

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>SUBJECT:</b> | <b>TO DELETE THE POST OF FINANCIAL SYSTEMS SUPPORT MANAGER AND REPLACE IT WITH A NEW ROLE OF PROJECT RESOURCE CO ORDINATOR</b> |
| <b>MEETING:</b> | <b>INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION</b>  |
| <b>DATE:</b>    | <b>8<sup>th</sup> August 2018</b>  |

## **1. PURPOSE:**

This report seeks approval to delete the post of Financial Systems Support Manager and replace it with a new post of Project Resource Co Ordinator.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 To delete the post of Financial Systems Support Manager.
- 2.2 To approve the creation of a new post of Project Resource Co Ordinator.
- 2.3 To retain the resultant savings of £4,385 in the service to address known cost pressures.

## **3. KEY ISSUES:**

- 3.1 The current team structure has been in place since February 2015. At the time this structure created a new post of Financial Systems Support Manager. The purpose of this new role was to oversee and develop the new System Support Team that was created at the same time. This role included extensive line management and daily supervision of staff.
- 3.2 In April 2018 the then Financial Systems Support Manager left the Council. This presented us with an opportunity to review how the current set up was working and to make any required adjustments.
- 3.3 Following discussions with the team, the general view was that the day to day management could be undertaken in a different way.
- 3.4 One of the key roles of the System Support Team is to develop our financial systems (Civica, Northgate, Comino and Business World), particularly in respect to digitalisation and self-service. Our team discussions identified the need to refocus this resource to concentrate on project management and system development.
- 3.5 A revised job description, attached as Appendix One, has been prepared. Both the Team and Trade Unions have been fully consulted and have assisted in the

development of the job description. The change in team structure is also detailed in Appendix Two.

#### **4. OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

##### **4.1 *Option 1 – Do nothing and reappoint to the role of Financial Systems Support Manager***

4.1.1 This option wouldn't address concerns raised by the team and the requirement to focus resources on developing our systems.

##### **4.2 *Option 2– Revise the job description to reflect the current service demands***

4.2.1 This option ensures that the Team's structure is fit for purpose and allocates resources to areas of the most demand.

4.3 Option 2 was considered to be the best approach. It is therefore proposed that the revised job description is approved and the structure amended accordingly.

#### **5. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

An evaluation assessment has been included at Appendix A for future evaluation of whether the decision has been successfully implemented. The decision will come back to this committee in 12 months for review. **A TEMPLATE FORM IS AVAILABLE AT THE END OF THIS DOC.**

#### **6. REASONS**

With the post of Financial Systems Support Manager becoming vacant, we have taken the opportunity to review current roles and responsibilities and redesign the post to reflect the current demands of the service.

#### **7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 The Financial Systems Support Manager post was graded as H 33-37, with annual budgeted costs (including on costs) of £43,905.

7.2 The new proposed Project Co ordinator post has been job evaluated and given the grade of G 29-33, which equates to annual costs of £39,520.

7.3 The proposed change therefore releases a saving of £4,385. It is recommended that this saving is retained by the service to address identified cost pressures elsewhere.

#### **8. WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS IMPLICATIONS (INCORPORATING EQUALITIES, SUSTAINABILITY, SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING):**

There are no corporate parenting or safeguarding implications associated with this proposal. The proposal does help in sustaining the service. The details of which can be found in Appendix Three.

**9. CONSULTEES:**

Consultees are listed below:

- Chief Officer - Resources
- Revenues, Systems & Exchequer Team
- Employee Services
- Unison

**10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

Appendix One: Project Resource Co ordinator job description

Appendix Two: Team structure

Appendix Three: Future Generations Evaluation Form

**11. AUTHOR:**

Ruth Donovan– Assistant Head of Finance: Revenues, Systems & Exchequer

**12. CONTACT DETAILS:**

**Tel:** 01633 644592

**E-mail:** [Ruthdonovan@monmouthshire.gov.uk](mailto:Ruthdonovan@monmouthshire.gov.uk)

## Evaluation Criteria – Cabinet, Individual Cabinet Member Decisions & Council

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title of Report:</b>        |  |
| <b>Date decision was made:</b> |  |
| <b>Report Author:</b>          |  |

### What will happen as a result of this decision being approved by Cabinet or Council?

What is the desired outcome of the decision?  
What effect will the decision have on the public/officers?

**12 month appraisal**

*Was the desired outcome achieved? What has changed as a result of the decision? Have things improved overall as a result of the decision being taken?*

### What benchmarks and/or criteria will you use to determine whether the decision has been successfully implemented?

Think about what you will use to assess whether the decision has had a positive or negative effect:  
Has there been an increase/decrease in the number of users  
Has the level of service to the customer changed and how will you know  
If decision is to restructure departments, has there been any effect on the team (e.g. increase in sick leave)

**12 month appraisal**

*Paint a picture of what has happened since the decision was implemented. Give an overview of how you fared against the criteria. What worked well, what didn't work well. The reasons why you might not have achieved the desired level of outcome. Detail the positive outcomes as a direct result of the decision. If something didn't work, why didn't it work and how has that effected implementation.*

### What is the estimate cost of implementing this decision or, if the decision is designed to save money, what is the proposed saving that the decision will achieve?

Give an overview of the planned costs associated with the project, which should already be included in the report, so that once the evaluation is completed there is a quick overview of whether it was delivered on budget or if the desired level of savings was achieved.

**12 month appraisal**

*Give an overview of whether the decision was implemented within the budget set out in the report or whether the desired amount of savings was realised. If not, give a brief overview of the reasons why and what the actual costs/savings were.*

**Any other comments**

