

Appendix A - Harris single team options analysis

An officer working group involving representation from the finance, legal and HR departments of both councils met several times during 2016 and 2017 to discuss the development of a shared service and potential single team at the Harris. The Harris Project Leader also met with Members and senior officers from both councils to discuss the ambition to create a single team.

The options appraisal below was developed from the feedback secured from these meetings and interviews. The key requirements reflect the main concerns identified by the two councils.

The appraisal uses the following scoring system.

0 – Does not meet requirements

1 – Partly meets requirements

2 – Meets requirements

3 – Exceeds requirements

Key requirements of staffing approach	Staffing situation remains the same	Single team for the Harris. Staff retain existing employer, pay and conditions	Single team for the Harris. PCC staff transfer to LCC	Single team for the Harris. LCC staff transfer to PCC	Single team for the Harris. LCC and PCC staff transfer to third party (e.g. Trust, CIC)
Meet expectations of funders (e.g. HLF, ACE)	0 – Funders are clear they expect a single team	1 – Creates single team but still have to work across both councils	2 – Meets the expectations of funders	2 – Meets the expectations of funders	2 – Meets the expectations of funders
Deliver services effectively and efficiently	1 – Hard to align key services such as front of house delivery with differing pay and terms	1 - Hard to align key services such as front of house delivery with differing pay and terms	2 – Services can be aligned and co-ordinated in an effective manner	2 – Services can be aligned and co-ordinated in an effective manner	2 – Services can be aligned and co-ordinated in an effective manner
Enables the Harris to adopt a more commercial approach	0 – Very difficult to deliver enterprising approach working across procedures and policies of 2 councils	0 - Very difficult to deliver enterprising approach working across procedures and policies of 2 councils	2 – Greater freedom and flexibility will be enabled by a move to a team delivered by a single council	2 - Greater freedom and flexibility will be enabled by a move to a team delivered by a single council	3 – Moving away from direct council control would allow enhanced freedoms and flexibilities

Understands and meets the needs and expectations of users	1 – Very difficult to deliver across two separately delivered services	1 – Difficult to deliver across two councils with differing engagement processes	2 – More straightforward to understand users and shape services if team delivery by 1 council	2 – More straightforward to understand users and shape services if team delivery by 1 council	2 - More straightforward to understand users and shape services if team delivery by third party
Maintains strong links with other key services in both councils	3 – Strong links with all other council services e.g. LCC Library Service retained	3 - Strong links with all other council services e.g. LCC Library Service retained	2 – Links with other council services retained through delegation agreement	2 - Links with other council services retained through delegation agreement	1 – Relationship with other services delivered through service level agreement
Enables a joined up and seamless approach across the Harris	1 – Teams reporting through different management structures make this difficult	1 – Staff on different pay and conditions, even in same team, may find this challenging	2 – Single team, single council approach will drive seamless approach	2 - Single team, single council approach will drive seamless approach	2 – Single organisation approach will drive seamless approach
Harris able to deliver a major capital redevelopment project	1 – Significant risk to effective delivery of major capital project, funders want to see change	2 – Balance of benefits from both councils being involved against challenging LCC relationship with HLF	1 – LCC has track record of major project delivery, but relationship with HLF and ACE effected by museum closures	3 – PCC owns the building and the majority of the collections. Has recent track record of delivering HLF projects	1 – Access may be limited to the expertise of two councils. No track record of delivery
Aligns to wider approach across the councils	1 – Un-coordinated approach at odds to direction of travel in the councils	1 – Difficult to see creating a team with mixed employers, pay and conditions meeting wider council priorities	1 – County Council outsourcing services rather than taking on new ones. Wider museum service delivery reduced	3 – PCC has delivered single team on behalf of other councils, and is keen to take the Harris forward	1 – councils not yet ready to pass on responsibility of the Harris to third party
No increased costs to either council	2 – Costs directly controlled by both councils	2 - Costs directly controlled by both councils	2 – Costs fixed through delegation of service agreement	2 - Costs fixed through delegation of service agreement	1 – Independent Board of Trustees may provide challenge to the two councils
Total Score	10	12	16	20	16