

Title:	Public Service Board (PSB) Restructure
Author(s):	Penny Thompson, Chief Executive Officer, Brighton & Hove City Council
Purpose/Key Messages:	To inform the BHSP of the decisions reached concerning the proposed changes to the PSB board
Significance to BHSP and Delivering SCS outcomes:	The PSB acts as the responsible body for performance and public service delivery across the city. This proposed restructure aims to improve the function of the PSB
What is BHSP being asked to do?	To support the decision reached by PSB partners
Next steps and report back mechanism:	The restructure aims to improve communication between PSB and BHSP relating to activities undertaken by PSB

1. Background

The Public Service Board in Brighton and Hove was initially established in response to the introduction of the Local Area agreement (LAA) initiative in 2005. Its formation was based on a paper produced by the Local Government Association, and as a consequence it was led by the Local Authority (LA) as opposed to the Brighton & Hove Strategic Partnership (BHSP). It was to be chaired by the leader of the LA, and in their absence by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the LA.

The PSB was intended to act as a performance board for the LAA, providing city leadership and vision. The membership comprised of CEOs and chairs of public sector organisations. In terms of Sussex Police however, the place was offered to the Borough Commander, not a member of the Police Authority. The chair and CEO of the Economic Partnership were invited, but no other partnership chairs or managers.

It was considered that the membership at this time was not in the best position to attend to the detail of the performance management requirements for the LAA.

Following development work, there was a re-focusing of the PSB on the LAA, performance management and tangible benefits of working together. Also around this time was the introduction of the BHSP chair as a member of the PSB to establish a formal link with the BHSP. Support functions transferred to the partnership team.

Political changes have neither spurred on or arrested development of the PSB, though conversations with previous leaders have led to the question “why do we need the PSB and BHSP?”

2. Opportunities

- Arrival of new LA CEO provides opportunity to re assess the functioning and effectiveness of the PSB
- Policy and organisational changes that affect public sector organisations provides opportunity to re align membership of PSB to optimise effectiveness
- Recently agreed operating principles for PSB, the accountability framework, stronger business planning and protocols with thematic partnerships provides basis for strengthening focus on delivery of shared objectives
- The financial situation demands more effective use of limited resources, some of which can be delivered through more effective partnership working.
- Focus on service improvement within very tight financial constraints requires strong leadership from the LA and its partners, especially, though not exclusively those in the public sector.

3. Current Situation

- Current membership is comprised of a mix of public sector, community and voluntary sector and business representatives.
- The meetings normally receive a range of papers that focus primarily on strategic policy and performance.
- All partners are able to bring items forward for the agenda. The majority are brought forward by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC).
- The majority of action points that arise from the meetings concern the production of policy/ performance papers and rarely focus on changes to service delivery, configuration or resource allocation.
- The performance challenge framework, owned by PSB, is an attempt to hold a range of partners to account for certain aspects of service delivery, though this is still in developmental stage.

- The second point in the operating principles for the PSB states a key role is “*Exercising a leadership and governing role, identifying and articulating the needs and aspirations of local people, reconciling competing interests including those from the various partnerships and taking into account national developments including finance and governance arrangements*”. This is an area where there is general agreement that the PSB can improve.

4. Options for Future Development

Option 1

Maintain membership as it is, though introducing a stronger emphasis on commissioning, financial management, and development of new approaches through agenda items, presentations etc.

This option could also incorporate inviting new members, or attendees as and when required

Advantages:

- Allows gradual changes, without major upheaval
- Changes can be incremental allowing for change of emphasis as and when required

Disadvantages:

- Effectively business as normal with a slight tweak.
- This hasn't really delivered in the past, and if we want to get somewhere different, it may not be wise to keep going in the same direction

Option 2

Maintain membership as it is, though with an explicit focus on outcomes to be achieved. This would require a stronger emphasis on the operating principles for the board.

The specific outcomes for the PSB to focus would need to be agreed, and this will inevitably involve not focussing on everything if it is to be successful. This will need to be related (inform) the CPP for 13/14

In turn, this will require more explicit discussions and agreements on resource allocation linked to outcome achievement, rather than viewing individual organisational budgets as the start and finish of the discussion

New members could be invited to join as appropriate

Format of meetings would need to change, with a much stronger focus on effective decision making. Any decisions taken would need to be implemented through the partnership and organisational structures that currently exist.

Development of this approach would probably require changes in some of the theme partnerships and supporting partnerships' objectives and will require strong leadership to implement these changes across the range of organisations

Advantages:

- Can deliver changes more quickly
- Can reinvigorate the PSB whilst not making radical changes which could get bogged down in process
- If successful, can help to identify redundant business processes that exist within and between partner organisations

Disadvantages:

- Mixture of membership may not be appropriate to the priorities identified by PSB
- Discussions concerning resource allocation, particularly involving reducing resources may be difficult with representatives of service providers who are commissioned to provide such services

Option 3

Reconfigure the membership. This could be done in a number of ways:

- a) CEOs of major resource holding public agencies
- b) As above with the addition of political representation
- c) As above with Community & Voluntary Sector Forum (CVSF) and business representation (i.e. removal of chairs positions from PSB)

Detail of membership would need to be worked up to show balance of representation for each model

Would effectively act as a commissioning board for the city

A combination of membership options could be possible, to allow for separation of 'strategic' discussion and 'resource allocation' discussion.

Advantages

- Would provide something closer to a finished product than options 1 or 2
- Allows for a fresh start in terms of momentum and enthusiasm

Disadvantages

- May take longer to implement
- Could result in long conversations around membership, which ultimately damage partnership relations
- If there is a lack of political representation legitimacy could be challenged,
- Political representation could make it more difficult to have open conversations concerning financial options

Following initial consultation with chair of BHSP and CEO of BHCC, the proposal is to pursue some version of option 3. The remainder of this paper builds on the selection of option 3 as the preferred option for exploration.

Option 3a)

The PSB would be restructured with all CEO s or equivalents as members. The make up of the board under this proposal would include the following:

1. CEO, BHCC
2. Divisional Commander, Sussex Police
3. CEO, Sussex Police Authority
4. Accountable Officer, NHS Brighton & Hove
5. Vice-Chancellor, University of Brighton
6. Vice-Chancellor, University of Sussex
7. District Manager, Department for Work & Pensions
8. Area Manager, Fire and Rescue service
9. Principle, City College

This option would potentially add the following people/ organisations

10. CEO, Brighton Sussex Universities Hospitals Trust (BSUH)
11. Director Brighton and East Sussex Local delivery Units, Surrey & Sussex Probation Trust

This option would remove the following organisations

- Chair, Brighton & Hove Economic Partnership
- CEO, Brighton & Hove Economic Partnership
- CEO, CVSF
- CVSF Rep
- Leader, BHCC

Issues for consideration:

1. This model is consistent i.e.: membership criteria is clear
2. It can be seen as objective and rational, delivering on agreed outcomes as determined by politicians and boards/authorities of public agencies
3. As all members are significant fund holders, it allows clear

- separation between deciders and providers
4. This model will require extremely effective, open communication to ensure that good relationships are maintained and that those not at the table still view themselves as stakeholders
 5. Will require efficient and effective communication between members and their various constituencies.
 6. The will require improved communication to BHSP. This could involved the PSB sharing its proposal with all BHSP partners to sense check and develop citywide support
 7. If this model does not increase effectiveness of the board, the challenge from business and voluntary sector is lost
 8. Failure of effective two way communication will undermine status, legitimacy and effective leadership of the board

Option 3b)

As above with the addition of political representation

Issues for consideration:

1. This model will serve to enhance political ownership and responsibility for the commissioning approach as well relationships with partner agencies
2. This should increase political legitimacy, though possibly only from the perspective of the leader and/or administration. If the board is to act as a commissioning board, the sole presence of a minority administration could be questioned by other parties. A solution to this could be to invite representation from other political parties, though this may raise further issues.
3. The presence of politicians could inhibit the openness of discussions, particularly around sensitive financial issues of non BHCC organisations
4. If the CEO of the LA is present to represent the collective view of the LA, this option becomes redundant as the political view is represented by the CEO

Option 3c)

As above with CVSF and business representation (i.e. removal of chairs positions from PSB)

Issues for consideration:

- Voluntary and private sectors attract significant funds into the city, though they do not hold significant funds themselves
- The success of improved service delivery relies heavily on the skills and vibrancy offered by the voluntary and private sectors.
- As representatives of provider organisations, their legitimate role is to act on the interests of their membership and provide a

challenge to statutory agencies

- A clearer definition of their role at this level would be required to ensure effective participation on the board
- CVSF and business representation would reduce the consistency applied to membership in terms of budget holding
- It is difficult to quantify what responsibility the business and voluntary sector infrastructure organisations have for the performance of their members.
- A question of how far they can speak for the totality of their sector and therefore a legitimate question can be asked concerning their contribution
- The presence of voluntary and private sector representatives could inhibit the openness of discussions, particularly around sensitive financial issues