Essential collaborative transformation skills for public sector leaders and managers
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DEVELOPING NEW PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACTS IN SHARED SERVICES
David Mannion-Marsh, CTArc, on the importance of positive employer/employee relationships during shared service change

UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT! WELSH COUNCIL COLLABORATION
Welsh Assembly Minister Mark Drakeford facilitates the next chapter in the Welsh Councils’ collaboration story

THE SSA GUIDE TO THE NEW LGA SHARED SERVICES MAP
SSA have provided you with a guide to getting the most from the 2016 update of the LGA Shared Services Map

NINE NEW UPDATES FOR YOUR HIGHWAY CODE FOLDER INCLUDING:
• Update on NHS Transformation Plans
• Six tips for successful collaborative outsourcing
• Enterprise Architecture and Shared Service Architecture
• Collaborative Communication: Checking who is onboard
• The future for shared Revenues & Benefits
• What could possibly go wrong in shared service working?
What did the successful candidate have on their CV that you didn’t?

The Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation

from Canterbury Christ Church University Business School
...six months’ distance learning and a turbo-charged CV

Canterbury Christ Church University Business School, in partnership with Shared Service Architecture, established the UK’s first postgraduate qualification in public sector shared service working in 2010.

In 2016 it has been enhanced, in partnership with CIPFA, for leaders and managers involved in developing combined authorities, city regions, localism, blue light transformation, health service collaborations, systems-wide transformations as well as shared services.

This course provides you with the knowledge and skills to initiate and develop collaborative transformation and shared service projects, whilst also giving you a valuable postgraduate qualification. You will become a skilled and valuable in-house resource, able to cascade your learned skills across colleagues in collaborative transformation activities.

Visit www.shareservicearchitects.co.uk

Or email Dr Wim van Vuuren, Programme Director
wim.van-vuuren@canterbury.ac.uk

You can enquire about the 2017 cohort now!
Has collaborative working reached the tipping point where it is mainstream?

It is likely that from 2017, collaborative working will move from “nice to be seen doing” to “essential for the survival of our organisation”.

Collaboration is now in play across all public sector activities. From shared services, to the much greater savings to be gained in integrated health, combined authorities, academy clusters, blue-light and mergers.

To avoid a slow, costly, stumble to success (or failure!), hundreds of leaders and managers employed on new and existing collaborative projects will require the skills of collaborative transformation.

To help them, in this edition of Collaborative Transformation Magazine, twenty CTPracs and CTArcs have submitted articles with tools, templates, or valuable solutions to the challenges they are meeting in their collaborative transformation activity.

Updating your Highway Code Of Collaborative Working

There are nine new updates, to ‘cut out and keep’, for your Highway Code folder, starting from page 53. They are written by practitioners for you because it is information that they have found relevant in their work.

Collaborative Transformation Magazine is written for Collaborative Transformation Practitioners, by practitioners. So please get in touch if you would like to contribute an article, tool or Highway Code update.

New pathways to the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation (PCCT)

Another sixteen students have joined the October 2016 cohort of the PCCT, at Canterbury Christ Church University. Maybe you will decide to turbo-charge your CV and join in 2017. Dr Wim van Vuuren (p31) explains the new offer by the university to accept students through a wider range of CTPrac seminar pathways, including the Collaborative Leadership programme.

Dominic Macdonald-Wallace - Editor
dominic.wallace@sharedservicearchitects.co.uk
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CONTENTS

26 contributions to accelerate

THINKING OUT LOUD

Manny Gatt SSAf
SSA Managing Director

Public sector integration: Tipping point or breaking point? p7

SSA ALUMNI UPDATE

Lucie Hall SS(PRAC)
SSA Alumni, Media and Research Manager

Meet the new Practitioners and Architects p9

CASE STUDIES AND SUPPORT MATERIALS FOR YOUR COLLABORATIONS

2016 LGA Shared Services Map: How to benefit from the indicative data… p12

Henry Pavey SSA, MD The Collaboration Man Ltd
Under new management: Welsh Council Collaboration p21

Alasdair Robertson SSAf, is MD of i-three ltd
The 2016 LGA Shared Services Map analysed p15

Robert Milford, Director of Milford Research & Consultancy Ltd
Upstream collaborations vs mirror collaborations p23

Benjamin Taylor, Chief Executive of the Public Service Transformation Academy.
The new Public Service Transformation Academy p25

Jane Taylor, Head of Service for Employment, Skills & Learning at Bristol Council
Jointly turning the curve in the Bristol Workzone p19

Magda Zurba CTPrac, SSA Client Relationship Manager
Enhancing collaborative working through games p27

Terry Huggins SSAf is an SSA Associate Director
Who are the ideal team players for assembling a collaboration team? p29

Your name, CTArc
Your role and organisation’s name

POSTGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN COLLABORATIVE TRANSFORMATION

Wim van Vuuren, SSAf
Canterbury Christ Church University
Making the Postgraduate Certificate even more accessible to you p31

Collette Smith, SSA
Head of Shared Services at LONZA
Managing people, power and politics in a world of collaboration p33

Dave Mannion-Marshall, CTArc
Head of Business Services, SSD, Essex Police & Kent Police
Developing the new psychological contract across the organisation p36

Why not submit an article for the next edition to renew your recognition without charge?
effective collaborative transformation...

POSTGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN COLLABORATIVE TRANSFORMATION

Jackie Hewlett-Davies, CTArc
MD of Hewlett-Davies Associates Ltd

Pushing the boulder up the health collaboration hill!

Andrea Kilby, SSA
Legal Services Practice Manager, Surrey County Council

Let’s get emotional about project managers

The views expressed in this magazine are those of the contributors for which Shared Service Architecture Ltd accepts no responsibility. Readers should take appropriate professional advice before acting on any issue raised in this magazine.

SSA ONLINE TOOLKITS

Jisa Prassanan, SSPrac and Debbie Whitton
Shared Services, Sutton Council

Creating an in-house shared service toolkit using SSA’s online tools

Mark Andrew SS(PRAC)
Area Manager, People & OD, Leicestershire Fire & Rescue

Applying SSA’s tools to engage Chief Fire Officers in shared service decisions

NEW UPDATES FOR YOUR HIGHWAY CODE OF COLLABORATIVE WORKING

Dominic Wallace, CTArcf
SSA Director of Learning and Development

Accelerating the NHS transformation strategy

Errol Williamson, CTArc
Director of I AM Change

Six tips for successful change in outsourcing

Rob Neil SSA
MD of Accordio Ltd

Enterprise Architect, or Shared Service Architect?

Tim Smith SS(PRAC)
MD Blue Heron Communications Ltd

Collaborative Comm’s: Temperature checking everyone’s understanding

Robin Bates, CTArc
Head of LGSS Revenues & Benefits

Shared revenues and benefits: The knowns and unknowns

David Edwards, CTArc
Director of DEManagement Ltd

Shared services: What could possibly go wrong?

National Housing Fed Merger Code: What can we learn?

Police & Fire Reforms 2016: Merger is not inevitable

TECKAL Test: Update your guide to public-public shared service contracts
WHICH PRACTITIONER RECOGNITION WILL IMPROVE YOUR CV?

Collaborative Transformation Practitioner
Iain Hughes

Iain Hughes is recognised as a Collaborative Transformation Practitioner and is licensed to use the post nominal letters CTPrac™ until 01/10/17.

A Collaborative Transformation Practitioner has attended the following seminars, which are part of the Postgraduate Certificate In Collaborative Transformation:

- The Highway Code Of Collaborative Transformation
- Collaborative Leadership Within Organisations
- Collaborative Leadership Between Organisations

CTPrac™ signifies that as a recognised Collaborative Transformation Practitioner, Iain Hughes is equipped with a range of over 100 tools, templates and techniques to support a collaborative working project using the Shared Service Architecture® methodology.

Shared Service Practitioner
Jenny Fowler

Jenny Fowler is recognised as a Shared Service Practitioner and is licensed to use the post nominal letters SS(PRAC)™ until 01/10/17.

A Shared Service Practitioner has attended the following seminars, which are part of the Postgraduate Certificate In Collaborative Transformation:

- The Highway Code Of Collaborative Transformation
- The Trust & Shared Vision Toolbox
- The Collaboration Business Case Toolbox

SS(PRAC)™ signifies that as a recognised Shared Service Practitioner, Jenny Fowler is equipped with a range of over 100 tools, templates and techniques to support a collaborative working project using the Shared Service Architecture® methodology.

Employers are looking for collaboration and shared service skills. CTPrac™ or SS(PRAC)™ sends a clear message to them on your CV.

To find out more about the Collaborative Transformation, or Shared Service, Practitioner Programme and seminar dates, visit:

www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk

*CTPrac™, SS(PRAC)™, CTArc™ and SSA™ are registered trade marks owned by Shared Service Architecture Ltd and may only be used with permission.

* Acceptance on the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation requires approval by the University.
PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRATION: TIPPING POINT OR BREAKING POINT?

We are at a high water mark for public service integration.

Never before have there been so many initiatives designed to transform public services through collaboration. Nor has the pace for change been so dynamic.

Are we at the tipping point?

Some argue that we are at the tipping point, where collaborative working will go mainstream.

They cite Sustainable Transformation Plans (STPs) in health, or combined authority arrangements in local government. Place-based devolution deals between national and local governments and area reviews in education. These are their examples of public service transformation through collaboration.

Or breaking point?

Others argue that we are at a breaking point, where public sector organisations are overstretched, due to rising demands, reductions in funding and the ‘leaning’ of organisations to the point where they lack the head space, resources and capacity to collaborate with others.

Examples cited include adult and children’s services, the integration of health and social care and the pressures of NHS providers.

So, which is right? Are we at a tipping point or breaking point? The answer to this is that both can, and do, happen simultaneously.

Why the paradox?

There are a number of dimensions to this paradox.

The ‘place paradox’: The drive to collaborate, is frequently place-based. People have a genuine shared commitment for their places and their communities. But ‘places’ are also contested. Politicians who contest places via elections and public sector organisations frequently find themselves competing for scarce resources, customers (eg education) and new ways to derive income.

The ‘survival paradox’: Organisations under pressure will focus on self-preservation and their survival instinct may undermine attempts to collaborate with others.

Evidence of survival instinct can be seen where districts and county councils seek different models of local government re-organisation, or where NHS secondary and primary care providers have different visions for new models of care.
Thinking Out Loud

The ‘trust paradox’: Successful collaborations do exhibit high levels of trust. Yet sometimes public sector partnerships exhibit much lower levels of trust. A council CEO once said to me that ‘partnership can be defined as mutual loathing temporarily suspended in the pursuit of money’. As a guide, partnerships that exhibit low trust behaviours, tend to focus on the deal, rather than building trusted and sustainable relationships.

Here is the rub, no matter how compelling the ‘deal’ is, poor partnership relationships are likely to scupper it. This is why forcing organisations to share is frequently unsuccessful.

With so many dimensions to the paradox, can they be overcome?

We believe that there is also the tipping point and breaking point paradox.

This paradox happens when the case for collaborative working and the need to change one’s organization both become self-evident at the same time.

It happens when leaders recognize that, only by working with others will they achieve their objectives and this will require the organization to re-imagine itself to make it relevant in this new context.

When these stars align, the opportunity to genuinely transform public services through collaboration becomes real.

Making the most of the tipping point and breaking point paradox

So, how can leaders help make the stars align and leverage the potential of the tipping point and breaking point paradox?

Based on my experience of working with local authorities, CCGs, STPs, blue light and education, we would suggest that leaders come together and focus on three things:

- **Having the right conversations:** Ensure that they talk about the important issues not the side shows

- **Build the right relationships:** Invest in the relationships and agree on how they work together to make change happen

- **Bring their organisation to bear on the project:** Commit their organisation’s resources to the shared endeavour and through the right leadership behaviours evidence that the change is going to happen no matter how painful to the traditional ways of working for staff or management

If the leadership embraces the tipping and breaking point paradox and focuses on these three actions, it will accelerate the pace and scale of collaboration projects.
TRADING YOUR KNOWLEDGE FOR POST-NOMINAL RECOGNITION

Almost 3,000 senior managers and leaders have attended at least one SSA Collaborative Transformation, Collaborative Leadership or facilitated session; over 500 in 2015 alone.

Already, in 2016, large numbers have become eligible for “practitioner” recognition, and over 100 are eligible for “architect” recognition.

This entitles them to choose the post-nominal letters CTPrac™ or SS(PRAC)™, and CTArc™ or SSA™ for addition to their email signature and business cards, and join the online community to share good practice.

More importantly, at job interview in Health, Blue Light, Local Authority, Education and Housing, it is being used as a competitive edge. Large numbers of public sector employers are interested in candidates who can evidence skills development in collaborative transformation and shared services. This will gain pace as devolution starts to require large project teams skilled in collaborative transformation.

There's no money left for professional fees…

In these times of austerity, many organisations have stopped funding the professional fees of their employees.

Therefore, there are five options for CTPrac™, SS(PRAC)™, CTArc™ or SSA™ recognition holders to renew their annual membership as an alternative to paying an annual fee of £199 + VAT.

The options are centred around contributing to the SSA body of knowledge and increasing practitioner numbers.

For example, the first option is submitting an annual article to this magazine.

Our practitioners and architects are continuously creating excellent examples of good practice that they could be sharing with others. This magazine provides a platform for them to share that knowledge in a structured way.

You can see in this edition of the magazine that the majority of our community is taking up this option. They will be fully credited with writing the article and, instead of paying a renewal fee for continued Practitioner or Architect recognition, the copyright of the article will transfer to SSA to be added to our online tools library to expand the knowledge base.

Swapping tools for renewal…

A second option is submitting a new collaboration tool for publication in the SSA online tools library.

The purpose of the SSA toolboxes is to inspire users to develop new and better tools. Therefore, if you are a practitioner or architect you can put forward a tool, template or technique you have developed, to be included in the online toolkit, or in future published toolkits.

Full acknowledgement for the tool will go to you, the copyright of the tool, template or technique will transfer to SSA, as an alternative to you paying your annual recognition fee.

If you would like to read more about all the options and how they might work in practice, please visit: www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/Annual-Renewal-of-Recognition

More importantly, at job interview it is being used as a competitive edge. Large numbers of public sector employers are interested in candidates who can evidence skills development in collaborative transformation and shared services.

Lucie Hall SS(PRAC)
SSA Alumni, Media and Research Manager
Meet some of our recently registered Architects and Practitioners

Delegates who attend a three day Collaborative Transformation Practitioner programme can apply for Collaborative Transformation Practitioner - CTPrac™, or Shared Service Practitioner - SS(PRAC)™ recognition.

This indicates that they are equipped with tools and knowledge to be considered for working in a collaboration project team.

David Mannion-Marshall CTArc
Kent Police & Essex Police

Jackie Hewlett-Davies CTArc
Hewlett-Davies Associates Limited

Stewart Taylor SSA
Surrey County Council

Carol Norfolk CTArc
Kent Police

Adrian Gorst SSA
London Borough of Islington

Rhonda Skelton SSA
Maitland City Council (AUS)

Simon Roscoe CTArc
North Wales Police

Jolil Shah SSA
London Borough of Camden

Mary Swanston SS(PRAC)
LGSS

Shona Maclean CTPrac
Civil Nuclear Constabulary

Conrad Moore CTPrac
Kent Police

Michelle West CTPrac
Kent Police

Magda Zurba CTPrac
Shared Service Architecture Ltd

Miah Fozlu CTPrac
London Borough of Camden

Supt Tom Richards CTPrac
Kent Police

*CTPrac™, SS(PRAC)™, CTArc™, SSA™ and CArc™ are registered trademarks owned by Shared Service Architecture Ltd and may only be used with permission.
Delegates who complete the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation, or hold an equivalent M-level qualification and have completed the practitioner programme, can apply for **Collaborative Transformation Architect - CTArc™**, or **Shared Service Architect - SSA™** recognition.

This indicates that they are equipped with tools and in-depth knowledge to lead a collaboration project team.
HOW CAN YOU BENEFIT FROM THE 2016 LGA SHARED SERVICES MAP UPDATE?

SSA has prepared a guide to four ways in which the Local Government Association (LGA) Shared Services Map update for 2016, can help you in your shared service projects.

In addition we have matched the map to a number of our tools, templates and techniques, to support your practitioner work with the SSA toolboxes.

The map is only indicative...

It is important to understand how the data for the map was provided, to understand the context in which you apply the data.

Firstly, the data is supplied voluntarily by councils who want the opportunity to register their shared service on the map.

Secondly, not all the data requested was provided by all the services registered, especially the ‘savings made’ from the shared services.

Some services have fulfilled their purpose and are no longer active, others no longer record their savings because the service has become ‘business as usual’, others declined to disclose them.

The map’s key strength, is that it provides a starting point for contacting those who have gone before you, to learn from them, borrow their documentation and ensure you don’t repeat already known mistakes.

This will accelerate the progress of your projects and programmes to deliver the new, better, lower-cost collaborative services that will be required to meet the public sector challenges of the next few years.

You can visit the LGA Shared Services Map at http://www.local.gov.uk/shared-services-map

A Thank You To The Contributors

Through a competitive tender, Shared Service Architecture were commissioned to collect and collate the data for the 2016 LGA Shared Services Map Update. Working with Alasdair Robertson at i-three, we also provided a level of data analytics to create a basic understanding of what the data is indicating to the sector.

We had strong support from our CTArcs™ and CTPrcs™ who are at the heart of many shared services across the UK, and from the FDs and other Officers within partnering councils. We would like to thank all those Officers, and our alumni in the contributing councils, who took the time to provide the data to our team.
Don't pay for documents that already exist...

Tool T&V 0.03 in the SSA Online Toolbox is called “Who else can help you with this project?”.

The premise of the tools is that shared services in almost all of the service delivery categories in local government have already been attempted.

So, there is plenty of existing documentation that can either short cut your work, or save you a fortune in paying for duplications.

For example there will be:
● Existing business cases you could draw on
● MOU documentation that could help you
● Legal options documents on shared service vehicles and staff restructures

Therefore a valuable use of the LGA map is to click on the Categories Option under the map (shown above) to identifying the projects that already exist in your area of service delivery.

This will show on the map where the partnership projects are happening across England.

Click on any of the numbered circles to identify the councils involved. You can then contact your counterpart in one of the councils and ask (nicely!), if they have useful project, or legal, documentation you can feed into your work without having to pay for its creation.

The LGA Map Categories Option

Are you looking to create, or add to, a shared service?

By virtue of being a map, you can use it to identify the shared service activity in your locality, or within your new devolution or combined authority geography.

That can help you either identify who is already in a partnership that you could join, or isn’t in a partnership and therefore may be available to join with you, or your existing shared service.

These factors can be valuable in either:
● creating a new shared service
● adding new partners to your shared service
● or joining the partners of an existing shared service because you feel it is quicker than setting up a new shared service

Start at the Categories Option underneath the map and click on the category of service you are interested in. (See box 1 above). Circles with different numbers will appear.

When you click on a circle with the number ‘1’ on it, a box will pop up with the name of the partnership, the lead organisation and who the partners are. You can now ponder on the membership of that partnership.

A question could be not ‘who is listed?’, but ‘who is not listed’? if you are seeking to add partners in your locality to your existing shared service.
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The LGA Map Contacts Option

How can you avoid the mistakes of others?

The LGA Shared Services Map can help you avoid the expensive mistakes that others have made.

Projects to develop shared services have been attempted in almost all delivery areas and professions in local government. Notice we say "attempted" rather than successfully completed.

Whilst formal case studies of success are interesting, learning from the mistakes of others is more valuable.

It helps you avoid the blind alleyways, wasted effort because of what you don’t know, and expensive spending on projects that are doomed to fail no matter what you do.

Start at the Categories Option underneath the map and click on the category of service you are interested in. Circles with different numbers will appear. Click on a circle with the number ‘1’ on it and an information box will pop up.

Scroll down to the bottom of the box and you should see a contact name and email, or a generic email, you can contact. When you approach them, ask: “What three things would you do differently if you were to start again?” Asking: “What mistakes did you make?”, is not a particularly motivating question.

The LGA Map Data Table Option

How can you analyse what the map data is indicating?

The underpinning data table for the LGA map is structured in CSV spreadsheet format so that you can manipulate and analyse the data in more depth.

You can download the data by clicking on the text above the map which says: To download a CSV file of the full data set behind the map click here. There is a picture above to show you the location.

The data has been structured around each partnership, starting with the lead partner as a 'parent' line of data. The line includes names of all the other partners, the category the service falls into, financial savings and a contact name and email. (It is this line that appears when you click on a circle with a ‘1’ in it).

Below each ‘parent line’ are lines of similar data for each named partner, but listed under the ONS geographic number for the location of that partner.

Alasdair Robertson applied his whizzy data analytics skills and technology to come up with the graphs and infomatics shown in his article on page 16.

If data analytics is not your field of expertise, you can contact Alasdair if you would like to know more.
The Four Options

1. **Categories Option**: Click on any of the numbered circles to identify the councils involved. You can then contact your counterpart in one of the councils and ask (nicely!), if they have useful project, or legal, documentation you can feed into your work without having to pay for its creation.

You will find the ‘Categories Option’ helpful in:
- applying tools T&V0.03, BC0.02 and BC0.03, which are tools for preparing yourself before stepping into a collaboration project. For example you could borrow existing shared vision documents and business cases to learn from and inspire your work.
- BC4.03, which works to identify the up-front costs of a collaboration project.
- If they have an MOU you could borrow, it will help with T&V5.03.

2. **Locality Option**: By virtue of being a map, this can help you either identify who is already in a partnership that you could join, or isn’t in a partnership and therefore may be available to join with you, or your existing shared service.

The ‘Locality Option’ can help you populate these tools:
- CLB1.01, which maps existing systems and sector collaborations to identify the best fit for your collaborative working ambitions
- CLW2.03, which will help you assess why you are stepping into the collaboration
- T&V2.10, which explains how to manage collaborative working tourism

3. **Contacts Option**: You should see a contact name and email, you can get in touch with. Ask: “What three things would you do differently if you were to start again?”. Asking: “What mistakes did you make?”, is not a particularly motivating question.

The ‘Contact Option’ can help you with lessons learned activity:
- T&V1.03 focuses on obtaining overviews of a number of similar projects with a summary of both successes and failures.
- T&V1.06 tests what could possibly go wrong in your project and speaking to others could reveal issues that you are not currently aware of.
- The 16 BC techniques - you can ask in depth about the economic case methodologies used to evidence both potential and actual savings.

4. **Data Table Option**: The underpinning data table for the LGA map is structured in spreadsheet format so that you can manipulate and analyse the data in more depth. It includes financial savings for a large number of the collaborations.

The ‘Data Table Option’ can help you with:
- BC0.09, informing the Gateway Review process on the actual financial benefits of similar, mature, collaborations - are they too small to bother?
- BC4.01, which supports evaluating financial and non-financial benefits
- BC4.02, gaining agreement on how to measure your ROI

---

How can you add or amend data on the LGA Shared Service Map?

If you are a council, you can add your shared service to the LGA Map, using the online data collection tool. It will be helpful to have the following information to hand before you start:

1. Details of the partnership, its members, the lead authority if there is one and a contact for further information.
2. A brief description of each collaboration including the nature of the project and all expected benefits, eg money saved; improved customer experience; improved customer satisfaction; collection rates; recycling rates, etc.
3. The year in which the service started to deliver, or started development if not yet delivering, or closed. What legal vehicle it is formed under? For example, the choices in the questionnaire include: joint committee, limited liability partnership, limited company.
4. If available, details of the banked savings (eg £475,000), and, if available, the percentage of savings made compared to the cost when the partners were delivering individually (eg 17%).
5. Information on whether you wish to add partners to the shared service.

Visit [https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/35XZRHN](https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/35XZRHN) to add your service

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION SHARED SERVICES MAP

THE 2016 LGA SHARED SERVICES MAP ANALYSED...

What does the map tell us?

Having applied data analytics to previous editions of the map, I was keen to see what comparisons could be drawn from the 2016 map data.

Where are the big savings being made, what are the most popular areas for sharing and are shared services increasing in number, or diminishing?

However, we need to temper any of the conclusions that my analytics evidences, with an understanding that the LGA are clear that the map is an indicative guide to trends and activity in shared services between councils.

For example, where suggested savings are involved, more councils did not state savings figures from their projects than provided them. A larger base of evidence of savings would have provided greater assurance of the figures for analysis.

What are the key facts?

- 224 shared services are shown on the map as operational
- 1,327 is the total number of partners in operational partnerships
- £500m is the total savings reported by the operational partnerships
- 23% is the average savings reported by the partnerships
Many of the services which have saved the most are among the less ‘contentious’ areas such as property and procurement.

There is no reason why these areas should be limited to local authority peer-to-peer sharing. They could be done in geographic areas involving collaboration with other agencies.

This could be a useful prelude to better joint working in devolved areas.

Some partnerships are truly mature and involve multiple sharing arrangements.

These authorities can truly evidence that they have achieved collaborative advantage and ‘know how to share’.

Many others are still early in their journeys of sharing and have yet to develop multiple arrangements.

It will be interesting to see how this pattern develops as partners develop more trust and experience.

The top five services dominate the others for average savings.

**What are the average savings by partnership type?**

1. **Shared procurement and commissioning** has saved the most
   - £15,387,708

2. **Property, Facilities and Utilities** has saved £9,627,217

3. **Shared Leadership & Chief Execs** has saved £6,373,333

4. **Shared Management** has saved £3,000,364

5. **Housing, Benefits, Finance & Financial Services** has saved £2,798,333

Some councils have really driven forward with sharing and are involved in 7, or more, partnerships.
The scale of savings among the ‘premier league’ of sharers is impressive and must be making a substantial contribution to maintaining services in these areas.

The period 2010-13 saw the biggest number of new shared services start, but the percentage saved during this period was less impressive. Were these initiated to enable other services to share later, or was this a period when some shared services were started to ‘keep up with the Joneses’ rather than on the business logic?

You can download a more in-depth PowerPoint analysis of the LGA Map data at www.i-three.co.uk.
JOINTLY ‘TURNING THE CURVE’ IN THE BRISTOL WORK ZONE

Bristol is a city of contrasts, with a number of neighbourhoods experiencing far higher than average concentrations and persistence of unemployment, worklessness and low skills.

Evidence suggests that it might take up to two decades for some of the worst performing wards in Bristol to reach the average levels of employment experienced across the whole city.

Conversely, there is strong evidence to show that people in paid employment enjoy a higher quality of life through improved personal and family outcomes, including more secure housing and higher levels of self-esteem, health and well-being.

Therefore, it is widely recognised that there are huge economic benefits in supporting people to progress from a life on benefits to financial independence.

However, turning the curve is a real challenge. In this instance, providers and strategic partners alike recognise the difficulty in addressing the ‘turning the curve’ challenge. No single provider or strategic partner can solve this on their own.

Bristol Ways2Work Strategy 2016-2020

If no single provider or strategic partner can solve the ‘turning the curve’ challenge on their own, how might they work together in new ways to ‘turn the curve’? This was the challenge set by the Bristol City Learning Partnership.

Bristol City Learning Partnership is overseen by a group of influential city leaders who aim to improve the local employment, skills and learning offer so that more local people can improve their employment prospects and outcomes.

In order to deliver this ambition, the Bristol Learning City Partnership developed the Bristol Ways2Work Strategy which provides the implementation plan for the Bristol City Learning Partnership vision, by focusing on six priority areas that collectively will help turn the curve.

Priority 6 states “we will develop localised ‘work zones’ with and for priority neighbourhoods”.

What is a work zone?

The concept of a ‘work zone’ is to bring employability and skills providers together in new ways, to deliver a more integrated and coordinated approach to local employment support and learning.

The objectives of creating localised work zones in priority areas were identified as follows:

- improve the co-location, integration and co-ordination of local employment and skills services;
- improved resident access to local, high quality, co-ordinated employment and skills services;
- underpinned by a common operating framework to ensure consistency and quality.

Developing the work zone concept

Commissioned by the funders and developed by the providers, the co-designing of the Bristol Work Zone Model was done in a collaborative way, bringing together leaders and practitioners from different backgrounds.
Therefore, a series of enquiry and engagement events were held by Bristol City Learning Partnership culminating in a provider event in January 2016. During the event, the concept of a work zone was agreed in principle and commitment pledged by the strategic funders, to pull together their existing employability and skills strands and future dovetail funding streams to support its development.

Following this event, a team of provider volunteers were selected and tasked with developing an 'operating framework' for the Bristol work zone model.

Over a ten-week period, the provider team, facilitated by Shared Service Architects have addressed the key objectives set by the Bristol City Learning Partnership of phase 1 of this initiative, namely the:

- development of a single, consistent customer pathway which will guide participants through their work zone journey
- development of a single diagnostic which will capture and share high level customer information with delivery partners.
- development of protocols and procedures for participating work zone providers around information sharing, referring customers to providers and minimum service levels.

Therefore, they have considered and developed the following elements that would make up a work zone operating framework:

- a shared and consistent customer journey for workless adults, including new shared diagnostic tools, a common approach to client segmentation and referral as well as a clearly defined core offer
- a common set of protocols across into work service providers for cross referrals and core data collection
- a coordinated marketing approach through an enhanced and updated Ways2Work website
- Charter Mark to underpin a "one team approach" for participating employment and skills providers

To ensure a sense of connectivity and flow for the operating model, the team developed the zone operating framework using Prezi Presentation Software.

Next steps

Assuming the operating framework is backed by the strategic partners, the next steps are:

- to develop a new specification for the Ways2Work website,
- to pilot and test the work zone operating framework in a specific locality,
- to ensure that strategic partners funding streams and programmes are aligned with the work zone model and
- to roll-out of the work zone model through the creation of up to three integrated employments, skills and learning support hubs within the north, central, east and south of the city.

In this collaborative way, the providers and strategic partners are working together to solve the ‘turning the curve’ challenge.
Mark Drakeford was appointed Welsh Assembly Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Local Government in May 2016, from his role as Minister for Health and Social Services. His brief includes fostering effective collaborative working between local government.

But maybe, it’s who he replaced that is more significant. His predecessor, Public Services Minister, Leighton Andrews, was adamant that the 22 Welsh councils should be reduced to either eight, or nine.

Promoting his draft Local Government Bill of November 2015, Mr Andrews stated that: “There is a real opportunity here for local government to make significant savings for taxpayers and if councils work together, plan well and involve their staff, there is the opportunity for savings even greater than the £650m we have identified…This means more money for frontline public services, more money to invest in communities and more money to support local economic prosperity.”

Unfortunately for Mr Andrews, his local electorate replaced him with Plaid Cymru leader, Leanne Wood in May 2016.

New Minister Mark Drakeford, has proposed all 22 councils remain with an ‘enhanced level of mandatory and systematic collaborative working’.

Building on the 2004 report, Sir Jeremy Beecham’s 2006 review of local service delivery sparked the Welsh government into “…using existing and new legislative powers to strengthen the duties on public bodies to co-operate, removing barriers to collaboration...”.

The integration of relationships was also developed in the Government of Wales Act (2006) which established Cyngor Partneriaeth Gymru - the Partnership Council for Wales. This fostered relationships between both central and local authorities and an environment for collaborative working.

Politicians ‘walking the walk’...

One Wales (2007) was the collaboration exercise by politicians to develop coalition leadership in the Welsh Assembly. Within the agenda, of almost 200 commitments, was an ambition to build on the Beecham Report and pool the budgets of local service boards.

---

4 For the purposes of this section of the bill, local authorities in Wales include county, borough and community councils, national parks, police, fire & rescue and others ‘specified for the purposes’ by Welsh ministers.
6 public services boards in Wales are similar to Local Strategic Partnerships in England.
There would be no change to the existing number of local authorities, but the Welsh Government would support voluntary mergers. The focus for reforming local government at the principal level hinges around regional collaboration.

Cymdeithas Llywodraeth Leol Cymru published a review of collaboration and shared service activities across the country in their 2008 paper Working Together 1.

A paper remembered for its opening line, “Sex, suggested Philip Larkin with his usual sarcasm, was discovered in 1963.” It evidenced, across sixteen service deliver areas, a wide number of existing collaborations covering:
- shared information
- joint regional planning
- shared procurement
- joint service delivery

The following year, Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru delivered their austerity paper, Better Outcomes For Tougher Times 2. It stated: “We are committed to meeting the needs of citizens through collaboration, rather than competition.”,

“...with leaders and managers being collaborative”, “...and collaborative service delivery and improvement.”

Enshrining collaboration in law...

A “duty to collaborate” was introduced in the Local Government (Wales) Measures 2009. Under section 9, collaboration powers were given to improvement authorities: This section confers on Welsh improvement authorities’ broad powers to enable them to collaborate with each other and with other bodies, for the purpose of discharging or facilitating the discharge of the duties under section 2(1), 3(2) and 8(7).

In the meantime, the Simpson Report was published 3 which set out the ‘Big Offer’ drawing together the potential for collaboration on social services, education, mineral planning services, procurement, regulatory services and emergency planning.

This would be achieved through, “A Compact detailing the development of collaborative and national services delivery...”: between the Assembly Government and the WLGA which was jointly signed on 5 December 2011.

In July 2014, Lesley Griffiths, Minister for Local Government & Government Business added a white paper on reforming local government. However, ten years on from the initial thinking, little tangible reform was happening.

Where are we now?

Fast forward to January 2015 and Minister Leyton Andrews published an Explanatory Memorandum to the Local Government Bill Wales 4. Its opening lines are: The provisions of the Local Government (Wales) Bill are intended to allow for certain preparatory work to enable a programme of local government mergers and reform and includes provisions to facilitate the voluntary early merger of two or more Principal Local Authorities by April 2018.

Minister Andrews also requested that the 22 local authorities develop a map of their ambition for merger. Then in May 2016 he lost his Welsh Assembly seat and Minister Drakeford took over the collaboration reigns.

The Society of Local Council Clerks 5 captures the next stage succinctly: In an update to Assembly Members at the Senedd on 4 October 2016, Mr Drakeford outlined proposals on how local authorities would work together to deliver key services. There would be no change to the existing number of local authorities, but the Welsh Government would support voluntary mergers. The focus for reforming local government at the principal level hinges around regional collaboration.

Repeating the known mistakes...

I hope local government colleagues in Wales will use the SSA toolkits, project library and this magazine to draw on the case studies of successes, mistakes and heart-aches English councils have experienced over the last few years in developing their approaches to collaborative working.

It will accelerate the Welsh collaboration journey and probably assure more successes than failures.

---

5 http://www.slcc.co.uk/news-item/wales-local-government-reform/1296/
With some relief, I am heading towards the end of my PhD research into public sector shared service working and it’s making me wonder if we are being too narrow in our collaboration strategies.

Indeed, discussions with my fellow researchers and collaborative peers has highlighted that there are many new, emerging and changing forms of collaboration.

For example mirror collaborations: council-to-council shared benefits services, police-to-police shared ICT, or joint fire control rooms. 

You look in the mirror and see a similarly named organisation delivering almost identical services to your own and therefore feel that they should be the ones to collaborate with. Almost 100% of the LGA Shared Service Map listings are mirror in style.

The mirror collaboration question is: If there are multiple sets of CExs, directors, managers, etc., delivering the same service for different organisations, could one set suffice.

Collaborative integration

Collaborative integration is frequently used to describe non-mirror organisations partnering where they feel it is obvious that “they are better together, than on their own”.

This can be seen in blue-light collaborations, health and social care, or multi-partner action weeks. For example Thanet District Council reported that in June 2014:

“... over 40 agencies, including HMRC and dog units from the Police and Trading Standards, took part in the Margate Task Force’s (MTF) ‘Operation Streetweek’ a high visibility multi agency operation, to identify local concerns and provide reassurance to those living in Margate and Cliftonville.

Moving to the next stage in this style of collaborative integration can be seen in the Northamptonshire Police and Fire Interoperability Programme. It has three steps towards its final ambition:

• The first phase of the programme would be focused around improving the understanding between the two organisations, which endeavoured to develop more efficient and resilient response models between the two organisations.

• The second phase of the programme would focus on building capacity, better aligning the resources between police and fire and developing shared strategies with a focus on developing a broad skills base and capabilities between staff in the two organisations.

• The third and final phase would begin to see the community taking ownership of issues themselves, supported by the new single organisation (Police/Fire) that assists when a community cannot help itself and supports them to help themselves when they can.

So, working together on a ‘prevent agenda’ the programme could reduce the number of emergency (999) call-outs and related costs.

Northamptonshire Police is involved in mirror collaborations too, sharing services with other police forces.

---

1 See page 12
3 Interoperability Programme Briefing note for prospective Police and Crime Commissioners (14/03/2016)
No redundancies occur, no mergers happen, but the potential savings can be counted in hundreds of millions, if not billions, of pounds.

**What is an upstream collaboration?**

This is an attempt to name the new emerging activities that create neither mirror, nor integration, style collaborations.

In these collaborations, the problem for one partner is resolved “up-stream” by a group of other, potentially un-connected partners.

No TUPE occur, no mergers happen, but the potential savings can be counted in hundreds of millions, if not billions of pounds. Examples can be seen in the NHS Vanguard programme.

In September 2016, The Guardian profiled the Sunderland All Together Better Partnership.

It reports that Sunderland is one of the most deprived cities in England. On average, people born there start having health problems more than 10 years before those born in wealthier parts of the country, and die more than six years sooner.

The article tells this story: In a desperate effort to get relief for excruciating pain caused by osteoarthritis, curvature of the spine, and abdominal discomfort following surgery, Linda Douglas went to A&E twice a day.

The chronically ill 48-year-old, who lives near Sunderland, was “at the end of [her] rope” because of the constant pain and frequent hospital visits, and felt life “was not worth living”. That was until a new team of health and social care professionals took over her case and improved her quality of life from “six to 99%” in early 2016.

The team comprising her GP, consultant, community matron, social worker and paramedic worked together to come up with a care plan tailored to her needs.

Now, she can largely avoid hospital and live a much more normal life, mainly because John, her husband and carer, has been trained to administer her daily medication. She says: “My life was driven by fear. I was terrified of being unwell and not being able to get the care I needed to control my pain. I don’t need to worry any more. It’s like a weight has been lifted.”

So, upstream of A&E, a group of dedicated professionals not employed by A&E or necessarily in touch with A&E, have prevented another walk-in patient. No-one has lost their job, no one has been TUPEd, or shifted unwillingly to a new work locality.

This upstream action will free up a potential A&E casualty team, for extreme emergency arrivals, potentially prevent a bed being filled in a hospital ward, even prevent a respite bed being occupied at a care home. All multi-thousand pound costly activities, per individual.

When compared to many mirror collaborations, this activity could save substantially more money and have better outcomes of the citizen. The only problem is that we don’t tend to count the down-stream savings to measure success.

**Adding “upstream collaborations” to your strategies...**

Maybe in your internal “Who should we collaborate with?” debates, you could add upstream to your mirror and integration options.

Ask the question: Which organisations upstream could gain us the efficiencies we require, if they prevented the need for our services?

As a researcher and specialist in collaborative risk management, governance and control, my request would be if you adopt upstream activities, please count the downstream savings to evidence the impact of your work.

---

It seems like everyone wants public services to improve – and everyone wants them to cost less too.

There’s no magic bullet, but we need to explore and learn about all ways to do this. Nor is there a ‘one-stop-shop’ for this learning – in fact, there’s a lot of ‘institutional clutter’ as soon as you look for organisations that can help the sector with its challenges.

This is where the Public Service Transformation Academy comes into play. It is a partnership formed by RedQuadrant with a significant number of sector bodies.

The Public Service Transformation Academy is a not-for-profit social enterprise, with RedQuadrant as the lead partner. Delivery partners include the Whitehall and Industry Group, OPM, NCVO, Browne Jacobson LLP, E3M, TSIP, the Alliance for Useful Evidence, Local Gov Digital, Collaborate, Basis, Numbers for Good, and members of the Public Service Transformation Network.

We have been lucky enough to take on the legacy of the Public Service Transformation Network (that group of civil servants joining up the gaps between central and local government to support community budgets and devolution).

We will be offering a wide range of capacity building offers as well as regular free events and webinars to provide samples and great, practical ideas.

The jewel in the crown is the Cabinet Office Commissioning Academy, a proven programme which equips leaders to develop their organisations. In three years, the Academy has worked with over 1,100 public service leaders to really develop the understanding and the application of commissioning.

So, what is commissioning?

Well, it seems that commissioning is many different things to many different people. But this is because of the richness of its conceptual base; and I believe that this is a very good thing, otherwise learning about it would be a very boring exercise.

Let’s look at the current challenges faced by public services – not enough money, and too much demand. Yet seeking to control, or ‘manage’, demand is a dead-end street. It’s dispiriting, and ultimately counter-productive, because demand isn’t a thing, it’s a symptom – and if we block it, it’s like trying to stop the sea. A rising tide finds a way through!

There’s something behind demand, then – and we might call it need. Looking beyond demand to dealing with need has much greater potential, and is much more rewarding. Yet there’s a dark side to ‘helping’ people with their needs – co-dependency is a risk and if we as public servants are motivated by needs, that’s all we will see.

Behind the need, there’s the purpose that people have in their lives. What we’re really here to do, I believe, is to help people achieve their purpose. That requires much bigger thinking, and a huge loss of the illusion of control.

It requires a different relationship with citizens, and new skills. But giving up control actually gives us more power to achieve something in the world, and allows us to strip away the wasteful and pointless work – and find the really rewarding work to do.
It’s the difference between procuring a street cleansing service, and commissioning for clean streets.

In the latter case, you might still need a good contract and good management of a street cleansing contractor (or not), but you have to think about human behaviour, the causes of litter, about bin design and location, behavioural change, volunteering, what enforcement really works, urban and rural design and more and wider.

Simply put, commissioning is about getting really clear about the outcomes you want to achieve, and all the resources available – your budget and people, surely – but also your partners, the community, the local environment, business and voluntary sector.

And it’s about asking what’s the most powerful role you can play in shaping all the resources to help to achieve the outcomes.

You have to work within your limits to achieve that, and it can unlock massive savings… as well as challenges ranging from better partnership working to ‘what to do when the best answer doesn’t involve my organisation at all’?

What we know for sure is that you never know what will work until you start to try it, so commissioning is about learning as quickly as you can and proceeding, with a strong vision and a plan, step by step by step.

Those of you who have worked with Shared Service Architecture, and any good consultants, partners, leaders and colleagues will recognise some of the learning – and will have many of the skills already, but know that you and your colleagues need more!

That’s why the Public Service Transformation Academy seeks to assist the sector with all the changes needed to support this step-change.

Our goal is to be a strong ‘first stop’ to:

- offer key training and development – developing people to develop their organisations
- provide a focal point for knowledge sharing and learning
- work shoulder-by-shoulder with the institutions, organisations, and practitioners seeking improvement and efficiency across the sector

Our first national Commissioning Academy has been so oversubscribed that we launched two cohorts in June 2016, not one. The next one you can sign up for starts in October 2016.

And local academies, bringing together all the partners across an area or in a sector, will start monthly. We welcome feedback and engagement, so please get in touch!

You can contact Benjamin at the PSTA on 07931317230 and view details of their programmes at www.publicservicetransformation.org
A key activity of the FtF team is to increase the collaborative working of staff, to identify ideas that will reduce overheads, increase services and where possible improve the quality of delivery.

Facing The Future (FtF), is a programme of projects to transform the way Sandwell Borough Council’s staff work collaboratively, to save money following £132m cuts to the budget over the last five years.

I visited the council recently to learn how they have developed a board game to harness collaborative thinking by staff to deliver the savings required.

Facing The Future has a £22 million savings target by the end of 2016/17 and plays a central role in the council’s overall strategy described as ‘...to stave off bankruptcy, stay in business and continue serving our residents’.

Central to FtF is reaching out to every one of their 4,700 employees so they:
- know all about the programme;
- appreciate just how vital it is to all our futures; and (crucially)
- can chip in with their own ideas to contribute to it.

FtF ‘champions’ in each of the council’s main departments are reaching out to colleagues with key updates – and in the process injecting fresh impetus to the programme.

**Back to basics comms...**

A ‘back to basics’ communication and engagement strategy lies at the heart of the council’s comms approach.

The council has created a video for its website that explains to residents the impact of the budget cuts on the delivery of services.

However, the delivery of the budget reductions requires strong engagement of the staff within the organisation - and this is where the board game comes into play.

A key activity of the FtF team is to increase the collaborative working of staff, to identify ideas that will reduce overheads, increase services and where possible improve the quality of delivery.
But, how do you do that effectively across 4,700 staff?

Do board games work with staff?

The FtF game is a kind of municipal Monopoly, which the FtF ‘champions’ designed and developed themselves to gain and hold the focus of staff on the budget reduction project.

It uses the recognisable format of board games – complete with dice – to engage staff in thinking about the problems and challenges (and potential solutions), that local government faces (and will face with increasing severity) in times of austerity.

Phil Challoner, the FtF Communications and Engagement Manager at the council, says that there was some initial scepticism that a board game would be effective in helping staff collaborate around the budget challenges. Being asked to play games, when your job could be on the line, is not an easy mix.

Phil says that the scepticism was dispelled when players took part. What they found was that gaming helped them to articulate fresh, and frequently innovative, ideas that can be harnessed by the FtF team.

During the game, players get the opportunity to select questions about:

- transforming services
- saving money
- quick wins
- risk/reward

Using the questions, they are challenged to come up with responses that can win points for their team, in the spirit of collaborative working ‘ideas gathering’ and future success.

A number of ideas raised have led to the creation of employee led ‘Quality Circles’ and effective savings, efficiency and improvement gains.

The Facing The Future game lasts, on average, around 45–60 minutes and is frequently used as a lead-in to planning sessions, or as a team meeting tool.

The innovative and fun nature of the game is successful with staff and other councils Sandwell have shared it with, as part of their partnership working.

The game board also features heavily in an FtF poster campaign across the council, to keep the focus of the 4,700 staff on the continuing requirement for Sandwell Council to save money and deliver quality resident services.

For more information on the FtF Game email Phil_Challoner@sandwell.gov.uk
ASSEMBLING AN EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVE TEAM

One of the key messages for SSAs and CTArcs, is that for any collaboration or shared service arrangement to be implemented successfully there are two components: ‘the deal’ and ‘the relationship’. Both need to be worked at.

Often the deal (business case) is given the most attention whereas in our experience it is commonly inattention to the relationship that causes collaborations to fail.

I find myself regularly considering what are the qualities of those persons who develop and form those great relationships which enable effective collaboration. If you are pondering the same question, I would recommend the newly published book from Patrick Lencioni, The Ideal Team Player. It will be be very helpful in stimulating thought.

As I was reading, it caused me to reflect on situations where his ideas supported exactly what I had witnessed in working with teams assembled to implement a shared service or to work across organisations on a wicked issue. Things both positive and negative.

Patrick Lencioni is an author and speaker who also runs a small US based consultancy. His best known book is The Five Dysfunctions of a Team. I’m sure many SSA graduates will have read this.

In his new book, The Ideal Team Player, I believe you will find assistance in identifying those people who you want as part of any collaboration team.

The style of all Lencioni’s books that I’ve read is a little unusual in that they begin with a fictional story from which his ideas are developed. Some won’t like this approach and if that’s you it’s possible to go straight to the second part of the book.

In his new book, “The Ideal Team Player” I believe you will find assistance in identifying those people who you want as part of any collaboration team.

The three virtues...

Lencioni’s conviction is that there are three virtues that ideal team players have in common: humility, hunger and being smart.

Humble people are those without excessive egos and concerns about their status.

As Lencioni says “they are quick to point out the contributions of others and slow to seek attention for their own. They share credit, emphasise team over self, and define success collectively rather than individually”.

He says that humility is the single greatest and most indispensable attribute of being a team player. In the public sector we regularly read articles informing us that collaborative leadership skills are a necessary strength for the modern chief officer.
However, when recruiting senior staff have our methods evolved to support this, or are we still recruiting chief officers with big egos and a sense of self-importance? My observation would be that in collaboration across organisations, the egos of leaders are still a stumbling point.

**Hungry people** refers to an attitude of always seeking more. Not more possessions or personal wealth but more learning, more responsibility, more opportunities.

These are people who are self-starters, self-motivated and diligent. They go above and beyond what is expected of them but don’t take this to an extreme. It’s a healthy hunger!

**Smart people** has nothing to do with intelligence or knowledge and is best described as “people” smart.

Lencioni describes someone who has high emotional intelligence (EI). The ability to be interpersonally appropriate and aware. Someone who is in touch with what is going on in the group and can relate to people effectively. Good at asking questions and listening.

All three virtues seem straightforward and not earth shattering. He says that what makes them unique is the required combination of all three. “Even if one is missing, teamwork (collaborative working) becomes significantly more difficult.”

**The bulldozer, the charmer and the politician…**

The book describes the issues associated with individuals who are lacking in one or more of the virtues.

For example the person who is hungry only is described as “the bulldozer” and the one who is smart only as “the charmer”.

Similarly for combinations of only two of the virtues, for example the person who is hungry and smart but not humble is “the skilful politician”. The dangers and disruptions that each will cause in collaborative work are described.

Lencioni’s suggested applications of the model are fourfold:

- when hiring staff
- when assessing current employees (including self-assessment),
- when developing employees who are lacking in one or more of the virtues
- when embedding the model into an organisation’s culture.

…and I would suggest a fifth which is ‘Team Selection for Collaborative Projects’.

When organisations assemble a team for developing a shared service, or other collaborative project, I am amazed at how often little thought is given to the selection of people for the team.

Ask the senior managers what are their priorities and shared services will often feature, but this sense of priority is not then reflected in the people they select for teams.

Selection is often based on who’s available or will cause least disruption to day to day working.

I would suggest that attention to the message of this book when selecting staff for collaborative projects would go a long way towards ensuring their success.

---

The Ideal Team Player is published by Jossey-Bass and is available through the usual outlets including Kindle.
I am pleased to confirm that we have made the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation even more accessible to you.

In 2010, Canterbury Christ Church University, in partnership with Shared Service Architecture, established the UK’s first postgraduate qualification for developing public sector collaborations. Initially, it was titled the Postgraduate Certificate in Shared Services. However, the name was revised in 2016 to the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation (PCCT) to take account of the major collaborative transformations that may not be transactional shared services.

For example, the PCCT provides learning for leaders and managers who will be involved in shared services and collaborative transformations such as combined authorities, city regions, health & social care, blue light integrations, NHS systems-wide transformations.

The certificate provides you with the knowledge and skills to initiate, lead and develop public purpose collaborations and shared service projects, whilst also adding a valuable postgraduate qualification to your CV.

You’ll become a skilled and valuable in-house resource, leading on collaborative programmes and able to cascade your learned skills across colleagues working in collaboration activities.

**New pathways onto the programme**

The majority of students have stepped onto the postgraduate programme as a result of attending these three Shared Service Architecture taught programmes:

- The Highway Code Of Collaborative Transformation
- Building Trust & Shared Vision Between Partners
- Drafting Collaborative Business Cases

These were the underpinning session of module 1 of the certificate. The module 1 assignment is to write a reflection on four tools, templates and techniques from the toolkits provided in the CTPrac™ sessions.

However, in 2015, Shared Service Architecture widened the scope of their CTPrac™ recognition, adding the following taught seminars and toolkits:
The PCCT provides learning for leaders and managers who will be involved in shared services... combined authorities, city regions, health & social care, blue light integrations, NHS systems-wide transformations.

- Collaborative Leadership Within Your Organisation
- Collaborative Leadership Between Organisations
- Collaborative Leadership Across Communities
- Managing Collaborative Communications

As part of the university’s 2016 review of the postgraduate certificate, it has been decided that these additional CTPrac™ seminars and toolkits can become part of the module 1 assignment.

Students who have attended these sessions can draw on four tools, templates or techniques from the toolkits for their assignment.

Highway Code plus two other seminars

This new pathway flexibility means that all students must attend the Highway Code of Collaborative Working, but can then pick and mix from the other approved seminars offered in the CTPrac™ programme.

Discounted fees too...

It has always been the generous policy of the university that if you have already attended the CTPrac™ seminars (possibly your employer paid for them), you attract a personal discount of £250 per seminar, off the £2,850 postgraduate certificate fee, to a maximum of £750. One of the attended seminars must be the Highway Code session.

This will now apply to future, approved, newly added sessions on the programme too.

So you now have a wider pathway to the postgraduate certificate and a wider opportunity for discounts off the full price.

ARE YOU GETTING THE RECOGNITION YOU DESERVE?

SSA are the national awarding body for Shared Service Architect (SSA™) and Collaborative Transformation Architect (CTArc™) recognition.

- **CTArc™**
  - Fellow recognition
- **SSA™**
  - Architect recognition
- **CTPrac™**
  - Practitioner recognition
- **SS(PRAC)™**
  - The three steps of SSA recognition

After you have graduated from the postgraduate certificate you can apply to SSA for either Shared Services Architect - SSA™ recognition, or Collaborative Transformation Architect - CTArc™ recognition.

Which one you choose will relate to the type of collaborative working you are engaged in.

For example, you may decide to choose SSA™ recognition to confirm that as a result of your studies on the postgraduate programme you are equipped with knowledge and skills to lead shared service project teams.

Or, you might choose CTArc™ recognition because you feel equipped with knowledge and skills to lead project teams in devolution, blue light transformation, health & social care integration or similar collaborative transformation project teams.

You are also allowed to apply to swap to the alternative of CTArc™ or SSA™ if that helps your CV. It’s free the first time and subsequently there is a small admin fee.

If you become a regular annual contributor to the body of knowledge and learning, you may be awarded Architect Fellow recognition.

The PCCT provides learning for leaders and managers who will be involved in shared services... combined authorities, city regions, health & social care, blue light integrations, NHS systems-wide transformations.
PEOPLE, POWER & POLITICS IN A WORLD OF COLLABORATION

In my academic review for the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation, I chose to explore the issue of politics and power, one of the most extensive influencers of organisational change.

In the public sector, there is an unprecedented level of transformation required, to achieve the austerity measures across central and local government. Much value can be gained to deliver them through closer collaborative working between government departments, agencies and the locality based organisations.

However, as my research revealed, wherever there are people, then the work place politics and power issues can either accelerate, or hinder, collaborative progress.

Defining politics and power

Over the last 40 years, there has been valuable and insightful academic research carried out on power and politics within organisational change.

Definitions of power and politics can create great debate due to their contentious nature and even the academic world has frustration with regard to the lack of consensus in agreeing a common definition of power and politics.

Buchanan and Badham suggest that ‘power is defined as the ability to get other people to do what they want them to do and politics is the power in action by using a range of techniques and approaches’.

Power and politics are one of the most frequent problems encountered by organisations when managing change.

It is a significant given that most change projects fail to deliver on their business case.

The occurrence of project failure in collaborative working (which are multi-partner, change management projects) is well documented within academic research and government reviews.

Buchanan and Badham state that ‘research suggests that most managers view organisational politics as a routine part of their experience, and a key factor in career success. However, the evidence also reveals that most managers have had no training in how to deal with this dimension in their roles’.

French and Raven in their theory on power suggested there was the role of the ‘Power-Holder’ and the ‘Subordinate’ and identified five power bases:

- Coercive Power: the psychological influence over an individual or group
- Reward Power: describes the ability to gain power by offering financial benefits and rewards to individuals.
- Referent Power: is the ability to show charisma
- Expert Power: can be achieved from a position of specialist knowledge and expertise
- Legitimate Power: refers to that gained by roles and hierarchy.

With reference to the subordinate role, they have a perception of the leader (a power-holder) which may not be accurate.

The power bases are interrelated and some or all can be demonstrated in the same situation.

---

1 Drory and Romm (1990)
2 Kacmar and Carlson (1997)
3 Buchanan and Badham (2008)
4 (CIPD, 2003)
6 Buchanan and Badham (2008)
7 French and Raven (1959)
Reward, Legitimate and Coercive power are based on power as a result of position, while Expert and Referent power are personal power.

Traditionally, power is viewed in respect of changing behaviour, but more recently it has also been proposed that the power to get people to think the way that you do is known as ‘soft power’.

It is argued that power in isolation will be inactive without the use of politics which is the practical application. Eisenhardt and Bourgeois talk about ‘the observable, but often covert, actions by which executives enhance their power to influence decisions’.

There is a suggestion that political behaviour is unavoidable, but also necessary in facilitating debate and providing imagination which will lead to better solutions and so should be considered as a benefit not an issue.

As a result, there are constructive aspects of political behaviour which can serve to support the organisation’s objectives in addition to the well documented negative aspects of political behaviour.

Being a Collaboration Architect in a world of people, politics and power?

The logic therefore is that any change agent (for example you, as the Collaborative Transformation Architect) is required to engage out of necessity in political behaviour as a result of both organisational and personal drivers.

A number of academics, and you will find this in the SSA toolkits, also suggest that you should embrace it, and your organisation should equip you with the skills and tools to manage it rather than try to eradicate it.

While isolated actions may be considered inappropriate, political behaviour may be defensible when considered in context.

Seeing the results of mis-management of power and politics...

I was completing my postgraduate certificate at the same time as being in charge of a public sector project to deliver existing services, at a minimum of 25% cost reduction while improving management information and user experience.

I was the Shared Service Architect in the organisation and appointed to provide shared services expertise and recommend the best vehicle for delivery, in-house or commercial, to ensure best value for money for the tax payer.

The austerity agenda made cost reduction the primary ‘unofficial’ driver of decision making. Affordability was a key issue, with a severe lack of investment available to replace IT infrastructure in the near future.

There was significant reputational and financial risk to both the organisation and individuals if the programmes failed to deliver on their business cases, which could result in negative press coverage. As a result of the stakes being so high, it began to drive extreme power and political behaviours.

This is important considering the evidenced high failure rate of strategic change and the cost savings of £25-50m pa to the tax payer.

---
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However, distance and geography also played a role in the power and politics problems that developed as the change programme began to be implemented.

For example, my colleagues and I were based in the north west of England, but London was the epicentre for strategic direction and where most senior officials were based.

Colleagues described the London base, as having its own distinct sub-group culture and political dynamic. The political and power perception of many staff in the north was to see London-based individuals as operating from an *ivory tower* and disconnected from the parts of the organisation about which they were making decisions.

It was also taken for granted that for individuals or groups in the north to have any influence over decision making in London, you have to be physically present in London, as out of sight was definitely out of mind.

I realise now that this undermined each of the five powers and led to resistance to change in these ways:

- **Coercive Power:** the psychological influence over an individual or group was broken by distance and the ‘*ivory tower*’ narrative

- **Reward Power:** the ability to gain power by offering financial benefits and rewards to individuals evaporated because the only offer was loss of livelihood, cuts in pay, or relocation to other parts of the country

- **Referent Power:** is the ability to show charisma. It’s difficult to gain referent power by email and frequent personal visits from the leadership to talk to staff on so many different sites was not realistic

- **Expert Power:** achieved from a position of specialist knowledge and expertise. This was diminished as many of those who were the experts of many years, were often replaced with external consultants who had never done the work before

- **Legitimate Power:** this is gained by roles and hierarchy. They were still in place, however the psychological contract that made people willingly align with legitimate power had been broken

**So what did I learn?**

Organisational politics has fascinated and frustrated me in equal measures throughout my career. I felt that in change management settings, people, power and political behaviour was usually negative and self-serving. During ‘good’ times individuals will support the greater good of the organisation more readily, whilst in ‘difficult’ times people revert to self-interest.

In terms of people who face change, I realise now that we need to equip them with the skills to handle it, rather than just do it to them.

In terms of the five powers, I now spend time analysing which of the five powers, the leadership I engage with own. Also, which of those powers I possess in the different situations I find myself in.

As a result I approach people, power and politics in collaborative working in a more informed and fluid way.

By the way, in 2015 I moved to shared service working in the private sector. I can confirm that there is life in shared services outside the public sector, if you are worried about the future of your current role.
DEVELOPING THE NEW PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT

The Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation (formerly shared services) was very helpful in my work in Kent & Essex Police Business Services.

For my academic review, in module 2, I chose to focus on the psychological contract aspect of the employee/organisation relationship with a view to understanding and considering any particular emphasis on the relevance of the psychological contract in a shared services environment.

I was seeking an answer to the question of whether there is a difference and/or there are additional considerations for managers, with regard to the psychological contract during periods of change, particularly when implementing a shared services project.

What is the psychological contract?

The psychological contract as an exchange process between workers and organisations is described as “the spoken and tacit beliefs, understandings and obligations between the employer and employee, often setting out the dynamics of the relationship itself and the manner in which it operates”.

In considering collaboration, the psychological contract is put perhaps more simply as the “organisational expectations and what employees will receive in return for meeting them” which also underlines the concept of an exchange between the organisation and its staff.

This implies a two-way relationship which, like any relationship, requires mutual trust and a perception of fairness in order to be successful. The authors go on to comment on the complexity of the psychological contract, between staff and immediate managers as well as with the organisation as whole and within it the importance of clarity about expectations and reward.

They conclude that views are formed based on the interactions between the staff and the manager and/or the organisation and those views will in turn determine the strength or otherwise of the psychological contract and (perhaps during a period of change, for example) the conditions in which it will be perceived to have been broken.

Why is the psychological contract important?

The changing nature of the public sector workplace is bringing together staff with different employers into the same workspace, for example cross organisation project teams, collaboration, joint ventures and outsourcing.

There is a blurring of organizational boundaries with regard to differences in formal contracts (terms and conditions) and employment relationships, including performance and the line management relationship.

This has implications for how to manage employees who may perceive their responsibilities and hence their commitment to align with one of a number of organisations, for example either their direct employer or with individuals or teams who may be employed by other organisations.

These perceptions affect and require a different approach to employee relations and employment management than more traditional methods.

One effect of changing organisations and the impact on psychological contract, is that there are no longer jobs for life. There is instead a move to an environment of multiple careers over shorter time frames and hence reduced loyalty to one organisation.

1 (Rousseau, 1996)
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This is further reflected from the perspective of managers and professional staff employability and careers, in the context of shared services and the factors affecting managers and professionals in these new style organisations 6.

The recognition is that, traditional public sector career progression through a single organisation is becoming a thing of the past. Recurring adjustment to the variety of different organisations that individuals are likely be employed in, requires personal flexibility and the ability to manage employment insecurity.

Therefore, the importance of the role of positive leadership is underlined with regard to the establishment of organisational cultures and communication channels as part of a stabilization process for employees, for the time they are with the organisation.

In collaborative working, it calls for examining leadership, change management and culture in terms of the transitory consequences for individuals and impact they will then have on the success (or failure) of new mergers and amalgamations 7. This is particularly relevant as such change is often a catalyst for shared services.

**Why do you need to create a positive psychological contract?**

There is therefore a need for leaders to create, or re-create a positive psychological contract and safe working environment...

This is set in the context of proposed mergers and is relevant within collaborative arrangements; a link is again made between the fear of change and the impact on the psychological contract, which is perceived to have been broken due to the potential change in the terms of the exchange.

The academic studies provide examples how the potential to lose one’s job as a result of a merger, or be subject of some form of enforced change as a result of it, has an effect on loyalty to the “old” organisation and the perception of the “new” organisation in terms of fairness and the decisions of managers, resulting in mistrust.

This is further complicated by new relationships with the new organisational “identity” and between existing, assimilated and new employees and suggests that most staff initially view the merger negatively. It implies that managers and staff are therefore likely to be less loyal to organisations, in the same way that they perceive organisations are less loyal to them and indeed staff at all levels 8.

This emphasizes the importance of constant engagement and communications by leaders and managers, and engagement and working with employee teams to design the new organisation and work processes.

This suggests an increased need to create and re-create employee and stakeholder relationships and a shared sense of purpose (vision and goals) by leadership at all levels. A new, positive, psychological contract must be purposefully structured.

The psychological contract also plays a role within internal service relationships, i.e. between teams and departments within the same organisation.

---
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As well as the transactions themselves between such organisational units, there are often unspoken expectations based on a whole range of factors including experience of past encounters. These affect, for example, levels of trust, perceptions of competence and the nature and tone of interpersonal exchanges.

These factors in turn impact upon how willing (or not) individual employees may be to work together, to complete a process or task as part of a project or service line. This can have a direct effect on overall service delivery and performance and may give rise to issues of conflict.

A checklist for developing the new psychological contract

Based on my academic review and personal experience, I would suggest the following will contribute to the development of a new psychological contract.

Firstly, create opportunities for more of a team-based approach during the implementation of projects, especially on activities that will contribute to creating the new culture, organisational identity and service provision. This will include policy and working practices design.

Place a much greater emphasis on relationship building with staff (i.e. staff engagement and effective communication) as a way to achieve involvement in the definition of new policies and procedures and hence the desired process improvements, rather than a “top down” approach led by management. In other words, encourage a participative implementation, “doing it with the staff” rather than “doing it to them”.

This approach could also be applied to a range of internal stakeholder relationships (eg inter-department, employee and customer relations) in a managed way, to influence positive outcomes in terms of the psychological contract and hence performance across service lines that require inputs from other departments.

Try to achieve greater standardisation in the use of IT, as a result of the enhanced involvement of staff as stakeholders in process reviews and optimisation on an ongoing basis, with greater empowerment and self-management opportunities with the new service teams.

There are also some communication lessons to be learned. For example the need for more two-way dialogue as you develop a new customer service vision. Establish face to face workshops and information exchanges with staff and customers to generate positive energy for the change, and remove any recent experience of negative fear of change.

This is particularly important at the early stage (whilst responding to the need to change due to economic factors) in shaping the vision and goals (how to change to meet the challenge) and implementing the new services (design and delivery).

Take care to ensure that, whilst a significant driver for the impending implementation may be cost reduction, the focus in communications isn’t too heavily on savings targets. This could be balanced with a strong focus on improved services, job enrichment through greater empowerment and engagement in decision making.

Highlighting opportunities for personal development within the new organisational structure will have a positive impact if included in the communications strategy.

On the next page I have turned these suggestions into the beginning of a checklist for developing a new psychological contract, to inspire your leadership work. I hope it proves helpful.
An example checklist for developing the new psychological contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions for developing the new psychological contract</th>
<th>How will we achieve this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for more of a team-based approach during the implementation of projects, especially on activities that will contribute to creating the new culture, organisational identity and service provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place a much greater emphasis on staff engagement and effective communication as a way to achieve involvement in the definition of new policies and procedures and the desired process improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This approach could also be applied to a range of internal stakeholder relationships (eg inter-department, employee and customer relations) in a managed way, to influence positive outcomes in terms of the psychological contract and hence performance across service lines that require inputs from other departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to achieve greater standardisation in the use of IT, through involvement of staff as stakeholders in process reviews and optimisation, on an ongoing basis. Offer greater empowerment and self-management opportunities for the new teams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more two-way dialogue as you develop a new customer service vision. For example, face to face workshops and information exchanges with staff and customers to generate positive energy for the change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and engage staff and stakeholders in: the reasons for change (eg economic factors); in shaping the vision and goals (how to change to meet the challenge); and implementing the new services (design and delivery).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place a strong focus on improved services, job enrichment through greater empowerment and engagement in decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight opportunities for personal development within the new organisational structure include them in the communications strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are David’s suggestions to inspire you. Work with your leadership team to add or amend them.

This article and template is ©2016 Shared Service Architecture Ltd with acknowledgement to David Mannion-Marshall MBA, CTArc as the author.
In my module 2 assignment for the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation, I chose to explore ‘Organisational Culture and its impact on achieving Health and Social Care Integration and Collaboration Policy Objectives’.

The research evidences that whilst collaborative working is a key solution to health and social care activity, the NHS funding and culture may prevent it from happening.

**Partnership is no longer an option**

Closer integration of, and collaboration between, health and social care has been the stated policy direction of successive UK governments for many years.

Dowling and others have highlighted that it is “difficult to find a contemporary policy document on the delivery of health and social care that does not have collaboration as the central strategy for the delivery of welfare. Partnership is no longer simply an option; it is a requirement.”

However, progress towards those stated goals has not been fully delivered and remains patchy and limited.

Differences in culture and ways of working have been identified as one of a variety of reasons for this, as well as several rounds of organisational change to the systems governing the NHS which have created further fragmentation and division.

This is not helped by the different commissioning, funding and performance management regimes that apply to different parts of the system.

---

[Dowling et al., (2014)]
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**Setting the policy context**

The current legislative framework for health and social care in England is the Health and Social Care Act (2012) and the Care Act (2014) which both place duties on organisations to promote integrated care.

The resulting publication of the Five Year Forward View (FFYV) is the latest stage in many years of health policy encouraging the NHS to build new partnerships with carers, patients, voluntary sector organisations and communities.

It describes how the system will work in new ways to break down the barriers of care provision between:
- family doctors and hospitals,
- between physical and mental health,
- between health and social care.

The FYYV sets out a vision of personalised and co-ordinated care designed around people and their care needs with the opportunity for shared budgets across health and social care.
The organisational culture context

Schein describes organisational culture as “a pattern of basic assumptions – invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration; that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems”.

Scott explores organisation culture further as including an organisation’s customary dress, language, behaviour, beliefs, values, assumptions, symbols of status and authority, myths, ceremonies and rituals, and modes of deference and subversion; all of which help to define an organisation’s character and norms.

The causal link between culture and performance started to be questioned by the end of the 1980s which then led to a large number of studies from the 1990s. They identified the relationship between the performance of the organisation and the strength of commonly shared values that would also help management predict employees’ reactions to particular change options.

Organisational culture can provide a framework of consistent values and views of the world to support decision-making, co-ordination and control. However, a strong culture may result in those attitudes and beliefs becoming embedded, difficult to challenge and therefore resistant to change.

Bringing the discussion up to date, Muls and others, perceive that culture in a large organisation is seldom uniform and that subcultures can exist. Different values can compete at different levels and in different professional groups. Therefore change specialists need to understand these subcultures in order to understand why some strategies can be affected and others are resisted.

Organisational culture in health and social care

There has been a focus on the culture in healthcare, in particular following the Francis Report into Mid Staffordshire hospital that mentioned the word ‘culture’ 486 times and stated: “What is required now is a real change in culture, a refocusing and recommitment of all who work in the NHS – from top to bottom of the system – on putting the patient first. We need a common patient centred culture which produces at the very least the fundamental standards of care to which we are all entitled, at the same time as celebrating and supporting the provision of excellence in healthcare”.

Following the publication of the Francis recommendations, the requirement for healthcare organisations to embed a culture of learning, safety and transparency were recurring themes in three subsequent publications:

- the Berwick Report (2013)
- the Keogh Review (2013)
- Hard Truths: The Journey to Putting Patients First (DH, 2013)

The cultural gap between healthcare and social services with regard to philosophies, priorities and perspectives has been highlighted by McMurray. He argues that there are three factors that continue to act as barriers to greater collaboration and integration in health and social care:

- the dominance of the medical model in health;

---
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The medical model is based on diagnosis of disease and application of cure, whereas the social model of care promotes a more holistic approach focusing on the maintenance of well-being and interaction with the whole person.

In other words, health professionals were looking inwards at the anatomical parts and thinking within the bounds of their organisation’s function, whereas social care workers considered the person as a whole and the spaces between provider agencies.

**My recommendations**

From reviewing the literature and reflecting on my particular project to establish a collaborative approach to medical recruitment, it emphasised the need to take account of the strength of the sub culture that exists within the medical and healthcare professional groups. For example the impact of those professional bonds on their willingness or capacity, to change their own behaviour to achieve an organisational goal.

Medical consultants, and particularly those in managerial roles such as clinical directors, stated their support of the model in the light of the need to save money. However, I recognise that financial arguments are probably not sufficiently compelling to that group and their colleagues. This reflects the need to achieve alignment between the clinical, financial and operational aspects of any change programme.

I also recognised that frequently, other HR directors, although a powerful group and very senior in their organisations, may not have the strategies available to challenge, or change, the behaviours of the medical professional group.

Therefore, I would recommend that collaborative working project leaders in health and social care, should take more time to ensure that they engage directly with senior medical leaders in the organisations to identify champions who would support the concept and the implementation at a practical level.

Greater investment in work on stakeholder mapping will also be beneficial in identifying the variety of organisational cultures and sub cultures within partnering organisations, in order to develop a more targeted business case that would appeal to each group required to be influenced and persuaded.

In addition, I found a great deal written about organisational culture within the different health sectors and how to achieve more integrated working between secondary care and primary care, commissioners and providers, consultants and general practitioners, acute and community services for example, but there is a lack of literature available on delivering integration between health and social care.

However, I was disappointed that, despite the clearly stated policy direction of greater integrated working between health and social care, the Department of Health policy documents still refer to the NHS as the leader of the system needing to bring in other partners.

We are still in an environment where greater integration is described as the only way we are going to deliver sustainable services, but the funding, regulation and governance arrangements remain separate at a policy level nationally.

In that context, for many health and social care project leads it will feel like they are pushing the collaboration boulder up a hill.
LET’S GET EMOTIONAL ABOUT PROJECT MANAGERS

I was really pleased to have graduated with a Postgraduate Certificate in Shared Services, from Canterbury Christ Church University in 2015. It has been very helpful in my shared service and collaborative working across my council’s partnerships.

For module 2, the postgraduate academic review, my interest was in organisational change because it “affects people, their jobs and responsibilities and their existing behaviour patterns”.

In accepting that collaborative working is a multi-partner, change management programme, I wanted to understand how emotions influence and drive the “reaction process” that individuals go through, when they are personally confronted with major organisational change.

I wanted to apply my research to my project activity, with a view to using the learning to influence strategies that enable change in the project plan and avoid the phenomenon of collaborative inertia that slows down, and frequently defeats, project progress.

What drives reaction to change?

Much academic study indicates that 70% of change initiatives are unsuccessful in living up to the original promise of the business plan. However, it goes on to recommend that in order to ensure this is not the case, “focusing on employee reactions, including resistance and acceptance, during organizational change is of utmost importance to the success of the initiative”.

Reflecting on why so many shared services and collaborative projects under-perform, it appears that the influences responsible for determining the individual’s response to the changes appears to have been underestimated.

The reason is that most change models are problem based and take little account of emotions. They focus on ‘the deal’ and not ‘the relationships’.

Much research on change seems to have excluded psychological traits and predispositions, which are equally as important in the success of any change programme.

Saunders and Thornhill evidence that the recipe to change success, though not guaranteed, is more about individual and group psychology, than strategy and leadership in isolation.

Taking time to consider the impact that emotions have on employee reaction to change is important, because without such understanding, and left unchecked, emotions expressed in behaviours may be obstructive and even destructive to the goals of change.

Emotions during change can be positive or negative as people anticipate or experience its outcomes and processes. This resonates in the process of creating a shared service where questions relating to career prospects will no doubt emerge as there may be new roles and promotion prospects available for some, yet job roles may be obsolete for others.

Other concerns relating to training and work group status in the newly merged organisation will also arise and may result in positive or negative emotions dependent on if they are perceived as beneficial or not to the individual concerned.

The evidence demonstrates that emotions determine employees’ reaction and are useful in charting the response that emotions are likely to bring about. So how can we take that into consideration?

1 (Thompson, 1997, p. 669)  
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6 (Vince and Broussier, 1996 cited in Nikolaoou et al., 2004).  
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9 (French, 2001 as cited in Matheny et al., 2010, p. 29)
Understanding emotions as the cause of reactions is useful, because they have “behavioural outcomes and can help or hinder the implementation of organizational change”\(^1\).

In fact, emotions to change can be so intensive, that the academics, such as Kübler-Ross, compare them with individual responses to traumatic incidents such as death and grief.\(^2\)

My challenge is how to account for this in my collaborative transformation, or shared service, projects. After studying the academic papers and reflecting on my own, and colleagues’, emotional reactions to the change fostered by our shared services journeys, I would suggest the following.

**Three suggestions to support the challenge of collaborative change**

1. On appointment of a project manager for the delivery phase of collaboration, high importance should be attached to ensuring this individual has high emotional intelligence and empathy for colleagues. In addition to focusing on the deal, they must put substantial effort into emotional relationships.

   The level of importance of this soft skill is such that “the project manager’s leadership and associated emotional intelligence can play a key role in organizational success”\(^3\).

2. The project manager (with the support of the leadership) should initially complete an employee temperature check.

   Stepping into the delivery phase of the collaboration, it is important to take a snapshot of employees’ emotions, attitudes and opinions.

   This will prove a useful method of setting a benchmark against which future checks could measure improved or reduced morale. Such an understanding would ensure that communications and actions are directed to maximise positive emotional reactions.

3. Initially, time must be spent by the project manager on understanding employees’ emotions.

   I have gained so much from understanding emotional reactions and what drives them. I believe that project leads should also take time out to learn more about themselves and how emotions may influence the reaction of their colleagues.

   Tools such as Belbin and Myers-Briggs, which explain group dynamics and personality type respectively, may be assessments the project team could consider, particularly for managers, to support the soft facts of change.

**Collaborative transformation is a change journey...**

In summary, even where there are positive emotional reactions to the announced change, it is essential to focus on maintaining this, especially as the reality hits and changes become physically evident.

Understanding emotions, emotional reaction and the ways in which to influence these in a positive fashion are all skills that are essential in the leadership of collaboration projects going forward.

One tenet of leadership according to Elrod and Tippett (2002) is the ongoing need to transition people, or groups, from one state to another.

If leaders of the change exert high levels of emotional intelligence, they will “be able to recognize and use his or her own and others’ emotional states to solve problems and regulate behaviour”\(^4\) and influence a positive response during the change journey.

---
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Over 200 downloadable tools, templates and techniques to accelerate collaborative working across your organisation and collaborations.

“*If the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem looks like a nail!***

**The Collaborative Transformation Toolkits are now available online…**

- Combined Authority Working
- Devolution Projects
- Merger Development
- Health and Social Care Programmes
- CCG Collaborative Working
- STP Systems-Wide Working
- Collaborative Transformations
- Alternative Ways Of Working In Partnership
- Shared Services
- Collaborative Working Within Organisations

Visit [www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/SSA-Online-Tools](http://www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/SSA-Online-Tools)

Or email [Magda.Zurba@sharedservicearchitects.co.uk](mailto:Magda.Zurba@sharedservicearchitects.co.uk)

to arrange a demonstration
WHAT DO THE ONLINE TOOLS LOOK LIKE AND HOW ARE THEY STRUCTURED?

Each tool is set out in its own six-page layout, and designed so that what you read in the morning, you can be applying that afternoon.

The tools provide support for each of the six stages of the Collaborative Transformation Journey Map, that all devolution, partnership and shared service projects must go through, from initiating Collaborative Leadership through to Operate and Improve.

Pages one to four explain the tool, the situations you might consider deploying it in and the background, academic and practitioner underpinning. Page four also contains a step-by-step guide, to applying the template, tool or technique in ‘real time’.

Page five provides an example layout of the tool so you can develop and adapt it for your specific purpose.

Page six is a user log to record when and how you used the tool and any adaptations you would make when using the tool again.

They will also inspire your project teams to create their own, tailored tools, templates and techniques for their projects.

Equipped with these tools, this is their opportunity to be enterprising and innovative and accelerate the success of the collaborative projects they are delivering.

Visit www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/SSA-Online-Tools for full details.

Or email Magda.Zurba@sharedservicearchitects.co.uk to arrange a demonstration.
We attended the Shared Service Architecture’s Collaborative Transformation Practitioner Programme (CTPrac™) in 2015.

The skills development proved very timely as we both then moved straight into our first shared service project - bringing together the highways, transport and regulatory services within the London Borough of Sutton and the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.

This is the council’s first external customer facing shared service.

Creating Sutton’s bespoke shared services toolkit

During the start-up of the project, we were fortunate to have a wide range of tools and techniques from the SSA toolboxes at our fingertips.

For example, we used tool T&V4.01 for a workshop to create a shared vision. Once we moved onto the implementation stage of the project, we created our own bespoke templates for the various delivery workstreams.

We worked collaboratively with colleagues from human resources, legal, ICT, finance and communications to design templates and documents for each of these workstreams. This ensured we took account of expert knowledge and practical experience from each of these disciplines.

On completing the project, we decided to gather these documents together with templates from previous shared service projects to create our own bespoke toolkit for colleagues to use for similar projects in the future.

This toolkit has been promoted and explained to colleagues within the council, and is shared with them via our council Google Drive, ensuring that up to date versions are always available.

By creating a central repository for best practice, we are avoiding the need to reinvent the wheel and have ensured the tools are tailored to Sutton’s requirements and governance arrangements.

It also helps provide quality assurance and consistency to the delivery of shared service projects across the council.

It is important to note that our toolkit is not static, but rather an organic evolving resource. We encourage our colleagues to not only use it, but to suggest changes to existing tools or to add new tools which they have developed, or come across, in their own projects.

How has the toolkit been used?

The toolkit has been used for other shared service projects since, including the council’s shared human resources service and shared pensions administration service projects.

The tools are not just applicable for shared service projects but are suitable to be used and adapted for any projects where change, or collaboration, is required.
For example, it could continue to be used if we were to set up a jointly owned company structure with a neighbouring authority, from which to run shared services. This is currently being explored.

We therefore continue to publicise the toolkit to colleagues across the council.

Sutton has recently subscribed to the SSA Online Collaborative Working Toolkit, which provides over 200 tools, templates and techniques from the seven printed SSA toolkits.

We will use this to complement our own bespoke toolkit.

### The LB Sutton Shared Service Toolkit

These are the sets of tools and templates we have in our shared service toolkit. They are organised by workstream.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstreams</th>
<th>Templates</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business case</td>
<td>LBS business case</td>
<td>Integrated impact assessment (equality &amp; diversity, health and wellbeing, local economy and sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Communication and engagement plan</td>
<td>Staff updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Shared Service budget report</td>
<td>Feedback form for staff events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>TUPE Final Measure Letter</td>
<td>Management Response to consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>ICT requirements capture spreadsheet</td>
<td>Payroll guidance on timings for TUPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Governance</td>
<td>Collaboration Agreement</td>
<td>Staff welcome pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Governance</td>
<td>Service Level Agreements</td>
<td>HR Change protocols for shared service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project board highlight report</td>
<td>T&amp;Cs comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lessons Learnt Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workstream briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project governance structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, it could continue to be used if we were to set up a jointly owned company structure with a neighbouring authority...

### What difference has it made?

Our own bespoke shared services toolkit, together with the SSA Online Collaborative Working Toolkit has helped project managers to save time, avoid errors and costs, and build on good practice and use new ideas and techniques to deliver change projects.

As a result, the investment in the SSA tools and the development of our own has paid for itself many times over.
ENGAGING THE CFOs IN SHARED SERVICE DECISIONS

The first stage in the SSA Collaborative Journey Map is Collaborative Leadership.

It is rather obvious that a collaboration that is not supported by the leadership of an organisation, will not get very far when it falls into difficult areas of activity.

However, being able to engage the leadership at the beginning of the journey can prove difficult.

Often leaders have initiated the process by asking for recommendations on collaborative working activity. However through a lack of experience, they find it difficult to make a decision on whether to share the services presented back to them.

In addition many leaders find moving from from hierarchical, 100% control over services in their organisation, to the diluted control of participatory leadership of the same services (e.g. 50% control for two partners, 33% for three, 25% for four, etc.), can be daunting.

For example having to formally ask other Chief Fire Officers (CFOs) if you can make significant changes to services within your own organisation can feel uncomfortable.

It is only when leaders see a clear advantage in sharing, that will ease their personal path in delivering their organisation’s strategic purpose, that they happily enter into participatory leadership mode.

In this journey that we have been on in the East Midlands.

Five Go Adventuring

In 2015, the five Fire & Rescue Services (FRS) within the East Midlands identified that there might be some benefit from collaborating in the provision of operational training.

This opinion was formed at a senior level (Chief Fire Officer or CEO) as collaboration was something they wanted to embrace, or be seen to be embracing, and each service had expressed support for working together in their areas of expertise.

For some, this may have been premised on thinking that “…because we are good at (insert service here), the others will come to us”.

As a consequence they appointed a project manager (PM) at a senior level from Leicestershire FRS and seconded him to a time limited exploration of share service activity.

This article is a short description of what happened next and how the SSA toolkit and insights from me as a recognised practitioner (SSPrac) helped guide the project.

Aligning the ambitions of each partner

It was apparent that the brief for the project was initially too broad and required clarification.

As a consequence the project manager met each CFO individually, using a template question and answer on what they wanted to share, or not share.

The aim was to clarify vision and objectives. In addition there was a need to consider the collaborative appetite and try and obtain a shared understanding of what each CFO meant by collaboration.

The SSA training and guidance stresses the importance of understanding what the decision making leaders are trying to achieve.
The discussions with the CFOs suggested that in this case the outcome didn’t feel like collaboration (e.g. better together).

It sounded more like some form of joint procurement. It was suggested that a further exploratory meeting with CFOs was required, to tease out exactly where to start and what to focus on.

But, in order to test, and bring positive challenge to, the thinking of the CFOs, it was agreed that the project manager should use the Trust & Vision Tools 3.02 and 3.04 to engage a number of the service managers.

It could bring more confidence to CEOs if a group of their senior managers were suggesting shared services between the five partners that were most likely to succeed, as a good place to start.

**T&V3.02**: *Testing The Ripeness of Services For Sharing*, requires the participants to agree a set of criteria that test if a service is more appropriate for collaboration than others.

For example, chosen criteria could be: The service requires high spend on new technology and potentially the cost could be shared with partners. Or, the service can no longer be sustained effectively by an individual organisation.

Using a paired analysis approach each service (ICT, HR, Driver Training, Transport Maintenance, etc.) is then tested against the criteria. If it matches the criteria it is given a score of ‘1’. If it does not match it attracts a score of ‘0’.

When the exercise is complete, the services with the highest scores (the most ‘1’s) can be selected as starting points.

**T&V3.03**: *The Quality-Cost-Vacuum Matrix*, approaches the choice of sharing services from a more opportunistic view.

For example, a current Head of Service has just retired so that could lead to a shared head of service. Or the department is due for a restructure anyway, and that could take the form of sharing the staff with another organisation.

Again reflecting on SSA’s advice the CFOs were invited to use this ‘opportunistic’ approach with guidance on changes in regulations that would also make collaboration attractive.

Applying the tools, the leadership came to a view on shared driver-training and requested further work (in this area only) using self-assessment (in each service) and the national subject matter expert that we have in region.

This was to show a tangible example of how we can all work collaboratively together in a mutually beneficial way.

To date the work using some SSA tools has helped gain an understanding of the complexities of joint working.

The next steps are yet to be determined.
“Let’s stop senior managers thinking they are running away from burning platforms! Let’s empower them to work with partners to start running towards burning desires”

Harnessing Collaborative Leadership to transform public services

A choice of three inter-linked toolkits and workshops designed to enhance the collaborative leadership skills of your leadership and senior staff to:

- reduce service delivery costs
- improve systems-wide value
- empower community-led solutions

These are pathway sessions to the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation at Canterbury Christ Church University

To download an information pack and for details of in-house options visit www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/The-Collaborative-Leadership-Programme
# Updates for Your Highway Code of Collaborative Working

In the following pages are nine new updates provided by frontline SSA Practitioners and Architects.

1. **Health Update:** Accelerating the NHS transformation strategy (p53)
2. **Outsourcing:** Six tips on successful change in outsourcing (p55)
3. **Project Methodologies:** Enterprise Architect or Shared Service Architect? (p57)
4. **Collaborative Communications:** Temperature check all the stakeholder’s understanding of the project journey (p59)
5. **Shared Revenues & Benefits:** The knowns and the unknowns (p63)
6. **Risk Management:** Shared Services: What could possibly go wrong? (p65)
7. **Organisational Mergers:** Housing Merger Code: What could you borrow from this? (p68)
8. **Bluelight Collaborations:** Police & Fire Reforms: Merger is not inevitable (p70)
9. **EU Procurement Rules & Public Sector Shared Services:** Update for your Highway Code Folder following 2015/16 amends to EU regulations (p71)

---

### The Five Steps in the Highway Code of Collaborative Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Your Skills And Knowledge</td>
<td>Collaborative Working Models</td>
<td>European Union Legislation</td>
<td>Sharing Employees</td>
<td>Collaborative Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key success factors for collaborative practitioners?</td>
<td>Exploring successful and unsuccessful collaborative models</td>
<td>The EU rules that impact on public sector collaborations</td>
<td>Engaging with trade unions on collaboration activity</td>
<td>Communications for collaborative working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and practice in successful collaborative working</td>
<td>What are the legal vehicles that can be harnessed for collaboration?</td>
<td>VAT Cost Sharing Agreements; Public Service Social Value</td>
<td>Choosing between TUPE and secondments</td>
<td>Managing your document management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the right model for your collaboration</td>
<td>Co-creating effective collaborative governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equalities and collaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Highway Code seminar is one of the most popular in the CTPrac™ programme and mandatory for students stepping onto the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation. The reason is that many leaders and managers have been thrust into collaborative working without any formal training in the statutes and rules that govern public sector collaborative working and have found themselves lacking knowledge in the key decision-making areas.

Each delegate comes away from the session with a Highway Code folder, which they can update with new materials that impact on their collaborative work.

Visit [www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk](http://www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk) for dates of the next sessions.
ACCELERATING THE NHS TRANSFORMATION STRATEGY

The NHS is piling on plenty of new directives in its drive towards collaborative working, but do they have the skills and knowledge to deliver it?

Shared services and STPs...

Section 7 of the Feb 2016 Carter Review, on the impact on shared services and collaborative working across the Health Sector states that: All trusts’ corporate and administration functions should rationalise to ensure their costs do not exceed 7% of their income by April 2018 and 6% of their income by 2020 (or have plans in place for shared service consolidation with, or outsourcing to, other providers by January 2017)...

Then, in September 2016, NHS England and NHS Improvement published their planning guidance for the health service, setting out the new orders and priorities for Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs), from providers and CCGs.

It covers a two-year period (April 2017 to March 2019) and confirms that: “As part of the process for setting up new care models, NHS England will work with CCGs ...to include building on locally led initiatives up and down the country for CCGs to work together across larger geographical footprints, for example, through joint appointments, integrated management and governance arrangements.”

The NHS Five Year Forward View (FYFV) signals a major change in direction for healthcare – from an organizationally-based, illness-focused service, to a place-based population health service.

In response new place-based partnerships have been established to deliver the change via Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs).

The leadership of the STPs’ challenge is to address the quality gap, the health gap and the funding gap through the introduction of new models of care and collaborative ways of working.

As place-based system leaders, collectively they must make real the ambitions set out in their STPs.

For example the Carter Review efficiencies (back-office shared services), the prevention agenda (engaging public differently with health, social and voluntary care), new models of care (integration around places), workforce development (more multi-discipline team working and new roles).

So what could possibly go wrong?

The good news for the NHS is that local and central government have already made all the expensive mistakes in collaborative working that Trusts and STPs can learn from.

As place-based system leaders, collectively they must make real the ambitions set out in their STPs.
The reasons for failure are well known...

Firstly, leaders fail to lead collaboratively. They consistently make the mistake of focusing on the savings to be made and not the partnership that needs to be built to deliver them. Collaborative working is “75% about relationships and only 25% about the deal”.

This was emphasised in August 2016, by Bruce Mann, Executive Director of the Government Property Unit, and the national lead on joining up the One Public Estate (OPE) programme. He wrote about the experience of the OPE progress to date: ‘Absolutely everything depends on decent data; decent maps……even more important than data, however, is collaboration. The clue is in the title, it’s all about collaboration, and if you don’t have that collaboration round the table, if you don’t have people who get on well together, then you’re not going to make very good progress’.

Secondly, shared service and collaborative working business cases are usually under-funded, under-resourced and frequently suffer from optimism bias.

Finally, project teams rarely have the skills, experience and knowledge to deliver these multi-partner, multi-million pound, change management programmes. In addition where there are direct reports by collaboration project teams to decision making leaders above the casualty line, viable shared service and collaborative transformation projects are delivered more quickly, with cash and outcome benefits realised earlier.

There is a right way of delivering success...

However, it is not all doom and gloom, and collaborative transformation and shared services can be successful if done in the right way.

The clear message is that if NHS organizations, STPs, CCGs, etc. are stepping into collaborations, then they have an opportunity to avoid the mistakes of those who have gone before them.

For example, the STP must be the place where the mandate for shared service opportunities is agreed. Shared services must be led from the top and the leadership must ‘stay in the room’ and not delegate the leadership to others.

STP leaders must make the distinction between system leadership and shared leadership – systems leadership is adaptive, shared leadership is the consolidation of leadership across multiple entities.

CCG leaders will need collaborative leadership agility to secure the right balance between systems leadership and shared leadership. Shared services require shared leadership – leaders prepared to pool resources and cede 100% control to achieve better efficiency.

Sharing the leadership of transformation-enabling services such as HR, ICT, Facilities, procurement etc. will provide STP system leaders with the levers to develop the collaborative cultures and behaviors that will support and nurture multi-disciplined team working.

It can facilitate the breaking down of the organizational silos, underpinning growth of the essential building blocks to a more adaptive systems-led approach for health and social care integration.

Canterbury Christ Church University’s Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation, and SSA’s toolkits, can help to accelerate the NHS collaboration journey.

---

1 Public Sector Executive magazine - August 2016
**SIX TIPS FOR SUCCESSFUL CHANGE IN OUTSOURCING**

Hit with a challenging savings target, the desire to dramatically improve capabilities and the corporate board constantly singing “achieve more for less”, your organisation has taken the plunge to outsource a service.

No big deal, outsourcing has been around forever. Clearly it’s big business because the UK’s four biggest outsourcing providers (Atos, Capita, G4S and Serco) receive £billions a year to run our public services.

We are seduced by their ability to provide cutting edge technology, expertise and flexibility. Design the service specification, go out to tender, select the provider you fancy and sign on the dotted line, sweet and simple!

But it’s not so simple, as I have found, in change management roles, because transferring your service and staff is a complicated process and if you get the people side wrong, that sweet deal will turn sour long before the pen gets anywhere near the contract dotted line.

Outsourcing is a major change for staff transferring to the outsource provider and, let’s not forget the staff remaining who work closely with the soon-to-be outsourced team.

**Resisting the change**

As Collaborative Transformation and Shared Service professionals, we are aware through the change programmes we have exposure to, that people resist change.

Staff resistance can be for a multitude of reasons such as:

- Distrust of the outsourcing company.
- Possible change of location.
- Fear of eventual job loss: since the outsource contract will be a fixed price, a way for them to increase profit will be to eventually decrease numbers of staff.

Whatever the reason, staff resistance can seriously hinder your outsourcing programme.

If you want a chance of enjoying the sweet fruits outsourcing has to offer, then people management is critical to success.

This is the first thing I’m tackling in my current role, as a change manager preparing a financial services function for outsourcing.

**One gym session is not enough!**

In my quest to put the people first, because I’m fully aware that organisational success is dependent upon the people, I studied the drivers of success stories. I have identified common traits and summarised them into the following six tips which will help ensure outsourcing success for your organisation.

1. **Have a strong why**

   Clear goals and outcomes will get you off to a secure start.

2. **Keep it real**

   Will one gym session get you fit? Nope! So don’t expect outsourcing to solve everything immediately. Be realistic about what can be achieved, perhaps aim to improve services before expecting savings to be realised.
3. **Tell, tell, tell!!!**

Develop a communication programme to inform all stakeholders affected by the outsourcing. The message should answer the burning question “Will I be affected?” Give staff the opportunity to ask questions and be heard.

4. **What’s in it for me?**

Highlight the benefits outsourcing has, eg outsourcers can offer new opportunities and skills to staff who transfer to them.

5. **Manage stakeholder expectations**

Managing expectations of outsourcing can create high goodwill among stakeholders for the venture.

If expectations are too high this can lead to disappointment. The change management team should keep up to date about reasonable risk of outsourcing, cost and mitigation strategies. Staff and other stakeholders should be kept informed.

6. **Create collaborative advantage**

Collaborate with the outsource provider to create a partnership. A co-design process displaying transparency and openness about business objectives will enable trust and provide incentives for both sides to participate in harmony.

To help you out, I have created the following questionnaire template to inspire your work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tips for outsourcing success</th>
<th>What do you need to do to answer the questions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Why are you doing this?**

What are the clear goals and outcomes for your project that will get you off to a secure start? |
| 2. **Keep it real**

How will you be realistic about what can be achieved? |
| 3. **Tell, tell, tell!!**

How will you create the resource to develop a communication programme to inform all staff and stakeholders affected by the outsourcing? |
| 4. **What’s in it for the staff?**

How will you work with the outsource provider to highlight the benefits outsourcing has to the staff to be transferred? |
| 5. **Manage stakeholder expectations**

How will you create high goodwill among stakeholders for the venture? |
| 6. **Create collaborative advantage**

How can you collaborate with the outsource provider to provide incentives for both sides? |

Errol can be contacted through: errolwilliamson@gmail.com
ENTERPRISE ARCHITECT OR SHARED SERVICE ARCHITECT?

Inevitably, the design and implementation of any shared service will also involve a long, hard look at the methods of delivery and almost certainly SSAs and SS(PRAC)s will want to take advantage of the opportunity to rebuild those services and embrace “digital” (although that trendy term can, and does, mean different things to different people).

One thing is certain though – “digital” is more than just web enabling a service or introducing an app – it involves a fundamental rethink of how interactions, processes and the organisation itself are all constructed to deliver this service.

But how can you be sure that you have considered all of the business and technical issues that come out of the woodwork?

Another trendy phrase of the moment, Enterprise Architecture, can help you frame these issues. This article can only scratch the surface but will hopefully give you some pointers for further research.

Put simply, Enterprise Architecture is a blueprint that defines the structure and operation of an organisation – or what we do and how we do it.

This blueprint is formed of four layers, or “perspectives” which start by focusing on the “what” and then become more detailed as they start to concentrate on the “how”.

The Target Operating Model (TOM)

In a nutshell, a TOM is a description of the desired state of the operations of a business.

 Typically a TOM also includes the roadmap over time that specifies what the company needs to do to move from the “as is” state, to the “to be” state.

Just like all of the other shared services tools, it’s not about the technology – people and processes are more important.

The Four Perspectives of Enterprise Architecture

Business perspective

Application perspective

Information perspective

Technology perspective
The Four Perspectives of Enterprise Architecture

There are many variations on the Enterprise Architecture theme and a number of models with varying degrees of complexity. I prefer to use a simple model that uses four different viewpoints to build an understanding of the enterprise – The Open Group Architecture Framework (TOGAF).

Each of these so-called “perspectives” helps you to produce a set of documentation (or at least an outline understanding) detailing what is going on at various layers of abstraction, and collectively helps to ensure that you are using the right technology, information and applications to deliver the aims of your organisation:

The Business Architecture describes the business strategy, models, processes, services and organisation. It provides the foundation upon which the other enterprise architecture dimensions base their decisions.

Application Architecture defines the specification of technology enabled solutions in support of the business architecture, and provides a view on how services should be bundled to support a business process – which applications are used, the interactions between them and what functionality will be exposed.

Information Architecture identifies, documents and manages the information needs of the enterprise, assigns ownership and accountability for this information, and describes how data is stored by and exchanged between stakeholders.

Technical Architecture defines the strategies and standards for technologies and methods used to develop, execute and operate the Application Architecture – the basic IT infrastructure in terms of hardware, software, networking and security.

Of course, each one of these layers will use specific tools to help define the architecture, ranging from SWOT, Six Sigma and balanced scorecard at the strategic level, through to business process reengineering, business cases and down to things like ITIL and software analysis and design techniques.

Now, you don’t need to be an expert in all these things – you just need to have enough awareness to ask the stupid questions that turn out not to be so stupid after all!

So, why do this?

Well, if you don’t, there are some immediate impacts:
- Lack of information to support decision making
- Inability to adapt to changing demands or market conditions
- Inefficient and redundant processes
- Sub-optimal use of organisational assets

And, just in case there was any doubt about the relevance of this to your work as a shared services professional, look at the skill-set that is most often associated with a successful Enterprise Architect – one who is able to take on board the different perspectives and help define new ways of working. For example:

- Leading/working in/empowering a team towards a common goal
- Evaluating the technical, business and economic impact, viability and integration requirements of technologies
- Negotiating skills
- Stakeholder Management
- Team building and consulting skills
- Strong tactical and strategic skills
- Information gathering skills, including interviewing

It appears that the roles of an Enterprise Architect (EA) and a Shared Service Architect (SSA™) are close in their skills requirement.
Tool: CCom3.02

TEMPERATURE CHECK EVERYONE’S UNDERSTANDING - JUST IN CASE...

CCom3.02 is a versatile tool that can be used at different stages of the comms journey to check how comms messages have been received and how well they have supported understanding of your transformation.

Here you can use it as the final step in building the business case for getting the resource and funding for your communications strategy.

If you have worked through the toolkit so far, you will have:

- built an understanding across the leadership of their role in the communications activity
- drafted an outline strategy of what communications needs to be delivered
- fostered a collaborative relationship with the communications teams in the partners
- gained an understanding of the internal communications within each partner’s service and organisation
- developed a shared vision of what the outcome of a successful communications strategy will look and feel like to those who receive it, or deliver it

Now there is a final piece of work - and it is probably the most important.

You must engage with the staff and key stakeholders who will be effected by the change. You need to understand where the existing formal and, more importantly, informal communications have left their thinking. That will determine the size of resource and funding that the leadership will need to provide you with.

Have the communications’ messages even reached them yet?

Putting information on the intranet, holding staff meetings and sending regular emails, does not mean that the messages have been internalised and understood.

So it’s time to take the temperature of the staff within the partnering organisations and any directly effected stakeholders.
CCom3.02 is a versatile tool that can be used at different stages of the comms journey to check how comms messages have been received and how well they have supported understanding of your transformation.

Here you can use it as the final step in building the business case for getting the resource and funding for your communications strategy.

If you have worked through the toolkit so far, you will have:

- built an understanding across the leadership of their role in the communications activity
- drafted an outline strategy of what communications needs to be delivered
- fostered a collaborative relationship with the communications teams in the partners
- gained an understanding of the internal communications within each partner’s service and organisation
- developed a shared vision of what the outcome of a successful communications strategy will look and feel like to those who receive it, or deliver it

Now there is a final piece of work - and it is probably the most important.

You must engage with the staff and key stakeholders who will be effected by the change. You need to understand where the existing formal and, more importantly, informal communications have left their thinking. That will determine the size of resource and funding that the leadership will need to provide you with.

How to use this tool

CCom3.02 is the final step in building the business case for getting the resource and funding for your communications strategy.

It will help you engage with the staff and key stakeholder who will be effected by the change. You need to understand where the formal and, more importantly, informal communications have left their thinking. That will determine the size of resource and funding that the leadership will need to provide you with.

Please don’t set your survey out like this! We just needed to provide you with examples of what to ask - we are not suggesting you ask them in this format.

Please remember that these toolkits are to inspire you to do better. Therefore do not just accept the questions we have provided. Step back and think of the most appropriate ones for your circumstances.

Step 1: Working with your comms colleagues and project managers, decide how you will conduct the survey of the staff and directly effected stakeholders - who could for example be recipients of the service such as patients, residents or businesses.

Step 2: Test your chosen system and questions on a sample of each group to ensure that the system works and the questions are clear.

Step 3: To increase the likely hood of a response, you may like to forewarn the staff and stakeholders that they will have the opportunity to comment through the survey.

Step 4: Declare if you are going to openly publish the results of the survey, or just use the results for your business case.

Step 5: Set a deadline for return and remember to thank all those who contributed.

Have the communications’ messages even reached them yet?

Putting information on the intranet, holding staff meetings and sending regular emails, does not mean that the messages have been internalised and understood.

So it’s time to take the temperature of the staff within the partnering organisations and any directly effected stakeholders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Questions</th>
<th>Example Option Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 How aware are you of the plans for (new service name), the shared back office support service for (partner’s names)?</td>
<td>Very aware/slightly aware/not very aware/not at all aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How well do you understand why the shared service is being created?</td>
<td>Very well/well/not very well/not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How positive do you feel about joining (new organisation name)</td>
<td>Very positive/positive/not very positive/not at all positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Do you feel that you have the information you need at this stage about joining (new organisation name)?</td>
<td>Yes, I have all I need/I’ve got enough but would like more/Not really/Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How effective are each of the following in giving you information about joining the new shared service?</td>
<td>very effective/effective/not very effective/not at all effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) emails from (names of leaders from each organisation who have already communicated the change)</td>
<td>very effective/effective/not very effective/not at all effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Face-to-face staff briefings</td>
<td>very effective/effective/not very effective/not at all effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) intranet</td>
<td>very effective/effective/not very effective/not at all effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Frequently Asked Questions</td>
<td>very effective/effective/not very effective/not at all effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) What could we do better/more of?</td>
<td>Free text answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) What other information would you find useful?</td>
<td>Free text answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How well overall do you feel the change is being managed?</td>
<td>Very well/well/not very well/not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Are there any other points you would like to make?</td>
<td>Free text answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Are there any questions you would like to ask?</td>
<td>Free text answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which partner and service do you work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Partner name)</th>
<th>( )</th>
<th>(Partner name)</th>
<th>( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchequer Services</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Procurement</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Shared Services</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Property and Commercial Development</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Democratic Services</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic HR &amp; OD</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you would like a reply to any of the questions above, please provide:

Your name:
Telephone number:
Email address:
“Many of the major problems that occur in collaborative working, can usually be traced back to inadequate communications from both the leadership and project team!”

CREATING EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS IN COLLABORATIVE WORKING

A new toolkit and one-day seminar for Communications and/or Project Leads who are responsible for multi-partner, multi-stakeholder communications, often with limited resources or specialist skills.

Delegates will leave with a:

- Five step journey map to successful collaborative communications working
- Guidance on how to engage the partners’ leadership in the communications activity
- A folder of twenty proven collaborative communications tools, templates and techniques they can start using immediately

This is a pathway session to the Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation at Canterbury Christ Church University

To download example tools, an information pack and details of in-house options visit www.shareservicearchitects.co.uk/Comms-Seminar
**SHARED REVENUES & BENEFITS: THE KNOWNS & UNKNOWNS**

In a Revenues and Benefits shared service and partnership environment, engaging with existing and prospective partners to work together leads to the same question: “How are we going to factor in the national reforms to the benefit system and the migration of Housing Benefit to Universal Credit?”

Without directly quoting Donald Rumsfeld and his famous Known Knowns speech, which is relevant to a point here but not quite the full fit, we do know about the unknowns and we know it! We just don’t know the exact local delivery role in this known.

Of course, we also have some genuine unknowns that only complicate our local planning further. And then of course we have the known areas of future delivery and there will be pressure to deliver efficiency and maximise income generation here in the future as well.

While wrestling with this, the drivers for partnership remain the same: “save money and maintain or improve performance for our service users”. However, the question of reform often causes concern in terms of how to deliver these objectives, while so much about the timetable, and final role for welfare locally, remains unclear.

The strength of delivering in collaboration

What is clear is the relative strength of being a member of a partnership, in order to achieve a better outcome in delivering transitional reforms. The resilience provided through the larger scale of a shared service operation during periods of change should also not be under-estimated.

Councils are faced with making the decision to invest time and effort into exploring the wider sharing of services, while at the same time working with these “known unknowns”.

---

1 Feb 2002 Donald Rumsfeld said: “…because as we know, there are known knowns; there are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns; that is to say we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns – the ones we don’t know we don’t know….”
Attendance Allowance, the “unknowns” are set to continue.

Again, this points to decisions on scaling down services before all of the aspects of local delivery are known.

So what should we be doing?

Firstly, we should focus on making efficiencies through collaboration, alongside the “known” service areas such as Council Tax collection and the increased emphasis on maximising income from business rates, with 100% retention on the horizon.

This focus, whilst also managing difficult transitions effectively, will keep our services at the forefront and highlight the innovation and efficiency we continue to deliver.

This in turn will only emphasise on a national platform, the strength of our collaborative working and the benefits to be found in supporting local authorities to be a large part of continuing to deliver valuable welfare services - locally in support of local people.
In 2012, the National Audit Office (NAO) reported on the lack of success of five central government shared service centres set up by the Cabinet Office. The damning report had the snappy title: Efficiency and reform in government corporate functions through shared service centres.

The NAO revealed that over £1.4bn had been spent on central government shared service projects, with a saving of less than £500m as a result.

They wrote, “We found that the government had not achieved value for money and that complex services were tailored too much to individual departments, increasing costs and reducing flexibility”.

Shorter titles - longer reports...

In 2014, the NAO published a longer review of the Cabinet Office’s shared service progress with the shorter, less snappy title: Next Generation Shared Services Strategy.

This examined a new strategy to create two independent shared service centres to provide back-office functions for up to 14 departments and their arm’s-length bodies.

Amyas Morse, Head of the National Audit Office, commented on the report, “The Cabinet Office has made progress with its shared services strategy.

However, as the initiative enters its most challenging phase, it is crucial that the Cabinet Office fully address previous recommendations by the Public Accounts Committee. In particular, lessons from intelligent customers should be shared, and the Department should prepare and communicate performance benchmarks.

In May 2016, a further review was published by the NAO, simply called ‘Shared Service Centres’.

The review confirmed that although the Cabinet Office programme had achieved some benefits, these are below what was expected. Their report tells the story: ‘The government set up the two independent shared service centres as planned. It signed contracts with two private sector companies (arvato UK Ltd and Steria Ltd) to operate the centres, initially known as ISSC1 and ISSC2. These began providing outsourced services to participating departments and arm’s-length bodies in 2013.

Staff working in the Department for Transport’s existing shared service centre were transferred to arvato.’

3 March 2014 - NAO Website Press Release
4 Comptroller and Auditor General (2016) Shared Service Centres. HC 16 Session 2016-17, May 2016
Departments have reported savings to date of £90 million and investment costs of £94 million.

Staff in other departments joined Shared Services Connected Limited (SSCL): a new joint venture company (75% owned by Steria and 25% owned by the Cabinet Office).

Departments have reported savings to date of £90 million and investment costs of £94 million.

Shared services = reduced costs. Right?

The report goes on to confirm that ‘Customers’ costs have increased because they have had to maintain project teams and, in the case of the arvato centre, maintain and extend the life of existing and ageing systems.’

Suppliers’ costs have increased because they had to take more time than they had originally envisaged developing their single operating platforms, extend migration timetables and carry out commercial negotiations that have arisen as a result of delays.’

Unpacking the report, evidences the following predictable problems that are highlighted in the SSA taught programmes and Postgraduate Certificate in Collaborative Transformation.

The lack of trust and shared vision

The 2016 NAO review reveals that:

● While remaining committed to the programme, customers’ confidence in it has deteriorated

● The Cabinet Office did not secure sufficient support from departments at an early stage of the programme

● Departments varied in the extent to which they believed in the merits of the shared service centres

● Some said that they felt pressurised into joining the programme. Several departments were unhappy not to have been sufficiently consulted on key elements…

Insufficient skills and knowledge of the project teams and providers

The 2016 review reveals:

● Weaknesses in the programme design have undermined its success

● The Cabinet Office did not develop an integrated business case for the Strategy that consolidated the business cases…

● The approach to creating standardised processes was not well managed

● …contractors for both centres did not have the capability in-house to design and implement the single operating platforms

● They also had varying degrees of experience in managing transformation projects.

Déjà vu all over again…

The NAO reports should be praised, because they highlight the challenges and mistakes that we can all learn from and avoid.

However, when you compare the 2012, 2014 and 2016 reports’ recommendations, you see frequent repetition of the same mistakes.

Maybe you remember the saying: Insanity, is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results?

You can download the NAO 2016 Shared Services report at: https://www.nao.org.uk/report/shared-service-centres/

You can contact David through: DavidEdwards@demgmt.co.uk
“Project managers who are not aware of the reasons shared services have failed in the past, are doomed to repeat those failures!”

WHAT COULD POSSIBLY GO WRONG IN SHARED SERVICE WORKING?

A half-day workshop for project leads and teams to identify and predict, where their collaboration projects will go wrong.

In the workshop they will:

- Unpack six key candid reports from official sources, on the reasons for failed shared services and collaboration projects
- Identify where the similar failures may occur in their collaboration projects
- Put in place a high level plan to take steps to avoid the mistakes from happening

To download an information pack and for details of in-house options visit:

www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/
What-could-possibly-go-wrong-in-shared-service-working
If you find your collaborative working moving towards merger discussions, then you may find this 20 page document from the National Housing Federation’s board helpful.

Published at the end of last year, it is the NHF’s approved merger code, devised to encourage good practice, promote transparency and dispel perceptions of inefficiency.

The document, entitled Voluntary Code for Housing Association Mergers, Group Structures and Partnerships, suggests ten principles to provide guidance on how boards should deal with the first stage of a merger process. The ten are set out on the next page.

**A framework to work to...**

The press release that accompanied the publication states that, “Produced on our behalf by Savills, this code has been written to provide a framework for organisations’ boards and executives to work to, having decided that a merger, group structure or other partnership is the best way forward for their organisations and tenants.

It is a voluntary code and not prescriptive. It does not seek to influence the outcome of dialogue on mergers or other forms of partnership. It sets out clear principles for boards and the executive to consider when they explore the questions of merger, group structure or partnership opportunities.

This Code sits alongside a suite of relevant law and regulatory requirements and other codes supporting excellence in governance in the housing association sector. It seeks to provide a baseline rather than a ceiling, and adopters of the Code may choose to be bolder in their approach.

The report is said to be responding to significant changes in the sector caused by policies such as the 1% social rent cut and the voluntary extension of Right to Buy.

An *Inside Housing* survey of housing association chief executives in 2015 found that one in three of 129 respondents were likely to consider a merger to cope with budget shortfalls in 2016/17.

Paul Hackett, chief executive of Amicus Horizon, which has been in merger negotiations with Viridian, told *Inside Housing* that the code would be welcomed by well-run associations and apply pressure on those that are less efficient.

**But not everyone agrees...**

However, not everyone welcomed the code. In May 2016, *Inside Housing* reported that a group of nine housing associations had commissioned consultancy Housing Quality Network and law firm Anthony Collins Solicitors to come up with a new set of guidelines for mergers, as they are unhappy with the NHF’s code, which they feel is too prescriptive.

So whilst the document may be helpful for inspiring partners outside or inside housing, don’t accept it as a definitive document - more as one of a number of options for exploration of what a merger may require.
Mergers, Group Structures and Partnerships: 
a voluntary code for housing associations

Below is a summary of recommendations from the code. We would recommend you download the full code from www.housing.org.uk/resource-library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The role of the board is to act in the best interests of the organisation and its beneficiaries. There should be no presumption that a merged entity is in the best interests of the organisation but the board will give the proposal serious consideration.</th>
<th>6. No board member or members of the executive should behave in a way which could frustrate due consideration of the first-stage proposal by the whole board. This includes failure to present or discuss proposals with the board, dismissal of an offer without due consideration, or withholding information that is integral to a decision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Boards should review an organisation’s purpose and value statement regularly to consider if the intent is clear and specific enough to allow the board to determine how to continue to fulfil its objects.</td>
<td>7. A board’s decision on a first-stage proposal should be documented and communicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where merger or partnership opportunities emerge the whole board should be informed promptly. The parties should agree a process and timeline for the consensual development of first-stage proposals in order that the respective boards may properly evaluate the opportunity and make an informed and timely decision.</td>
<td>8. Once a first stage proposal has been agreed by the board, a process and timetable for the next step should be agreed in writing by both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decisions around mergers, group structures and partnership proposals must be presented to, and decided upon, by the board. In considering any proposal, a board should have access to sufficient written information to reach an informed in principle decision to explore or reject merger, group structure or partnership. Information provided at the first stage should include written proposals with enough material to allow the board to consider the over-arching suggested intent of a combined business or partnership and the strategic and practical implications for their respective organisations.</td>
<td>9. Following approval of the first-stage proposal and intent to proceed, an outline business case should be prepared which will include disclosure of financial and non-financial undertakings and target efficiencies undertakings to be realised as part of the merger proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Boards should ensure they have, or have access to, specific skills and experience necessary to objectively evaluate the merits or otherwise of mergers or partnership proposals.</td>
<td>10. Boards which adopt the voluntary code will declare this each year in their financial statements. Boards will seek to keep a record of any activity under the code including any proposals reviewed or submitted, along with the outcome of these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The National Housing Federation
POLICE AND FIRE REFORMS 2016: MERGER IS NOT INEVITABLE

“…this is not a police takeover and the important distinction between operational policing and firefighting will be maintained. We will preserve the distinct identity of the fire and rescue service and the police force…”.

Over the last three years, the boundaries of collaborative working between police and fire have blurred, especially on the front line.

We have reported many times in this magazine on voluntary, blue-light shared buildings, shared response centres and in some cases shared back office services.

However, the voluntary nature is being replaced with the Policing and Crime Bill which was introduced to the House of Commons on 10 February 2016. The main proposals are:

● A new statutory duty on police, fire and ambulance services to collaborate to improve efficiency and effectiveness (with local discretion over how this is done)

● Police and Crime Commissioners would take over responsibility for fire and rescue services “where a local case is made”

● The transfer to those PCCs would be done through secondary legislation following local consultation and the case being made to the Secretary of State

● Where the parties were not in agreement about the transfer, the PCC would still be able to put the case to the Secretary of State, who would decide, taking into account the local consultation and an independent assessment of the business case

● In areas where the PCC takes over fire services, there would be a “single employer” for fire and policing rather than a separate Chief Constable and Chief Fire Officer

● Where the PCC had not taken over responsibility for fire services, legislation would enable them to have voting rights on their local Fire and Rescue Authority (FRA) or its committees if they make the case and the FRA agree

● The Government will legislate to abolish the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, and create a “London Fire Commissioner” to run the London Fire Brigade with the Mayor being responsible for setting budgets and strategic direction.

The new collaboration duty has been broadly welcomed, although some have questioned whether it is necessary.

The central proposal of allowing responsibility to transfer to PCCs where there is local demand, has received a more mixed reception.

But not a merger of Police and Fire

At the September 2016 Chief Fire Officers AGM, the new Policing and Fire Minister Brandon Lewis stated that “…this is not a police takeover and the important distinction between operational policing and firefighting will be maintained. We will preserve the distinct identity of the fire and rescue service and the police force…”.

So you may want to put your “First Responder” hi-viz jacket, back in the wardrobe for now.
GUIDE TO PUBLIC-PUBLIC
SHARED SERVICE CONTRACTS

When was the last time you updated your Highway Code material on the TECKAL test and EU public-public shared services?

Especially since February 2015 when the EU guidance on public-public activity was amended to make the law clearer.

To update your material you may want to download the 10-page, Crown Commercial Service’s Guidance on public-public contracts. It was originally issued in February 2015, but has been updated regularly since.

What does the guidance cover?

In the introduction to the guide, it confirms that: The new provisions on public-public contracts aim to codify, clarify and develop the case law on whether contracts between public bodies should be subject to the public procurement rules or not.

The two most quoted cases relating to this are the Teckal case and Hamburg case, both clusters of councils being challenged when they came together to deliver services between, or on behalf of each other, without tendering to the private sector.

What are the headlines?

Citing the sections in the EU rules, it summarizes the cumulative conditions for the Teckal exclusion as:

- Where the contracting authority exerts on the ‘supplying authority’ a control similar to that which it exercises over its own departments, and
- Where more than 80% of the activities of the supplying authority are performed for the buying authority or by other bodies controlled by it, and
- Where there is no direct private capital participation in the ‘supplying authority’

The cumulative conditions, for the Hamburg exclusion to be met, are:

- The participating authorities co-operate to perform public services they provide, meeting common objectives, and
- The co-operation is for public interest reasons only, and
- The participating authorities perform less than 20% of the co-operative activities on the open market

Pull the guide out at meetings...

The caveat when it comes to EU procurement and the SSA taught programmes is that there is no intention to make you an expert.

However, it is important that you have enough of an understanding to suggest to colleagues that they may need expert advice, if you feel they are going down a wrong alley.

You can download the guide from: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/transposing-eu-procurement-directives
Have your public sector collaborative working news and jobs delivered to your desk or mobile...

In 2015, over 300 collaborative transformation news items and over 200 shared service and collaborative working jobs were published on the SSA website

- Seminar, events and qualification updates
- Weekly news & jobs round-ups by email
- Access to the online library

To help you get the most from the SSA collaborative transformation and collaborative leadership taught sessions, facilitation and publications, visit the SSA website.

Through your phone, tablet, laptop or PC you can:

- Access 22 areas of learning, news, downloads and activity to help get the most for you, your organisation and your collaborative transformation and shared service projects
- Download free tools, templates, booklets and guides and a PDF copy of this magazine to share with colleagues
- Access the SSA library with hundreds of reports, papers and case studies
- Reserve your place on a seminar too
- Put questions to our lecturers and facilitators on the collaboration issues you are being challenged by

www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk