

# CHESHIRE EAST

## Cabinet

---

**Date:** 2 December 2008  
**Report of:** HR Lead Officer  
**Title** Investors in People

---

### 1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To outline options available to Cheshire East (CE) should they wish to retain and/or seek re-accreditation against the Investors in People (IiP) standard.

### 2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 To agree that the Council commits to continue with IiP and seeks accreditation by April 2010 as outlined in Option 3.

### 3.0 Financial Implication 08/09

- 3.1 There are no known transitional costs as retaining IiP recognition in the existing Authorities in the run up to vesting day as these will be met from individual Authority budgets.

### 4. Financial implication 09/10

- 4.1 Costs will arise in this period if Cheshire East decided to go for a new first assessment, as a corporate whole, in April 2010. The assessment is likely to cost approximately £17,000. This is based on 8,000 employees, over various locations but excludes schools based staff. No transitional funding has been allocated to this therefore a bid will need to be made through the 2009/10 budget setting process in order to proceed.

### 5. Legal implications

- 5.1 None Identified

### 6. Risks of not re-accrediting

Risk	Impact	Mitigating Action
Negative messages about importance of workforce development and value of individual's contribution	De-motivation of staff	Continue to use standards informally
Loss of IiP logo	Failure to attract staff in a competitive market. PR issues	None

## **7.0 Background**

- 7.1 Macclesfield and Crewe and Nantwich currently hold the liP award as do all five Departments in the County Council. For most of these the three year reassessment falls at various dates throughout 2009. Congleton does not hold the liP award.
- 7.2 The Districts who hold the award and the County Council use the liP standards proactively as an organisational and workforce development tool. This has proved particularly valuable during times of organisational change, as the standards provide a template for ensuring that key processes are in place to support the ongoing development of staff to enable them to contribute to organisational objectives and outcomes
- 7.3 In May this year the Joint Implementation Teams for the East accepted the recommendation outlined in the paper on Transitional Learning and Development priorities which was:
- To provide the ongoing support necessary to maintain liP recognition up to 31 March 2009

## **8.0 liP options for the New Authority**

- 8.1 In consultation with the liP Centre for Assessment and Recognition in the North West (CARNW) the following options for the new Authority have been established.

### **Option 1 - not to continue with liP**

- 8.2 The new authority could decide that they do not wish to continue seeking accreditation against the liP standards.

#### **Advantages**

- There would be some financial savings in terms of costs for the assessment processes and in terms of staff time in preparing for assessment.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Whilst this option would not preclude the on going use of the liP standards to inform learning and development there could well be less focus to the process. Deciding to 'drop' liP could give out negative messages to staff about their value and the importance of their development at a time when morale may well be suffering anyway.

### **Option 2 - Commitment to seek recognition at a later date**

- 8.3 The new authority could decide to make a totally new commitment to start again to gain recognition from 1 April 2009 within its own time frames. This would involve post vesting day:
- formally communicating this decision to CARNW
  - deciding whether to seek authority wide accreditation or accreditation at directorate level
  - setting up a steering group(s) to draw up an action plan(s)
  - working to identified actions to achieve accreditation

### **Advantages**

- This option gives the authority the opportunity to set a realistic time scale for seeking liP accreditation and to consider how it wants to use the liP standards in the most effective way to support organisational and workforce development.

### **Disadvantages**

- If CE chooses this option it would lose the right to use the liP logo until recognition has been gained.
- There is a danger that with other competing priorities liP might slip down the agenda with the similar issues about negative messages to staff and affect on morale as outlined with Option 1

### **Option 3 - Commitment to Continue**

- 8.4 This option would enable the new Authority to be recognised as holding the liP standard for **up to one year** from vesting day. This option is available provided that the majority of staff are covered by the liP standard, with either full recognition or retaining recognition status, in their current authority or department, at 31 March 2009 (this will be the case). This would involve the authority:

Prior to vesting day:

- Setting up an interim steering group consisting of County and District staff with previous experience of supporting liP
- submitting a letter of commitment and an action plan with the aim of being assessed by April 2010.

Post vesting day:

- Reviewing the membership of the steering group to ensure it is representative and preferably includes a 'champion' at Senior Management level
- Working towards agreed actions to achieve accreditation

- 8.5 With this option there would still be the choice of whether to seek authority wide or directorate level accreditation. This choice would have implications for the number of steering groups required.

### **Advantages**

- The right to continue being regarded as an liP accredited organisation and to retain the logo.
- Positive messages for staff about their value and the importance of their development, with this being treated as a high priority
- Focusing on the real actions that will provide support to staff during the changes

### **Disadvantages**

- Tight timescales to be ready for assessment within one year of vesting day (N.B. If this proves to be the case, once the process has started, it may be possible to negotiate a later assessment date).

## **9.0 Conclusion**

- 9.1 In view of the scale of changes faced in Cheshire East and the importance of supporting and developing staff throughout this, Option 3 is strongly recommended.

### ***For further information:-***

<i>Officer:</i>	<i>Trish Barnett</i>
<i>Lead Member</i>	<i>Frank Keegan</i>
<i>Tel No:</i>	<i>01244 972273</i>
<i>Email:</i>	<i>tricia.barnett@cheshire.gov.uk</i>

### ***Background Documents:-***

*Westfields. Middlewich Road, Sandbach*