

**John Polychronakis**

---

**From:** Cllr. Patrick Harley  
**Sent:** 10 September 2014 11:14  
**To:** Teresa Reilly  
**Cc:** John Polychronakis

Hi Teresa

This is the submission for the consultation from the Conservative Group:

It covers three key aspects of the report:

- 1) Duration of future Chief Executive
- 2) Children's & Adults Social care
- 3) Pay structure

1)

The Conservative Group recognise that such a post is essential to both "hold a complex organisation together" and drive forward the political leadership's vision for the Borough. It is accepted that such was Dudley's renown as a well-run local authority that it had been consistently successfully in retaining senior officers who could probably have sought greater financial reward elsewhere. However, the restructuring plan should be an evolving project and one that within 5 years could possibly deliver capability to function without the need to employ a Chief Executive in the current role and pay structure.

Therefore we would propose that any new Chief Executive is employed on a fixed term contract. This would enable politicians to measure performance and ensure that the relevant change was being driven from the Chief Executive down. One of the current issues is that senior members of the council hierarchy have been accused of creating silos and empire building and of then being protectionist when challenged with change. A new CE on a fixed term would be tasked with delivering the real change needed geared to pushing through the necessary transformation of the Council – "recruiting for a task, rather than for a job."

Obviously, a fixed term could be renewed if the Council Leadership at that future time thought it an option. At the same time future consultation may decide that the role could be changed to that of a hard-driving Chief Officer instead.

2)

It seems that the basic premise for separating out adult and children's social services was the size of the budget under the control of a single Chief Officer. This really makes no sense as it is the fitness for purpose of the service that should be a priority rather than the relative 'clout' of the officer.

The Conservative Group having looked at a number of scenarios feel that if we are really going to remove silos and have cross council working, we only need to remove the word 'children's' from the top line of the children's social services chief officer.

This will actually have the effect of balancing the budgets of the Chief Officers better across portfolios. Since most members all appear to agree that children who have demand on social work

support are normally the product of a dysfunctional family, we believe we should include the line troubled families in that brief also.

As education is becoming a smaller part of the Councils responsibility and seems likely to continue that way, it seems reasonable to leave it where it is. The effect of this small amendment will be to effectively turn the 'Chief Officer for Children's services' into the 'Chief Officer for social care commissioning and education' and the 'Chief Officer for Adult Social Care' into the 'Chief Officer for Social Care provision'. A client and provider relationship which is particularly relevant if you look at the lines 'Access to Care' and 'All Age Disability Support'.

3)

We do not accept that 11 very privileged individuals will have effectively been exempted from the austerity measures of the last four years by having a pay increase of between 30 and 40 percent, whilst all other staff have had their pay frozen (even those on the lowest pay scales). If we take account of the single status changes, many have had their pay cut.

The suggestion that the extra responsibilities would lead us to being unable to recruit the right calibre of people may be true, but that is a bridge we should cross 'IF' we come to it. This looks for all the world like fat cats looking after themselves.

The Group were interested to hear how Colin Williams suggested that the £1 million saving would be made by setting a budget envelope for the review of the forth tier management. This, in effect means that the extra £300,000 being paid to those 11 can't be used to fill 4th tier responsibilities. This could well have the perverse effect of overburdening more junior managers and causing service failures due to lack of control.

This is bad management. We might just as we have gotten rid of the surplus AD's and created three new Directors on the current pay scales instead. Minimal disruption, minimal redundancy payments required, which by the way, haven't been factored into the savings figures presented. When will these savings show any return after redundancy or early retirement bonuses, as the salary increases will be with immediate effect.

Looked at another way, if we leave their pay as is, we could save £1.3 million.

Many thanks  
Cllr Harley