

AGENDA

COUNCIL MEETING

Date: Wednesday, 17 June 2015

Time: 7.00 pm

Venue: Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT

RECORDING NOTICE

Please note: this meeting may be recorded.

At the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being audio recorded. The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items.

You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this recording will be retained in accordance with the Council's data retention policy.

Therefore by entering the Chamber and speaking at Committee you are consenting to being recorded and to the possible use of those sound records for training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this please contact Democratic Services.

Quorum = 16

1. Prayers

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Minutes

To approve the Minutes of the Meeting of the Annual Council held on 19 May 2015 (Minute Nos. 1 - 4) and 20 May 2015 (Minute Nos. 5 – 17) as correct records.

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillors should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves or their spouse, civil partner or person with whom they are living with as a spouse or civil partner. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.

The Mayor will ask Members if they have any interests to declare in respect of items on this agenda, under the following headings:

(a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI) under the Localism Act 2011. The nature as well as the existence of any such interest must be declared. After declaring a DPI, the Member must leave the meeting and not take part in the discussion or vote. This applies even if there is provision for public speaking.

Pages

(b) Disclosable Non Pecuniary (DNPI) under the Code of Conduct adopted by the Council in May 2012. The nature as well as the existence of any such interest must be declared. After declaring a DNPI interest, the Member may stay, speak and vote on the matter.

Advice to Members: If any Councillor has any doubt about the existence or nature of any DPI or DNPI which he/she may have in any item on this agenda, he/she should seek advice from the Director of Corporate Services as Monitoring Officer, the Head of Legal or from other Solicitors in Legal Services as early as possible, and in advance of the Meeting.

5. Mayor's Announcements

6. Questions submitted by the Public

To consider any questions submitted by the public. (The deadline for questions is 4.30 pm the Friday before the meeting – please contact Democratic Services by e-mailing democraticservices@swale.gov.uk or call 01795 417330).

7. Questions submitted by Members

To consider any questions submitted by Members. (The deadline for questions is 4.30 pm the Wednesday before the meeting – please contact Democratic Services by e-mailing democraticservices@swale.gov.uk or call 01795 417330).

8. Leader's Statement

Members may ask questions on the Leader's Statement. (To follow).

9. Scrutiny of MKIP Governance and Communications

1 - 8

In accordance with Procedure Rule 3, the Lead Members will be invited to summarise the findings from the review. The Leader will be invited to give the Cabinet's response.

10. Appointments to Outside Bodies - Faversham Swimming Pool Management Committee

9 - 12

11. Modification of Prescribed Standing Orders relating to the dismissal of Statutory Officers

13 - 26

Issued on Monday, 8 June 2015

The reports included in Part I of this agenda can be made available in **alternative formats**. For further information about this service, or to arrange for special facilities to be provided at the meeting, **please contact DEMOCRATIC SERVICES on 01795 417330**. To find out more about the work of Council, please visit www.swale.gov.uk

**Democratic Services, 01795 417330, Swale Borough Council,
Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT**

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Council | Agenda Item: 9 |
| Meeting Date | 17 June 2015 |
| Report Title | Scrutiny of MKIP Governance and Communications |
| Cabinet Member | Cllr Andrew Bowles, Leader of the Council |
| SMT Lead | Abdool Kara – Chief Executive |
| Head of Service | N/A |
| Lead Officer | N/A |
| Key Decision | No |
| Classification | Open |
| Forward Plan | Reference number: |
| Recommendations | 1. Council is asked to note the recommendations made by Scrutiny Committee on MKIP Governance and Communications and Cabinet’s response to them. |

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for Council to note the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee in their report of MKIP Governance and Communications, and Cabinet’s response to those recommendations.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Committees from Maidstone, Swale and Tunbridge Wells Borough Councils established a Joint Task and Finish Group (JTFG) to review the governance and communication arrangements of the Mid Kent Improvement Partnership (MKIP). The role of the JTFG was to:
- “consider how the Mid Kent Improvement Partnership’s (MKIP) governance arrangements should be taken forward and how an MKIP communications plan should be developed.”
- 2.2 The review was instigated by a joint meeting of the Maidstone, Swale, and Tunbridge Wells Scrutiny Committees on 7 July 2014.
- 2.3 The review was conducted principally through a number of question and answer sessions with a range of Cabinet members and senior officers from the three authorities and/or external partners. The JTFG also reviewed a number of reports, agendas, and minutes of meetings, and other papers.

2.4 The final report of the JTFG was completed on 12 January 2015. The recommendations were received by the Swale Cabinet on 4 February 2015 where Cabinet resolved to respond to the JTFG recommendations at its meeting on 11 March 2015. This duly took place.

3 Proposals

3.1 The Scrutiny Committee’s recommendations and Cabinet’s response to them are set out at Appendix I.

4 Alternative Options

4.1 None.

5 Consultation Undertaken or Proposed

5.1 The original work of the JTFG was widely consulted on. The responses were considered through Cabinet and officer discussions.

6 Implications

| Issue | Implications |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Corporate Plan | The delivery of effective shared services is key to the ongoing corporate health and financial sustainability of Swale Borough Council. |
| Financial, Resource and Property | The costs of meeting the recommendations that are agreed will be met from within existing budgets and staffing resources. |
| Legal and Statutory | There are no specific legal or statutory implications – the MKIP Board is not a decision-making body. However, whilst every attempt will be made to ensure transparency in the work of the MKIP Board, there may be occasions where commercially confidential or personally restricted information will be withheld, in line with Data Protection and Freedom of Information guidelines. In addition, the general principles of access to information will be applied, so confidential or exempt information, as defined under the Local Government Act 1972, would not be disclosed. |
| Crime and Disorder | None. |
| Sustainability | None. |
| Health and Wellbeing | None. |
| Risk Management | None. |

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| and Health and Safety | |
| Equality and Diversity | None. |

7 Appendices

- 7.1 Appendix I: Scrutiny Committee's recommendations on MKIP Governance and Communications, together with Cabinet's response.

8 Background Papers

The report of the JTFG as agreed by the joint meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees on 12 January:

<http://services.swale.gov.uk/meetings/documents/s1962/MKIP%20Report.pdf>

and the minutes of that meeting:

<http://services.swale.gov.uk/meetings/documents/g1504/Printed%20minutes%2012th-Jan-2015%2019.00%20Special%20Meeting%20of%20the%20Overview%20and%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf?T=1>

The report to Cabinet on the response to the Scrutiny Committee recommendations:

<http://services.swale.gov.uk/meetings/documents/s2259/Report.pdf>

and the minutes of that Cabinet meeting:

<http://services.swale.gov.uk/meetings/documents/g1277/Printed%20minutes%2011th-Mar-2015%2019.00%20Cabinet.pdf?T=1>

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Response to the Scrutiny Committee Recommendations on MKIP Governance and Communications

Overarching recommendation: That the Overview and Scrutiny Committees for Maidstone Borough Council, Swale Borough Council and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council each request that their individual Cabinets should jointly consider and respond to the following recommendations that have arisen from the joint scrutiny of governance and communications.

Cabinet response: the MKIP authorities have considered responding jointly, as suggested above, but have decided to respond separately as the recommendations affect each council's governance and communications arrangements in slightly different ways.

| Scrutiny Recommendations | Cabinet Response | Cabinet Member | Lead Officer |
|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| MKIP Governance | | | |
| a) That opportunities for pre-scrutiny should be provided within existing governance arrangements at each authority prior to any new shared service proposals being considered at a tri-Cabinet meeting (i.e. after MKIP Board consideration, if not before) | <p>Opportunities for scrutiny pre-decision consideration of any Cabinet decision already exist both in law and therefore as part of our constitutional arrangements.</p> <p>Cabinet would of course be pleased to engage with Overview and Scrutiny on any such discussions that they choose to activate.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| b) That joint Overview & Scrutiny task and finish groups should be convened by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee(s) of the individual authorities, as necessary, to jointly review any major issues that arise in regard to shared service delivery and also any new options, such as the possibility of contracting to deliver a shared service for an authority outside the partnership | <p>The convening of task and finish groups by Overview and Scrutiny is a matter for Overview and Scrutiny, and not for Cabinet.</p> <p>However, Cabinet would of course be pleased to engage with Overview and Scrutiny on any such discussions that they choose to activate.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| c) That the MKIP Board will notify the Overview and Scrutiny functions of each authority when there are potential items of interest that a joint task and finish group | It is for Overview and Scrutiny to consider the potential items that it wishes to review, and it is not for Cabinet to presume what they might be. | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |

| | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| could review on their behalf | Having said that, see the response to item (m) below, where the proposal is to place those MKIP Board papers that are not subject to commercial or personal confidentiality issues on an accessible part of the Swale intranet for Overview and Scrutiny members to review as they see fit. | | |
| d) That the creation of the Mid Kent Services Director post should be favourably considered in light of the value already placed on this role by members of the Shared Services Boards and others, as it provides a single point of contact for the MKIP Board and Mid Kent Service Managers; | <p>This recommendation strays beyond the remit of the Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group as set out in its initial scoping report¹ – in particular this is a recommendation related to management issues.</p> <p>Having said that, we are clear that it will be appropriate to review the position of the MKSD at the agreed time and on an evidential basis, in light of the report due from the independent review group that has been set up, chaired by Zena Cooke from Maidstone BC, and of course taking into consideration the resources available to fund the post.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| e) That the role of the MKIP Programme Manager should be re-examined and aligned with the reporting arrangements arising from the appointment of a Mid Kent Services Director (if the post is confirmed); | <p>Again, this is a recommendation related to management issues and not issues of governance or communications.</p> <p>Having said that, the post of the Programme Manager has been designed since its inception to largely support the 'client' side of the MKIP arrangements, in particular the MKIP Board, the MKIP Chief Executives, and latterly the improvement in effective working of the Shared Service Boards.</p> <p>The necessity for this role is unaffected by the appointment of the MKSD role.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| f) That early consideration should be given to transferring the management of the Planning Support and Environmental Health shared services under the Mid Kent Services umbrella as soon as | <p>Again, this is a recommendation related to management issues and not issues of governance or communications.</p> <p>Having said that these services are hosted/led by Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells BCs respectively, and therefore the line management location of these services are in law a matter</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |

¹ The terms of reference were stated as: Governance arrangements; Seeking clarity on the role of O&S to be able to scrutinise the decisions of the MKIP Management Board, if it so wished; The objectives of the Mid Kent Services Director and how these would be measured; and Communication.

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|---|
| possible | <p>for those authorities to determine, rather than ourselves.</p> <p>However, we work closely in partnership with both authorities, and so would expect to continue to have meaningful and positive discussions with them about the most appropriate management arrangements for both of these services.</p> | | |
| g) That a toolkit is created to assist managers in their role as internal clients of shared services | <p>Again, this is a recommendation related to management issues and not issues of governance or communications.</p> <p>Having said that, we would support the sharing of good practice for those officers who are acting as client-side managers. To a great extent this is already happening through the maturing of the Shared Service Boards and the role of the MKSD.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| h) That (where appropriate) shared services create a service catalogue for their service that will help internal clients to better understand the extent of the service they provide. | <p>Cabinet is clear that it is for the client side of any service to explicitly specify the range, scope, scale, and quality of service that it wishes to receive from its respective shared service, and for the shared service to be clear about what the cost for that would be.</p> <p>This process is formally followed each year as part of agreeing the annual Service Level Agreement and Service Plan.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| Communication | | | |
| i) That a joint communications plan is developed to improve staff and member awareness and understanding of MKIP (shared service development) and MKS (shared service delivery); | <p>Cabinet support this recommendation.</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Emma Wiggins, Head of Economy and Communities |
| j) That the MKIP Board has responsibility for the effective implementation of an agreed communications plan and ensures its delivery is resourced appropriately | <p>It is right that the MKIP Board would take an overview of the creation and implementation of the communications plan, but the aim must be to keep the MKIP Board working at a strategic and forward-looking level.</p> <p>Therefore, implementation will in practice be actively</p> | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader | Emma Wiggins, Head of Economy and Communities |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | monitored by the MKIP Chief Executives, and day-to-day implementation will be led by the MKIP Programme Manager. | | |
| k) | That communication should be improved between the newly created Shared Service Boards and the MKIP Board to ensure the latter is fully aware of any major service issues and any suggested options for change | The relatively new reporting format that escalates issues from the shared services boards to the MKIP Board is working well, and we consider that it is already fulfilling this function. | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| l) | That client representatives on the Shared Service Boards should ensure the outcomes of their meetings, including any related direction coming from the MKIP Board, are effectively cascaded to relevant staff within each authority | Cabinet supports this recommendation, but considers that this is already largely the case at Swale BC, with an update provided after every Shared Service Board by the client side Director. | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| m) | That future MKIP Board meetings should be held and papers published in accordance with the appropriate local authority access to information regulations. | Cabinet agrees that MKIP papers should be afforded the same degree of openness as the Access to Information legislation requires. However, we do not wish to add unnecessary bureaucracy and extra costs to our already stretched Democratic Services Team. Therefore, this may best be achieved by placing those MKIP Board papers that are not subject to commercial or personal confidentiality issues on an accessible part of the Swale intranet for Overview and Scrutiny members to review as they see fit. | Councillor Andrew Bowles, Leader Abdool Kara, Chief Executive |
| Corporate Governance | | | |
| n) | That, given the change in governance arrangements at Maidstone BC from May 2015, consequential amendments be made to reflect that the Overview and Scrutiny function will be absorbed within the Policy and Resources and three other service committees. | Not applicable to Swale BC. | N/A N/A |

| |
|------------------------|
| Council Meeting |
|------------------------|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Meeting Date | 17 June 2015 |
| Report Title | Appointments to Outside Bodies – Faversham Swimming Pool Management Committee |
| Cabinet Member | Leader |
| SMT Lead | Director of Corporate Services |
| Head of Service | n/a |
| Lead Officer | Democratic and Electoral Services Manager |
| Key Decision | No |
| Classification | Open |
| Forward Plan | Reference number: n/a |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Recommendations | 1. The Council is asked to agree Borough Council representation on the Faversham Swimming Pool Management Committee |
|------------------------|--|

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 At the Annual Council meeting held on 20 May 2015, the Council made appointments to outside bodies, trusts and statutory bodies. The decision was made to defer making appointments to the Faversham Swimming Pool Management Committee, to clarify whether two of the appointed representatives wished to continue.

- 1.2 Mr Root has confirmed that he wishes to continue in this role.

- 1.3 It has not been possible to make contact with Mr Collins. We have contacted the Management Committee and they have asked the Council not to reappoint Mr Collins, as he has had no involvement for some time.

- 1.4 The Management Committee has asked the Council to consider appointing a Mr Mick Ellsmore.

2 Background

- 2.1 By way of background, the protocol agreed by Council on 23 February 2011 set out the following guiding principles as to whether or not appointments should be made. They are:

Essential:-

- Representation is still required – will be reviewed annually

- Appointee's role is clearly defined and does not duplicate existing arrangements
- Aims and objectives of the Outside Body (OB) are compatible with the Council's
- OB must have Terms of Reference, Constitution, Written agreement, Trust Deed or Memo and Articles, Audited accounts
- OB indemnifies appointed member and adequate insurance cover is arranged by organisation
- Appointment required by virtue of a statutory duty or other legal requirement;
- Appointment required by virtue of a specific decision or policy adopted by the Council;
- Any costs of attendance can be met within resources available to the Authority

Additional considerations:-

- Appointment will improve the Council's working relationships with outside bodies
- Appointment deriving from the Council's community leadership/consultative role or enhances the Council's Community Leadership role
- Organisation set up by the Council
- To ensure that the authority is in a position to influence sub-regional strategic decisions
- Capacity building – where interests, expertise or specific skills or knowledge are required – two way process
- Time commitments must be proportionate to the Council's objectives
- Equality of access to Councillors' time
- Expenses covered by external organisation (save from VCS)

2.2 Members may wish to think seriously before being nominated as a trustee or director by the Council, with regard to the legal obligations that this imposes on the appointee. Attention is drawn to the information below:

2.2.1 **Constitution position** – the appointment process within the Constitution follows certain principles. It is split between (a) those bodies to which the Council appoints as a body corporate e.g. charities and trusts and which fulfil primarily council functions and (b) those which do not require 'body corporate' appointment and are more closely linked to the exercise of executive functions e.g. partnerships.

In relation to Faversham Pools Management Committee, the Council is appointed as the Custodian Trustee and has to discharge its responsibilities as a Council function and is not able to delegate it. The appointment of trustees is set out with the Declaration of Trust which states that a member need not be a member of the appointing organisation. So notwithstanding that this is a Council responsibility, if the desire is to appoint more community members then this can be achieved by the Council through its own normal nomination process.

- 2.4 **Register of Interests** - Members are required to record any changes to their interests arising from their appointment to an outside body.

3 Proposal

- 1.5 Council is asked to determine who will represent the Council on the Faversham Swimming Pool Management Committee.

- 1.6 The nominations put forward at the Council meeting on 20 May were:

- Mr Anthony William Collins
- Mr Steve Root
- Mr Barnicott
- Cllr Monique Bonney
- Cllr Mike Henderson
- Cllr Anita Walker

- 1.7 Given the comments received back from the Committee, the re-appointment of Mr Anthony William Collins is not recommended.

- 1.8 The Chairman of the Trust has suggested the following replacement:

"The Pools Trust is progressing with its incorporation and is seeking to attract trustees with specific skills to add to the growing range of specific professional disciplines available to manage the Trust. Mick Ellsmore's background as a former local government Director of Finance combined with his experience in dealing with charitable bodies and his interest in leisure and recreation services would make him a great asset to the Trust.

Mick is already advising the Trust on its incorporation and if the Council agrees to his appointment Mick's formal service as a trustee would begin at the next AGM which this year will take place in October".

- 1.9 The Leader has confirmed his support for the appointment of Mr Ellsmore.

4 Alternative Options

- 4.1 Council can decide whether or not to make appointments to those outside bodies. Consideration should be given to the principles already agreed in the Outside Bodies' Protocol adopted by full Council on 23 February 2011.

5 Consultation Undertaken or Proposed

- 1.10 Group Leaders have been made aware of the feedback from representatives and the Management Committee.

6 Implications

| Issue | Implications |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Corporate Plan | Open for Business |
| Financial, Resource and Property | None identified at this stage, although should the Executive recommend to Council to review the process and policy of nominations on outside bodies, this would have a human resource implication. |
| Legal and Statutory | <p>The Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 sets the responsibilities between Council and the Executive.</p> <p>Some appointments are as Trustees or Directors which have specific legal responsibilities and liabilities for the individual member.</p> <p>To ensure compliance with the Members' Code of Conduct any member appointed to an outside body must review their declaration in the Members' Register of Interests within 28 days of any change.</p> |
| Crime and Disorder | None identified at this stage. |
| Sustainability | None identified at this stage, although should there be a further review of the process and policy of nominations on outside bodies, this could have equality and diversity implications. |
| Health and Wellbeing | None identified at this stage. |
| Risk Management and Health and Safety | The audit of outside bodies reviewed the roles and capacities of Members the Council nominates to outside bodies. The audit enabled the Council to identify and manage any risks that may arise from making appointments to outside bodies and allows members to take informed decisions about whether or not they wish to accept appointments that could impose significant legal obligations on them. |
| Equality and Diversity | None identified at this stage, although should there be a further review of the process and policy of nominations on outside bodies, this could have equality and diversity implications. |

7 Appendices

None

8 Background Papers

None.

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Council Meeting | |
| Meeting Date | 17 June 2015 |
| Report Title | MODIFICATION OF PRESCRIBED STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO THE DISMISSAL OF STATUTORY OFFICERS |
| Cabinet Member | Cllr Bowles, Leader |
| SMT Lead | Mark Radford – Director of Corporate Services and Monitoring Officer |
| Head of Service | |
| Lead Officer | |
| Key Decision | No |
| Classification | Open |
| Forward Plan | Reference number: |
| Recommendations | 1. That the modifications to the Councils Prescribed Standing Orders, Standing Orders Relating to Staff, be modified as set out in Appendix 2 to this report and be incorporated into the Council's Constitution. |

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

1.1 To modify Standing Orders relating to the dismissal of statutory officers as required by the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 and to incorporate them within the Council's Constitution.

1.2 The government has made legislative changes which require the Council to amend its Standing Orders insofar as they relate to disciplinary action against and the dismissal of the Council's Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer. The report identifies the necessary changes and recommends that the Council makes them.

2 Background

2.1 Since the Council commenced operating executive arrangements it has been a requirement of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 ('the 2001 Regulations') that the Council makes or modifies standing orders so that they include certain provisions relating to staff and other matters. The Council's Constitution currently incorporates standing orders which comply with the requirements of the regulations.

2.2 The provisions required to be in the Standing Orders in relation to staff operated so as to require the council to appoint a "designated independent person" before it could discipline or dismiss its Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer.

2.3 On 25 March, following a long standing commitment to do so, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government made the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 which will come into force on 11th May 2015 ('the 2015 Regulations'). The 2015 Regulations repeal the provisions of the 2001 regulations insofar as they relate to the appointment of the "designated independent person" and make new provision

about the procedure to be followed to dismiss a Head of Paid Service, a Monitoring Officer or, a Chief Finance Officer. These provisions must be incorporated into the Council's standing orders "no later than the first ordinary meeting of the authority falling after 11th May 2015".

2.3 The 2015 Regulations require that before dismissing one of the officers identified above, the Council must appoint a "panel" for the purpose of advising on matters relating to the dismissal of the relevant officer. The Council must invite independent persons who have been appointed under section 28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 to be considered for appointment to the panel, with a view to appointing at least two such persons to the panel. These independent persons are those appointed by the Council in connection with the procedures for dealing with alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct for members.

2.4 The Department for Communities and Local Government have issued an explanatory memorandum to the 2015 Regulations which can be viewed at:

http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/881/pdfs/ukxiem_20150881_en.pdf.

2.5 The section of the document headed "Policy Background" cites issues of complexity and expense as the reasons for the legislative changes although it is fair to say that many commentators do not accept this nor, that the new procedures actually address the perceived problems. The view of ALACE, the organisation representing senior managers in local government, is set out in the implications section below.

2.6 The governance consultancy firm Hoey Ainscough Associates Limited working with Wilkin Chapman Goolden solicitors have also produced a useful briefing note which expands on some of the implications of the 2015 regulations. A copy of this is attached as Appendix 1

3 Proposals

3.1 The requirements of the 2015 Regulations are mandatory insofar as they relate to the adoption of the prescribed standing orders and therefore it is not possible to put options before the Council for consideration in this connection.

3.2 As will be noted from paragraph 28 of the attached briefing note the Council does have a choice as to whether it appoints a standing panel in pursuance of the standing orders or, whether it only appoints one if and when the need arises. The latter is considered the most appropriate for the reasons set out in paragraph 4.2.

4 Alternative Options

4.1 The circumstances giving rise to the need to appoint the panel are likely to occur very infrequently, if at all. It is therefore not proposed that the Council should appoint a standing panel. In the event that one was to be needed, this would be the subject of a report to Council at the time.

4.2 There is also a fundamental legal difficulty in attempting to appoint a standing panel and this lies in the need to ensure that the panel is comprised of members who are impartial. The nature of the positions to which the 2015 applies is such that there is a high probability that one or more members will themselves be involved in any disciplinary action whether as instigators of it or, as witnesses. Clearly, any member involved in this capacity could not sit on the panel. Therefore, until a particular issue arises and the circumstances are known, it would not be possible to identify which members could and (more importantly) could not, sit on the panel.

5 Consultation Undertaken or Proposed

5.1 Consultation has been undertaken through the Kent Secretaries Group to seek to find a consistent response to the regulations and this report reflects that approach.

6 Implications

| Issue | Implications |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Corporate Plan | The purpose of these regulations is to change prescribed standing orders and to streamline processes for the dismissal of statutory officers. |
| Financial, Resource and Property | The purpose of these regulations is to change prescribed standing orders and to streamline processes for the dismissal of statutory officers. Any financial implications would be identified in the event of the revised procedure being invoked. |
| Legal and Statutory | <p>The legal implications in adopting the prescribed standing orders are already contained within the report</p> <p>It should also be noted that there is ongoing discussion about the status of the regulations in the context of employment law.</p> <p>ALACE the group representing senior officers in local government have written to DCLG stating:</p> <p>“ALACE are concerned that, once again, the Department has failed to take account in any way of the practical experience of those with experience of these procedures. The Explanatory Memorandum to the Regulations reflects the absence of this sort of understanding. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACAS Code of Practice on discipline states: ‘It is important to carry out necessary investigations of potential disciplinary matters without unreasonable delay to establish the facts of the case’ (para 5); and ‘where practicable, different people should carry out the investigation and disciplinary hearing’ (para 6). • ‘It [the DIP process] has placed councils as the employer at a great disadvantage in comparison to the position of the employee, particularly given that the recommendation of the DIP must be followed.’ (7.1) The only disadvantage is that the council is prevented from dismissing someone whom an independent investigator believes does not warrant dismissal – but the process primarily exists to prevent arbitrary dismissal of statutory officers, so presumably the disadvantage is that councils are prevented from dismissing senior staff arbitrarily. • ‘...performance management process for top staff...The |

Government believes that such a process is not appropriate as it defeats the purpose of having the DIP process in place.' (7.3) A DIP is engaged to investigate disciplinary allegations, not to undertake performance management. As the Committee made clear, appraisal/performance management is a key element of proper oversight of senior officers. (In truth, it is inconceivable that the Government believes performance management is not appropriate – it's good practice in every area of work.)

- 'In place of the DIP process, the decision will be taken transparently by full council' (7.4). With the DIP process, the decision is taken transparently by full Council. These are not alternatives: one is an investigation; the other is a decision. Both are features of every disciplinary process (as the reference to the ACAS Code of Practice above makes clear).

So ALACE is concerned at both the lack of rigour in the thinking around the process, and the inappropriateness of some of the specific requirements; in summary:

- The addition of a further stage in a process already regarded as capable of being made more efficient
- A complete absence of the recognition that the disciplinary process needs to include an investigation of the facts
- A so-called independent component, but with the right to appoint the independent persons being in the hands of the Employer only, and the officer subject to the process having no rights to insist on a genuinely independent appointment
- The involvement of individuals appointed for a completely different purpose and with no requirement whatsoever that they have the necessary experience or expertise for the task involved in this process
- Ambiguity as to the make-up of the Panel on which the independent persons serve – is it a committee of the Authority, in which case the independent persons can be outvoted by councillors and the independent advice might never come to the attention of the Council, or is the Panel composed only of the independent persons?

In more than two years, the Department has been trying to amend these procedures, and exhibited in that time no clarity of purpose and, indeed, no understanding of the nature of disciplinary processes and the legal

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>context in which they take place. It has been clear throughout that the Employers and Employees both attach a great deal of importance to the efficacy of these arrangements, and share views on many aspects of how this can be done better than under the present arrangements. But at no point has the Department sought a solution which enjoys the confidence and support of those who have to operate the procedures. It is incomprehensible that we now have Regulations in place that simply make life more difficult for authorities and officers alike, and frustrate and undermine the purposes of these processes.</p> <p>In all this time, one wonders why the Department has not invited the two sides to work with it to at least seek to produce a workable, economical and efficacious process which meets the objectives of the Department, Employers and Employees alike. We suggest the Department now does so, and assure you that we will enter into such discussions positively to produce such an outcome.</p> <p>In the meantime, we support the request of the LGA that these Regulations should be repealed pending such discussions.</p> |
| Crime and Disorder | Not applicable |
| Sustainability | Not applicable |
| Health and Wellbeing | Not applicable |
| Risk Management and Health and Safety | Not applicable |
| Equality and Diversity | Not applicable |

7 Appendices

7.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix I: Briefing Note; Hoey Ainscough Associates Limited/Wilkin Chapman and Golden Solicitors
- Appendix II Modification of prescribed standing orders, (relevant extract only)

8 Background Papers

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015

NOTE ON THE NEW REGULATIONS RELATING TO DISMISSAL OF SENIOR OFFICERS

Background

1. The Government issued new regulations on 25 March 2015 to come into force on 11 May. The Regulations introduce new arrangements for dealing with disciplinary cases involving a council's three statutory officers - the Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer. The new Regulations contain requirements for councils to amend their Standing Orders.
2. Because these three roles are statutory positions with specific roles and personal responsibility to ensure a council acts lawfully and has effective governance in place, they have had specific protection from dismissal under legislation in order to avoid them being scapegoated or victimised by local politicians were they to blow the whistle on impropriety within the authority. This is because the proper discharge of these personal responsibilities can bring the statutory officer into conflict with members of their authority, as their report may conflict with the political objectives of the authority, or indicate misconduct by a particular member.
3. Traditionally, before one of these officers could be dismissed, the council had to appoint a designated independent person (DIP) to carry out an investigation into the circumstances. The DIP was appointed on agreement between the council and the officer concerned, although if no agreement could be reached on the individual the Secretary of State had reserve powers to impose a DIP. The council could then only take disciplinary action in accordance with the DIP's report and recommendation.
4. The Secretary of State regarded this as a cumbersome and expensive process and wished to make it easier and cheaper for such officers to be dismissed where the council believed there had been significant misconduct or poor performance. He had therefore been consulting on draft regulations to streamline the arrangements and in particular remove the need for the DIP.
5. Concerns had been expressed by local government, however, that it was important to continue to provide some form of protection so that chief officers could not be dismissed purely because of political differences or for speaking uncomfortable truth unto power.
6. The new Regulations therefore seek to introduce a new streamlined procedure while attempting to retain some sort of independent check within the system. This is broadly done by giving the 'independent person' (IP) appointed to support the members' conduct framework a role in the disciplinary process for chief officers.
7. However, the regulations do raise a number of issues, both about the role of the IP and the way the process would work more generally, which remain to be clarified. This paper

therefore summarises our initial understanding of the new process and some of the issues councils will need to consider. These Regulations do not stand alone but need to be considered in conjunction with wider provisions relating to local authority governance and any local process will have to have regard to general principles of employment law as well as any contractual employment agreements, so we should stress that these views below are only preliminary views and may be amended after further analysis.

The new process – in brief

8. The Regulations introduce new mandatory standing orders which all councils will have to put into their constitution to replace arrangements relating to the previous framework.
9. In brief, from now on, only the full council can dismiss one of the three statutory officers. Previously the decision could have been delegated to a committee or to the Head of Paid Service.
10. Before considering such action, the council must set up a panel whose role will be to give views, advise and make recommendations to the full council. The council must invite independent persons to sit on this panel. The panel must be appointed at least 20 working days before the relevant meeting of full council.

Issues – the independent person on the panel

11. There is no statutory minimum or maximum number of IPs that the council must appoint with regard to member misconduct issues. Some councils only have one, others have more than one.
12. Under the officer disciplinary process, the panel must invite at least two IPs to be on the panel, but can invite more. It is worth noting that the Regulations say the IP must be invited, but there is no obligation on any IP to take up the invitation, nor is there anything which would prevent the panel sitting if the IPs did not attend.
13. IPs are to be invited in a particular order. First priority is to be given to an IP appointed by the council who is also an elector in that council's area. If that proves insufficient numbers or the invite is refused, the council should invite any other IP it has appointed. And finally, it can then approach IPs from other authorities.

Issues – composition of the panel

14. The covering letter from DCLG accompanying the Regulations describes the panel as an 'independent panel'. In fact the Regulations state that it is to be a panel drawn from the council in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 which means that it has to comply with certain legal requirements.
15. As by law it is an advisory panel under s102(4) of that Act, this can indeed be a panel consisting solely of independent (non-elected) members appointed for that purpose, which would meet the Government's stated aim of an 'independent panel'. However, there is nothing to say this has to be the case. It could also include elected members – and indeed if no IP takes up the invitation it would have to be made up of elected members.

16. If the Panel includes elected members then the political proportionality rules will apply to any elected members on the Panel, unless the Council votes to waive the proportionality requirements. In considering the composition of any Panel the principles of natural justice and employment law considerations would need to be borne in mind.
17. By virtue of s13 (3) and (4) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 IPs who are appointed to an advisory panel have the right, alongside any elected members to vote on matters at that panel. This differs from the IP's role in relation to member conduct issues, where they are there simply to give views rather than to make decisions and have no voting rights.
18. Incidentally, that would mean that any IP appointed to such an advisory panel would be considered a co-opted member with voting rights, and hence would become subject to the code of conduct under the Localism Act, including the requirements to register and declare DPIs.
19. There is no upper limit placed on the membership of the panel, although by convention a panel should always consist of a minimum of three members. Although there is no obligation to invite more than two IPs, if the panel consists of wholly independent appointees, three IPs would have to attend. Otherwise, there must be at least one elected member alongside two IPs.

Issues – how would the panel carry out its considerations?

20. Inevitably the business of the panel relates to employment law and contractual matters. So, while there is no requirement for HR expertise on the panel, they would clearly need to have access to proper legal and HR advice to help their deliberations.
21. There is also no requirement specified as to what they are to consider. However, it is likely if they are to consider whether a dismissal can be justified, they would have to consider the outcome of an investigation or at the very least hold a hearing on the matter in hand. This is not least because employment law and existing contractual terms and conditions would still apply to the operation of the panel.
22. Regardless of the contractual provisions for a DIP in the JNC Chief Officer conditions of service, employment lawyers will be very familiar with the tests of employer reasonableness set out in sections 98(4) of the Employment Rights Act 1996. Whether the council's dismissal of a statutory officer will be regarded as fair or unfair by the Employment Tribunal will be determined by the circumstances (including the size and administrative resources of the council) and whether it acted reasonably. Iceland Frozen Foods v Jones [1982] IRLR 439 remains the leading case on the test to be applied. It is likely to be unfair to dismiss unless a reasonable and sufficient investigation into the alleged misconduct has been carried out, including the provision of an opportunity to explain.
23. Previously, the investigation was done by the DIP. The Government implies the guarantee of independence provided by the DIP has been replaced by the independence of the IP. Yet it seems unlikely that the expectation is that the IP would carry out any investigation, as that is not their role, so there will still need to be some sort of investigator appointed to

provide evidence for the panel to consider.

24. It must be remembered that the panel is not the ultimate decision-making body – it is merely there in turn to advise the full council – so its procedures will need to reflect this.
25. That said, unless and until JNC terms and conditions are amended any procedure would need to comply with these contractual obligations. In particular, the JNC terms refer to the need for there to be an investigation committee to consider the findings of an independent investigation, and for there also to be an appeals committee. We would consider the advisory panel to meet the requirements for an investigating committee even though it is merely making recommendations rather than a final decision, but councils will need to consider how the need for any appeals committee would be met.
26. When the matter is referred to full council, it must have regard to any views, advice or recommendations made by the panel as well as the findings of any investigation and any representations made by the officer concerned.

What the council needs to do

27. These changes to standing orders come into force on 11 May. Councils must therefore adopt these changes at their first ordinary council meeting after that date. At the risk of sounding trite an ordinary meeting would be any meeting which is not ‘extraordinary’ under schedule 12 para 3 of the 1972 Act. Hence the annual meeting would be classed as an ordinary meeting. **(Note advice from the Local Government Association has confirmed a different view on what constitutes an ordinary meeting, hence why the matter is being reported to this meeting)**
28. Councils will need to decide whether they wish to create a standing panel or not. In any case, they should agree what the composition of any panel they might need to set up in future should be and agree procedural rules for the panel in case it needed to be convened in the future, to avoid future arguments about arrangements at a time when sensitivities would be likely to be high.
29. The Regulations also allow an allowance to be paid to any IPs appointed to the panel. Councils should consider now what those allowances might be and how they are incorporated into any existing allowances IPs might currently be getting. The Regulations say this allowance cannot be more than the allowance paid to the IP for their ‘member conduct’ role. While this is not entirely clear, the implication does seem to be they can receive two separate allowances – one for this role and one for the member conduct role, provided the allowance for this role does not exceed that paid for the member conduct role.

Implications and considerations for IPs

30. IPs will need to be aware of the implications of these Regulations for their role. Chief officer dismissals can arise in a number of circumstances – where serious misconduct has been found, where there has been serious performance issues or occasionally where there has been a breakdown in relations between the officer and politicians. This last scenario will always prove the most contentious as officers can only be dismissed where there are clear

grounds to do so under employment law.

31. In particular therefore IPs will need to think how they would carry out their role where the issue arises from a breakdown in relationships. They will need clear guidance on relevant and irrelevant factors they will need to consider.
32. While the Regulations say that IPs have to be invited to participate, it does not appear that they have to accept the invitation. If IPs decline the invitation, it seems clear that the council will have discharged its duty by inviting them so can proceed in their absence. IPs will therefore need to consider the grounds on which they would/would not accept the invitation.
33. As with their role in dealing with member conduct issues, the IP role here appears to be above all that of a guarantor of independence and due process. Even though they are part of the panel, unlike with member conduct issues where they merely give views to the relevant panel, it is not the panel which is the final decision-making body. IPs will therefore need to consider how they would fulfil their role on the panel and, in particular, how they would make representations if they disagree with conclusions reached by the councillors on the panel, particularly where they think the conclusions have been influenced by political rather than employment considerations, or if they do not believe that full council has properly taken the panel's views into consideration.
34. As their role is similar to their role in terms of member conduct, albeit they would have voting rights, we see no need to consider recruiting IPs with different mind sets or skill sets. They will not need to be employment law experts but merely able to reach an independent view based on evidence presented.
35. An IP would become bound by the code of conduct and related statutory obligations were they to become members of the panel and will therefore need to be reminded of their obligations when they do so.

A final reminder

35. Such cases are of course, thankfully, very rare. The most important role for an IP will remain in relation to member misconduct and that should be the main emphasis when recruiting and training IPs. This will simply be an additional duty which they will need to be aware of, but may never be called upon to exercise.

Note prepared by

PAUL HOEY AND NATALIE AINSCOUGH, HOEY AINSCOUGH ASSOCIATES LTD and JONATHAN GOOLDEN, WILKIN CHAPMAN LLP

2 APRIL 2015

Hoey
Ainscough
Associates

wilkin chapman
goolden
solicitors

Relevant extract from:

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS 2015 No. 881

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015

Made - - - - 25th March 2015

Laid before Parliament 25th March 2015

Coming into force - - 11th May 2015

“SCHEDULE 3 Regulation 6

Provisions to be incorporated in standing orders in respect of disciplinary action

1. In the following paragraphs—

(a) “the 2011 Act” means the Localism Act 2011**(b)**;

(b) “chief finance officer”, “disciplinary action”, “head of the authority’s paid service” and “monitoring officer” have the same meaning as in regulation 2 of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001**(c)**;

(c) “independent person” means a person appointed under section 28(7) of the 2011 Act;

(d) “local government elector” means a person registered as a local government elector in the register of electors in the authority’s area in accordance with the Representation of the People Acts;

(e) “the Panel” means a committee appointed by the authority under section 102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972**(d)** for the purposes of advising the authority on matters relating to the dismissal of relevant officers of the authority;

(f) “relevant meeting” means a meeting of the authority to consider whether or not to approve a proposal to dismiss a relevant officer; and

(g) “relevant officer” means the chief finance officer, head of the authority’s paid service or monitoring officer, as the case may be.

2. A relevant officer may not be dismissed by an authority unless the procedure set out in the following paragraphs is complied with.

3. The authority must invite relevant independent persons to be considered for appointment to the Panel, with a view to appointing at least two such persons to the Panel.

4. In paragraph 3 “relevant independent person” means any independent person who has been appointed by the authority or, where there are fewer than two such persons, such independent

persons as have been appointed by another authority or authorities as the authority considers appropriate.

5. Subject to paragraph 6, the authority must appoint to the Panel such relevant independent persons who have accepted an invitation issued in accordance with paragraph 3 in accordance with the following priority order—

- (a) a relevant independent person who has been appointed by the authority and who is a local government elector;
- (b) any other relevant independent person who has been appointed by the authority;
- (c) a relevant independent person who has been appointed by another authority or authorities.

6. An authority is not required to appoint more than two relevant independent persons in accordance with paragraph 5 but may do so.

7. The authority must appoint any Panel at least 20 working days before the relevant meeting.

8. Before the taking of a vote at the relevant meeting on whether or not to approve such a dismissal, the authority must take into account, in particular—

- (a) any advice, views or recommendations of the Panel;
- (b) the conclusions of any investigation into the proposed dismissal; and
- (c) any representations from the relevant officer.

9. Any remuneration, allowances or fees paid by the authority to an independent person appointed to the Panel must not exceed the level of remuneration, allowances or fees payable to that independent person in respect of that person's role as independent person under the 2011 Act”

(a) SI 2005/421. Article 16 of Part 1 of Schedule 3 of the Order applies regulation 7 of the 2001 Regulations to the New Forest

National Park Authority, as if it were a local authority as referred to in the 2001 Regulations.

(b) 2011 c. 20.

(c) S.I. 2001/3384.

(d) 1972 c. 70.

This page is intentionally left blank