

IRP Evidence Gathering Session – Notes of Evidence Received

19 September 2011

Present

Chair of the Panel – Martin Traynor OBE

Panel members – Pat Zadora MBE

Mike Kapur

Professor Dominic Shellard (present for the evidence from City Mayor and Deputy)

Note taker John Thorpe

Prior to the first witness the Chair of the Panel summarised the process and timetable for the session for Panel members. Further written submissions received from Councillor Ross Willmott, Councillor Sarah Russell and the Director of Corporate Governance were distributed to Panel members.

City Mayor – Sir Peter Soulsby

The Chair of the Panel welcomed the City Mayor and explained that the Panel sought his view on:

- His vision for the administration
- His personal role
- His views of the Deputy City Mayor and Assistant City Mayors roles
- His view of current SRAs
- His view of the basic allowance

The City Mayor explained that he had been very critical of the current model of allowances as he was concerned that they risked being used as a system of patronage, and this was why he had voted against them when introduced.

He felt that the City Mayor role was very different to that of the former Leader in terms of public expectation and that he worked over 70 hours per week with many events on Saturdays, Sundays and in the evening. The City Mayor suggested that

the expectation was shown in the recent disturbances where he had spent much of the night working with the Police and local media and compared it to the situation in London where the Mayor had been criticised for not meeting public expectation.

The City Mayor suggested that a key aspect was very strong personal responsibility for the office holder for the actions of a very large (16,000 employees – c£1bn budget pa) and complex organisation, as a unitary authority, for an extremely large range of functions and not a single service such as health care. As such he was not aware of any comparable posts and as a former MP did not see the responsibility as comparable. The City Mayor gave by example the upcoming decision needed regarding Building Schools for the Future which would have major consequences for the City. In addition for example where a child was not properly safeguarded the City Mayor would have to take personal responsibility for the matter, reassure people and ensure that the authority was doing everything it could to prevent such risk.

The City Mayor referred to work undertaken since the election to improve decision making, accountability and strategic direction. This included a decision to delete the post of Chief Executive to reduce duplication and save £250,000 pa. Further work had been undertaken to increase standards and probity. A different Cabinet approach had been defined with detailed portfolios focussing on delivery with Assistant City Mayors reliant on the City Mayor for their posts. The City Mayor noted that the City faced cuts of £30m this year and £20m in subsequent 3 years.

The City Mayor felt that the office holder needed a detailed knowledge of the City, its economy, demography and significant communication skills in order to deal with significant press interest. Further skills needed were political skills, a detailed understanding of local government finance, an understanding of the public and private sector and the sympathy and trust of the voluntary sector.

In terms of remuneration for the role the City Mayor noted the symbolic importance of the remuneration for the post to show its value, define the model and attract a suitable successor.

Following his submission the City Mayor received questioning from the Panel and in response to questions the City Mayor gave the following responses:

Concerning appropriate comparators the City Mayor noted that in London there was a 2 tier system of governance whilst Leicester was a unitary authority and that the Government had identified a figure of £122,000 for a police commissioner role which controlled a less complex organisation.

The City Mayor noted that around half of Mayoral authorities had deleted the post of Chief Executive, though many Mayoral authorities were smaller than Leicester. Since the change the overwhelming majority of the Chief Executive responsibilities had transferred to the City Mayor. In terms of the relationship between City and Lord Mayor's roles he felt that there was some possible overlap and there had been issues as organisations often wished to meet the person with the decision making powers, however there was still a specific civic role. He noted that the Lord Mayor was currently undertaking duties in Cyprus visiting the Royal Anglian regiment which was something he felt would not be appropriate for the role of City Mayor. He suggested that this could be something that a future panel may wish to look at in 12 months.

In terms of the role the City Mayor concurred with the suggestion that all 3 City MPs felt that the City Mayor had greater power than an MP and noted that whilst an MP had significant influence an elected Mayor had more direct power.

In terms of measuring performance the City Mayor stated that there would be an annual report created to follow up the 100 Days work. Job descriptions for the Deputy and Assistant City Mayors had measurable criteria attached to them and were directly scrutinised. However the Deputy City Mayor was a very different role to Assistant City Mayors with a statutory responsibility to undertake the roles of an elected Mayor in his/her absence. Also in Leicester the Deputy City Mayor had taken responsibility for delivering the 100 Day project and had the role of making the administration's programme happen. As such the role was more important than any director, with 75-80% of the remuneration of the City Mayor more appropriate than the 50% received by the former Deputy Leader role. The City Mayor confirmed that he supported Councillor Palmer's assertion that he undertook a 'Chief of Staff' type role.

In terms of Assistant City Mayors roles the City Mayor noted that office holders worked to the agenda of the City Mayor and Deputy but that a high degree of competence and a significant time commitment was needed including evenings and weekends. This related to more than full time with ward work especially as the number of portfolios holders had been reduced. As such he noted that a number of

Assistant City Mayors had not been able to retain previous employment whilst undertaking the role. The City Mayor noted that there were some differences in the weight of Assistant City Mayor portfolios but not enough to differentiate remuneration. The City Mayor stated that he sought to empower Assistant City Mayors and was seeking to extend team working, including through meeting 3 times a week.

In terms of the number of Councillors the City Mayor noted that he had been quoted that he didn't believe the number should be cut. In terms of non-executive Councillors he felt that some roles should link to ward Councillor roles and be covered by the basic allowance with some Vice Chair roles not significant roles with risks that they could be used as patronage. In terms of Chairs the City Mayor noted the particular responsibilities of the chairs of Planning & Development Control / Licensing and Overview Select Committee but saw these as less than those of executive Members. He suggested however that if designing a new system there might be benefits in increasing the basic allowance but reducing chairs allowances. In terms of buying out allowances he noted that if Councillors worked 20 hours per week on ward duties the basic allowance equated to a low rate.

Deputy City Mayor – Councillor Rory Palmer

The Chair of the Panel welcomed the Deputy City Mayor and asked him to give the Panel more detail of his current role.

The Deputy City Mayor explained that he saw a closing of the gap between officer and Member roles with the Deputy City Mayor acting as a senior leadership/management role. He felt that the role was unique and could not be compared to the previous system or that of a Deputy Leader. He suggested that it was similar to that of a 'Chief of Staff' acting as the key linkage between the City Mayor and officers shaping officer proposals in a system of operationalised political leadership. The role had responsibilities beyond its portfolio with the 100 Day programme a good example of authoring and creating the programme. The Deputy City Mayor felt that the role was not just an internal one assisting leadership of the City not just the Council.

Following his submission the Deputy City Mayor received questioning from the Panel and in response to questions the Deputy City Mayor gave the following responses:

In terms of comparison of the role of City Mayor with a police commissioner and the Deputy remuneration being set at 75-80% of the City Mayor he felt this was accurate. He saw a necessarily very close link between the Deputy and City Mayor role with the responsibility to pick up the City Mayor's duties when he was not available. He however saw a slightly bigger gap between the Deputy City Mayor and Assistant City Mayors and suggested that in terms of remuneration the gap between Deputy and City Mayors should be not far off twice as much. The Deputy City Mayor saw the role as having a power and influence greater than that of an MP and noted that he had 2 mandates – 1 as a ward Councillor and 1 as a pre-announced Deputy City Mayor candidate.

In terms of changes to the number of Councillors the Deputy City Mayor stated that he was not convinced of the need for change and that any change would require very detailed work. He noted that he combined his duties with that of a ward Councillor and drew attention to London Assembly where the executive was not drawn from the 25 GLA members who held the executive to account.

The Deputy City Mayor stated that he was mindful of the challenges facing the Council and had referred to the need for personal development in his submission. He also noted the senior management review which would reduce costs.

In terms of ward responsibilities The Deputy City Mayor felt that his first job was that of community representative but though due to the weight of his responsibilities his co-Councillor had taken on some of his ward roles. He stated that he had felt that as a ward Councillor he had much influence.

He stated that he saw himself on a career path and noted that it was very difficult to 'twin track' with work and Council responsibilities. However if roles were seen as full-time they should have set hours / annual leave and severance as professional roles would. Work had been undertaken to develop job descriptions and the Panel's comments on these were welcome.

In terms of SRAs and basic allowances the Deputy City Mayor stated that he had argued against Vice Chair allowances though the position with scrutiny was difficult to judge as it was also new. He felt that a pro-active Councillor could easily do 20+ hours per week.

Councillor Ross Grant – Conservative councillor

Councillor Grant stated that he worked c 12 hours per week on Council duties and suggested that there was a potential bias to show increased hours by including activities such as political campaigning and not using facilities to help Councillors such as the City Warden service and Ward community meetings.

Following his submission Councillor Grant received questioning from the Panel and in response to questions gave the following responses:

Councillor Grant noted that the range of hours could vary and agreed that the level of hours could be linked to factors such as deprivation. Councillor Grant suggested that some Councillors acted as a first point of contact rather than intervening if services were failing. He suggested that this approach could increase the amount of time Councillors had to spend and could create issues by Councillor queries being fast tracked. In terms of training there were difficulties as the Council had few means of compelling Members to attend training.

In terms of changes since the election he had not felt the political balance had increased his workload but felt that he would not wish to be compelled to attend a meeting where he did not see its value.

In terms of chair roles he suggested that the chairs allowance was generous and that his experience had led him to feel that the vice chair role was often not significant.

In terms of the basic allowance Councillor Grant felt that a reduction may be problematic for some Councillors but did not see ward Councillor roles as full time. In terms of allowances he suggested that in some respects these were overly generous such as for broadband which he would have at home anyway.

Councillor Grant suggested that he felt that the City Mayor may have seen an increase in responsibility but there had been no overall increase in responsibility. As a result this represented a shift in responsibility and any increases or new allowances should be balanced against changes elsewhere.

Councillor Nigel Porter – Liberal Democrat Councillor

Councillor Porter received questioning from the Panel and in response to questions gave the following responses:

Councillor Porter noted the regulations regarding political balance and suggested that his key role was to represent his ward. In terms of hours spent on Council work he stated that he could spend up to 14 hours per day on ward duties as he was prepared to put the level of research in as necessary such as regarding park and ride. He agreed that being the only Liberal Democratic councillor had led to some distortion in his role.

In terms of the basic allowance Councillor Porter suggested that it was fair and increased attendance at meetings did not show a Councillors value. He felt that vice chair roles were not needed if the system worked properly with a dialogue between the scrutiny chair and Cabinet lead.

Councillor Porter stated that no training was available for Councillors in relation to their ward roles and felt that mentoring support might be useful. He felt that it was likely that Councillors could work 'smarter' and stated that he saw his role as referring issues brought to him by a constituent to Members Services if he could not resolve them himself.

Peter Coley

Mr Coley stated that he felt that the City Mayor role did face increased responsibility but candidates were aware of the Allowances Scheme in place and that staff had seen their pay frozen. He also suggested that the increase in responsibility for the City Mayor meant a reduction in Cabinet responsibility. He felt that the deletion of the Chief Executive post should create a saving rather than being used elsewhere.

arrangements. He undertook a range of meeting commitments including Safeguarding Adults, Safeguarding Children, Allotment Users and school governors meetings.

He suggested it was difficult to say whether he would have taken on the additional roles if he had not become full time and noted that he worked up to 70 hours per week with many commitments in the day. In terms of training he received induction and worked with continuing Councillors.

In terms of the scheme Councillor Newcombe referred to the previous Attendance Allowance regulations and stated that some people may do 6 or 7 meetings whilst some did only 1. He suggested that the level of the basic allowance was not correct with some neighbouring authorities paying more. He had found it very difficult to undertake full time work as most employers could not fit in with the demands on a Councillors time. He had tried working nights but this had not proved possible either.

Councillor Newcombe stated that he had become a Councillor as his family had been involved, he was interested in politics and he wanted to make a difference. He had found it very difficult to make a difference when working full time but could now give more. Councillor Newcombe felt any proposals to 'buy out' allowances might receive a mixed response and felt that Councillors had different personal situations but many were finding it difficult with it costing them to be a Councillor. He suggested that some County Councillors may be able to see Council work as a 'hobby' but it was different in the City and for many being a Councillor was their job.

Councillor Newcombe suggested that the system of 54 Councillors worked well and was about right though should be kept under a watching brief.

Councillor Barbara Potter – Chief Whip

Councillor Potter received questioning from the Panel and in response to questions gave the following responses:

Councillor Potter stated that she spent at least 20 hours per week on ward duties though it could reach 50 and there was a link between the time required and factors such as deprivation. Councillor Potter stated that the role of Chief Whip was very

demanding with increased expectation following the changed political balance of the Council and the decision of the City Mayor to base himself in New Walk Centre. The role was more complex and less political with tasks such as taking on responsibilities for filling Council places on 50 outside bodies. Training fell under Councillor Potter's responsibilities and she identified areas where Members required training, however she felt that more training for new Councillors was needed as was more relating to the management role of a Councillor.

Councillor Potter felt that when she became a Councillor she had been naïve and new Councillors needed to be given a basic understanding including such issues as working with many vulnerable people and undertaking surgeries and home visits.

In terms of the role Councillor Potter saw Council work as her job and was available 24/7. The role required great flexibility so she was very restricted in applying for outside work. Members views on the basic allowance were likely to be mixed but consideration needed to be given in that Members were restricted in what roles they could take on and that for the hours worked Members could often earn more at Tesco's.

Councillor Potter suggested that less time was needed for Planning and Development Control than work on Fostering and Adoption Panels. She felt that Planning and Development Control was a lesser commitment than Licensing as these meetings were in the diary whilst Licensing Panels were called as needed and could last a considerable time.

In terms of Civic allowances Councillor Potter felt that the Lord Mayors allowance was not sufficient. In terms of the support package Councillor Potter had a laptop but did not have the time to make other claims but felt frustrated that tax was taken at different points rather than once.

Councillor Potter felt that vice chair allowances were needed as sometimes a vice chair undertook most of the work but did not express a view concerning the relation of remuneration between chair and vice chair roles. She noted that the level of Council communication made a big impact in the first 12 months of being a Councillor but it was needed and had improved. Councillor Potter noted that she needed 5-10 hours per week reading time.

Actions agreed by the Panel to be undertaken following the Evidence Gathering Session

- That data regarding comparator roles for Planning & Development Control, Audit & Risk, Scrutiny and Licensing chair and vice chair roles and basic allowances in similar authorities including Nottingham and Derby be requested.
- That the Director of Corporate Governance be requested to consider:
 - how a system could operate where computers and equipment were borrowed by Councillors to replace the Support Package
 - if travel and subsistence within the City boundary could be incorporated into the basic allowance
 - how what is currently claimed (including childcare allowances) for could be simplified
 - how a GLA report style could be used as a report style for the Panel
- That details of the Localism Bill proposals be passed to the Chair of the Panel when closer to finalisation.
- That a further meeting of the Panel be arranged for early October (c 1 hour) to receive the data above, to define the next steps and that Perry Holmes be invited to attend this meeting.

CONFIDENTIAL

Please ask for: Councillor Rory Palmer
Direct Line: 0116 2526011
Our Ref: 172rplt
Date: 13th September 2011



Martin Traylor OBE, FIH
~~Group Chief Executive~~
Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce
1 Mill Lane
Leicester
LE2 7HU

Dear Martin

Thank you for your letter dated 22 August 2011 inviting submissions as part of your independent review of allowances following the election of a new council and the introduction of the city's new governance arrangements.

I am also grateful for the opportunity to provide evidence and to answer questions in front of the panel and I am pleased to accept this invitation.

Like the role of City Mayor, the role of Deputy City Mayor is new and unique. With Leicester being the only principal city outside of London to have a directly elected mayor and mayoral team, the role of Deputy City Mayor in Leicester is currently unique to local government across the country.

It is with this in mind, and in recognition of the fact that my role has evolved and developed continuously since day one, that I wanted to take this opportunity to set out for your panel some thoughts which may be of assistance as you develop your recommendations.

I want to make clear first and foremost that this role is challenging, stimulating, demanding and exciting. I consider myself extremely fortunate to have the opportunity to carry out the role of deputy city mayor and it is a privilege to be able to do so.

It is almost impossible to liken the role of Council Leader with that of City Mayor; it is likewise very difficult to equate the role of Deputy City Mayor with the previous Deputy Leader of the Council role. The roles are fundamentally different in scope, responsibility and application, as well as having a significantly different set of functions on a day-to-day basis.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CITY MAYOR
Rory Palmer

Page 1 of 8

7th Floor B Block, New Walk Centre, Welford Place, Leicester LE1 6ZG
TELEPHONE (0116) 252 6011 deputymayor@leicester.gov.uk www.leicester.gov.uk

The Role of Deputy City Mayor

There are three broad areas which make up my role, which define my workload and time commitments. I have a set of wide-ranging and senior responsibilities by virtue of being deputy city mayor. I also have a full cabinet departmental and service portfolio like the assistant mayors (Transport and Climate Change); and, unlike the City Mayor, I am also an elected ward councillor.

I will attempt to provide some detail and aim to illustrate how these different areas of responsibility together form the totality of my role of Deputy City Mayor and to give you an impression of the role's demands and responsibilities.

In your letter of 22 August 2011 you ask specifically for information about hours worked. My diary since Monday 9 May and my own time-sheet logs show average weekly hours well in excess of 60 hours per week. This includes the very many evening meetings and requirements expected of councillors and executive members. The role of Deputy City Mayor also includes heavy demands on weekends through workload and public events.

Without question this role is full-time and should be formally recognised and defined as such. It would simply be impossible to combine this role with any other paid employment. In my view it would be a perfectly reasonable recommendation for your panel to make that the role of deputy city mayor is designated as full-time and that the post holder should not be allowed to take up any other paid employment alongside the role.

As a clear example of this, the Mayoral team now meets as a full cabinet three times each week, typically for around two hours (this is in addition to the Public Cabinet meetings we hold). These internal cabinet meetings are a key part of the workload and commitment of the Assistant Mayors. Under the previous Leader/Cabinet model such internal cabinet sessions happened around once or twice a month. Furthermore, the cabinet appointed by the City Mayor is smaller than the previous arrangement, having been reduced to City Mayor, Deputy plus six Assistant Mayors from Leader, Deputy Leader and eight cabinet members.

I do not want to rely on the use of clichés but in many ways this role is a 24/7 job. There is not really a time when, like the city mayor, I am not 'on call'. There have been a number of occasions since May when I have taken calls or had to respond to urgent and unforeseen situations.

For example, I spent much of my family holiday this year dealing by phone and e-mail with the response and impact of the city centre disturbances. I do not in any way resent this and I see it is a perfectly acceptable and required expectation and requirement of my role, and absolutely consistent with the level of responsibilities and the leadership role I now fulfil.

It is difficult for me to respond to your request to disaggregate hours spent on my ward councillor duties and my wider responsibilities as Deputy City Mayor. In

essence on a day-to-day and week-to-week basis all my responsibilities merge and represent the totality of my role and workload.

However, it is my determination and desire to continue to be an active and visible ward councillor and I continue to hold regular advice surgeries, ward meetings and attend events in my ward. I am also initiating a number of projects and initiatives in my ward including developing a ten year strategic community plan. I have enclosed a calendar of my ward advice surgeries.

I have enclosed a copy of the current job description for the role of Deputy City Mayor. As you will be aware, this job description – along with those for the roles of City Mayor and Assistant Mayor – are currently published for consultation. I hope that the panel's deliberations and conclusions may contribute usefully to this consultation and the finalising of these job descriptions.

It should be said that this job description has been developed following discussions with me about my role, the responsibilities I have assumed and with some input from those with whom I have worked closely with and alongside since taking office.

The job descriptions have also been modelled and aligned to those of senior officers of the council and have been drafted following research of similar job descriptions of senior politicians.

The job description for Deputy City Mayor clearly shows that this is a role with very significant strategic leadership responsibilities and is a senior level position within the local authority.

There is significant crossover and replication between the job description set out for my role and the job descriptions of the most senior officers and managers of the council. This reflects the fact that the political executive roles are now much more closely aligned to the senior management roles within the council.

There has been a very clear and evident equalisation of responsibilities and roles of political and officer/managerial leadership.

This 'closing of the gap' plays out on a day-to-day basis and places new responsibilities and demands on senior politicians, as would be expected and is appropriate within an executive mayoral system.

My role involves providing political, strategic and organisational leadership. This is reflected in the current job description, which states that the role of Deputy City Mayor involves:

- *To support the City Mayor to build a vision for the City, to undertake the role of community leader and to lead the Council and its partners towards delivering that vision.*
- *To represent the Council and provide leadership of the Local Strategic Partnership and other key local partnerships in the absence of the City Mayor.*

From my letter of appointment:

- *As Deputy City Mayor you will deputise for me on all areas of policy, responsibilities and all other matters as is required.*

It is also set out in my letter of appointment that I have specific responsibilities for emergency planning and resilience, alongside the city mayor.

The City Mayor has also asked me to take on a set of key strategic responsibilities including:

- Policy development, strategy and delivery – including full oversight of the delivery of the policy programme and priorities.
- Communications.
- Partnerships.

The 100 days programme was something I initiated, compiled, authored and co-ordinated and led the delivery of. With the support of senior officers I project managed the 100 days programme and oversaw its successful delivery.

Extending from this, I am now developing new delivery arrangements and processes inside the council, linking to the current Organisational Development and Improvement team and their work. This will align more closely to the political leadership of the organisation as we develop a new focus on delivery, and again illustrating the 'closing of the gap' between the political leadership and officer/management divide.

Through our determination to continue to ensure the City Mayor, Deputy City Mayor and Assistant Mayors have a very hands-on role in the development, progression and delivery of policy, work programmes will be developed for each Assistant Mayor portfolio which will be published and which I will provide oversight of. This also emphasises again the individual responsibility and accountability which each member of the Mayoral team will be expected to fulfil.

As you will see from my letter of appointment, including those aligned to my departmental cabinet portfolio and the cross-cutting and corporate pledges, I was asked to lead on the delivery of 25 of our 100 pledges we undertook to complete within our first 100 days.

I am managing the political delivery of the Cabinet work programme, interacting with senior officers to plan and execute the delivery of our strategic priorities.

I am currently overseeing a review of the council's partnership arrangements and authoring a paper which will include recommendations on the future set-up of citywide partnerships and the Local Strategic Partnership. This review will respond to the changing nature and demand on partnerships as a result of the new governance and city leadership arrangements.

I have also been tasked with leading on a number of citywide and corporate priorities and projects. I have established and will chair our new Child Poverty Commission and our Fairness Commission. I am also leading, alongside the Assistant Mayor for Heritage, Leisure and Sport, our work in preparation for the 2012 Olympics. I am chairing the community partnership group for the Leicester stretch of the 2012 Torch Relay and I have been invited by the Assistant Chief Constable to join the county-wide 2012 Strategic Planning Group.

It is difficult to define my role, which as I have stated, is new and unique. Beyond my cabinet and departmental responsibilities I am managing a large and varied portfolio of corporate and cross-cutting programmes and projects. I am also managing the delivery programming and planning of our manifesto commitments and policy priorities.

Alongside the City Mayor, I provide leadership to the council and work closely with the senior management team on a day-to-day basis, and it could be said that a key part of my role informally – and which is difficult to define formally in a job description – is being the key interface and conduit between the City Mayor's office, the political body and the senior management team and officer administration.

This element of the role evolved quickly in the opening days and weeks and this unique range of responsibilities generated a wide and varied workload. Those who have observed the development of this role closely, and who have worked alongside me and the mayoral team, have remarked, anecdotally, but it is perhaps a fair and accurate assessment, that my role has become very similar to a chief of staff type position.

This is not an attempt to over-state my role, it is a way of describing the position in a way which endeavours to capture my formal responsibilities as set out in the job description and letter of appointment, my wider responsibilities and workload and the day-to-day realities of the role – particularly what is now a very close and fully integrated interface between the senior politicians and mayoral team and the council's senior management team.

The individual mandate of the City Mayor immediately and naturally leads into personal and direct responsibilities of all the mayoral team. This sense of personal accountability differs dramatically from the previous leader/cabinet system, which I experienced first-hand as a cabinet member. This personal accountability is emphasised through my responsibilities and functions as deputy city mayor – and is reflected in the nature of scrutiny we are now, rightly, subject to through revised scrutiny arrangements at the council, but also through the media and by the public generally.

The profile of the mayoral team roles is without question higher than those of the previous political roles of the council. Our Meet the Mayor events continue to be busy and well attended. We receive many questions via our new online 'Ask the Mayor' system and the volume of correspondence both I and the city mayor receive is very significant. Given the citywide basis of our positions and responsibilities the

nature and volume of our correspondence is more comparable, and is probably higher, to that received by Members of Parliament.

From my experience to date the role of Deputy City Mayor covers a number of important and demanding areas including strategic and organisational leadership of the council; leadership of the city and locality; acting as an advocate and figurehead for the city to internal and external audiences; and being an active and senior member of the council's leadership team.

The role may well evolve and develop further, in response to shifting and new priorities, or in response to new powers which may be devolved to city mayor administrations from central government.

I have attempted here to provide an accurate and clear overview of my formal responsibilities and the day-to-day duties and realities of this job.

Professional Development

If the panel concludes that the role of Deputy City Mayor -- together with the other executive leadership roles -- are full-time and constitute senior and strategic leadership roles within the council and the city, then I believe it to be important that the panel considers making recommendations in relation to our approach to continuing professional development.

We rightly expect the council's senior officers and managers to be appropriately performance managed, to assess their personal development requirements and to undertake relevant professional development opportunities, for both quality of service and leadership, and career progression, reasons. If we see the new political leadership roles as being roles which are professionalised then the same should be required of those of us currently carrying out these roles.

I have always taken my personal professional development seriously. In my first term as an elected councillor (2007-2011) I completed a number of development courses to support me in undertaking new responsibilities as a councillor.

In 2009 I became a graduate of the Common Purpose Leicestershire Matrix leadership course. I have also completed the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) Fast-track Leadership Academy for councillors and the Leadership Centre for Local Government's Next Generation programme.

I have already met the director of City Learning, the city council's professional development and training service, to discuss personal development opportunities relevant to my new role of Deputy City Mayor. In the next few weeks I will be meeting with a senior IDeA peer through the Labour Group office at the Local Government Association. I am also actively exploring under-taking an Executive Leadership MBA course either this year or next

Wider Considerations

Beyond continuing professional development, if the panel concludes that political leadership positions are full-time, are fully professionalised and are senior leadership positions then further recommendations should be considered to align these roles to senior manager roles inside the council. For example, it should be considered that we are given a specified annual leave entitlement and pay for car parking at the council's office building on the same staggered pricing structure in the same way that senior officers and managers do.

Where positions are considered full-time and in effect become the post holder's career then other issues could be considered including pension arrangements and arrangements in the event of loss of office for whatever reason.

I trust that you will share this submission with the panel members for their consideration. I am happy to provide any further information which may be of assistance to the panel, including diary and schedule excerpts. Should you wish to consider a job evaluation exercise for these new roles I would of course be happy to co-operate.

I look forward to meeting with the panel.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rory Palmer', with a stylized flourish at the end.

RORY PALMER
Deputy City Mayor

Enclosures

1. Deputy City Mayor Job Description
2. Letter of appointment from the City Mayor
3. Calendar of ward advice surgeries