

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 2 March 2016 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 13 April 2016.

**Elected Members:**

- \* Mr Steve Cosser
- \* Mr Eber A Kington (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- \* Mr Bill Chapman
- \* Mr Stephen Cooksey
- \* Mr Bob Gardner
- \* Mr Michael Gosling
- \* Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- \* Mr David Harmer
- \* Mr Nick Harrison
- \* Mr David Ivison
- \* Mr Colin Kemp
- \* Mrs Hazel Watson
- \* Mr Keith Witham

**Ex officio Members:**

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Chairman of the County Council  
Mr Nick Skellett CBE, Vice-Chairman of the County Council

**11/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mark Brett-Warburton. There were no substitutions.

**12/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true record of the meeting.

**13/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**14/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were none.

**15/16 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]**

The responses from the Cabinet in relation to the Revenue & Capital Budget and Orbis Public Law were agreed by the Board.

#### **16/16 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE [Item 6]**

This item was included on the agenda in error and was withdrawn.

#### **17/16 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 7]**

##### **Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. It was noted that the first Council Overview Board Bulletin would be available in April 2016, and updates for the Carbon & Energy Policy actions from October 2015 and the HR & OD and Agency Staff actions from November 2015 would be provided through the bulletin
2. The Welfare Reform Task Group was due to meet in April 2016, and a progress update would be provided in the Board's Bulletin in May 2016.
3. It was agreed that the following items would be added to the work programme for the meetings in April and June 2016:

Strategic Risk Register – review of the risks included and the risk levels identified.

Budget Scrutiny - review of the scrutiny arrangements for the 2016/17 budget and opportunities for the improvement in the process for the future.

The Council's Senior Management Structure – explanation of the changes made to the senior management structure and the costs/savings as a result (including the consequent impacts from changes to the responsibilities of staff at other levels).

Agency Staffing – review of the overall costs and use of agency staff.

4. It was noted that a specific report on Surrey Choices would be included as part of the Shareholder Board Annual item in June 2016. The Chairman of the Audit & Governance Committee would be invited to attend for this item.

#### **18/16 STAFF SURVEY REPORT [Item 8]**

##### **Declarations of interest:**

None

##### **Witnesses:**

Amy Bailey, Strategic Change and Efficiency Manager  
Ken Akers, HR Relationship Manager

##### **Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Board expressed disappointment regarding the low response rate to the survey and asked how a better response rate could be achieved in the next survey, which was due to happen October 2016. The Strategic Change and Efficiency Manager agreed that the response rate was disappointing and informed the Board of the clear guidelines set by Best Companies (the organisation commissioned to run the survey), which meant that the Council was not able to promote the survey in advance because it was in competition with other organisations. However, now that the first survey had been held there was more scope to raise awareness of future surveys. Whilst the last full Surrey survey was completed in September 2011, a series of small locally-managed surveys had been completed since that time. These would now be better managed so that the Best Companies survey would not overlap with other mechanisms for canvassing staff opinion, and this was also expected to improve the response rate. The Board were informed that the Benchmarking data were available and would be circulated to members in due course.
2. Concerns were expressed regarding the area of Fair Deal as it received the lowest overall score in the survey. The HR Relationship Manager explained that the Council was currently consulting on a new Pay and Reward scheme, which aimed to develop a better pay structure for staff and address some of the issues raised. It was stated that the aim was to become an employer of choice and fulfill commitments to residents at the highest possible standard. The consultation period would end on 22 April 2016. Unions would then be consulted and recommendations made to the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC). So far over 800 managers had attended briefings, and 2,200 members of staff had signed up to attend one of the consultation events. The aim was to implement changes by 1 July 2016. The Council Overview Board would review the outcomes of the consultation prior to the PPDC meeting.
3. It was reported that when comparing overall scores to other organisations, the County Council generally scored positively for areas such as My Manager, Personal Growth, My Team and Wellbeing. It was said that the factors which were below the benchmark were Leadership and Fair Deal. The Board requested further a further break-down of the results by service.
4. Whilst acknowledging the positive results in many areas of the survey, the Board highlighted the fact that one of the lowest scores was in response to the question about senior managers doing a lot of telling and not much listening. The Board asked whether this was an issue for particular services and whether more could be done to embed the Council's coaching culture. It was noted that the Council would continue to invest in its coaching approach and the High Performance Development Programme (HPDP) for managers. 'Leading with Confidence' events for middle managers had also recently been held. The Council was using the survey results to inform its improvement strategy, and had also commissioned Surrey University to review the effectiveness of the HPDP programme. The Pay & Reward scheme would focus on performance and engagement, and the skills required of managers would be a key focus of the appraisal process.
5. In relation to welfare issues flagged up by the survey, the Council had signed up to the Healthy Workplace Charter and had re-tendered for Occupational Health support and guidance to incorporate physiotherapy and mental wellbeing.

6. It was agreed each Scrutiny Board Chairman would consider whether there were any specific issues from the staff survey for their service areas which would require further scrutiny.

Resolved:

- (a) That a further break-down of the staff survey results by service be provided to the Board.
- (b) That Scrutiny Board Chairman consider whether there were any specific issues from the staff survey for their areas which would require further scrutiny.
- (c) That the outcomes of the review of the effectiveness of the High Performance Development Programme be shared with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board.
- (d) That a further break-down of the bench marking data which compares other employers to be provided to the Board.

Action by: Ken Akers/Amy Bailey

## **19/16 CYBER SECURITY & IMT REPORT [Item 9]**

### **Declarations of Interest:**

None

### **Witnesses:**

Paul Brocklehurst, Head of IMT  
Chris Millard, Group Manager, Business Solutions  
Morgan Rees, Technical Delivery Manager  
Lorraine Juniper, Programmes Manager

### **Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The report was introduced by the Group Manager of Business Solutions who explained that the IMT Service had responsibility for security compliance and the technical security controls needed to protect the organisation against cyber threats. It was highlighted to Members that due to the challenging world with ongoing new technology including social media there are ongoing risks with sensitive information.
2. It was stated they were currently undergoing a security review to update the security policy and approach, including security training, new tools and techniques and more internet access and review of supporting security technology. The focus would be on tailoring security to people's jobs, including opening up access to websites and applications where it was appropriate to the role.

3. The Technical Delivery Manager informed the Board that they currently have undertaken a number of operation tests for Cyber attacks including internet based attacks to ensure they are identified and blocked each year. The Board was informed that the IMT service had trailed two new security products known as 'Smoothwall' and 'Splunk' which had allowed IMT staff to monitor usage easily and also give access to Internet sites. The purpose of these was to protect the organisation in a more hostile technical world.
4. It was noted that the virus attack against the County Council on 2 February 2016 did not disrupt any Council activity or result in direct costs to the Council, and the IMT team was reviewing security arrangements in the light of the attack.
5. The Council worked under the same compliance regime as East Sussex, used the same security tools and technology and worked together to share intelligence. Therefore integration as a result of the Orbis partnership would not impact negatively on either party. The audit report provided reassurance about the security arrangements in place.
6. It was reported that technology boards for each directorate were responsible for deciding items for inclusion in the project work plan. Projects were funded from a combination of service and IMT central funding, with IMT funding used to support the top priority projects. The technology boards were chaired by senior managers. The Board requested further details about the process for agreeing funding decisions for IMT projects. Once this information had been reviewed the Board would decide if there were further areas it wished to scrutinise.
7. The Board noted that savings were achieved by re-negotiating contracts rather than by putting projects on hold, and the team had been working very effectively over the last eighteen months to ensure cost savings were made.
8. The Board noted that Paul Brocklehurst, the Head of IMT, would be leaving the Council at the end of the month. The Chairman thanked him on behalf of the Board for his contribution at Surrey, and it was reported that his replacement would be Matt Scott from East Sussex County Council, who would fulfil the role for both Councils.

**Resolved:** That the Board reviews the further details to be provided about the process for agreeing funding decisions for IMT projects and decides if there are further areas it wishes to scrutinise.

## **20/16 TRUST FUNDS REPORT [Item 10]**

### **Declarations of interest:**

None

### **Witnesses:**

Kevin Kilburn, Deputy Chief Finance Officer  
Saba Hussain, Strategic Partnerships & Policy Manager

### **Key points raised in the discussion:**

1. The Chairman of the Board introduced and thanked the Deputy Finance Officer for the report. The Deputy Chief Finance Officer explained that many local authorities acted as trustees for funds that had been set up for charitable or non-charitable purposes, known as Trust Funds. It was stated that the County Council may contribute to the Funds.
2. Responsibility for the ongoing management of Trusts was delegated to officers of the County Council, and clarification was sought about whether overall responsibility rested with Councillors, as stated in paragraph 19 of the report, or with the Council as a body.
3. The Deputy Chief Finance Officer informed the Board that one of Surrey County Council's largest Trust Fund was the Tulk Bequest, and the purpose of the fund was to provide outdoor sports facilities for Surrey secondary schools. Members queried whether residents knew the full details regarding this and other trust funds and whether they were eligible to apply. It was noted that in some cases the criteria would need to be changed so that the funds could be accessed, and the Council would need to ensure that the funds were used for charitable purposes.
4. Officers updated the Board that the County Council had previously transferred some trusts to the charity Community Foundation for Surrey who ensured the trusts were used for the benefit of Surrey residents in the way the trust was originally intended. The transfer of dormant trust funds to Community Foundations is supported by the Charity Commission.

*Michael Gosling left the meeting at 12.27pm.  
Keith Witham left the meeting at 12.30pm.*

### **Resolved:**

That a task group be established to review the Council's trust funds and report back to the Board: members to be Steve Cosser, Nick Harrison and Mark Brett-Warburton (or another member of the Education & Skills Board)

### **Further Information to be Provided:**

Clarification to be provided about whether overall responsibility for trust funds rests with Councillors or with the Council as a body.

### **21/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]**

13 April 2016.

Meeting ended at: 12.40pm.

---

**Chairman**