated authority from the Council to prioritise the reviews for 2016/17 using the criteria above and for this to be completed in September for reviews to begin as soon as possible. With 120 reviews in scope, this is likely to mean a programme of reviews for up to 24 months; although the direction for redesign and savings targets associated with future reviews can be agreed within the timescales set for the Board.

#### 4.7 Proposals on how to undertake the reviews

This covers two key issues:

1. What does a review mean?
2. Who would undertake the review?

#### 4.8 What does a review mean?

There will be different ways to approach reviews depending on the function and the context it operates in. When the reviews for 2016/17 are prioritised the scope for them can be clarified. This will involve understanding how the function currently operates as well as gathering early views on the scope for redesigning it. The Board has already agreed that Heads of Service affected by reviews would be engaged in the process given their expert knowledge. Early discussions with relevant Heads of Service and Directors would help to scope the review and the types of questions involved are attached at Appendix 2. Views from Heads of Service on these questions were sought at a Senior Leadership event in June to produce this discussion guide.

- 4.9 In addition through the workshops the Board has confirmed it is open to ideas

on how services can be delivered. The Board has expressed interest in:

1. In-house services – running these better and more efficiently, learning from where this has been demonstrated in the Council already<sup>2</sup> and with a ‘Lean’ approach currently being tested<sup>3</sup>;
2. In-sourcing of services currently contracted out;
3. Shared services – both provided by us and provided for us;
4. Outsourced services – including an interest in different approaches to commissioning (by outcomes, by payment by results, by measuring social value) to encourage preventative services and demand reduction;
5. Services delivered in partnership and integrated services;
6. Arms-Length External Organisations and Trading Operations to enable more commercial practice and sustainability of service;
7. Community-run services;
8. Opportunities for new place-based approaches with partners arising from the new local Community Partnerships; and
9. Stopping services (with the framework from the Accounts Commission recommended for use<sup>4</sup> alongside impact assessment).

4.10 The Board is asked to confirm that this range of options for service delivery should be part of the review process. Some functions may require a more narrow focus e.g. where the Board has identified charges and income to be reviewed.

4.11 Who would undertake the reviews?

The Board and the Council have already committed to involve staff in the redesign process. Board Members have already received information from Heads of Service with a proven track record on challenging current arrangements and effectively managing change. With their time freed up they could be actively involved in redesign. Other Heads of Service and managers have expressed an interest in being involved, some are currently leading other review activity and some are scheduled to support future Board workshops. There may also be scope to re-focus the Corporate Improvement Team as a dedicated resource trained in business change.

4.12 It is proposed that staff are identified to be part of a challenge and review team, conducting the reviews as peers, drawing on the talent within the organisation, demonstrating the values and using methods and guides produced to support the reviews.

---

<sup>2</sup> As examples the Board has heard about the approach to integrating welfare payments and advice (£3.3m of savings/income) and through the Digital Highland programme (£5m of savings). Both demonstrate the scope to make savings while improving service delivery.

<sup>3</sup> A rapid appraisal of landlord registration is underway and Board Members can find out more about it at a workshop on 20<sup>th</sup> September.

<sup>4</sup> This provides a rationale for stopping services where: there is little or no demand for the service; the costs outweigh the benefits; alternative providers exist and people using those providers would not be disadvantaged; the function does not contribute to Council objectives; and there is no statutory or strategic requirements to make provision. Source: Accounts Commission (March 2016) An overview of local government in Scotland 2016

- 4.13 Different skills<sup>5</sup> will be needed for different types of review so a pool of staff would be needed, with some involved for longer times than others depending on individual review requirements. Where particular external advice is required this would be proposed to the Board. Options might include the Improvement Service, professional bodies, staff from our partners or private sector organisations / consultants.
- 4.14 This approach would fit well with the Council's values and use the learning from the study visit to Wigan Council where the importance of involving staff throughout their redesign was seen as vital to its success. Once the prioritisation of reviews is clear the skills required by when will be known and a pool of staff can be identified to begin the first reviews. The Chief Executive can identify a pool of staff within current resources to be part of challenge and review teams, supported by the unallocated funding for redesign in 2016/17 for those reviews prioritised.
- 4.15 Review outcomes would be scrutinised by Board Members. To ensure timely governance it is proposed that small groups of Board Members are matched to particular reviews to support their consideration at the Board with their knowledge of the review activity. The matching of Members to reviews will be possible when the reviews to be prioritised are identified. At some point there may also be a need for the Board to seek delegated authority from the Council for some review decisions. This will be clearer when the early reviews are identified and their scope is known.
- 4.16 Proposals on how to engage key stakeholders  
Key stakeholders include our staff, our public, our partners and our community bodies. These are considered below and offer opportunities to demonstrate all of the values.
- 4.17 Staff participation  
Involving staff in Phase 1 on purpose, values and outcomes and for Phase 2 in clarifying the statutory nature of our functions has been essential and very productive. For Phase 3 the Board can take the seven new ways of engaging staff further. They are:
1. Involvement of Trade Union Representation on the Board: representatives will continue to be engaged for Phase 3. Their advice on early staff communications has been especially helpful. As reviews are undertaken their advice on staff impacts will be needed.
  2. Creating a Staff Panel: the sample of 5000 is identified and invites will be emailed / sent to staff the week beginning 29<sup>th</sup> August.
  3. Local Focus Groups: Over 20 have been run in localities and in depots as part of Phase 1 of the Board's work and these can be arranged again as required. For Phase 3 it is proposed that local discussions

---

<sup>5</sup> These skills will be clearer when the reviews are prioritised but are likely to include e.g. commercial practice, analytical skills (in understanding business data on costs and performance), process mapping, options appraisal, partnership, engagement, impact assessment, Lean techniques, community development etc. Leading and support roles would be identified.

involve the Chief Executive and Board Members.

4. In depth discussions with Heads of Service: these will be scheduled for the reviews identified for 2016/17.
5. Board members to shadow staff (with their agreement): this can be considered for the reviews identified for 2016/17.
6. Staff Facebook page: over 600 staff have signed up and this is one of several ways to communicate about Phase 3.
7. New digital tools for engagement: options are narrowed down and are being costed and as part of our Digital Highland approach.

In addition,

- some staff would be involved in challenge and review teams;
- others would provide information and ideas for reviews; and
- where the staff roles are proposed to change, they would be consulted on the proposals.

4.18 A communications plan is in place for advising staff of proposals for Phases 2 and 3 and of the key dates for decisions to be made. This has involved briefing staff through their line managers of the recommendations being considered by the Board and the Council. The Board has acknowledged that keeping staff involved, especially those potentially affected by reviews is very important. Staff have had to cope with considerable change and budget reductions for several years and this phase of redesign will be unsettling so it is important to provide assurances about the ongoing involvement of staff in redesign and to appreciate them and value their public service.

4.19 Public participation

Views from the public were fed into Phase 2 of the Board's work through some responses from the Citizens' Panel surveys on Council performance. Phase 3 offers scope for considerable public engagement. This could be gathered:

- from the public generally – through the Citizens' Panel, new digital tools and through social media;
- from representative groups within the community – such as community councils, or other groups;
- from those affected by the services being reviewed. This will be especially important for understanding the impacts of any change proposed and the values give a commitment to hear voices that are not normally heard.

4.20 To support the Board to develop public engagement on redesign it is proposed that Group Leaders plus the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board work with officers to consider this in more depth and with proposals to come to the Board once the reviews for 2016/17 are identified.

4.21 In addition, the Board will consider the recommendations from the Commission on Highland Democracy, which will also engage the public.

4.22 Participation of partners

In Phase 1 of the Board's work partners, through the Community Planning Partnership (CPP), participated by providing views that influenced the development of the statement of purpose, values and outcomes appended.

To inform Phase 2 a further discussion took place with the Chief Officers' Group in August to gauge the interest in exploring options for service delivery. Partners are supportive and the points made helpfully in that discussion are attached at Appendix 3.

- 4.23 Phase 3 provides opportunities to take forward new and further partnership approaches and to understand the impacts of redesign on partners' services. The opportunities:
- will be identified within particular reviews, e.g. with the Board and the CPP keen to pursue opportunities for shared services especially around depots, fleet and property;
  - should come from discussions at a strategic level on the role of respective public bodies and how to get a better focus for the public purse as a whole;
  - may arise to invite senior staff from the CPP to be involved in the challenge and review teams to extend the peer review to partners;
  - may arise through any place-based approaches that could develop from the new Community Partnerships; and
  - exist for the Board to engage with the CPP Board as well as the Chief Officers Group.

4.24 Participation of community bodies

The statement of purpose, values and outcomes developed in Phase 1 set out the Board's ambition to empower and support communities to be more involved in matters that affect them and in doing more in their communities. Phase 2 was informed by a workshop on being an enabling Council from the perspectives of 12 diverse community groups from across Highland.

- 4.25 From that workshop specific actions are being identified for the Council and for partners and it is proposed these are developed further through a conference hosted by the Council in the autumn for community bodies, partners and Government to attend. It is proposed that the Highland Third Sector Interface is approached to support this and for the Highland CPP to be actively involved. This would also help address the strategic issues identified by the Board as set out in Booklet B around how best to support community bodies with the right infrastructure, including social enterprise, how to enable enthusiasts to be more involved and how to enable more preventative services to be developed. A proposed programme for the conference will be taken to the Board in September.

- 4.26 Phase 3 offers potential for considerable engagement with community bodies in the individual reviews where the option of community-run services seems feasible.

- 4.27 Other action with partners and Government includes discussion on respective roles on economic growth and protecting the beneficiaries of European funding and feeding into national reviews.

**5. Future Board activity**

- 5.1 In September workshops are arranged on commercial practice and Lean



approaches. Other business will include prioritising reviews for 2016/17, the proposed programme for the conference with community bodies, partners and Government and the approach to public engagement. Given the scale and pace of work required for redesign it is recommended that the Board continues to meet fortnightly through October, in workshops and formally as required.

For October topics identified include:

- learning from experience in Edinburgh, Scottish Borders and East Ayrshire;
- capital and revenue funding links;
- commissioning methods (by outcomes and payment by results);
- assessing community impacts of change (equalities, rural, poverty and staff impacts); and
- an up-date of the review underway on Catering Cleaning and Facilities Management (CCFM).

5.2 The other phases of the Board's work agreed are:

- Phase 4: localism and public participation objectives. These will be incorporated in Phase 3 reviews and continue through to March 2017;
- Phase 5: organisation change and support programme. This is focused on the support required for staff and Members in a redesigned Highland Council. This includes how staff are involved in redesign, an important part of Phase 3 too, and from the reviews we will identify the skills to develop across staff to undertake reviews and implement recommendations. This phase runs to the end of March and beyond.
- Phase 6: recommendations on the structure and management of Council operations and Committee structure. This is planned for late December until March. The insights noted so far questioning current arrangements for property spread over three services and how to enable a great focus on commercial activities.

## **6. Implications**

### **6.1 Resource implications:**

Redesign is required because of the financial situation facing public services, increasing demand for particular services and new legal duties to empower communities. The scale of the financial challenge facing the Council from 2017-18 is not yet known and is unlikely to be known until December. If there is continued reduction in the Council's Grant then further significant savings will be required. The proposed programme of reviews is about redesign of the Council so that services are affordable and sustainable which will mean doing things differently and doing different things. There are resource implications of carrying out the reviews, but capacity to do this internally can be found if reviews can be programmed over a 24 month period and are supported by the unallocated budget for redesign in 2016-17 (£70,000). The direction for redesign and savings targets associated with future reviews can be agreed within the timescales set for the Board.

### **6.2 Risk implications**

There are risks that there is insufficient challenge of current arrangements, that limited options will be considered for redesign and that decisions for

making change will not be made. Audit Scotland<sup>6</sup> highlights that changing the way services are provided can be difficult for both staff and Councillors.

“Change is never easy, it can be challenging for officers and councillors to radically change the way a Council has provided a service often over a lengthy period of time. Councillors might believe that options appraisal would be too difficult and fear that alternatives seem too radical. Councillors may also be uncomfortable with alternatives given their personal and political sympathies and aspirations.”

- 6.3 Challenge can be supported through the review process that will also consider a range of options for delivering public services. The Redesign Board is tasked to make recommendations to Council on the changes required and for these to feed into the budget decisions in December. This makes Phase 3 vital to redesign.
- 6.4 There is a risk that there is insufficient capacity to take forward the reviews through internal challenge and peer review. To supplement review teams partners, the Improvement Service and professional bodies can be involved, and where required external consultancy could be commissioned with the Board's approval.
- 6.5 Legal implications  
The statutory requirements for Council functions are shown in Booklet A and for those proposed for review in Booklet B. Recommendations for change for those reviewed in 2016/17 will be mindful of the Council's legal duties for them and as an employer.
- 6.6 Equalities and Rural implications  
Equalities, rural and poverty implications will be assessed before any recommendations for redesigning functions are made. This is a topic for Board workshop in October. That will also include understanding staff impacts, led by the Trade Union representatives.
- 6.7 Climate Change/Carbon Clever implications  
No implications are identified at this time.
- 6.8 Gaelic implications  
The Gaelic Language Plan is included as one function in the long list of around 120 functions proposed for review. The scope and timing of that is not yet known so it is too early to identify implications.

---

<sup>6</sup> Audit Scotland (2014) Options appraisal: are you getting it right?

## **7. Recommendations**

### **7.1 Board Members are asked to note:**

1. That by meeting fortnightly through the Summer recess the Board is on track with concluding Phase 2 of its work and beginning Phase 3 and to report this to Council on 8<sup>th</sup> September;
2. The wide range of Council functions and the extent to which they are statutory or discretionary as shown in Booklet A;
3. That a communications plan is in place for concluding Phase 2 and beginning Phase 3 of the Board's work;
4. The positive feedback from community planning partners to engage with redesign as described in Appendix 3 with further opportunities to engage as set out in paragraph 4.23;
5. The implications set out in section 6 of the report.

### **7.2 Board Members are asked to agree:**

1. Any changes to the long list of functions proposed for review as set out in Booklet B, noting that they cover both statutory and discretionary functions and are spread across all Council services;
2. That the approach to Phase 3 can demonstrate the values of challenging, open to ideas, participating and empowering;
3. That the long list of reviews are prioritised by the Board during September taking into account the factors listed in paragraph 4.5 and that it seeks delegated authority from the Council to decide those functions for review in 2016/17;
4. Reviews should include the range of options for service delivery included in paragraph 4.9, other than for those identified by Members to have a narrower focus e.g. on charges and income;
5. Reviews are carried out internally over a period of up to 24 months and through challenge and review teams, with a pool of staff identified by the Chief Executive for these teams, with scope for external support where appropriate as described in paragraph 4.13;
6. Reviews are scrutinised by the Redesign Board, supported by sub-groups of Members for particular reviews once the reviews for 2016/17 are identified;
7. To continue with the ways to engage staff as listed in paragraph 4.17;
8. That Group Leaders and the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board meet with officers to develop proposals for the Board on public engagement, including the public in general, representative groups across communities and with those using the services in scope for review in 2016/17;
9. That a conference is hosted by the Council in the autumn involving community bodies, partners and Government to agree action to support community bodies to do more in and with their communities. A draft programme will be considered by the Board in September.
10. That the Board continues to meet fortnightly through October and to cover the topics set out in paragraph 5.1.

Supporting documents:

Booklet A: Council functions that support Council outcomes

Booklet B: Review activity proposed to support redesign

**Statement of Council purpose, Values and Outcomes  
(agreed by the Council 29.6.16)**

The Highland Council's purpose is to improve outcomes for Highland communities, Highland citizens and the region as a whole. It leads, invests in and gives strategic direction for regional development.

We stand up for the Highland region. We represent its interests and the contribution the Highlands make at a national and international level.

The Council is the only public body in the Highlands that improves public services through democratic scrutiny by elected members. This includes a wide range of Council services and police and fire services. We seek to widen democratic rights so that more people can have a say in what matters to them and local community groups can be supported to do more for their local communities. This will bring people together in new ways to be honest about and openly discuss the funding challenges which face public services and to find local solutions together.

The Council must achieve best value for the public money it spends on services. This means being efficient, open and accountable for our own resources, and also challenging the arrangements for public services provided by other public agencies in the region. We will work with partner agencies to simplify and integrate public services in order to get better value for public money. Responsibilities and ways of working may change and we will adapt, putting the needs of people and communities before the needs of organisational and professional boundaries.

The Council has the interests of Highland citizens at the heart of everything we do. We do our best to respond to people's current needs and demands for service and we also work to prevent poorer outcomes for people and communities which can lead to higher costs arising in the future.

We intend to do more to support disadvantaged people and disadvantaged areas, so that economic growth in the Highlands is shared more evenly. We want more people to contribute to, as well as benefit from, economic success. This will mean changing how services are provided and resources are used.

The quality of our staff is a major asset to the Council. We must be a good employer, as well as one of the major employers in our region. We will encourage our staff to challenge positively and to be innovative, making the most of a 'can do' attitude, and their close connections with communities. We will support them through change.

Elected Members know when to set aside potential differences and work on a constructive basis to support the work of the Council and deliver positive outcomes for the community as a whole. They share a strong public service ethos with staff and will foster good working relations with them.

## **Draft statement of Council values**

We believe everyone can have new ideas for doing things better. We want to hear them, especially when they challenge us. We believe good ideas and good results come from people coming together with different views, being respectful and honest about what we can do together. We will make even more effort to hear voices that are not normally heard. We will have faith in staff to use their initiative and we will have faith in local communities to do more for themselves.

Challenging

Open to ideas

Participating

Empowering

## **Draft statement of Outcomes for the Council**

Highland is an attractive place to do business, with key sectors supported and making the most of our outstanding natural resources. Our economic growth is shared across the region, with opportunities for everyone to contribute and benefit, making the most of the skills of our people and developing them.

The world class environment of Highland is protected, enhanced and enjoyed by residents and visitors.

Highland is an attractive place to live, work and learn, where people and communities can achieve their potential, supported and connected by good infrastructure, amenities and services. In growing up and growing older we enjoy a good quality of life, living in safe communities, taking care of each other and looking out for those who need more support.

Highland communities are better supported to do things for themselves, with opportunities for wider participation in local decision-making and community led services.

As a public body, we are resource efficient, work smarter using up to date technology and trying out new approaches. We are business-like, operating commercially in order to support public services. Our staff and Members are closely connected to their local communities and are supported in their commitment to public service. We work with other public services to ensure all our public resources are used effectively and to prevent poorer outcomes which result in higher costs in the future.

### **General discussion points to gather views from Heads of Service on function reviews and redesign**

“Staff are experts in their own fields of service and therefore are valuable sources of information and ideas when considering change and new ways of delivering those services. It is important to remember that staff are also service users.”

*Communications Strategy agreed by the Redesign Board meeting 24.5.16*

“Change is never easy, it can be challenging for officers and councillors to radically change the way a Council has provided a service often over a lengthy period of time.”

*Audit Scotland (2014) Options appraisal: are you getting it right?*

### **General points to cover on current arrangements**

1. Views on the new values and how they fit with the team's current way of working – how challenging they are and what we might need to do to support them further.
2. Clarity on who uses or needs the service.
3. Understanding the dependencies on other functions e.g. other internal functions.
4. Understanding the connections, if any, with other public bodies – how the Council functions fits with them / touches on them.
5. Getting a picture of how the function is currently provided e.g. in-house, in partnership with others, by others (in-house, out-sourced, shared service, integrated service, commercial service, community-run service).
6. Knowing how it is currently resourced and any pressures around that – and thinking about resources widely e.g. budget (capital and revenue), staff, technology and any physical assets and if we know unit costs.
7. Understanding current performance, so including what is collected and to what geography, whether it's about quality, satisfaction, cost or anything else, what it tells us and how we compare with others if known.
8. Given the Council's localism agenda, we will be looking at whether we have the best geographies and scale for operational delivery, governance and decision-making. What does it look like just now? Your comments and views on that.
9. Whether you feel the function is currently preventative, i.e. whether it avoids poorer outcomes or more costs arising later.
10. The current arrangements for understanding citizen or user views and where you would pitch their involvement just now e.g. informing – consulting – involving –

collaborating – empowering - or a combination of these. And what feedback tells us.

11. What you feel does not work well just now in this function – the issues, the frustrations and blockers.

**General points to cover on scope for change**

1. The Redesign Board is keen for external views, challenge and insights on how Council services are provided differently elsewhere. Ideas on speakers you feel would be of interest to the Board are welcome.
2. A sense of how this function has changed over the past few years, positively and negatively – e.g. budget reduction, new ways of doing things, how that changed was managed. Your views on capacity to change given budget and staff reductions in recent years.
3. Whether there is anything else on the horizon from UK or Scottish Govt. that might affect the function going forward – (NB Heads of Service identified external factors affecting redesign from the SLT session 2.6.16 – refer to these).
4. If we know what future demand might be like – and levels of certainty about this.
5. If there are any restrictions (e.g. legal or financial) you know of about providing this function in a different way.
6. How the function is provided elsewhere – e.g. Councils elsewhere, Community / third sector / social enterprise if appropriate or private sector if appropriate
7. Whether you are aware of other providers who might be interested in providing this in Highland/ North of Scotland. Are there others who might want to provide this as a shared service?
8. If the function is currently delivered in-house whether you feel there would be any risks around out-sourcing it.
9. If the function is currently out-sourced whether you feel there would be scope for bringing it back in-house and running it more commercially/ effectively/ at a lower cost.
10. Whether you feel we could do more around the reform agenda, i.e. views on how we could reduce demand for it, being more preventative, better partnership effort or integration, how staff might need development, and performance changes.



11. Where there is scope for more public participation in this function (i.e. moving up the scale from inform – consult – involve – collaborate - empower) and what might be needed to make that happen.
12. Your views on possibilities for amending the scale of the function given the localism agenda - i.e. whether there are different or better geographies for different parts of the process, so for decision-making, budgets, operational management.
13. Your views on what you think could make this function more efficient and successful. Ideas might be whether the function or elements of it might benefit from:
  - a. Being more specialised or regrouped with others,
  - b. Being scaled up and maybe providing it for others, or others providing it for us – e.g. shared service
  - c. Mapping out the whole process to see where costs could be reduced.
  - d. Whether a charging review is appropriate.
  - e. Whether new technology might enable change.
14. If your view is that the function cannot be run more efficiently, your views on how feasible or acceptable it might be to change the level, standard and frequency of the service to achieve a saving.
15. Whether the function, or parts of it, could be re-located to bring community benefit to particular parts of Highland that need more support. We would also have to cost that and weigh up against the benefits, but ideas welcomed at this stage.
16. How we prepare for assessing the impact of any change proposed – so thinking through who would be affected by the change and where the impacts would be felt e.g. people using the service, particular places, partners and other service providers and staff groups.
17. Whether there is anything else you want to raise about redesign.
18. Your views on this process for discussing functions.

### **Feedback from the meeting between the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board and the Highland CPP Chief Officers' Group 11.8.16**

#### **Background**

The Chief Officers Group (COG) of the Highland CPP includes senior officers from: the Council, NHSH, HIE, Police Scotland (PS), Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), SNH, Skills Development Scotland, UHI, Highlife Highland, the Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA), The Scottish Government (SG) and the Highland Third Sector Interface (HTSI). All were in attendance apart from the UHI and CNPA on 11.8.16 and the meeting was chaired by Elaine Mead, Chief Executive of NHSH.

The Convener provided an overview of the Board's progress and advised that the Board was currently identifying functions to review. She asked for views from partners on how they wanted to be engaged in redesign and whether we could all look at shifting responsibility for services by working more collaboratively, asking if they felt there were services that the Council provided that they could do better and vice versa.

#### **Key points for redesign:**

1. All partners had been under review and continually adjusting their business models and so understood the need for redesign.
2. The national review on economic development (for HIE, SDS and SFC) would report in the autumn and could fundamentally affect what all public bodies do on economic development. The review of NHS structures was noted and would affect all partners.
3. All partners needed to focus on prevention, with links to better information sharing.
4. There are opportunities for redesign for doing things differently together through the new community planning structures and particularly the new network of local community partnerships.
5. All are keen to engage on the efficiency agenda and are open to opportunities from the Council's redesign. The benefits of physical co-location were acknowledged.
6. Areas of shared interest included:
  - a. Property;
  - b. Business Gateway;
  - c. The Science Technology Engineering Maths and Digital (STEM D) agenda;
  - d. Winter gritting (SFRS);
  - e. Workshops, fleet and depots (SFRS and PS);
  - f. Other services could be delivered through the ALEO model and HLH is able to offer advice on the set up of any new ALEOs if that was needed;
  - g. Joint approach to data analysis and intelligence across the partners;
  - h. Joining up engagement and consultation with the public in localities;

- i. Joint training and learning, especially in CPP requirements;
- j. Potentially rural payments (SG).

### **Other issues**

1. HTSI is keen for engagement on redesign with them and the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector.
2. How best to support the move to more community run services and the infrastructure for that.
  - a. the need to provide reassurance for communities that public bodies will be there to support them to do it – and that they won't have to do it on their own. The mantra of 'doing it for myself – not by myself' might be helpful;
  - b. for support infrastructure to be able to help when things run into trouble. Issues of governance and volunteer fatigue were raised;
  - c. how could public sector staff with skills to support community bodies be released to help with such issues – volunteering schemes as part of employee development? Also with potential as a benefit for the private sector to be involved in – with payback as staff skills development and business development and organisational learning.
  - d. concerns about different capacity in communities to be involved and how this could widen inequalities if support was not targeted and coordinated better in the CPP;
  - e. the need to involve communities of experience and not just of place.
3. SNH is feeling the effect of Council VR on biodiversity duties and considering how to take those forward.
4. How the CPP can work together to re-set public expectations of public services given the changes across all public bodies.
5. Whether the committee structure might feature in redesign was raised and confirmed.
6. The CPP wanted SG support to remove artificial restraint for working collaboratively.

### **Next steps**

A commitment was made to factor all of these ideas into the redesign process, to engage on individual function reviews and strategically around the themes of the roles of respective public bodies and community support infrastructure. There would be ongoing dialogue with the CPP collectively and with individual partners.